U. S. Congress

Appendix

Military Government Association Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on June 13, 1959, the Military Government Association held its 12th annual conference at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D.C.

One of the feature events of the conference banquet was the presentation of the association's distinguished service award to five leaders of the Congress and one former Member of Congress, all of whom have rendered distinguished service on behalf of the national defense and in furtherance of the objectives of the Military Government Association.

The awards were presented by Dr. Eli E. Nobleman, the able national president of the association and a member, for many years, of the professional staff of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. The receipients of the awards, with the remarks of President Nobleman about each, are appended.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Dr. Nobleman about each recipient be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LYNDON B. JOHNSON, senior Senator from Texas, majority leader of the U.S. Senate, member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and chairman of its Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, chairman of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee:

First elected to the 75th Congress in a special election in 1937, Senator JOHNSON was reelected to five successive terms in the House of Representatives. He was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1948, and reelected in 1954.

Senator JOHNSON was elected minority whip in the 82d Congress, minority leader in the 83d Congress, and majority leader in the 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses. As majority leader he is also chairman of the Democratic policy committee, the Democratic steering committee, and the Democratic Conference of the U.S. Senate.

As a member of the Naval Reserve, Senator JOHNSON was the first Member of the U.S. Congress to enter active duty following the outbreak of World War II. He was decorated with the Silver Star by Gen. Douglas MacArthur for gallantry in action over hostile positions in New Guinea.

He has been a firm advocate of adequate military preparedness and a foe of extravagance and waste. His contributions to the national defense of our Nation, as a Member of the Senate, and as chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services are well known.

For your distinguished service on behalf of national defense and in furtherance of the objectives of the Military Government Association, we award you this distinguished service citation.

STYLES BRIDGES, senior Senator from New Hampshire, ranking Republican Member of the U.S. Senate; ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and ranking Republican on its Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee; ranking minority member of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Subcommittee; ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations; and one of the small group of Senators who attend weekly conferences with the President of the United States:

Senator BRIDGES served as a member of the New Hampshire State Public Service Commission from 1930 to 1934. In 1934, he was elected Governor of New Hampshire at the age of 36—the youngest Governor in the country at that time.

On the national scene, Senator BRIDGES was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1936. He was reelected in 1942, 1948, and 1954, and is now serving his fourth consecutive term. During the 80th and 83d Congresses, he served with distinction as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. He holds many other important offices in the U.S. Senate and has served as minority leader and President pro tempore of the Senate.

Senator BRIDGES has served continuously since 1937 as a member of the Senate committee concerned with military matters and has worked tirelessly these many years in the interest of our national defense. More specifically, he has been an outstanding supporter of strong naval and air power and a powerful defense setup. During the years preceding World War II, Senator BRIDGES worked continuously for preparedness and for a militarily strong America, sounding the alarm again and again.

For your distinguished service on behalf of national defense and in furtherance of the objectives of the Military Government Association, we award you this distinguished service citation.

HENRY M. JACKSON, junior Senator from the State of Washington:

Senator JACKSON first entered public life when he was elected prosecuting attorney of Snohomish County at the age of 26. His success as rackets buster paved the way for his election to the 77th Congress in 1940 at the age of 28. He was subsequently reelected to five succeeding Congresses, serving in the House of Representatives with such distinction that he was selected, in 1952, by a national magazine as one of the 10 top House Members on the basis of independence, honesty, and leadership. His career in the House was further highlighted by his membership on the original Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, during which time he joined with the late Senator Brian McMahon in leading the fight for an all-out expansion of our peaceful atomic energy program. He also participated in the crucial decision to proceed with the manufacture of the H-bomb.

Elected to the Senate in 1952, and reelected in 1958, Senator JACKSON serves as a member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Government Operations and its permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, in addition, he is a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and chairman of its Military Applications Subcommittee. As chairman of a Special NATO Scientific and Technical Committee, he first proposed and then steered to realization the new NATO science program of scholarships and advanced research institutions.

Senator JACKSON will soon head a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations which will study the effectiveness of present governmental organizations and procedures for the development and execution of national policy for survival in the contest with world communism.

He is a major, Infantry, USAR, and trains regularly with an organized Reserve unit.

He is our principal speaker this evening.

For your distinguished service on behalf of the national defense and in furtherance of the objectives of the Military Government Association, we award you this distinguished service citation.

Representative CARL VINSON from the Sixth Congressional District of Georgia:

Mr. VINSON first entered public life in 1905, when he became prosecuting attorney for Baldwin County, Ga., serving in that capacity for 3 years. He then served two terms in the Georgia Legislature, serving as speaker pro tempore for 2 years. Thereafter, he was appointed county judge of Baldwin County.

On the national scene, Mr. VINSON was elected to the 63d Congress in 1914. He has since been reelected to 23 consecutive terms in the House of Representatives. He served as chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee from December 1931, through January 1947. He was chairman of the Armed Services Committee in the 81st, 82d, 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses, a position which he continues to fill with great distinction.

Mr. VINSON has devoted his life and his outstanding talents to the defense of our Nation and has held public office for over 50 consecutive years, 45 of which have been in the House of Representatives, where he is the second ranking Member.

For your distinguished service on behalf of national defense and in furtherance of the objectives of the Military Government Association, we award you this distinguished service citation.

Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, from the 17th District of Illinois:

Mr. ARENDS is now serving is 13th consecutive term in the House of Representatives. He has risen to a position of leadership in the House where he is the Republican whip, having been elected to this position in 1944. As party whip, he acts as assistant floor leader on the Republican side of the aisle. He also serves on the Republican policy committee and has an important voice in the determination of party policy on the various measures which come before the Congress. Mr. ARENDS is one of three leaders in the House of Representatives who attend the weekly conferences with the President of the United States.

As ranking Republican member of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. ARENDS has rendered outstanding service to the Nation and in support of our national defense.

He is a veteran of World War I, having served in the Navy and has taken an active interest in Veterans' affairs. Prior to his

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

election to Congress in 1934, Mr. ARENDS was District Commander of the American Legion and continues to be an active Legionnaire.

His interest, hard work, and many contributions to our national defense have long been a matter of public record.

For your distinguished service on behalf of national defense and in furtherance of the objectives of the Military Government Association, we award you this distinguished service citation.

Dewey Short, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower, Personnel and Reserve Affairs:

Mr. Short has had several separate careers. First, he was professor of psychology and moral and political philosophy at Southwestern College in Kansas for 3 years. Thereafter, he occupied the pulpit at Grace Methodist Church in Springfield, Mo.

On the national scene, Mr. Short was elected to the 71st Congress in 1929, serving until 1931. Thereafter, in 1935, he was elected to the 74th Congress from the Seventh Missouri District, serving until 1957, a total of 24 years.

Mr. Short served for 22 years as a member of the House Military Affairs Committee, later known as the Armed Services Committee, and was chairman of that committee during the 83d Congress.

During his service in the House of Representatives, Mr. Short was a delegate to two sessions of the Interparliamentary Union, an official congressional observer at the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty in San Francisco, and a member of the Select Committee for Postwar Policy.

His wisdom, foresight, and tremendous capacity for hard work have contributed much to the defense posture of the United States.

For your distinguished service on behalf of national defense and in furtherance of the objectives of the Military Government Association, we award you this distinguished service citation.

All-Out Medical Offensive Against Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, two excellent editorials in support of an all-out medical offensive against cancer and the other killers and cripplers of mankind have appeared recently in the Washington Post and the Washington Sunday Star.

These publications are to be commended for their excellent and incisive presentations expounding the vital need for a continuous and constantly accelerated fight against diseases and disabilities that cost this Nation millions of lives, untold human suffering, and billions of dollars in lost taxes and workmen's compensation payments yearly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 26, 1959]

SPENDING TO SAVE

The $4 billion appropriation bill passed by the Senate on Wednesday for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare is essentially a conservation measure. Although it exceeds the budget recommendations made by the President, it is in no sense a spendthrift proposal. We hope that when it reaches the White House Mr. Eisenhower will review it not solely in arithmetical terms but in the light of the real congressional concern it reflects for pushing the fight against killing and crippling diseases.

The bulk of the increase over the administration budget recommendations came in the form of added funds for the research programs of the National Institutes of Health. The President would have confined these programs to a total appropriation of $294,279,000. Not long ago the House voted to increase this amount by $50 million. To a distinguished list of nongovernmental experts in the fields of cancer and heart disease and arthritis and mental illness and other scourges of the human family, the budget sum seemed pitifully inadequate. They pleaded with the Senate to raise it dramatically. Spurred by the leadership of Senator LISTER HILL, who argued that people are more important than dollars, the Senate voted to give the Institutes $480 million.

If that sum is finally appropriated, it can pay rich dividends. Research sparked and financed by the Institutes has already won spectacular gains in the war on disease. For example, as Dr. Sidney Farber of Harvard told the Appropriations subcommittee when he testified, "the actual cancer cure rate * * * has changed in the last 3 years from 1 in 4 to 1 in 3." The American Cancer Society estimates that the lives of 75,000 additional Americans could be saved if the latest and best means for diagnosis and treatment for cancer could be made more widely available. Dr. Isidor Ravdin, one of President Eisenhower's physicians and one of the country's leading pathologists, said to the subcommittee: "I cannot accurately predict the future for cancer treatment, I might be so bold, however, to assert that I believe we shall see a vast reduction in the mortality from cancer in the lifetime of the oldest of us here." There is a sort of saving here which is worth the expenditure of some money.

[From the Washington Sunday Star, June 28, 1959]

MEDICAL RESEARCH PAYS

Medical research costs a lot of money—but there is dramatic proof that it pays big dividends, too. It would seem logical that the more money spent on such research, the more lives will be saved and the more the Nation will benefit accordingly. But there is a limit, of course, to the amount which the Government can afford to invest, at this time of growing deficits, in even so important a health program. It is not surprising that there should be differences of opinion on the subject between those concerned with maintaining the financial strength of the Government and those responsible for maintaining the physical and mental strength of the people.

The question of how much to spend during the next fiscal year on scientific studies designed to combat cancer, heart disease and the many other disabling and killing ailments of mankind has come to a head as a result of congressional action to increase health appropriations substantially above the figures recommended by the President—$294 million. The House voted to give the National Institutes of Health $50 million more. The Senate, upon the urging especially of Senators LYNDON JOHNSON and LISTER HILL, approved an increase of $186 million. A conference committee now must resolve the difference between the two appropriation measures.

Meanwhile, administration supporters in Congress have warned of the possibility of a presidential veto of any material increase over the budgeted figures for health. Whatever the final amount agreed to in conference, the increase would add to the Government's fiscal difficulties. And it is the duty of the President to consider the economic welfare of the country as well as the state of its health. However, as Senator JOHNSON told the Senate, medical research has proved profitable from an economic as well as a humanitarian standpoint. He pointed out that it has been estimated that citizens whose lives have been saved by new medicines and techniques during the past 14 years pay Federal taxes annually of about $623 million. Judged from a dollars-and-cents angle alone, the money invested in medical research is, in effect, returning to the Treasury in large amounts each year.

We hope, therefore, that the President will give most serious consideration to all the persuasive arguments for an enlarged research program before deciding whether to approve or veto the bill as it is passed by Congress.

Statement of George J. Burger, Before Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., Washington, D.C., before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, May 14, 1959, relating to Senate bill 1046.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, INC., WASHINGTON, D.C., BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, MAY 14, 1959

I am George J. Burger, vice president, legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business.

We are the largest business organization in the Nation, from the standpoint of directly supporting business and professional enterprisers. Our membership is exclusively among small, independent enterprisers. These people, who are your constituents, and they alone, set our stand on bills and issues by direct, signed ballots which they send to their congressional Representatives on the House side, in our mandate polls. I mention this only to emphasize the fact that what I say here is intended to reflect their collective thinking, just as though they were here to speak for themselves.

I might mention here that the federation is the only independent business organization performing this function for smaller firms and their Congressmen.

Now, we have not polled our members on S. 1046. But we have polled them on three occasions over the past 4 years on earlier bills that touch on the points at issue in S. 1046. The results of these polls are my authority to speak before you on this bill, S. 1046.

For instance, in Mandate No. 215 (September (1955) we polled our members as follows:

S. 662 (Lehman, New York). Extend Federal minimum wage and maximum hour control to larger retail, wholesale, and service firms which operate four or more outlets.

And this is how they voted on this bill:

Following is the national summary of votes cast on issues carried in the Mandate No. 215. This summary has been forwarded to Members of Congress, to members of the permanent Senate Small Business Committee, to members of the House Small Business Committee, to other interested congressional committees, members of administrative government and Government agencies.

[In percent]

	For	Against	No vote
1. Use Robinson-Patman Act to check discounters, co-ops	77	19	4
2. Tax cut on earnings of American firm foreign branches if they resell in the United States	16	79	5
3. S. 2247. Central control of surplus property disposal	82	13	5
4. H.R. 5684. Flat 5 percent excise tax on all manufactured goods	44	50	6
5. S. 662. Extend wage-hour law to larger retail firms	42	54	4

H.R. 585. Federal wage-hour controls: Extend Federal wage and hour controls to all retailers and service establishments (Representative CELLER, New York).

And this is how they voted on this bill:

Here's the national summary of votes on issues in Mandate 235. This has been sent to all Congressmen and Senators, all congressional committees, and all agencies and individuals in the executive branch of our Government for their information.

[In percent]

	For	Against	No vote
1. Cut back other activities to finance guided missile programs	84	12	4
2. H.R. 6027. Tax deductions for losses on business investments	74	22	4
3. Government investigation into discount house price competition	73	22	5
4. H.R. 5826. Congress let Government agencies close down business-type activities as they want	65	22	13
5. H.R. 585. Extend wage-hour law to all retail-service concerns	28	67	5

H.R. 83. $1.25 minimum wage: Require all businesses subject to Federal regulation to pay their employees at least $1.25 an hour, instead of the $1 an hour minimum required now (Representative CELLER, of New York).

And this is how they voted on this bill:

Here's the national summary of votes on issues in Mandate 245. This has been sent to all Congressmen and Senators, all congressional committees, and all agencies and individuals in the executive branch of our Government, for their information.

[In percent]

	For	Against	No vote
1. H.R. 2. Tax allowance for inventory increases	71	25	4
2. H.R. 9. Private retirement plans	76	20	4
3. H.R. 83. $1.25 minimum wage	30	66	4
4. H.R. 99. Reduce Government competition	88	9	3
5. H.R. 63. Permit social security pensioners to earn up to $1,800 yearly in private employment	81	17	2

The results of these polls, none of which evoked an overwhelming "for" or "against", tell us that by and large our members are opposed to (1) wholesale inclusion of all businesses under Federal wage-hour control; (2) expansion of this control to a limited number of larger independent firms; and (3) any further increase in the Federal minimum wage, at least to the $1.25 an hour level.

These results are especially interesting when considered against the background of federation membership. Of course, we have all sizes and types of independent business and professional man operations among this membership. Some of them, for one reason or another, are already subject to Federal wage and hour control. Others are in the category of the larger independents thus far exempt from these controls. Many operate under contracts with labor unions. But by and large the greatest proportion are the smaller-sized independents generally proposed for continued exemption from Federal wage-hour controls.

This might explain the two-thirds vote "against" the proposal for wholesale inclusion of all businesses under Federal wage-hour controls. But it doesn't explain the majorities against the proposals for limited expansion and for the new $1.25 minimum hourly wage, except in the light of these important considerations: That among these smaller independents are many who fear that if their larger brethren go under control now, they may be next, that they fear this is part of a trend that will in time deprive them of necessary freedom of judgment in running their own businesses, and that it amounts to another step in the direction of complete Government controls.

Frankly, I can understand these fears. The history of past years has been one of constantly expanding Federal controls. I do not mean to say that these businessmen have been deprived of their freedoms. I do mean that the controls have become more extensive, to the point where no one can be sure when they will stop spreading.

And let me say that as a former independent businessman, for 25 years the owner and operator of a retail tire firm with six or more in employ, I know what freedom of judgment can mean in the operation of a business, particularly in the field of wages. I can tell you that many times during the depression years I was faced between making across-the-board reductions or of eliminating entirely hard-to-find jobs.

Now, consider these business and professional men federation members. From my own experience, and from observations now and then, I can safely say that most of those who opposed these earlier bills were, and are, paying at least the Federal minimum wage rate, many even more. As practical men they realize it costs money to live, to marry and to raise families. They realize that employees burdened by financial difficulties are not most efficient. They know that to attract and hold the kind of worthwhile employees a good business needs, they have to meet wage-rate competition from other firms, some bound by the Federal standards, others by union contracts. Besides this, due to their size they have to live in intimate daily contact with their employees whom they know as human beings, not as mere statistics on a weekly payroll.

Of course, I don't ignore the fact that there are some who may be paying so-called substandard wages. But I think, and I feel the facts will bear me out, that most in this category are doing so for reasons beyond their control. I know that in my own business, when sales and profits were good, our wages and bonuses were good. But once the giant automobile manufacturers stepped in and snapped up a goodly share of my customers, and once the depression struck, I had to cut, and cut all along the line. Given the opportunity I would have done better, and I think that given an opportunity they would be doing better. Denied the right to private judgment, I might have been driven to the wall. Denied this right, they could be driven to the wall.

Nevertheless, there's no denying the fact that there are, always have been, and likely always will be, a small minority of "chiselers" interested in getting the most for the very least. To the extent employees of these people need protection, it should be given them.

But these protections should not be fashioned in such manner that they act as a deterrent to, or threaten the freedom of, businessmen who are honestly doing their level best to keep afloat and pay the best wages they can.

You know, our system of justice holds that it is better, in terms of legal safeguards, for 99 wrongdoers to escape punishment than it is for 1 innocent man to be convicted unjustly.

I do think it is the sense of our members, based on the polls cited, that this is the principle that should be applied in connection with the basic issues raised in this bill. In order to convict and control the guilty we must not sacrifice, or endanger, the welfare of the innocents. Further, I think the majority of our members, as indicated in these polls, are flatly opposed to any further expansion in these Government controls.

Finally, if it is your desire, as a further aid to this committee we will be glad to make an up-to-date poll of our members on the control expansion feature of this bill (we have already polled them on the minimum wage increase portion), and to advise you of the results as soon as they are recorded.

Pacific Coast High School Students Trail History on American Heritage Association Eastern Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, high school students in our eastern

United States have a distinct advantage over their contemporaries in other parts of our Nation. Because of their relatively close proximity to Washington, D.C., they can enjoy a first-hand lesson in history and government which students in our Western States, like Oregon, can rarely experience.

The American Heritage Association, a nonprofit organization in Oswego, Oreg., has attempted to change this situation for a number of outstanding students in my home State. This year, for the third consecutive year, American Heritage Association tours are bringing high school students from may parts of Oregon and from neighboring Washington and California cities to the East for visits to historical points of interest.

Again this year I have had the pleasure of meeting these students for a question and answer session shortly after their arrival in Washington. Despite the fact that they had just come from a long, cross-country train trip, the students were eager and alert. They posed questions far more penetrating than the average tourist. Indeed, the youths on the AHA tours are not just average tourists. They have spent some time, prior to their departure from Oregon and while en route, studying history and government texts so that their visit here will be the more meaningful. In addition, their time is not spent only in gawking at monuments or tip-toeing through marble halls—far from it.

Through arrangements made by my office, the students have had seminars with officials at the National Park Service, the Organization of American States, and the State Department. They have met with members of their Senate and House delegations in Congress.

From their 8-day visit in Washington, the groups are touring other points of interest in the East before returning home to Oregon. Their activities are well described in an article by Malcolm Bauer in the Christian Science Monitor for June 29, 1959, entitled "Students 'Relive' History on Tour." I ask unanimous consent that this article, together with the names of the 47 students and their 8 chaperones be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STUDENTS RELIVE HISTORY ON TOUR

(By Malcolm Bauer)

PORTLAND, OREG.—Oregon high-school students are studying their American history firsthand this summer in a program that is unique in the West.

The first of two groups has already departed here by rail for a month's tour of the historic spots and metropolitan centers of the East. A second will start before the end of June.

These are the American Heritage Tours, originally organized in Oswego High School in a Portland suburb in the summer of 1957.

An American Heritage Tour is no summer vacation lark for its teen-age participants. Most of them have just finished their junior year in high school, curriculum of which includes American history. In addition, they have prepared themselves in the weeks before departure to appreciate the significance of the places to be visited. Chaperons include teachers and school administrators, at least one to each nine youngsters.

COST SET AT $444

In the beginning, 2 years ago, the tours were for 21 days, 5 of which were spent in the train journey to and from the Atlantic seaboard. This year's tours have been extended 1 week, giving additional time for study. Cost per youngster is $444, a part of which must be earned by the applicant to qualify for selection. All participants must also have a high level of academic and extracurricular achievement.

"We should be proud of these Oregon pioneers," said Felix Calkins, a teacher at Oswego High School and one of the founders of the sponsoring American Heritage Association of Oswego. "Their purposeful approach to learning through traveling was (in the first two seasons) refreshing to those easterners who had seen many groups take routine trips only for the lark they might offer. The fine citizenship displayed by our young men and women made it possible for them to gain even more than they had expected from their itinerary."

The young travelers have been uniformly enthusiastic about their experience. Here are comments typical of those volunteered by Oregon high-school students who have participated:

"We learned so much that can't be found in books."

"The greatest value of the tour lies in its making the tour member feel that he has visited the past and has been close to great Americans who are shaping the future."

"I will never forget the thrill of meeting the Vice President (RICHARD M. NIXON) and shaking his hand."

The 1959 itinerary is a challenge to the most ambitious traveler. It includes:

Eight days in Washington, D.C., and vicinity, including visits to Mount Vernon, Gettysburg, Arlington National Cemetery, and such capital landmarks as the Washington Monument, Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials, the White House, Capitol Hill, the Supreme Court, the National Art Gallery, and the Smithsonian Institution. A moonlight cruise on the Potomac will provide a period of relaxation.

In and around Williamsburg, Va., the students will visit the reconstructed colonial capital, Jamestown Island, and Yorktown Battlefield.

They will visit Richmond to see relics of the Confederacy, and in Philadelphia will spend a day viewing such points of interest as Independence Hall and the Betsy Ross House.

In Massachusetts, the youngsters will explore the roots of U.S. history at Plymouth, Lexington, and Concord. In Boston, they will visit nearly a score of historic places.

BACK IN OREGON

In New York, the young travelers will relax for an afternoon or two with some contemporary history on Broadway. Members of the 1959 tours have tickets for "My fair Lady" and "A Raisin in the Sun." They will visit the United Nations, New York Housing Authority projects, the Federal Reserve Bank, and New York Stock Exchange.

After a day visiting Fort McHenry in Baltimore, the U.S. Naval Academy, and Johns Hopkins University, the students will turn homeward. On the way, they will stop over a day in Chicago to visit the Board of Trade.

Back home in Oregon, which this year is celebrating its 100th year of statehood, the students of the American Heritage Tours will this fall have the means of relating the history of their home State to that of the Union of which it became a part in 1859.

NINETEEN FIFTY-NINE AMERICAN HERITAGE ASSOCIATION TOURS

TOUR NO. 1

Sharon Blomquist, Walla Walla, Wash.; Crystel Bradley, Eugene, Oreg.; Debbie Brewer, Portland, Oreg.; Molly Campbell, Florence, Oreg.; Gayla Collar, Lake Grove, Oreg.; Janet Cousins, Oswego, Oreg.; Rettie Crum, Oswego, Oreg.; Jeanne Deremiah, Oswego, Oreg.; Alice Dickie, Oswego, Oreg.; Marilyn Duke, Oswego, Oreg.; Debby Earle, Lake Grove, Oreg.; Gina Elliott, Oswego, Oreg.; Geri Gainer, Newberg, Oreg.; Susie Geist, Oswego, Oreg.; Thomas Hatch, Portland, Oreg.; Faye Henderson, Florence, Oreg.; Beth Henkle, Lake Grove, Oreg.; Lisbeth Holbrook, Portland, Oreg.; Lisabeth Huff, Oswego, Oreg.; Rosalie Johnston, Oswego, Oreg.; Linda Kiser, Oswego, Oreg.; Bill Lang, Portland, Oreg.; Margo Maris, Portland, Oreg.; Patricia Moll, Astoria, Oreg.; Mary Nelson, Oswego, Oreg.; Beverly Riley, Walla Walla, Wash.; Lynn Rohde, Oswego, Oreg.; Judith Stebinger, Portland, Oreg.; Gretchen Van Orsdel, Lake Grove, Oreg.; Betsy Webb, Oswego, Oreg.; Kent Worsham, Oswego, Oreg.

Chaperones: Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd R. Barker, Portland, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Roy D. Pierce, Milwaukie, Oreg.; Mrs. Joe D. Kiser, Oswego, Oreg., and Mr. Donald R. Brand, Florence, Oreg.

TOUR NO. 2

Barbara Beck, Mapleton, Oreg.; Sandra Bowles, Oswego, Oreg.; Joan Brennan, Portland, Oreg.; Grace Copernoll, Portland, Oreg.; Barbara Finklea, Oswego, Oreg.; Judy Gainer, Newberg, Oreg.; Sue Hall, Longview, Wash.; Don Hogan, Mapleton, Oreg.; Joan Mallon, Lake Grove, Oreg.; Mary Patterson, Portland, Oreg.; Judith Rogers, Portland, Oreg.; Kay Sweet, Orland, Calif.; Linda West, Oswego, Oreg.; Kathy West, Portland, Oreg.; and Tom Wicks, Dorena, Oreg.

Chaperones: Mr. and Mrs. Robert B. Sweet, Portland, Oreg.

A Message for Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on July 4, we will commemorate our country's struggle for independence. Across the land, there will be a wide variety of Fourth of July celebrations.

As a Nation, we have inherited vast reservoirs of rich resources; an idealistic, but also a realistic and practical philosophy of life; the best governmental system in the world; and a climate of freedom in which to seek and obtain our personal and national goals.

Historically, our freedom has been safeguarded not only by eternal vigilance, but also by the willingness of our people to sacrifice to protect that freedom; by a dedication to continuous improvement of our system of Government and climate of opportunity; and by fervent patriotism by which our citizens dedicate their God-given ingenuities and capabilities to meeting the challenges and problems confronting the Nation.

Recently, it was my pleasure to receive a copy of "A Message for Independence Day," by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

As we all appreciate, the life of Mr. Hoover and his work as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has been in itself an example of splendid dedication to service for the country.

I ask unanimous consent to have the message printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MESSAGE FOR INDEPENDENCE DAY

(By J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation)

The American ideal is woven of unfaltering faith in God, of faith in the destiny of this Nation, of heroic battles such as Bunker Hill and Gettysburg and the Marne and Anzio and Iwo Jima. Threaded through the fabric is the patience of Washington, the wisdom of Franklin, the humility and compassion of Lincoln, the integrity of Eisenhower, the courage of an unknown soldier, the vision of Jefferson, and the sacrifice of Nathan Hale.

It is laced with the memory of men's words: "I have not yet begun to fight" and "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."

The American ideal is embodied in our Nation's integrity and honor, and in our homes where respect for the rights of others is taught by precept and example. It is part and parcel of our Bill of Rights, and the constitutional concepts which recognize that all men are created equal.

The American ideal embodies the wisdom, the courage, and the sacrifices of our Founding Fathers. It includes gratitude for our many blessings and a firm resolve to be worthy of them.

Finally, the American ideal has its roots in religion. Without religious inspiration, the American ideal would die. It is the American precept that men shall live as equals under a government by law, which is embodied in the greatest of all laws: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets."

GTA Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the GTA Daily Radio Roundup, prepared by the GTA public relations department, St. Paul, Minn., of June 23, 1959.

There being no objection, the roundup was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP

Congress has passed a good wheat bill, but what will the President do to it and, in the process, to farmers.

That is the big question now in Washington, where farm prices are made. Congress has passed the wheat bill which the House passed last week and the Senate yesterday.

Now this is the big decision the President must make: Does President Eisenhower really mean what he says when he says he is concerned about cutting down on farm surpluses? Or is the President only talking for his Secretary of Agriculture, who wants to cut down on farm price supports and farm income? The President is the only one who can sign (or veto) the wheat bill that will cut production 300 million bushels next year and the year after (1960 and 1961) reduce the cost of the wheat program in 2 years by about $500 million, and at the same time protect the farmer's income by assuring him $2.20 a bushel and payments in wheat surpluses from Government stock on the reduced acres.

This bill is good for both farmers and taxpayers. It cuts surplus—it cuts the cost to taxpayers—and while it does not improve the wheat farmer's income, it at least does not cut it any more. Will the President sign that bill? Or will the President veto the bill, because the Secretary of Agriculture is against any increase in wheat support prices? That's one decision the President cannot duck.

The radio and newspaper men in Washington say it is a foregone conclusion the President will veto the wheat bill. The news reports all say that both President Eisenhower and the Secretary of Agriculture have "repeatedly warned that any measure raising farm price supports, no matter if the surplus is cut and taxes reduced, would be vetoed." It is generally believed, too, that the Secretary of Agriculture wants to use wheat farmers as whipping boys to punish them for backing firm price supports and marketing quotas in the past.

There you have the picture of what is happening in Washington. Headway has been made in the last 30 days since Thatcher of GTA and the Farmers Union told Congress to cut out the alibis and stalling and to report out a good wheat bill. Pass the wheat bill, Congress was told. Don't alibi that the President will veto it. That is his decision to make. Get the votes to override the veto.

Last week the House swung into action. They said it could not be done (the old-time professional politicians) but three new stalwarts, Congressmen MCGOVERN of South Dakota, BURDICK of North Dakota, and ANDERSON of Montana got enough city congressmen to join them to push through the good wheat bill. Then yesterday, in what the newspapers call a gesture of bitter defiance to the Eisenhower administration the Senate passed the House wheat bill (25 percent cut in acres, 90 percent support price, and $35,000 ceiling.)

It went through on a 44 to 40 vote. Again the spring wheat States where GTA farmers operate led with flying colors. It took courage for the Republicans to hold the farmers in the face of powerful administration threats.

Senators LANGER and YOUNG of North Dakota, and MUNDT of South Dakota had courage to defy powerful administration pressure. They stood by their farmers and voted "yes." Defections were Senator CASE of South Dakota and WILEY of Wisconsin.

Republican Senators in other wheat States like Kansas and Nebraska and Colorado caved in to the Secretary of Agriculture. Now the campaign is to get enough votes to pass the wheat bill over the President's veto if he decides to make a mess out of the whole farm program.

Big job for Senators YOUNG and LANGER and MUNDT is to rally more wheat-State Republican Senators to stick with them. The big job in the House is for BURDICK and MCGOVERN and ANDERSON to get even more big-city Congressmen to override the President. Don't be mistaken, this is a big day for wheat farmers in Congress. Bigger than most of us may realize. As M. W. Thatcher said, "This may be the strategic move that will save our farm program." Then we can start building again. In the meantime, remember you have a date on July 23 to vote in the wheat referendum.

Maryland's British Champion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, it was my privilege today to be present at a special luncheon to honor the Maryland boy who recently went over to England to play a little golf against some stiff opposition and returned the British amateur champion. I am referring to Mr. Deane Beman of the great free State of Maryland.

The testimonial luncheon in honor of Deane Beman was sponsored by the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce, the Silver Spring Board of Trade, the University of Maryland and its "M" Club, the Washington Board of Trade, the Terrapin Club, the District of Columbia Golf Association, the Maryland State Golf Association, the Middle Atlantic Golf Association and the Touchdown Club.

In attendance were many notables including both British and American officials. Dr. Wilson Elkins, president of the University of Maryland, where Deane Beman is attending school, spoke briefly.

The menu was as follows:

Melon balls a la tee, breast of chicken a la hazard, string beans with mushrooms a la slice, potatoes a la divot, sherbet a la hook, coffee a la green, and rolls a la putt.

Mr. Frank Emmet gave the invocation. It was as follows:

Heavenly Father, Look down with favor upon this gathering of sports people gathered together through the medium of the great game of golf. Bless them, and forever keep them in the fairways of virtue, and forever keep them from the rough of sin. Look with special favor on our honored guest, Deane Beman, and his angelic wife, Miriam. Keep them together, happy through life. Dear Father, for all here present, I ask, bless us, O Lord, for these and all the gifts which we are to receive from thy bounty. Amen.

Mr. E. K. Morris, president of the Washington Board of Trade, presented a scroll, reading:

DEANE BEMAN, BRITISH AMATEUR CHAMPION

In recognition of his outstanding performance in winning the British Amateur Golf Championship at the Royal St. George Golf Club in Sandwich, England, May 30, 1959, the golfers of the Washington Metropolitan area offer this testimonial of their admiration and pride in his achievement.

By his victory, he has brought honor to the Nation's Capital and its environs and has set an example of successful endeavor and becoming modesty that will be an inspiration to the thousands of young American golfers who will follow in his footsteps on the fairways of the Nation and the world.

Time To Put Warren Court Into Its Proper Function

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, much editorial comment has appeared on the recent modification by the Supreme Court of its decision in the Jencks case. While the modification was encouraging, it is by no means a correction of the many missteps of the Warren Court and should be viewed in its proper perspective. In this regard, I ask unanimous consent that a most realistic editorial, entitled "Time To Put Warren Court Into Its Proper Function," which appeared in the State, a newspaper published in Columbia, S.C., on June 27, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO PUT WARREN COURT INTO ITS PROPER FUNCTION

The New York Daily News has a favorite name for the U.S. Supreme Court—the Warren court. And it's news nowadays, the News says, when the Warren court "upholds an act of Congress, instead of overruling it or finding that it doesn't mean what Congress thought it meant."

In its June 24 issue, the News comments on the Court's recent ruling in the Clinton F. Jencks case and sees a ray of hope that the Court at long last is showing some reaction to the criticism that has been heaped upon it.

"On Monday of this week," the News wrote, "the Warren court—though by divided votes, to be sure—upheld a 1957 act of Congress aimed at undoing some of the damage wrought by the Warren court's decision in the Clinton E. Jencks case.

"In that affair, the Court ruled that Jencks, a union leader convicted of falsely swearing that he wasn't a Red, should have been allowed to see, before his trial, reports on him sent to the FBI by a couple of FBI plants inside the Communist Party.

"This decision obviously threatened the FBI's effectiveness in fighting the criminal Communist conspiracy. Congress made haste to limit strictly the types of pretrial statements of witnesses which persons may inspect.

"Day before yesterday, the Warren court politely obeyed this act of Congress, by upholding convictions of seven assorted characters whose attorneys claimed that they had been unjustly prevented from forcing the prosecutors to tip their hands before trial.

"It looks as if the Warren court is at last properly impressed by the storm of bench, bar, press and everyday-citizen criticism of its long string of pro-Red decisions. That's a gain; but we hope Congress will not assume that a few pullbacks by this Court mean that the tribunal has mended its ways completely."

The News makes a point which the State has made on more than one occasion lately—that any "letting up" by the Court should not be taken to mean that there has been permanent reform. Congress should not be deterred, and the House in its passage of H.R. 3 last week didn't seem to have been affected, we are glad to say, by the recent decisions. This bill "clips the claws which the Warren court stuck out in the Steve Nelson case and has withdrawn only a little way. In that decision, the Court denied the right of States to prosecute subversives plotting against the Government."

The News says, "It's time to stop this trend toward Government by the Supreme Court, and restore the Court to its proper function of interpreting laws instead of making them."

How National Parks Help Tourist Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Astoria Budget is published at the heart of one of the great scenic and recreational areas of the Nation—at the mouth of the majestic Columbia River.

In its issue of June 26, 1959, the Budget has stressed how mighty a boon a national park in the Oregon Dunes could be to the tourist trade along the entire Oregon seacoast, which is one of the most beautiful shorelines in the world.

Declares the Budget editorial, in part:

Anything that draws tourists to any part of the Oregon coast is going to help the whole coast area. We look with favor on this national park project for the same reason the Oregon Coast Association supports the Astoria Bridge.

This reference is to the proposed bridge across the Columbia between Astoria, Oreg., and Megler, Wash. I endorse the bridge, too, Mr. President, and I hope that the Budget's fine editorial is read far and wide by both friends and foes of my Oregon Dunes and Sea Lion Caves National Seashore Park proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that the June 26 editorial from the Budget of Astoria, Oreg., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARKS HELP OUR TOURIST TRADE

Senator NEUBERGER's proposal for a national seashore park along 23 miles of the southern Oregon coast between the Siuslaw and Umpqua has generated a surprising amount of hostility among western Lane County property owners.

Offsetting this, it is noteworthy that one newspaper in the area, the Port Umpqua Courier, is supporting the proposal that on the grounds that creation of the national park would produce an increased tourist business more than compensating for the limited adverse effect on agriculture and loss of taxable property.

The Courier cites figures on attendance at other national parks as evidence.

National parks get national attention, to a far greater extent than do State parks, and hence logically are more likely to draw visitors from all over the Nation.

The Port Umpqua Courier argues that development of the tourist business is needed to develop and balance the economy of the Oregon coast, which has only limited agricultural possibilities and is too dependent on the up-and-down lumber business, its one large industry.

This is sound argument, and it is the reason why we up here in Clatsop County, at the far north end of the coast, are interested in this development down in western Lane County.

Anything that draws tourists to any part of the Oregon coast is going to help the whole coast area. We look with favor on this national park project for the same reason the Oregon Coast Association supports the Astoria bridge.

The Importance of Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, the House Subcommittee on Mines and Mining is holding some very important hearings on our domestic mining industry. We have been hearing expert witnesses from all parts of the United States and from every segment of our mining industry. This morning Mr. Merrill E. Shoup of Colorado Springs, Colo., presented a statement on our gold situation, which I wish to include in my remarks. Mr. Shoup has been connected with the gold mining industry in Colorado for a quarter of a century. He is now president of the Golden Cycle Corp. in Cripple Creek, Colo., and is recognized as an authority on gold. I am sure that the observations of Mr. Shoup will be of intense interest to every Member of the House.

In his statement, Mr. Shoup calls attention to the rapid withdrawal of gold from this country. Our gold reserves have now dropped to below $20 billion which is the lowest point in many years. There is genuine concern over the continuing large exports of gold from the United States, and it is obvious that these stocks must be replenished if we are to maintain sound fiscal policies. The practical way to build up our gold stocks is to encourage the production of gold in this country. We have the gold deposits and the mines with which to produce the gold. Mr. Shoup suggests a program under which our gold mines can resume operations, and again produce the gold which is so vitally needed.

The statement of Mr. Shoup follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Merrill E. Shoup. I reside at 17 Broadmoor Avenue, Colorado Springs, Colo. I am the president and a director of both the First National Bank of Canon City and the First National Bank of Cripple Creek, Colo. I am a director of the First National Bank in Grand Junction and the First National Bank of Colorado Springs; a director of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad; a director and the president of the Golden Cycle Corp. and Holly Sugar Corp., and an executive of other enterprises. I taught economics at Dartmouth College from 1921 to 1922 and was an instructor in economics at Brown University from 1922 to 1924. I subsequently

studied law, then engaged in a general legal practice in Colorado Springs before becoming a corporation executive.

I appear before this fine committee in two capacities: First, and most important, as a patriotic American citizen genuinely concerned with the welfare of our Nation and where it is headed; secondly, as an individual who has been closely associated with the Colorado gold mining industry for more than 25 years, on behalf of the Colorado Mining Association and other similar organizations.

I want to thank the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and his fellow Congressmen for their recognition of the desperate condition in which the domestic mining industry is in today. I am sure you all know that the one-time virile domestic gold mining industry of the United States today is practically nonexistent. The demise of the gold mining industry dates back to the war period immediately preceding the year 1942 and the closing of the gold mines in the United States and Alaska by the provisions of the unnecessary War Production Order L–208, decreed October 8, 1942, from the results of which directive the industry has never recovered. If domestic gold producers were considering only their own sorry plight and the terrific cost to rehabilitate and restore their gold mining properties, they need a bonus of at least $70 per ounce on all newly mined domestic gold or a monetary gold price of at least $100 per ounce, either of which events would raise immediately a lound chorus of objections.

If the monetary gold price were raised to $100 per ounce, the argument immediately would be made that it would be of great aid to Russia. As a matter of fact, the payment of a bonus of $70 per ounce on all newly mined domestic gold could not in any manner help Russia. It would cost about $100 million per year to pay this bonus, which sum, compared to the billions of dollars our Nation has paid out in the past years and will pay in future years in farm subsidies, is insignificant. The bonus payment would aid in the rehabilitation and restoration of the gold mining industry and, in addition, help to carry the costs of producing copper, lead, zinc, and other complex ores of the type which carry a small gold content. The bonus would stimulate gold production, help rebuild our rapidly dwindling gold supply, help restore people's confidence in our continually deteriorating and depreciating dollar, help check our continuing inflation and be to the best long-range economic and financial interest of our people. In addition to the payment of a bonus, the following measures should concurrently be put into effect:

1. Convertibility should be restored. An American statesman, after the Civil War, discussing a return to gold convertibility, once said, "The way to resume is to resume."

2. A free market for gold should be established and the producer permitted to sell his gold either to the U.S. Treasury at $35 per ounce or to any other purchaser at any price he can get. The $70 per ounce bonus should be paid only on newly mined gold sold to the Treasury.

3. Ownership of gold is a private property right which has been taken away from citizens of the United States and should be restored to them at the earliest possible moment.

I turn now to one of the most fundamental issues confronting our Nation, the solution to which must be worked out by the Congress and the administration. I respectfully call your attention to the basic underlying factors vitally affecting our Nation's present and future financial and economic welfare:

1. The U.S. gold stock is at its lowest point in 13 years, approximately $20 billion compared to $25 billion in 1949, and the drain on our gold continues. To date in 1959, it amounts to almost $400 million, during the past 16 months to more than $2,500 million. Of the $20 billion more than $12 billion (the required gold reserves fixed by law to back our currency) is earmarked as the minimum amount necessary. Best available estimates are that from $13 billion to $16 billion are now held in net claims of foreign countries against our gold, which indicates a possible gold deficit against our gold stock of between $5 billion and $8 billion.

2. The ratio of claims (U.S. required gold reserves plus foreign short-term dollar balances) to U.S. gold reserves is now about 145 percent, which shows the greatest deficiency of gold reserves in this country since the end of World War I. Considering our net gold position (the ratio of U.S. required gold reserves plus foreign short-term dollar balances to U.S., gold reserves, or claims to reserves) since the end of World War I, we note the following: gold flowed toward the United States to 1925; away from the United States to 1929; toward the United States until 1934; away from the United States to 1944; toward the United States to 1949; and away from the United States for the last 10 years, or since 1949. Since the end of World War I, total claims on the U.S. gold reserve have exceeded U.S. gold reserves only during 1927–29, in 1944 and 1953–59. Today's excess of 45 percent of claims over gold reserves holds the record of deficiencies; the year 1934, when claims were only 41 percent of reserves, holds the record on the plus side. The outflow of gold contracts credit, thus raising interest rates and depressing bond prices.

3. Gold, the basis of all good money, both historically and in the world of today, has been taken from our gold reserve by foreigners in record amounts since the end of 1957 because foreigners apparently consider our $35 selling price as a great bargain. If no further gold drain to foreigners from our Treasury occurs, our additional contribution of $344 million in gold to the International Monetary Fund will shortly reduce our gold reserves to about $19.8 billion and at the same time raise foreign claims on our gold reserves to about $18 billion. Should the gold drain then progress, we will shortly see our reserves to be insufficient even to meet foreign claims.

4. We continue to permit foreigners to buy our gold at the bargain price of $35 per ounce, while this same right is denied to American citizens.

5. No one in our national administration will admit that our national financial and fiscal policy is one of giveaway, but the fact remains that we have continued to lose gold since 1949 despite the fact that the United States during this period has continuously exported more goods and services than she has imported.

6. Americans now are burdened with taxes approximating 37 percent of their income. Our Nation's debts and guarantees amount almost to the unbelievable sum of $600 billion. Our Government is having difficulty to sell its long-term bonds to the public. Americans appear to be moving from the dollar into the stock market in an apparent attempt to hedge against inflation, and, as above pointed out, foreigners continue to buy our gold at what they no doubt consider a bargain price—$35 per ounce, all of which continues to feed the fires of inflation. Russia appears to have substantial gold reserves, is a substantial gold producer, and it is now well known that a gold ruble for use in external trade is very high in Khrushchev's plans, that this ruble can be backed by Russia's large gold horde which, at this time when U.S. gold stocks are down and rapidly declining further, may seem to Moscow to be the propitious time to enter a gold ruble into competition with the deteriorating American dollar which can lead to the ruble displacing the dollar as the No. 1 currency in international trade and relegate the United States to a secondary power insofar as world commerce is concerned.

7. Our high taxes cannot be raised higher. The Treasury is having difficulty in selling bonds even at historical bargain prices; and paper money has been issued in amounts to depress its value. U.S. Government bonds are now at new historic low prices which means that everyone, individual and institution, who bought a government obligation at any time over the years now has a substantial loss.

Because the gold problem has become so vitally important to the present and future welfare of our Nation, we respectfully urge your committee at the earliest possible date to ask that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee call public hearings and take prompt action using all its congressional powers to restore our dollar to its one-time high leadership which, if it is not done, will mean the American citizens can unconfidently look forward to—

(a) The further deterioration and decline in the purchasing power of the American dollar;

(b) The loss of billions of dollars in income and principal to persons dependent for their livelihood upon income from pensions, savings, retirement funds, life insurance, bonds and preferred stocks with a fixed return and other similar assets;

(c) The further worsening of our trade balances with an increasingly greater loss to our American producers who, because of increasing inflation and cheaper dollars, are finding it increasingly difficult to compete with foreign Nations. This inevitably must lead to greater imports, smaller exports, curtailment of industry, less employment and detriment and loss to our entire economic system;

(d) Increasing difficulties for the U.S. Treasury to finance and refinance our huge Government debt and to higher interest costs and all other attendant difficulties.

I am indebted to my friend and associate, B. Barret Griffith, of Colorado Springs, Colo., one of the Nation's foremost gold and monetary students for his help in assembling data for this statement.

I could discuss the gold problem and its effect upon the lives and happiness of our people for hours, but the committee has many other witnesses to be heard, and I thank you for your courtesy and patient attention.

Investigations Are Useful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizens Patriot of June 29, 1959:

INVESTIGATIONS ARE USEFUL

Do investigations by congressional committees really do any good? Are all those junkets to faraway lands at public expense truly necessary?

These questions frequently are asked, and Representative GEORGE MEADER, of the Mich-

igan Second District, now uses the results of one investigation to supply the answers.

Mr. MEADER has done much traveling around the world as a member of the Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations which recently reported on the foreign aid program in Laos. The Congressman points to the results of the investigation and says:

"That the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration (in charge of foreign aid) followed our report with 45 pages of comment admitting existence of some deficiencies and promising improvements.

"That the case of Edward T. McNamara, who received $13,000 in bribes from contractors, is in the hands of the Department of Justice which has the additional advantage of sworn testimony taken by the subcommittee.

"That the chairman of the subcommittee, together with other members, appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House summarizing our inquiry and suggesting amendments to the foreign aid program in an effort to tighten up its administration. Some were incorporated in the bill and reported to the House floor.

"That the chairman of the subcommittee, supported by other members, submitted still other amendments on the floor of the House in addition to those accepted by the committee.

"And that, perhaps most important, information developed by the subcommittee and included in its report was available to other Members of Congress; was utilized during the debates and thus forms a part of the knowledge upon which legislative decisions are made."

Mr. MEADER certainly makes a good case, if one really is needed, for the investigations and the junkets.

Much of the criticism of the committee comes from persons who would like to see Congress keep its fingers out of the administrative branch of Government. Their strategy is to confuse the issue by belittling the investigative procedures.

The case of wasteful foreign aid spending in Laos shows why these critics of Congress are so anxious to succeed—and why they must fail.

How Travel and Communication Taxes Discriminate Against Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the grievous disappointments over the conference report on Federal excise taxes was the elimination from the Senate bill of the repeal of the 10 percent levies on passenger travel and on telephone and telegraph service.

These proposals were particularly important to us of the Pacific Northwest. The travel tax repeal was sponsored by the able Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the telephone and telegraph repeal was sponsored by the eminent Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

Let me express why we of the Northwest have such a stake in these proposals. The Pacific Northwest is located some 3,000 miles from the governmental, industrial, and commercial citadels of the United States. This imposes upon our people in business and industry the need for extensive journeying across the continent, as well as for many telephone calls and telegrams to such places as Washington, D.C., and New York City. We suffer disproportionately from these particular taxes.

A thoughtful editorial which analyzes these levies was published in the Coos Bay World of June 26, 1959. The author of the editorial is Mr. Forest W. Amsden, executive editor of the World, which is published in the seacoast lumbering community of Coos Bay, Oreg. The title of Mr. Amsden's editorial is "Repeal of Two U.S. Taxes." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPEAL OF TWO U.S. TAXES

A possibility exists that the 10-percent Federal tax on passenger tickets (rail, air, and bus) may be repealed almost immediately and that the 10-percent tax on telephone and telegraph service may be repealed in about a year.

The U.S. Senate passed a bill yesterday extending many war-caused excise taxes, due to expire at the end of this year. The Senate, however, adopted amendments which would do away with the passenger and communication taxes. The House passed the bill earlier, without the repeal amendments. Observers believe the House will refuse to go along with the Senate version, although there is much pressure being brought by transportation and communications firms to do so.

It would be conducive to increased travel, telephone, and telegraph use if the repeals stick.

However, Congress and the administration must also look to the loss in revenue in a precariously balanced budget, and this is a telling factor. President Eisenhower recommended that both taxes be continued. If they aren't, his narrowly balanced budget for the next fiscal year will quickly become a deficit—on paper at least.

These taxes were instituted during the Korean war to help pay for that conflict. They were patterned after similar—but twice as heavy—taxes use to increase revenue and hold down travel and line overloading during World War II.

The most potent argument being used for repeal now is that the Korean war is long over. The measures were instituted to help pay the cost of that conflict. They were temporary. How come they are being continued again, 7 years afterward?

The answer is that almost all taxes are temporary, instituted for the duration of some emergency. Seldom are they repealed or allowed to lapse. And the temporary argument being used to end transportation and communication taxes applies just as effectively against the other temporary revenues—against corporate profits and liquor—which would be continued by the same measure which seeks to stop the two taxes under discussion.

Still, it cannot be denied that repeal will be beneficial for the public—who pays the tax—and for the companies, who presumably would be helped through increased use of their facilities.

Nor is there any reason to fear the tax cut would be quickly added onto prices, making a 10-percent revenue hike for the companies. Fares and tariffs are regulated by either Federal or State agencies. The benefit, this time, will go to the consumer or user and not to the owners.

If the revenue loss estimates are not too prohibitive, the taxes should be dropped.

The Senate amendment to the extension bill should be likewise adopted by the House of Representatives.

White Man Found Guilty of Assault of Negro Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, from time to time the critics of the South have alleged that there is a double standard of justice for the white and the colored races in the South. Much attention and publicity was focused on a recent criminal trial in Jacksonville, Fla. The result in Jacksonville was one of the many examples that disproves such allegations. The result of the Jacksonville trial was not an isolated incident. Although there was no national publicity attending it, a very similar trial took place in Beaufort, S.C., this week. It was the trial of a white man for the rape of a colored woman. The verdict of the jury was guilty without recommendation of mercy, which verdict carries a mandatory death sentence. I ask unanimous consent that the report of this trial which appeared in the June 30 issue of the Greenville News, a newspaper in Greenville, S.C., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITE MAN FOUND GUILTY OF ASSAULT ON NEGRO WOMAN

BEAUFORT.—A 19-year-old white marine private was convicted here Monday in the rape of a 47-year-old Negro woman.

The all-white jury did not recommend mercy, making the death sentence mandatory.

The marine, Fred Davis of Atlanta, will be sentenced Tuesday by General Sessions Judge J. Henry Johnson.

If he should be executed, it would be the first recorded case of the execution of a white man for raping a Negro woman in the United States.

CHARGE IS DENIED

Davis, an electrician at the Marine air station here, denied the assault charge in testifying in his own behalf. He said the woman consented.

Sheriff J. E. McTeer testified, however, that Davis admitted attacking the woman. The sheriff quoted Davis as saying he sometimes had "an overpowering sex urge and got pleasure out of using force with women."

The victim also testified.

She said he dragged her into some bushes near the National Cemetery here and attacked her.

Several law officers, including a military policeman, testified for the prosecution.

Their testimony was to the effect that two Negro boys saw the attack. When Davis spotted the boys, the officers testified, he ran and the boys followed.

The military policeman, W. R. Hartley, said Davis asked for help, insisting the boys were following him.

Further investigation disclosed the attack on the woman, the officers testified.

Miles Randall and E. F. Sineath, Beaufort police officers, and Deputy Sheriff C. E. Bessinger, Jr., corroborated the sheriff's testimony that Davis admitted attacking the woman.

Davis also admitted, the sheriff said, that he attempted to attack two women in his native Atlanta but their screams scared him away. The officer said the two cases are being checked out in Atlanta.

McTeer said the case is the first in his 33 years as a sheriff that a white man has been charged with raping a Negro woman.

McTeer said Davis' mother lives in Atlanta, but his father is dead.

DELIBERATE OVER HOUR

The jury deliberated an hour and 10 minutes.

Beaufort is an old, coastal South Carolina town of 5,000 about midway between Charleston, S.C., and Savannah, Ga. The Parris Island Marine Recruit Depot is nearby.

The prospective jurors were asked by the judge and Solicitor Randall Murtaugh if they objected to capital punishment. Some were discharged when they said they did.

Ben Carter, defense attorney, disqualified five Negro men and two white men from serving on the jury.

Meanwhile, a 20-year-old Negro, Israel Sharpe, is to be tried in the same court Tuesday on a charge of attempted rape of a white woman. He is charged with attempting an attack on the wife of a marine.

The Spenders' New Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Green Bay Press-Gazette of June 15, 1959:

THE SPENDERS' NEW LINE

One of our most interesting political developments during this relatively uneventful nonelection year has been the emergence of a new line of reasoning on the part of those who want the Federal Government to spend, spend, spend no matter what the circumstances or the time. For the first time in our memory the politicians, editorial writers, cartoonists, and other distributors of the spenders' philosophy are openly ridiculing the very idea of a balanced budget, of economy in any shape or form. The new war cry is that we as a Nation are not realizing our economic potential—whatever that is—and it is usually added or implied that Russia is beating us in this respect. Advocates of holding down the size of the Federal budget are pictured as unimaginative old fogies clinging blindly to outmoded economic dogmas; the implication is made that any effort to save the taxpayers a dime will result in a failure to meet the needs of the Nation in such fields as education, housing, defense, and so on.

Since the spending mania infected us during the early years of Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration the excuse always has been that we have been facing an emergency of one kind or another requiring us to temporarily abandon good fiscal habits. During the depression it was argued that it was cruel and inhuman to worry about balanced budgets while people were actually suffering from want. This point of view won the support of a large majority of the American people, and properly so. Then came war, when the only goal was victory at whatever cost; again the American people rightfully threw overboard any thought of fiscal prudence in the face of the dictators' terrible threat.

After the war the spenders began to have trouble finding emergencies on which to peg their pleas for keeping the Federal Treasury's spigots open. The cold war in Korea, the recessions of 1949 and 1958, sputnik and the opening of the missile age offered them temporary alibis, but they obviously longed for the good old days of the great depression and the great war when they could shout down timid suggestions for economy in the name of humanity and patriotism.

As the year 1959 dawned, the spenders were up against it; they had no emergencies left. The Nation's economic system had shown itself disappointingly robust and was bouncing back from the 1958 recession with such speed that some economists began worrying about a runaway boom; the people's incomes were higher than ever and despite some pockets of unemployment (caused chiefly by geographic dislocation) more people had jobs at higher pay than ever before; a half-hearted attempt to exploit the missile gap was effectively answered by a soldier-President and his military advisers. Thus the spenders had to come out in the open and admit that they want spending anytime, every time and all the time; spending for its own sake, for the blessings it bestows on those who do the spending and, above all, for the votes it garners.

It is a frightening thing to behold men in high public office argue that we must vote a badly unbalanced budget at a time when we are more prosperous than ever before, when our military budget already is the greatest of any nation in history, when taxes are bringing in the greatest revenue ever received by any government in peacetime, when State and local budgets are straining to the breaking point because of the overwhelming pressure of Federal taxation on our citizens. Even the great Lord Keynes, the patron saint of the spenders, knew better than to advocate such measures; while he argued for heavy pump priming during hard times he argued just as hard for balancing it with budget austerity in good times.

The spenders' enthusiasm for their new credo has reached the point of arrogance, and on occasion of ridiculousness. When the President recently advocated an increase in the rate of interest on Government savings bonds which, of course, would put an upward pressure on all interest rates and thus discourage individuals and companies from borrowing, he was not only assaulted with the now familiar cries of "inhumanity" and "callousness," but Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, shouted that this was an inflationary move. The only thing with which we can compare Representative PATMAN'S statement is George Orwell's "1984," in which "black is white, good is evil, slaves are free."

Yet obviously the spenders feel they can go this far with impunity and the reason, of course, is the victory they won last November. The people voted for spending, and spending they are going to get, with no more nonsense about emergencies or humanitarianism or patriotism, but just because spending is wonderful and come on, boys, get your share before someone else gets it.

First National Bank of Boston Celebrates 175th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on July 5, 1959, the oldest chartered commercial bank in the United States, the First National Bank of Boston—originally chartered as "The Old Massachusetts National Bank"—celebrates its 175th aniversary of its establishment.

Throughout the decades and generations this banking institution has served in a progressive manner to become as it is now, a very important part of New England economy, us well as the economy of our Country.

While it is the oldest banking institution of its kind in our country, it has always kept young in spirit and service by the unusual ability and understanding leadership of a banking institution in the life of State and Nation.

Among its officers and depositors in its early days are many historic figures. Throughout its long history First National of Boston has always through its officers viewed their responsibilities with vision and forward-looking minds.

The present officers of First National of Boston, under the leadership of president Lloyd D. Brace, are carrying on in the highest traditions of the past, looking to the future with sound vision.

I congratulate First National of Boston on its 175th anniversary, confident that this outstanding bank will continue to serve for countless of decades to come in the advancement of the economy of Massachusetts, New England and our country.

In the Sunday Boston Globe of June 28, 1959, appeared an informative article on the 175th anniversary of First National Boston, written by Charles L. Whipple, which I am pleased to include in my insertion of remarks:

HUB BANK OLDER THAN UNCLE SAM—AMUSING, STARTLING, QUAINT STORIES MARK THE PATH OF FIRST NATIONAL OF BOSTON, AMONG WORLD'S BIGGEST

(By Charles L. Whipple)

The oldest chartered commercial bank in North America celebrates its 175th birthday July 5—and thereby hangs a tale of total resources of $1,885,424,084.89 that are still growing.

The bank, of course, is the First National Bank of Boston—until 1903, "The Old Massachusetts" National Bank.

One might expect such a bank to be stuffy. It's not—all the way up from Frank Jacobson of 98 Hemenway Street who answers questions down on "A floor" where thousands cash checks daily, to President Lloyd D. Brace.

What makes this oldest of old banks also the most active in developing new services?

The answer seems to lie in a tradition of such innovations, as well as in Brace's fostering of a pioneering atmosphere.

Consider these examples:

"The First" once shipped New Bedford's whale oil for the street lamps of Paris, changed the size of its currency notes to fit the billfold of its president, and was the first institution to put silk thread in banknotes to foil counterfeiters.

That was many years ago.

But today more than 40 percent of this bank's revenue from loans comes from types that did not exist only 25 years ago.

For example, its "First Check-Credit," the revolving personal plan plan of borrowing by writing a check, has been adopted, with permission, by more than 125 banks across the country since it started in 1956.

You don't have to be a Harvard man, or a sixth generation Bostonian, to go places with this bank, for the old Boston institution is basically run by non-New Englanders.

Brace himself comes from Lincoln, Nebr. Of five senior vice presidents, only two are original Bay Staters, while one comes from Russia, another from Canada, and one from Brooklyn.

"We're all aware that all bankers are considered stuffy," said Brace, a tall, youthful-looking executive, "but it's not true of our gang in here, nor of our broad-minded and courageous, forward-looking customers."

"We're not adventurers," he added. "We're not going off on a tangent without thought. But we do use independence of thinking by our people—a calculated plan and approach."

One of his 54 vice presidents, Ephron Catlin, Jr., put it another way:

"We make a point of doing the unusual. A great deal of leeway is allowed to the officers. Loan officers can make loans up to the legal limit. Mr. Brace encourages the maximum use of abilities without too much supervision. Other banks are much more strict."

Then he added with a chuckle: "The only thing you can't do here is to make a bad loan."

That's a far cry from the bank's early days, when one black ball in a box of white ones was enough to turn down a would-be borrower.

Five years older than the United States of America, the bank acquired its first home when it bought for $4,000 the Manufactory House, a brick structure on the northerly corner of what is now Hamilton Place, at Tremont Street.

When its charter was signed, the Governor put a no-fooling John Hancock on it, for that was his name.

There were 107 original stockholders, 10 of them women, including Abigail Quincy.

Paul Revere was an early customer.

James Bowdoin, scientist, philosopher, and twice Governor, was its first president.

Col. Thomas Dawes, cousin of Paul Revere's famed companion, adapted the brick structure from a school where use of the spinning wheel was taught to a banking house. For $55, 30 chairs or stools were bought—the kind one associates with Dickens.

Two iron chests were bought for $15 and $26.32 to keep the money in, and the bank still has one of them. Dawes rigged up an elaborate gadget to lower them into the basement every night for security.

The bank's light bill on opening was $1 for "candles."

The first international deal of "The First"—which today ranks among the world's leading international banks—was the import of an iron fence from Russia, for "at or under £120."

Boston had 17,000 people that year, and they had just voted not to make the town a city. The day's first deposits were $26,429.21. The Bank of North America in Philadelphia was the country's only other bank at the time, and gave help to the Massachusetts, as well as giving it its first cashier, Samuel Osgood, at $1,000 a year.

In those days Boston exported rum, salt pork, dried cod, and barrel staves, but shrewd Yankee merchants were already trading over the seven seas.

An early bank customer was Margaret Magee, wife of one of the first captains to go to the northwest coast.

Another, says the bank's official history, was "Thomas Brattle of Cambridge a gentleman who appears to have found the bank's insistence that loans be repaid on time not particularly to his liking."

Stephen Higginson was the merchant who exported whale oil for Parisian street lights, long before Standard Oil thought of the lamps of China.

Loan delinquents in those days found their names posted in a prominent place.

The interest rate was always 6 percent. Loans were from $100 to $3,000.

Until the Constitution was ratified in 1789, the unit of currency was the Mexican dollar.

The bank produced its own money from a hand rolling press. Its plates came from Robert Scott, who later became engraver to the U.S. Mint.

One early president had a favorite wallet, but to carry bills of the ordinary size he had to fold them. The answer was simple: He changed the size of an entire issue of banknotes.

The man who put silk threads into banknotes was John James Dixwell, president from 1847 to 1874. His brother in Calcutta sent him a lot of colored silk threads, and to beat the counterfeiters (the penalty for counterfeiting in 1787 had been cutting off one's right ear) he mixed them with the paper pulp for the banknote paper.

Dixwell was also the man who saw through a telescope from his Jamaica Plain home the Great Boston Fire of 1872, thought it would reach the bank which was then on Devonshire Street, and so ordered one of the Nation's earliest moves of big money.

Teams of oxen, at $50 a trip, lugged a heavily guarded $7 million in cold cash to a house in Pemberton Square. There it stayed under guard for 2 days and 2 nights. The fire never reached it there. But then the flames never reached the bank on Devonshire Street, either.

Through wars, panics, and other storms the bank went on growing. The 20th century began with John W. Weeks, later Senator and Secretary of War, installed as president.

Then in 1903 the Old Massachusetts purchased the First National Bank of Boston, and took its name. Later it took over 7 others, and today includes 60 banks, 59 of which it took over.

Today it is Boston's and New England's largest bank, holding a fifth of the total deposits of all New England banks, and more than half the total deposits of all Boston banks.

But let's not be parochial. It's also one of the leading banks in the world, capable of standing up and being counted along with what remains of the reputation of The Old Lady of Threadneedle Street.

But despite its age and its assets, it reminds one of a woman, always coming up with new ideas and proud that it remains young.

Such ideas, for example, as its installation last year of the largest electronic data processing machine of any bank in the world.

It processes in minutes all checks and statements that used to take days and lots of manpower—more than 100 employees, all of whom, by the way, now have other jobs in the ever-growing bank.

The data processing system has replaced at the 67 Milk Street headquarters, what was once the largest bookkeeping bank operation under one roof anywhere in the world.

"The new system makes errors once in a great while," said one bank official, "but it catches them itself a lot quicker than we used to."

And then, besides the bank's international branches started 40 years ago, particularly in Latin America, there are the 25 branches in Boston, downtown and uptown.

" 'The First' has done more new things in the last 20 years than any other bank," says Catlin, matter of factly.

"It's just the most progressive bank in the country."

He lists among the other chief innovations the first check-credit loan plan already mentioned, its being the only major bank that does a big factoring business, one of the five principal factors in the country, and its use of the registered check.

The bank officers responsible for the four chief innovations were born in Russia, Copenhagen, London—and Fitchburg, Mass.

"A great many of our vice presidents come from outside New England," says Catlin.

"A lot come to college here and stay. Mr. Brace cames from Lincoln, Nebr.

"There is something about the human mix here that gives us all ideas.

"Contrary to some people's opinion, our bank's main business is in the Boston area of New England," Catlin adds.

"Three-fourths of our business is local."

Its loans run around a billion dollars outstanding, nine-tenth of it in this country, where it has 4,000 employees with another 1,600 abroad.

Deposits run about $1.6 billion. There are 90,000 savings accounts in this area, 60,000 borrowers, and more than 100,000 checking accounts, a little less than 80,000 of them regular ones.

So the bank is big, and some people occasionally get wrong ideas about it. Some think, for example, that it owns or controls the Boston Herald-Traveler. It does not.

Does it mix in politics? Says Catlin:

"Our policy is to stay out of politics, but to offer the benefit of the bank's financial thinking to solve the problems of the Commonwealth for either political party."

Catlin cites as an example of swaying with the tide the setting up of a special department to handle so-called growth stocks and make loans to research companies.

Recently the bank took 54 presidents of these firms to a 3-day meeting in Sturbridge, recognizing their importance to the area's economy as well as to the bank.

A leading figure in this field is the bank's real estate expert, senior vice president William F. Keesler. Another senior vice president, Serge Semenenko, is a story all by himself, too.

But perhaps the real story of "The First" is told by the tellers and the bank guards down on A floor below the vaulted offices of the executives.

Down there, for example, 21 tellers cash as many as 8,000 checks within 2 hours on a busy day.

Guard Eddie Walsh, of 102 Center Street, North Easton, and executive assistant Richard Corcoran, of 29 Coyne Road, Waban, say sometimes the huge hall is choked with persons of all types, yet the ruffled temper is rare.

But perhaps the best story about "The First" is told by Matthew T. Hoevy, of 750 Saratoka Street, East Boston, chief guard at the main bank.

"It was just after I came here in 1931," he says, "when the bank holiday ended after Roosevelt's inaugural. A little old guy tried

to get in at 1 Federal Street, said he wanted to open a bank account.

"We asked him what kind and he said, 'Either savings or checking.' How much did he have? 'Something fabulous,' he said, '$7,000 in cash. I just drew it out from my bank.'

" 'What bank was that?' we asked him, and he said, 'Oh, the First National Bank over on Hanover Street.'

" 'But this is the same bank,' we told him.

" 'Oh, no,' he said. 'My money will have more security here in a bigger building.' "

Which only goes to show that you just can't blow out the candles on the First National Bank of Boston, 175 years old.

Letter to Time Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 29, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, Mr. Ed Hiles, executive vice president of the Georgia Savings & Loan League, Inc., Atlanta, wrote a note to Time magazine in which he requested Time to discontinue his subscription. This note resulted in a reply from Miss Gwyneth Kahn of the Time magazine staff in which she promptly concluded that the reason for this discontinance was the editorial policy of Time on the question of integration. I commend to you Mr. Hile's reply to this letter from Time. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the letter herewith:

MAY 6, 1959.

Miss GWYNETH KAHN,
Time Magazine,
Rockefeller Center,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MISS KAHN: It was good of you to take the time to write as you did on April 10 in reply to the scribbled note in which I requested discontinuance of my Time subscription.

Your letter, however, only serves to emphasize the primary reason for my decision. I do not believe my note made any reference to the school integration problem in any manner whatsoever, yet in replying to it you have promptly concluded that that was the source of my discontent with your editorial policy.

I have been a Time subscriber ever since I graduated from college and entered the business world which has been since 1937.

I do not recall in all those years any instance which Time magazine has attempted to give its readers a fair and unbiased picture of the South and the many constructive things which have been done to erase the heritage of bitterness and prejudices which were bound to be a natural aftermath of that tragic conflict which pitted brother against brother in this country.

It may surprise you but I hope will interest you to know that I was born and reared in Cumberland County, N.J., on a dairy and produce farm. In the first and second grades at Haleyville, N.J., grammar school I shared one of the old-style double school benches and desks with a pigtailed girl whose skin was as black as coal. During my freshman and sophomore years at Port Norris, N.J., high school, the occupant of the desk next to mine was a young man from a Negro family who lived at the "Shellpile," a colored settlement near Bivalve, N.J., occupied almost exclusively by families who earned their livelihood shucking oysters.

I have no reason to believe that life since that time has been any more fruitful for them nor any less fruitful for me because of this early relationship.

The relationship existed, however, under longstanding established customs of social and human relations in the area.

These customs have never existed throughout the South and as long as human beings are what they are, I am of the rather firm belief that such customs cannot be legislated into existence.

I have resided in the South for the past 26 years and until the entrance upon the scene of the NAACP, the colored people of the South were enjoying a gradual but very sound advancement in both living standard and living conditions through a mutual understanding between the two races of the many and complex problems which had to be overcome.

The race-baiting activities of the NAACP coupled with the grossly unfair editorializing such as displayed by Time magazine and other northern publications have virtually put an end to a very commendable record of progress through cooperation and have restored hatred, bitterness and demagogism on both sides.

While it is the good citizens of the South, both black and white, who are being made the immediate pawns in a game of political hypocrisy, it is this great Nation of ours which is destined once again to be the ultimate victim.

Very truly yours,

ED W. HILES.

Resolution of Reserve Officers' Association on FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, one of the most patriotic organizations in our country, has recognized that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is being subjected to a storm of unjust criticism from subversive and uninformed groups. The Reserve Officers Association on June 26 adopted a resolution expressing wholehearted support for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, its director, agents, policies, and operations. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the U.S. Department of Justice is under unjust criticism from subversive and uninformed groups and individuals; and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation is the only authorized civilian agency of the Government of the United States to make investigations relative to the internal peacetime security of this Nation and to protect this Nation from enemy within; and

Whereas these subversive attacks have been made against the person of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, as well as the membership of the FBI, with intent to smear and belittle this patriotic and high-charactered organization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, assembled in conference this 26th day of June 1959, at Denver, Colo., does hereby support wholeheartedly and without reservation, the leadership of Director J. Edgar Hoover, the agents, the policies, and the operations of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in its correlated activities in the defense of our country; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the U.S. House, the Attorney General of the United States, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the members of the Appropriations and Armed Forces Committees of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives.

REAR ADM. LEON J. JACOBI, USNR,
National President, Reserve Officers Association of the United States.
COL. JOHN T. CARLTON, USAR,
Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

Top-Ranking Government and Military Leaders Join in Paying Tribute to Congressman Dan Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include herein the articles which concern the testimonial dinner given in honor of our beloved colleague DAN FLOOD in his hometown—which I had the honor to attend, together with our most able Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, and Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois. The affair, which was sponsored by various citizen groups, was a most outstanding one and paid high tribute to their Representative in the Congress:

[From the Editor's Page on station WILK, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., June 4, 1959]

There will be a local event on Saturday evening, June 6, which has considerable bearing on the story of Israel. I mean the dinner which is being given to our Congressman, DANIEL J. FLOOD, in recognition of his special services to his community. The public gathering will take place this coming Saturday evening at 6 o'clock, at the Wilkes College Gymnasium on South Franklin Street. The sponsors represent the entire community, and this is exceptional.

It is not often that a political figure can raise his community above the partisan prejudices of political rivalries. When a man appears who can do that, who can inspire all factions to embrace him with respect, admiration, and pride, then truly that man deserves that his neighbors should seek an opportunity to do him honor. Such a man is DANIEL FLOOD. All kinds of people, groups, and organizations have come together to have a part in this public demonstration of their regard for their Congressman.

DANIEL FLOOD has been a hard-working Congressman. The term "public servant," at times carelessly used, is a faithful description of this man. He has devoted himself to the service of the people he represents. In him is reflected the literal preciseness of the meaning of the name "House of Representatives." In that House he is the ideal Representative.

Among the residents of Luzerne County, Congressman FLOOD does not know any "important" people. Neither is he acquainted with any "common" people. All the people belong to him, and he understands that he belongs to all. He works zealously and with spirit for any cause or proposition bearing on the interests of any of his people, the only price for his advocacy being that he must believe it to be in the right.

His interest in Palestine came early in his congressional career. As far back as 1945 he sponsored in the House, in collaboration with Senator Taft in the Senate, a concurrent resolution, expressing the sympathetic interest of the Congress of the United States in the hopes and aspirations of the Jewish people for Palestine. He has been a consistent, articulate, and intelligent supporter of Israel.

In both Houses of Congress there are now a great many who recognize that Israel is the only stable, dependable, democratic nation in an area of tyranny, instability, dictatorship, and feudalism. Congressman FLOOD is one of those who understand that only Israel and Turkey can be counted as friends of the West in that region. But, Congressman FLOOD was among the first to understand it. As long ago as 1946, DANIEL FLOOD's interest in Israel was recognized by the local Zionist organization, when arrangements were made to plant a forest of trees in the Holy Land, in his honor. The certificate bearing witness to this distinction occupies a place of prominence in the Congressman's office.

Now that the entire community joins together to rejoice in him, it is timely for these matters to be recalled. They are important in themselves, for the idealism and devotion of Congressman FLOOD and others who joined him in helping to create the new nation of Israel, but in this context they also are useful in demonstrating the human sympathies and the sense of justice which Congressman FLOOD possesses in such abundant measure.

May this community continue to have pride and profit in him for as long as we deserve him.

CONGRESSMAN'S DAY—FLOOD WILL RECEIVE COMMUNITY TRIBUTE

Today is being observed as "DAN FLOOD Day" in Wyoming Valley.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD is being paid tribute by citizens of this community for the many contributions he has made to the well-being of Wyoming Valley as representative of this area.

Tonight, at 6:30 o'clock, at Wilkes College gymnasium, Congressman FLOOD will be honored at a dinner expected to be attended by more than 700 persons.

The dinner is being sponsored by a large group of local citizens and friends of the Congressman and will be a nonpolitical, nonprofit affair.

Representative SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House will be the main speaker.

Speaker RAYBURN will head a delegation of Government officials and military leaders who came from Washington.

Judge J. Harold Flannery will be toastmaster. He will be introduced by Reuben H. Levy, general dinner chairman.

Others on the program will include the following: Invocation, Rev. Jule Ayers, pastor, First Presbyterian Church, city; humorist, Attorney Joseph L. O'Donnell, and benediction, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis A. Costello, pastor of St. Mary's Church, city. Music will be provided by Donlin's Orchestra, and the Wilkes College Collegians, a mixed chorus.

Besides Levy, other principals connected with arrangements for the dinner include the following: Program, Charles Weissman, program chairman, and John A. Hourigan, Jr., cochairman; dinner committee, William O. Sword; tickets, Frank A. O'Neill; reception, Rulison Evans; secretary, Livingston Clewell, and treasurer, George M. Nicholson.

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader]

MEMORABLE EVENING

This should be a memorable evening in the life of Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD and his attractive wife who will share in the tribute to her husband at a public testimonial dinner at Wilkes College gymnasium.

Members of Congress, unless they are retiring from public service, rarely are feted, so this makes the occasion unique. Representative FLOOD perhaps has attended more gatherings for others than any man in local history, but tonight the tables will be turned and he will be cast in the role of honor guest.

What adds to this affair will be makeup of the audience. Speaker SAMUEL RAYBURN of the House of Representatives will head a contingent of Washington notables to the scene, an indication of the standing of DAN FLOOD in the Nation's Capital. The guest list, limited to 900 locally because of facilities, will constitute a cross section of the community, with Republicans competing with Representative FLOOD's fellow Democrats to do him honor. Present will be men and women from all walks of life, representing many faiths and with roots deep in the soil of a score of countries throughout the world.

A champion of capital and labor and ever so many other elements, as well as worthy causes without end, DAN FLOOD occupies an unusual position in the Eleventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania. That explains his mounting victories at the polls where he has the added distinction of being high man of both major parties, no mean feat.

A lawyer by profession, he is a politician by choice. He frankly loves his job and works at it accordingly, applying himself with the refreshing zeal of the dedicated public servant. The results have added immeasurably to his stature and speak eloquently for themselves.

At a time when men in office so often are targets of outraged taxpayers and others, it is stimulating to note that we have here a public official the people honor personally as well as politically by paying him the compliment of a testimonial in addition to giving him their overwhelming support at the polls repeatedly.

[From the Wilkes-Barre Record, June 6, 1959]

FLOOD TESTIMONIAL

For Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD to be guest of honor at a dinner will be no new experience for him, but the affair to be held tonight at Wilkes College gymnasium is to be no ordinary show of good will. Primarily it is his friends at home who will be acclaiming this sixth-term Congressman as a public official, a fellow citizen, and a friend. At the same time distinguished associates of Congresman FLOOD, including Representative SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, who will deliver the chief address, will be listed among the guests.

Congressman FLOOD has good reason to take pride in the home setting of tonight's tribute and in the approving response which has come from outside as well as within the region.

Historically and contemporaneously Congressman FLOOD has established a reputation for himself as an exceedingly active Member of the House. He has responded in generous measure to the exacting demands of his post. He has earned the plaudits which can be expected to be his tonight for long-sustained and dedicated service.

TOP-RANKING GOVERNMENT AND MILITARY LEADERS JOIN IN PAYING TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN DAN FLOOD—NINE HUNDRED TURN OUT FOR SPLENDID TESTIMONIAL

(By Libby Brennan)

Top Government officials, military leaders, representatives of business, labor, and the community in general assembled last night at Wilkes College gymnasium to pay glowing tribute to Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD.

It was the largest gathering ever held to pay tribute to a resident of Wyoming Valley. Approximately 900 people attended.

Included among the dignitaries present were Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives Sam Rayburn, Democrat, Texas; Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, Illinois; Representative Michael J. Kirwan, of Ohio, former Plains resident; Gideon Surgay, consul of the State of Israel to New York City; Maj. Gen. David W. Traub, Rear Adm. G. F. Beardsley, Brig. Gen. Herman Nickerson, Robert Freedman, Director of the Budget; Air Force Maj. John W. Persons; Joseph J. Lawler, Pennsylvania Turnpike Commissioner; William Davlin, Secretary of Commerce; Brig. Gen. Anthony J. Drexel Biddle Jr., adjutant general, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Two former Governors of Pennsylvania, Arthur H. James and John S. Fine; representatives of the Luzerne County courts, the mayors of Hazleton, Nanticoke, Pittston, and Wilkes-Barre, Chief Judge John W. Murphy, U.S. district court, and hundreds of other community leaders stood in respect to the work done for his home county and the Nation by Congressman FLOOD.

The evening was a full one for the guest of honor and his "Lady," beginning with a cocktail party at the Weissman Recreation Center, followed by the dinner and an afterdinner party at the home of Mr. and Mrs. John S. Cresko, Kingston.

SCORES OF TELEGRAMS

Telegrams were received from well-wishers from all over the United States, including special tributes from Pennsylvania Senators JOSEPH CLARK and HUGH SCOTT.

As the gathering of dignitaries formed, the guests of honor were escorted to the speaker's table by representatives of the local Naval Reserve unit under the command of Comdr. John C. Bush.

Rev. Jule Ayers opened the program with the offering of prayer. Reuben H. Levy, general chairman, thanked the guests and his committees for their cooperation.

He introduced Judge J. Harold Flannery, toastmaster for the evening, who reminisced over the early days that he and the guest of honor spent working together in the Little Theatre.

Judge Flannery then introduced Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, principal speaker.

"I think Christian civilization is in more danger today than it has ever been since the time of the Holy Man," the 77-year-old Texan declared.

"There are forces that deny God and the home; there are those who deny every element of decency and good will; there are people in the world who only recognize the material things," he continued.

People who have gained freedom have had to be willing to pay a high price for it, he stated.

TRIBUTE TO FLOOD

"As long as this crisis in the world exists; as long as we are threatened by those who

wish to destroy every element of decency and goodwill I am going to vote to levy taxes to pay for the material that will make us strong. This is a high price, but it is the only way to protect our liberty," the man who has served since 1913 in Congress stressed.

"The price for freedom is staggering and almost inconceivable but it must be paid."

Turning to the honored guest Speaker RAYBURN said: "We need experts in Government, men of character, integrity, ability, and industry. DAN FLOOD has lived up to the highest standards. In the years since I first met him he has grown in stature, knowledge, and popularity.

"In doing our work in Washington, the burden is made easier by having someone of the type and ability and decency of Congressman FLOOD.

FLOOD IS GRATEFUL

Rising to the podium, Congressman FLOOD addressed the assembled body: "What can one say in response to all you have done for me tonight?

"As I stand here so much in your debt, I see with true clarity that I am largely what you, my friends, have made me. Your belief and your faith and your confidence have built my career.

"May I dedicate this evening to the cause of helping this area to the fulfillment of its historic destiny. We have suffered embittered years of torment; we have experienced happy years of joy. But to our stand have rallied men of all faiths and conditions.

"Tonight, I see in this meeting a bridge between many diversified views which, I am told, do not always meet in full agreement. It is possible that we have emphasized too much our divergencies. I prefer that we emphasize more our unities. I promise that we give less consideration to our tensions and pay more attention to the good things that bind us together.

"It is possible that we have squandered our natural resources. But I submit that there are areas with a lack of resources, but where there is a people which in themselves are inexhaustible resources. Such is our community.

"The Nation is not unaware of our problems. You have permitted me the opportunity to bring these to the Nation's attention. A bevy of Senators, Congressmen, writers, economists, and a legion of others have examined us. In our trouble, from Washington and Harrisburg have come commissions. In my judgment, the only commission we invite now from these capitals is a commission against any other such commission.

ONE OF OUR VIRTUES

"We cannot guarantee that we can restore our rich past, but dynamism will do it if it can be done, and that is one of our many virtues here in the Wyoming Valley—dynamism.

"From the very bottom of my heart, I say to you that if in my soul of souls there has ever been any wavering as to our future, it has been banished forever in the warm flow of your friendship and demonstrated confidence."

"THIS IS YOUR LIFE"

"This Is Your Life, DAN FLOOD, the Devoted Public Servant," was the feature of the evening.

Mrs. Thomas Herbert (Kay Flood, sister of the guest of honor) narrated the background of her brother. His high school days were discussed by Attorney and Mrs. Maurice Cantor, classmates.

Congressman FLOOD's days at Syracuse University were told in a testimonial letter from Roscoe Drummond, columnist of the New York Herald Tribune.

The next phase, his interest in theatrics, was told by Miss Annette Evans who appeared with him in "The Swan" in 1933 in a Little Theater presentation.

Louis Greco, member of the American Legion National Committee on Countersubversive Activities, described the Congressman's interest in Veterans' Affairs.

The Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Member of Congress from Ohio and a native of Plains, described FLOOD's early experiences in Congress.

Gideon Saguy, the Israel Consul, New York City, told of the guest of honor's interest in the affairs of Israel.

HIS MARRIAGE RECALLED

The next stage in his life, his marriage to the former Catherine Swank, was depicted through the appearance of his wife and Rev. Raymond E. Larkin, pastor of St. John the Evangelist Church, who married the couple.

The Congressman's interest in the National Guard armories and the Central European help program was described by Maj. Gen. Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., adjutant general, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

State Senator Martin L. Murray presented citations from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

To a standing ovation, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, cosponsor of the Flood-Douglas bill for depressed areas appeared to describe the work of the sponsors.

DAN FLOOD and the future was depicted by the following high school seniors, Hugh James Godwin, Tom Glenn, Patrick O'Connor, Joseph Meighan and Robert Namovicz. Godwin spoke in behalf of the students.

PRESENTED WITH GIFT

Reuben Levy, general chairman, presented the guest of honor with a hi-fi stereophonic sound phonograph. Mrs. Flood received flowers and gifts.

Seated at the speakers' tables were: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis Costello, Maj. Gen. David W. Traub, Rear Adm. G. F. Beardsley, Brig. Gen. Herman Nickerson, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives Sam Rayburn, Hon. Daniel J. Flood, Reuben Levy, Judge J. Harold Flannery, Attorney Joe O'Donnell, Brig. Gen. Robert Freedman, Director of the Budget, Air Force, Maj. Gen. John W. Persons, Rev. Jule Ayres, Rev. Raymond E. Larkins, Maj. Gen. Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., Congressman Michael J. Kirwan, Senator Paul H. Douglas, Hon. Gideon Saguy, Israel Consul, county commissioners Bowden Northrup and T. Newell Wood, Judge Bernard Brominski, Judge Michael J. Eagen, Scranton, Judge Thomas J. Lewis, Judge Frank Pinola, Judge John J. Aponick, Judge J. W. Murphy, Scranton, U.S. District Court; Hon. Joseph Lawler, turnpike commissioner; William Davlin, secretary of commerce, Luther Kniffen, mayor of Wilkes-Barre; Frank E. Kieler, mayor of Nanticoke; S. Thomas Capparell, mayor of Hazleton; James J. McNulty, city solicitor for Scranton, representing the mayor; State Senator Harold Flack, State Senator Martin L. Murray.

Mrs. Daniel J. Flood, Mrs. Thomas Herbert, Mrs. Charles Weissman, Mrs. Reuben Levy, Thomas Herbert, Mrs. Harold J. Flannery, Mrs. Martin Murray, Miss Helen M. Tomascik, Mrs. Joseph O'Donnell, Mrs. Thomas Lewis, Attorney J. George Tomascik, Comdr. Ed Boyd, Eugene D. Hegarty, J. Harold Flannery Jr.

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE

Members of the committee who assisted Mr. Levy with the arrangements included Livingston Clewell, secretary; George M. Nicholson, treasurer and the following:

Dinner committee, William O. Sword, chairman; program committee, Charles Weissman, John A. Hourigan, Jr., Roy E. Morgan; ticket committee, Frank A. O'Neill, Peter A. Garriety, R. E. Neal, Attorney James Lenahan Brown, John S. Cresko; publicity committee, Joseph F. Collins, Larry Greenspon.

Reception committee, Rulison Evans, chairman, David M. Baltimore, Percy A. Brown, Frank Burnside, Guthrie Conyngham, Victor G. Deihm, Frank A. English, John R. Gallagher, Dr. Vincent Gallizzi, George W. Kanarr, Thomas Kennedy, Joseph H. MacVeigh, John Malinowski, Mrs. Min Lurye Matheson, Andrew J. Sordoni, Jr., and S. M. Wolfe, Jr.

Sponsoring committee, Robert J. Barrett, Michael Bonchonsky, Eugene Burke, Eugene J. Considine, Miss Grace B. Daniels, Miss Annette Evans, Eugene Goldstein, Thomas E. Hefferman, Attorney Andrew Hourigan, Jr., Dr. Bronis J. Kaslas, Joseph Lester, Mrs. Thomas J. Mack, Donald MacKenzie, Jr., Frank Mueller, R. N. Myers, Vincent O'Hara, James Price, Attorney George I. Puhak, Patrick W. Shovlin, Roy Stauffer, Attorney Enoch H. Thomas, Jr., Thomas C. Thomas, Miss Esther Tinsley, Col. Frank Townend, Frank Walser, and Aaron Weiss.

SPEAKER IN SPOTLIGHT

Saturday was DAN FLOOD Night at Wilkes College gymnasium, where a testimonial dinner was given in his honor, but with the hearty approval of Representative FLOOD and others present at this unique gathering SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, shared the spotlight.

This is understandable, as he is the third ranking officer in the Government at Washington and holds an office, comparable in some respects with the Presidency itself in influence and responsibility. His visit to Wilkes-Barre on this occasion was not only an impressive tribute to Mr. FLOOD, but to the community.

Of Speaker RAYBURN, it has been said that he has listened to more spoken words than any individual living. By the same token, he has heard more words of praise about himself than any other American, which is saying a great deal. As a result of his weekend visit to this city, important additions have been made to his impressive record.

SAM RAYBURN is an unusual public official in that he rose to high office on the basis of his record as an American. He always has concerned himself with the public interest. He has fought for free enterprise and for labor in turn, championing whichever cause he felt was deserving of support at the moment. There have been no strings attached to him. Nobody thinks of him other than as a good citizen and official, dedicated to the advancement of the American way of life and the cause of freedom throughout the world.

Speaker RAYBURN is a realist. For instance, he dislikes paying taxes as much as the next individual, but he is for higher taxes if they will provide the sinews that will keep America independent in these perilous times. His audience agreed with him on Saturday night, judging from the enthusiastic applause that greeted this phase of an outline of his philosophy of government.

Mr. RAYBURN is the author of many measures that have had a far-reaching effect on the Nation's economy and will for countless years to come. As in the case of the late Senator Robert Taft, Republicans and Democrats alike respect Mr. RAYBURN as Speaker and dean of the House both for his ability and integrity.

As a Member of Congress, he belongs to the Fourth Congressional District of Texas; as Speaker, he belongs to the country, including the Eleventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania, represented by DAN FLOOD.

The warmth of Wilkes-Barre's welcome to Speaker RAYBURN is evidence that he won immediate acceptance and a permanent place in the affections of the community. Obviously, his reputation as an outstanding American and a dedicated public servant had preceded him to our city and he fully justified the expression of confidence that was forthcoming.

A Message to College Graduates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the East Side News of June 26, 1959:

A MESSAGE TO COLLEGE GRADUATES

(By Abraham Schlacht)

No light illuminating the intellectual horizon has cast a greater glory in contemporary history than that of education. It is the lifestream of our democracy.

Our college graduates are the luminaries in our educational firmaments. They are our mighty arsenals lifting our democratic ideas and ideals throughout the world. Our graduates are leaving college, but the knowledge they have acquired will never leave them. For she always exults in their success and sorrows in their failures.

There are times when circumstances inspire greatness of soul. Now more than ever we need stout hearts, trained minds, dedicated men and women to strengthen our ramparts and to repel the vicious elements here and abroad that seek to tear down the citadel of our institutions.

We cannot build for the future of our youth unless we build our youth for the future. We are now faced more than ever before with the march of youth rather than the march of time. Our graduates have studied in the company of great intellects in history as they pondered over their works. Our graduates have been instructed and trained in the ways of clear thinking.

The era in which we live is achieving things which make the eight wonders of the world a mere heirloom, so many are its vast accomplishments. Those who have followed in the path of education have been the benefactors of mankind. They have brought about the test tube, the electric ray, the surgeon's instrument, and the countless benefits that came from a greater knowledge of chemistry and physics. They have indeed played an extraordinary part in mankind's service.

Opinions may alter, names may change, creeds may rise and fall, but behind education, imperative as it is, is the moral law. It should be remembered that obedience to the moral law and the deep religious convictions of our people have built the greatness of America. It should ever be recalled that success is not measured merely by degrees of scholarship but rather by the moral victory attained. The applause of men, and the smile of fortune, will be like dust driven aimlessly by an idle wind, and direct it to the service of our fellow men. Nothing that is good comes easy, for life is made up of cheers and tears.

Let our college graduates bear in mind as they go about their tasks that progress has never been in direct line of ascent. There have been advances, peaks, and then descents into the valleys. There is progress and retrogression, but the next forward move somehow brings man to a higher and clearer view of things.

College graduates: You are our hope of today and our promise of tomorrow. You are the inheritors of a great tradition. With your knowledge, your vigor, your integrity, your faith—your future will be a bright one.

Harry B. Lee, Jr., of Chicago, Wins Coveted Goodwin Medal Award for Conspicuously Effective Teaching at Massachusetts Institute of Technology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress, as well as all of the people of this great Nation, have had our attention focused on the importance of education to our Nation's welfare and our very existence in this modern world. Tremendous emphasis has been placed on education, particularly in the field of science and engineering.

Things are happening so fast in this so-called space age that education is foremost in the mind of all of our people. Naturally, we look to our grade schools, high schools, colleges, and universities for outstanding leadership in education.

In the field of higher education there is no more outstanding institution in the entire world than the Massachusetts Institute of Technology at Boston, Mass., which recently had installed as its 11th president Julius Adams Stratton. At this inaugural, President Lee A. DuBridge, of the California Institute of Technology, warmly called rival Massachusetts Institute of Technology "the leading college of science and engineering in the world."

This high praise from famed Caltech was no polite gesture. M.I.T. began in 1861 as a land-grant professional school for engineers. When Seattle-born "J" Stratton took his electrical engineering degree there in 1923, its aims were still basically the same. Last year, under Acting President Stratton—who stepped up from chancellor when President James R. Killian, Jr., became President Eisenhower's science adviser—M.I.T. spent an estimated $22 million for operating costs, another $56 million for sponsored research projects. It produces some of the country's ablest pure physicists; it has grown from the Nation's main wartime radar laboratory to the leading center of electronics and computer development. Out of its orbit have spun a dozen graduate-launched electronics companies—for example, Raytheon—in the golden brain center of surrounding Cambridge. It attracts more foreign professors—198 last year—and has a higher proportion of foreign students—12.4 percent—than any other U.S. institution. Above all, M.I.T. has led in broadening scientists by trying to ground them as thoroughly in the liberal arts as in the arts of technology.

For such achievements, Julius Stratton can claim major credit. No narrow specialist—he left Cambridge in 1923 to study French literature at the universities of Grenoble and Toulouse, still refreshes himself by reading French and German history in the original—Stratton is humanist as well as scientist. Under President (1930–48) Karl Compton, who first aimed M.I.T. toward real scientific eminence, Stratton taught electrical engineering and physics, won wide respect for his wartime radar research and later for his administrative abilities in organizing the institute's Research Laboratory of Electronics. Under President (now board chairman) Killian, who made him righthand man, Stratton engineered an important reform: Raising the departments of humanities and social sciences to equal rank with the institute's other professional schools. Today, M.I.T.'s curriculum spans the whole range of man's technology, from politics to psychology, from international relations to interstellar space. "M.I.T. must adapt itself to the needs of a changing epoch," Stratton said last week in his inaugural address. "It must assume new roles and accept new responsibilities." But not at the expense of education, he vowed, and laid out three guidelines for his administration.

At his impressive ceremony President Stratton said:

> We must strive to develop more effectively the creative, imaginative, constructive powers of the student. University research serves but half its purpose if it becomes remote and isolated from the students themselves.
>
> We must bring about a more productive integration of the humanities and social sciences with the physical sciences and engineering.
>
> We have an obligation to impart to our students an understanding of both the privileges and responsibilities inherent in the professional estate. The truly professional man must be imbued with a sense of responsibility to employer and client, a high code of personal ethics and a feeling of obligation to contribute to the public good. * * * By precept and example, we must convey to (students) a respect for moral values, a sense of the duties of citizenship, a feeling for taste and style, and the capacity to recognize and enjoy the first rate.

Not only was Massachusetts Institute of Technology being honored with the inaugural of a new president, but it also received a very distinguished honor in having one of its straight A students in its graduating school, who was graduated this year with a master's degree in electrical engineering, awarded the exceptional and coveted honor known as a "Goodwin Medal Award" given for "Conspicuously Effective Teaching." This most prized medal, with $500 was awarded to Harry B. Lee, Jr., of Chicago, Ill. The only time this is awarded, and the standards and requirements are exceptionally high, is only in the years when a graduate student qualifies under these exceptionally high standards. In some years it is not given at all because no graduate student makes the sufficient qualifications.

Here is a remarkable example of the great opportunities in the field of higher education in the United States for a student working on his master's degree, making straight A's, and at the same time was teaching classes in this great university with such outstanding effec-

tiveness that he was awarded this highly coveted honor at a school which, as has above been stated, is one of the outstanding engineering schools of the United States if not in the world.

Quite naturally, Harry B. Lee, Jr., is to be congratulated in his outstanding work. I believe his remarkable achievements are a splendid example of what we should hope that all our youth would work to acquire in the various schools, colleges, and universities throughout the United States. It is most obvious that without good teachers you certainly cannot expect to have outstanding students. Here is a unique example of a combination of both. Most sincere congratulations go to him.

I wish to add that Harry B. Lee, Jr. of Chicago, Ill., happens to be a nephew of my distinguished colleague and old friend, the Honorable JAMES H. MORRISON of Louisiana.

Support of Postmaster General in Prohibiting Obscene Matter From the Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, considerable misunderstanding has arisen lately regarding Postmaster General Summerfield's action of banning certain publications from the U.S. mail on grounds that such publications are obscene and filthy. I think it should be made clear that it is not the Postmaster General who says obscene material should not be sent through the mail—it is the law, and the courts have interpreted what is obscenity. The Postmaster General is merely carrying out his obligations under the law.

I believe that the Postmaster General should be commended, rather than condemned, for the action he has taken. I have received considerable correspondence from church and civic organizations strongly supporting the Postmaster General in the position he has taken on this matter.

As several examples, I would like to insert in the RECORD letters I have recently received from Dr. Carl F. Reuss, executive secretary, Board for Christian Social Action, American Lutheran Church; Dr. Caradine R. Hooten, chairman, Churchmen's Commission for Decent Publications; and Mr. Martin Work, executive director, the National Council of Catholic Men, which indicate that a vast segment of the citizens of this Nation want to have obscene matter barred from the mail and commend the Postmaster General for the action he has taken recently in banning literature that has been deemed obscene and filthy.

As chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have been concerned for many years with this problem. I would like to say that no Postmaster General has shown more courage and taken greater direct action in this regard than Mr. Summerfield.

I wish to commend Postmaster General Summerfield for the worthwhile effort he is making to uphold the law which prohibits obscene matter from going through the mail.

BOARD FOR CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ACTION,
AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Columbus, Ohio, June 25, 1959.

The Honorable TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Room 215, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MURRAY: It has been brought to my attention that the Postmaster General is being attacked for decisions prohibiting specific publications defined as obscene material from going through the mails.

As a Christian citizen I expect the laws passed by our representatives in the Congress to be enforced fairly and firmly by administrators in the executive branch. A public official should be commended, not condemned, for enforcing laws impartially, without fear or favor.

Of course many of us might differ as to whether a specific publication is, or is not, obscene. The administrator, however, must make his decision on the laws as he understands them. If abuses result, we have the courts to protect us.

As much as anyone, I abhor censorship. It is dangerous. It can be misused and can be destructive. On the other hand, I believe that obscenity is not entitled to the benefits and protection of the U.S. mails. If laws defining obscenity are not adequate, they should be amended to be realistic and workable.

Impartial enforcement of laws, without fear or favor, is expected of public servants. If such enforcements proves the need for changes, the people will support needed revisions. I firmly believe, however, that our members want and demand legal protections against obscene matter in the mails.

Sincerely yours,

CARL F. REUSS,
Executive Secretary.

THE GENERAL BOARD OF TEMPERANCE,
THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1959.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, House Post Office Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: As chairman of the Churchman's Commission for Decent Publications, and in my own behalf, I want to thank you for vigorous defense of the American people against unconscionable invasions that are made and threatened by purveyors of salacious materials, sometimes called literature.

While supporting your every effort to strengthen existing laws against the transmission of such filth, I want to express deep chagrin over unjust criticisms recently directed against the Postmaster General's Department for seeking to enforce the good protective laws we now have.

The Hon. Arthur E. Summerfield deserves the wholehearted commendation of all good citizens for his courageous performance of duty in checking this unlawful and unwanted flow of vulgarity through the U.S. mails. This is definite encouragement to work now being done by so many to encourage better and cleaner living among all groups of the American people.

With the feeling that your praiseworthy endeavors cannot be successfully confused with ideas of "censorship", and prayers for your success, I am

Sincerely yours,

C. R. HOOTON.

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL
OF CATHOLIC MEN,
Washington, D.C., June 26, 1959.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: The recent attacks upon Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield resulting from his action to ban from the mails the book "Lady Chatterley's Lover" prompts me to reiterate the position of this federation stated by our president, John Cornelius Hayes, in his testimony last month before the subcommittee investigating the mailing of obscene and pornographic material:

"* * * any governmental censorship necessarily impinges on the individual's freedom to communicate (which stems from his right to know), and—this freedom is absolutely essential, not only to the development of the individual, but also to the democratic state. But this freedom to communicate also has obvious social implications, which require that the freedom be exercised within the limitations imposed by the equal freedom of others in society and by the general welfare. To this end, public officials have a duty of watchfulness. * * *"

No amount of oratory about civil liberties or freedom of speech or the blight of governmental censorship will influence mothers and fathers who seem to be fighting a losing battle against juvenile delinquency, especially when even the power of government appears to have been enlisted against them through the use of the mails and through the subsidy of the second class mailing privilege. Nor can American parents be persuaded that obscenity is practically indefinable. They know it when they see it, because, as rational beings, social by nature, they have the inherent competence of making practical moral judgments in accord with a social conscience.

In banning "Lady Chatterley's Lover" from the mails, the Postmaster General was exercising the "watchfulness" expected of public officials, as expressed in Mr. Hayes' statement before your subcommittee. On behalf of our president, the executive committee and the 8 million American Catholic men who constitute the National Council of Catholic Men, I would like to commend Mr. Summerfield for his courageous and forthright action in this instance and to reassure you of the support of this federation in your efforts to secure the enactment of stronger measures to stem the increasing flow of mail-order obscenity.

Sincerely,

MARTIN H. WORK,
Executive Director.

They Would Destroy Anglo-Saxon Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on June 24, 1959, the Metropolitan Herald, one of the South's most distinctive community newspapers, printed in Atlanta, carried a most thought-provoking editorial entitled "They Would Destroy Anglo-Saxon Influence." In these days when we see so many assaults against our beloved Constitution, it is heartwarming to read such a concise and fac-

tual analysis of some of the factors which have made us a great Nation. Under consent to extend my remarks, I insert the editorial herewith:

THEY WOULD DESTROY ANGLO-SAXON INFLUENCE

Reading the liberal press and the so-called liberal columnists, these days, one gets the impression that those of Anglo-Saxon heritage have never contributed anything to the United States except prejudice, bigotry and a complete disregard for the law of the land.

The fact is in much of the public press, people with an Anglo-Saxon background are considered of little import. Their religion, love of personal liberty, their devotion to self-government and the written Constitution is considered stupid and intolerant.

All thoughtful Americans recognize that people of many nationalities contributed much to make the United States great.

However, every honest historian must admit that it was the Anglo-Saxon heritage of love for liberty which made this Nation possible. The great leaders of the Revolution were men in whose hearts and souls burned the flame of liberty, inbred in the Anglo-Saxon tradition.

Our Founding Fathers, determined that this new national government would never become as despotic as had the English king, had so much concern over the rights of the ordinary citizen they brought forth a written Constitution enumerating these rights and made it "the supreme law of the land."

Now we are told by so-called modern authorities that our written Constitution is outdated, that it is "a near plot" against the common man and that it has no place in the modern world.

Because those of the Anglo-Saxon heritage have been the foremost defenders of the Constitution, they have been slandered, smeared, scorned and accused of seeking to undermine the majesty and authority of "the law of the land."

We would remind these critics that from the day when King John was forced to sign the Magna Carta in 1215 down to the present day this Anglo-Saxon heritage has contributed more to the cause of freedom and self-government than all other sources combined.

History also records the fact that of all the major nations, only those of the English speaking nations, with their Anglo-Saxon traditions, have been able to escape the iron heel of political dictatorships.

No wonder, then, those alien philosophies and ideologies are repugnant to those of Anglo-Saxon background. No wonder, then, those who seek to destroy the United States, realize they must first destroy the Anglo-Saxon influence.

The cunning campaign now underway in the United States is part and parcel of a master plot. Destroy those who hold to the Anglo-Saxon traditions of self-government and it will be able to divide and conquer this Nation from within.

Federal Credit Union Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. FOLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Friday, June 26, 1959, was celebrated on the floor of the House as Credit Union Day, the 25th anniversary of the passage of the Federal Credit Union Act of 1934. On that occasion, a number of distinguished Members of the House rose on the House floor to pay tribute to the effectiveness of the Federal Credit Union Act. The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] gave us some of the history of the passage of the act, and others who were Members of the House when the act was passed referred to the historical development of this important legislation.

I felt I could add very little to the admirable statements of other distinguished Members with greater legislative experience in connection with Federal credit unions. But I want to go on record in support of the vitally needed new amendments to the Federal Credit Union Act incorporated in the Patman bill, H.R. 5777.

The Maryland Credit Union League, which is composed of 192 credit unions in the State of Maryland, consisting of 114,000 members, has prepared a statement of the "pros and cons of credit union" which I feel is a very valuable contribution to this whole discussion. Since I believe this document can be of value to my colleagues in considering legislation in this field, I ask that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD following my remarks.

THE PROS AND CONS OF CREDIT UNIONS

(By the Maryland Credit Union League, Jan. 23, 1959)

ANTICREDIT UNION

Credit unions are foreign and un-American.

PROCREDIT UNION

Credit unions originated in Germany. However, they have become completely Americanized. They are the "Do-It-Yourself" movement of finance and just as American as any other do-it-yourself project. Our whole American heritage of culture and government has its roots and its origins in Europe, but all have become thoroughly Americanized, including credit unions. Do you think that the White House, the Senate, the House of Representatives and thousands of publicly owned, profitmaking corporations would have credit unions, if they were foreign and un-American? There's certainly nothing un-American about a group of people getting together to help each other. That's the American way.

ANTICREDIT UNION

Credit unions are socialistic.

PROCREDIT UNION

Credit unions are the opposite of socialism. They help their members become practicing capitalists. Each credit union is a corporation owned and operated by its shareholders, not by the Government as in socialism. The largest number of credit unions are in publicly owned, profitmaking industrial corporations. Credit unions teach their volunteer workers the principles of management and finance. They teach their members how to practice thrift, how to get out of debt, sound buying, and the pride and responsibilities of ownership. They personify the American ideal of self-government, ruled by the membership from within.

ANTICREDIT UNION

Credit unions are cooperatives which are dedicated to the elimination of the profit motive.

PROCREDIT UNION

Credit unions are cooperatives. Cooperatives have a long history in the United States and are provided for in both Federal and State laws. However, the credit union movement is not against the profit motive. Some extreme individuals and authors in the cooperative groups are against profits. These men do not speak for the credit union movement. We cannot be held responsible for what they say. Arguments of this type against credit unions are based on statements not made by credit union spokesmen. No CUNA statement ever has been made against the profit motive in this country. This is the old, old device of "guilt by association." All credit unions are co-ops, but all co-ops are not credit unions.

ANTICREDIT UNION

Credit unions are tax dodgers and pay no taxes.

PROCREDIT UNION

Credit unions do pay taxes. The question here is that credit unions do not pay income taxes. The reason is simple. Credit unions do not make a profit. They do not do business with the public. They do business only with their own shareholders * * * at no profit. The officers and committeemen of credit unions are all volunteer, nonpaid workers, except for the treasurer. Credit unions for the most part pay property and other taxes. Their members pay income taxes on their dividends. The tax exempt status of nonprofit organizations is well established in the United States. Many organizations are exempted by law from paying income taxes. Among them are religious and charitable organizations; business leagues, civic and employees associations; labor, agricultural, and horticultural organizations; social clubs, fraternal beneficiary societies; Federal employees associations; teachers retirement associations; local benevolent life insurance associations; mutual irrigation and telephone companies; cemetery companies; religious and apostolic associations; corporations organized to finance crop operations; and farmers cooperative associations.

ANTICREDIT UNION

Credit unions are unfair competition to banks and other financial institutions.

PROCREDIT UNION

Credit unions create business for banks. Most of the savings deposits and loans made by credit unions are too small to be profitable for banks. By law all credit union receipts must be deposited in a chartered bank, thus creating large, single commercial accounts for the banks. Credit unions do compete with financial institutions making small loans, but only within their own membership. The American system was built on competition. Credit unions always will be competitive. Incidentally, 32 banks, including that of the president of the American Bankers Association and all but one of the Federal Reserve banks, have their own credit unions.

ANTICREDIT UNION

Credit unions get free rent and management subsidizes them with quarters, heat, and light.

PROCREDIT UNION

Management finds that it pays to encourage and help credit unions because it takes the burden of the employees financial problems and garnishments out of its hands. Also the credit union helps make happier and safer employees who do not lose time or worry over financial problems. Many credit unions do pay rent and do pay for their utilities. In fact, many credit unions have their own modern building outside the plant and are not subsidized in any way. Managements with credit unions are not the ones complaining.

ANTICREDIT UNION

Credit unions are making too many big loans and getting away from their original purposes.

PROCREDIT UNION

How big is big? Size was never a real consideration in making credit union loans. The need and character of the member applying for the loan is the true consideration. Although many loans are made for automobiles and the like, the great majority of credit union loans are for provident and remedial purposes, not for luxuries. The average credit union loan made in Maryland is $380. Only 15 percent of the people can make bank loans. Banks and other financial institutions can make much larger loans for much longer periods than credit unions. The credit union philosophy of service and thrift and self-help has not and will not be changed.

ANTICREDIT UNION

Credit unions are planning a checking account system permiting members to write checks.

PROCREDIT UNION

This is not true. The basis of this charge is the misinterpretation of recommendations made in two bills in the last Congress. These would have permitted credit unions (1) to pass on actual bank charges for cashing checks, such as paychecks for members, and (2) to pass on actual bank charges for writing checks paying off creditors of members. In no instance did the credit union spokesmen advocate a checking account system.

ANTICREDIT UNION

Credit unions are advocating a central banking system of credit unions and the capital will be used to finance cooperative enterprises.

PROCREDIT UNION

Not true. First, the charge of advocating a central banking system of credit unions comes from misinterpretation of provisions in two bills before the last Congress allowing Federal credit unions to deposit funds in central credit unions. The primary purpose of central credit unions is to provide a source of credit for the credit union officer who, by law, does not enjoy full borrowing privileges from the credit union he serves. Central credit unions also make possible the flow of credit union funds within a limited area so that credit unions can help each other. Of the many State central credit unions which have long been in operation, not one has served as a source of capital for cooperative enterprises. Second, as for capital being used to finance cooperative enterprises, this was suggested by a man not connected with the credit union movement. Again, credit unions should not be held responsible for remarks, made by people outside the movement, or who do not represent the official policies of CUNA.

ANTICREDIT UNION

Credit unions are multiplying too rapidly and have large goals for the next 5 years.

PROCREDIT UNION

Misinterpretation of figures used in "Operation Impact" caused this charge. They were intended to demonstrate to the movement how little of the potential job now is being done, and how much remains to be done. This is considered sound practice in private business and marketing. Why can't credit unions use the same technique?

ANTICREDIT UNION

Credit unions are not serving the lower income groups as originally intended.

PROCREDIT UNION

On the one hand credit unions are charged with "multiplying too rapidly" and on the other hand are accused of not serving all of the lower income groups. The credit union movement is expanding to take care of as many of them as possible as quickly as possible. Hundreds of thousands of people are turning to either banks or credit unions for small loans. If the need for credit unions is there, we will attempt to fill it.

ANTICREDIT UNION

Credit unions get a free ride at the taxpayers' expense.

PROCREDIT UNION

Not true. The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions which charters and supervises credit unions operating under the Federal Credit Union Act draws no money from the tax rolls. It is supported entirely by the credit unions themselves through the supervisory and examination fees they pay. And State chartered credit unions also pay their own way with examination and filing fees to the State supervisory agency. In Maryland this is the State Banking Department.

ANTICREDIT UNION

Credit unions have amateur and incompetent management.

PROCREDIT UNION

Credit unions have good management and their record proves it. True, some credit union officers are not experienced, but the many training and field programs both by the league and by CUNA are excellent. In fact many company managements report that they watch for up and coming credit union officers because they find that these men receive such excellent training and experience that they are fine executive material. Credit union officials are much closer to the problems of their credit unions and members than the officers of other financial institutions can ever be. And the great majority are volunteers, motivated by the desire to help their fellows.

ANTICREDIT UNION

Credit unions are unsafe places to put your money because their funds are not protected.

PROCREDIT UNION

Credit unions do not have deposit insurance and for a very good reason. Any bank having deposit insurance is forced to close its doors for liquidation when poor management or defalcations cause it. Credit unions affiliated with the league and CUNA can carry maximum bond coverage up to $2 million to cover defalcations, and would not have to close in event of even large embezzlement. Also many leagues have stabilization funds to handle liquidation problems. Affiliated credit union liquidations usually result in no loss to its shareholders. Most credit unions give their depositors and borrowers insurance covering their deposits and loans at no extra cost.

ANTICREDIT UNION

Credit unions are getting too large.

PROCREDIT UNION

Who is to say if something is "too large?" How long is a piece of string? How high is up? It would seem that "too large" applies only to the other fellow, or to a competitor. Banks and companies are allowed to grow. The Government is growing. Credit unions are growing too. But they are small in comparison with other financial institutions. The largest credit union in the country is very small compared to a metropolitan bank of even average size. It is our hope that each credit union will grow large enough to fill the needs of its members, no larger, no smaller. We have not reached this point yet.

ANTICREDIT UNION

Credit unions give organized labor a foothold in a company.

PROCREDIT UNION

Credit unions are one thing that management and labor agree on. Both are in favor of them. Credit unions have nothing to do with organized labor, except that some members are naturally also members of labor unions. In fact there are labor unions with their own credit unions, just as there are banks and many thousands of private corporations with credit unions. Credit unions are not connected with organized labor. The word that scares some management people here is "union." They might as well be scared of the United States, because it too is a union.

Memorial for James Madison, an Honor Deserved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I inserted into the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Irving Brant in which he urged that a suitable memorial be built for our fourth President, James Madison, for whom the capital city of the State of Wisconsin, which I have the privilege of representing, was named.

The Washington Post newspaper and I promptly second the suggestion, and today the Washington Post, in its issue of Wednesday, July 1, 1959, has printed an article by Francis de Sales Ryan, a retired Treasury Department official, author of Treasury Pageant and other volumes of local history, and a recognized student of Washington folklore which lends more support for this worthy project. The article follows:

AN HONOR DESERVED

President James Madison, fourth President of the United States, richly merits a public memorial here in the Capital City as urged by Irving Brant and endorsed by your June 28 editorial, "Neglected Father."

Indeed it would be most fitting and appropriate that the discarded columns of the Capitol's east front form a part of the proposed memorial, for it was Madison himself who first selected the site for the Capitol and fought against powerful forces to have his selection approved.

History records that when Congress enacted a bill called "An act establishing the temporary and permanent seat of Government of the United States," no reference was made to the exact location of the Capital City or the Capitol Building.

At President Washington's request James Madison and Thomas Jefferson studied the problem and Jefferson agreed with Madison on the choice of the site now occupied by the Capitol. Their agreement received the hearty approval of the President, but met with vigorous congressional opposition. Helen Nicolay, in "Our Capital on the Potomac," records the judgment of historians in stating that "James Madison's deft parliamentary skill * * * saved the Potomac project from defeat."

Moreover, Madison selected the very names for our District and our Capital City. When the purchase of the land had been effected, President Washington selected three Commissioners to take charge of the surveying and laying out of the District. The three Commissioners invited Madison and Jefferson to meet with them.

At their first meeting Madison suggested that the new district be called "The Territory of Columbia," in honor of Christopher

Columbus, the discoverer of America; and that the Capital City be known as "the city of Washington," in honor of the Father of our Country.

Both of these suggestions were adopted and for many years the official designation of our city was "the city of Washington in the Territory of Columbia."

Records of the Treasury Department show that when the British invaders were nearing Bladensburg during Madison's administration, he hurried to the office of the Secretary of the Treasury and borrowed two Army pistols which always hung behind the Secretary's desk. Then, mounting a horse, the President hurried out to the battlefield and fought beside General Widner until retreat was sounded. He loved his country with a great love and in a farewell letter to the American people, which he left among papers to be opened after his death, he wrote:

"The advice nearest my heart and deepest in my convictions is that the Union of the States be cherished and preserved. Let the open enemy to it be regarded as a Pandora with her box opened; the disguised one as the serpent creeping with his deadly wiles into Paradise."

Madison was a scholar and a Christian gentleman. While he was studying at Princeton University he wrote a manuscript, now at the Library of Congress, in which he copied 29 of the proverbs of Solomon from the Bible. One of them, heavily underscored, is a proverb that he often quoted in letters and addresses. It reads as follows:

"Get wisdom because it is better than gold, and purchase prudence for it is more precious than silver."

How appropriate it would be if these words were carved into the stone of a majestic memorial, formed of the 24 columns from the east front of the Capitol, as a grateful Nation's tribute to a brave soldier, a brilliant statesman, and an excellent President of the United States, James Madison.

FRANCIS DE SALES RYAN.

Proposing the Corn Tassel as National Floral Emblem—June 30, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN V. CARTER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join that growing group of Members of Congress who have supported the various resolutions to have the golden corn tassel made our national floral emblem.

In the beautiful corn tassel we have something that is truly indigenous to the Americas. Geologic artifacts indicate the presence of corn here long before the coming of the first settlers. The Indians knew it well and cherished it for its lifegiving abundance. Then when the first settlers came to America the Indians passed this along to them and it sustained our early Americans through those very trying early years and through their conquest of the continent just as it continues to sustain Americans today. It is a universal symbol of the productivity of our American soil and is grown in all the 50 States to some degree, not the least of which is in my own native State of Iowa.

Other proponents of the golden corn tassel as our national floral emblem have confined their efforts largely to tracing its historical usage and to disparaging for one reason or another the other flowers and floral symbols which have been proposed for adoption as our national floral emblem.

I would like to point up the fact here today that some of our most outstanding predecessors in this Congress and in American history were very conscious of the unique place of corn in American life and of its symbolism of beauty, productivity, and fertility. In fact, a monument to corn, an everlasting monument, exists in this very Capitol Building and was permanently incorporated into its architecture in the early 1800's. I speak, of course, of the six cornstalk columns and capitals which are located on the ground floor vestibule of the Law Library entrance of the U.S. Capitol Building. These were built into the Capitol during the term of B. H. Latrobe, who served as Architect of the Capitol from 1803 to 1811 and from 1815 to 1817—break in service due to suspension of work at the Capitol on account of war with Great Britain.

Latrobe, in a letter of August 28, 1809, to Thomas Jefferson, speaks as follows of these columns and capitals:

DEAR SIR: I have packed up and sent to Richmond to be forwarded to Monticello a box containing the model of the capital of the columns of the lower vestibule of the senatorial department of the north wing of the Capitol, which is composed of maize, on a short frustum running about 4 feet from the ground. It may serve for a dial stand, and should you appropriate it for that use, I will forward to you a horizontal dial in Pennsylvania marble of the proper size. These capitals during the summer session obtained me more applause from Members of Congress than all the works of magnitude or difficulty that surrounded them. They christened them the "corncob capitals," whether for the sake of alliteration I cannot tell, but certainly not very appropriately.

Then Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to Latrobe dated October 10, 1809, at Monticello, had the following to say:

I congratulate you on the successful completion of your great arch of the Senate Chamber as well as that of the Hall of Justice. I have no doubt you will finish those rooms so as to be worthy counterparts of that of the Representatives. It would give me pleasure to learn that Congress will consent to proceed on the middle building. I think that the work when finished will be a durable and honorable monument of our infant Republic, and will bear favorable comparison with the remains of the same kind of the ancient republics of Greece and Rome. I have no doubt that your cerealian Capitol will be handsome, and I shall be very happy to receive the model of it.

Of course, this latter reference by Jefferson is to the cornstalk columns.

Latrobe, in a letter of November 5, 1816, to Thomas Jefferson several years later again speaks of these columns and capitals after the burning of the Capitol by the British in 1814.

Dear Sir: Your letter of the 27th of August received. * * * You have done my capital much honor in making it the support of your dial. The columns and capitals as executed and standing in the north wing of the Capitol on the ground floor were not much injured by the British, so little, indeed, that I wish some part of the building to remain as they left it. I do not propose to repair them unless the President shall order it to be done.

And in more recent times, the author, Frary, in his book "They Built the Capitol" gives the following interesting description of the columns and capitals designed by Latrobe in this very building:

His fertility of imagination is well illustrated in the capitals and columns which he designed for the ground floor lobby and the small rotunda of the Senate or north wing of the Capitol. In the former he deserted the 2,000 year old tradition of loyalty to the acanthus leaf, and bestowed his artistic affections on the lowly cornstalk. His "cornstalk" or "corncob" capitals are among the most unique features of the great Capitol and are the delight of all who are fortunate enough to discover them and appreciate their individuality. In them Latrobe made a distinctly original contribution to decorative design and as might be expected from a man with his ability and discriminating taste, he did it well.

In place of the customary fluted columns, he represented bundles of cornstalks bound at the top with a rope, producing an effect not unlike that of the Egyptian papyrus column. On the capitals were carved ears of Indian corn, with the husks partially separated to show the kernels.

And so it goes, from the earliest geologic evidence of Indians on this Continent up to this very day, we see the bountiful plant corn with its beautiful golden tassel inextricably interwoven with the history of America and its people. I know of no other floral emblem which could bear the symbolism of all that is American in the genuine manner than could the golden corn tassel. I therefore urge all my colleagues to advance the corn tassel as the floral emblem of America.

Red Subversion in Our Back Yard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address to the House on Tuesday, June 30, 1959, I dealt with the worsening situation in the Caribbean and made some specific suggestions aimed toward its amelioration.

The latest summary of the distressing conditions to the south of us is found in a thoughtful article in a recent issue of the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., by Constantine Brown, one of the Nation's ablest observers on foreign affairs.

As this article supplies in brief form important additional information relative to the background of my June 30 address, it is commended for study by all concerned with the formulation of U.S. policy toward Latin America.

The text follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 30, 1959]

RED SUBVERSION IN OUR BACK YARD—WEALTHY LATIN REPUBLICS HAMSTRUNG ECONOMICALLY BY COMMUNIST INTRIGUE

(By Constantine Brown)

South America from the Caribbean to Tierra del Fuego is seething. Never before has America's backyard been in more serious danger than at present. Yet we do not appear to be able to take the initiative even in that area in which this country has so much at stake.

Latin American Republics have enormous wealth in raw materials. This should normally assure them at least limited prosperity. Yet they appear on the verge of collapse. If nature were to take its usual course, all these countries, with a measure of assistance and advice from the United States, would be able to weather the storm. But the chances of their being able to pull out are considerably reduced because of the activities of the Latin American Communists, strongly backed by Moscow.

As things stand now, there is a good chance, according to intelligence sources in Washington, that we may find ourselves ringed with Soviet submarine bases in the Caribbean. Despite Fidel Castro's protestations that he is only an ardent lover of democracy and freedom, the Communist element's influence in Cuba is much stronger than the alleged will of Castro to make that island republic neutralist.

Communist influence in the government of Venezuela is equally powerful and reports from Caracas indicate that in the event of a major international crisis the government will be taken over by active Communists under Moscow's discipline unless the present heads play along.

A realistic survey of most Latin American Republics indicates an alarming increase of Communist conspiracy. The agents, strongly backed financially by the Kremlin, are taking advantage of the economic distress—which they lay at the threshold of this country—to create chaotic internal conditions. Once these break out in revolutions against the dictatorial governments genuine dictators completely in the pocket of international communism are installed.

Washington is making some vague moves by offering limited financial support to the existing non-Communist administrations. But these are not effective because the ailment of our sister Republics south of the Rio Grande are more political than economic as appears on the surface.

We are dedicated to the elimination of dictators in Latin America. This was emphasized by Vice President NIXON when he visited that area some months ago and said: "We extend a cold hand to the dictators and a warm embrace to those opposed to them." It was realistically illustrated when Fidel Castro visited Washington unofficially. Despite the wholesale executions of sometimes innocent men and women, Castro received from our Government and enthusiasts in Washington and New York almost a hero's welcome.

There is not a single head of state in Central and South America who is not convinced that the hero of the Cuban revolution is under Communist discipline—by necessity if not by choice. But the hasty acquiescence of the U.S. Government and to some extent of the American people toward the Cuban dictator has created the impression thta the United States (the principal target of international communism) is leaning toward the Castro type of dictatorship rather than the strongly anti-Communist Trujillo type. This impression has, of course, given strength and unprecedented impetus to the Moscow agents who are doing their utmost to precipitate revolutions in as many Latin American Republics as feasible, and especially in those which could offer interesting bases within reach of our boundaries.

The abortive rebellions in Panama, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic are examples of international Communist strategy. They have failed temporarily. But there are strong indications that there will be a repeat before the end of the year.

The Kremlin has been planning for a decade for the day and has taken advantage of our lackadaisical policies whenever possible. Thus the Soviet intrigues in Latin America date back to the late 20's when agents infiltrated Central America selling the blessings of communism to the peons. Hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and House Un-American Activities Committee showed this conclusively from the testimony of former agents who became fed up with communism after a while.

An American citizen, Joe Zack (his real name is Kornfelder), who was trained at the Lenin school of subversion and worked under direct orders of Stalin, spelled out the entire plan to the two congressional committees. But none of our officials seem to have taken the warnings seriously. Their accuracy was proven in the recent developments not only in the Caribbean but also in almost every one of the other Latin American countries.

While the attention of the administration, Congress and our people is focused on the great futility at Geneva and wherever the summit meeting is to take palce, the Muscovites are working overtime at our expense in our very backyard.

Mutual Security Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, recently the Honorable Spruille Braden made a presentation before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which is considering the mutual security bill. Because it contains much valuable and important information, I include it herewith:

STATEMENT OF HON. SPRUILLE BRADEN, MEMBER OF THE CITIZENS FOREIGN AID COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS, JUNE 24, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a privilege to be invited to appear as a witness before this distinguished Committee on Appropriations of the House, because this seems to be the one place in Washington where fiscal and economic sanity still prevail, especially in the area of foreign aid. I am unaware of any other congressional committee or representatives of the administration who have shown greater concern for the sorely afflicted American taxpayer than have you, gentlemen, under the courageous leadership of your chairman, Representative PASSMAN.

That I am competent to testify on foreign aid or mutual security, is indicated by the fact that most of my life has been spent in, or having to do with, the so-called underdeveloped areas of this hemisphere. Both in business and diplomacy, I have dedicated myself to the initiation, carrying out, and successful completion of many and varied developmental enterprises. I am proud of the fact that I am the only living U.S. citizen who has negotiated and signed a peace treaty (between Bolivia and Paraguay settling the bloody and ferociously fought Chaco war), which now has endured for 21 years.

I submit a brief curriculum vitae, which I request be made part and parcel of my testimony.

Although I appear as a member of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, I want it understood that my testimony here today in many places represents exclusively my own convictions. Also, I am especially experienced and informed about the Western Hemisphere.

I must confess to feelings of both frustration and alarm when once again I am requested to testify on the Mutual Security Act. Frustration, because none of the points which I have raised repeatedly through the years, beginning in 1949, in testimony before both House and Senate committees, as well as in many speeches I have given, seem to have made any worthwhile impression. Nor have any questions ever been answered competently by any individual or agency of our Government. Similarly, I am unimpressed by the answers made by several Government agencies to a first report by the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

I feel alarm, as I contemplate the callous way in which the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) is permitted to waste and misspend billions upon billions of our citizens' earnings. These feelings I expressed on May 10, 1959, by radio, over the Manion Forum:

"Innumerable and comprehensive reports have been and are being published by different congressional committees and by the Comptroller General of the United States describing the extravagance, waste, and corruption which permeates so many of the International Cooperation Administration's operations all over the world. So voluminous are they that few people could find the time to read all the shocking details.

"Dean Manion, I earnestly ask our listeners today to obtain and skim through just a few of these reports. (Reports of Comptroller General of the United States and General Accounting Office: June 30, 1955, on Iran; December 27, 1955, on Pakistan; June 30, 1955, on Egypt; June 30, 1955, on Lebanon; Comptroller General's Report on Pakistan for Fiscal Years 1955–57; House Committee on Government Operations, May 15, 1957, January 16, 1958, June 28, 1958, June 15, 1959.)

"If they will do so, they will be angered to learn how billions of hard-earned tax dollars are being thrown away on so-called mutual security or foreign aid. They will demand that the President and Congress forthwith put an end to the squandering, misuse and dishonesty involved in so many of these programs.

"The conditions disclosed in these official investigations are so appalling as to convince me that neither the President, the Cabinet, nor congressional leaders have ever read them. If they had, they long since would have taken positive measures to eradicate this disgraceful situation."

I respectfully request that this complete broadcast of May 10, 1959, be made a part and parcel of my testimony. Similarly, I request that two speeches, bearing on the subject of foreign aid, be incorporated in my testimony. These were made before (1) Associated Industries of Massachusetts on October 22, 1958; and (2) Rotary Club of New York on April 11, 1959, and Federation of Women's Clubs on April 12, 1959. I dare to hope that some of you gentlemen may find time to read these addresses, since they complete and supplement my testimony.

For more than 15 years I have reiterated at every opportunity, publicly and privately, that I felt the gravest danger to the survival of the United States and of civilization was the breakdown in morality everywhere, but particularly in government. Perhaps now I should add that this breakdown in morality is partially explained and unquestionably exacerbated by the failure of governments to exercise commonsense. Whom the gods destroy, they first make mad.

In our country, the rash extravagance, heedless waste, and immorality which increasingly characterize all Government activities nowadays are peculiarly apparent in the operations of the so-called Mutual Security Act.

Nikita Khrushchev recently in Albania proclaimed that capitalism is doomed, because "however strong a man may be, in time he becomes senile." If Khrushchev buries us, as he says he will, it will not be due to the blunders of senility, but because of our immaturity; because we refuse to learn from history, which teaches that foreign aid has been tried and has failed before. (See my aforementioned Rotary Club speech.) Truly, in this area of government, have the ICA "officialdom gone mad, officialdom erected into a new and merciless exploiting class." [1]

There may be a few places in the world, such as Korea or Taiwan, where for the security of the United States, some foreign aid temporarily may be necessary. But to have dissipated somewhere between $75 billion and $80 billion—in other words, between one-fourth and one-third of our national debt—at a time when the U.S. Federal Government is facing financial disaster, is not only senseless but unmoral. It is well nigh criminal to continue such folly in the face of a $12 billion or $13 billion deficit, when the U.S. dollar is depreciating all over the globe, excepting in those countries whose currencies—frequently due to our so-called aid—are depreciating even more rapidly, and when gold has been flowing out of this country at an unprecedented rate.

Especially is this true when none of the objectives claimed for foreign aid have been acomplished. Even Mr. Hollister, formerly Director of ICA, practically has admitted this already amply evident fact in a recent Reader's Digest article.

For years, we have been told that the principal reason for foreign aid was to do away with the menace of communism. Now, $70-odd-billion later, the President's Committee To Study the U.S. Military Assistance Program (the Draper committee), in its March 17, 1959, report, admits that: (1) the Communist military threat is greater than ever, (2) the Communist economic and political threat and capabilities are expanding, and concludes that we must throw out more hundreds of millions on a continuing basis.

That the Communist threat steadily has increased in the face of our foreign aid, was only to be expected, because as I have detailed repeatedly in the speeches to which I have referred today, we have been doing precisely what Lenin and Stalin urged as the best way to spread their wicked ideology and enslaving controls. And, instead of the Soviet paying for it, we have served their interests all for free.

My associates on the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee know that the only thing the U.S.S.R. and Communists respect is superior power. Therefore, we endorse all reasonable expenditures for the Strategic Air Command. Just as emphatically we oppose dribbling out billions of dollars all over the world, with relatively little, and often no benefit to the recipients and with grave harm to the United States of America.

[1] "Reflections on the Failure of Socialism," by Max Eastman.

As I have said, the operation of foreign aid has been characterized by extravagance and waste, corruption and fraud. This was true of the past and it is true today.

As for the extravagance, the Honorable Eugene R. Black, president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, before the Pilgrims, London, England, on Tuesday, May 5, 1959, while maintaining the successful development of the underdeveloped world as a vitally important objective, makes the following statement:

"We may learn a striking lesson, I think, from some of those underdeveloped countries now undergoing the most severe shortages of foreign exchange and the worst distortions of their domestic economies. Among these countries are a number which, far from having had the least finance from abroad, have had the most.

"This finance was made available for both commercial and diplomatic motives. It was made available in quantities and at times that enabled these countries to persist in the folly of unwise economic policies, and made it possible for them to postpone the painful decisions and real sacrifices necessary to their economic progress. In these cases, neither the diplomat nor the exporter was able to take what sometimes may be the wisest decision of all—that is, not to proffer finance in circumstances that offer no prospect that it will be effectively employed for the good of the receiving country."

As a citizen, I cannot comprehend why the Congress and the administration will not abide by economic law as proven by the experience of all history and confirmed by Mr. Black.

Similarly, Mr. Edward Hunter, an expert on the Far East, testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on March 24, 1959, that when we attempt, with American aid, to counter Asian countries with their slave labor, "we depress our own labor standards, and try to fill a bottomless pit with our aid." He urges that we stick to private enterprise, observing that the government-to-government procedures often cannot be distinguished from socialism. Finally, he says the leaders in various countries (receiving our aid) have said to him, "What are you people trying to do? Do you want us to be Communists?"

As for the waste and corruption, I refer you to your own congressional reports, and those of the Comptroller General of the United States and the General Accounting Office, which I have already mentioned. I cannot understand how any legislator who has studied these reports could fail to demand, henceforth, the most meticulous estimating and subsequent accounting, together with the complete elimination of ICA's malpractices.

Gentlemen, at a fabulous cost to the American taxpayer, ICA has squandered countless billions, lowered the prestige of the United States, and dragged this Nation's reputation through the muck of corruption. And all to what end? To train other peoples to expect, demand, and depend on billions of dollars in grants and loans from us, and to abjure self-reliance, hard work, and sacrifice as the only sure means wherewith to develop their countries, and acquire spiritual and economic independence and dignity.

As for the fraud involved in foreign aid, the American public and the Congress, from the beginning repeatedly have been misled and misinformed. They were told at first, that these programs were to be temporary, and of short duration. Now the ICA bureaucrats, abetted by the Draper committee, insist they must be put on a continuing basis. Thus, all debate as to the need for foreign aid would be silenced permanently. They were told the expenditures would be relatively modest; now the ICA bureaucrats demand even more gargantuan appropriations than before. The giveaway programs allegedly were developed to defeat communism, whereas, in fact, we have handed over more than $1 billion to Yugoslavia, hundreds of millions to Poland, and supported Marxist regimes in Bolivia and, I am told, Indonesia. Private enterprise was to be upheld; actually, we have encouraged and financed collectivist and Socialist regimes all over the earth, thus making a Communist takeover far easier than it possibly could be otherwise. ICA officials declared that great progress was being made, thanks to our gifts in Bolivia. A few months later, events compelled these same officials to admit that their declarations had not been true.

So-called defense support is, I believe, much the biggest category of economic aid in the foreign aid bill. Purportedly, it was established in order to enable certain nations to carry on a large defense effort. Yet, according to the New York Times on May 31, Mr. Leonard J. Saccio, Acting Director of ICA, admitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that this, too, was an untruth. When, as is exposed by Mr. Saccio's testimony, contradicting his previous declarations, we find the Congress and the American public have been misinformed deliberately and fraudulently, we indeed have come to an all-time low in the conduct of affairs by ICA officials and bureaucrats.

Through the years, foreign aid has been presented to the public under a variety of names and agencies: Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, UNNRA, Marshall plan, point 4, technical aid, ECA, MSA, FOA, mutual security, and so forth. So many are the series of changing names, the proliferations of structures, and the overlapping organizations, as to leave the ordinary citizen in a maze of utter confusion. He neither can tell what has been done with his money, nor where it was spent, nor by whom. When his Representatives in Congress try to ascertain some of the facts, they are stopped, too often, by the information being classified, in totalitarian fashion.

Among the more alarming developments are:

1. Proposals in the administration and elsewhere to expand and make permanent the Development Loan Fund. Last year, before the Senate Appropriations Committee on July 18, I made the following statement on this economically unsound project:

"Under Secretary Dillon is reported to have told this committee on July 8 that the reduction of $325 million in the Development Loan Fund must be restored because: 'In all gravity I say to you that the future of our country and the future of freedom in the world will be decisively influenced by your decision on this particular appropriation'."

In reply to Mr. Dillon I say:

(a) "If all that stands between the future security of our country and the freedom of the world is the Development Loan Fund having $325 million more to disperse in soft loans, unacceptable to any other private or official banking organization, then, indeed, the United States of America and freedom have reached the end of the road. Mr. Dillon's alarm is false and should be stilled by you, gentlemen, rejecting his plea."

(b) "The whole idea of the Development Loan Fund is contrary to proven economic (Gresham's) law, that bad (soft or unsound) money and credits always drive out good (hard or sound) money and credits. To entrust this fund to ICA bureaucrats will do great harm wherever it is used and bring us enmity."

Fortunately, Mr. Dillon did not get his additional $325 million, but only a part of it. Nevertheless, the security of our country and the freedom of the world did not come

to an end. On the contrary, both the United States and our freedoms are more secure by reason of some saving having been made, thanks largely to you gentlemen on the House Appropriations Committee.

The proposition that the Development Loan Fund should be assured a minimum of $1 billion per year for 5 years is, I believe, not merely unconstitutional, but is so contrary to economic (Gresham's) law, which is just as much a law of nature as is the law of gravity, as to be sheer lunacy.

Anyone having a knowledge of economics can prophesy with assurance that Development Loan Fund credits, insofar as repayments are concerned, in large measure, will in due course be tantamount to grants. Certainly the U.S. taxpayers never again will benefit from their dollars. To the extent Development Loan Fund credits are repaid to ICA, more local currencies will be piled on top of those already acquired by the U.S. Government through the operations of Public Law 480. These huge accumulations of local currencies in many countries will create serious new problems, both for us and for the recipient nations. Of these, inflation will not be the least to plague both them and us.

2. It is proposed that an inspector with a staff, i.e., more bureaucracy, be created in the State Department for policing the administration of the foreign aid program. Of course, this in itself is an admission of the inefficiency and dishonesty with which it has been operated heretofore. The Department of State and ICA—without the supervision of an inspector—should handle this program competently and with integrity. The Congress and the people should be fully informed at all times in respect of all its operations, and above all, under the Constitution, the Congress should control the pursestrings, based on its own reports and those of the General Accounting Office, and see to it that it is properly and honestly run. This suggestion of appointing an inspector is like the system, with which we are all familiar, of appointing a coordinator when things did not go well; another coordinator when they continued badly; and eventually, a coordinator to coordinate the coordinators. This inspector suggestion is typical of the way in which bureaucracy has been piled upon bureaucracy in ICA. There is no sense to it.

3. The attempts through SUNFED (Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development), the special U.N. fund, headed by Paul Hoffman, and otherwise, to transfer foreign aid to some U.N. organization where we will be by far the largest contributors, and our dollars often will be spent by a hodgepodge of Communists and other Marxists, Socialists, and misguided idealists and unidentifiable theys, all of them basically disliking or hating the United States of America. Under any such U.N. setup, the people of the United States soon will learn that their money is being used more than ever to propagate collectivism and communism, and to destroy the United States of America and all the noble principles for which it stands. If these U.N. aid schemes prosper, the advanced nations will be impoverished, and the underdeveloped ones will be poorer and more helpless than ever. All hope for improving the world economic conditions will disappear.

Parenthetically, I would add that administration representatives are less than frank with us in these matters. In this connection, I submit for the record, as an integral part of my statement, copy of the National Economic Letter for February 15, 1957.

It would take volumes adequately to describe the vast and unending evils of foreign aid, as carried out by ICA (and still more, the U.N.). It is counter to our religion and our Constitution. (See my speech before American Coalition included with my testimony before Senate Appropriations Committee, July 18, 1958.) It encourages communism and foments collectivism and socialism all over the globe. It demoralizes both its recipients and our own citizens, who are connected with it. It contributes materially to our unbalanced budgets, national debt, and excessive taxation.

So intolerable and immoral is it, that I respectfully but strongly urge your acceptance of the recommendations of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, that the appriation for the next fiscal year be reduced by a total of $2 billion, and thereafter successively be reduced until finally taken off our already overloaded backs.

The Monroe Doctrine and Red Infiltration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as we adjourn over this Fourth of July weekend we should take the opportunity to reaffirm the ideals set forth in our Declaration of Independence and at the same time evaluate the threat inherent in the continuing drive on the part of the minions of Moscow to sow the seeds of subversion and unrest among the republics of the Western Hemisphere.

In his able article appearing in yesterday's Washington Evening Star entitled "Red Subversion in Our Back Yard," Mr. Constantine Brown points out—

> South America from the Caribbean to Tierra del Fuego is seething. Never before has America's backyard been in more serious danger than at present. Yet we do not appear to be able to take the initiative even in that area in which this country has so much at stake.

Mr. Brown's indictment is unquestionably based on the simple fact that we are apparently standing idly by while the agents of communism are sowing their seeds of unrest and, as usual, are playing the tune that the economic problems confronting Latin America are due to the machinations, or at least to the indifference, of the United States—that old whipping boy—the colossus of the north.

When the Monroe Doctrine was originally laid down we firmly enunciated our determination to resist with every means at our command the infiltration of the Americas by any power or combination of powers from outside the area. That dictum was respected down through the years and while our southern neighbors had their internal problems it was not until the advent of international communism that the problem became hemispherewide.

At this writing the United States is meeting Moscow head on in what has been called the Berlin crisis, while at the very moment of our involvement in Europe the ground is being cut from under us, as Mr. Brown puts it, "in our own backyard."

What to do? Well as I see it, it is fairly simple. First, let us include to a larger degree our South American neighbors in a share of our foreign aid expenditures—our mutual security program. And then let us take our time-honored stance under Mr. Monroe's doctrine and reaffirm America for Americans, the implementation of which shall be a clear-cut warning that we will intervene militarily and economically in any case where the overthrow of constitutional government is being engineered by a Communist coup. We did it in the case of Guatemala and it worked—let us not hesitate to do it again.

Following that, let us serve notice on Fidel Castro, or any other revolutionary leader, that we will not tolerate the invasion of one nation by another until the grievances impelling the attack have been carefully reviewed by the Organization of American States. We have the means and the military might necessary to maintain peace in this section of the Western World and we should not shirk that responsibility.

H.R. 3 and REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, during the course of debate on H.R. 3 on June 24, 1959, reference was made to the impact of the legislation on the REA program.

Shortly thereafter, the members of the Virginia congressional delegation received the following letter dated June 26 from Mr. Earl J. Shiflet, executive secretary, Virginia Association of Electric Cooperatives, Richmond, Va.:

> In view of a report carried in the Richmond Times-Dispatch June 25, 1959, reporting that members of the Rural Electric Cooperative Association were opposed to the Smith bill (H.R. 3) and for fear that the people of the State of Virginia will construe this to mean that the consumer members of the rural electric cooperatives in Virginia took action opposing the bill, I must dissassociate the more than 100,000 Virginia members of the Virginia Association of Electric Cooperatives from such implication.
>
> 1. At no time has the Virginia Association of Electric Cooperatives officially discussed the Smith bill.
>
> 2. At no time has any representative of the rural electric cooperatives of Virginia taken action concerning the bill as a representative of the electric cooperatives at national or regional meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.
>
> 3. No such action has been taken because we had not interpreted the bill to have any effect on the rural electric cooperatives.

However, today I received a telegram from Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, author of the letter referred to above, in which he stated the statement carried in the Richmond Times-Dispatch that "CELLER cited a letter from Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association who claimed its 4 million members opposed the measure. Several rural members disputed this," was untrue. What he did say, quoting Ellis' telegram, "I did write five Members of the House in the

hope of getting an amendment to exclude matters affecting the rural electrification program from H.R. 3 and such an amendment was offered on the floor. I did not say that our member systems or the members of NRECA opposed H.R. But rather that NRECA, the service organization of the rural electric systems of the United States which represents some 4 million member consumers, has a vital and direct interest in this legislation."

In reply to Mr. Shiflet's letter, I wrote the following letter dated July 1, 1959:

After dictating my letter of June 29, in reply to your letter of June 26, I decided to explore further the excerpt from the telegram sent to you by Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. As quoted in your letter, that excerpt read as follows:

"I did write five Members of the House in the hope of getting an amendment to exclude matters affecting the rural electrification program from H.R. 3 and such an amendment was offered on the floor."

Clearly that language was phrased in a manner calculated to convey the implication that the amendment was offered at the instance of Mr. Ellis. This amendment was offered by Hon. JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania. I have just talked with Congressman FULTON and he advises me that he did not receive a letter from Mr. Ellis; that he himself, with the assistance of legal counsel and members of his staff, conceived and drafted the amendment; and that he did so without the request or even the suggestion of Mr. Ellis.

The letter which Mr. Ellis wrote to a few Members of Congress appears on page 10724 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 24, 1959. Contrary to the inference in Mr. Ellis' telegram, nowhere in that letter did Mr. Ellis suggest an amendment to exclude matters affecting the rural electrification program from H.R. 3. Rather, the letter registered unequivocal opposition to H.R. 3 and clearly was designed to leave the impression that H.R. 3 was opposed by the some 4 million member consumers in the REA system.

As I stated to you in my letter of June 29, H.R. 3 does not in any way adversely affect REA, the views or comments of Mr. Clyde T. Ellis to the contrary notwithstanding, and I think it is extremely unfortunate that Mr. Ellis should undertake to convey the erroneous impression that he was speaking the views of 4 million farmers in opposition to a bill which is designed to preserve the principle of States' rights. I am sure that the overwhelming majority of REA members and consumers in the congressional district I am privileged to represent do not share Mr. Ellis' views.

Sincerely,

RICHARD H. POFF.

Foreign Affairs—Untying the Hand Behind Our Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the cold war which now rages between the United States and the Soviet Republic, the following article by C. L. Sulzberger carries a particularly trenchant message.

For more than a decade we have been at grim odds with te U.S.S.R. and in that period of time our annual expenditures have risen at a pace which saw our budgetary deficit rise to a total of almost $13 billion in 1959.

Mr. Sulzberger's remarks follow:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—UNTYING THE HAND BEHIND OUR BACK

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

Peace, a word easy to interpret and to understand, has virtually disappeared from the lexicon of our times. Instead we find turgid and unsatisfactory phrases: cold war, peaceful coexistence or competitive coexistence.

Formerly nations considered themselves at peace when they were not actively at war. War itself was seen, to use the words of Clausewitz, as "a continuation of state policy by other means." Now Soviet leaders have inverted this. For them state policy becomes a continuation of war by other means. True peace doesn't exist.

In its absence competition rages between disparate and rival political systems. This competition, involving all aspects of international life, is unabashedly recognized by communism. But much as we ourselves talk of competitive coexistence, we do little about adjusting to its implications.

The cold war has lasted almost 14 years, during which period our adversaries often warned that they intend to destroy us, albeit by nonmilitary means. Responding to the threat, we have spent billions of dollars on our own and our friends' defense. We have distributed largesse around the earth to dam menacing Soviet tides.

Nevertheless, costly as this response has been, we avoid the essential, central issue. This is that war is a contest for actual existence, whether that war be hot or cold. We have refrained from adjusting our social or political systems to the totality of the challenge.

While dealing with incalculable sums, we continue to budget their allocation on a restrictive annual basis, knowing all the while that our opponents plan 5 or 7 years ahead. The Russians, reaching around the globe, use the entirety of their immense and highly trained population where and as the state demands. But our reply is diffident.

In Morocco, where vital U.S. airbases are located, the Soviet Embassy is generously staffed with fluent, expert Arabists. Only one American in our mission speaks that language; and he doesn't know the local dialect. This typifies the way we are meeting the menace to our survival. We play the game as if it were an amateur tournament. The stake is winner-take-all. Yet we tie one hand behind our back.

OLYMPIC COMPETITION

Soviet teams, including numerous stars whom we would call professionals, score increasing point totals each time they meet us at the Olympics. We protest that their athletes violate the defined amateur status laid down for Olympic contests. A Russian soccer forward or pugilist may be paid by state factory or collective to do nothing but kick or punch. But surely we cannot ask Moscow to revamp its social system merely to suit our own old-fashioned, gentlemanly terms.

There is no simon-pure amateur in the U.S.S.R. Consequently, in sports as in other realms, we should compete by sending our best representatives, regardless of who pays them. This is above all true of the grimmer game whose prize is existence itself.

How can we provide the necessary skilled experts for our worldwide obligations as long as private industry continues to drain off talent by offers of pay exceeding the best our Government can afford? There is need for a law permitting the state authority to draft civilians for national assignments.

If a young man is expected to serve many months learning military techniques he may never be required to use, surely an older man might be expected to serve a lesser period to fight his country's cold war battles. Why should Washington not be entitled to demand, for limited terms, the abilities of specialists familiar with specific areas or problems but now working for oil companies, newspapers, banks or commercial firms?

Numerous complications are posed by this idea. Many sincere people would find abhorrent such intrusion into individual privacy. Nevertheless, need a rationed and carefully controlled authority, watched over by suspicious legislators, be either revolutionary or dangerous? Once the mere thought of Federal income tax was considered a violation of personal freedom. But democracy survived.

The paramount task for democracy today is to survive. However, we will win no coexistence competition with a hand remaining fettered to our back. The time has come to reconsider how better to use the talent that abounds in the United States—and remains unavailable for its defense.

A Duty to Foreign Orphans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, in the field of adoption of foreign-born orphans by American couples—in many instances, on a sight-unseen basis—there are many weak points in existing law which my bill, H.R. 7239, would eliminate and the present statute relating to such matters would be greatly strengthened.

This proposed legislation would still make it possible for American couples to adopt children born abroad. It would still make it possible for such children to be issued visas outside the normal immigration quotas for the country of origin.

The situation is best explained in the following remarks by Secretary Arthur S. Flemming of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on this subject and in regard to this legislation:

The present law exempting such children from the immigration quotas expires on June 30.

The proposed bill has two major objectives:

1. It would establish authority for issuance of nonquota visas for these children on a permanent basis.

2. It would require assurances that any child adopted abroad or brought to this country for adoption here will be properly cared for.

The effect of the bill is to extend to children adopted abroad, whether by the adoptive parents in person or by proxy, safeguards similar to those which now exist in the law for children adopted after they have been brought to the United States.

This would mean that an American couple wishing to secure a nonquota visa for a child adopted abroad would have to give assurances satisfactory to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare that the child

will be well and properly cared for in a suitable home.

Legislation enacted in 1957 permits the entry into this country under special nonquota provisions of any orphan who has been lawfully adopted abroad by a U.S. citizen and spouse.

This legislation also provides that nonquota visas may not be issued to admit children to this country for adoption unless assurances have been given that they will be properly cared for and preadoption requirements, if any, of the State in which the child is to live have been met.

The existing law vests in the Department of Justice the responsibility for determining that such assurances are satisfactory. The proposed law vests in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the determination of satisfactory assurances not only for children brought to this country for adoption but also for children adopted abroad.

Almost 1,200 children adopted abroad were issued visas under Public Law 85-316 between September 11, 1957, and June 30, 1958. It is estimated that more than half of these children were adopted by proxy. Cases have been reported in which there have been tragic consequences for children thus adopted.

While it would still be possible under the proposed bill for American couples to adopt children from abroad by proxy, a visa could not be granted until the prospective American parents gave assurances satisfactory to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that the child would have a suitable home.

It is our belief that the working partnership which already exists between this Department and a network of recognized public and voluntary social agencies active in adoption placements at the local, State and international level can be extended to play a key role in achieving the objectives of the bill.

The proposed measure would be a further expression by our Government of its concern for the welfare of all children. These new citizens of ours from other lands are entitled to the same safeguards that we traditionally extend to our native-born children in need of homes. The cooperative efforts of this Department and other Federal agencies can make a substantial contribution to that end.

A New New House Office Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the widespread, insistent demands from the people for less Federal spending, a lowering of the high cost of living, and relief from burdensome taxation, I replied that one cause of all three was the ever-continuing pressure on the Congress from the people for new benefit payments of one kind or another from the Federal Government.

That laid the primary cause for our financial ills squarely upon the shoulders of the taxpayers. That is where most, but not all, of it rests. But quickly I received replies that Members of the Congress themselves were not free from guilt, and my attention was called to the waste connected with the construction of the new Senate Office Building—and there was plenty of it—to the construction of another new House Office Building, neither of which any taxpayer even suggested building.

The situation was again called to mind by a June 13 editorial in the News-Palladium, published at Benton Harbor, Mich., which was captioned "Congressional Spenders." It started out:

A hundred-million-dollar bill to foot the cost of Congress next year breezed through the House this month with scarcely a ripple.

It called attention to many items, regular expenses of running the House, which ran into $150 million for next year. Another was the $82 million new House Office Building for Representatives.

No taxpayer other than Congressmen was responsible for that.

Permits me to show, by quotes from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 18, 1955, why my effort to prevent that expenditure failed.

Mr. CANNON was in charge of an appropriation bill which was before the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. Mr. RAYBURN, Speaker of the House, from the floor offered an amendment authorizing construction of a new House Office Building. Mr. CANNON, likewise a Democrat, and chairman of the Appropriations Committee, said, at page 3205:

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the emergency involved, and the urgent need of the facility for which the appropriation is proposed, the committee accepts this amendment and approves the expenditure.

Of course, there was no emergency.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order does come too late.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How does it come too late when I was on my feet seeking recognition before the gentleman was recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman, as chairman of the committee was recognized first.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is to say the rule that requires recognition of the chairman of a committee would deprive another Member from making a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. No. Did the gentleman address the Chair?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did address the Chair before the Clerk finished reading.

The CHAIRMAN. That was not the proper time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was on my feet and addressed the Chair before the Clerk finished and as soon as he finished. Now, if I have to shout louder, I can do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair could not recognize the gentleman until the Clerk had finished reading.

I was on my feet with a valid point of order before and when the Clerk finished reading, but was overruled, and that is how the building of the New House Office Building was authorized.

The ruling was wrong and that is known to every student of parliamentary law. I objected both before the Clerk had finished reading and as soon as he finished reading, and was entitled to recognition. Moreover, as every student of parliamentary law knows, a point of order is always in order.

But the Speaker of the House offered the amendment which called for the new building, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee accepted it, and the chairman of the Committee of the Whole House—all Democrats—overruled an obvious, valid point of order, and the authorization went through.

That is the way the Democrats in control of the House worked their will with the taxpayers' dollars on that particular occasion.

An appropriation of some $80 million authorizing the building will probably, if present trends and practices continue, involve a final total cost of more than $100 million—all for the convenience of the Congressmen—an expenditure which the voters did not request or approve.

It is obvious that, while the taxpayers are primarily to blame for many expenditures, they are by no means responsible for all. Some of the big ones the Congressmen think up all by themselves.

Exit Lewis L. Strauss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. George E. Sokolsky and published on June 26, 1959, entitled "Exit Lewis L. Strauss." Mr. Sokolsky is an exceptional writer, and he has dealt with the treatment given to Lewis Strauss very effectively and factually. My reason for placing this in the RECORD is so that everyone throughout the country may have an opportunity to read this article.

The article follows:

EXIT LEWIS L. STRAUSS
(By George E. Sokolsky)

The Strauss controversy is not dead and will not cease to be a political issue until after the 1960 election. It is easy talking for Senator LYNDON JOHNSON and Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN to say that they will bury that hatchet. But they have buried it in the neck of a human being. It may even lead to a constitutional amendment giving the President the authority to choose his own Cabinet without "the advice and consent of the Senate."

By a parliamentary trick, Lewis L. Strauss was rejected as Secretary of Commerce of the United States. It was a soul-searing experience and while the vote was 49-46 and the proceedings were strictly partisan, nevertheless a human being who has served his country well, has been rejected and humiliated.

For any man, this is a tough deal. It will hurt forever.

The question is: Does Lewis L. Strauss deserve such treatment? Is he a thief? Has he accepted bribes? Has he ever harmed his country? Is he a wicked man?

No one, except possible Senator WAYNE MORSE, has ever questioned Lewis Strauss' integrity, and to be insulted by Senator WAYNE MORSE is not altogether an unhappy occurrence. It may even help a man in his political relationships.

What then is Lewis L. Strauss' crime? Let me list some of the accusations against him:

1. He is haughty in manner.

2. He has withheld information concerning atomic energy from committees of Congress.

3. He has followed President Eisenhower's program in the Dixon-Yates matter, seeking to save the United States from socialistic power programs.

4. He has refused to consent to Senator CLINTON ANDERSON'S program to enter upon a wasteful and costly atomic public power program for which there is no necessity in this country.

5. He has been a banker.

6. He brought about the dismissal of Robert Oppenheimer from the Atomic Energy Commission after Oppenheimer gave testimony to establish that he had lied and that he had paid dues to the Communist Party.

7. He has prevented the shipment of American goods to Soviet Russia.

For these felonies and misdemeanors, the Democratic Party in the U.S. Senate opposed his confirmation as Secretary of Commerce. For these reasons, he was humiliated and rejected.

It is not astonishing that Senator WAYNE MORSE and Senator CLINTON ANDERSON opposed Strauss. It is astonishing that Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, a man of foresight and political know-how, resorted to a political stratagem to force a vote on the Strauss matter when several Republicans who would have voted for Strauss, were away from Washington. Some of them rushed back, just in time to vote. All he needed was two more votes for a narrow confirmation. On such small margins are great issues decided. Had he been confirmed in this manner, he would undoubtedly have declined to serve as Clare Luce had.

I have known Strauss well for about a quarter of a century. I first met him in the company of Herbert Hoover. He had been Hoover's secretary and friend since 1917. He had been associated with Hoover in all his relief enterprises. He had thus had a vast experience in administration and in humanitarian endeavor.

When President Truman appointed Lewis Strauss to the Atomic Energy Commission, it was because of this experience and because Strauss had made himself a master of atomic science and had had close relations with the Princeton group, including Albert Einstein.

Strauss may go back to banking or may devote himself to public service but this is certain: He will not be sore. He is not that kind of a man. He will accept it that when one enters politics, one must be prepared for anything.

On the other hand, when the game is played in this manner, how is it possible to mobilize the brains and character of this Nation for public service? Who needs to go through the ordeal of Clare Luce or of Lewis Strauss? There are other things to do. There are places to work where one's services are appreciated and where one is not humiliated by politicians who cater to pressure groups.

Operation Brainpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 16, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am very much impressed by a statement made by Mr. Thomas Meloy, president of Melpar, Inc. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a report on this talk which appeared in the Northern Virginia Sun on June 25. Mr. Meloy expresses an idea which I believe merits the attention of all who are concerned with the future of our country's educational and technological development in the coming space age.

THOMAS MELOY, MELPAR'S PRESIDENT PROPOSES OPERATION BRAINPOWER TO BUILD UP U.S. SCIENTIFIC EDUCATION

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Thomas Meloy, president of Melpar, Inc., a subsidiary of Westinghouse Air Brake Co., talking before the National Rocket Club here, proposed a plan, Operation Brainpower which industry should sponsor to meet the need of our space age manpower challenge.

Speaking from his own company's experience and training program, Mr. Meloy suggested that industry, especially those engaged in military and Government projects, and employing high-level scientists, engineers and skilled technicians, could utilize them for teaching in-plant courses and also to teach in their areas schools and colleges, which are not equipped with scientific and engineering courses and technical facilities.

Mr. Meloy in amplifying his talk stated: "This plan which I am proposing, Operation Brainpower would utilize a national reservoir of scientific brainpower on a scale that has never been achieved to date.

Operation Brainpower would enable every industry employing scientists, engineers and highly skilled technicians, who are faced with the common problem of increasing the future supply of scientists, to effect a solution.

The following steps were suggested to overcome future scientific manpower needs:

1. Preparation by industrial plants of roster of engineers and scientists in their employ, who could be offered as instructors to schools and colleges in their areas not having complete engineering courses.

2. Work out program of in-plant training courses with local colleges, universities and trade schools which would enable company to upgrade promising, young men and develop them into future scientists and engineers for the space age.

He further stated that "Industries engaged in research and development work should actively encourage and support scientific education at the community, State and national levels." This means establishing fellowships at leading universities, awarding scholarships to colleges and inspiring high school students to study for careers in science and engineering.

Mr. Meloy stated that he felt the urgency for a plan such as Operation Brainpower, because of the predicted shortage of approximately 20,000 engineers within 5 years. He also indicated that some economy in the cost of recruiting could be achieved by developing the proper number of engineers and scientists to meet the need of the U.S. space age.

The American Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, confronted as we are by a powerful and revolutionary force dedicated to our destruction the activities of the Department of State and the Foreign Service have come to occupy a central place in the life of the Nation. With each new assumption of global responsibility the importance of these activities is expanded and multiplied.

As the activities of the Department have grown, the position of the Secretary of State has become increasingly complex and compounded. Policies must be formulated, negotiations conducted, and decisions articulated on a broad range of foreign policy subjects.

Writing in the June 4 edition of the Listener, Prof. H. G. Nicholas has sketched a peculiarly informative portrait of the transformation in the office of Secretary of State. In the belief that his sketch will provide a valuable insight into the position of the Secretary, I ask that it be included with my remarks.

[From the Listener, June 4, 1959]

THE AMERICAN SECRETARY OF STATE

(By H. G. Nicholas)

The world has become used to the United States rotating like some vast planet every 4 years. In November of each leap year a President is elected; for 4 years he holds sway uninterrupted until in November of the next leap year his mandate expires or is renewed. The resignation of the late Mr. Dulles, however, halfway through one of these quadrennial periods, was a reminder not only that the rhythm is not necessarily so fixed but also that the planet is not alone. Rather, the President now appears (like Saturn) as only the center of a series of concentric rings of which by far the nearest and most important is the Secretary of State. The world, perhaps as never before, is now conscious of the potency and dimensions of the office, and views a change in its incumbent as only one degree less significant than a change in the tenancy of the White House itself. How has this come about? Are we right to see the Secretary of State in these impressive terms?

The historian will not find the present situation entirely novel. He will remind us that before there was a President there was a Secretary of State—or, to be precise, a Secretary of Foreign Affairs. In the infancy of the Republic, during the years of Confederation, when Congress served as both executive and legislature, it found it impossible to get along without a Department

of Foreign Affairs, and to the post of Secretary it appointed in succession two of the ablest figures of the period, Robert Livingston and John Jay. They laid a foundation so solid and sensible that when the new Constitution came into operation in 1789 the existing system was continued, though with the difference that the Secretary no longer served under the immediate authority of Congress but under that of the newly created supreme Executive, the President of the United States.

Unfortunately in the rush to get everything packed and the system of government underway, one or two things were left out. It was discovered that there was an assortment of duties which had to be performed but which none of the executive departments was exactly adjusted to discharge. No arrangements had been made for publishing the acts of Congress, no one had been designated to keep the Great Seal and the accounts and records of the United States; worst of all, now that the United States was a federation, no part of the Federal Government had been made responsible for conducting correspondence with the several States. There was nothing much in common between these tasks and none of them had much to do with the conduct of foreign relations, but they had to be handled somewhere, and it seemed to Congress as if the Department of Foreign Affairs was not too overburdened to take them on. However, if it was to have its functions thus irrelevantly augmented, it hardly made sense to go on calling it by the old name. So in September 1789 the Department of State was born and its principal officer was designated henceforth the Secretary of State.

Neither then nor since have these odds and ends taken up much of the Secretary's time or thought. But in the lighthearted way in which Congress dumped these forgotten items in the Secretary's lap one may see an indication of the contradictory attitude which Congress displays towards him at intervals throughout American history. Oh the one hand foreign affairs are judged so important that the Secretary of State is the senior member of the President's Cabinet and was indeed, between 1836 and 1947, second in succession to the Presidency. On the other hand there is recurrent hope that foreign affairs will give so little trouble that the Secretary of State will be free to go fishing and that the most important U.S. embassies can be staffed with party spoilsmen.

The act of 1789 which set up the Department makes it clear that the Secretary is, in law, the direct subordinate of the President. He is to perform such duties as the President may assign him and is to conduct the business of the Department "in such manner as the President * * * shall from time to time order or instruct". In this respect the Secretary is no different from any other member of the President's Cabinet; they are all servants of the President, alter egos who do for him, in relation to the work of their separate departments, what, owing to human limitations of space and time, he cannot do for himself. He appoints and dismisses them, consults or ignores them, instructs or leaves them to their own devices. What their relationship with the President is to be is entirely for him to determine. It is not a team he leads, like the British Prime Minister; it is an administration he directs. The people have put the President where he is; he alone has put them. The power they exercise is all delegated by him. But this has never meant that a President could safely surround himself by nonentities. Indeed the ideal has always been what George Washington proclaimed it to be when he chose his first Cabinet, to appoint men "already of marked eminence before the country; not only as the more likely to be serviceable, but because the public will more readily trust them".

Especially is this true of the Secretary of State. From the earliest days the country has always wanted to have someone as the head of the State Department that they could trust. If you look over the long roll of Presidential Cabinets you will find that the Secretaryship of State has generally been held by the weightiest and ablest member of the group. In the first formative years of the Republic in particular, when the fundamentals of American foreign policy were being laid down for a century, a series of brilliant statesmen followed each other in the Department of State—Jefferson, Randolph, Marshall, Madison, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Henry Clay. In this period the office, more often than not, was a stepping some to the Presidency itself. In the first 40 years half of the Secretaries of State go on to become Presidents. Then comes a change. After 1831 only one Secretary of State, James Buchanan, is elected to the Presidency, and only one, James G. Blaine, is even nominated subsequently as a candidate. Nowadays, it is probably true to say, no serious aspirant to the Presidency would regard the road to the White House as lying through the State Department. How should we account for this change?

In part it is due to a transformation in the character of the Presidency. The early Presidents were all, in varying degrees, patrician statesmen chosen from a limited circle for their proven fitness and experience; for an office so conceived the Department of State was an obvious proving ground. But as America's westward expansion turned her gaze further and further from Europe and from foreign relations in any shape or form, and as popular suffrage spread and national parties developed, a change occurred. The President was now nominated by a national party and directly elected by the people; thus the emphasis fell, as with Andrew Jackson, not on proven competence in the arts of Government but on broad popular appeal, and appeal of this kind could not easily be acquired by performance in the State Department.

At about the same time, though for different reasons, the Secretary of State's job changed its character too. Or perhaps not its character so much as its scope. With the extrusion of European imperialism from the Western Hemisphere and the enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine, the great formative periods of foreign policymaking for the young Republic were over. It was as if the ship of state had now been set on her course and could be left to plough ahead on calm seas with only an occasional touch from the steersman. For three-quarters of a century this was broadly true, so that although there were some able men at the State Department there was no great outlet there for their talents; indeed, if it happened that a superannuated dud like Senator John Sherman was appointed, few people thought that the Republic would come to any great harm in consequence. (The low esteem into which the office had fallen in the eyes of politicians was well indicated by Sherman himself who grumbled, "They deprived me of the high office of Senator by the temporary appointment of Secretary of State.")

Then came, at the turn of the century, that first American awakening to the perils and possibilities of world responsibility which is associated with the name of Theodore Roosevelt. Thenceforward to our own day, with only momentary intervals, foreign affairs are a major concern of American government and an increasing preoccupation of American public opinion. This brings back to the State Department a sequence of eminent and able Secretaries—John Hay, Elihu Root, Robert Lansing, Henry Stimson, Cordell Hull. But it does not make the Department once again a stepping stone to the White House. In all the tributes that the resignation of Mr. Dulles evoked there was not one suggestion that if time and health had been permitted to him the highest office might have been within his grasp. Nor has Mr. Herter's elevation made him a serious contestant for the Republican nomination in 1960. Why is this?

We can see something of the answer, I think, if we look at the relations between President and Secretary of State in two administrations notable for their concern with problems of foreign policy. Both Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt began with Secretaries of State whom they appointed primarily because they were considerable political figures in their own right. Bryan, three times Democratic candidate for the Presidency, had been largely instrumental in securing the nomination for Wilson in 1912. Hull, much less of a national figure, was none the less highly influential in the Senate and throughout the Democratic South which provided half of Roosevelt's popular following. But Wilson found the divergencies between his policy and Bryan's pacifism were too great to be bridged and in 1915 Bryan the politician was replaced by Lansing the Counsellor of the Department, the lawyer who was the technician of policy, the expert official.

"F.D.R." under strain of war reacted similarly; his disagreements with Hull were never great enough to warrant dismissal, but whenever he was at odds with his Secretary of State he simply by-passed him and used Sumner Welles, the Under Secretary. In 1943 the jealousy to which this gave rise obliged Roosevelt to dismiss Welles, but the by-passing did not cease; Harry Hopkins, the President's personal assistant and White House lodger, was repeatedly employed on diplomatic errands.

Historians have sometimes tried to explain these relationships in terms of the personality of the President involved—Wilson's autocratic moralism, Roosevelt's reliance on personal charm and devious indirection. But there is more to it than this. In proportion as foreign affairs have become a growing preoccupation of American public opinion, so the Secretary of State has come under the shadow of the Jacksonian concept of the Presidency. Too important now to be left to mere technicians, the conduct of American foreign relations requires at the State Department a man of stature who can deal with foreign ministers abroad and with Congress at home as an equal, if not a superior. But just because the decisions in foreign affairs involve issues of life and death for the Nation these decisions cannot ultimately be taken by a mere appointee, however able and however dedicated. They can only be taken by the one man who represents the American people because he has been elected by them, the President. Truman understood this perfectly; although he had, first in Marshall and then in Dean Acheson, Secretaries of State to whom he gave his complete confidence, from the outset the big decisions were all his.

One is tempted sometimes to think that there may be more to it even than this. Respected though he may be, the Secretary of State can seldom hope to be a very popular man. Like the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, one of his main jobs is to tell the public what they do not wish to hear. This has been especially so during these last decades when the cherished dream of American omnipotence has come into such painful clash with the realities of world politics. In such a case, and when things go awry, it

seems as if it is not necessarily the President who mainly suffers; he is, after all, the electorate themselves in another guise. Instead the Secretary of State becomes the whipping-boy.

It is the Secretary of State who has to spend long hours before the committees of Congress, to defend a policy which may often be of his master's making. It is he who has to answer a barrage of questions from Senators and Congressmen. When these assume, as they often do, a humiliating or embarrassing form, he can neither, like the President, take shelter behind the prestige of his office, nor, like a British parliamentarian, give as good as he gets in the sure knowledge that his back-benchers will cheer him. The Senate, in particular, believes that truculence should be a one-way street. A Secretary of State who would win their support must combine the patience of Job with the heroism of St. Sebastian; he is not even permitted to imply that the arrows are wide of the mark and do not really hurt—that was what lost Mr. Acheson votes when he was tied to the Senatorial stake. The President can, upon occasion, read Congress a lecture; the Secretary of State never. So it comes about that for the "loss of China" and the stalmate in Korea, Truman admittedly was criticized, but it was Marshall and Acheson who were scourged. And has not something of the same happened upon occasion where Eisenhower and Dulles were involved?

So the picture emerges of the Secretary of State as a figure strangely compounded and curiously placed. In the increasingly complex world of international politics he must be an expert diplomat; yet he must also have a political standing at home. For all that, he can never press his own judgment against the President's; the people's choice is the boss. If things go well he may get some credit, but even when he has brought the dragon to its knees it is probably a St. George from the White House who will administer the coup de grace and take the plaudits. If things go badly he will get most of the boos and may even be thrown to the lions. And when his time is done he can hope for no further preferment, except what comes from writing his memoirs or returning to his law practice. Happy the country which offering so little can yet attract to its employment so many illustrious public servants, from Robert Livingston to Christian Herter.

Commodity Credit Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, June 30, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tables he had been furnished by the Department of Agriculture having to do with Commodity Credit loans made to producers which were in excess of $50,000.

On pages 11201 and 11202 were listed loans made to soybean growers, and on that list were six loans made to growers in Mississippi County, Ark. The record should be clear, and I wish to make clear the fact that these were loans—not outright grants such as are made to commercial airlines; loans—not subsidies such as are used to pay a great part of postal charges for slick-paper magazines. Many other such subsidies could be cited. The CCC loan program does not cost the taxpayer unless the commodities were not withdrawn by the farmer and subsequently sold by the Government for less than the amount of the loan by Commodity Credit. To illustrate this fact, I wish to place in the RECORD at this point a telegram which I have received from a Mississippi County farmer, who is also general manager of the Mississippi County Production Credit Association:

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Mississippi County ASC office made $4,386,000 soybean loans in 1958; 75 percent has been paid. Most of balance will be before deadline. Collected enough fees from farmers to pay clerical and field help 5 years. Farmers averaged $2 for beans. Where storage not available $1.50. Without storage and loan farmers would have had minimum of $3 million less income this county. Program has not cost Government. Saved farmers big and little from heavy losses. Despite insidious propaganda program is good for agriculture and business. Limitation will upset orderly marketing. Will not save money for Government. Will cost economy of Nation.

LLOYD GODLEY.

Attorney Joseph J. Savitz, of Wilkes-Barre, Elected Commander of Pennsylvania Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of June 29, 1959.

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader, June 29, 1959]

ATTORNEY JOSEPH J. SAVITZ, OF WILKES-BARRE, ELECTED COMMANDER OF PENNSYLVANIA JEWISH WAR VETERANS

Attorney Joseph J. Savitz, of 278 East Northampton Street, city, was unanimously elected commander of the Department of Pennsylvania, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, at the concluding session of the 26th annual convention yesterday. The 3-day conclave was held in Atlantic City, N.J., and was attended by some 500 delegates.

One of the several resolutions adopted at the convention was that future department conventions be held within Pennsylvania and not outside the State.

A member of the law firm of Rosenn, Jenkins and Greenwald, Attorney Savitz is a past commander of Post 212, past department of Pennsylvania judge advocate, past national liaison officer and is vice chairman of the National Foreign Affairs Committee.

He served 3 years with the Army during World War II, in this country and overseas. He received the bachelor of arts degree from Wilkes College and was graduated by the University of Pennsylvania Law School. Attorney Savitz is a trustee of Wilkes College and has served as president of its alumni association since 1957.

Attorney Savitz serves as a director of the Legal Aid Society, Wyoming Valley United Nations Association, Jewish Community Center, Wyoming Valley Jewish Committee, B'nai Jacob Synagogue, Wilkes-Barre Hebrew Institute and Luzerne County Civil Defense.

Delegates of Post 212 who attended the session were William Cherkes, post commander; Harry Fierverker, newly elected central district commander; Attorney Sol Lubin, Dr. Joseph Lubin, Theodore H. Yudkovitz, past department commander; Leonard Brader and B. J. Levin.

Members of the post auxiliary in attendance were Gloria Fierverker, newly elected president, and Dorothy Yudkovitz, past president.

Are Employment Security Offices Functioning Properly?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to include an article by Herb Levitt relating to the frustration experienced by a young mother who wished to hire a woman to care for her infant son while she and her husband worked; but she had no success.

We read daily of how many people are out of work; however, here we read about a job for which nobody had applied. I would say that the Michigan Employment Security Commission has been negligent in carrying out its obligations as far as administrative duties are concerned. It is time that we took a new look at the operations of all such employment security commissions in an endeavor to determine whether a complete overhauling is needed, or at least a reorganization so we won't have the very apparent mismanagement of operational functions as in this instance.

WOMAN WHO OFFERS JOB SENT AROUND IN CIRCLES

(By Herb Levitt)

A week-long battle against city, county and State bureaucracy by a Garden City mother has ended in a draw.

Considering the odds, however, Mrs. Janet Rasor thinks she must be credited with at least a moral victory.

Mrs. Rasor didn't want to battle the Detroit Welfare Department.

She had nothing against the County Department of Social Welfare. The State Bureau of Social Aid, with its Aid to Dependent Children and Old Age Assistance bureaus had never troubled her.

She wasn't even sure what the initials of the Michigan Employment Security Commission stood for until last week.

All she wanted was to hire a full-time housekeeper.

WOMAN WANTED

She is the office manager of an investment company. Her husband, William, is an engineer. They needed a woman to keep things tidy and care for their 7-month-old son, Bart, while they were at work.

"I thought I would contact a welfare office because I had read that many women were on relief because they couldn't find jobs," she said.

Mrs. Rasor tried the Detroit Welfare Department. Someone there, she said, told her that they didn't approve of their welfare cases getting work outside the Detroit area.

The County Department of Social Welfare was next on Mrs. Rasor's list. No help there.

Next on the list was Aid to Dependent Children—ditto.

WORKS IN CIRCLE

"A lady there told me to call the Dearborn Welfare Office, because it was closest to my home," Mrs. Rason said. "I did, and the woman there gave me the same phone number I had just called at ADC.

"By this time I was angry. I wasn't getting all of my work done around the office either."

ADC instructed Mrs. Rasor to call Old Age Assistance.

There she was told that while some of the older women in that program occasionally seek domestic work, there is no list of available prospects.

"Some of the people I talked to seemed put out because I wanted to put someone to work," Mrs. Rasor said. "I got the feeling I was rocking the boat.

MORE CALLS

"After awhile I was determined to get to the bottom. I didn't have any malice when I started—but when I finished—whew."

She also tried several other suggestions, before she finally hit on the answer—she thought.

"They told me that the Michigan Employment Security Commission ran a domestic placement service," she said. "So I called the Inkster office."

That call also proved fruitless.

"Somebody there told me that few domestics are eligible for unemployment relief—so they don't come around.

Welfare and employment office officials expressed amazement and disbelief when informed of Mrs. Rasor's woes.

NAMES SENT IN

"We've sent hundreds of names of capable domestic help to the Michigan Employment Security Commission domestic placement service," said R. Bernard Houston, director of the Wayne County Bureau of Social Aid. "We have one woman whose job is to route such calls to the proper place.

"You can be sure my workers will be further instructed."

Daniel J. Ryan, city welfare superintendent, could not believe one of his workers did not know about the Michigan Employment Security Commission services.

"We have a Michigan Employment Security Commission branch office right in our own central intake office," he said. "We welcome callers like Mrs. Rasor, and in the past we've placed many welfare recipients in such jobs."

Perhaps most surprised was John Watt, a Michigan Employment Security Commission spokesman.

"We have an agreement with county, Detroit and similar welfare agencies by which they screen domestic clients and refer them to us for placement.

"I'm going to send memos to every welfare agency to remind them."

"I hope this does some good," Mrs. Rasor said.

"I really saw red when one welfare worker told me to advertise for the help I wanted in the newspaper.

"I called the newspaper, all right, but it wasn't to advertise."

Meanwhile, neighbors are caring for her infant.

No Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a letter to the editor of the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Daily Journal from Matthew Cvetic on the subject of recognition of Red China.

Mr. Cvetic is a former Communist for the FBI whose recent lecture tour in South Dakota was very well received. His comments deserve careful consideration.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

NO RECOGNITION

I would like to comment on an article by George W. Cornell, Associated Press religion writer, in the June 9 issue of the Rapid City Daily Journal. The article deals with the question of whether we should or should not recognize Red China.

When I posed as a Communist for the FBI, I knew, as a matter of fact, that the Chinese Communists were part and parcel of the international Red conspiracy directed by the Kremlin. Why some of our diplomats of the late forties dealt with the Chinese Reds as agrarian reformers, despite the fact that they knew better, is something that stands the scrutiny of every American.

Why some American diplomats permitted the Chinese people to fall into the hands of Communist bandits is something only they, the diplomats who caused it, can explain.

From knowledge acquired inside the Soviet conspiracy from Communist agents, one thing stands out crystal clear—If we are to remain a free Nation and if we are to avoid a disastrous world war III, we can never recognize Red China. And why not? Simple mathematics reflect that recognizing Red Russia lost almost half of the world to communism. Recognizing Red China most assuredly can have only one final and appalling result—loss of the other half of the world to communism—and we are in that other half. To those who want to know the Kremlin's position on Red China, here it is:

The Kremlin's plan for Red China was handed down to Communists all over the world by the late leader of the Red conspiracy, Stalin, in 1949. Since, during that year, I was still posing as a Communist, I also received this Red directive. Quoting Comrade Stalin, it stated as follows:

"Comrades, we have now taken over China—our next task in China is fourfold: First, in 1950, we must liquidate (Communist for murder) 20 million in China to solidify our control. Second, we must gain recognition for our new Communist government in China. Third, we must secure admission for her to the United Nations. Fourth, finally, and the most important task, comrades, is as follows: We must get all the help in the way of machinery, material, equipment, and supplies from the enemy (we always called the United States the enemy in secret Communist Party meetings) for our new Communist government in China. This help from the enemy, comrades, will hasten the day of the Communist revolution in the United States."

So you can see that according to the Kremlin's plan, by recognizing Red China, by admitting her to the United Nations or trading with her, we would be literally sowing the seeds of our own destruction.

To those who want to recognize the Red tyrants in China, because they think it is the Christian thing—or the American thing to do—let me, as a fellow American and Christian, pose a couple of questions.

"Did Moses compromise with Pharaoh in Egypt to win freedom for the Hebrew slaves?"

"Did Christ compromise with the moneychangers, hypocrites, or the devil?" Of course not. And neither can we appease or compromise with the Red tyrants. Appeasement or compromise, not only will never win freedom for the enslaved behind the Iron or Bamboo Curtain, but can have the disastrous result of loss of our own freedom as calculatingly plotted by the Reds.

True Christians, good Americans, can never acquiesce in the enslavement of men by recognizing and giving respectability to the ruthless tyrants who enslave them.

MATTHEW CVETIC.

Water and Property Rights of the Individual and the Several States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication through the office of the distinguished secretary of state of the State of Illinois, the Honorable Charles F. Carpentier, from the members of the Illinois General Assembly, enclosing a copy of House Joint Resolution 46, relative to the water and property rights of the individual and of the several States, and to prevent Federal ursurpation of these rights, as accomplished through the recent decisions of the Federal courts and the recent opinions and assertions of the U.S. Department of Justice.

I am, by request, presenting this resolution, which follows herewith:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 46

(Offered by Messrs. Stremlau, Morris, Hunter, McConnell, Mills, McCully, Haag, Loughran and Whalen.)

Whereas recent decisions of the Federal courts and recent opinions and assertions from the U.S. Department of Justice have deprived States and persons of rights which said States and persons previously enjoyed, to regulate and control the use of water in those respective States and areas; and

Whereas said decisions and opinions are a part of a general pattern gradually developing into Federal supremacy over and usurpation of water which, if continued, will destroy individual and States rights and substitute in lieu thereof an all powerful centralized government control over water: Therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the senate concurring herein, That the President and Congress of the United States and the Representatives of the State of Illinois in the Congress of the United States, be and they hereby are urged and requested to take all necessary action (1) to preserve the water rights of the individual

and of the several States and to prevent Federal usurpation of those rights; (2) to initiate and support legislation which will reestablish and secure to individuals and to the States the rights taken from them by the Federal courts and the Department of Justice, and (3) in every way possible to reaffirm, renew, further, and defend the concept that water rights are property rights and that these established rights to the use of water by State or an individual should not be taken away without due process of law and adequate compensation.

Further resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the chairmen of the U.S. Senate and House Committees of Interior and Insular Affairs, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house, May 6, 1959.

PAUL POWELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

CLARENCE BOYLE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the Senate, June 10, 1959.

JOHN WM. CHAPMAN,
President of the Senate.

EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

An Oklahoma Salute to DAV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, during the past 7 years in Congress I have had many occasions to appreciate the fine work being done for the veterans of Oklahoma by the national veterans organizations which are active in my State. The service which they give to many veterans and the families of our veterans, is almost beyond measure.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Oklahoma, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

DAV ORGANIZATION

Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have very substantially benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger, its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan, and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its National Service Headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained an able and hard-working staff of full-time trained national service officers. The 138 full-time service officers, located in 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its Central Office in Washington, D.C., are on constant call to serve our disabled American veterans and their families.

They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

SERVICES IN OKLAHOMA

The DAV maintains a full-time national service officer in the VA regional office at 2d and Court Streets, Muskogee. Joe Adair is a good personal friend of mine and he also serves as DAV department adjutant, in addition to his community service as president of the Muskogee School Board. There are two VA hospitals in Oklahoma at which the DAV has VAVS representatives as follows: Mr. Guy T. Kavanaugh, 918 Boston Avenue, Muskogee, and Mrs. Floyd Edens, 1133 NW. 82d Street, Oklahoma City. Both of these VAVS representatives are a credit to the DAV in its mission of service, and my friend Guy Kavanaugh is the newly elected department commander.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $82,201,000 for its veteran program in Oklahoma, including $23,117,548 disability compensation to its 27,862 service-disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Oklahoma furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities.

The following figures supply impressive additional evidence of the outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officer in behalf of Oklahoma veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted, est	45,814.00
Claims folders reviewed	38,178.00
Appearances before rating boards	8,680.00
Compensation increases obtained	3,034.00
Service connections obtained	599.00
Nonservice pensions	1,029.00
Death benefits obtained	248.00
Total monetary benefits obtained	$1,933,309.66

The above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the Central Office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Oklahoma veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

ADDITIONAL DAV AIDS

These figures do not tell the full story of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—Civil Service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

For the service officer, every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are often not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible. A Claims and Rating Board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendent, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting it to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations, and schedule of disability ratings.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—and one major reason is that many claims are not properly prepared. The DAV is justly proud of its success in the preparation and presentation of claims—many successes having been scored in cases which had been turned down previously because of inadequate preparation by the veteran

acting alone and without skilled assistance.

LOSSES BY REVIEWS

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About 1⅓ percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Oklahoma with a consequent loss of about $364,000 per year.

A great number of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. Every disabled veteran in Oklahoma should carefully consider the advisability of enlisting the skilled assistance of the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, as a protective measure in the safeguarding of his rights.

HOW SERVICES ARE MAINTAINED

Many claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Indento-Tag—minature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in its own right. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Indento-Tag department, many of whom, during the last 8 years, were Oklahoma residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. Much more could undoubtedly be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

MEMORIAL HONOR ROLL

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all "serviced" claimants, DAV members, and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds, and by establishing special types of trust funds.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in Oklahoma by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington 4, D.C. Every such "serviced" claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100—$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal-year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations and various religious, fraternal and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations. For America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, the DAV has been a forceful, eloquent, and effective voice in our Nation's Capital, and a strong right arm in cities and towns all over the country.

I welcome this opportunity to salute the DAV—a great veterans' organization doing a great job.

Dr. Samuel Slavin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of June 29, 1959.

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of June 29, 1959]

DR. SAMUEL SLAVIN

Like so many individuals, who arrived here before the turn of the century, Dr. Samuel Slavin, a native of Russia, found America truly a land of opportunity. He was only 14 when he first sighted his adopted country. Twelve years later, he was a doctor of dentistry. For more than a half century, he practiced his profession, living to see his son and associate, Dr. Mortimer Slavin, who paid him the compliment of following in his footsteps, elected president of the Luzerne County Dental Society.

Greater Wilkes-Barre has a large number of individuals who found success and contentment under circumstances, similar to the experience of Dr. Slavin. Not all, to be sure, were professional men, but they and their offsprings today are numbered among our leading citizens. America and this community owe them a considerable debt of gratitude for the contribution they made to its development through their courage and initiative. Dr. Slavin is a notable example.

Latin American Police Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Roscoe Drummond as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 21, 1959.

As you know, one of Senator SMATHERS' amendments to which Mr. Drummond refers, to provide for an Inter-American Court of Justice, was not adopted by the committee. The other amendment, however, to provide for a Western Hemisphere Police Force, was modified and adopted in substance, by providing that $35 million be set aside for use by the Organization of American States to encourage the appointment of a police force. Of course if the $35 million is not used by the OAS for that purpose, it reverts to use for economic assistance to Latin America.

Recent events in Latin America point up the need for such a police force.

Mr. Drummond's article follows:

LATIN AMERICAN POLICE FORCE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Democrat of Florida, who has always shown an alert interest in Latin America, is making significant headway advancing a significant proposal.

What Senator SMATHERS is urging—and he is winning increasing support—is that the organization of the 21 American States be strengthened at two vital points so that it will have the means of securing the peace in the Western Hemisphere the way the United Nations was intended to secure the peace of the world but has never been allowed to.

Mr. SMATHERS proposes two concrete steps.

He would create a "volunteer police force" to deter or counter any use of force against any Latin American country and would put this police force at the disposal of the Organization of American States for such emergency.

He would establish an Inter-American Court of Justice as the legal arm of the Organization of American States to which the members would agree to refer justifiable disputes.

Senator SMATHERS' purpose is not just to show how well the United Nations could do its job if it were free to do it. That is just a byproduct, though a useful one.

The reason for creating the Organization of American States police force and an inter-American court is that relations between numerous of the Latin American nations are seriously deteriorating. There have been either threats or overt aggression against Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, and Panama in recent months. Without forces which it could instantly deploy, there is a dangerous prospect that the Organization of American States would be unable to help.

The United States would be benefited by helping to create a Western Hemisphere police force.

1. If the Organization of American States decides it must use force to counter an aggression against one of its members, the only adequate force which could be called upon would be U.S. defense forces. This could easily be made to appear like U.S. interference in the internal affairs of another coun-

try. How much better for both the Organization of American States and the United States to have an international police force for this purpose—a police force which could be used only by the Organization of American States and for the Organization of American States.

2. It would be more economical and would save us the myriad headaches of military aid to individual Latin American countries. This aid is not designed to prop up any government, but our military aid has been so used—much to our political discredit. For the next fiscal year the administration is proposing to allot $96,500,000 for military assistance to Latin America. I think there can be no doubt that we could achieve more mutual security throughout Latin America by spending part of this sum on a Latin American police force. We'd be better off politically. The Latin American countries would be better off defensively.

2. It is clear that the Communists in Latin America, taking their orders from Moscow, are organizing for the opportunity to get hold of other Latin American countries, as they did temporarily in Guatemala, where they will be as embarrassing and menacing to the United States as possible. Commenting on the recent attempted invasion of Panama, President Ernesto de La Guardia said: "This was not just a group of adventurers from our won country or even from Cuba. These people were mostly Cubans, but directed by and led by militant Communists. Their ambition is the long-stated one of taking over the Panama Canal." An Organization of American States police force would be good protection there.

The U.N.'s World Court lies limp from lack of use.

The U.N.'s international police force was still-born because the Soviet Union vetoed it.

The Western Hemisphere could use its own police force and its own court of justice.

Senator SMATHERS has already won important backing in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He needs—and deserves—further allies.

Edgewood Arsenal in World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I want to offer for the RECORD a speech of Mr. Michael J. Dwyer, candidate for national commander of the Veterans of World War I, endorsed by the Florida department:

One of our buddies revealed to me some first-hand observations of the chemical warfare operation during 1917–18. Edgewood Arsenal was a poison gas factory. It was located near Baltimore on the Chesapeak Bay. This was a top-secret operation and this buddy was assigned there as a private soon after induction into the Army.

There were no promotions, transfers or leaves granted to any one after they were assigned to this gas factory. The privates worked there many hours a day and slept, ate, and worked with gas masks around their necks. There were a 100-percent casualties per month in the mustard gas plant. That is every man was in the hospital by the end of a month with burns from this gas and every veteran that was in a combat unit over there should know what that means.

There were 7,000 enlisted men in this factory who lost their voice or could just whisper, all of them had scabs under the arms, between the legs, or wherever body moisture absorbed the mustard gas which was always present in the air.

The phosgene gas affected eyes, voice, lungs and appetites adversely. Many of the buddies could not read, talk or walk without considerable discomfort. They were too sick to go to the mess hall more than once a day but they had to continue to work regardless of illness.

For this they received $30 per month, minus $9 for their own insurance. Now this factory and camp was built by an American patriot who worked for $1 per year, his name was Honest Andy Mellon. A Major Walker from Ohio State University and undergraduates and other chemists were working there as privates. This Mr. Mellon built the factory and camp on a 10 percent cost plus basis. The barracks were beautiful steel and concrete permanent buildings, about 30 of them all erected for future expansion. The Du Pont firm acquired them after the war was over and there was no more gas needed for warfare.

The civilian employees received $30 per day and many of them were paid much more as it was a cost plus contract. It should be interesting to know how many of those 7,000 buddies are alive today after breathing all the gas fumes that affected their health in later years.

We Veterans of World War I deserve our traditional pension for the faithful service rendered during the Nation's time of need.

Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I have the privilege to include a resolution adopted by the council of the city of Philadelphia at a meeting held June 25, 1959:

RESOLUTION 357

Resolution memorializing the 86th Congress of the United States to enact the Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill (S. 1046 and H.R. 4488), a bill which would increase the minimum wage and extend protection to nearly 8 million additional workers

Whereas the present Federal minimum wage of $1 an hour is inadequate to provide a bare subsistence in the United States today; and

Whereas more than 20 million Americans lack the guarantee of even this inadequate figure and we are without any legal limitation on their hours of work; and

Whereas these shocking facts constitute a grave threat to our national economy, a challenge to our moral standards as a people and a peril to our reputation as democracy's showcase throughout the world; and

Whereas the existence of underpaid and overworked wage earners is a particular danger to the well-being of the people of Philadelphia. Unless a national minimum wage standard is established by Federal law, Philadelphia industries which pay a decent wage scale will suffer unfair economic competition from those in other communities which pay their employees low, substandard wages and are thus able to undersell our industries; and

Whereas there is now before Congress the Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill (S. 1046 and H.R. 4488) which would greatly ameliorate this problem by raising the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 and include nearly 8 million additional workers under the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act: Therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the Members of the 86th Congress of the United States to enact S. 1046 and H.R. 4488, a bill which would increase the minimum wage and extend protection to nearly 8 million additional workers.

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Members of Congress representing Philadelphia and the U.S. Senators representing Pennsylvania.

"A Flaming Torch to All America"—Remarks by the Honorable Bernard F. Dickmann, Chairman, at Ground-Breaking Ceremonies for Jefferson National Expansion Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thrilling experiences of my first term in the Congress of the United States was to be permitted authorship of Public Law 361 of the 83d Congress authorizing the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at St. Louis as a joint Federal-local project under the National Park Service. Work on this great project had been underway for 20 years or more before my bill became law, but the law was necessary to regularize appropriations already made and to be made in carrying out Federal responsibilities for the memorial.

The one man most directly responsible for the successful achievement of our dream in St. Louis of a great memorial project symbolizing the opening by Thomas Jefferson of the vast western areas of this continent to American settlement and development was and is the Honorable Bernard F. Dickmann, director of welfare of St. Louis since his recent retirement as postmaster, and, prior to a long and distinguished career as postmaster, one of the finest mayors St. Louis has ever been fortunate enough to have.

My husband, prior to his election to Congress in 1940, was secretary to Mayor Dickmann. No man is a hero to his secretary unless he is of truly great stature. I can attest to the fact that Mayor Dickmann was very much of a hero—and was a great inspiration—to John B. Sullivan, as he has been to everyone I know who has worked with him or for him over the years.

It was most fitting that when the long-delayed groundbreaking occurred on June 23 for the relocation of the railroad tracks which will clear the last obstacle to erection of the great riverfront project in St. Louis under the National Park Service, that "Barney" Dickmann was chosen as chairman of the impressive ceremonies.

I am very sorry that the heavy schedule of important legislation before the Congress early last week made it impossible for those of us in Congress who have worked many years for the achievement of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial to be present in St. Louis for the groundbreaking. Unfortunately, the arrangements were made without taking into consideration the difficulty of Members of Congress in attending affairs far from the Capitol during midweek.

However, I was pleased to receive a copy of Mr. Dickmann's excellent talk in officiating at the groundbreaking, and I am sure they will be of interest to all Members, particularly those from areas of the country which were part of the Louisiana Purchase.

Mr. Dickmann quoted the late William Allen White, of Emporia, Kans., about the desirability of establishing this memorial to Jefferson in St. Louis as a national park, as follows:

> The Louisiana Purchase * * * was Jefferson's major contribution to American life. The Louisiana Purchase, which Jefferson promoted and finally secured, made the United States a continental empire. The Louisiana Purchase, more than any other one political act, recast our Nation.

It was the view of Editor White that in making the great Purchase from Napoleon, "he did more to preserve democracy than he did when he formulated the ideals of democracy in the Declaration of Independence."

Chairman Dickmann not only dramatized the meaning and significance of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in officiating at the groundbreaking last week but put into perspective the great work done by many outstanding citizens of St. Louis since the late Mr. Luther Ely Smith first broached the idea to a brandnew mayor of St. Louis in 1933.

The remarks referred to, Mr. Speaker, by the Honorable Bernard F. Dickmann, at groundbreaking ceremonies for the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at St. Louis, June 23, 1957, were as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. BERNARD F. DICKMANN, DIRECTOR OF WELFARE, CITY OF ST. LOUIS, AT GROUND-BREAKING CEREMONY, JEFFERSON NATIONAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL JUNE 23, 1959

Members of the Jefferson National Expansoin Memorial Committee, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, this is a most auspicious occasion and I am deeply honored and privileged to act as chairman for these dedicatory ceremonies, here on the site of a dream come true. How I wish the late Luther Ely Smith were here to join with us, because it was he who conceived the idea of a memorial on the riverfront in St. Louis, and it was he who first approached me when I was newly elected mayor of St. Louis, back in 1933, to ask me to consider plans for a memorial on the site of Old St. Louis on the riverfront.

Twenty-six years ago, on December 15, 1933, a small group of citizens of this great city convened at the first meeting, held in the Adolphus room of the Jefferson Hotel, to plan a great memorial to the territorial expansion for which St. Louis is the gateway—the gateway to the west, as a memorial to the man who was responsible for that territorial expansion—the greatest peacetime acquisition in these United States, conceived and achieved by Thomas Jefferson. That, and the next meeting, was attended by men you know, men you knew, some with us here today, some called from us, to our deep regret. I think it is more than fitting that I call the roll of these men and women:

Mr. Luther Ely Smith, who fought the battle for this memorial from the beginning, and with whom it was my privilege to be associated in all the planning, the battles and the victories. Mr. John G. Lonsdale, Mr. Carl F. G. Meyer, Judge Jesse McDonald, Mr. Baxter Brown, Mr. Morton May, Sidney Maestre, who has been in the front all through the years. Tom Gilmartin, Isaac H. Orr, Claude B. Ricketts, McCune Gill, whose research gave us the valuable historic background on which to build our memorial. Walter B. Weisburger, Bill D'Arcy, William J. Gibbons, Gale F. Johnston, Max O'Rell Truitt, Frank C. Rand, Louis LaBeaume, Albert T. Perkins, J. Lionberger Davis, Judge George Hitchcock, Mayor Rolla Wells, Hon. Charles Nagel, Mrs. W. M. Grossman, Mrs. Edna Gellhorn, Miss Temple Burrus, and myself. From these two meetings came the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Association, incorporated June 11, 1934.

There have been many meetings, many conferences, many heart-breaking obstacles, but all happily overcome. How prophetic were the words of the late Newton D. Baker, a member of the U.S. Commission, who said: "This memorial will be like a cathedral; built slowly, but surely." Slowly it has been indeed, but how surely. Today marks the realization of this gigantic dream, a worthy prize in a long and well-fought battle.

I will not bore you too much with statistical data over these 26 years: the city of St. Louis took the first step by passing the necessary ordinances permitting our citizens to vote for a bond issue to contribute up to $7,500,000 for this memorial. That was in June and July of 1935; in August 1935, Congress passed a Historic Sites and Building Act, and in September of 1935, the citizens of St. Louis, at a special election, passed the $7,500,000 bond issue by more than a two-thirds majority. In November of 1935, the Missouri Supreme Court, in a test case, sustained the validity of the city's bond issue. In December 1935, by Executive order, the President of the United States, the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt, designated the National Park Service as the executive agency to acquire and develop the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, with an allocation of $6,750,000 of Federal funds, to be matched by $2,250,000 contributed by St. Louis. In January 1936, injunction suits in State courts were filed to restrain city officials from proceeding with the memorial, but the suits were dismissed.

In May 1936, the city of St. Louis deposited in the Treasury of the United States, $2,250,000 realized from the sale of the city bonds, making a total of $9 million available for the acquisition and development. This left $5,250,000 of city bonds unissued, available to match further funds from the Federal Government in the ratio of $1 of St. Louis funds to $3 of Federal funds. In July 1937, the city of St. Louis offered the old courthouse to the Federal Government for inclusion within the area of the memorial. In 1940 demolition of the buildings in these 37 city blocks was completed, and the only buildings left were the old courthouse, the old cathedral, the first church west of the Mississippi River, and the old rock house, all three of which are now part of our great memorial.

As we know, there was a national architectural contest for a design for our memorial, which was won by Mr. Eero Saarinen.

Then came one of the biggest obstacles to the building of our memorial, the removal of the tracks of the Terminal Railroad. This obstacle seemed unsurmountable, but with grim determination, our present mayor, the Honorable Raymond R. Tucker, resolved to overcome this obstacle, once and for all, and he appointed a committee of our leading railroad officials, requesting them to study the matter unselfishly, and from a civic standpoint, and through the combined efforts of our friends and leading citizens, Mayor Raymond R. Tucker, Hon. Russell L. Dearmont, new president of the Missouri Pacific Railroad, Hon. Arthur K. Atkinson, president of the Wabash Railroad, and the late Armstrong Chinn, president of the Terminal Railroad Association, the difficulty was resolved, and today marks the beginning of the relocation of the troublesome tracks.

Our forefathers built a sturdy democracy, they formed a more perfect union, and they established justice, insured domestic tranquillity, and provided for the common defense; they promoted the general welfare, and secured the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity. The Louisiana Purchase provided a growing people the greatest peaceful territorial expansion in history. With the purchase of Florida, the annexation of Texas, the cessions of the Oregon and Mexican territories, together with the Gadsden Purchase, our dominion was extended from coast to coast, and the foundations were laid for an enduring Nation. Can you visualize what our country would be like today if it had not been for the foresight of Thomas Jefferson? We would be a small country indeed, with much fewer opportunities for our people. That is what we are memorializing, fellow citizens, opportunities provided us by our forefathers, the right to expand, to develop, to grow, and go ever farther and farther westward. And it all started right here, in what was known as Old St. Louis. You all read about, and some of you participated in the reenactment of the day St. Louis was under three flags. What a moment in history. And it all took place right here, where we stand today.

May I quote some excerpts from an editorial written by the world-famous Emporia, Kans., newspaperman, who was a member of the U.S. Commission, the late William Allen White. He said, "The memorial in St. Louis will be the only adequate memorial to Thomas Jefferson, on the continent. It will be erected at the gateway to the Louisiana Purchase, which was Jefferson's major contribution to American life. The Louisiana Purchase, which Jefferson promoted and finally secured, made the United States a continental empire. The Louisiana Purchase, more than any other one political act, recast our Nation. Jefferson gave us our inspiration toward democracy and when he bought from Napoleon, the vast territory stretching from the Mississippi far into the western mountains, toward the Pacific, for $13 million, he did more to preserve democracy than he did when he formulated the ideals of democracy in the Declaration of Independence. Therefore, it is fitting at this time to erect this dignified monument on the waterfront in St. Louis to the great visionary whose ideals were realized and whose dream came true. This Jeffersonian Monument, here in the center of our land, will light a flaming torch to all America. It will point the way that Jefferson would lead us, to an enlightened country, peopled by free citizens with equal opportunity for all."

Luther Ely Smith was the first president of our local memorial association; he was

succeeded by Mr. William W. Crowdus, who has served in that capacity, very ably, for the past 10 years. And this past week, we acquired a new president, Mr. Morton D. May. Buster May has succeeded Mr. Crowdus and we welcome him, and look to him to carry on our work to the final completion of this memorial.

There are other speakers here today who will tell you more about our great memorial, its plans, and what it means to the Nation. So I shall stop here and introduce the first of our distinguished guests. As you all know, the Jesuits were the first to bring educational opportunities to St. Louis—today they are one of the strongholds of our community, one of the most inspirational and respected leaders in our spiritual welfare. It is fitting indeed, that the first church west of the Mississippi River should be a part of this memorial, and as the representative of the great faith that brought to us our earliest spiritual leaders, it is my distinct privilege to introduce to you, Rt. Rev. Msgr. James E. Hoflich, pastor of the Old Cathedral, who will give the invocation for the ceremonies to follow—Monsignor Hoflich.

One Step Forward, Two Steps Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the June 25 Journal of Commerce, which characterizes the wheat bill passed by the House and Senate as "one step forward, two steps back":

ONE STEP FORWARD, TWO STEPS BACK

Once again Congress has proved beyond any reasonable doubt that it is either unwilling or simply incapable of facing up to the realities of the crop support program.

The wheat bill it sent to the White House on Monday—even though labeled a "stopgap" measure and limited to 1960 and 1961 crops—is patently unacceptable. It is an open invitation to a White House veto, and perhaps a good many of the Senators and Representatives who voted for it intended that it should be precisely that.

They have certainly had fair warning that the President would balk at it. They had the opportunity to produce compromise legislation the President might accept, even though with reluctance. The course they chose, however, was the seemingly easy way of showing the farmers they favored high supports while shifting over to the White House the onus of saying, "No; the Nation cannot afford this kind of nonsense any longer."

Outwardly, the purpose of the wheat bill is that of cutting planting allotments 25 percent under the present national minimum allotment of 55 million acres. And since this in turn offers some hope of cutting the rate at which the Government's massive wheat surplus continues to pile up year after year, it is certainly commendable.

But at what price would this be accomplished? At the price of fixing price supports at 90 percent of parity. Not at 75 percent, as at present, not at 80 percent—or even at 85 percent, as suggested in various moves to compromise the House and Senate bills—but at the full 90 percent demanded by the House.

This is the equivalent of taking one step forward with a flourish of trumpets in broad daylight, then quietly retreating as darkness falls with the vague hope that perhaps no one will notice what is really happening.

The President and his Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, have fought a hard and thankless battle these 6½ years past to cut away some of the roots of the system that drives farmers one year after another to produce more of certain crops than they would have any hope of selling if the Government didn't step in and pick up the tab.

They have not sought to eliminate the system altogether, but merely to modify it by replacing high rigid supports with a more flexible system under which production would tend to drop as incentives were cut back by establishing at least a slight relationship between parity payments and market prices.

Experience has shown that it is not always sufficient to reduce acreage allotments, for farmers naturally withdraw their more marginal lands and concentrate all the harder on their most productive soil. And if this has been so in the past, what can we expect if the parity payments are suddenly jumped up to 90 percent?

For one thing, a good deal of the painful progress made during the past half-dozen years will be wiped out. So far as wheat is concerned, the withdrawal from 90 percent of parity will have to start all over again 2 years from now.

This is perhaps the most depressing aspect of the whole affair, for what the present Congress has done is wash its hands of a difficult issue and pass it over to another Congress in a state considerably worse than it was at the beginning of the present session.

For another thing, whatever reduction this measure may seem to make in the accumulation of 1960–61 wheat surpluses will be largely illusory. The physical surplus may be smaller in those years, but the Government will pay a good deal more for what is actually produced. Mr. Benson has warned in fact, that far from cutting the overall cost of the program by $264 million a year, the measure would raise it by $100 million to a total of $800 million.

The odd thing about the wheat bill is that its worst feature—the 90 percent parity requirement—was affixed not in the Senate, where agricultural interests exert the greatest strength, but in the House.

Another curious twist is the unofficial explanation that the Senate approved the original House version as the lesser of two evils—the other having been the necessity of working out still another version which would be acceptable to both Houses—something that would naturally require both time and effort.

This is about as lame an excuse for bad legislation as we have heard in some time. Of course, it would have required more time and effort. But it is not, after all, the business of legislators to legislate? And if the President vetoes this measure—as we expect and hope he will—will not both House and Senate have to get to work on another measure anyway?

They will unless they can override his veto. And judging by the narrow margin (44 to 40) with which this bill passed the Senate, we rather doubt they can muster the votes to do so.

The World Refugee Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, last December the United States joined with other free countries in the United Nations in sponsoring a proposal for a World Refugee Year.

It was the hope of our Government that the proclamation of such a year would have the effect of arousing interest in refugees among countries and segments of the public who had not previously seemed aware of their plight, and would at the same time revive public concern and lead to greater assistance from those countries which had traditionally shown compassion for, and generosity toward these, our unhappy fellow human beings. Only the Soviet bloc opposed the proposal for the obvious reason that many of the refugees are fugitives from communism. Currently more than 30 countries have indicated that they will participate in the year, which begins today, by doing what lies within their power to help.

It is hard to estimate the extent of the refugee problem. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold of the United Nations has said that over 40 million people have become refugees since the end of World War II and that there are still 15 million without permanent homes. Of this number the United Nations helps only the 2 or 3 million who require international aid in special ways. The two largest groups are the nearly 1 million Palestine Arab refugees in the Middle East, almost half under 15, and the 1 million refugees from Communist China living in desperation and poverty in Hong Kong. The Algerian-French war has resulted in the flight of 210,000 refugees from Algeria into Tunisia and Morocco, the large majority of whom are women, children and oldsters. Escapees from communism in Europe number 100,000, many of whom are still in camps after nearly 20 years. There are 9,000 European refugees in Communist China. The recent aggression of Communist China against Tibet has driven 10,000 Tibetan refugees into India. Refugees from Nasser's Egypt number about 5,000 and other scattered groups increase the total by some 15,000.

Some countries have welcomed large numbers of so-called refugees as nationals and accord them all the rights of citizenship. West Germany, for example, has opened its doors to 12 million East Germans and 2,000 a week are still filtering across the border to escape the Communist dictatorship. South Korea and South Vietnam have offered the same kind of haven to their nationals from the Communist north.

During the World Refugee Year the United States plans a five-point program of assistance for the refugees aided through the United Nations.

First. Continued support for existing refugee programs at a cost of about $40 million a year.

Second. An additional $4 million to be assigned to the most pressing refugee problems.

Third. A special immigration program to bring to the United States part of the refugees requiring resettlement.

Fourth. An increase of $10 to $20 million for food distribution from the surplus agricultural commodity program.

Fifth. Full support for programs undertaken by the U.S. Committee for Refugees, which is coordinating the efforts of private refugee relief groups.

Those of us who are interested in helping in this program can do so through the many private agencies cooperating through the U.S. Committee for Refugees. Here is one instance in which individual efforts can help in the solution of an international problem of great importance. We should not miss the opportunity the World Refugee Year affords.

Public Highway Route U.S. 51

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication from the office of the distinguished secretary of state of the State of Illinois, the Honorable Chas. F. Carpentier, from the members of the Illinois General Assembly, enclosing a copy of House Joint Resolution No. 15, relative to the inclusion in the system of public highways now provided for by Federal law, and known as the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, of U.S. 51, starting near the shipping port of Duluth on the shore of Lake Superior, and extending in an approximately straight line to the great shipping port of New Orleans.

This highway is of the highest importance to the national defense. I am presenting this resolution, which follows herewith:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 15

(Offered by Mrs. F. C. Pierce, Messrs. Choate, Eberspacher, Scott, Hunter, McConnell, Mrs. M. E. Green, Messrs. Harbeck, Haag, Stremlau, William Pierce, Hollerich, Alsup, McCarthy, Clyde Lee, Billhartz, Holloway, Manning, Baker, Mills, Rhodes, McCully, Willett, Davidson, and Soderstrom.)

Whereas the existing public highway route marked as U.S. 51, commencing near the important shipping port of Duluth on the shore of Lake Superior and extending in an approximately straight line to the great shipping port of New Orleans, transverses the heart of the industrial, agricultural, and mining areas of the State of Illinois and is hereby one of the most important avenues of this Nation in the transport of personnel, goods, wares, merchandise, and foodstuffs essential to the health, welfare, and defense of this Nation; and

Whereas it is the sense of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois that such highway route in this State is a more heavily traveled and a more important pathway of communication than some of the routes that have been designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and should therefore be included as part of such National System of Interstate and Defense Highways provided for by the Congress: Therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, That the Congress of the United States is urged to take appropriate action to provide for the inclusion of the route of the existing public highway marked as U.S. 51 in the State of Illinois in the system of highways now provided for by Federal law and known as the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and that an appropriate copy of this resolution and its preamble be forwarded by the secretary of state to each Member of Congress from this State.

Adopted by the House, February 16, 1959.
PAUL POWELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
CLARENCE BOYLE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.
Concurred in by the Senate, June 8, 1959.
JOHN WM. CHAPMAN,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

Poison in Your Water—No. 136

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the RECORD an editorial from the Maine Outdoorsman and Conservationist for July 1959, entitled "Stinks in Portland, Too":

STINKS IN PORTLAND, TOO

When Portland residents began to get a whiff of what foul air smells like, and also an example of how contaminated air can change the color of the paint on a house, they rose in righteous indignation and demanded that something be done to remove this unpleasant situation. They're asking about Federal funds to alleviate such a nuisance.

Well, the good folks who live along the Androscoggin River, as well as numerous other highly polluted waters in our State of Maine, can certainly sympathize with their Portland neighbors. No; it isn't a pleasant odor. Incidentally, been up Rumford way lately?

Sooner or later, the people are going to become sufficiently nauseated with the whole stinking mess they'll start demanding that the legislators, who so far are much too complacent about the growing pollution problem, stop listening to the industrial lobbyists and start listening to the people who cast the votes to elect them to office.

Some day, perhaps, some of these elected public servants will start listening to the many, instead of the few.

Ezekiel Connected Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 1959

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a most interesting address delivered by Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, executive director, American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C., at the commencement exercises of Chowan College, Murfreesboro, N.C., on June 1.

The address follows:

EZEKIEL CONNECTED THEM

(Commencement address by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.)

I was talking with a sophomore junior college student not so long ago who was astounded to hear the dean of the general college of the University of Minnesota remind a faculty group that students could be looking at a teacher with rapt attention and still have their minds a thousand miles away. She said she didn't know that teachers knew that.

This happens, too, sometimes to people in church. With the best of intentions let me tell you a story. I sat in church a few weeks ago. As the service proceeded an impression began to trouble me. I though how matter-of-fact we seem to behave. How lifeless the words spoken. All at once I could hardly stand it. Like a torrent breaking through a dam, great resounding phrases began to come to mind:

"God created man in his own image."

"Know ye that the Lord He is God; it is He that hath made us."

"Go ye therefore and teach all nations."

"I am come that ye might have life and have it more abundantly."

"Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace."

How could we sit there, impassive, casual, proceeding mechanically? Where was the note of wonder and awe as we spoke His name? Where was the motivation of urgency? How could our faces be other than radiant with His glory as we spoke and thought of Him? How had we reduced the work of God to such a commonplace? And there came to mind the vision of the prophet, Ezekiel, as he saw the valley filled with dry bones and asked: "Son of man, can these bones live?" And I thought further, of my own vocation, what of our work in higher education—the learning process which ought to be such a thrilling quest—a glorious adventure into the problematical and the unknown—has it, too, had the life suffocated out of it? Are we too occupied with dry bones? Chemical equations, names and dates, rules and formulas, semester hours and passing grades, 64 credit hours and an A.A. degree. How can these bones live?

Ezekiel was a prophet to a people in bondage. And there is a kind of bondage that theratens us today. Goethe, the German philosopher spoke of it. He said it is the commonplace that enslaves us all. "Commonplaceness, the surrender to the average, that good which is not bad but still the enemy of the best—that is our besetting danger." And Henry Drummond, the great preacher, said we need to "move the vast inertia of the soul, and place and keep it

where the spiritual forces will act upon it."

To those who were in bondage Ezekiel, speaking in the name of Jehovah, promised: "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you * * * and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God."

Sometimes the greatest lessons are spoken in the simplest ways. I have heard choral groups sing the spiritual about the prophet Ezekiel. And the text of this talk might very well be put in a most rhythmic way: "Ezekiel connected them—dry bones—hear the word of the Lord." And the word of the Lord was: "I shall put my spirit within you and ye shall live."

Yes, shall live. There are certain characteristics of a living, vital individual. He is sensitive to his environment. He is tuned in to what is going on. He is not like the bull in a china shop. He is using all of his senses. He is not oblivious to his surroundings. He knows when it is raining and knows enough to come in out of it. He sees with perception—his hearing is acute. He has broad peripheral vision. The individual with vitality is sensitive.

In addition to registering the sounds, sights, and happenings in his environment he has a predisposition toward action. He is alert. Alertness means a readiness to respond. This is much like the description that William James gives of faith—a predisposition toward action. Action is anticipated. The individual is expectant, close to excitement. He is ready to move. What a thrill it is to have some people like that in the classroom.

And the live creature responds to his environment. In fact, continuance of life requires a response. If you poke an animal and it doesn't move, you suspect that it is dead. The environment will work toward the elimination of a creature that does not respond. If we are alive we answer to the situation—we reply to it. We do something about it. A man throws a brick at you. You respond to the situaion by ducking or you get hit. You have a class assignment. You turn it in or you get an "F".

But do you notice that we have said something else? You could respond to the brick-throwing situation by not ducking. You might simply shout at the man or make a face at him. This bring us to our next characteristic of vitality. The response will be an appropriate one. It will be suitable and proper and timely. This seems to be the essence of intelligence, that a person know how to respond to a situation in an appropriate way. He is sensitive enough to define the situation in accurate terms. He sees the picture. He responds in a way to further the objectives and values of his group. This is appropriateness.

The man doesn't want to get hit by the brick so he ducks. His objective is to save his face, to go on living—fight another day—this is considered desirable. The student prepares his assignment because he wants to remain a member in good standing of the college community. One great contribution of a college education ought to be the growing ability to size up a situation and to be able to respond to that situation with a knowledge of what is appropriate, that is suitable and timely.

There is one other characteristic of this vital individual. Not only does he respond appropriately, he responds with competence. This means that the appropriate way of behaving has been mastered so that when the occasion arises the individual is ready to respond, he has the ability. Appropriate behavior might call for the man to duck when the brick is thrown but what if the man is not agile? Appropriate behavior is to respond to the teacher's question with a comment, an answer, but what answer?

Let us look at it another way. We are going to sing a song—all of us. We need a songleader. You look around. Nobody volunteers. You are aware of the need. Sensitive to it. Tensions mounts. Finally you say you will do it. You have responded to a need, and appropriately too. The situation requires a songleader. You didn't leave the room in answer to the problem. You said you would do it. You know you need to do. But do you know how to do it? This is competence.

Now, to borrow a phrase from Ezekiel, How do we connect these qualities to areas of our lives so that we may live?

We live in a world of people—two and one-half billion of them. People of various colors, languages, religions. People with needs and wants. People with problems. People with dreams. There will be no life in us unless we make secure our connection with this world of humanity. I am part of all of this. The problems and issues of these people are my problems. This college is not an island off from the world. All that we have done here will lack sincerity, honesty, meaning unless the course in Geography means living, breathing people with hopes and aims and passions and burdens; unless Chemistry and Physics mean metals and soils and materials and energy and power for people; unless Religion becomes values, and striving, and believing and searching of people. Here then we find motivation. Here is the answer to that perennial question, "Why learn this stuff?" Here is the connection that gives the spark to what could so easily be the dusty verbalisms of the classroom.

There is a real possibility that you could interpret these two years here as an interlude between the life that was at home and your life when you leave here. Two years taken out with little connection between what has gone before and what will come. However life is not like that—not a sequence of pools. We do not jump from one to another with the water chemistry different in each pool. Rather life is like a river and the elements up stream are flowing into the portion right before us and that part of the river now visible is going down stream to join with that which is out of sight at the moment. Experiences before flow into the experiences of now and the now becomes our future character.

In this light we see our present work connected with reality—no busy work about this—no idle abstractions—no lifeless forms. Here and now there can be the essence of vigorous and meaningful and pulsating life as we connect ourselves with the factors in this present time and space at Chowan College. And with sensitivity and alertness we respond in suitable and timely ways with developing competence to the continuing stimulation of this college community.

There is another connection to be made if we shall live. Just as our biological make-up is the result of transmission of life from one generation to another just so there is a heritage of wisdom for those who would seek it. We have lifelines that extend back through the centuries to other people who lived and breathed and wondered and sought. They give us a head start if we can understand what they are trying to say to us. Unfortunately there is a possibility that life is squeezed out of the words that form the major record of these people who have gone before us. At Harvard, students have used the original laboratory notebooks of scientists who were searching for truths that we now accept. By retracing the scientists' steps, by sharing in their mistakes and disappointments, by joining in their hypotheses and thrilling to discovery with them, the student senses a fellowship with those who have contributed to our reservoir of knowledge and appreciates more fully the disipline and rigor of research. Surely "all experience is an arch wherethu' gleams that untraveled world whose margin fades forever and forever when I move. How dull it is to pause, to make an end * * *."

A cut flower soon withers away and dies. We need to be grounded in the vast store of wisdom which is available if we shall work for it.

We acknowledge our connection with humanity. We recognize the vitality which can be ours as we connect ourselves with present opportunities in the college community. We are aware of our relationship to our academic forefathers. There is one additional connection—another dimension needed.

We need to look up—to dedicate ourselves to life's highest values—to understand the ways of sacrifice. We must find a cause, a reason for being—something worthwhile to which we can give ourselves completely. Sometimes we refer to dedication as sacrifice. There is a misconception here we ought to clear up. Sacrifice is not unpleasant—not a way of action forced upon a person of sanctimonious intentions. Sacrifice is simply service that is disciplined—that costs something—that insists that a person examine his scale of values. It is not like putting a dollar on the offering plate, an action that requires little examination or evaluation—it is like our putting $1,000 on the plate. It means forgoing something desirable for the sake of some greater good.

And it does not mean that this shall be done reluctantly or unhappily or grudgingly but freely and fully and happily. Sacrifice is service given a vertical dimension. It is singlemindedness. We make service sacred by relating it to that which is of the most importance. It means assuming the obligations of discipleship—the disciplined life. The option remains with us to choose our goals, our objective, but sacrifice means to yield ourselves to the way of life defined by those objectives—the way of life we are bound to as the result of our choices of goal. Sacrifice means to freely respond to restraint for the sake of achievement. It means recognizing that if there are some things we want to do then there are some things we must do. In this elemental principle and its application lies the hope of perpetuating a society of freemen.

Ezekiel talked of the resurrection day of a nation, when God would gather together the nation's dry, dead bones and breathe life and spirit into them again. The world in which you hold membership and in which you move now with increasing responsibilities has almost desperate need of a people who can add to their learning and skills a new heart and a new spirit. Man's greatest achievements are still before him. Be glad that you were born for such a day. Accept this blessing. Immerse yourselves in the exciting, challenging, demanding environment in which your life will have its setting; be guided by the experiences of those who have led you to this day and upon whose work you build and reach for life's highest goals with boldness and humility—that man may live.

Two Thousand Independent Merchants in V-Stores Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the independent community merchant is one of the finest traditions

in our national economy. Within the lifetimes of most of us we have seen the development of great mail order houses, chain stores, and giant retail businesses to supply American households with goods. Somehow, our local independent retail stores have continued in business despite the keenest price competition imaginable.

In the United States we recognize the merits of bigness, but we strive also to protect the little fellow. Searching for a reason for the growth of our Nation we might well come to the conclusion that it is this precarious balance between big and little business that has kept our economy going.

The Congress has struggled for many years with legislattion designed to protect independent business. We have enacted antitrust legislation and we have armed the executive branch with powers to curb and destroy monopolies. As our economy grows and changes, we find that the problem is constantly before us and the solution becomes increasingly difficult. Even now, the Congress is in a crossfire of opinion regarding the relative merits of so-called "Fair Trade" legislation which would have as its avowed purpose the protection of independent merchants all over the land.

But there is a practical limit to the lengths we can go in enacting laws to protect small business. Some means must be found for independent merchants to compete fairly and legitimately with their big neighbors, and one effective system to serve that purpose has been developed out in my district in Minnesota.

One of the most unusual businesses in America has its headquarters in Clara City, Minn. Probably not more than half-a-dozen of our colleagues ever heard of that little city, but more than 2,000 merchants all over the United States look to Clara City as the home of the Variety Supply Co. with which they are associated.

The V-Stores organization exists for the sole purpose of making high quality merchandise available at the lowest possible prices through the independent member stores. While retaining and strengthening the fiber of independence, it brings to its membership the advantages of bigness. More than 2,000 little neighborhood stores buying as one through the V-Stores organization have patterned a new and proven means of existing in the sharply competitive retail economy we have today.

The character, efficiency, and integrity of this system reflects the qualities of its founder, Mr. Gordon Yock, of Clara City. If any man in his lifetime erected a national monument to free enterprise, such a monument has been built by Gordon Yock in his establishment of the V-Stores organization. With unusual foresight he has translated an urgent need into a brilliant opportunity for community merchants to live and grow in sharp competition with their big economic rivals.

I have followed year-by-year the phenomenal growth of this merchandising system and I have marveled at its success. Under the unanimous consent given me, I am including in the Appendix a statement released today detailing the story of this family of merchants. It is a typically-American success story and one which should strengthen the faith of every one of us in our great system of free enterprise.

The release follows:

TWO THOUSAND INDEPENDENT MERCHANTS IN V-STORES FAMILY

The west-central Minnesota farmlands surrounding Clara City are best known for their rich crops of corn and soybeans. But right within the community, population only 1,106, has grown one of the most remarkable success stories in modern merchantile history.

It's the story of the Variety Supply Co., headquarters of the V-Stores organization, which today is one of the largest—and certainly the fastest-growing—groups of independently owned dry goods and variety stores in all the Nation.

Fast growing? Twenty years ago there were only seven V-Stores, all in Minnesota. Two years ago there were 529 in 11 States and Hawaii. Today there are more than 2,000 in every part of the United States.

So reports Gordon Yock, the easy-smiling, crew-cut president of Variety Supply Co., who has been the guiding force behind what he frankly calls a miracle.

By far the biggest single expansion in the V-Store saga occurred 2 years ago when Variety Supply Co. made available on a franchise basis its V-Store program to 6 wholesalers in other parts of the Nation. Adding the already existing 529 V-Stores to the stores serviced by the 6 new affiliates brought to more than 2,000 the number of hometown merchants teamed under the big V emblem.

The five wholesalers who are affiliated with the V-Stores program include C. B. Meyers Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.; Berkow Sales Co., Baltimore, Md.; Kling Co., Inc., Louisville, Ky.; Gail Enterprises, Inc., Boston, Mass.; Singer & Co., Columbus, Ga.; and Progressive Wholesalers, Los Angeles, Calif.

Primarily, they are teamed up with Variety Supply Co. to form a massive buying group for its member stores, all of which are locally owned and operated stores. For this purpose the group maintains its own buying office on Fifth Avenue in New York City with a 3-man staff and 800 square feet of showroom space.

"But," explains Mr. Yock, "we are not just a buying organization. We perform all services from store planning to a complete sales program for the entire year, including advertising and promotional events."

Definite plans for further expansion of the V-Stores program are now in the mill. Besides its Clara City headquarters, Variety Supply Co. also has a branch of its own in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho; New Hampton, Iowa; and Omaha, Nebr., to serve its distant members.

It's with understandable pride that Mr. Yock recalls the beginning of the V-Stores story in 1939:

"I had a general merchandise store here in Clara City and visited with six good friends who had good stores in nearby towns. I showed them it would be to our advantage to do our buying together and suggested we get together for this purpose.

"We decided that if we used my Clara City store's basement plus its phones and office equipment we could perhaps make it worthwhile for ourselves. We agreed to give it a whirl on the basis if it didn't work we could always divide up the merchandise and quit. We set a 6-month period as a trial.

"Then a southwestern Minnesota group of merchants was told what we were doing. These stores were all individually owned but they were sort of a voluntary group because of relationship, mostly brothers. They acted on our auditor's suggestion and did join with us. That made a total of 18 stores.

"From there on our program has grown to today's level."

Growth was something less than spectacular during the early years, however. Sales the first year were only $66,000, Mr. Yock relates. And it took another 8 years to reach the million-dollar milestone.

In 1958, Mr. Yock estimates, some 500 V-Stores did about $75 million in retail sales. With 2,000 stores now in the organization—and many more due to join—even last year's figure will appear puny compared with what is in sight for the immediate future.

Despite its amazing growth, the V-Store organization has always remained a picture of utter simplicity. Member stores pay nothing to join nor anything in the way of annual dues. There are no contracts to sign or promises to make.

"The only requirements," explains Mr. Yock, "are that a prospective member be a well-rated merchant, a nice fellow to do business with, and that his city is open. Then he's in and free to try out our program for 1 month, 6 months, 1 year, or 2 years, but quit if he ever wishes. However, nobody ever does."

Most unusual part about the whole V-Store story, says Mr. Yock, is that none of it was planned. It all just developed and quite by accident one cog after another seemed to fall right into place.

Disgraced Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 12, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, last weekend I journeyed to Canada—at my own expense—and I was amazed to find that our dollars are now disgraced and humiliated up there in that great and busy land of the north. Every time I gave some of the Canadians a dollar bill I would get back only 95 cents in Canadian money. They said the discount was 5 percent. Now it used to be the other way around, for if you gave the Canadians a dollar bill in the good old days you would get back a dollar and five cents in Canadian money. But how times have changed. So, now it costs you exactly $1 to get a $20 bill changed when you visit "sound money Canada" for a vacation.

This disgraced dollar of our land has already smacked the daylights out of the real income of millions of Americans from Martha's Vineyard to San Diego. Its value went below 50 cents compared to 1940 some time ago. And this means we have robbed the widows, orphans, coal miners, pensioners, social security beneficiaries, old-age assistance people, and untold millions of others out of their patrimony or income or standard of living.

This disgrace upon the dollar has now settled like a shameful dunce cap even upon the head of the once respected Government bond so that today it is selling at less than 85 percent of its face

value or par value. People apparently no longer have full faith in the Government bonds of our country.

While anyone may entertain his own opinion about the cause of all this disgrace and humiliation, yet I feel that it basically lies in the deficit Government financing we have been practicing in almost every year during the past generation of our recent history. What is deficit financing? Well, it is simply putting out more than you take in. Uncle Bill Provins ran a country store a few miles from my hometown. Some drummer asked him about his markup and his net income. He said, "I don't know nothing about them things but I do know when I buy a hat for $3 and sell it for $5, I ain't lost nothing." Well, I myself am an economist or financier, but I do know when we put out more than we take in we are doing deficit financing and disgracing the dollar and robbing the widows and workers of our country and all the income receivers, both big and small, throughout the whole land.

One of the easiest and best ways to stop deficits and deficit financing is to stop most of this foreign aid right now. Some high Government officials recently stated that we would have to continue foreign aid indefinitely and maybe for the next 50 years or so. It is the only way, they claim, to stop Russia and prevent the spread of communism. I do not agree at all. But if we are planning to keep on with this foreign aid over an indefinite period, then we should change the motto on all our coins and make that motto "In foreign aid we trust" instead of our present motto, "In God we trust." Where did we ever obtain the insipid notion that America could be sustained or helped or defended by foreign aid? This overall program has already cost the American taxpayers about $70 billion over the past 14 years. It has done nothing for our country but cause disgrace to the dollar, flight from our Government bond, inflation of our grocery bills, robbery of our common people, embezzlement from our pensioners and workers, and continuation of high taxes upon every American that makes his bread in the sweat of his face. While Great Britain and Japan both were reducing taxes in recent times for their own people, we had to continue all of our tax burdens, transportation tax, telephone tax, income tax, gasoline tax, and all the rest, so we could help Great Britain and Japan reduce their own taxes upon their own people. A total of $3 billion of foreign aid money has actually gone to foreign powers so that they could reduce their national debts and balance their budgets, and yet to extend this kind of aid we ourselves had to borrow the money that was needed. We have also given more than $2 billion to foreign governments that were and are unfriendly to the United States, including the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, and Poland.

Mr. Speaker, paraphrasing the remark of Patrick Henry, I know not what course others may take but as for me, give me something for Albany—Kentucky—ahead of Afghanistan, something for Harlan ahead of Hindustan, and something for London, Ky., ahead of London, England. And, in conclusion, it is now almost the Fourth of July and I wish to say that I do not apologize for being an American instead of an internationalist or for favoring the motto, "In God we trust," over the current song of many, "In foreign aid we trust."

Let us return to sanity and let us lift our pitiable dollar out of disgrace up to a returned respectability. Let us shake off our old sackcloth and ashes and say, "Hurray for America—I am proud to be an American and to stand for Americans as long as the world stands."

Yellow Journalism: A Case History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, one who confines his reading exclusively to the New York Times would be likely to believe that interracial crimes are commited only in the Southern States, and are virtually unknown in their own area of New York City.

When a crime is committed against a Negro by a white southerner, the Times takes great pains to see that it is prominently mentioned, and covered as an "interracial" incident. On the other hand, when a white person is the victim of crime at the hands of Negroes in their own circulation area, the fact that such crime is interracial in character is carefully, deliberately, and meticulously suppressed in their news reports.

The Times put great emphasis on the interracial character of the recent Tallahassee assault of a Negro girl by white men, but as may be seen from the following copy of their report of a similar assault in their own city by Negroes against a white girl, racial identities were excluded. Under leave to extend my remarks, and in order to illustrate the above charges, I include herewith the New York Times report of this incident, and, also, the report of the same crime by the Newark Evening News:

[From the New York Times, June 20, 1959]

SIX SEIZED IN RAPE HERE—QUEENS YOUTHS HELD IN ATTACK ON GIRL, 14, NEAR SCHOOL

Six Queens youths were seized yesterday in the rape of a 14-year-old Queens girl on Thursday.

The attack took place near Public School 16 in Corona following an evening recreation program.

The police said the girl, who is in fair condition, knew all of her attackers. With her description, officers picked up a 14-year-old boy, who they said had acted as a lookout. He named the others, according to the police. He was charged with juvenile delinquency and paroled in his parents' custody after a hearing in Jamaica Children's Court.

[From the Newark Evening News, June 20, 1959]

SIX YOUTHS ARRESTED IN RAPE OF GIRL, 14

NEW YORK.—Six Negro youths, aged 14 to 17, have been arrested for the Corona, Queens, schoolyard rape of a 14-year-old white girl. She was attacked three times.

The victim, a pretty blonde eighth grader in the junior high school, was assaulted Thursday night after attending a recreation program at the school. Her name was withheld.

Police said two of the youths admitted assaulting the girl, but that a third denied it. They said a 16-year-old admitted holding the girl down while the others attacked her. Of the four, one is employed as a messenger boy and the others were students at the Brooklyn Automotive School.

ARRAIGNMENT TODAY

The four youths will be arraigned today in Ridgewood Felony Court on rape charges. Arraigned yesterday and charged with juvenile delinquency were a 14-year-old and 15-year old boy. The 14-year-old, accused of being the lookout, was a student in a school for problem children. The 15-year-old was a student at Flushing High School, Queens.

Police said the youth who first grabbed the girl, hit her with his fist, and raped her the first time. The victim's girl companions, who fled when she was struck and dragged away, ran into the school and sought the aid of Mrs. Louis Clifford, director of the recreation program. She rushed into the schoolyard and the youths fled.

The Corona section's population is about equally divided between whites and Negroes. An unidentified detective told newsmen: "There was nothing racial about the attack. It was just a punk kid trying to prove himself in front of his friends."

Police were on the alert, however, since the brutality of the assault might lead to revenge action by whites against Negroes. The neighborhood remained quiet.

Still a Master

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 23, 1959

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I enclose an editorial entitled "Still a Master," taken from the editorial page of the News and Observer, Raleigh, N.C. The Honorable Lindsay C. Warren will be remembered as one of the great leaders of this distinguished body.

The editorial follows:

Still a Master

When Lindsay C. Warren announced last year his intention to return to the State senate after an absence of exactly 40 years from that body, there was considerable speculation in political circles. Observers differed as to whether he would again be one of the dominant figures he was in the State senate in 1917 and 1919 and in the house in 1923.

The 1959 session has ended and Mr. Warren's role in it is now a matter of record. There is room for a considerable difference of opinion as to the wisdom of some of the

things he tried to do. In fact, this newspaper differed with some of his positions.

But there is no doubt that Lindsay Warren is still a master of the art of legislation—as he had shown himself to be early in his career and in the U.S. Congress from 1925 to 1940—when he became Comptroller General.

Lindsay Warren always knows what he wants to do and is uncommonly successful in getting much of it done.

Tribute to Interns and Residents of Freedmen's Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered at the annual banquet of the Association of Former Internes and Residents of Freedmen's Hospital, Washington, D.C., June 3, 1959.

The address follows:

I am happy to be with you today, as I always am when in the company of physicians and other medical scientists. Usually, the medical people are talking to me, telling of the accomplishments of research in health and medicine and of their hopes and plans for future progress.

Today, the shoe is on the other foot, and I have the privilege of talking to physicians and medical scientists. While I shall not presume to talk to this audience about specific details of medical research, I do want to tell you how proud I am of the accomplishments of such research. I am proud, too, that I have been able, through my many years of service in the Congress of the United States, to secure support for research and other programs leading to advancement in health and medicine through appropriations to the Public Health Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I want to tell you, also, of some of my hopes for future progress in health and medicine.

I know that some of the national progress in medical research has been made right here at Freedmen's Hospital and Howard University. Some of you in this audience—your program chairman, Dr. Spellman, among many others—have made notable contributions. I daresay many of you who are now in general practice assisted, during your student days, in the research then underway here. And I am sure that all of you, inspired by the example of your teachers here, have continued your interest in research, although I know the demands of the general practice of medicine make it difficult to devote much time to scientific investigations per se. Even if you cannot actively engage in research, I know that you keep abreast of research findings and their application to medical practice through the postgraduate seminars your association conducts, and doubtless through other means, too.

Because of my interest in medical and health research, and in my role as chairman of the House subcommittee that hears testimony of health and medical scientists in connection with appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I do a little homework myself, reading over the testimony and the reports that sketch for me the progress of research and its probable application to practice in the control and prevention of disease and the alleviation of human suffering.

From this homework, I gather that our medical researchers now think that we can look forward perhaps—and I know that they stress the "perhaps"—to such advances as the following:

1. Solution to the present question of whether some or many human cancers are caused by viruses, with all that implies for possible prevention or treatment.

2. Better, or perhaps complete, understanding of that artery disease you medical people call atherosclerosis. From such understanding would come methods physicians could advise for prevention of this major cause of death.

3. Better drugs or other means for treating high-blood pressure, resulting from an understanding of its cause, and with this understanding, even development of a rational method for its prevention.

4. More and better vaccines for control or prevention of infectious diseases, including tuberculosis and the common cold.

5. New knowledge in the field of mental and emotional disease and the environmental factors leading to deviant behavior of both children and adults.

Perhaps from advances in this last area will come the most striking changes in your practice of medicine. I have been told that physicians in the future—and I hope it will not be a too distant future—will be applying the new knowledge in the field of mental health to both individual patients and to community groups. Through such an approach we—you as physicians and I as legislator—may be able to contrive a more intelligent social environment, so that each of our younger and our older citizens can better make his total contribution to his community and his nation. I know that you here today look forward especially to such future advances, as I do, and I can assure you that as our scientists show us, through their research, the way to improve the health of individuals and of communities, I, as a legislator, stand ready to work with you physicians to implement the improvements.

Now let me talk a few minutes about some of my hopes in a broader area—the area of international medical research. I believe these hopes of mine may be of especial interest to you because this institution of which you are alumni serves not only our Nation but has for many years served in international areas also. In fact, some of you here today may have returned for this occasion from your homes and practices outside the United States. And I am sure all of you, while students, internes and residents, established friendships with men and women who, students or internes then, are now your colleagues in medicine in other lands.

I have just returned from Geneva where I had the pleasure of joining other workers for health—dedicated health workers from all over the world—at the World Health Assembly. A major concern of the Assembly this year was the advancement of medical research. In my opinion, no subject could be more important, or more timely, for deliberation by the Assembly.

It seemed significant to me, too, that this World Health Assembly was meeting at the same time and in the same place as another group of world leaders were assembled. This other group met for the purpose of discussing ways to ease international tensions and to make a beginning, at least, toward a solid and lasting world peace. Yet it may be that the seeds of such a peace lie in the hands of delegates to the World Health Assembly and the medical scientists of the nations they represent.

After all, the fruits to be reaped, as medical research advances around the world, are vastly better health for vaster numbers of the world's population. They are improved nutrition and housing. They are happier and friendlier people. And they are the unities of a healthier and stronger peace.

On my way to and from Geneva I visited with medical and health workers in London, Dublin, Rome, Madrid. Everywhere I went, I found these men and women of medical and health science in agreement with me on the importance of expanding medical research. They feel, as I do, that expanding research and disease control around the world is one—perhaps the one—truly global effort in which all nations can and will join as real partners.

As I visited various health workers, and talked with others at Geneva, I gained fresh, firsthand knowledge of some of the health problems of the world, some of the potentials, some of the programs and their cost. These matters may be familiar to you. Yet, perhaps, busy with your patients and your local community health problems, you have not been aware of worldwide needs, as well as of your own—needs for research, for more trained medical manpower, for health facilities and better education and information dissemination.

Overall, the world health situation shows that man has progressed far in his fight for health; the world is healthier than it has ever been before. There have been sizable declines in the death rates from disease all over the globe, not just in highly developed areas. The world's population has, therefore, been increasing. Yet the increase has not, as some may believe, come about because of great increases in the birth rates. Primarily, the population increase is a result of decreasing death rates in many countries.

This means that medical research advances have been great and have been applied in enough force to effect declines in deaths from disease in many areas. In the last half-century, it has been said, the progress of science has been more rapid than in the previous 2,000 years. The lowering of mortality from disease proves the statement.

Moreover, directly against disease itself we see progress on many fronts. There have been real advances against cholera, a tremendous world problem. Perhaps the most notable victory, although it is like the winning of a battle and not a whole war, has been against malaria. Then there have been gains against typhus, a deadly disease enemy in many parts of the world.

Again from the overall viewpoint, the life span of man on earth has been extended and there has been some decline in the death rate of infants. Progress has been made against venereal disease around the world, and some advance, though little and far from what could or should be accomplished, against tuberculosis.

All of this is to the credit side of the ledger. The other side shows that, while we have come far, we have farther still to go. The familiar illustration of the iceberg is apt. What has been achieved is but the top part, which we see, of the iceberg. Nine-tenths of it is underneath. Just so, the greatest part of the world's health problems is still unsolved.

I found, too, that in countries abroad where the communicable diseases have been reduced, as they have here in our country, chronic illnesses have emerged as today's great cripplers and killers.

I was impressed again by the fact that in the past medical contributions to knowledge have come from all quarters of the globe and that today, as in the past, participation in medical research is widespread around the world. You know, even better than I, that the roots of any great medical discovery lie in scientific findings made over the years by many researchers. I have been told, and I am sure you know this, too, that careful observations at the bedside and in the clinic—observations such as you men

and women in general practice may make—have often pointed the way to important advances in control of disease.

The history of institutions, too, shows that they are erected upon and stem from methods and organizational structures developed in no one country. But in many, I have been told that Freedmen's Hospital offers an excellent training in hospital administration. I am sure that those of you who have taken this training, and followed careers in hospital administration, know full well how much any of our modern hospitals and research and teaching institutions have drawn from others around the world for methods and organizational details.

Coming back closer to home and close, I know, to all your hearts, is the matter of the relation of Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University and the possibility of transfer of its jurisdiction to the university. I know that many major changes in physical structure, expansion of bed capacity of the hospital, and changes in program, are being deferred until this matter is settled. I share your hopes and those of the hospital's administrators that the matter may be settled soon, and in a way that will be to the best advantage of all concerned.

As you know, I have, during every one of my many years of service in the Congress, devoted myself to the advancement of health and of medical research. I think you know that I can be counted on to espouse any measures which, in my considered judgment, will contribute best to such advancement.

This hospital has a proud record of achievement in service to the sick and suffering, in teaching, and in research. I am sure that each of you, and all who are following in your footsteps, will add to the brilliance of that proud record and that Freedmen's Hospital will continue to be known as a national and international center for training, for service, and for the advancement of the world's store of health and medical knowledge.

May I say that I include that in my hopes for the future? It is one in which I am sure you share. And because you are physicians—"standing above the common herd" as "the flower of our civilization," as Robert Louis Stevenson so beautifully and truly wrote—I am sure you share also my larger hopes that in our lifetime we may have:

Means to conquer such dreadful diseases as cancer, heart and blood-vessel disorders, mental and emotional sickness.

Such extension and expansion of medical and health research and practice that health, happiness, and peace shall spread throughout the world.

Red Subversion in Our Backyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it is increasingly apparent that the political situation in some South American countries is grave and foreboding. The Communist elements in these countries not only threaten the well-being of our southern neighbors, but that of the entire American hemisphere. The learned news analyst, Constatine Brown, graphically points out the danger of this Communist infiltration in an article which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star of June 30, 1959.

I ask unanimous consent that his comments be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD and I commend its reading to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED SUBVERSION IN OUR BACKYARD—WEALTHY LATIN REPUBLICS HAMSTRUNG ECONOMICALLY BY COMMUNIST INTRIGUE

(By Constantine Brown)

South America from the Caribbean to Tierra del Fuego is seething. Never before has America's backyard been in more serious danger than at present. Yet we do not appear to be able to take the initiative even in that area in which this country has so much at stake.

Latin American Republics have enormous wealth in raw materials. This should normally assure them at least limited prosperity. Yet they appear on the verge of collapse. If nature were to take its usual course, all these countries, with a measure of assistance and advice from the United States, would be able to weather the storm. But the chances of their being able to pull out are considerably reduced because of the activities of the Latin American Communists, strongly backed by Moscow.

As things stand now, there is a good chance, according to intelligence sources in Washington, that we may find ourselves ringed with Soviet submarine bases in the Caribbean. Despite Fidel Castro's protestations that he is only an ardent lover of democracy and freedom, the Communist element's influence in Cuba is much stronger than the alleged will of Castro to make that island republic neutralist.

Communist influence in the Government of Venezuela is equally powerful and reports from Caracas indicate that in the event of a major international crisis the Government will be taken over by active Communists under Moscow's discipline unless the present heads play along.

A realistic survey of most Latin American Republics indicates an alarming increase of Communist conspiracy. The agents, strongly backed financially by the Kremlin, are taking advantage of the economic distress—which they lay at the threshold of this country—to create chaotic internal conditions. Once these break out in revolutions against the "dictatorial" governments genuine dictators completely in the pocket of international communism are installed.

Washington is making some vague moves by offering limited financial support to the existing non-Communist administrations. But these are not effective because the ailment of our sister Republics south of the Rio Grande are more political than economic as appears on the surface.

We are dedicated to the elimination of dictators in Latin America. This was emphasized by Vice President NIXON when he visited that area some months ago and said: "We extend a cold hand to the dictators and a warm embrace to those opposed to them." It was realistically illustrated when Fidel Castro visited Washington unofficially. Despite the wholesale executions of sometimes innocent men and women, Castro received from our Government and enthusiasts in Washington and New York almost a hero's welcome.

There is not a single head of state in Central and South America who is not convinced that the hero of the Cuban revolution is under Communist discipline—by necessity if not by choice. But the hasty acquiescence of the U.S. Government and to some extent of the American people toward the Cuban dictator has created the impression that the United States (the principal target of international communism) is leaning toward the "Castro type" of dictatorship rather than the strongly anti-Communist "Trujillo type." This impression has, of course, given strength and unprecedented impetus to the Moscow agents who are doing their utmost to precipitate revolutions in as many Latin-American Republics as feasible, and especially in those which could offer "interesting" bases within reach of our boundaries.

The abortive rebellions in Panama, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic are examples of international Communist strategy. They have failed temporarily. But there are strong indications that there will be a repeat before the end of the year.

The Kremlin has been planning for a decade for the "day" and has taken advantage of our lackadaisical policies whenever possible. Thus the Soviet intrigues in Latin America date back to the late twenties when agents infiltrated Central America selling the blessings of communism to the peons. Hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and House Un-American Activities Committee showed this conclusively from the testimony of former agents who became fed up with communism after a while.

An American citizen, Joe Zack (his real name is Kornfelder), who was trained at the Lenin school of subversion and worked under direct orders of Stalin, spelled out the entire plan to the two congressional committees. But none of our officials seem to have taken the warnings seriously. Their accuracy was proven in the recent developments not only in the Caribbean but also in almost every one of the other Latin-American countries.

While the attention of the administration, Congress and our people is focused on the great futility at Geneva and wherever the summit meeting is to take place, the Muscovites are working overtime at our expense in our very backyard.

Research and Aluminum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, my remarks relating to research and aluminum.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESEARCH AND ALUMINUM

(Remarks by Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN of Iowa, July 1, 1959)

Mr. President, in this critical period, one of our greatest resources is the skill and knowledge of our trained scientists and engineers who are able to probe nature's secrets.

The Aluminum Co. of America has one of its most important operations at Davenport in my State. Throughout the years its efforts have represented American research at its best. Recently two advertisements on their approach to science and technology which were placed in national magazines were brought to my attention.

In view of my long concern with research as well as my interest arising from my membership on the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I wish to share these views with my colleagues and include portions of these two advertisements in the Appendix of the RECORD:

"DR. VAN HORN GETS THE 'GREEN LIGHT'

"You could staff a college of engineering from the Alcoa research laboratories, for 37 of 762 technical experts hold a Ph. D. degree and 275 more are masters of science. Alcoa built this talent pool with the same philosophy that raised research and development expenditures to $18 million in a recession year when other aluminum firms chopped already slim budgets 20 to 50 percent.

"This year, Director Kent Van Horn has the 'green light' for a new $30 million science center. Yet this news is no surprise to men who know that Alcoa investments in research created 95 percent of all aluminum alloys, invented the alclad process to thwart corrosion, developed anodic treatments to give aluminum color and abrasion resistance, pioneered the fabricating techniques that turned aluminum from a curio into a metal with over 4,000 product applications.

"For 70 years, Alcoa research has helped to put more than just 16 ounces of metal into every pound of Alcoa aluminum."

"NO ONE TOLD GUS HOGLUND YOU COULDN'T WELD ALUMINUM

"Twenty years ago, Gus Hoglund gathered a dozen skeptics around a jar of flux, a torch and some bits of aluminum. He was breaking trail for the man who now brazes 350 percolator spouts an hour, and for the company that will crack a new market with welded aluminum cans, churned out at 500 a minute.

"Even when doubting Thomases granted you could weld aluminum, they had to be taught how to do it. Gus Hoglund and his process development crew gave lessons by the thousands. And their work between classes with alloys and techniques has led to the development of welded aluminum structures three times as strong as the best of the past.

"Aluminum is second to no other metal in variety of commercial joining methods. With the industry's largest staff of engineering specialists to solve your joining problems, you get extra value in every pound of Alcoa aluminum you buy."

AMA Positive Health Program for Older Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, recently, the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging had the privilege of listening to a number of the Nation's leading authorities on the problems of our older citizens.

Among these was Dr. Frederick Swartz, of Lansing, Mich., who is chairman of the Committee on Aging of the American Medical Association. Dr. Swartz presented the subcommittee with the AMA's positive health program for older citizens.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Dr. Swartz's statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENTATION BY FREDERICK C. SWARTZ, M.D., LANSING, MICH., AS REQUESTED BY SENATOR PATRICK V. MCNAMARA, CHAIRMAN, U.S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE PROBLEMS OF THE AGED AND AGING, IN CONNECTION WITH SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON JUNE 16, 1959

If it is not inappropriate, I should like first to compliment the chairman and committee members on the way in which they are beginning their study of the problems of the aged and aging. The deliberative, thoughtful approach which the committee apparently intends to follow should help provide the Senate with a clear picture of the basic needs of older persons.

The work of the American Medical Association in the field of aging has shown that the needs of persons over 65 are complex and that providing opportunity for these citizens to meet their needs requires full recognition of the widely varied circumstances under which they live. The calm, dispassionate approach by the committee, therefore, augurs well for its study results.

If the experience of the AMA committee on aging is any indication, the members of this committee may even find their own concepts of aging undergoing material changes as the study progresses.

When our committee was first formed, it was charged with the responsibility of studying the problems of geriatrics, that is, the diseases of the aged, and was so named. It became apparent early in our deliberations that there are practically no diseases specifically and exclusively attached to the aging process and that while there are diseases among the aged, there are no diseases of the aged.

In the light of this, the committee recognized that its real purpose is the health of the nation's aging population, sick or well.

The committee's goal is optimum health for each individual. This embraces the areas of (1) adequate medical care at the lowest practical cost for those who are ill; (2) promotion of better understanding and wider use of restorative services on behalf of those who are disabled; (3) encouragement of activities, both group and individual, for the prevention of illness among all older persons; and (4) the promotion of long-range positive health programs which will increase the overall capacities of persons to live active, meaningful lives in their later years.

From the earliest, study of these areas showed that the health of the senior citizen is not solely a medical or health habits matter. It became increasingly plain that the health of persons over 65 depends in a large measure on socioeconomic and psychological factors which prevent many persons from exercising their potential for responsible participation in society. As long as these patterns exist, unnecessary illness will occur despite medical care and otherwise sound health programs. Likewise, the duration of illnesses may be unnecessarily prolonged, the degree of disabilities increased.

It was in this frame of reference and after protracted study, that the AMA Committee on Aging developed its positive health program for older citizens. It did so only after numerous conferences with physicians throughout the Nation and other informed persons and groups capable of providing data on aging. The program calls for:

1. Stimulation of a realistic attitude toward aging by all people.

The present general attitude of perspective of the public toward this ever-increasing segment of itself is well known but somewhat puzzling to understand. After a fourth of a lifetime spent in preparing to be a producer and after a half a lifetime spent in gaining experience and contributing to the public welfare, the oldster finds himself with a commodity which is still in demand but not from him.

* * * * *

He is robbed of his ego and individualism. He is now just "Grandpop" or "Gramp" or "Grandpa." He is cashiered out of the human army.

He now stands naked without rank, weapons, medals, or identification.

To change this perspective will take much good, hard work. We, as a Nation, can ill afford this tremendous loss of human resources. Retirement at the present retirement age for all of the ever-increasing older group is economically unsound and will prove ruinous in time. As physicians, we know it often interferes with optimum health for the individual.

The argument that there are not now and will not be enough jobs in the future to go around is just as fallacious as it was when it was offered to keep women from working. Now, 9 million women are working without having impaired the earning power of the male. Automation may dislocate labor on occasion but industrial advances have always been associated with increased employment opportunities. It may well be that industry of the future will hire him for his entire working life and by inservice training keep him as a member of the production team in the face of automation, changing products, and changing times.

The medical profession is not opposed to retirement of those who want to retire. As physicians, however, we know that retirement to inactivity, for health reasons if no other, can for many people be an impediment to their health. Inflexible retirement based solely on age is unsound and unfair to many thousands of men and women who deserve better.

Is it too much to ask that the aging, who are no less human because of their age, be reincorporated into the human family? Is there no still healthful and happy motivation that is worthwhile to the total group?

This may sound like an impossible undertaking, but it will be made easier when we produce a new generation of oldsters. A real senior citizen group which will recognize aging for what it is—growing—and present themselves in the older years with advanced accomplishments, dignity, and rank.

* * * * *

2. Promotion of health maintenance programs and wider use of restorative and rehabilitative services.

Dr. Henry A. Holle, of the Public Health Service, and former health commissioner of Texas, says: "The interest of the apparently well senior citizen in his own health has been grossly underestimated. Our work is thereby made easier.

"For many years we have ignored the so-called degenerative or chronic diseases in the elderly. We accepted them as matters of course in the treatment of more acute symptoms. Now our researchers are studying tissue cells to find out why their rate of replacement slows down with increasing age. Who can say that these mysteries will not be solved? Who can say that atherosclerosis may not some day be reversible, or at least preventable?

"Because of these things, we see a beginning realization on the part of the physician in practice and in health agencies that the development and application of regimens of health maintenance in our oldsters can be tremendously productive. If we can take this positive approach to the stitch-in-time philosophy, we may avoid being faced with the necessity of doing a complete sewing job later on when it can do little good.

"Too much emphasis cannot be placed upon the need for a medical adviser in the middle and senior years. We need here the individual physician-patient relationship. It pays its greatest dividend during the years when body reserves are dwindling and when advantage should be taken by the physician of intimate knowledge of the individual patient gained through years of experience as his medical adviser."

* * * * *

3. Extension of effective methods of financing health care for persons over 65.

With the continuing expanding enrollment in prepayment plans and the health insurance industry, the problem of inadequate numbers of aged having protection is a temporary one and is constantly decreasing. At the present time there are more than 6 million persons over the age of 65 who are covered by voluntary health insurance—over 43 percent of the aged population. Most of the growth in plans and coverage for persons over 65 has been achieved in the past 5 or 6 years. It can be assumed that an ever increasing number of persons will be able to carry their protection into retirement years and that the percent covered will soon be maximal.

This is substantiated by national Blue Shield experience since 1952. It has been the general policy of Blue Shield plans to permit continuation of coverage after retirement. In the past 6 years total enrollment has increased 85 percent but the number of subscribers over 65 has grown 170 percent during the same period, showing not only the results of this continuation policy but also of new enrollment of those over 65.

A number of commercial insurance companies have also made protection available for persons over 65 and a great number have modified their regulations to permit continuation of benefits upon retirement.

* * * * *

A significant step toward the accomplishment of this objective was taken by the American Medical Association last December when the house of delegates adopted a resolution urging the development of voluntary health insurance and prepayment programs designed for the low income aged with modest resources.

Constituent and component societies, and their Blue Shield plans, throughout the country have responded enthusiastically to the proposal and are moving rapidly and forcefully to fully implement its intent.

* * * * *

The whole area of financing health care has been confused by conflicting claims about the abilities of persons over 65 to pay for medical expenses or health insurance. On the other hand, we are frequently told of the obvious fact that most persons in this age group have reduced incomes. On the other hand, we are told that the older person's need for income is not as great as it was in earlier years; that his accumulation of assets often more than offsets reduced income, that other members of the family are willing and able to help, that reported income is sometimes at variance with the facts, and that in rural areas "income in kind" is sometimes a major factor.

It is also true that by most data the older patient takes up more time in the hospital per illness than does the younger.

This may well be changed somewhat when the physician and patient commence to realize the potentialities for corrective and curative treatment, along with rehabilitation, may be as productive in the oldster as in the youngster and can be accomplished in relatively short time.

4. Expansion of skilled personnel training programs and improvements of medical and related facilities for older people.

Since a larger part of modern medicine will be occupied with the treatment of the chronically ill and rehabilitation problems, a whole new generation of health personnel will have to be trained to fill these positions. Because of the impact of geriatrics and rehabilitation, the form and function of the traditional acute hospital is being changed rapidly. The newer concept of the general hospital is growing in popularity. It has intensive care units and recovery rooms and chronic wings. It is set up so that the patient can be rapidly moved from the higher priced acute facility to the chronic wing. This will serve as a distinct advantage to the geriatric and rehabilitation patient.

From the chronic wing of the hospital the next step will be to the rehabilitation center to the convalescent home and then to the patient's own home and occupation. This better utilization of hospital and other medical facilities should lead to a downgrading in medical expense totally.

5. Amplification of medical and socio-economic research in the problems of the aging.

Investigation up to a present time has revealed the following:

(a) The acid base equilibrium of the blood is maintained within normal limits in the old person.

(b) The arterial fasting blood sugar does not change significantly with age.

(c) The hematological values of the blood are well maintained in the aged.

(d) Total lung capacity corrected for surface area does not change.

(e) Measurement in vitamins A and C do not vary significantly between the youthful and the aged.

(f) Tests of endocrine gland function at rest show no significant statistical variation between the young and the old.

(g) In fact, after the subject has reached adult life there is no satisfactory test or battery of tests that will actually indicate the individual's place on the chronologic time scale.

Dr. Falzone and Dr. Shock conclude in their paper, "The Physiologic Limitation of Age," that examination of experimental studies on physiologic changes in age indicate that, under resting conditions, the aged human is usually able to maintain uniformity of the internal environment. However, when increased demands are placed on a number of organs and systems, impairment of function can often be detected.

* * * * *

The application of what we already have learned and what we are about to learn may bring about results as startling in the field of chronic disease as the discovery of the antibiotics in the field of infectious diseases.

6. Cooperation in community programs for senior citizens.

The problems of the older citizens have placed an increased demand on the physician. The change in the type of practice for the family physician now, more than ever before, means he is challenged to leave his traditional occupation of diagnosis and treatment and enter actively into the field of prevention. He is challenged more than ever before to take an active part in the total health problems of his community. More than ever before he will be called upon to provide leadership in these health fields and to cooperate fully with other disciplines trying to accomplish the same end.

* * * * *

As every scientist realizes, the thing he knows constitutes probably the greatest hurdle he must get over in his efforts to arrive at the truth. If it is possible to set aside such thoughts as outlined in the previous definitions and to examine the material at hand with the tools of logic and experience, we will have had some measure of success in explaining the reasons for this paper.

* * * * *

Sometime, somewhere in the dim unrecorded past something happened. What it was and how it will be described will depend upon the discipline making the investigation. The scientist may say it was the first effort of a new creature to find the eternal truth. Religious disciplines will point to the birth of religious principles, especially the concept of the brotherhood of man. In any case, man by his own acts began to interfere with the balance of power and natural selection as maintained by the law of the jungle. The moment he did this certain individuals who were given a longer life span were unprepared for it. The pace may not have been slowed any, but a helping hand was offered to those who faltered. Those who were unable to carry on in the usual style of the tribe caused a change in the philosophy of living and as their numbers grew became the first gerontologic problem. The great number of individuals involved seems to have interested most of the investigators. Does it not seem, however, that the real problem is the lack of preparation of these individuals for their increased life span rather than the increased number of individuals or the increased number of years? Today's rush to counsel and advise the aging and retiring emphasizes the validity of this concept, but the counseling overlooks the important factors.

This presented a new frontier. It called for a new race of pioneers to map the pathways for the millions who were to come after. As yet there have been very few who have had the vision to meet the challenge. Like the flotsam and jetsam of the deep washed upon the shore or floating the calmer inlets, most of the present oldsters are being pushed out of the stream of life. Instead of making an effort to extend this age frontier into a land of new experience, enjoyment, and compensation they are constantly looking backward as if all life had been left behind them. * * *

Aging, as presently maintained by the gerontologists, constitutes a rather vague condition or state representing a balance between evolution or growth and involution or atrophy. They go hand in hand, growth being in ascendency in the young and atrophy being in ascendency in the old. This is further elaborated on to include the involution or atrophy that occurs when certain structures like the thymus or ovary cease to function. They get old. Thus, we become more mixed up trying to understand and account for varying degrees or rates of evolution or involution of certain parts of a whole that is itself of one age.

Would it not be simpler to use those proved tenets of physiology and anatomy which have taught that structure depends on function? Thus, the varying degree of evolution or involution in organs would represent a varying degree of need and function and would not be related to time or age. This, at least, gets us out of the dilemma of having one part of the whole older or younger than the remainder.

In earlier times, the number who reached the advanced years was not large. The society was largely based on agriculture, and it was comparatively easy for the oldsters' efforts, diminishing in amount as they were, to be utilized and appreciated in the total farming effort. In the main, the general philosophy of these times was for the family to take care of its own. * * *

As the refugees from infant mortality and the infectious diseases crowded the confines of the aged and aging, many things happened.

1. Great numbers of younger people forgot their responsibility for the care of the aging members of their family. How much of this phenomenon was born of recessions and depression thinking cannot be estimated. There can be no doubt, however, that this attitude has an infectious quality and leads to a diminution of those qualities of altruistic love which binds families and groups together for the benefit of all.

2. Society has changed from agricultural to industrial. As pointed out above, agriculture has a built-in method of taking care of most of its aging workers. Youthful industry, interested as it was in production and competition, saw no obligation at first to assume a social responsibility for its older workers. This change produced an increase in the size and intensity of the problems of aging.

3. Retirement methods, as they are practiced today, add to the size and complexity of the problem. This is true in spite of the efforts made to insure some degree of economic security for the older worker.

4. The so-called miracle drugs worked their charms among the older as well as the younger groups and continued the status of many as refugees from the infectious diseases.

As a result of the above and many unenumerated factors, we now have a segment of our society that includes an excess of 15 million people whose one mark of similarity is that they are 65 years or older. Reports from the U.S. Census statistics, social security agencies, health agencies, medical clinics, and hospital and medical research, all indicate that the aged are not a homogenous group whose status can be simply described in a few words.

Doctors have agreed that there really were no diseases characteristic of the older age group. Poliomyelitis and other diseases usually thought of as appearing only in childhood were occurring in those past middle life. Also, the so-called degenerative diseases of men, such as arteriosclerosis, hypertension, and nephritis, originally thought of as being part and parcel of the aging process, are being recognized in the younger age groups. Hardening of the arteries and coronary diseases are supposed to be characteristically a malady of middle or old age, but in 1954 arteriosclerotic heart disease, including coronary, killed 98 children under 5, and is found in every age bracket thereafter.

It was therefore decided that the AMA Committee on Aging's interest and activity as a physicians' committee should be:

1. The sick oldster;

2. The frail or fragile oldster who, without good attention, would become sick; and

3. The well oldster, who, if guided by a positive health program, should be able to solve most of his own problems.

We approach the total national problem in the same way a doctor tackles a single situation in his own office. The solution of many of the individual illnesses requires some knowledge and ability to deal with all the problems of the patient's environment, such as family, work, religion, and community adjustment. When need be, help is called for from the proper disciplines and agencies so that the patient may better be served. Using this type of procedure as a guide, organized medicine is being urged to and is studying the needs of the oldster in the fields of work, home, retirement, housing, recreation, etc.

The doctor realizes from his experience that the stigmata and diseases usually associated with aging are due to the impact of stress and environment. This, like infectious diseases and infant mortality, can be attacked and defeated.

And finally the doctor realizes that aging is a growing process and he expects the senior citizen to present certain admirable accomplishments, dignity and rank. He is expected to keep pace in dress, manner and thinking. In turn, for his past contributions and his present status his community should recognize anew that the right of citizenship be not abridged because of age.

San Luis Irrigation Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on June 28, 1959, the Washington Post and Times Herald published an editorial entitled "Irrigation Question." The editorial, which was printed in the June 29 RECORD—page A5613—concerns itself with the San Luis project bill and raises two questions in its criticism of the proposed legislation. I have written the editor of the Washington Post answering the editorial and I ask unanimous consent to have my reply printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 30, 1959.

Mr. ROBERT H. ESTABROOK,
Editorial Page Editor, Washington Post and Times Herald, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: I read with special interest your editorial of June 28, 1959, entitled "Irrigating Question."

The editorial raises two questions: One relating to the 160-acre limitation, and the other regarding the intelligence of building new irrigation projects while the Government is spending millions of dollars to subsidize surplus farm production.

With reference to the first question: The San Luis bill as reported by the Senate Interior Committee applied the 160-acre limitation to the Federal water service area. The fight made by Senators DOUGLAS and MORSE was for the purpose of striking language in the bill, section 6(a), which stated that the 160-acre limitation would not apply to the water service area under the State project. The bill, as you perhaps know, provides for the joint use of the San Luis Reservoir by the State and the Federal governments, with each paying the full amount for its respective benefits. I do not believe that the Federal Government ought to tell the State government what kind of a limitation, 160-acres or otherwise, it should have on the areas irrigated under the State project. I attach a copy of colloquy on the Senate floor (p. 7168 of May 12 RECORD) between Senator MORSE and myself which I think makes it perfectly clear what the issue was. You will note from my remarks that Governor Brown and I agree that the 160-acre limitation should apply to the Federal water service area, as the bill provides, but that the State government should determine the nature and the extent of the acreage limitation on the State-serviced area.

The second question raised in the editorial is far more fundamental—that is, the intelligence of building more irrigation projects while we presently have farm surpluses running out of our ears. The answer is that we do not have too much farm production in general but that we do have too much farm production of certain types. The San Luis bill specifically provides that the amount of subsidized production of agricultural products cannot be increased in the areas irrigated under this project. We do not believe that those crops would increase anyway but, just to be sure, we put in a special amendment in the bill prohibiting it. This amendment, while stated in general terms, was offered by Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, for the specific purpose of being sure that cotton production was not increased. The area involved under the bill is running out of water and if this project is not built, we believe the land will revert to wheat and grains, presently the worst surplus crop we have. Under irrigation this land will go into row crops and the various types of nonsubsidized farm production necessary to serve the needs of the expanding population in the metropolitan areas of our State adjacent to this land.

I call attention to the fact that the State legislature this year authorized a $1½ billion State project because of the growing water shortages in California for irrigation, municipal and industrial use. We Californians believe that the shortage of water is the most serious single local problem we have. The San Luis project which passed the Senate will help in a small way to solve that problem; otherwise, a vast area of the great Central Valley project will return to sagebrush and sand. We think, too, that in formulating this legislation we have adequately answered both of the questions raised in your editorial—regarding the 160-acre limitation and the problem of adding to our current farm surpluses.

Sincerely yours,

CLAIR ENGLE,
U.S. Senator.

Wanted: A Sound Fiscal Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, as we enter a new fiscal year, the seriousness of the record peacetime deficit of last year is staggering to contemplate. The President in recognition of the graveness of this situation appointed several months ago a committee of the Cabinet to analyze the problem and make recommendations in an effort to solve this unhealthy situation. David Lawrence, writing in the Evening Star on June 30, 1959, analyzes this report which was recently made to the President, and I ask unanimous consent that his comments be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTED: A SOUND FISCAL POLICY—CABINET REPORT POINTS OUT DANGERS IN MAKING BONDS EQUIVALENT TO MONEY

(By David Lawrence)

Tomorrow—July 1—is New Year's Day so far as Government finances are concerned. One fiscal year ends, and another begins. The deficit is more than $12 billion, largely due to the economic recession. It's a record for so-called peacetime. The coming year, however, is expected to see a balanced budget.

With armament expenditures taking a bigger and bigger proportion of the national budget, due to the cold war in a nuclear age, it is not surprising that a setback on the economic front runs into such big figures. For the Government's chief worry is the con-

tinuation of rising prices. It has to pay each year more and more for the same articles of warfare that it bought in previous years at lower prices.

This is why inflation is being so widely discussed as a danger to the American economy. President Eisenhower appointed a committee of the Cabinet to analyze the problem. After several months of study, it has just issued its report.

Unfortunately, because of the prominence of some of the Cabinet members in the political arena, the report is being regarded by Democratic opponents as political. It would have received more attention perhaps if it had been signed only by such nonpolitical figures as Robert Anderson, Secretary of the Treasury, and Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Here, for instance, is an extract from the Cabinet committee report which reads like the language of Messrs. Anderson and Saulnier:

"Without firm control of the quantity of money and credit, all other measures to check inflation will be futile. Sound monetary policy requires that the Federal Government avoid making its bonds, other than those of comparatively small denomination designed for family savings, the equivalent of money. Government bonds are the equivalent of money if they can always be changed into actual money at virtually face value, not only when they are due and payable but any time before.

"This is the case if the Treasury is forced to issue only very short-term bonds, or if the Federal Reserve System stands ready to buy at a pegged price all Government bonds offered to it in advance of the date when they are due to be paid by the Treasury. There is only an imperceptible difference between the Government's issuing bonds that are equivalent to money, and the Government's just cranking up the printing presses and rolling out greenbacks. The Government will be forced to continue issuing large additional amounts of short-term bonds that are the near-equivalent of money until the Congress allows the Treasury sufficient flexibility to achieve a balance in our debt structure by inducing people of their own free will to invest their savings in long-term Government bonds. Thus, to avoid inflation it is essential that the present limitation on the interest rate on long-term Government bonds be removed, as the administration has already recommended.

"The issue is whether we want price stability or whether we want, in a concealed way, to do the equivalent of printing money—something the American public would not stand for if done openly."

This is the most outspoken appraisal yet of what deficit spending can mean. It comes at a time when the President is asking Congress to permit interest rates to find a natural level and not to be restricted by Government action. Many Democrats are fighting for the maintenance of artificially low rates.

Inflation is to no small extent a matter of public confidence. If interest rates are held low for Government securities, while in the money markets interest rates generally are rising, the danger is that investors will turn from Government securities to other forms of investment.

The inflationary spiral is related, of course, to many other factors besides Government spending and Treasury deficits. The Cabinet Committee report says, for instance:

"Wage settlements have been made recently which raised wages substantially; wage agreements negotiated in earlier years provide for increases in rates this year; and wage agreements to be negotiated this summer or autumn in many industries (steel, aluminum, other metals, construction, rubber, lumber, railroads, paper, longshoring, meatpacking, and metal containers are among them) could result in wage increases of such magnitude as to lead to price increases. * * *

"We face a serious risk of price increases which not only would be directly harmful to American families but would seriously endanger the healthy prosperity now developing."

The Cabinet Committee doesn't propose any concrete solutions but does point out that excessive concentration of power in the hands of labor or business results in practices which are contrary to the public interest and that such practices reduce efficiency and productivity, and they create inflationary pressures.

But what to do about them? The Cabinet Committee says it soon will examine and later report on the extent to which such concentrations of power in labor and business "contribute to inflation or impede economic progress."

Padre Island, Tex., National Seashore Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Associated Press recently issued a story on Padre Island in Texas, concerning the move to make it a national seashore area.

This story is self-explanatory, as it tells of the area advantages of the island for such a purpose. Wildlife refuges and marine laboratories are already in the area, making the preservation of Padre Island even more desirable. I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article as it appeared in the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald for Friday, June 26, 1959, under the heading "Texas' Long, Thin Padre—Gulf Island May Become National Seashore Park."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS' LONG, THIN PADRE—GULF ISLAND MAY BECOME NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK

ARANSAS PASS, TEX.—Padre Island is a vast and beautiful area of large and irregular dunes along the beach, sculptured anew by each passing breeze.

Chances are that more and more persons from over the Nation will learn its beauties if it becomes a new national seashore park.

A resolution in the legislature calls the island a magnificent, history-rich, romantic expanse of dune and beach that is a priceless Texas heritage.

The resolution is to authorize Congress to establish a seashore park between the Port Mansfield Channel and Yarborough Pass.

It further says, "Padre Island is the longest unspoiled natural beach still in existence in the United States. The major part of the island is still unspoiled and might yet be preserved for public use and enjoyment if steps are taken without delay."

Not all persons are in favor of the seaside park plan. Private owners of some of the land claim that the park plan will infringe on private property rights.

The island is a very thin, very long strip stretching from the tip of Texas far north and slightly east to the vicinity of Corpus Christi.

When held in place by sparse vegetation such as sea oats, morning-glories, and sea grapevines, the dunes are often imposing, towering 40 feet or more.

Elsewhere, the sand lies in small rippling mounds, or is nonexistent, as on the southern part of the island where flats stretch across it from sea to the Laguna Madre.

Because of the encroachments of civilization on both Atlantic and Pacific seaboards, Padre presents one of the last opportunities to preserve such a length of beach in its natural state. It could provide an outstanding area for biological and geological study.

The National Park Service has recommended that the middle and upper portions of the island be preserved, from about opposite Port Mansfield to a spot just below the Nueces County Park at the northern end.

The central portion of this would be roadless, to preserve the island's primitive character and in other sections a road system behind the barrier dunes would provide access to the beach.

Other developments would include camping and picnic areas and information centers at the north and south entrances.

Between Tivoli and Brownsville there are almost unmatched attractions for nature lovers.

There is the Aransas Wildlife Refuge near Austwell, the last wintering ground for the whooping cranes.

At Rockport, where the great migration routes from Central and South America are constricted by the coastal bend, there are concentrations of birds at certain seasons of the year.

At Rockport, too, is the marine laboratory of the Texas Game and Fish Commission, and there is another such institution at Port Aransas, under sponsorship of the University of Texas.

WELDER REFUGE

At Sinton the Welder Wildlife Refuge is the largest privately endowed foundation for study of wildlife in the world, and under leadership of Dr. Clarence Cottam, it is becoming internationally famous and a mecca for naturelovers and scientists.

At the lower end of Padre there is the Laguna Atascosa Wildlife Refuge in Cameron County, which harbors enormous concentrations of waterfowl during the migratory seasons. In Aransas and Mesquite Bays and the Laguna Madre there are great nesting grounds for wading birds, pelicans, gulls, terns, herons, and all the myriad waterbirds that live on the Texas coast around the year.

At the Santa Ana Refuge, not far from the lower end of Padre, there are unique opportunities to see birds and animals normally found only in Mexico and Central America.

Los Angeles Elks Lodge 99 Observes Annual Flag Day Ritual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 23, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on June 10 the Los Angeles Elks Lodge No. 99 conducted its annual Flag Day ritual under the chairmanship of Mr. Charles R. Tyson, Americanism chairman of the lodge.

During the inspiring and beautiful program, presented basically in the form of a question-and-response service, there was presented a comprehensive history of the evolution of the American flag from colonial days until the present, a prayer, a presentation of the new 49-star flag to the lodge, and a discussion of our struggles over the years for freedom under the Stars and Stripes as our symbol of the American way of life. Another highlight of the ritual was the uncovering of a floral bell of liberty, made up of red, white, and blue flowers, representing not only the colors of the flag but the ideals we live by.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be very worthwhile if greater stress were placed nationwide on celebrating Flag Day, for it is an inspiring way of focusing attention to our beautiful flag and its meaning as a symbol of America.

Military Influence on Defense Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on June 3 my amendment to bar defense funds to defense contractors who employ retired military officers was dramatically defeated by one vote upon the assurance of the leaders that an investigation would promptly be pursued. Such an investigation is scheduled to commence on July 7.

I have heard many comments favorable and unfavorable regarding my amendment. Some declare that the need exists, but that the remedy is too broad and the restrictions should be narrowed. One of the most critical written comments that has come to my attention regarding the so-called Santangelo amendment came to me by a learned professor of law of Harvard University, W. Barton Leach.

Professor Leach is a former brigadier general, USAFR, and the founder of the Harvard defense studies program, which has studied the problem of recruiting and retaining in the Military Establishment the best brains and leadership ability of the country. His comments are critical of my amendment, have a great deal of pertinency and merit, and, I believe, casts light upon the weaknesses and the merits of my bill. I submit the comments by Professor Leach in the knowledge that it will give the readers a better understanding of the problem:

COMMENTS ON SANTANGELO AMENDMENT (RETIRED GENERALS AND ADMIRALS IN DEFENSE INDUSTRY), NEW YORK HERALD-TRIBUNE, JUNE 12, 1959, PAGE 1

As reported, this amendment to a defense appropriation bill would bar defense contracts to any company employing any officer above the rank of colonel in the last 5 years.

1. Our military personnel policies properly force retirement of officers at successive rank levels, since each rank has a number of T/O spaces much smaller than that of the next lower rank; i.e. the officer structure is a steep pyramid. If these men are good—and it is a major national objective that they should be of the best—they will seek and obtain employment throughout the civilian economy. But where? Obviously where their training and experience is relevant—and it is in the national interest that this training and experience should be drawn upon after, as well as before, they get out of uniform. There are some, like Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin Jr. and Maj. Gen. James McCormack Jr., whose technical qualifications enable them to go outside the direct defense field; but the proposal of Representative SANTANGELO would almost certainly require Arthur D. Little, Inc., and Massachusets Institute of Technology to dismiss these two officers from their respective posts as vice president. Some few might qualify for government administration, like Maj. Gen. Roger J. Browne now deputy administrator of the city of New York (after first serving with American Brake Shoe); but this would create, and indeed has created, another furor about the Government being taken over by "men on horseback." A few might get into education, like Gen. Mark W. Clark (The Citadel) or our present professor of military science and tactics at Harvard, Col. De Vere Armstrong (who is going to the McCaillie School, Chattanooga); but if this took place on a large scale you would soon hear criticism of impregnating youth with the military mind—and of course the number of these openings is trifling.

2. If retired general and flag officers are forbidden to engage in the types of business where they have the greatest knowledge and experience, one can predict the effect on the officer of colonel-equivalent grade. If he is industry-employable, he will quit with his 20 or 30 years of service and refuse promotion to a grade which disqualifies him from earning a living after he gets out. The result will be that selection of general and flag officers will be by survival of the unfit, with the exception of a few who have married rich women. The impact upon the morale of the officer corps from the lowest to the highest is incalculable.

3. What of the civilians—Frank Pace and Earl Johnson of General Dynamics, John Sullivan with a brisk Washington law practice, Trevor Gardner who is up to his ears in defense work? Are we going to throw up additional barriers to getting good civilians in the Pentagon by assuring them that, in addition to being inadequately paid while they are serving, they will be unemployable when they get out? Or are we to say that what is wrong for the officers is right for the civilians? And, how about Senators and Congressmen—especially those who have served on the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees? After they are defeated or withdraw are they to have freedom denied to retired officers? And how about the undersigned, who is a Reserve general; and, as a personal consultant of all Secretaries and Chiefs of Staff since the Air Force was established, probably has contacts in the Air Force which are as close as those of most Regular generals. Does he get the boot, too? And if he does, where are you going to get any Reserve generals, or consultants either?

The proposal is patently absurd; but somebody has got to stand up and say so and run the risk of being labeled an admiral lover or a cat's paw for the generals.

Now, just a word about competition between weapons manufacturers. As long as the competition relates to the merits of the weapon, that is a good and necessary thing. (I deplore the Boeing advertisement which plugged Bomarc by showing how many subcontractors it supported; they ought to fire their public relations man.) Very few weapons are the subject of interservice competition; so, if you are going to get competition at all, it must be between manufacturers where each does his best to produce the best weapon or piece of equipment and to convince the using service that it is the best. A striking and well-documented example of how this works in the public interest appears in the testimony of Maj. Gen. Frederick H. Smith, Jr., in the first phase of the B–36 investigation (House Armed Services Committee, 1949) where he shows the three companies which developed the B–54, B–49, and B–36 competing for the intercontinental bomber production contract—all, I submit, to the benefit of national defense. Now, who do we want managing these companies, supervising development and production, and presenting the case for their weapons—men who have no knowledge of the realities of combat or men who have spent their lives as users of the things they are now developing and producing? The question answers itself.

Are there potential abuses in the present system? Probably—in this or any system where salesmanship is a factor. I don't know what percentage of the working force of the country is engaged in selling, but it is large; and the job of selling is to get buyers for your product through (a) its intrinsic merit and (b) establishment of favorable personal relationships which create a receptive attitude toward the product. Unless you are going to try to eliminate factor (b) by forbidding all personal contact between defense suppliers and procurement officers, it is futile and self-defeating to blacklist one particular class of men who can be very helpful indeed.

I have been in close contact with the Air Force since the end of World War II. Mistakes have been made in procurement of weapons and equipment, but I know of no case where the mistake was related to the personal influence of any employee of a supplier, whether or not a retired officer. Indeed I will go further; I don't think the influence of any retired officer has the slightest effect on procurement decisions except as the retired officer is able to put himself in the position of the procurement authority and thus present more effectively the merits of the weapon—and any supplier who employs a retired officer in the hope of cashing in on personal influence is wasting his money.

W. BARTON LEACH,
Consultant to the Chief of Staff, USAF,
Brigadier General, USAFR.

David P. Haxton, of Miami, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Floridians are honored to have the International Headquarters for the Junior Chamber of Commerce located in Miami Beach, Fla. Junior Chamber International is a marvelous and deserving organization which is interested in community understanding and peaceful relationships among the peoples of the world.

For 4 years, Mr. David P. Haxton, 1200 5th Street, Miami Beach, Fla., was the secretary-general of the junior chamber of commerce. Recently Mr. Haxton was placed in a position of great honor and

responsibility as nongovernmental liaison officer for the United Nations Childrens Fund at the United Nations in New York. It is a high honor to be appointed to this office. Mr. Haxton's appointment was no doubt due to his experience in junior chamber matters, his knowledge of world affairs, his ability to express himself freely and openly, and his sincere devotion to democratic principles and desire to help his fellow man. David Haxton has been an enthusiastic leader, and has constnatnly demonstrated those qualities of leadership which have contributed to the promotion of good will between the younger generation of the free nations of the world.

I would like to express my personal appreciation to Mr. Haxton for the contributions he has made to the young men of the United States and to those who make up the J.C.I. membership in 89 countries of the world.

I am certain all Jaycees join with me in extending David Haxton our deep appreciation and gratitude for the excellent job he has done in the past and wish him continued success in his challenging new position.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor: Scholarly Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 15, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent article from the Wall Street Journal of June 30, 1959.

The writer, William Henry Chamberlin, is a highly recognized student of government. He consistently contributes columns of special significance on the problems of the Nation. In the inserted article, he details the military philosophy of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor and the general's great concern with the failure to effectively modernize the Army for the conventional wars of the future.

General Taylor's retirement from the military service is a loss to the Nation. There is no question of the debt our country owes to him for the great service he has rendered. His activities and his views will long be remembered and we hope that, even in retirement, his opinions and advice will be sought by the Department of Defense.

The article is as follows:

SCHOLARLY SOLDIER—IN GENERAL TAYLOR'S RETIREMENT, PENTAGON LOSES OFFICER WHOSE POLICY WAS READINESS FOR LITTLE WARS, TOO

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, who said the other day that his retirement from the Army came about because his views over modernization of the service were unacceptable to the administration, is one of America's most articulate and outspoken military leaders.

The Army Chief of Staff—he ends his career today—possesses an uncommonly broad and varied experience as a scholar, linguist and educator, quite apart from his splendid record as a fighting general in command of a paratrooper unit in Europe during World War II.

A West Point graduate, Taylor served for a time as instructor in French at the Point and was later sent, with the rank of captain, to Tokyo as a language officer, with the double assignment of mastering the difficult Japanese language and attending Japanese army maneuvers and field exercises. After a war experience that included a daring dash into Rome while the city was still under Nazi occupation, Taylor was at various times Superintendent of West Point (where he showed a keen interest in modernizing teaching methods), American military commandant of Berlin and commander of the U.N. forces in Korea until the armistice was signed. He then served two terms as Army Chief of Staff.

Three points on which General Taylor has been insistent in congressional testimony and public speeches during his last months in office are these:

America must be prepared to fight little limited wars as well as all-out thermonuclear conflicts.

Special emphasis, in plans for defense against hostile attack, should be laid on development of an antimissile missile.

Just for this reason, and because suspension of nuclear tests would involve serious handicaps in developing efficient and economical tactical nuclear weapons, there should be the utmost care about concluding far-reaching agreements with an opponent not noted for good faith on this subject.

BALANCE OF TERROR

This question of American willingness and ability to wage limited wars, in which the more awesome weapons of mass destruction would not be used, is especially important at a time when something like a balance of terror has been established between the United States and the Soviet Union, with each side theoretically capable of inflicting crippling damage on the other. It may well be that Nikita Khrushchev's ultimate decision about resorting to some dangerous provocation to the Western forces in West Berlin depends on his own judgment as to American capability to react with limited warfare to a challenge too serious to be ignored, yet not serious enough to warrant the unloosing of the more terrible weapons.

As General Taylor pointed out in a speech before the Institute of World Affairs in Pasadena, there have been 17 limited war situations since 1945. In this speech he sounded the following warning of more difficult times that may lie ahead:

"The Soviet leaders have always shown a willingness to take chances, even when they had no counterpart to our preponderant atomic strength. With the rise in their capability in the atomic and missile fields it appears possible that we may expect increasing intransigence on their part. We may well be required to respond to increased levels of provocation in an atmosphere of heightened international tension. * * * In exploiting the fear imposed by mutual atomic capabilities it would appear quite likely that they will henceforth undertake to kick us higher and harder on the shins than they have done during the period of our atomic monopoly."

How should America improve its preparedness for limited war? General Taylor spells out five conditions for achieving this end. Weapons and equipment should be modernized; there should be more light atomic weapons, new types of air and ground vehicles, improved signal equipment based on radio. Speed and mobility should be assured, partly by forward stocking of supplies in critical areas. A certain amount of air and sea lift facilities should be earmarked for emergency situations like the landing in Lebanon.

His fourth, more general point, is that "we be as effective in meeting the complex requirements of limited war as the Strategic Air Command is in meeting the requirements of general atomic war." Fifth and last, General Taylor would like to see more demonstrative testing of our capabilities for "little wars."

"We must," he says, "overcome any impression that we are a country which can respond with a big bomb and little else."

BALLISTIC BOASTING

General Taylor considers the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile one of the Army's most important development efforts, since it is the only weapon under development that can meet effectively the threat of long-range ballistic missiles, the new weapon of which Khrushchev likes to boast.

As regards the cessation of nuclear tests, the subject of long negotiation at Geneva, General Taylor offered this statement of sober warning in testifying before the Senate subcommittee on disarmament:

"It is certain that our program for the development of nuclear weapons will suffer from the banning of tests. Test bans or suspensions would slow down and ultimately halt the development of essential empirical knowledge needed to develop improved nuclear weapons and methods of atomic warfare.

"A ban on the use of nuclear weapons would not of itself signify a worldwide rejection of force as an instrument of policy in international relationships. Forces equipped with nonatomic arms would still provide an aggressor nation with a capability for imposing its will upon others, particularly those possessing fewer conventional resources. Additionally, there is always the possibility that other parties to the ban might cheat."

GOING SLOW

Such a "go slow" signal, coming from a man of General Taylor's judgment, experience and intimate knowledge of the international military picture might well be heeded, both by our negotiators at Geneva and by the Senate, which will presumably have to ratify any agreement that may be reached there.

Meantime, Congress doubtless will give more consideration to the military doctrines that, because he considers them unacceptable to his superiors, led to Taylor's retirement.

"Urban Renewal Is Good Business": Letter From John Hirten, Stockton, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. McFALL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD today a very timely letter from John E. Hirten, Jr., executive director of the Redevelopment Agency of the city of Stockton, Calif.

The Congress in the past few days has completed action on a good housing bill and sent it to the President for his signature. I hope that it will be signed into law. Included in the bill are authorizations for continued urban renewal, public housing, FHA mortgage in-

surance, and many, many more programs that are good for individual communities and good for the prosperity of our country.

The bill we sent to the President was cut back considerably from the versions which both the House and the Senate had adopted earlier as being required to meet the needs of our expanding economy.

Mr. Hirten's letter is particularly pertinent at this time since he points out very clearly how the voices of national organizations that have been raised so strongly against this good housing bill, do not in many instances accurately represent the actual feelings of their individual members.

The city of Stockton, which is in the District I represent, has done a particularly fine job in the areas of urban renewal and public housing and I sincerely hope that the new housing bill will become law so that these worthwhile programs can continue.

Following is the text of Mr. Hirten's letter:

The Honorable JOHN J. MCFALL,
Member of Congress,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent to our members transmitting a resolution concerning the discontinuation of our West End project. The lack of any housing legislation means that this project must be terminated.

I realize that the Senate and House have passed legislation covering the omnibus housing problems and now it is up to the President. However, since I am sending this letter, I did want to add a comment to the effect that I feel a general misunderstanding exists in certain areas of Washington with respect to the importance of urban renewal and urban renewal legislation to the local communities. I would like to refer you to an article in the June issue of Architectural Forum, page 147, entitled "Urban Renewal and the Ambivalent Businessman," by Stephen G. Thompson. He points out, and I think rather accurately, that such national organizations as the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Realty Boards are taking one position with respect to urban renewal and housing programs, while their local counterparts are in disagreement with their national policy. The U.S. Chamber, for example, has been against urban renewal, while the local chambers in many cities (and in Stockton particularly) have strongly supported the urban renewal progam. The National Association of Realty Boards has been against the proposed housing legislation, while their local counterparts, (including, again, Stockton) have been strongly in back of the urban renewal program.

These are just some of the many other examples. Urban renewal is good business; and from a local point of view, very good business. Urban renewal, also, represents (in my opinion) the only real possibility for saving our urban communities. With large areas of slums and blight in this city and in almost every other city throughout the country, how can the city operate as a balanced economic entity? How can revenues meet necessary disbursements when the sick areas of our city are being subsidized by the healthy ones. Mr. Mason, the present Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, states that this legislation and proposed bill is not a bill that is good for the people. If this bill, which pours money right back into the local community and into the pockets of the citizens, owners, renters, businessmen and community economics—while correcting the physical and social ills brought on by slums and blight—is not good for the people, then what bill in Congress is?

I don't know what will be the next step if the President vetoes the bill; but I surely hope if that occurs every step will be made by Congress to override such a veto. The tremendous progress being made in Stockton and in many cities throughout the country is directly related to their programs of renewal and redevelopment. Without urban renewal, the sick and deteriorated parts of our city will continue to demand heavy abnormal expenditures, while private investment (in avoiding these blighted sections) will scramble for new land on the outskirts of our community and further complicate matters by demanding the extension of city services well beyond the economical logic of such extensions.

I don't wish to burden you with comments such as these, for I am aware of your feeling for our program and toward progressive legislation in general. However, I did feel the urge to express some of my comments concerning this, and take the liberty of doing so in this letter to you.

Thank you for all the help you have given us in the past. I assure you that we will put forth our fullest energies to carry out an effective and worthwhile program.

Most sincerely,

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF
THE CITY OF STOCKTON,
JOHN E. HIRTEN, Jr.,
Executive Director.

Statement of Edwin Christianson, President, Minnesota Farmers Union, Before the House Agriculture Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, Edwin Christianson, president of the Minnesota Farmers Union, testified at the general farm hearings being conducted by the House Agriculture Committee. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include Mr. Christianson's testimony in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF EDWIN CHRISTIANSON, PRESIDENT, MINNESOTA FARMERS UNION, BEFORE THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE

I am happy to have this opportunity to present our views before this committee and to say that we regard these hearings as very significant because there are several actions which need to be taken on farm matters by this session of Congress.

I want to associate myself with the comments and recommendations of Mr. Patton, our national president.

We appreciate the difficult position which the committee is in, due to the attitude of the administration on farm policy. The recent wheat example, certainly, is not encouraging, since once again it has put the Congress in the position of being severely criticized for not acting, and then equally as severely criticized for acting.

Nevertheless, the fact that there is no leadership from the administrative branch does not mean that the Congress should cease to try to exert leadership as far as is possible.

There are some conditions in agriculture which should not be left unremedied—there are some conditions which will become increasingly more serious by a year from now—and there are some conditions which will cause severe damage to the national economy if not corrected before next year.

Since this is true, it becomes the responsibility of the Congress to constructively put together the kind of legislation which it believes will be of some assistance to the Nation.

Three conditions are becoming intolerable and need to be acted upon as soon as possible:

1. The low level of farm prices and income.
2. The collapse of market levels on perishable farm products, now on eggs and soon to come on hogs and other products unless action is taken.
3. The tremendous surpluses and excessive cost of the ineffective Benson program.

As we told the agricultural subcommittee of the House committee on appropriations early in April, unless Congress forces a reversal of the present policy, the Nation may some day see a Benson budget of $10 billion a year and total national net farm income less than that figure.

We expressed to the appropriations subcommittee our view that a full parity farm program can be operated through direct payments and allotments at less than half the cost of the Benson program and that we could avoid both the economic deficit which has resulted from low farm income and the accumulation of further surpluses of farm commodities.

We feel that the basic things which we must have in any farm legislation are the following:

1. Bring farm income to parity levels.
2. Cease the new accumulation of large stocks of farm commodities.
3. Bring the farm program cost to a reasonable figure.

In our statement, we wish to use an illustration of how a combination of allotments and direct payments can achieve these three program goals on one farm commodity—dairy products—and how a similar program could be tailored to fit many other commodities.

We believe that a dairy program along the line of the program spelled out last year in title 6 of the omnibus House farm bill could bring dairy prices to 90 percent of parity, yet could be operated at an annual cost to the taxpayers of $50 to $100 million a year compared with the outlay of $200 to $400 million a year in recent years to achieve a price average of about 75 percent of parity.

As you know, title 6 has been reintroduced, with some revisions, in this session by Congressman LESTER JOHNSON in the bill H.R. 6750. The Johnson bill would authorize the use of deficiency payments, compliance deposits and market allotments to achieve stabilization of dairy prices and production at reasonable levels.

An important consideration about the Johnson dairy bill is that it would permit dairy farmers for the first time in history, to vote on the type of program they would prefer to have in operation.

The Johnson dairy bill would place much of the administration of the new dairy plan in the hands of a farmer-elected national dairy board. Decisions on establishment of marketing allotments and levying of compliance deposits would be made by the dairy board, rather than the Secretary of Agriculture. The dairy board would also estimate the probable free marekt price of manufacturing milk in the absence of a support

program. If it appeared that the average market price would be less than 90 percent of parity, the dairy board would be authorized to establish marketing bases and allotments for each dairy farm and would also be authorized to require the deduction of compliance deposits of 25 to 50 cents per hundredweight from the price paid to producers for milk.

If allotments are required, the marketing base for each producer would be the average production for a 3-year period. The marketing allotment would be reduced below the base by 1 percent for each 5 percent which the market price was likely to be below 90 percent of parity.

Farmers who stayed within their marketing allotment would be eligible to receive a refund of the compliance deposits in full and also to receive a deficiency payment to represent the difference between the market average price and the support level. The compliance deposits of farmers who exceeded their allotment would be defaulted and would be appropriated to CCC to be used in helping finance the support program payments.

From this brief outline, it can be seen that the Johnson dairy plan would be self-regulating, because any weakness in price would result in the incentive being offered for a reduction in volume.

The program would be self-financing in large part because the defaulted compliance deposits would be available if some producers failed to comply with their allotment.

The program outlined in the Johnson dairy bill would be a voluntary one. A producer could produce and market as much milk as he desired if he was willing to forego receiving a deficiency payment and did not intend to claim a refund of his compliance deposits. Yet, for the average producer, the combined total of the deficiency payment and the compliance deposit would represent too large a sum for him to wish to exceed his marketing allotment.

Furthermore, the allotment and compliance deposits would be in effect only when prices threatened to fall below 90 percent of parity. They would act as a preventive measure, encouraging a reduction in production volume as quickly as any price weakness appeared likely. Thus, we would avoid surpluses rather than waiting for them to develop and then trying, with costly and largely ineffective measures, to reduce or dispose of them.

The formula contained in the dairy bill, we believe, could be tailored to fit any or all of the major farm commodities, with the same desirable results of maintaining fair farm income, avoiding the accumulation of further surpluses, and bringing the cost of farm programs to a reasonable figure.

Because such programs would be self-regulating in nature, we would head off surplus and price trouble before it happened. Therefore, we are confident that such programs for the major commodities could be operated at an annual cost of less than $1 billion a year to the taxpayer.

A program of market allotments, together with compliance deposits at 10 percent of the parity price for each commodity, would take care of most of the stabilization problem for most commodities, leaving only a nominal amount of the support funds to be supplied by the public treasury.

Such a program would not only be very effective on the perishable items, but would be practical as well on the crops on which we are seeking to broaden our export volume.

Farm leaders in the Congress, many of them on this very committee, have time after time made legislative proposals which would have improved the farm programs.

While the opposition of the administration forces us to delay the adoption of a program based on market allotments and deficiency payments, Canada is moving ahead to try to solve its farm price difficulties by use of the production payment principles on milk, eggs, and perhaps hogs as well.

A program of incentive payments to attract hogs and cattle to market at lighter, more desirable weights, would help considerably to reduce market volume to demand.

For example, by offering incentive payments of $1 to $3 per hundredweight for hogs, marketed at 200 pounds or less, a sizable cutback in market volume could be achieved.

We need to consider that the 1959 pig crop will be about 9 million head greater, and the feed supply will be about 30 percent greater per animal unit than in 1955, the year we suffered the great collapse on hog prices.

By bringing these hogs to market at 200 pounds or less instead of 240 to 250 pounds, we could achieve a reduction in pork volume of as much as 20 percent.

We could thus avoid the oversupply and the price break which are otherwise sure to come late this year and next.

To those who would propose that we should let the hog situation iron itself out, let us point out that if the addition to the feed carryover of some 11 million tons of feed in just this past year (from 59 to 70 million tons) were to be fed up—it would mean an additional 22 million hogs on the market. Hog incentive payments would be a method of preventing surpluses, rather than curing them after it is too late.

If an overall program of market allotments were to be established in order to tailor the market volume to national needs, it would be advisable and necessary to make available a program temporarily, at least, to divert some resources out of agricultural production.

Our farm productivity at least for the present is likely to outrun visible demand. We do not believe that there is any point in using valuable resources in the production of commodities surpluses for which there is no ready market. This is not to say that we should have a program of planned scarcity, but that we should cut back on production to the extent that it outruns all possible demand domestically, for export and for needed reserves.

The soil bank has not proved to be an effective measure for reducing the resources going into agricultural production. Whether or not the soil bank was sound in theory, at least it has been administered into ineffectiveness. The soil-bank acreage reserve has been terminated and the conservation reserve will expire after the 1960 sign-up.

In the consideration of any land-diversion program, we ought to avoid the mistakes and shortcomings of the soil bank.

We believe the House Appropriations Committee made a very good suggestion when it proposed that a diverted acres program could be carried out much more effectively within the framework of the agricultural conservation program.

We would feel that a land-retirement program, if it was operated in conjunction with the type of a price support program as proposed herein, could be successfully run on an effective scale yet at much less than the cost of the soil bank.

Farmers would be able to take land out of production at a nominal rental if they were assured of a satisfactory return on the remainder of their production.

We believe that it will take many years to use up the surpluses accumulated under the Benson program. To use them up within a 2- or 3-year period, in our opinion would require that 80 to 100 million acres would have to be taken out of production. The economy of our agricultural areas could not withstand a third of the cropland being taken out of production at one time.

We would propose instead that the goal be to work off the surpluses over a longer period of time with perhaps 10 to 20 percent of the cropland being taken temporarily out of production.

We feel that the diverted acres program must be such that it will fit into the normal rotation and cropping programs of typical farmers.

We also feel that there must be a limit to the acreage which any farmer can place into the program so that we avoid the undesirable effects of whole farms being taken out of production. The program should be operated in a way that will keep the farm production unit intact.

We believe a workable program could be developed along the following lines:

1. Each farmer, who wishes to be eligible for any support loans or Government support payments, would be required to keep 10 percent of his cropland base out of production and in the agricultural conservation program as a regular matter, with no payment except cost-sharing on the agricultural conservation program practices.

2. A program of rental payments to encourage placing additional acreage, ranging between 1 percent and 10 percent of cropland base, into agricultural conservation program practices under a 2-year program under which no cropping or grazing would be permitted.

3. The rental payments would be based on the prevailing average rent on land in the respective township or county.

4. A program of additional incentive payments ranging from $1 to $10 per acre, with a rate of $1 in incentive payments for each 1 percent of the cropland base being placed in the 2-year agricultural conservation program. Thus, a farmer could qualify for payments under this program, totaling the rental value plus a maximum of $10 an acre in incentive payments if he had the full 10 percent of his cropland in the regular agriculture conservation program and another full 10 percent in the agricultural conservation program 2-year program.

We estimate that under such a program, we would annually have about 50 to 60 million acres taken out of production, half of it under the agricultural conservation program 2-year program and the other half of it voluntarily under the regular agricultural conservation program without any compensation except for cost-sharing on the practices.

We believe that a land-diversion program of this sort is a necessary part of a broad farm program, because it is important to the future of the Nation to preserve and build up the soil resources. An agricultural conservation program land diversion program, or land-use adjustment program as it used to be called in the earlier years of the AAA program, would provide a way in which soil nutrients could be maintained and built up while the land was placed temporarily on a standby basis.

We believe that the essentials which we have outlined, including market allotments, compliance deposits, and direct payments are the framework of a workable program for most farm commodities. Further, we believe that a farm price support program needs to be supplemented by a land-retirement program over a period of years and that this can be done most effectively and most economically within the framework of the agricultural conservation program. We recommend these actions to the consideration of the committee.

Steel Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the officers of the United Steelworkers of America have sent to their membership a true history of the negotiations with the steel corporations which I thought every Member of Congress should read.

It tells the story in full of the employer's stand, and his unwillingness to accept collective bargaining and to keep peace and good relationship in the steel industry.

Management has insisted on changing many of the benefits now enjoyed by the steelworker. If these changes are to be accepted by the union, many of the gains won on the picket line will be sacrificed.

I ask that the Members of Congress make a fair appraisal of the justice of the union's demands.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
Pittsburgh, Pa., June 20, 1959.

To the Members and Families of the United Steelworkers of America:

We, as international officers of your union, are writing you this personal letter out of a strong sense of duty and responsibility which we feel toward you and your family. Since this union has always tried its best to protect and extend the best interests of you and your loved ones, we feel a direct obligation to inform you of any development which may threaten your status as a wage earner and family breadwinner.

There is afoot at this writing a most serious effort to undermine your job security, your earnings, your fringe benefits, and your union's ability to safeguard these for you. Although for the time being this effort is directed at those who work in the basic steel companies, it is a cancer which could take hold and spread throughout every company and industry in the United States and Canada with which we bargain. So this matter about which we write you is one that directly or indirectly involves every member of the union.

For almost 2 months now, your union has been hard at work trying to negotiate new wage agreements to replace those which expire at midnight, June 30, 1959. In these negotiations we have been talking to the 12 largest steel corporations or their spokesmen, but in reality we have been dealing with a united industry which has marshaled the wealth and power of business and industrial America to fight the Steelworkers' Union and its membership.

Several months before contract negotiations with our union got underway, the rich steel corporations began a carefully contrived campaign to condition the public and our members to the idea that steelworkers should not share in their great profits. In newspaper advertisements, television and radio messages, in booklets and letters, they beat the drums of inflation and foreign competition.

Both the inflation monster and the foreign competition hoax which industry conjured up have had a telling effect on the public, even though most of our members knew these issues were meant to frighten them into accepting inferior wages and watered-down benefits at a time when steel companies are piling up profits at a record-breaking pace.

While your attention and the eyes of the public have been fixed on the alleged effect of inflation and foreign competition the steel corporations mapped their plan to atomize and completely undermine your job rights now guaranteed under various union contract provisions—won through bitter struggles over the years—which protect you as an individual employee.

Less than 3 weeks before current basic steel agreements were due to expire, the company representatives let the cat out of the bag. They laid before your union negotiators eight blockbusters which would demolish or jeopardize almost every important right you now enjoy as a union worker.

This coldblooded plan of the steel industry is set forth in a document which is now a matter of public record. In it, the corporations took eight separate and distinct steps toward the destruction of your individual job rights. They demanded that you take a giant step backward toward the dark days of company unionism.

In the following paragraphs, each of these eight demands from industry is spelled out. With each one you will find a brief explanation of how the companies would use such contract changes to their advantage against you.

Please study all eight of the industry's proposals and the full meaning behind each of them:

1. The industry proposes to modify contractual language to allow management to make any changes which would produce greater efficiency and economy.

This means the companies want the right to eliminate any contract protection which stands in the way of speeding up operations or wringing from you and your fellow employees something more than the last possible ounce of productive effort. This includes the elimination of jobs, abolishment of established work practices, and the surrender of other hard-won benefits which you count on to protect you on the job.

2. Management wants to reinforce present contract restrictions against wildcat strikes, slowdowns, and other interferences with production.

This is demanded by the companies despite the fact that union contracts already contain ironclad guarantees which are far tougher than those in other industries and which have been rigorously enforced by the international union. More language in this section can only mean that the companies want the right to punish you for any sort of work interference whether or not you may be involved or responsible. They could deprive you and your family or your income or fringe benefits if some kind of shutdown occurred over which you personally had no control and which might be deliberately provoked by management.

3. Management wants the union to recognize "the functions of management to develop incentives and establish sound standards."

Present union contracts already provide for such recognition. All the union requires is that incentives set by management must be fair, just, and provide equitable compensation, without jeopardizing the earnings of employees involved. Why do the companies want to change the present arrangement? They either want to install incentives without being fair, just, and equitable, or they want to cut your earnings under existing incentive plans. Or they may want to impose incentive work standards on you without any incentive pay whatever and set the standards by industrial engineers and foremen without your participation.

4. Management proposes to clarify the right of companies to change work schedules.

Each company now has broad rights to change work schedules, subject only to giving proper notice to affected employees so that each person can adjust his private life to the needs of management. Management evidently wants to ignore entirely the interests of the employees with respect to work schedules. The company would like the right to make you come and go without advance notice, or stand by on 24-hour call, as it may suit management.

5. The companies propose (a) to add additional requirements for the receipt of vacations and (b) to enlarge the period for scheduling vacations.

The first part of this industry proposal would make it doubly hard for you to qualify for a vacation, requiring you to work a specified amount of time both in the year before you take your vacation and in the year in which the vacation occurs. Even the companies themselves in 1956 recognized the injustice of such a qualification and upon their suggestion it was eliminated.

The second part of industry's proposal shows how you would be forced to let management do as it pleases about your vacation. As you know, the companies already have the right to schedule your vacation without your consent during 6 months of the year in the case of United States Steel and even longer periods in the case of other companies. Management also has the further right to schedule vacations at any time—if the individual employee agrees. Somehow, the companies feel they still do not have enough authority over your vacation plans.

6. The steel companies propose to eliminate what they call "an overlapping or duplication of benefits" under provisions relating to severance allowance, supplemental unemployment benefits (SUB) and pensions.

This is a very mystifying proposal since all programs mentioned by the companies already contain provision against duplication. Management apparently wants to take away your rights to continue your insurance after you are retired and on pension. Or the steel companies are, perhaps, thinking of depriving you of already inadequate 30-day life insurance coverage if you should be laid off and collect supplemental unemployment benefits.

7. Management wants to "simplify" the procedure for establishing seniority units.

Under present contracts, existing seniority units are preserved and new units are established by mutual agreement at the local plant level. In event there is disagreement over new jobs, management has the right to place the job in question in an appropriate unit, subject to your union's grievance procedure. But what the companies evidently now want is the right to determine and revise seniority units, which affect your job status, without any challenge whatever from the union. You know how much job security you would have without seniority rights. Without such protection, you would have to depend on the whims of management to hold your job.

8. The steel industry proposes, finally, to simplify and clarify contract language.

The union agrees that contract language could be written more clearly so that everyone could better understand its provisions. But in light of management's other proposals to simplify and clarify, this last proposal can only mean a virtual end to the union contract. This would make it simpler for management. There is no simpler contract than one which gives you no rights.

If you have read these proposals of the companies carefully as we have you can come to only one conclusion.

This is one of the most sweeping and brazen attempts to destroy the individual rights of workers that any management has ever seriously proposed in the history of collective bargaining.

As you have probably already noticed, not one of these industry proposals has anything to do with the argument that better wages and conditions for you will bring about

"inflation" or extend the threat of "foreign competition." This proves that such diversionary issues and tactics were used by the companies merely to hide the real, sinister goal of the industry until negotiations were underway.

Stripped of their high-sounding language, these industry proposals tear down the protective fence the union has built up around your job over the past 18 to 23 years. They would give the company unlimited power and authority over you, and your union could do little but stand by helplessly.

If this letter sounds alarming there is good reason to get excited. Unless the United Steelworkers can prevent the steel corporations from destroying these fundamental job rights, you and your family face a great loss. Your job security, your job rights, your earnings and your fringe benefits will hang by the thinnest thread of management mercy.

We must not permit a backward step. We must stand united against this assault on your rights. Talk to your fellow-employees on the job about this matter. Explain to your friends and neighbors what the rich and powerful steel industry is trying to put over on you. Now that these corporations have openly revealed how they hope to wreck your job rights—while operating behind a phony crusade against inflation and foreign competition—it is time to speak out.

We, the officers of the United Steelworkers of America pledge to you that there will be no backward step. We will fight a positive, constructive battle for decent honorable agreements. We will tell the industry that you need more protection and a better standard of living—not destruction and a return to the dark ages of company unionism.

Our cause is just. With your personal support, we will win.

DAVID J. MCDONALD
International President.
I. W. ABEL
International Secretary-Treasurer.
HOWARD R. HAGUE
International Vice President.

Congressman Commended for Change in Milk Check Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 1959

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend our distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE], upon the splendid service he has rendered to the American dairy farmer. My congressional district produces more milk and cheese than any other district in the country and we appreciate the fine efforts on behalf of the dairy farmer rendered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

This week a letter addressed to the gentleman from Idaho from the National Milk Producers Federation was called to my attention. I wish to include this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letter is as follows:

NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1959.

Hon. HAMER BUDGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BUDGE: Recently we had occasion to make reference to the compilation of the statutes restricting the transportation of letters and the interpretations of such statutes.

We noted an insert relating to milk checks and in view of the fact that this problem had confronted many of our member associations, we made inquiry in the Post Office Department with respect to the amendment.

We were informed that you did considerable work on this issue and on pursuing the matter further we found that most of the credit for the amendment is due to your efforts.

On behalf of our dairy farmer members, we express our deep appreciation for your interest and success in securing the much-needed change in the regulations.

Sincerely,

E. M. NORTON,
Secretary,
National Milk Producers Federation.

The Great Epic of the Opening of the West Translated Into Jefferson National Expansion Memorial—Speech by Hon. Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the long, hard road over the years to obtain necessary Federal appropriations for the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at St. Louis reached a high point last week with ground-breaking ceremonies for the relocation of the railroad tracks as the first major phase of the extensive project.

Many times in the past, other Members of Congress have asked me why the Federal Government should be helping to build what is often thought to be a purely local project for the improvement and beautification of downtown St. Louis and the riverfront. Of course it is not a local project for local enjoyment only, and one of the best statements of why it is not a purely St. Louis project—why it is of national importance—was made in St. Louis last week by Director Conrad L. Wirth of the National Park Service, under whose agency the memorial is being constructed.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this excellent address on the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial made by Mr. Wirth at a luncheon last week given by the Advertising Club of St. Louis in conjunction with ground-breaking ceremonies earlier in the day. The address by Mr. Wirth is as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONRAD L. WIRTH, DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, BEFORE THE ADVERTISING CLUB OF ST. LOUIS ON JUNE 23, 1959

I am highly honored that you have asked me here today to join you good people in St. Louis in breaking ground for the first major step in a great memorial development which will honor the spirit that conceived and made possible the territorial integrity and national greatness of this country. I want to thank the advertising club for inviting me and for its interest and enthusiasm in our plan to develop Jefferson National Expansion Memorial.

To reuse the words made famous by Lindbergh 32 years ago, we see here today another great expression of the indomitable "Spirit of St. Louis."

Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton is vitally interested in the rewarding progress the National Park Service, with the encouragement and support of the American people and the Congress, is making in its Mission 66 program. He has asked me to extend his greetings to all of you and to convey his sincere regrets that he cannot be present with you on this memorable occasion.

I am especially gratified to hear of the extensive new development, modernization, and rehabilitation programs planned and being undertaken throughout Greater St. Louis. I think it is most significant that many of these activities will assure the economic rebirth of downtown St. Louis. The Jefferson National Expansion Memorial will play a vital and unique role in the economic life of the community, and the harmonious redevelopment of the environs of the memorial will be a tremendous achievement in which the city of St. Louis, the people of all America, and this Service and the Department of the Interior can take just pride.

Certainly, there are tangible economic benefits from the construction program of some $22 million for the overall development of Jefferson National Expansion Memorial which is being financed jointly by the city of St. Louis, the Federal Government, and the Terminal Railroad Association. This is teamwork of Federal and local interests at its best. When development is completed (our target date is 1963), your city will be the locale of one of America's greatest intangible assets—an asset whose dividends will flow perpetually in the form of inspiration, patriotism, and pride of country in the countless millions of Americans who will make new contact with their past and with American history on these memorial grounds. This is the primary dividend we seek in giving our energies, our devotion, and our means to this project.

But there will be substantial continuing material dividends from the investment of dollars being spent here. In our Mission 66 planning, we have estimated that 3 million visitors annually will visit this memorial by 1966. Applying well-established formulas of measuring the value of tourist activity, it is evident that this inpouring of memorial visitors may contribute as much as $20 million annually to the local economy.

It is doubly significant that the groundbreaking today is in an area which played a role of paramount importance in this country's westward expansion. It is doubtful if the history of America west of the Appalachians affords the example of another city which approaches the stature of St. Louis as the hub of vast territorial exploration, the nerve center of a farflung trade, and the exclusive mart for so vast an extent of country as that which was tributary to St. Louis from the time of the Louisiana Purchase to the present day.

Almost every route of trade or adventure to the remote regions of the West, whether by water or over arduous trails through plains, mountains, and deserts, centered in this city. Following the lines of trade, almost all significant travel to the Far West, be it for gain, for pleasure, or for scientific research, be it exploring expeditions, military movements, trade with the Indians, or the enterprise of missionaries, made St. Louis a starting point and base of operations.

A great epic will be translated and presented for all to know and enjoy perpetually in the Jefferson National Expansion Me-

morial. The expansion of the United States westward from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean during the 19th century is a salient chapter of American history and perhaps the world's greatest example of a nation's peaceful growth. The first effective move in trans-Mississippi expansion was that of the farsighted Thomas Jefferson, who set out to open the Mississippi for the trans-Allegheny westerners by peaceful means, and gained, in addition, the vast new territory of Louisiana.

It has been said that a nation's capacity for survival depends upon the strength of its guiding traditions—the elements which created the national character. Such traditions are kept alive, not only by custom and literature, but also by the preservation of places where great historic events occurred. This we have set about to do here.

Long before President Franklin D. Roosevelt set aside the St. Louis waterfront area as a national historic site in 1935, many people, and you in St. Louis of all people, were aware of its significance as one of our Nation's great historic spots and recognized the importance of bringing it under protection provided by the organic laws under which the National Park Service guards the Nation's treasures of nature and man's record upon our land.

I think it is appropriate at this point that we pay tribute to the many far-sighted civic leaders and organizations of St. Louis who have been instrumental in acquiring and obtaining national recognition for this original gateway to the West. We are indeed fortunate to have some of those people with us here today—Mr. William Crowdus, president of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Association; Mr. Dickmann, who is a former mayor of St. Louis; your present mayor, Raymond R. Tucker; and Mr. Russell Dearmont, of the Missouri Pacific Railroad. We should pay special tribute to the late Luther Ely Smith, the first president of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Association, who exercised such unflagging faith and devoted so much time and effort in the initial establishment of this area. We are proud that his son, Luther Ely Smith, who is following in his father's footsteps in supporting the memorial program, is with is here today. We must, of course, never forget the guidance and the many fine contributions to this project through the U.S. Territorial Expansion Commission.

That you, the citizens of St. Louis, have great pride in and appreciation for the accomplishments of our Nation and of the noteworthy individuals and events that make up the fabric of American history is emphasized in your joining with us to finance this great project. The groundbreaking for relocation of the railroad tracks which we took part in this morning at the riverfront marks the first step in carrying out the Saarinen plan for the development of the memorial. I shall not bring coals to Newcastle by detailing for you all that will be accomplished under that plan, but certain elements deserve our attention on this occasion.

The dominant physical structure will be the graceful, breathtaking, parabolic arch. Although the arch will be unique in architectural history, its true significance far transcends that of merely a structure of outstanding design. St. Louis was the gateway to westward expansion, and an arch placed on the very ground from whence the westward movement flowed has a special symbolism as a visualization of the gateway concept. The imagination can also see in it a giant projection of the sturdy wagon bow so closely a part of the popular image of the great surge westward. So this structure of modern material and design also is a looking backward to the historic past in a recognizable symbol of high patriotic and sentimental value.

But the arch, like all symbols, will have many meanings for people of a nation so wondrously heterogeneous as ours. It may be to the space-age thinker a frozen trajectory of a missile seeking to escape earth's gravity. To those who think in abstract, it may be an inspired representation of unfettered human spirit, the human heart eternally searching for the achievement of transcendent goals. It embodies the spirit of enterprise, the same courageous advance into the unknown, and the same faith in man's destiny that characterized our ancestors on America's geographical frontier. In this sense, it will glorify those qualities which are still needed by us to cope with the enormous problems of modern technological and sociological frontiers. Thus, the arch, as we said earlier, will be symbolic not only of a gateway to the West but also of the new age of atomic poser, rockets, and exploration of space. It will remind us not only of our westward territorial expansion, but also of our continued progress toward goals our ancestors rarely dreamed of. In its morning shadow will lie your great city with its material witness to the benefits of the heritage focused here in the memorial.

Another major center of interest in the memorial will be a fine new visitor center. As a part of the development phase of Mission 66, visitor centers are being erected in many of our parks, but, like the arch, this one will be unique. Located beneath the memorial arch, it will be the only underground visitor center in the national park system. Here, by means of exhibits of original objects and of maps, texts, and murals, and by use of dioramas, the visitor can project himself into the events and onto the scenes of the panorama of western history. Here will be told the story of the inspiring and daring deeds of the statesmen, frontiersmen, and pioneers who brought about the final filling of the Continent to the waters of the Pacific. Here will be information to tie the thrilling events of the past to the responsibilities of our Nation today in its approach to future frontiers which involve technology, ideology, and the conquering of space.

In the future months, as you watch these structures gradually taking shape, I am sure you can see for yourselves the great good that is being accomplished under the 10-year Mission 66 program of the National Park Service. The contribution of the Federal Government to the developments which will be made at Jefferson National Expansion Memorial is a part of this program. In my enthusiasm, I sometimes forget that everyone is not fully aware of what Mission 66 means, and how it came about.

Mission 66 is so named because it is a 10-year program, launched in the summer of 1958 and scheduled to meet the goals by 1966, the golden anniversary year of the establishment of the national park system in 1916. Its goals are to so develop and staff our national park areas as to permit their widest and wisest possible use; provide maximum understanding and enjoyment for those who use them; and to preserve and give rigorous protection to the priceless scenic, historic, scientific, and wilderness resources of the national park system, existing and proposed, which comprise our people's greatest heritage.

Mission 66 was created to meet a near-disastrous situation which developed from the necessary economies our Nation was forced to meet during World War II and the critical defense period during the Korean emergency. When the war started, much of the national park system was placed on an emergency standby operation. We patched up our facilities and put patches upon patches. Roads deteriorated, guardrails rotted and fell, and trails became overgrown. Everywhere you looked you could find symptoms of neglect.

When peace was finally restored, if we can call our world situation today that of peace, Americans began to go back to the parks in tremendous numbers. The Park Service struggled desperately to catch up with the work that had been postponed, but with the limited means at hand, and accumulated arrears in planning, we could not hope to keep abreast of the demands made on us.

And so Mission 66 was created to arrest the deficiencies of the past, to meet the critical needs of the present, and to look ahead to certain future demands upon a very limited resource. The President, the Department of the Interior, and the Congress of the United States, have stanchly supported this program from the very beginning.

The National Park Service is guardian of approximately 340 historic structures of many kinds. Parallel with our work in preserving and protecting wilderness and natural features in the scenic and scientific areas of the national park system, one of our goals under Mission 66 is to preserve those buildings with high historic associations or symbolic value in bridging past and future frontiers in the mind of the visitor. You have just such a building in the memorial area—the restored rock house, built in 1818 and used originally as a riverfront warehouse for the upper Missouri fur trade, and now a precious relic of the past. Unfortunately, the only feasible relocation of the railroad will require the use of part of the present site of the rock house. We plan to move, faithfully reconstruct, and furnish this building as an historic fur trade museum, making it one of the memorial feature in the vicinity of the arch, where it will be readily accessible to visitors.

I should like to take this opportunity to recognize the unqualified support for this program on the part of the members of the Missouri congressional delegation.

Mission 66 is well underway now but we must beware of complacency. We are determined that this program for the people must not falter, here at Jefferson National Expansion Memorial or elsewhere in the far-flung park system. The American people have indicated their clear realization of the great heritage they have in their park system by the ever-increasing volume of visits—almost 60 million in 1957 and 1958 and we have every indication that this year will break all previous records.

Fifty years ago the population of the United States was less than 90 million. Ten years from now, we are expected to reach 200 million, and those added millions will have more leisure time to use for good or evil or indifferently. Visits to the great historic and scenic areas of our Nation already are becoming great factors in turning our leisure pursuits to constructive ends.

It has been said that the future of our Nation may very well depend upon the wisdom with which we make use of our added leisure time. To assure that we shall always have sources of spiritual refreshment, mental and physical realization, and patriotic inspiration in our national shrines like Jefferson National Expansion Memorial is a task worthy of our highest measure of dedication, and a dollar investment dwarfed by the immensity of the returns to our people.

It is in this spirit that we start this day the construction program at Jefferson National Expansion Memorial for the benefit and enjoyment of all the people. When this memorial is fully developed, visits to it will help Americans regenerate and dignify the values connected with their Western heritage and will reawaken in them a sense of the great responsibilities of citizenship in a democracy.

I know we will have your continued support in seeing this great undertaking to its full realization. I hope that it may be my privilege within a few years to join you good friends of St. Louis in dedicating the completed memorial which we have worked together for so many years to bring into being.

Anniversary of the Federal Credit Union Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on the 25th anniversary of the passage of the Federal Credit Union Act, I am pleased to join other Members of Congress in paying tribute to our colleagues whose work resulted in that legislation and to the credit-union movement itself.

In this we call attention to the fact that the uncomplicated democratic institution which is a credit union has lived up to its original promise, has thrived, and in doing so has clearly demonstrated that it will play a more and more important role in years ahead.

In the State of California, as elsewhere, credit unions are a healthy and widely accepted institution, which simply means that more and more thousands of citizens have joined with fellow workers and friends to pool their savings and make loans at low interest rates. In California in the past 5 years the number of individual credit unions has increased by 54 percent. I am advised by the California Credit Union League that today members of credit unions in our State have accumulated total savings of $499 million and total assets of $510 million and have loans outstanding in the amount of $420 million.

Having shared in the organizing of one such credit union in California and having served on its board, I know the credit union also as a down-to-earth workshop in the principles of democracy, as well as an entirely workable self-help agency for thrift and saving.

In the years ahead we will see continuing growth of the credit-union movement, and we can be confident that this is healthy growth.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

History of the Connally Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Ernest O. Thompson, a distinguished citizen and soldier, is chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission and an internationally recognized authority in the field of oil and gas conservation.

At a recent meeting of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission in New Orleans, La., General Thompson discussed the Connally Act and lauded it as a fine example of Federal cooperation with the oil States.

He expressed thanks to the Congress for this cooperation in the effort to build up adequate oil and gas reserves for our national security. Because of the wide interest in this vital national question, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from his speech.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY OF THE CONNALLY ACT

(By Ernest O. Thompson, chairman, Texas Railroad Commission, before Interstate Oil Compact Commission meeting in New Orleans, La., June 15, 1959)

In all my experience and study of administrative law and its practical application, there has come to my attention no such helpful and constructive cooperation between State and Federal agencies as has been furnished by the provisions and the administration of the Connally Act.

The Connally Act covers only movements of oil in interstate commerce where the oil is not produced in accord with the statutes, rules, and regulations of the oil producing origin State.

The act applies only to the strictly Federal field of constitutional authority and leaves entirely to the States the complete control of their oil and gas conservation laws, rules, and regulations.

Such was the aim and intent of the Congress when the act was passed in 1935 on February 22.

Some background may be of interest. The Texas Legislature passed the market demand statute and the Texas Railroad Commission in east Texas set up a tender system by which each well was given its daily allowable credit and movements of oil by pipeline, truck, and tankcar by rail were permitted only when the oil shipment had been cleared as legally produced and a tender issued to accompany the oil, attached to the bill of lading or shipping ticket on the oil concerned. We in Texas even checked the throughout efficiency of every refinery in order to see to it that no more gasoline tenders were issued the particular refinery than his throughout rate would yield out of the specific number of barrels of crude oil tender covered.

This action proceeded very well until we were met by the opposition of the railroad companies and shipment of oil by tankcars. It was pointed out by the railroad attorneys that the Railroad Commission of Texas was acting beyond its scope of authority in placing a burden on interstate commerce by requiring these tenders, and the railroads contended that if they did not obey our orders they would be subject to action by the Railroad Commission of Texas; and, at the same time, if they refused to take the oil that was tendered to them by interstate shippers they themselves—the railroads—would be subject to a penalty of $1,000 a day at the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission for not taking the shipments. They were afraid of that course, a course which would subject them to possible risks, and, of course, the railroads naturally were not anxious to lose some 700 cars of freight movement a day when they were hard pressed for revenue. And I do not suppose that it took a very strong urge for the railroad lawyers to raise the constitutional ground and thereby be compelled to take this business. Anyway, a part of the problem was to stop the movement of this excess produced oil from interstate commerce.

I suggested to the railroad lawyers and to the other members of our commission that we send a telegram to the President asking him to issue an Executive order which would relieve the railroads of this penalty pending the passage of an act. Here follows the telegram which I sent to the President on July 8, 1933:

"In order that full cooperative effect can be given to oil-control measure, may we suggest that our enforcement of oil proration orders could be made more effective if you could at this time prohibit the shipment of illegally produced oil in interstate and foreign commerce. We have called a hearing for July 31 at Austin to ascertain the amount of oil that will be permitted to be stored in Texas and will issue orders prohibiting storage in excess of that amount. Prevention of shipment of illegal oil and elimination of excess storage of crude will go far toward a solution of the oil problem. Your order at this time prohibiting interstate and foreign shipment of oil illegally produced or withdrawn from storage will greatly assist in bringing all elements of the industry in accord. The situation in Texas is steadily improving. The Railroad Commission of Texas is now getting the unqualified support of the greater part of the industry.

"ERNEST O. THOMPSON,
"Member, Railroad Commission of Texas."

On July 11, 1933, the President issued the requested Executive order prohibiting the transportation in interstate and foreign commerce of petroleum and products thereof unlawfully produced or withdrawn from storage. The order follows:

"By virtue of the authority vested in me by the act of Congress entitled 'An act to encourage national industrial receovery, to foster fair competition, and to provide for the construction of certain useful public works, and for other purposes,' approved June 16, 1933 (Public Law No. 67, 73d Cong.), the transportation in interstate and foreign commerce of petroleum and the products thereof produced or withdrawn from storage in excess of the amount permitted to be produced or withdrawn from storage by any State law or valid regulation or order prescribed thereunder, by any board, commission, officer, or other duly authorized agency of a State, is hereby prohibited.

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

After such action was taken by the President, all three members of our commission sent the President the following telegram:

"The PRESIDENT,
"Washington, D.C.:

"The railroad commission notes with much gratification your order of today prohibiting interstate transportation of oil produced or withdrawn from storage in excess of allowable amounts. This will, to a large extent, solve a vexatious problem in the oil industry and will help this commission in maintaining orderly production and fairness to operators so that all may benefit. The order means that the State and National authorities are cooperating for the good of the whole, and we congratulate you on the promptness and sympathetic interest you have given. With such forces at work and with harmony prevailing, the oil problem will be satisfactorily adjusted for the common welfare.

"TEXAS RAILROAD COMMISSION,
"LON A. SMITH, *Chairman,*
"C. V. TERRELL,
"ERNEST O. THOMPSON,
"Commissioners."

This cleared the atmosphere until the Supreme Court knocked out the Industrial Recovery Act, after which time Senator Connally promptly, on February 22, 1935, passed the Connally Act through the Congress which prohibits the shipment in commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law.

* * * * *

Our commission and staff have worked in wholehearted cooperation with the staff of the Federal Tender Board and we commend the administration of this act and all of those who have helped enforce this law. It is one of our main supports to conservation of oil.

I wish especially to thank publicly our distinguished former Senator, the Honorable Tom Connally, for his work in passing this fine piece of cooperative legislation which bears his name.

Also, I wish to highly commend the Honorable Nelson Puett, the present Chairman of the Federal Tender Board, or Federal Petroleum Board as it is now called, for his 19 years of work on this Board, the last 4 of which he has and is now serving as its able Chairman. Nelson Puett has served his State and Nation ably and aggressively. I know he is a good man. It was my pleasure to room with him in Texas University Law School days when he played quarterback for Texas University just as aggressively as he has worked in the enforcement of the Connally law.

The Board has an annual appropriation of $209,000 which gives employment to a total of 25 persons in four offices located at Lafayette, La., and Kilgore, Midland, and Victoria, Tex.

Fines have been collected in the sum of $1,092,000 in 22 years—1936–58.

All said and done, only praise and commendation can be given, and must be given, to this fine example of State and Federal cooperation, each division—State and Federal—operating strictly within its own sphere of unquestioned jurisdiction, thus showing that the sovereign States and the Federal Government can operate together each on its own ground.

Oklahoma's Future Waterborne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Oklahoma's Future Waterborne," which I delivered before the Oklahoma Press Association convention of June 12, 1959, at Tulsa, Okla.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLAHOMA'S FUTURE WATERBORNE

(Address by Senator KERR, before the Oklahoma Press Association Convention on June 12, 1959, at Tulsa, Okla.)

Well, I'll say this, that you haven't been introduced until you've been introduced by Ed Livermore.

I'll say that I'm grateful. I'll say it sincerely, but I realize, Ed, that all I say is entirely inadequate.

I'm glad that we saw the film of the Corps of Engineers, one of the great agencies of the executive branch of our Government.

A group of highly technical, professional men.

The film they presented to you had to do with the project already authorized. They know how serious the purpose of the Congress is with reference to the building of the project we call the Greater Arkansas Development program.

Because in the Congress this year there will be something like $60 million appropriated to be spent mostly by the Corps of Engineers in Oklahoma in the next 12 months in the development of water projects principally in the Arkansas River development program.

They know that next year something like $80 million will be required and that the following year and each year thereafter until the program is completed a hundred million dollars or more will be required.

As I talk to you about Oklahoma's future, waterborne, I do so with the concept of the addition of the central Oklahoma project to the Arkansas River development plan now under construction.

I do that because of its significance to the State as a whole and because of the fact that in reality the Arkansas program will receive a very great impetus from the extension of this project into central Oklahoma and because Oklahoma's future is tied equally to both. Now those who have felt that it was unduly optimistic to contemplate the completion of the two simultaneously, I remind you that the great dams now under construction on the Arkansas—I do not include Colagah because it is so far along in the course of construction, I refer to Keystone, Eufaula, and Dardanelle—will require some 3 to 5 years under good circumstances to be built and closed and put into operation. Until that time the actual work of the building of the channel will be only in the preliminary stages. It is our hope and purpose during that same period of time to bring about the completion of the preliminary survey now in course of progress, to be followed by the project survey which we hope to see authorized next year, its completion which should be within 2 years and then it would be our hope to secure the authorization of the extension, either in 1963 or 1964 which would be about the time of the closing of these great key reservoirs for the Arkansas River part of the program. And if the authorization for the central Oklahoma project can be obtained by that time the work that will be required for the central Oklahoma project beyond that date would be of no greater dimensions or proportions than that which will remain to be done in the development of the Arkansas River project itself.

As we try to determine the sepcifications of Oklahoma's future, waterborne, we have much information to guide us.

The Arkansas River will not be the first inland waterway developed in our country—it will be the last of the great tributaries of the Mississippi to be made navigable.

Actually we have 30,000 miles of navigable inland waterways. The accurate story of how they stimulate and sustain industrial growth and development is so fabulous that you must see it to believe it. Then you must experience it, to realize the magnitude of it. Actually the stories of other areas, astounding as they are, do not give an accurate picture of what ours will be.

The Arkansas navigation channel, plus the proposed central Oklahoma extension, will produce the most dynamic industrial growth and economic expansion of any inland waterway in the history of the country. It will trigger an economic explosion unparalleled by any other similar project in our history.

When the Ohio River navigation project was started in 1879, the Nation's population was 50 million, the total inland waterway mileage was 17,745 miles, the gross national annual income was $6⅔ billion, and the gross national annual product was $8.9 billion.

When the Illinois Waterway was started in 1852, the figures were as follows: National population, 23 million; inland waterway mileage, 5,100; gross national annual income, $2⅓ billion.

When the Tennessee Valley Authority began development of the navigation channel on the Tennessee River in 1933, the figures were as follow: National population, 122,700,000; inland waterway mileage, 27,000; gross national annual income, $40.2 billion; gross national annual production, $56 billion.

Today as we move into the serious construction phase of our project, we are confronted by these astounding figures: National population, 177 million; inland waterway mileage, 30,000; gross national annual income, $375 billion; gross national annual production, $470 billion.

When the TVA started, there were 4,900,000 people in the affected area. Our comparable population today in Oklahoma and Arkansas is 4,150,000. Their per capita income then was $262. Ours now is $2,027.

Each preceding navigation project, or extension of our inland waterways, received the impetus and was the beneficiary of every project theretofore built. The effect was and is cumulative. The most astounding and far-reaching project yet built has just been completed. It will be dedicated later this month. It provides a new navigable channel of greater length than our entire Atlantic seaboard. It extends from the Atlantic to every harbor on the Great Lakes and through outlets from them to the entire inland waterway system of our country. I refer to the fabulous St. Lawrence waterway.

Amazing as it may seem, every mile of our inland waterways, plus the St. Lawrence, and the entire gulf coast and the Atlantic coastline, will contribute to the traffic and tonnage that will move in the barges on the Arkansas channel and the central Oklahoma extension.

While industrial growth and expansion along the Tennessee, the lower Mississippi, the Illinois Waterway, and the Ohio, have been phenomenal and literally unbelievable, ours will be actually, or proprtionately, greater.

Growth of industrial capacity along the Tennessee is presently at a rate in excess of $100 million per year; along the lower Mississippi, in excess of $200 million per year; along the Illinois Waterway, it is estimated at $75 million per year; while along the Ohio, the growth now exceeds $1 billion of capacity per year.

In 1908 the Corps of Engineers estimated that the annual traffic on the Ohio would be 8 million tons. Their estimate in 1927 was 22,300,000 tons. The actual traffic in 1957 was 81,600,000 tons. The estimated annual traffic at present is in excess of 100 million tons.

The story of the Illinois, on a proportionate basis, is comparable. The Tennessee River navigation channel is 9 feet deep and extends 650 miles from Knoxville, Tenn., to Paducah, Ky. The difference in elevation between the two points is 511 feet.

In 1933, the river carried 33 million ton-miles of traffic. In 1957, it carried 12,742,223 tons of traffic for a total of 2,112,793,000 ton-miles.

In 1954, the Corps of Engineers estimated the Arkansas River project alone, without the central Oklahoma extension, would, if then in operation, carry 13,200,000 tons of traffic at an annual saving of $73 million, or nearly 4 percent more than actually moved on the Tennessee in 1957.

Our area not only has the benefit of all projects heretofore built, plus the impact of present greatly increased population, much larger gross National annual income and production; Oklahoma's future, waterborne, will be profoundly affected by these additional amazing facts:

1. The national population will increase by 50 million, or more, by 1972, the target date for completion of our project.

2. Before the year 2000, or 41 years from now, the national population will be more than double what it is now.

3. The Nation by that time will require 16 times as much electric energy as was used last year, and it was 16 times as much last year as in 1920.

4. Oklahoma has a more abundant supply of more natural resources with which industry can grow and expand than any other similar area in the Nation, and the sum total of them can be produced at lower cost than anywhere else in the Nation. In addition to our natural physical resources, we have 2,300,000 of the most alert, progressive and finest people on the earth.

Our most valued natural resource is soil. Then our next most valued natural resource and one we have in such a great abundance is water. Water for domestic and municipal use, water for irrigation, water for unlimited industrial growth, water for power, for recreation, water for the magic word of economic expansion, "navigation."

Good useable industrial water is not now obtainable in much of the Nation for industrial expansion at any price. In most industrial areas today, water of the quality available costs industry 15 cents per 1,000 gallons, or more.

When our presently authorized and proposed program is completed, high quality industrial water will be available from Oklahoma City, north, northeast, east, south, and southeast, at 5 cents per 1,000 gallons, or less.

Make no mistake about it, these are priceless elements of insurance for Oklahoma's future, waterborne.

The Department of Commerce tells us that the cities and towns in America must invest $80 billion in the next 20 to 25 years to keep abreast of the requirements for domestic and industrial water. In 1956, the Army Chief of Engineers reported that some areas even at that time were "constantly going through the ceiling of available average water supply."

Nowhere can so much good quality water be conserved and made available at such low cost as in the eastern 60 percent of Oklahoma.

Even with our present national population, a U.S. Geological Survey hydrologist finds that most water that is immediately available and inexpensive to use at each individual point, is in use already.

If we carry out our presently authorized and contemplated programs and let it be known, the industrial run into Oklahoma will make the run for land into the Cherokee Strip and other of our areas opened for settlement look like minor incidents and puny efforts.

Our next most valued and important natural resource is energy fuel—vast quantities of coal, oil, and gas available at low cost.

In October of 1956, at Western Hills Lodge, General Itschner, Chief of Engineers, was talking of Oklahoma's future, waterborne. He described the fantastic growth, past and present, in the Ohio Valley. He told us that coal and water had made it possible—coal for fuel, water for industry and navigation. He then told us that here in the Arkansas Valley, we have a much greater quantity of good, low-cost coal, plus vast supplies of oil and gas. He recognized our unlimited supply of good, fresh water for domestic and industrial growth and for navigation. He talked about our other mineral resources and our forests. He then told us that we have far more resources with which to build an industrial empire, and that with navigation, we could and would have a greater development here in the future than the Ohio Valley has seen in the past.

I am frank to tell you that he told us nothing which I had not already long believed and had been predicting. But, there were a host of fine and able men in his audience who, for the first time, began to really believe. One told me he had come to scorn, but remained to pray.

Oklahoma's future, waterborne, will see the great transition from a high plateau of discriminatory freight costs to a position as favorable for transportation as any area in the Nation.

Our land-locked Oklahoma, through water conservation and navigation, will see the growth of industry beyond anything we can now imagine. Our industrial production, ever growing, will move competitively, waterborne, to the teaming markets of the Nation.

Truly there is a bright, expansive waterborne future for Oklahoma for the products of its farms, its forests, and its vast mineral resources—also for the everincreasing production of its present and future mills and factories. Among the many things in this waterborne future will be:

1. More and more employment and jobs for the people of Oklahoma.

2. The planning and building of bigger cities; a rapidly increasing population, with higher and higher per capita income; an increasing demand here at home for the products of our farms, ranches, and forests.

3. Expanded trade and commerce for existing industries, and a rapidly growing influx of new basic industries requiring the further development and use of our vast resources of coal, oil, gas, and other minerals.

4. Expansion of existing and development of new basic chemical industries using great quantities of energy fuel and salt brine.

5. Industrial production of huge amounts of products basic to further industrialization, including chlorine, caustic soda, and the myriad petrochemicals.

6. Industries are for the production of plastics, synthetic fibers, and fertilizers.

7. Expanded utilization of our sand, gravel, granite, limestone, and rock asphalt deposits.

8. The development of an electric power complex of such huge proportions as to rival that of the famed Tennessee Valley—and I say that completely aware that the TVA now uses 20 million tons of coal annually in its steamplants generating electricity to firm up and augment her vast hydrocapacity.

9. A rapidly expanding construction industry.

10. An ever-increasing forest products industry.

Oklahoma's future, waterborne, within the lifetime of some in the sound of my voice today, will see industrial payrolls and production, each being measured in terms of billions of dollars per year.

And then, in that future, another picture and another vast industry will be seen. You and I can remember, just a few years ago, when the area of permanent water surface in Oklahoma was very small indeed. Now, there are scores of thousands of farm ponds, water-retardation structures, floodways, and dams. They have created vast areas of reservoirs and lakes on our high prairies and in our valleys.

They provide water areas of hundreds of square miles and hundreds of miles of shorelines. These changes have been publicized as being in the nature of a miracle. Indeed, as we think of what has already been done, we know that a miraculous change has already been brought about upon the face of our fair Oklahoma in our day.

This has been brought about under God's will by a great host of God's children. I wish I had time to pay adequate tribute to that great host of Oklahomans whose vision, faith, courage, and perseverence have wrought this miracle. It is the work of a mighty team, composed of our people, and their Congressional delegation working together. And, I pay an especial tribute to each Member of your congressional delegation. They have all done heroic work in this regard.

But, as I think of the water projects already built, I think also of the future. We are working on a great and noble plan. We call it the Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins development plan. It is the first of its kind, and the finest and most complete ever developed for any river basin in America

As it moves to completion through the next 20 to 30 years, Oklahoma will have more than 400,000 surface acres of impounded water, more manmade lakes and canal surface than any other State between the Rocky Mountains and the Atlantic Ocean. This, together with our fine climate, our location on the Nation's highways, will give Oklahoma a recreation industry beyond anything of which any of us has ever dreamed.

And, then, with all of these, Oklahoma—in this great waterborne and industrial future—will have something of which few States can boast. We will still proudly and gratefully possess hundreds of thousands of acres which will be preserved in its original natural condition. We will have vast areas, publicly and privately owned, of mountains and valleys, and prairies, where countless millions of people, yearning for the great out of doors as God made it—may rest, and dream, and play to their heart's content.

Yes, we will always have the pine-clad forests and the clear water mountain streams of our eastern and southeastern mountain areas; the rugged beauty and native fish and wildlife haunts of the Wichita preserve; the natural caverns of the northwest; and the high plateau and rugged uplifts of the Panhandle.

Other areas would consider themselves richly blessed, if, in their future, they could match either, the production of our farms and ranches; or, the truly fabulous production that will come in ever increasing quantities from our waterborne industrial empire; or, the breathtaking beauty of our original natural areas; or, the amazing recreational developments made possible by our streams, waterways, and lakes.

I know of no other area which can, in the foreseeable future, hope to match all of the rich blessings which are ahead of Oklahoma in her matchless waterborne future.

I salute Oklahoma's future, waterborne.

Housing Lag, Rather Than Japanese Imports, Lay at Root of Slump in Pacific Northwest Lumber Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful editorial from the Greater Oregon of June 26, 1959, entitled "Political Pap Versus Economic Facts."

This editorial effectively demolishes the false claim that imports of Japanese plywood had depressed the Oregon lumber market during 1957 and 1958. To begin with, Japanese plywood is hardwood which does not compete with the softwood product of the forests of the Pacific Northwest. Further, the editorial in Greater Oregon emphasizes that the lumber market in the Pacific Northwest sagged because higher interest rates and tight money had depressed the private housing market right here in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the June 26 editorial from Greater Oregon, which is edited by J. Francyl Howard, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL PAP VERSUS ECONOMIC FACTS

The above title is taken from Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER's Washington Calling report, just received, and deals with the frantic alarms raised this past fall and winter about how cheap imported Japanese plywood was causing unemployment in Oregon.

As we pointed out previously, and as Senator NEUBERGER states, the Japanese plywood is of the hardwood variety and thus not competitive with our Oregon plywood and the market for our product. These alarms were just designed to damage the

members of the Oregon delegation in Congress who had been active in supporting the reciprocal trade program, and were spread by certain political sources. Many people, naturally, did not realize this and believed in all earnestness that the Japanese plywood was a threat to our plywood workers.

Now, with the housing market being restored, Senator NEUBERGER points out that plywood shipments from the States of Oregon and Washington during the past 3 months have set an all-time record for volume and value. This represents an 18.3 percent increase over 1958 shipments for the same period.

Thus is exposed and punctured the 1958 false alarm, manufactured solely for political purposes, that the reciprocal trade program was weakening Oregon's plywood production and payrolls.

We certainly agree with this report, and we would go one step further than Senator NEUBERGER. The economic facts show clearly that it was not letting Japanese plywood enter this country that caused unemployment in Oregon. We did have and still do have unemployment. But this is due entirely to the failure of the administration to support an adequate housing program.

Now with the housing market being restored, as was mentioned above, movement of plywood and other building materials again is booming and jobs are opening up in the lumber industry and building trade.

Had President Eisenhower let the housing program continue, instead of opposing adequate funds and creating "tight money" trouble through higher interest rates, we never would have had a slump. We have the folks at home—not those abroad—to blame for our unemployment.

Public Service and the Liberal Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address by the Honorable William Benton entitled "Public Service and the Liberal Arts," delivered at the commencement exercises at Hunter College on June 16 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC SERVICE AND THE LIBERAL ARTS

(Address by the Honorable William Benton at Hunter College commencement, New York City, June 16, 1959)

We are gathered to celebrate one of the classic rites of spring. This is a feast day at Hunter College for more than a thousand families whose sons and daughters are today admitted to adult society. It is an ancient and honorable rite. You young people who are receiving degrees are the symbol of a tradition which grew from the higher arts reserved for liberales, the free citizens of ancient Rome. Since Roman days, men have acknowledged that the liberal academic disciplines can free them from ignorance, superstition and prejudice.

So I congratulate you, each of you; I congratulate you on the hours you have stolen from TV and the movies to devote to your education. You are today making the downpayment on the price of admission to the company of educated men and women. Because I respect this ancient ritual, I now come to remind you again that learning is a lifelong work, and that the wise among you will continue to pay the installments as long as you live—and to do so happily and usefully—even if you are so ill-advised that you do not devote yourselves to Britannica's new 54-volume set, the great books of the Western World. (This is my commercial.)

Last week the Associated Press began a news story with these two sentences: "Self-discipline, duty, tolerance, morality, faith. Those words echoed across college campuses yesterday at upstate New York commencement exercises." Two weeks ago the New Yorker magazine ran a cover of an outline of a young man's head in cap and gown; but there was no face, no indication of eyes or nose or mouth, merely a perfect blank under that cap and above that gown. The etching of your future life, of which every day is the commencement—the etching upon your faces of the decades of self-discipline, morality, faith, or of the reverse, today this is still to be drawn by artists and by trials and tribulations yet unknown. Let me express the hope that the artists will be tall, dark, and handsome.

For my own theme today I shall pick a man who is the right kind of artist, even if his hair no longer curls. Indeed, he is the living symbol of my text. I point to him, and I say to you, "Go thou and do likewise." He is why I am here as your speaker. My devotion to his character and his career is the reason I came here to stress to you the relation between the public service and the liberal arts. He is Dr. George N. Shuster and this is his last commencement. He retires today after 20 energetic years as Hunter's president. As your fathers will agree, these years have required more than energy; they have called for an understanding of women. For Dr. Shuster they have been 20 years of women.

You young women—and men—represent our Nations' seasonal crop of brainpower. The productive decades of your lives now stretch out invitingly before you. Unless you are radically different from the vintage generations our Nation has raised up before you—and you don't look like a beat generation to me—at least very few of you have beards—you will be divinely discontented with the world into which you graduate. That is as it should be and as it's often been. What makes your generation different from all others is the degree of promise and peril it faces. No young people in human history have faced these opposite twins in the measure you now do. And the nature of the promise and peril is such that the promise can best be realized, and the peril best averted, not merely by technical achievement but by the qualities of mind and character developed through the liberal arts.

In modern times these arts have come to be identified with general education—with the humanities and the social and natural sciences, as distinct from the applied arts. In our educational system we strive through the liberal arts to accomplish two great ends—first, to introduce young people to the accumulated wisdom and experience of the human race, and second, to help them learn how to think clearly and independently. The ideal liberal arts curriculum is that which most successfully induces its students to apply their brains vigorously—and rigorously—to the main substance of human learning, problems, and opportunities. There has never been greater need for such students than now.

In the dizzy world I foresee, freedom will be in constant jeopardy and wisdom must be a constant counterweight. Originality and resourcefulness, combined with understanding of and respect for enduring values, will be much more important than knowledge of techniques. The techniques of one decade may become the museum exhibits of the next. Every new breakthrough out into the cosmos, or down into the living cell and the atom, can make a whole syllabus of techniques obsolete. But wisdom won't become obsolete.

Last month, at the meeting of the Committee for Economic Development in Boston, I was astonished and disturbed to discover that 16 percent of all bachelor of arts degrees being given in the United States are for majors in business education. I remembered the wasted hours and weeks and months and years I spent at Yale enrolled in courses in banking, accounting, and other business subjects. Nobody in New Haven told me that the same hours spent studying literature, history, or even astronomy would have made me a better businessman. This I learned later in life.

There have been two recent attempts to guess how much time it takes for the sum total of man's information to double. One estimate gives 15 years as the period required, at our present pace, to multiply by two our entire stock of information. Another study says that information in all the natural sciences multiplies by two in 15 years but that two or three times as long is required to double the amount of information in the social sciences and the humanities.

Manifestly a man cannot educate himself by collecting more and more information. As an encyclopedia publisher, I ought to know. I don't have anyone working for me who has even attempted to read all of Britannica's 40 million words. (This is not a commercial.)

In Communist lands future scientists and administrators are being graduated this month too, getting their certificates and their "kandidat" diplomas. They owe allegiance to closed societies and they propose to make these societies universal. Their rulers spend less of their national income on comforts. They invest a far higher proportion on their future—for example, on education and research. They export needed skills to underdeveloped countries, with political doctrines thrown in at no extra charge. In political warfare, thus far they have been more original and more resourceful than we have.

One of the central differences between ourselves and our Communist adversaries is that our traditions commit us to belief in the utility, indeed the sanctity, of dissent—and theirs do not. They are ruled by an elite of ruthless and able men; let the rest of mankind follow and obey. Ours is a democracy with faith in the freedom and the dignity of all men—and faith that out of dissent and diversity will come progress. This is our faith as free adults.

Liberal education teaches us this faith. It is anything but a hothouse for dilettantes. It's no bed of roses for after dinner intellectuals. Neither is it designed to lay on a finishing school gloss.

Can a single one of the 86 Americans in our Hall of Fame be fairly described as a conformist? If there was one trait they held in common, it was independence of mind. They differed. They fought. They thought for themselves. They were the makers and builders of America.

Thus I have confidence that many among you will learn successfully to compete against the Soviet gospel according to Pavlov—however seductively and hypnotically it is enmeshed in the cabalistic writ of Marxism-Leninism. You will win if you have learned the lesson the liberal arts can teach you. If you have learned your lesson, other men and women throughout the world will learn it from you.

Many among you will proceed to advanced studies for teaching, research and the

learned professions. The large numbers who will do so help prove that the Western World is moving ahead in its respect for learning. In my time at Yale, the man with an A.B. diploma who went into graduate work was looked on—in the words of George Edgar Vincent, then president of the Rockefeller Foundation—as a fellow who didn't know enough to go home when the party was over.

I hope, too, that many of the most gifted among you will prepare yourselves to go into public service and into government. Our political life has never had the dynamic, mature development of personnel that has occurred in technology and the healing arts. It urgently needs more talent, more vision and courage. This is the world of politics, that area of our life which must necessarily be pragmatic, empiric and always imperfect.

Einstein once said, "Politics is more difficult than physics." The world, he said, is more apt to die of bad politics than of bad physics.

Political leadership is surely one of the most difficult arts ever practiced by men—if you will permit me to call it an art. And for better or worse, in our democratic western societies we can only depend for our safety on our politicians—those specialists in the art of the possible, those compromisers, those choosers of the lesser evil, those followers and leaders of public ignorance and public insight.

Thus my prayer to you today, to you as young men and women—and yes, even to you parents—my message today is: Cultivate politics and cultivate the politicians; make forthright demands upon them for what you know is right—and instruct them as you can. I urge upon each of you some active role in the public life of your community and your country. The Olympian questions of your world's future will be political.

You who are to become scholars, prepare for a life of partnership with the politicians. You who are to be politicians, prepare for partnership with the scholars. I plead with all of you: go into politics, at whatever level you can, beginning at the community level and aiming ever higher, even at the national.

I have five small bits of advice. Perhaps the first woman U.S. Senator from New York State is a new alumna here today to heed them.

1. Join a party and then get on a party committee—either party—in your community. Do it now. You'll be welcomed, if you're a worker. Sooner than you think, you'll find your political influence multiplied tenfold or a hundredfold.

2. Know what you want, in terms of your community's future, and go after it through your party. If you want better schools—or better city colleges—push for them. Don't make a speech at your first or your tenth meeting about the Founding Fathers or about efficiency in Government. Be specific and concrete about candidates and about issues—and state what you're after and why and how.

3. Be persistent about your political objectives. I know of no field where the old maxim, "Keep everlastingly at it," pays off more surely than in politics. But be good-natured too as the other fellow sometimes turns out to be right.

4. Run for office as soon as it is practicable to do so. President Truman once told me "No man can ever really understand American politics until he's run for office." Don't be afraid to make promises, but only make those you can keep. A man's word in politics counts for more than in academic life or in business.

5. Expect, and ignore, unwarranted abuse. This is one of the penalties of public service. But it is far outweighed by its rewards.

In public service, whether it be limited to community activities, or extended into a full career service, or whether it is an aspiration to the high elective offices of the State and Nation, you will find deep satisfaction that can be achieved in no other way. I discovered in the U.S. Senate that no experience I had ever had was without some value applied to some problem I had to meet. The intellectual and moral challenge in the public service gives a man or woman the chance to call forth his greatest capacities and capabilities, and through them to work toward that goal of man on which most western philosophers have agreed: That activity which develops your highest powers.

My personal hall of fame in the field of public service includes the man whose imprint has made Hunter College an infinitely richer place. His name is George Nauman Shuster. He is a great liberal artist, and because he is a great liberal artist he is the perfect public servant in any assignment he undertakes.

I have known George Shuster best through our joint efforts to organize and develop American participation in UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. I am greatly pleased that he has now agreed to serve as the U.S. representative on the Executive Council of UNESCO.

I have worked with George Shuster also as a member of the Commission on the Freedom of the Press, as a director of Encyclopaedia Britannica films, of which I have the honor of being chairman, and now as a member of the board of editors of the Encyclopaedia Britannica itself.

But these are merely a few among his galaxy of public services. He was High Commissioner for Bavaria after World War II when Mrs. Benton and I visited him and Mrs. Shuster in Munich. Later he served as chairman of the committee on discrimination in Washington.

George Shuster has given his associates and readers new insights into longstanding, even eternal, problems of man and society. His wit has given old truths new bite by using words with wings.

Few of us can hope to be George Shusters. But we can seek to emulate him by living up to the highest roles our neighbors and our country entrust to us. Even though the United States may be storm tossed and wracked by trials ahead, your America will still be grounded upon moral imperatives of which President Shuster is a shining symbol.

Hunter College suggests today, in conferring its degrees upon you, that there can be little doubt about the promise of your abilities. I pray that these potential abilities will be goaded by the example of President Shuster as well as by the great problems pressing in upon us. Let us hope, all of us parents here today, that the qualities kindled by the liberal artist who retires today as president of Hunter—will glow within you as long as you live.

Marinette's New Horizon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the progress in America is a story of successive efforts by individuals and communities, as well as those by the State and Nation, to provide a climate in which to achieve our aspirations and goals.

I am, therefore, always particularly encouraged when I witness a community guided by constructive leaders who are attempting to design constructive programs to make their community a better place for their citizens in which to live.

Although our free-enterprise system has provided more good things of life for more people than any other system in history, we all recognize that there are multitudes of problems to be resolved.

To meet these challenges, the American people characteristically demonstrate a spirit of optimism, confidence, and dedication. These are the qualities which have built America and made it the leading power in the world which it is today; these are the virtues of the pioneer spirit which has ventured forth to create a great nation from a wilderness. Those who possessed this pioneer spirit did not look far off for the answers to the many problems which they encountered; they looked within themselves and found the strength to build America.

Recently I was pleased to receive a copy of an address delivered by Mr. Henry S. Godshall before the Marinette (Wis.) Chamber of Commerce on the occasion of its 20th anniversary meeting, in which is outlined the constructive way in which that community and its leaders are attempting to meet and resolve the problems with which they are confronted. As an illustration of the kind of realistic effort that is essential by local communities in order to promote progress, I ask unanimous consent to have the address on "Marinette's New Horizon" printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARINETTE'S NEW HORIZON

It was quite flattering to have been chosen for the challenging assignment of bringing to you something worthy of your consideration. This is somewhat difficult in view of the fact I probably have not yet qualified as a native and have scarcely been in this community long enough even to have gotten citizenship papers. On the other hand, there may be some virtue to this if it can be considered that my comments may represent the thoughts of someone who has been able to stand off and see Marinette from a broader vantage point.

This is a memorable year in the life of the Marinette Chamber of Commerce since it marks the completion of 20 years' service to this community. As Bernie Schreiner has just outlined to you, these have been good years and fruitful ones. The community is a better place in which to live because of the work that has been done by those who have served in the chamber throughout that period. Many of you in the audience tonight have played your part throughout these 2 decades. To you all should go Marinette's heartfelt thanks.

We can glory in the past—particularly when it has been good to us—but there is no longer anything we can do about it, other than to profit from the experience gained. The future now lies within our control and it is to that future we shall direct our thoughts tonight.

It is my opinion that Marinette today stands at the crossroads and for the sake of

its future must decide now the direction in which it is going to go.

This country is moving into a bold era.

We are in the midst of a dynamic national economy which is bursting at the seams all around us. There is a rapidly expanding population, entirely new industries are coming into being based on the jet age and on the space age, there are countless thrilling developments underway which are pointing toward an exciting future.

Marinette should now decide if it wants to be a part of this challenging period, or whether it wants to stand on the sidelines and watch the passing parade.

I'll quickly venture to suggest such decision by expressing the sincere belief that this community wants to be a very vital part of this new era and wants to fit into its rightful place in this State and in this country. It is hungry to determine the course which will enable it to capitalize on its as yet untapped potential.

You may have noted that this little talk is keyed to new horizons. As are most things in life, horizon is a matter of relativity. Standing at the base of a mountain there is little of the horizon which is visible. Yet, as one laboriously works up toward a mountain's top, the horizon begins to widen out. When finally at the crest, the horizon is unlimited, infinite in every direction. Once there, what an inspiration this breadth of horizon can be.

What we see in such a horizon is also relative. This past week I heard a thought expressed which deeply impressed me. The speaker presenting this idea was a conservationist and referred to an occasion when he was standing looking out over a beautiful, fertile valley with mountains rising majestically on each side, and with a sparkling river winding its course down through this valley. He commented to a friend that this was nature in its greatest glory and should be preserved for all to see. The friend replied, "Yes, perhaps, but others have seen this same scene from a different vantage point. To a farmer it is an ideal spot for a prosperous farm; to the engineer, a perfect location for a reservoir to conserve water and provide power; to the actor, a natural amphitheater in which could be presented the great plays of mankind. The surroundings are the same, yet to different eyes a completely different meaning." So it is with Marinette. We must select our own horizons and through our own eyes, must determine how we can best use our many advantages and blessings.

I can see this city's future. I can see it here before me tonight. It is the people in this room—it is you. By your very presence here you have affirmed your belief that this is a good place to be and are willing to work toward its betterment. The future rests in the hands of those willing and anxious to do something about it, to control it, to guide it. Our natural resources, our surroundings are valueless except as put to use by human hands. We cannot wait or hope that something will happen. We must see to it ourselves. Those who are coming along behind us are looking to us to lead the way. We don't want to let them down.

These are the things dreams are made of, and it is from such dreams we get our inspiration to work for a better future. But from such dreams we must ultimately awaken and begin to work in the realities of the world around us. That is how we make our dreams come true.

To move now into the world of realism, what can we reasonably expect to happen to Marinette? It would seem to me that our growth would be gradual rather than spectacular. Our geographical position would point to this conclusion. Probably this is a good way to grow. Steady growth is sound growth, and provides a strong foundation. This might mean attracting light industry, small businesses, or development as a marketing or transportation center. But keep in mind, this growth will not take place unless we do something to help it. There is intense competition by many communities for this type of development. We must have something better or something more to offer if we are to attract the new faces we are seeking.

It is encouraging to note that we've already started along this path. Many things are taking place in our community. Separately we may tend to overlook them, but added together they become quite impressive. There are definite signs of a reawakening.

Running down the list; there is now a new post office underway, and the new Farmers & Merchants Bank is a tremendous asset. We can't overlook the fourth estate either. The Eagle-Star's new publishing plant is a significant addition to our well being.

The hopes for a deeper harbor and a new Menekaunee Bridge are nearing realization. The new historical museum will soon be a reality, the city waterworks is now bigger and better than ever. Many building owners or shopkeepers are improving their store fronts, and the chamber of commerce's new office is a great stimulant for this group. There is now underway some interesting and attractive motel improvement in the neighborhood. There have been several new small businesses started up or have come to town recently. That's quite an impressive list, isn't it.

Perhaps of greatest significance is the recent establishment of an industrial park area, spearheaded by the chamber of commerce, but made possible by the complete cooperation of both the city council and county board. For years there has been pious hope that more industry would gravitate to this city—but there was little to encourage anyone to do so. Now, at last, we have something to work with. We have something to sell. The results will not be evident overnight, and it will mean lots of hard work and patience. But we are on the way.

If we do want to see some new smokestacks, or to encourage new people and businesses to make this their home, what else do we really have to offer them? If you were to consider this town as a likely place to settle your family or to set up in business, what impression would you get? What would you look for? You know, and I know, there are many good things, and let's admit, a few less pleasant ones, too. Let's see what these amount to.

First off, this community has a wonderful lot of people—as citizens, as friends, as workers. As to the latter, I would say as steady and productive a force as can be found anywhere. Yet, with it all, I detect one ingredient lacking somewhat generally, and this is certainly one of the most important ingredients to success. There seems to be a lack of pride in the virtues of this community. We tend to sell down rather than up. Why is this? Why can't we speak of our virtues? Exploit them? Correct those flaws which may make us a little ashamed from time to time? If we can't be proud of what we have, and what we do, why should someone else believe in us?

One of the things that embarrasses us most is the appearance of our town. The unpainted homes, the unkept yards, empty stores, shabby buildings, bleak, blank spots where buildings once were, standing out like a missing tooth. Somehow we must begin to instill some pride in our surroundings so these conditions can be corrected. Some steps in this direction have been taken, but they have not yet been enough. Why can't each of us make certain the surroundings of our own homes or business are in good order, then talk it up in our own neighborhoods, in the hope others will begin to feel a certain swelling of pride and a desire to do the same thing? Holding back for fear of an increased assessment represents a narrow view. Our city administration is on record that they want to encourage such improvement without prejudice. Let's express our confidence in them—spread this word. If necessary, provide some incentive to get this housekeeping job done. For one, I pledge that our plant properties will live up to good standards.

Our streets are a scandal to the jaybirds, yet we know the city has embarked on a program calling for steady improvement in this situation. Each of us should support and encourage the city to carry out this program—and to do it promptly.

Our city hall is a relic and makes it look as though we are living in the past age. How long can we continue just talking of that day when it must be replaced? Is there not some way for us to get up our collective courage to do something about this, to do what is necessary to get the job done?

This is no more than just plain salesmanship. Putting a better package around the same old product.

If you saw a girl walking down the street in dirty dungarees, an old shirt, flat scuffs, hair looking like it was combed with an egg beater, the odds are you wouldn't give her a tumble. Take the same girl in a stylish dress, high heeled shoes, sheer stockings, and other tools of the trade used by women—what would be your reaction? Even a homely member of the species can do a lot with these kind of tricks. I do hope the ladies will forgive this particular example, but we men have to discuss the problem in terms we understand.

In making any references to our city administration, I must add that I sincerely believe we have a good government. They are dedicated, honest, hard working public servants. They are doing all within their power and within their limited means to make this a good city. We should stand behind them 100 percent. Our homes and our children are safe and comfortable, thanks to the job they are doing. This is one of the things of which we can rightly be most proud.

Incidently, let's also take some pride and interest in our government. City, State, and Federal. Become active or at least interested in your political parties' activities. Know what your legislators are doing—let them know what you think—and at least get out and vote.

One of the greatest assets we have at hand is the natural resources surrounding us which are admirably suited for recreation. They can, and should, be the heart of a whole new industry—the tourist industry. That can represent some mighty valuable business dollars. Are we really exploiting it to the fullest? We talk of public beaches, yet to find Red Arrow Beach is a formidable task, a challenge to the most durable of automobiles, and a shoddy affair at best when finally found.

The boating industry is a tremendous one today. Yet, where can a roving boatman tie up in our town? The yacht dock? How many of you have seen it recently? There is little or no space available. The visitor cannot get convenient service even to the extent of being able to gas up his boat easily. We seem to be missing another good bet here.

If a tourist wanted to go fishing in the bay or on the river, or just go boating, where could he even rent a boat? It takes more than just wanting tourists. We have to compete against other towns to give the tourist some reason to stop in Marinette or to gravitate to Marinette. It would appear there is still much to do in this field.

This should be a marketing center for a large area. Another pretty good sources of business dollars. How, then, do our shops stand up? Are they really interested in the customer, or do they merely indulge him? Are our stores well stocked with a good variety of merchandise of good quality? Do we get all the commercial business we should get right here—or does it go elsewhere all too often?

Our children are our most precious commodity. Proper schooling for them is of the first importance. Our school officials are a dedicated lot, making every effort to meet the needs of our time. Excellent progress has been made in keeping up the quality of the school facilities, particularly in the grade school buildings. Here, again, we should look more closely. Are our schools truly giving our students a broad outlook on life, an awareness of the opportunities around them and encouraging them or training them to go on to greater heights? Not only the handful at the top, but all those who have promise for the future. And I might add, we parents have a responsibility in this—to encourage our children to make best use of their talents.

Many people express the belief we seem to be training our young people for someone else. If that be the case why not make available more opportunities here at home for them? Why is it that my company, for example, doesn't seek out local men for responsible positions, and why is it local college graduates rarely apply to us for such positions? With a stronger, growing community can come increased opportunities and in turn the desire to do something better closer at home.

What if we are training them for someone else? After all, there are those like myself who have come here and were trained elsewhere. This is an age of a migratory population. Right or wrong, it is with us. Perhaps this blending of populations can be invigorating to the community. Those persons interested in coming to this town will certainly judge it in part by the educational advantages which can be provided for their children.

If our children are to go forth elsewhere in the world, let them go with the pride of good training. Let them spread Marinette's gospel widely and let us realize that in the final analysis that, too, will serve this town's best interests.

This is by no means a complete baring of our soul. There are lots of other things we could talk about far into the night. If we are looking for more things of which we can be justifiably proud, there are many. Fine churches, a splendid library, a beautiful county building, good golf courses, a vocational school, extension school, and teacher's college, a diversity of business, and many fine recreational areas. These are really selling points.

Then there are some others we'd like to sweep under the rug. Parking limitations, traffic flow, a dubious but well merited reputation for the greatest concentration of bars per capita found anywhere, limited new housing or presentable rental housing, and last but not least, the cave in Dunlap Square's Golden Triangle.

Even as I recount these various items, someone may feel offended. Please understand that my only purpose in bringing them to light is not an effort to disillusion or discredit anyone, but instead to fire your imagination, to show you that the problems we have are really little ones; ones that can be corrected or improved upon with reasonable effort.

In stating these beliefs—I am reminded of a comment Birdie Tebbetts made here in Marinette a short while ago. Someone asked him to name an all-opponent team—which he did. When finished, he said he wanted no arguments since this was just his opinion. Those who agreed with him thought he was smart; those who didn't then were sure they knew why Cincinnati had fired him. So with me—if you agree with me, you'll say that's why Marinette Paper is a good outfit—if you don't, you'll say that guy is a menace. There must be some smart guys somewhere else that are running the paper company. So it goes.

Up to this point we have dwelled on some of the day to day problems that surround us. Let's now return again to the concept of our horizons and our future.

Somewhere in the distance is our destiny. But how are we to get there? What should be our course, how can we create and carry out that overall plan which will put us in our rightful position? I think there is a way to do this.

You all know that the entire Midwest is extremely enthusiastic about the tremendous possibilities attendant to the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Marinette should be in a position to capitalize on this great new inland industrial empire. If there ever was one, this can be a rallying point around which all of us can muster our tremendous latent power.

We can no longer take time to merely talk about future development. Other cities are alert and are taking action. For us to stand still would be to go backwards. I submit to you here tonight a definite proposal that Marinette get on the move. To do this without delay, I propose this city call in a selected firm of urban planning consultants to evaluate Marinette's potential and that such firm be empowered to prepare a plan of long-range development for this city. This to include population projection, transportation potential, industrial prospects, traffic control and the many other related subjects. We should find out just where and how we can fit into this new economy. Is it in harbor development, as a distribution or storage point, or in providing a decentralized manufacturing location to provide for the needs of the growing population of the Midwest? To make such a determination is a greater task than any of us or all of us locally are capable of handling. With such a plan, we would know how far we can go—and how to get there, step by step.

For those of you who may wince at the consideration of the cost of such a project, I would like to add two comments. First, if it is worth doing, it is worth doing well and the means can be found to do it. Second, as much as I personally object to Federal handouts, I believe there are ways to get the Federal Government to share equally in the cost of any such survey.

I further pledge you that if this is done, the chamber of commerce will lend its strength and support in every possible way.

The time is now, ladies and gentlemen. You are the ones who must decide the breadth of Marinette's horizon. There is much of which to be proud in this community. You can be the leaders in creating that pride. The road ahead may be long, but the results can be most gratifying. Progress has never come easily, but is not beyond our ability to achieve it.

You have been a good audience. I am grateful to you for having listened so well.

Thank you.

Senior Citizens in Quincy, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Quincy (Mass.) Patriot Ledger has published a series of three articles by Dr. Glenn A. McLain, professor of social studies at Quincy (Mass.) Junior College and research director of the Quincy Council for the Aging. These articles describe what two communities in Massachusetts are doing to meet the problems of our older citizens.

In view of the increasing importance of adequate recreational facilities, adequate health services, adequate employment opportunities and adequate social patterns for this segment of our population, I commend these articles to the attention of the Senate. Soon 10 percent of the people of the United States will be 65 or over. It is already long past the time when we should have planned for their needs and their happiness.

I ask unanimous consent that the three articles, which appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger on May 28, 1959, by Dr. McLain, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENIOR CITIZENS IN QUINCY—ARTICLE I

(By Dr. Glenn A. McLain, Quincy Council for the Aging)

There are over 10,000 people in Quincy over 65 years of age. This statement might startle some in this city, but most informed Americans are well aware that amazing progress in medical and social services designed to prevent the diseases of childhood and youth has made our population an older one in recent years. Quincy has long been noted for the excellence of its programs for the youth of our city, but little civic attention has been paid to the problems of the aged or senior citizens. In fact, many people in Quincy and elsewhere in the United States don't believe that there is any such problem at all. A look at the facts in Quincy and throughout the Nation might modify the ideas of those who have been unable to see the necessity of sponsoring comprehensive and regular programs on a steady basis for retired people.

With about 8 percent of the manpower resources in the United States over 65 and approximately 10 percent in Quincy a new dimension has been added to our thinking about the status of the retired; his recreational facilities, health problems, employment opportunities, and his opportunity to belong in a society which is rushing toward automation in industry, but not in personality. The elderly must be given the opportunity to participate in community life, to continue to contribute to the social, economic, and political patterns of his society and most of all to make his golden years peaceful but stimulating if he cares to be stimulated. To further these objectives many local civic, religious, and private organizations have been working quietly for the past several years. One such organization, officially sponsored by the mayor in 1953 and continued by each succeeding mayor since then has been the Quincy Council for the Aging. The new program of the council is one which should be known and fully evaluated by every citizen in Quincy. The original program of the council in 1953 was led by representatives of both private and public agencies. A great deal of initial enthusiasm was developed in the city for a full program but many civic leaders felt that eventually the State of Massachusetts would provide funds for such activities. Among the accomplishments of the Council for the Aging since 1953 have been sponsored activities finally resulting in the building of special units for the elderly at Snug Harbor in Germantown, benches for resting at vari-

ous places throughout the city, and general community studies on geriatric problems. The recreation department has frequently sponsored sporting events and movies for the elderly with a great deal of success. However, the various members of the committee since 1953 have all felt that the mere surface of the problem was just being scratched.

As Anthony Venna, commissioner of welfare and chairman of the council for most of this period has expressed the issue "this is only a beginning. As long as the council continues to operate with only volunteer help, we will never be able to handle all the many problems on a coordinated basis. We need a paid, professionally trained worker to act as a resource person and to provide leadership for the development of new programs and recreational activities."

The experience of many other towns and cities throughout the Nation in trying to build a comprehensive program without the superior organization which naturally develops under a capable, well-trained person in this field would seem to bear out the advice of the chairman of the council.

Problems in the fields of health, housing, and recreation were attacked by the leaders of the group, but many of the plans foundered on the hard rock of lost expectations—that the State would eventually pay for the hiring of a full-time professional worker to coordinate the program.

Through legislation sponsored by Quincy political leaders funds were appropriated to provide for minimum expenses of $500 for the Council for the Aging to start a program. It is probable that this amount will be increased in the future, but the members of the council do not feel that money from State sources is the answer to this problem.

In 1957 the council was fortunate in securing the volunteer services of a vigorously aggressive retired person, Mr. Frederick Cornell. The 76-year-old Mr. Cornell revitalized the program of the council pushing an agenda which included support for the elderly in five fields: Housing, recreation, employment, transportation, and representation. During the 1 year in which Mr. Cornell spearheaded this program, much was learned by the Council for the Aging. Two results of this activity were that the group discovered the necessity for a full time worker to mobilize constant program activity and for a drop-in center to use as a base for the program activity. In order to explore the possibilities in these objectives, the council has surveyed many other projects of this type in Massachusetts and throughout the country. One of the most challenging and successful in the Springfield Hobby Club in Springfield, Mass.

THE YOUNG IN HEART IN SPRINGFIELD—ARTICLE 2

(By Dr. Glenn A. McLain Quincy Council for the Aging)

Will you be young in heart at 65? Did you ever meet an expert on the aged who lives her job 24 hours a day? Go to Springfield, Mass., and your questions will be answered as this writer's were recently when I visited the Springfield Hobby Club.

Located in the YMCA building, the Hobby Club was founded by Dr. Theodore Swartz for the lonely and frustrated senior citizens of Springfield. This was truly a pioneer effort as in 1946 little attention was being directed to the problems of the elderly. The goal of Dr. Swartz was through the development of hobby and recreational programs to help those over 65 become the "Young in Heart." Miss Leone Avery, a former schoolteacher and past master in humanitarian skills sparked his program leadership with ideas and imaginative plans. Starting in a small store with 55 men and women members to provide useful recreation for all those over 65, the club has, since 1946 moved into larger quarters four times and expanded its membership to over 1700 in 1959. Each members pays 15 cents monthly dues and the entire budget of this worthwhile project is raised by a combination of parties, dances, bake sales, etc. and United Fund support. There is every indication that a well planned Quincy project could also be mostly self-sustaining after initial support is received from the United Fund.

As the club prospered, it was obvious to the city of Springfield that the problems of the aged were many and complex. The countless health, recreational, welfare, financial, housing, and other special problems moved the entire community into action. One of the first Massachusetts Councils for the Aging was formed; and a Golden Age Club, separate from the Hobby Club, surged into activity. All of these groups led by the Hobby Club developed into models of creativity for the rest of Massachusetts and the entire Nation to copy with profit. The reasons for the outstanding success of the Hobby Club and other Springfield community groups in the field of the aging deserve evaluation by the citizens of Quincy and Americans everywhere.

Most Americans in 1959 are aware of some of the reasons for the so-called "problem of the aged." The rise in life expectancy at birth of men, from 48 to 68 years since 1901, and for women from 51 to 73 has highlighted other issues. Chronic disabling illnesses, lack of proper housing and poor retirement income for those over 65 have forced the establishment of State Councils for the Aging in many States. Many of these problems have been attacked throughout the Nation by social minded legislators who firmly believe that the "Young in Heart" are not just those in the age of romance, but also are those in the age of retirement.

Over the years from 1946 until the present time, the Hobby Club has concerned itself not with legislative problems, but only with those which would provide good recreation for elderly citizens. Miss Avery and her wise Board of Directors at the Hobby Club have found that all the increased social security checks in the world are not enough if the senior citizen does not have a purpose in life. The very air of the Springfield Hobby Club breathes purpose, self identification through constructive hobbies or games and human dignity for all once again.

The Hobby Club had the usual growing pains of any other worthwhile community project until it was accepted as a Red Feather and United Fund Agency in 1956. Quincy and other cities and towns in the United States should carefully analyze the experience of Springfield in this respect. Since this official recognition, the club has been able to offer a fully operative library; recreational features including TV, radio, woodworking shops, crafts classes, dancing, pool, shuffleboard, etc., all in daily operation.

The future of the club is bright. It's well-directed and spirited membership has sponsored a housing program in a local hotel which has drawn applicants from all over the Nation. It's present program and future plans have attracted national attention by oldsters and by young scholars who are writing doctor of philosophy dissertations on the successful operations. Members of the club agree that any city or town in the United States which has similar problems as Springfield can be equally successful if three things are done.

There must be a real need in order for a program of this sort to be developed. Rural areas do not need to develop complicated programs to organize the elderly. The "young in heart" must themselves be deeply involved in the planning and operation of any such "drop-in center" or sponsored recreational program. It is essential that dedicated people, with strong educational backgrounds if possible, but mostly those with heart, understanding, humility, and a sincere understanding of our young oldsters must be found to lead the aged programs.

Every city cannot be as fortunate in finding the leadership that has been tapped in Springfield. But every city can seek out the "young in heart" and help them fulfill their destiny as American citizens at the zenith of their lives. The Quincy Council for the Aging has begun to develop a program to help solve this problem and to build constructively for the future.

PRESENT AND FUTURE PLANS OF THE QUINCY COUNCIL FOR THE AGING—ARTICLE 3

(By Dr. Glenn A. McLain, Quincy Council for the Aging)

After several years of experimentation and general research in surveying the problems of the aged in Quincy the council has in 1959 developed three major objectives for the future: to fully analyze the activities, programs, and efforts of all groups in Quincy now working in this field; to work toward the establishment of a "drop-in center" here; and to hire a full-time professional worker to coordinate present programs and to organize future ones for all retired people.

The first step taken by most other councils throughout the country has been to take a survey of all agencies, clubs, and private organizations and religious programs. Only by exploring all available community resources can a fully matured program be developed for the future. The Quincy Council for the Aged has such a survey in the hands of 139 individuals and agencies in the city. When the questionnaires are returned and the results analyzed important resource materials will be available to help all Quincy citizens who may be interested in advancing the project.

As an example of the importance of the survey to the Quincy project the early returns of the mailing indicates that only 15 percent of organized group and privately sponsored city activities have any program underway at present for the aged. If these temporary figures are borne out in the final tabulation more stress will be placed upon the present plans of the council to gain community support for citywide efforts in this direction.

Another important aspect of the survey is to build up a permanent resource file for the use of all community organizations. If the League of Women Voters of Quincy which mostly confines its activities to governmental and political questions should decide to develop a project for the aged it can be guided to develop such a program within the scope of their special interests.

A major objective of the Quincy Council for the Aging is to eventually establish a drop-in center where a permanent and expanding recreational program can be maintianed. This important type of activity has been successfully organized and promoted by several cities in Massachusetts and hundreds throughout the Nation. There are many possibilities in Quincy of securing a house or home where card parties, television, radio, games, dances, and most of all just plain leisure-time activity may be sponsored.

Most civic sponsored projects for the aged in the United States have started with small quarters and expanded as the needs developed.

Many churches and private groups in Quincy already have such centers in operation but none of them are on a full-time basis. A Quincy council prop-in center would be fully operational 7 days a week under the direction of a full-time worker who would seek out the volunteer coopera-

tion of many civic groups. It is not expected that a council sponsored center would supplant other groups working in this direction, but rather to help them supplement their existing resources and to provide a source of new ideas for further expansion of their programs.

A mere review of the facts and statistics behind the record of drop-in centers in other parts of the country will not bring out the real secret behind any successful program. The real answer to this problem can only be found by talking to retired people in Springfield or members of successful projects in the pioneer States in this field in California, Michigan, or New York. There are four objectives behind any functional center: recreation, entertainment, personal involvement on the part of the members, and continuous progress. Add them all up and one word, "spirit" is the answer.

The spirit in Springfield, where 81-year-old youngsters ride 6 miles daily to attend the activity program of the hobby club and in other cities all over America where a longer and more interesting life are the rewards for these activities is the spark needed to activate a Quincy center. All of these things can be done in Quincy as they are done elsewhere if a drop-in center is developed.

The careful planning of a drop-in center is actually one of the two keys to a workable program for the aged in this city. Perhaps another hobby club of the Springfield type might be developed. There are many other possibilities according to the wishes of the senior citizens themselves. It is essential to keep this in mind as programs planned for but not with those involved are destined to fail. Many senior citizens' groups charge dues and engage in various types of fund raising activities which can best be sponsored from a drop-in center of a permanent nature.

The last, but perhaps the most important of the current objectives of the Quincy Council for the Aging, is to hire a full-time professional worker to coordinate the programs throughout the city. This is not the type of position for a part-time worker who is only able to borrow time from a regular job for the activities of the aged. The many private agencies in Quincy engaged in programs for our youth are mostly staffed with full-time workers. Any program for the aged involving over 10,000 citizens in our city deserves similar consideration. It is expected by the members of the council that the United Fund will favorably consider its request for funds to pay the salary of a full-time executive director to run this program.

In summary, it is important to understand that mere numbers of retired people in Quincy or anyplace else do not in themselves create a problem for the aged or for the city. The members of the Quincy Council for the Aging strongly feel that with over 1,200 of our citizens under the old-age assistance program and another 4,000 on the social security rolls there are sufficient reasons to further explore the need for organized activities for the retired in Quincy. After the survey taken by the council is interpreted the real nature of the situation can be fully understood in this city.

Only through the good advice of those groups already in the field and through the understanding of the citizens of Quincy can the objectives of the council be furthered in developing a program for the aged. A program for the future will be built only according to the needs of this community and the senior citizens who will be the inspiration behind the activities.

Federal Aid to Education—Oregon Educators Support Murray-Metcalf Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most important pieces of legislation now pending before Congress is the Murray-Metcalf bill, which would make available to the States Federal funds to assist in the construction of elementary and secondary school classrooms and to help raise teachers' salaries.

In the House of Representatives this proposal is identified as H.R. 22. H.R. 22 was reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor on June 8. It is now awaiting consideration by the House Rules Committee.

In the Senate, the plan is contained in S. 2, of which I am happy to be a cosponsor. This bill is currently under study in the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Hearings on the measure have been held and testimony published.

I am hopeful that Congress will take action on the Murray-Metcalf proposal in the current session. I think it is good legislation. I believe it is needed legislation. Inadequate classroom facilities and meager teachers' salaries represent a danger to American strength as surely as do second-rate weapons systems and an undermanned U.S. Army.

I wish to indicate my very strong belief that it would be an error for Congress to strike from the Murray-Metcalf bill that provision which allows utilization of Federal funds for increasing of teachers' salaries, as some have suggested. The American schoolteacher is the true heart and soul of our educational system. To promote the supply of qualified elementary and secondary teachers is to improve all education.

Mr. President, the representative assembly of the National Education Association is now meeting in St. Louis. Many able educators from Oregon are attending this important meeting and a number of them have wired me indicating their strong support for the Murray-Metcalf proposal. I ask unanimous consent that these telegrams be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with the text of a message sent to me by Dr. J. L. McCaskill, executive secretary of the NEA legislative commission, transmitting the text of the resolution approved by the assembly endorsing the Murray-Metcalf bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *July 1, 1959.*
Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Following is a resolution adopted by the 38th representative assembly of the National Education Association in session in St. Louis, Mo. When the resolution was offered on the floor by Miss Morma Mowrey, of West Virgina, it was enthusiastically seconded by 46 States and passed by an overwhelming vote of approximately 5,000 delegates. We hope that all members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will learn of NEA's endorsement of the bill which you have sponsored:

"I move that we of the National Education Association and its affiliated State and local associations pledge our total organizational strength and effort to obtain prompt passage of permanent broad purpose Federal financial support of education which assures State and local control of public schools. It is our firm conviction that the Murray-Metcalf bill as introduced in the 86th Congress embodies these basic principles which are of utmost importance to the future of our Nation. As delegates to this the 38th representative assembly we pledge our total organizational strength and personal efforts to obtain early passage of such legislation.

"I further move that we here and now make it crystal clear that we firmly reject as being unsound and unwise national policy all proposals to compromise the basic principles embodied in the Murray-Metcalf bill by eliminating either teachers' salaries or school construction.

"I further move that we make it known to the American people and to all Members of Congress that on these principles, and in this action, we stand firm and united."

J. L. MCCASKILL,
Executive Secretary, NEA Legislative Commission.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *July 1, 1959.*
Senator NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge you to exert your influence on behalf of S. 2, Murray-Metcalf bill. Urgent in interest of quality teaching and children of America.

K. J. SPEEDIE,
President, Roseburg Education Association.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *July 1, 1959.*
The Honorable RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please support Senate bill 2 in its present form. Oregon children are entitled to quality teaching. Without Federal aid for both the building program and salaries this will be impossible.

RUBY F. RAHN.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *July 1, 1959.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As a delegate to the NEA convention representing Jackson County, Oreg., teachers, we urgently ask your support of the Murray-Metcalf bill.

Mrs. GERARD C. CLUTE.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *July 1, 1959.*
Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senator From Oregon,
Washington, D.C.:

Ernestly urge you to do all in your power to secure enactment of Murray-Metcalf pub-

lic school support bill into law. No legislation could give as great insurance in permanent defense of our American free society nor as strong assistance to a permanently prosperous economy. It should be passed at this session of Congress.

FREDERICK M. HUNTER.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 30, 1959.*

The Honorable RICHARD NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: We understand some consideration is being given to amending the Murray-Metcalf proposal so that teachers' salaries will be deleted. The Oregon delegation at the NEA convention in St. Louis is unanimously opposed to any such move. Any support or help you can give for action on the present proposal will certainly be appreciated. Perhaps you may know some members of the Senate Committee on Education with whom you can discuss this matter. We certainly appreciate your continuing support for Federal support for education.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. POSEY,
Executive Secretary,
Oregon Education Association.

A Sweeping Court Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, from time to time I have made many statements about the decisions rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court. I have praised the opinions of this country's highest tribunal whenever I thought its decisions were worthy of praise. I have also taken strong issue with some Supreme Court decisions, particularly those dealing with communism and investigations for sedition, whenever I thought the decrees were not in the best interests of this country.

The Supreme Court has now said in effect, that the teaching of adultery and the breaking of marriage vows is lawful under the general cloak of free speech.

This decision is the topic for a straightforward and penetrating article written by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, and I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled, "A Sweeping Court Decision," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SWEEPING COURT DECISION—JUSTICES RULE TEACHING ADULTERY IS LAWFUL BECAUSE IT'S AN IDEA"

(By David Lawrence)

The same Supreme Court of the United States which recently ruled that it's all right to teach or advocate the overthrow of our Government—because this is just an idea—now says, in effect, that it is lawful to teach adultery and the breaking of the marriage vows. The Court says this also is just an idea which the majority of the people of America may not like, but that it all comes under the head of "free speech" and is protected by the 1st and 14th amendments to the Constitution.

This latest decision will come as a shock to church-going folks everywhere who do not believe that it is lawful to advocate sin, any more than it is right to advocate crime of any kind, especially in motion pictures that reach the young as well as adults.

The Supreme Court's own words are startling. The opinion of the Court, delivered by Justice Stewart, reversed a decision of the highest court of the State of New York, which upheld the law of that State forbidding the exhibition of motion pictures "which are immoral in that they portray 'acts of sexual immorality * * * as desirable, acceptable, or proper patterns of behavior.'" The New York court had interpreted that language of the statute to require denial of a license to a motion picture where "its subject matter is adultery presented as being right and desirable for certain people under certain circumstances."

The Supreme Court's opinion accepted the contention "that the motion picture here in question can be so characterized," but went on to hold that New York State has no right to pass such a law, because it is unconstitutional on its face. Justice Stewart says:

"What New York has done, therefore, is to prevent the exhibition of a motion picture because that picture advocates an idea—that adultery under certain circumstances may be proper behavior. Yet the first amendment's basic guarantee is of freedom to advocate ideas. The State, quite simply, has thus struck at the very heart of constitutionally protected liberty."

This is a sweeping interpretation of the first amendment. Time was when the Supreme Court of the United States considered the interests of the citizens as a whole superseded those of any individual citizens, and held that to cry fire in a crowded theater might be regarded as coming under free speech but didn't protect the people who would be killed in the ensuing panic.

In the instant case, the Court quibbles that incitement has not been proved. It similarly has previously argued, in effect, that, until acts are undertaken to overthrow the Government, there is no incitement to revolution on the part of speakers who teach the forceful overthrow of Government.

Justice Harlan, in behalf of himself and Justices Frankfurter and Whittaker, wrote an opinion concurring in the result in the Motion Picture case, but said the Court had moved too swiftly in striking down the New York State law. He said that, while the motion picture in question shouldn't be banned, the right of the State to retain such a law should not be forfeited.

Justice Frankfurter, in a separate opinion, concurred in the decision as to the picture involved, but stated his belief that the Court should have limited itself to deciding whether a particular picture is entitled to the protection of expression under the 14th amendment. Holding that there is an evil against which a State may constitutionally protect itself, whatever we may think about the questions of policy involved, he added:

"The real problem is the formulation of constitutionally allowable safeguards which society may take against evil without impinging upon the necessary dependence of a free society upon the fullest scope of free expression."

Justice Douglas, in behalf of himself and Justice Black, wrote a separate opinion concurring in the result but insisting that no State can constitutionally enact any law requiring censorship in advance. He holds that the exhibition of a controversial motion picture—as in the case of publication of a libelous article—should not be subjected to previous restraint, but should suffer legal consequences if any law is involved. Justice Douglas says: "If a particular movie violates a valid law, the exhibitor can be prosecuted in the usual way."

So, all in all, six Justices voted to take away the right of the States to decide for themselves what motion pictures involving sexual immorality are objectionable, while three others said they would rather see the Supreme Court, acting presumably as a supreme board of censors, decide each case on its merits.

Justice Black objected to that role, declaring that then "every member of the Court must exercise his own judgment as to how bad a picture is, a judgment which is ultimately based at least in large part on his own standard of what is immoral. * * * Such an individualized determination cannot be guided by reasonably fixed and certain standards."

But the impression left by the Justices is that the Supreme Court of the United States today is not disturbed by the teaching of the idea of sexual immorality or adultery. This is proclaimed now as protected by free speech, and evidently the scope of the first amendment cannot be limited in that respect to let the States of the Union regulate morals as they see fit.

The new doctrine seems to be that it is necessary to prove that each picture may incite its observers to subsequent acts of immorality. In other words, sin can be taught, and the States must silently accept such teachings as within the protection of the Constitution.

Kidding the Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News on Thursday, July 2, 1959, entitled "Kidding the Troops."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KIDDING THE TROOPS

Just like you may have figured, the wealthy corporation farmer won the battle of the $50,000 price support limitation.

The bill just passed by Congress includes the limitation, but with so many exceptions it is about 99.4 percent fraud.

As originally proposed—and passed by the Senate—$50,000 was the limit any one farmer, or farm corporation, would collect from the Government in any one year. Even $50,000 was far too high and far beyond the hopes of the average family farmer which the program is supposed to serve.

But under the compromise reached in conference committee and approved by both Houses the limitation is $50,000 for each crop rather than for each farmer. Even this lid may be removed under a variety of exceptions which appear to make the sky the limit.

This is a prime example of what the enlisted man used to call "kidding the troops." It saves no money, corrects no injustice yet is paraded as "reform," in obvious scorn of both the public purse and public intelligence.

American Art in Moscow Exhibition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the current interest in the political views of some of the artists whose works will be on display in our Moscow exhibition is reflected in the material which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. As I said on this floor on June 4, 1959, this can be an occasion for the United States to prove it is dramatically different from the Soviet approach on freedom of expression; an occasion to demonstrate our cultural maturity.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 2, 1959]

PURGE IN PAINT

If Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER paused for a moment's thought, he might find a cutting ironic edge in his current investigation of art works selected for the American Exhibition in Moscow. Mr. WALTER, the chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, began hearings yesterday on possible political heresies of the painters involved. But isn't this official mingling of art and politics precisely what caused the uproar over Boris Pasternak not so long ago? Surely Mr. WALTER ought to ask himself how Americans can honestly protest the official censorship of Pasternak's novel if the same kind of political blacklisting should be applied to—of all things—an exhibit designed to show the Russian people the felicities of liberty.

It seems to us that President Eisenhower missed a chance in his news conference comments yesterday to make clear the vital principle at stake. To be sure, Mr. Eisenhower stressed that he was not going to censor "the art that has already gone there." But he undercut the force of his sentiments by adding that all the editorial comment he had seen "is defending the committee very strenuously, and so I don't know what's right."

The 70 paintings and sculptures by 67 artists were picked for exhibition by a distinguished four-man jury solely on the basis of artistic merit. Critics are fallible, and perhaps some inferior works were included. But Mr. WALTER is guided by no lofty esthetic impulses in raising his objections. Instead, he asserts that 34 of the 67 artists whose works have been selected "have records of affiliation with Communist fronts and causes." Change that language to read "have records of affiliation with decadent bourgeois fronts and causes" and you have a phrase that could have come from the pen of Pravda's art critic.

Indeed, there is special irony in Mr. WALTER'S ill-advised attempt to impose a political varnish on these works of art. Few aspects of Communist conformity have aroused as much ridicule as the deadening official insistence on what is called "Socialist realism" in art. Abstractions and any other experimental forms have been proscribed with a vigor that has been endlessly embarrassing to such fellow-traveling painters elsewhere as Picasso. One result is that within the Soviet Union there is an extraordinary interest in seeing the kind of art that is considered illicit and "decadent" by the Kremlin's official connoisseurs. It would be a pity if this unique opportunity to bring a little esthetic ferment into Russia were clouded over by a quixotic crusade aimed at preventing Soviet citizens from seeing any pink in a painting.

[From the New York Times, July 2, 1959]

PRESIDENT FAVORS ART THE UNITED STATES LIKES—GIVES VIEW ON WORKS SENT TO MOSCOW EXHIBITION—CALLS ONE LAMPOON

(By C. P. Trussell)

WASHINGTON, July 1.—President Eisenhower said today that U.S. art selected to be shown abroad should include "what America likes."

His comment came at his news conference when asked about the controversy over the works to be displayed at the U.S. exhibition opening in Moscow, July 25. [Question 5, p. 10.]

The choices have been under attack by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and by Wheeler Williams, sculptor and president of the American Artists Professional League.

Mr. WALTER contends that many of the artists "have records of affiliation with Communist fronts and causes."

Mr. Williams, whose works and tastes are conservative, termed the paintings and sculptures selected for the exhibition "childish doodles" and said most of them were a "discredit" to the United States.

Mr. Williams is the sculptor of the statue of the late Sentaor Robert A. Taft at the Taft Memorial here. He testified before the House committee today.

A MINOR SECTOR

The President pointed out that "the art is really a relatively minor sector" of the Moscow exhibition, "two fairly small rooms and the exhibit is all over two floors."

As for the actual selections, he said, "no one in the Government had a single thing to do with it" except George V. Allen, Director of the United States Information Agency, which is staging the exhibition.

Twenty-one cultural advisers to the State Department and the Information Agency picked a four-man jury of art experts to select the works. Seventy paintings and sculptures of 67 artists were chosen.

The jury was headed by Franklin C. Watkins, instructor of painting at the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Art. The other members were Lloyd Goodrich, director of the Whitney Museum of Art in New York; Henry Radford Hope, chairman of the Fine Arts Department of Indiana University, and Theodore Roszak, a sculptor and faculty member at Sarah Lawrence College.

The President also pointed out the exhibit was limited to art of the last 50 years and said that "no piece of art or painting" had been sent to Moscow except those produced since 1918, since the First World War."

SEES ONE AS LAMPOON

While the President insisted that he was not a critic, one of the paintings sent to the Moscow fair appeared to him, he said, more like "a lampoon" than art. Painted in 1946 by Jack Levine of New York, it depicts a general with his mouth full of food at a victory dinner. It is entitled "Welcome Home."

"But I'm not going, I assure you," the President said, "I am not going to be the censor myself for the art that has already gone there. Now I think I might have something to say if we have another exhibition anywhere, to the responsible officials of the methods they produce, or get the juries, and possibly there ought to be one or two people that, like most of us here, say, we are not too certain exactly what art is but we know what we like, and what America likes—whatever America likes is after all some of the things that ought to be shown.

REITERATE CHARGES

Mr. WALTER, who first made his Communist-front charges to the House on June 3, reiterated them as he opened the hearings today.

He said that of the 67 artists whose works had been accepted for the exhibit, 34 had records of affiliation in various degrees with Communist causes.

Some were passing in nature, Mr. WALTER said, but 22 had "a minimum of a total of 465 connections with Communist fronts and causes."

He said he could not believe that Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, who is to go to Moscow to open the exhibit, would "knowingly condone" the art.

Mr. Williams attacked most of the art works and assailed modern art generally.

[From the New York Times, June 14, 1959]

U.S. ART FOR MOSCOW

(By Aline B. Saarinen)

It was predictable that if the jury which selected the contemporary art for the American National Exhibition chose paintings and sculptures that truly illuminated the vitality and variety of American art, some disgruntled Congressman, probably encouraged by disgruntled left-out academic artists, would criticize the show in one way or another.

The predictable happened. One Member of the House of Representatives made the accusation that more than half of the 67 artists represented in the exhibition had "records of affiliations with Communist fronts and causes." If this tired old red herring were the only thing that happened, there would be no point in remarking it.

What is worth remarking is that the diatribe of the loquacious gentleman from Pennsylvania encouraged other actions which are pleasing evidences of America's growing cultural maturity and which are all, explicit or implicit, endorsements of the show now on its way to Russia.

1. The U.S. Information Agency reiterated the fact that it had placed "the selection of the art for the Amercian National Exhibition in the hands of a four-man jury of distinguished art experts outside Government without any attempt at censorship. The jury felt that the judging of works of creative art should be solely on the merit of the paintings and sculptures rather than the political views of the artists. The Government authorities concerned concurred in this view."

2. At its annual meeting, held this year in the Carnegie Institute at Pittsburg, the American Association of Museums, representing the leading American museums of science, history and art, unanimously passed a resolution commending the USIA for using a professional jury to select art to be sent abroad and for allowing it freedom to act without political or artistic censorship.

3. Senator PHILIP HART, Democrat of Michigan, rose on the floor of the Senate and made the following remarks in answer to the criticism directed at the show:

WISE WORDS IN CONGRESS

"I had hoped that we had grown beyond the point where a political litmus test would be applied to our judgment of art. All that this hullabaloo would do would be to take the Russians off the hook of world opinion on which they find themselves in connection with the Pasternak case and put us on it.

"I believe that it is the Soviet Union which has lost face by attempting political censorship of its artists. We do not want to get ourselves into that situation. There

are a great many people in the world who think one can judge a civilization and the soul of a people more clearly by looking at its painting and sculpture than by counting its plumbing and automobiles. The sooner we understand that fact the better it will be for us."

It is perhaps important to underline his words about judging a civilization and the soul of a people by looking at its art. The ingenious "Seven Simultaneous Screens," with movie projections of actual photographs, in the great dome of the American National Exhibition at Moscow will give the portrait of Americans and the American way of life. That is not the job of painting and sculpture. Art is not supposed to be reportage: art is the distilled vision of a creative man. But the art will make other revelations—significant revelations—about freedom of expression.

That Russian painters and sculptors, intellectuals and students will recognize and applaud and envy these evidences of freedom is fairly certain.

CRACKS IN THE CURTAIN

Even those who have ostensibly and obediently followed the dictates of social realism have not been blind. A genial reader, Daniel Bell, reports a story about Russian art that was current in Poland at a time when there was less freedom there: a commissar with but one eye, one arm and one leg wanted his portrait painted. A Soviet painter painted him with one eye, one arm and one leg—and was shot for bourgeois naturalism. A second Soviet painter painted the commissar with two eyes, two arms and two legs—and was shot for reactionary idealism. A third Soviet artist posed the commissar in profile, showing the good eye, the good arm and the good leg and was given a medal for "socialist realism."

There may also be some significance in a current, well-founded rumor that the Soviet Union is planning for next year a large exhibition of works by Wassily Kandinsky. It may well be that their intention in showing the art of this Russian-born creative abstractionist is to prove their priority in the field of abstract and nonobjective art. But the fact remains that unless there were insistent and surging curiosity and interest within the ranks of Soviet artists, about such free forms of expression, the Government would never have stirred itself in such a direction.

Although the heterogeneity of our art exhibition—with only one example of each of the 67 artists—may be confusing, the very fact that American art is shown with all its many valid ways of seeing and ways of saying, achieved by artists of every different kinds, complexions and beliefs, makes a strong, inescapable point.

Tribute to Dr. Ralph Steen, President of Stephen F. Austin State College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Dr. Ralph W. Steen, head of the History Department of Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College was selected as president of Stephen F. Austin State College at Nacogdoches last November.

Dr. Steen is a noted educator with an outstanding background in many phases of his profession. He is an accomplished historian and a number of his books on history and government are standard school texts. His abilities as an administrator are exhibited in the college he now heads.

He believes inferior education is a detriment to the State. He is working to improve the educational system of Texas at all levels, and is particularly concerned with the demonstrated need of improvement in our institutions of higher learning.

The type of leadership Dr. Steen is furnishing is the type of vigorous young leadership that must ultimately result in improved educational facilities. He realizes that it takes money to build colleges, and he is too sensible to be frightened by the scare-crow of Federal control of education.

The needs, and the means of meeting our educational needs, are cogently stated in a recent article about Dr. Steen in the Houston (Tex.) Post.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an exceptionally good article by Jim Mousner which appeared in the Houston Post for Sunday, June 14, 1959, under the heading: "Titled Texan—No Second Rate Education, Says Dr. Ralph Steen."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Post, June 14, 1959]

TITLED TEXAN—NO SECOND RATE EDUCATION, SAYS DR. RALPH STEEN

(By Jim Mousner)

NACOGDOCHES.—Providing second rate educations is no way to become a first-class State.

This is the firm conviction of Dr. Ralph Steen after 30 years as an educator. And the president of Stephen F. Austin State College is deeply concerned about the fate of his State's institutions of higher learning.

"The people of Texas must realize that its colleges are facing a crisis and something must be done about it," says the noted historian, author, and educator.

Steen was aware of the crisis long before he resigned as head of the Texas A. and M. College department of history to become Stephen F. Austin's third president last November 1, but his new duties have sharpened his appreciation of its seriousness.

"I wish the State would realize the precarious position of its colleges. We can't compete with business or even other schools.

SALARY HIKES TOOK TEACHERS AWAY

"Since I have been here, we have lost excellent faculty members to colleges in New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Louisiana," says Steen. "They went at substantial salary increases * * * by substantial I don't mean a few hundred dollars but as much as $2,000 or $3,000."

Steen believes the answer—or at least part of the answer—lies in more State funds for its colleges.

"It's true," he says, "that the legislature has provided larger appropriations for education in recent years, but we were already behind and these funds have not enabled us to catch up."

The SFA president argues the case for a better educational system with a professional historian's insight into the impact that the dissemination of knowledge has had on mankind, and particularly upon his State and Nation.

Dr. Steen is the author of a dozen books on Texas and American history and government, several of which are standard texts in Texas schools. Quite an accomplishment for a man who "drifted" into his field.

When Ralph Steen was growing up in the west Texas town of Clyde where he was born December 26, 1905, a career as a historian or an educator was the furthest thing from his mind. He was one of three sons of Preston C. and Maude Flemming Steen. His father owned a hardware store and when young Ralph enrolled in McMurray College after graduating from Clyde High School, his choice of business administration as a major seemed a natural one.

PROFESSOR'S INFLUENCE WAS STRONG

Steen had not counted on the influence of William C. Holden, a history professor at McMurray. His admiration of Professor Holden led him into a more than casual study of history, a subject which he quickly found fascinated him.

After graduating from McMurray in 1927, he worked for a year in his father's hardware store. The experience convinced him that he did not want a business career and he returned to his studies.

Entering the University of Texas, he earned his master's degree in 1929 and his Ph.D. interspersed with teaching assignments—a year at McMurray, 2 years at Reagan County High School at Big Lake, and a year at Hillsborough College.

In 1935 Steen joined the staff of the Texas A. and M. College history department and spent the next 23 years there, the last 4 years as head of the department.

For more than 2 decades he divided his time between teaching, lecturing, historical research, and writing. Among his books are "20th Century Texas," an economic and social history of Texas from 1900 to 1940; "The Texas Story," a general State history; and "The Texas News," a history of Texas presented in newspaper style.

SOME OF HIS WORKS ARE TEXTBOOKS

Some of his books on Texas history and government have been adopted as junior and senior high school texts, and another recently-published U.S. history and civics book is in the process of being adopted on a national level.

He has also written numerous articles on Texas history, economics, and society. He retired recently after 2 years as president of the Texas State Historical Association.

Steen believes that the greatest advantage afforded by a study of history is some possible insight into what lies ahead.

"We cannot hope to make an intelligent guess about the future without a study of the past," he says.

Dr. Steen shies away from his reputation as a debunker of popular Texas historical myths, calling it "undeserved."

"I do think, however, that the historical facts are so colorful that we don't have to embroider them," he says.

As a historian, Steen's chief interest is in contemporary Texas history and his pet subject is the late Jim Ferguson, the Texas governor who was impeached.

"I would like to do a book on him some day," says Steen, but admits that "the books have been coming slower" since he became president of the Nacogdoches College.

CREDITS WIFE FOR HELP ON BOOKS

The 53-year-old educator credits his wife the former Gladys Edmonds of Bernice, La., with much valuable assistance on the books. He and Mrs. Steen, whom he married in 1929 while she was teaching school in West Texas, have one son, Joe Steen, a journalism major at A. & M.

After 23 years at an all-male school Dr. Steen has had no difficulty in adjusting to a coeducational institution which he says he prefers.

"All through life men and women work together. I think this pattern should continue through their college years. Of course, I have no argument with those who prefer a non-coeducational institution," he says.

Dr. Steen observes that today's student has much wider interests. He also points out that most people who attend college today have a specific goal.

Few students attend simply for a general liberal arts education any more. And the prestige factor of a college education has diminished from the student's viewpoint.

The SFA head says the "tremendous difference" between today's colleges and those of his day is the presence of married students on the campus. Thirty-seven percent of SFA's student body is composed of married students.

Steen says the married student is, as a rule, a serious student.

The school has under construction an apartment unit for married students, a boys' dormitory and an addition to a girls' dormitory.

"If we had 500 more apartments we could fill them without any trouble," he says.

The apartment unit and dorms are part of a $3.5 million building program planned to handle the growing enrollment which has increased at a rate of 10 percent a year for the past 3 years. A total of 2,017 students enrolled last fall and Steen says another 200 plus are expected this fall.

Also under construction is a $1.3 million fine-arts building. College officials plan to let a contract this summer for a $1 million student union building.

A $600,000 Federal loan for a boys' and a girls' dormitory has been approved for the school but the money has not been appropriated.

On the subject of Federal aid to education, Steen says the lower interest rates on Federal loans make them attractive to colleges.

"I don't believe that these loans put the colleges that receive them in danger of Federal control," he says. "We must get the money somewhere."

The president points out that some construction at the college was financed with funds from private lending institutions.

More serious than the problem of facilities, according to Steen, is the shortage of funds with which to pay good teachers. Stephen F. Austin's chief says he is having increasing difficulty finding instructors with the qualities that make a good professor. These qualities, says Steen, are:

1. Excellent preparation in the subject to be taught.

2. Ability to express oneself clearly and precisely.

3. A personality that makes him liked coupled with an ability and willingness to cooperate with others.

Dr. Steen regards Stephen F. Austin as "a good liberal-arts college serving a region."

"We don't try to compete with the University of Texas or other big schools. We attempt to serve an area within a radius of 100 to 150 miles of Nacogdoches. We don't seek to attract students from high schools in towns with junior colleges," he says.

Stephen F. Austin was founded in 1923 as a State teachers college but while the majority of its students still major in education, the school is now a liberal-arts institution. It is the only college in Texas offering a 4-year course in forestry.

Dr. Steen believes the U.S. education system is basically sound.

"I don't think we need to apologize too much," he says.

On the subject of college athletics, he says: "They have become so much an accepted part of American college life that it wouldn't be the same without them."

Steen says athletics will never be overemphasized at Stephen F. Austin for a very practical reason—lack of funds.

"We simply don't have the money to support a large-scale athletic program," he says.

Dr. Steen describes himself as a liberal-arts man, believing that a broad foundation of knowledge should precede specialization.

"Our goal here is to teach a student public responsibility as well as to train him in the field of his choice," says Steen. "No matter what field a person specializes in he should be prepared and willing to accept his role in society."

The historian-educator summed up his philosophy of education and the direction in which he intends to guide his school in his inaugural address as president of the Nacogdoches college last February 27, said Dr. Steen:

"We will have more than an ivory tower at Stephen F. Austin."

More on Olympics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, last month I stated before this body that the sanctioning of Red China's participation in the Olympic games should raise serious doubts in the minds of the American people concerning the activities of the International Olympic Committee.

I felt then, and still contend, that this action diametrically opposes the specific provision that National Olympic Committees must be entirely removed from all political, religious, or commercial influences.

Since that time, Mr. President, newspapers across the country have devoted considerable space to this situation. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues particularly to a column which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald under the byline of an outstanding newspaperman and columnist, George E. Sokolsky.

This is a very informative and interesting commentary on the Olympics situation, and I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE ON OLYMPICS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Apparently the official attitude of the Comite Internationale Olympique is that Nationalist China should change its name. Perhaps one day, this august committee of sportsmen will request the United States to change its name because there are other countries which call themselves United States or something like that.

Otto Mayer, chancellor of the Comite, takes the position that no politics are involved in asking Nationalist China to change its name although by all the rules of international relations, Nationalist China is the successor state to the Manchu monarchy. Sun Yat-sen, the leader of the Revolution of 1911 against the Manchu Dynasty, gave the name to the Republic of China. There is legitimacy among nations and the legitimate government of China is Nationalist China, situated on Formosa. Avery Brundage, of the International Olympic Committee, might ask the State Department about that. Of course, Soviet Russia does not hold with the American State Department on that or most other questions, but an American citizen is expected to.

Apparently the International Olympic Committee does not "make politics." The Peking-China Committee is permitted to enter the International Olympic Committee on condition that Communist China does not claim "to control sport over Formosa."

Writing to an American, Mayer says:

"You live in a complete different ideological world than we do in Europe and I think that Mr. Brundage is perhaps one amongst the few Americans who understand what is going about on this side of the ocean. Mind you, I would much prefer to be under American domination, if there should be any, than under any others."

Of course, what Otto Mayer does not understand is that we have no wish to dominate him or any other European. As a matter of fact, we do not look kindly upon human beings who permit themselves to be dominated by anybody. But the remark about an American living in a complete different ideological world than they do in Europe is a bit puzzling. What kind of an ideological world do those who manage the Comite Internationale Olympique live in? What is the nature of their belief?

It would seem to me that the United States has no place in this Olympic situation. Brundage, who is chairman of the American Committee and president of the International body, makes the point in his statement:

"The International Olympic Committee, which has as one of its fundamental principles, 'No discrimination is allowed against any country or person on grounds of race, religion, or politics'."

But the United States does make a distinction as to politics. It does not recognize Red China. It does not issue passports to Red China.

This is Brundage's statement and Brundage's logic:

"At our meeting in Munich it was pointed out that if the Peiping Committee has no authority in Taiwan, it is equally true that the Formosa Committee has no authority in China. It was for this reason that the following action was taken in Munich:

" 'The Chinese National Olympic Committee having its seat in Taipei (Taiwan) will be notified by the International Olympic Committee chancellor that it cannot continue to be recognized under that name since it does not control sport in the country of China, and its name will be removed from that list.

" 'If an application for recognition under a different name is made it will be considered by the International Olympic Committee.' "

Why not ask Red China to change its name? In fact, what is its name and what does it derive from?

It is difficult to understand the logic of this situation, unless it is as stated in the words of my friend, Gen. John V. Grombach, who says:

"I believe the International Olympic Committee has stepped into the realm of politics by dictating what name the Republic of China has to adopt. If this is not meddling in politics, I will eat Mount Blanc. What possible difference can it make to Mr. Brundage or the International Olympic Committee if the Chinese athletes from the island of

Formosa enter as representatives of the Republic of China or as representatives of Taiwan or Formosa—unless the International Olympic Committee is meddling in politics? They are, after all, Chinese and not Formosans."

How Not To Manage the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most thoughtful Members of Congress is Hon. HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin. Representative REUSS has written for the Progressive magazine of July 1959, an informative and challenging article entitled "How Not To Manage the National Debt," in which he demonstrates that excessively high interest rates have retarded national growth and expansion. He also shows how these increasing interest tolls have added to the cost of all our schoolhouses, highways, private housing, public-utility facilities and other manifestations of American progress.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by HENRY S. REUSS from the Progressive of July be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW NOT TO MANAGE THE NATIONAL DEBT
(By HENRY S. REUSS)

I

Though it is paying the highest interest rates in 25 years, the Treasury is having trouble refinancing the national debt as bonds mature and become payable. In May, when an issue of 1-year, 1.25 percent securities came due, the Treasury had to offer a 4.05 percent 1-year note in exchange—and even then a third of the security holders spurned the new offering and demanded cash.

The Government has just about given up attempting to issue long- or medium-term securities. It will probably not even try to refund with long-term debt the $22 billion of 1-year debt which comes due in the second half of 1959.

This is the crisis in debt management. One result is to doom the administration to violate each of the three canons it has itself set up as essential to sound debt management:

1. Keep the national debt away from the banks. Former Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey said in 1953: "The concentration of short-term debt in the banks by the previous administration was one of the causes of inflation and the increased cost of living which has cost the American people billions of dollars. A gradual placing of more securities in the hands of nonbank investors is a necessary step for economic stability." Yet, 6 years later, the administration has been unable to reduce the amount of the national debt held by the commercial banks—it was $63 billion in 1953, and it is $63 billion today.

2. Keep the national debt as long term as possible. In his first state of the Union message on January 2, 1953, President Eisenhower said: "It is clear that too great a part of the national debt becomes due in too short a time." The objection to too much short-term debt, of course, is that it puts the Treasury constantly into the market for refunding and thus requires the Federal Reserve to create bank reserves sufficient to absorb the offering at a time when creating such credit may be inflationary.

When the President spoke, the average length of the marketable interest-bearing debt was 5 years and 8 months. Today, the average length has declined to 4 years and 9 months.

3. Keep Treasury financing from contradicting other governmental economic policies. The administration has many times contended that the Treasury, in order to gear itself in with general governmental economic policies, ought to be issuing long-term bonds during prosperity, and short-term notes during a recession. But in practice, it has done just the opposite: the only time it can sell long terms is during a recession; and during prosperity, when it ought to be sopping up long-term investment funds, all it can sell are short terms.

The cynic may point out that the administration, by grossly violating its own canons of financial probity, may inadvertently have done the economy a great deal of good. To the extent that the administration has departed from its avowed canons of debt management, it has, despite itself, had to relax its excessively tight-money policy.

But the three main consequences for the Nation of our present debt management policies are more serious than any mental anguish the administration may suffer by its failure to follow its own criteria. These are the principal damaging results:

1. Higher interest burden. The interest burden on the national debt—$8.1 billion for fiscal 1960—is the fastest-climbing, as well as the largest single nondefense item, in the Federal budget. A rise of only one-half of 1 percent on the carrying charge of the $285 billion national debt adds nearly $1.5 billion to the taxpayers' annual burden.

2. Scaring off investors. The Treasury's present course of steadily increasing the interest rates on new securities which it offers compounds the problem of debt management. Even a small increase in the interest rate may result in a disproportionately large decrease in the market price of a long-term bond. Suppose you own a 2.5 percent, 20-year bond for which you paid $100. If the going rate on Government securities increases to 4 percent, your market price drops to $79.50. Is it any wonder that investors seem more and more allergic to any but the shortest-term Treasury notes?

3. Tight money's harm to economic growth. Most serious of all, when the Treasury raises the interest rate on the national debt, these increases are quickly communicated throughout the economy because the Treasury, in refunding nearly $80 billion annually, completely dwarfs all other borrowers. And high interest rates choke off economic activity wherever interest charges are a major consideration—housing, schools, public utility expansion, small business.

II

How did we get ourselves into this debt management muddle? Not through any lack of administrative skills. Secretary of the Treasury Robert Anderson and Federal Reserve Board Chairman William Martin are honest, capable men. The size of the debt cannot be the cause. We found a national debt of $267 billion no insuperable problem in 1946 even though our gross national product was then only $209 billion. Certainly, it should be possible to manage a $285 billion national debt in 1959, with a gross national product of more than $460 billion.

Why, then, can't the Treasury find people who want to buy the national debt? The easy answer, and one frequently given by the administration, is that the public is sacred away by budegt deficits and the fear of inflation. Now, sound national policy does require both that the budget be balanced at high levels of production, and that we have reasonable price stability. Attaining these goals would make debt management easier.

But today's debt management crisis would be with us even with balanced budgets and reasonable price stability.

In both 1956 and 1957, for example, we had budget surpluses, not deficits. Yet the Treasury was unable in those years to sell any long-term securities. As interest rates increase, and bond prices decline, investors become more and more wary of Government issues. So long as interest rates are going up, it does not matter whether the Treasury is issuing new debt to finance a deficit or is merely refunding.

Likewise, the idea that our debt management problems stem from investors' fear of inflation cannot withstand analysis. I strongly suspect that the influx of elevator boys into the stockmarket is caused more by a desire to make a speculative profit than by a lack of confidence in fixed-income securities. Fortunately, a large and increasing amount of individual and institutional funds remain anchored in fixed-income methods of saving and investment-insurance policies, saving and loan shares, savings accounts, corporate bonds, mortgages, State and local government securities. But individuals and institutions are decreasing their holdings of both U.S. savings bonds and other U.S. Government securities, and are greatly increasing their holdings of these other types of fixed-income securities. What this proves is not that fear of inflation is driving people away from fixed-income investments—our dollar holdings of these are the largest in history—but that something is driving investors away from that segment of fixed-income investments issued by Uncle Sam.

What, then, is the cause of the debt management crisis? More than from anything else, it arises from the administration's own one-track economic policy: tight money and high interest rates. High interest rates, in turn, have caused the price of Government bonds to fall so far and so continuously that investors have turned to other types of securities.

Except for 8 months during the 1957–58 recession, the Federal Reserve System has pursued a policy of choking off demand by a restricted money supply and high interest rates. From 1954 to 1958, our money supply grew by only 6.5 percent, while gross national product increased 27 percent. As the British economist Barbara Ward said: "The technique of checking production in order to stop inflation—the most drastic 'cure' conceivable in the face of Russia's rising production—does not cure at all. Inflation goes on. New thinking is thus in order."

III

The same new thinking—a reexamination of our overly restrictive monetary policy—which will be necessary if we are to achieve simultaneously adequate growth and reasonable price stability, is needed in order to solve the crisis in debt management. Attaining these goals will in itself make debt management easier. And the best way of attaining them—an adequate money supply—happens to be, in addition, just what the doctor ordered to ease the crisis of the national debt.

If the goal of adequate growth (4 to 5 percent a year, rather than the present 2.5 percent) is attained, debt management will become easier for two reasons:

1. As the economy expands, tax revenues will increase and some debt retirement will be possible. The fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, with its wholly unnecessary recession, will show a deficit of around $13 billion.

This contrasts with our experience in 1947 and 1948, when, with a high level of prosperity and an adequate tax base, the Treasury was able to reduce the Federal debt by $17 billion. As the debt is reduced, of course, the carrying charges likewise decrease, even if interest rates remain high.

2. As the economy expands, higher individual and corporate incomes will produce a higher volume of savings. All fixed-income securities will benefit as well as U.S. Government issues.

If the goal of reasonable price stability is attained, this, too, will make debt management easier. Administration spokesmen overdo it when they blame all their troubles on the public's fears of inflation. But for the future, fixed-income investments of all kinds, including Federal bonds, can be appealing only if there is some reasonable prospect of price stability.

Just as the attainment of growth and price stability would help debt management, so would the appropriate means of reaching these goals—an adequate money supply.

Monetary expansion need not be inflationary so long as men and resources are idle. We have recently learned that excessive demand is by no means the only factor at work when prices go up. Particularly in such concentrated industries as steel and automobiles, powerful corporations have been able to administer prices upward without immediate regard for market demand. For example, the steel and steel-using industries are responsible for seven-eighths of the 8-percent rise in the wholesale price index since 1953. Because a tight-money policy has little or no effect on administered price inflation, new methods to deal with the problem must be developed. One such technique is proposed in a bill sponsored by Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and myself. The bill empowers the President to focus an informed public opinion upon price increases, and associated wage increases, in the concentrated industries. It aims to moderate the upward demands in these industries, without invoking compulsory wage or price controls.

Where demand inflation threatens, however, steps to curtail overall demand must be taken. By far the most effective instrument here is fiscal policy—running a substantial budget surplus, by raising taxes where necessary. Monetary policy—raising interest rates and decreasing the supply of credit—should complement fiscal policy, but should not be expected to do the job alone. Selective credit controls over installment sales of consumer goods and over housing should also be available.

Of the several ways open to the Federal Reserve to increase the money supply, only one is really helpful from the standpoint of debt management. This is through purchases by the Federal Reserve of U.S. Government securities. Since the Treasury-Federal Reserve Accord of 1951, the Federal Reserve has looked upon helping the Treasury in debt management as something shady, to be practiced surreptitiously if at all. The accord was based on a sensible proposition: That the Federal Reserve should not be expected to support the Government bond market come hell or high water. But there is every reason for the Federal Reserve, when national policy requires an increasing money supply, to expand it by purchasing Government securities. This will reduce fluctuations in interest rates and in the prices of Government securities, thus markedly improving their relative attractiveness for investors seeking fixed-income investments.

Federal Reserve purchases of Government securities have two additional advantages. To the extent that the national debt is held by the Federal Reserve, the interest paid goes back to the Treasury. And the Treasury is spared the unpleasant surprise of attrition—when holders of the debt suddenly demand cash.

What this boils down to is: Where more and easier money is essential for general economic reasons, the Federal Reserve should supply needed funds, at least in part, by buying U.S. securities, rather than depending entirely on lowering reserve requirements or reducing interest rates.

But the administration continues to look at debt management as if it were an isolated problem. The crisis will not be solved by appeals to patriotic investors to buy now, or by investigating speculation in the Government bond market, or by raising interest rates still higher. The crisis will continue and deepen until the managers of our economy reverse their policies and create an adequate money supply by methods that will restore the confidence of investors in what should be the soundest investment in the world.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram I have received from representatives of Americans of central-eastern European descent, expressing their approval of resolution designating the week following the Fourth of July as Captive Nations Week.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y., *June 30, 1959.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

On behalf of subjugated peoples, assembly of captive European nations American friends of captive nations and conference of Americans of central-eastern European descent join in expressing their gratitude to you for joining in sponsoring resolution designating week following Fourth of July as "Captive Nations Week." Resolution particularly timely in view Khrushchev's ultimatums, Geneva conference and Kremlin's efforts to persuade captive people that free world is no longer concerned with their liberation. In particular, it helps to give the lie to Khrushchev-Mikoyan assertion that United States has renounced policy of liberation. Passionate hatred of captive peoples for Communist tyranny is chief deterrent to Soviet expansion in Europe. It is to Kremlin's advantage to destroy liberation spirit by persuading people that there is no hope. It is in West's interest to keep liberation spirit alive and to give it every moral encouragement. Your resolution we are confident will immediately be known to all the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, will give new hope and new determination to them, to assure broadest possible national observance of "Captive Nations Week" respectfully suggest that President's message call upon all editors to bring issue of captive nations to readers attention during week, and upon clergymen to offer prayers for the liberation of enslaved peoples.

STEFAN KORBONSKI,
Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.
CHRISTOPHER EMMET,
Chairman, American Friends of Captive Nations.
Msgr. JONAS BALKUNAS,
President, Conference of Americans of Central-Eastern European Descent.

Member Bank Reserve Requirements

SPEECH
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1120) to amend the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System against deposits and to eliminate the classification "central reserve city."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I deplore the fact that we cannot have adequate time to discuss an important bill like this. The hearings were not developed. The main document upon which the bill is predicated was not even put in the hearings. This bill ought to go back to the committee. I do not see how we can get adequate consideration for these amendments under a 3-minute rule.

The amendment I have offered will transfer the $15 billion in bonds that have been paid for with Government money once. Why should we expect the taxpayers to pay for these obligations twice? Not only will they have to pay for them twice, but they will have to pay the interest on them each year from now until the time they mature. And if we set a precedent here today of permitting the Reserve to give these bonds to the commercial banks, we are setting a precedent for the people paying their debts not only once, but requiring them to pay them twice. There is nothing to keep them from making us pay this debt three times or four times or five times. How will the American people ever get out of this when after one debt is paid, this debt has been paid by the U.S. Government obligations, it is a bona fide payment. There is no question about it. If we vote to let these bonds be given to the commercial banks as they propose to do and as the evidence conclusively discloses is contemplated to be done by this bill—there is no way on earth for the American people to ever pay the debt they have to pay today.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment be adopted because it will stop this transfer. There is no question about it.

That is what is contemplated. That is what is intended. I do not believe, the gentleman from Georgia himself, would say that the Federal Reserve will not transfer these bonds or a part of them, certainly, to the private commercial banks. He cannot say that because his own hearings disclose that. I state respectfully, Mr. Chairman, that we should have this transfer made for the purpose of cancellation, and not to permit the transfer to the private commercial banks, and then permit those banks not only to take a half billion dollars a year away from the taxpayers, which is now going to the Treasury of the United States, but permit it to go into the hands of the private commercial banks. It is absolutely wrong and I do not think it should be permitted. I hope the Members of the House will vote for this amendment. If you cannot see your way clear to do that, then vote to recommit this bill because it ought to go back to the committee.

Remarks of Vice President Richard M. Nixon at the 11th Biennial Young Republican National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 19, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Vice President NIXON at the 11th biennial young Republican convention:

REMARKS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE 11TH BIENNIAL YOUNG REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION, DENVER, COLO., JUNE 19, 1959

The Republican Party will have an unbeatable case to present to the American voters in 1960.

American wage earners will have the most jobs at the highest wages, with the best standard of living in the history of the country.

Our foreign policy has today, and will have then, the support of the overwhelming majority of the American people, Democrat and Republican alike. It is tragic but true that the death of Secretary Dulles helped to make people in this country and throughout the free world realize that the "inflexibility," "brinkmanship," and "peaceful liberation" for which he was so caustically criticized, represented basic principles of the highest order.

His "inflexibility" represented simply firmness where fundamentals were involved. As he said: "Communism is stubborn for the wrong, let us be steadfast for the right."

His so-called "brinkmanship" was the recognition of another ancient and honorable principle—by looking a great danger in the face we may avert it and lesser perils, that the United States would refuse to be bluffed into surrender.

And to those who scoffed at his advocacy of peaceful liberation for the captive peoples, he was stating the only position that a self-respecting free people could take. The Communists have no hesitancy in proclaiming their faith in the eventual domination of the world by dictators, let it never be said that we were less determined in our dedication to the cause of freedom from tyranny for all people.

History will be the final judge as to the wisdom of the policies of this administration. But of this we can be sure, the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy firmness and strength is right, it has worked and the American people, regardless of party, want it continued.

In 1960, the overwhelming majority of the American people will recognize the striking comparison between the high standards of conduct of this administration and the low state of ethics and morality of the 7 Truman years. No greater service has been rendered by President Eisenhower and his administration than that of restoring confidence and respect of the American people in the honesty and integrity of our Federal officials.

One of the greatest weaknesses of the Republican Party is in its failure to win the support of more younger voters.

It is not enough to ask young people to vote Republican. They must be given an active and important part in our campaign organizations. And one of the most effective ways to enlist their support is to put more young candidates on the ballot at the local, State, and Federal levels.

In 1958, one of the major advantages the Democrats had at all three levels was that generally their candidates were younger, more vigorous and articulate than ours. It is not enough to ask our young Republicans to be simply the balloon blowers, the confetti throwers, and whistle tooters in a campaign. If we want the support of young people, we must earn it by giving them more positions of responsibility and leadership in our organizations.

There is no question but that we have the ingredients for victory in 1960. The great issues will be on our side. The best 8-year record of any administration in history will be working for us. Our Republican organization, learning from the defeat of '58, will be revitalized and strong.

A comparison of our record with that of our Democratic opponents should be enough to assure victory but we have a better case to present, one even more worthy of the great traditions of the Republican Party.

Why is the Republican Party weakest among younger voters? In analyzing the reasons for this, let us see what young people want from government. The great issues of peace, prosperity, security for the future, and honest government have the same appeal to younger voters as to older voters. But in another respect, I believe young people differ from older voters.

There are two conflicting theories as to what is the major motivation for people when they vote. There is one theory that people primarily vote their fears, that they vote against fears—the fear of depression, the fear of inflation, the fear of war—that they vote against rather than for. The other theory is that people vote their hopes—that they vote for those candidates and that party which promises the better life for the future.

But, while both of these motivations affect voters, I do not think there is any question but that generally speaking young people vote their hopes rather than their fears; young people basically are idealistic and progressive; they are not concerned primarily in keeping things as they are; they are more concerned with getting ahead.

Therefore, I believe that if we are to appeal to young people we must do these things. We should point out the magnificent record of accomplishment of the past. We should point out weak points of the record and programs of our opponents. But we should not stop here. We should go further and put our primary emphasis on the hope the Republican policies offer for the future of America.

Let us apply this formula to the issue of inflation. We should point out why inflation is wrong. The fear of what will happen to the value of our pensions, our social security, our life insurance, and the cost of living will concern young people just as it does older voters.

But we should also point out why a sound dollar is right. Only when the dollar tomorrow and 5 years from tomorrow will buy as much as it will today, can you save and plan for your future. And only on the sound foundation of price stability can we avoid a boom-bust cycle and assure that the expansion of our great American economy will be based on solid investment in the future of the Nation rather than on the illusory value of inflated dollars. Let us take deficit spending as another example.

It is pretty well established in the public mind that Republicans generally are for a balanced budget. On the other hand, the Democrats claim that they are for more schools, hospitals, highways, jobs, and security—things which they say more government spending can produce. If this is the way the issue is presented to the people, they will win and we will lose.

We must not allow our Democratic opponents to have a monopoly on being for what people want. The record proves that we have the better case to present.

There are 5 million more jobs in America today than there were in 1952.

In 1952, only 26 percent of American families earned over $5,000. In 1958, 43 percent had an annual income of over $5,000.

The average weekly wage of factory workers today is $90. In 1952, it was $67.97.

In the 7 years of the Truman administration the cost of living went up 50 percent. Under the 7 years of this administration, the increase has been held to 8 percent.

Six hundred thousand more houses were built in the 6 years of this administration than in the 6 years of the Truman administration.

Sixty percent of all American families own their homes today as compared with 56 percent in 1952.

More money has been apportioned to the States for highways under this administration than during the previous 40 years.

More than twice as many school classrooms have been built during the 6 years of this administration than during the 6 years of the Truman administration.

Over four times as much money has been appropriated for medical research than under the Truman administration.

Eleven million more Americans have social security today than had it in 1952 and benefits have been increased by 25 percent.

In summary, the Republican administration produced the things that the Democrats promised.

The choice is not between a balanced budget and progress as the spenders try to make it appear, but between real progress based on a sound foundation as compared with the illusion of progress on an unsound base. In essence, they want Government to spend more. We want people to spend more. Our programs work and and theirs don't.

The lesson for Republicans, if we want to win the support of millions of younger voters, is very simply this: A defensive static, keep-things-as-they-are philosophy, never wins against an offensive, dynamic, progressive program.

The trouble in the past has been this: The spenders' words are dynamic, their actions static. Our actions are dynamic, our words static. What we need are words to match our actions.

We should be proud of the fact that the Republican Party is the party of sound policies, of safe policies, of conservative policies. But we must constantly reiterate basic truths—that we are conservative because we want progress, that we oppose the big Government programs of our opponents not because they promise too much but because they will produce too little; that as a party we have faith in America, a belief in its future—a future in which people, rather than government, will play an ever-increasing and dynamic role.

Foreign Aid Serves a Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 11, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, to a greater degree than with most of our programs, the results which we get with our foreign aid expenditures are difficult to appraise.

When we embark upon a highway program, either the highways get built or they do not. When we fight a war, we win it or we lose it. But in a program of economic assistance to freedom-loving nations, we can never know with certainty how much improved the free world is because of the program, or how much worse off we might have been without it. The mistakes are often easier to see than the accomplishments.

The unfortunate result is that foreign aid too frequently is discussed with a passion, pro or con, which generates more heat than light.

A notable exception was a recent editorial in The Flint Journal of June 23, 1959, which approaches this controversial program with levelheaded logic, admitting its weaknesses and assessing its strengths, and finding in favor of foreign aid. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial, which follows:

[From the Flint (Mich.) Journal, June 23, 1959]

FOREIGN AID SERVES A PURPOSE

The central committee of the Soviet Communist Party meets in Moscow Wednesday, this time under a spotlight of publicity.

The reason for the unusual openness of the meeting is the Kremlin's desire for ballyhoo about the Russian position in the economic war with the West.

Ordinarily the central committee meets secretly. About all the Russian people, and the world, learn is contained in propaganda announcements afterwards.

This time it is different. Pravda announced the meeting date in advance and even published an agenda. It is obvious that the Kremlin is seeking world notice about its progress in developing industry and trade.

It became apparent many months ago that Premier Khrushchev was emphasizing trade in his efforts to sell other nations of the world on the superiority of communism.

Khruschchev declared war in the marketplace. Russian goods were offered the world at ridiculous prices.

The Soviet Government is using the sweat of its toil-burdened people to get into the world market at prices which democratic nations cannot match because their people expect a fair return for their efforts. The Kremlin doesn't have to operate under the handicap of proper compensation to Russian workers.

Experts see in the economic war a greater threat to the West than a shooting war. If the Russian people can carry the burden long enough, they envision Soviet domination of world markets at the expense of free nations.

The Moscow meetings, and their possible propaganda value, bring renewed attention to America's program of economic assistance to nations which need help if they are to avoid capitulation to communism.

Foreign aid is not the Nation's most popular program, either with Congress or the people. The thought of billions hauled from American taxpayers going abroad to help some nation we know little about brings an angry, tooth-gnashing reaction.

Statesmen and military experts may argue ceaselessly that foreign aid is essential to the security of the free world and the cheapest defense the United States can buy, but a lot of Congressmen and citizens are not convinced.

We cannot afford to lose this economic war if we are to retain world leadership and our high standard of living. There are more than a billion people in underdeveloped lands and they could line up in the Communist camp unless we help them.

Indonesia, Ceylon, and Afghanistan are among those nations. The people there know they can gain economic help from Russia, but they are convinced that the only place they can turn to for aid with freedom is the United States.

One newspaper editor in Ceylon said that "in the struggle between democracy and communism, we are on the side of democracy." But, he added: "The only way you can stop communism is in helping these countries help themselves."

Supporters of foreign aid cite Greece as the outstanding example of the benefits we can obtain from a program of economic and military assistance to foreign nations.

After Greece was liberated from fascism in 1944, it had a Communist revolution. The Reds appeared near victory because of economic conditions, but U.S. aid saved Greece from slipping behind the Iron Curtain.

Today, Greece is almost self-sufficient in food. It is the 11th greatest maritime nation, and would be fourth if all Greek-owned ships were registered under the Greek flag. Inflation has been licked. The currency is stable. Greece is a strong pro-American bulwark in the Eastern Mediterranean.

It cost us $1.8 billion to save Greece from communism. We're still spending a little there, but Greece is close to becoming self-sufficient. How much a Communist regime in Greece would have cost us is only a guess.

Not all American aid is successful. We have lost the friendship of some nations despite economic aid. There has been waste and corruption. Some of our dollars have gone to Communist nations.

Despite its failures and frailties, and they are many, the foreign aid program has been of great value in the conflict to keep freedom and democracy from being swallowed by communism.

It is difficult not to believe that eventually even the opponents of foreign aid will become aware of the contribution it has made to the preservation of peace and freedom.

Member Bank Reserve Requirements

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1120) to amend the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System against deposits and to eliminate the classification "central reserve city."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, here in the Brown committee hearings on page 28 there is an answer to the American Bankers Association committee that says they want to transfer $15 billion from the Federal Reserve Banks to the private commercial banks. And what does the Federal Reserve Board say on page 26 of the hearing before the Brown committee?

This would in effect insure earnings, assets, from the Federal Reserve banks to member banks.

What are they talking about if they are not talking about that $15 billion? There is nothing else before them. That is what they were discussing. That is what the American Bankers Association wants to do. That is the only reason they put this in here. And, furthermore, it says that the present systems portfolio is sufficient to permit it to be done. It is here in black and white. It is in fine print, but it is in this volume; and there was not a single question asked about this before the subcommittee or before the full committee, not one.

So this question has not been developed, and I believe we ought to have all the facts. We ought to adopt this amendment that will permit the transfer just exactly like the Federal Reserve Board says here can be done, by transferring the earnings, assets, $500 million will not go into the U.S. Treasury this year; it will go to the private commercial banks.

How can we defend that at a time when we are trying to balance the budget and we take half a billion dollars cut and transfer them and give them away, because you allow the reserves free of charge to take these bonds. You are giving them away because the private commercial banks are not paying 1 penny for them, just exactly like they did in 1953. They created enough reserves for the private banks to buy free of charge $10.5 billion worth of U.S. Government securities, and they bought them. The reserves were given to them for the purpose of making business loans to bring our country out of a recession, but instead of spending the money for

the purpose intended they bought U.S. Government securities. Mr. Martin admitted this when I interrogated him when he was before the Joint Economic Committee. So there is no doubt it. It has been done; it can be done; it will be done.

The Case for Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that before very long we will have before us a most important piece of legislation known as the fair trade bill. The purpose of this bill is to equalize rights in the distribution of name brand merchandise by establishing a permissive national resale maintenance program. The bill, if enacted, will enable the small retailer to compete in marketing branded commodities with the large, independent manufacturers and wholesalers who are sufficiently integrated to control their own outlets.

What the public seldom realizes is that the larger retailers can afford profitless prices only if the leader loss is recouped somewhere else in unidentified or inferior goods. Manufacturers suffer because the leader-loss prices drive out smaller competition; profitless prices tend to become established prices; outlets are narrowed and there are fewer markets for the consumer.

An editorial which appeared recently in the Cincinnati Inquirer succinctly describes the hazards which face small businesses in marketing identified merchandise and gives a clear picture of the advantages which would derive to manufacturers, retailers, and consumers by enactment of a Federal fair trade law. I seriously urge my colleagues to take a minute to read this editorial before H.R. 1253 comes before this body:

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, June 4, 1959]

THE CASE FOR FAIR TRADE

Few subjects in our modern economic life have been discussed as vehemently—and with less real comprehension of the underlying principle—as fair trade.

The popular concept is that fair trade laws are enacted to keep people from getting bargains, or to prevent healthful competition, or to make the public pay more for manufactured goods than they are worth.

To see what fair trade really means, and how it operates, let's suppose you organize a company. You're going to manufacture electric irons, good electric irons, the best that can be made. You pay for research, to obtain the latest features in your product. You buy expensive machinery, hire skilled craftsmen, organize a merchandising and advertising campaign to create a popular demand for your irons.

Your electric iron is not cheap, but you are convinced that the public will pay a fair price for a really good iron.

First, though, you must sell them to appliance dealers throughout the country—unless you intend to operate thousands of retail stores yourself, which would be uneconomical if not impossible.

The thing that the appliance dealer wants to know is: Can he sell them, or will he get stuck with them?

In your case, it being a good iron and properly promoted, he can be convinced of its salability. But he might be stuck with them in another way. Suppose, after he's purchased a good inventory and sold some to his best customers, a discount house or the like around the corner starts selling them at wholesale?

His best customers will accuse the dealer of having gypped them. And if the retailer tries to meet the wholesale price, he is soon out of business. After all, he is renting his store, paying his help and keeping going on the usual traditional spread between wholesale and retail prices.

This doesn't have to happen too often, or too long, before you and your good iron manufacturing company are caught in a deadly vise. Once your product has gone the round of the discount houses and the special sales, how many retailers are going to stock up on your iron? And when you lose the promotion and merchandising support of the ethical retailers, even the discount houses and special sellers will lose interest in you. Or they'll demand special price concessions that would make it impossible for you to continue manufacturing a good iron.

Fair trade, in essence, requires all dealers in your product to observe the suggested price. It is a protection for the independent retailer as well as the manufacturer of trade name wares.

It does not end competition. Nonfair-traded products are subject to any price manipulation. And there always is the compelling factor of rivalry between manufacturers in the various fields.

What is so heinous about permitting a man—you, in the electric iron business—to suggest a retail price that will be adequate to keep you and your retailers in business?

The issue is being threshed out in Congress and the State legislatures. The public, we think, would do well to look at the broad principle involved. The bargains available when fair trade breaks down may be very illusory.

Lansing Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 11, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have previously called to the attention of the House that this is an important year for the city of Lansing, the capital of the great State of Michigan. The city was incorporated an even hundred years ago, and during these intervening years we have had 100 years of progress, growth and improvement.

To review the accomplishments during this first century, to express confidence for an even better century to come, and also to give the rest of the Nation an opportunity to share in the pride of one of its greatest cities, Lansing staged a gigantic centennial celebration which started February 15.

On Sunday, June 28, the official centennial program drew to a close, after nearly 5 months of spectacular activities.

The story of Lansing's centennial celebration now becomes an integral part of Americana, and should be recorded and preserved. In the Sunday, June 28, 1959, issue of the State Journal, of Lansing, PAT MCCARTHY expertly summarized the highlights of this extended pageant. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article, which follows:

[From the State Journal, Lansing, Mich., June 28, 1959]

LANSING CENTENNIAL

(By Pat McCarthy)

When the final rocket sputters and blinks out after the "Four To Go" performance Sunday night, it will mark the end of the biggest event in Lansing's history.

Bringing together more people—both as audiences and participants—than any in the city's 100 years, the centennial year program officially began last February 15.

Food, music, and dances of eight nationalities will be featured in the Centennial International Day events Sunday afternoon at booths in the 100 block of South Washington Avenue. In the event of rain, the events will be staged in the Civic Center.

The afternoon program and final performance of the colorful outdoor spectacle, "Four To Go," will raise to a quarter of a million the total number of participants and audiences for the many phases of the 5-month program.

H. Andrews Hays, chairman of the program, noted that the centennial events brought out thousands of participants who had never taken part in a community program before.

Core of the centennial participation was the Centennial Belles and Brothers of the Brush chapters. The ladies developed a membership list of close to 7,000 and the men had 5,000 official beardgrowers.

There were another 1,000 men who wore the emblem of the chicken—a permit to keep faces clean shaven during the reign of the beards.

The numerous chapters were instrumental in promoting the wide variety of centennial events as well as developing individual chapter programs such as dances, benefits, or visits to the bedridden. One of the big activities, a coeducational one, involved the five Saturday caravans throughout central Michigan, with about 1,000, all told, taking part.

The two crowning events, of course, were the 5-hour history of transportation parade, May 23, and the nine-performance "Four To Go," each a superlative spectacle in its own right.

The parade, featuring units from all parts of the Nation as well as all phases of transportation, involved approximately 7,000 persons in the 2-mile line of march and was viewed by an estimated 175,000 persons—not including those who saw it on television.

The colorful outdoor show at Memorial Field involved a cast and crew of more than 1,200 persons and will have played to roughly 30,000 people.

Both events—as well as others—involved thousands of hours of hard work by volunteer committee workers. The actual committees themselves totaled close to 500 persons, many of them working on more than one committee.

It meant evenings away from home, hurried meetings sandwiched in along with a hastily gulped lunch—and a large measure of forbearance on the part of many employers whose workers were permitted to make use of working hours to help in the huge birthday program.

The businesses and industries themselves pitched in substantially to support the $134,000 budget of the overall program. Souvenirs, tickets, and Belle and Brother memberships also played a big role in finances.

While participation on a truly community-wide basis was the major outcome of the program, it was successful also in promoting the city throughout the State and Nation.

City officials exchanged felicitations with Oregon State officials, also marking a centennial year—and had a little fun arguing over which, the city or the State, was going to be first in line for a huge order of centennial hats.

It all stated 2 years ago with the organization of a planning committee by the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Lansing.

Consultation with MSU officials gained the benefit of experiences in their 1955 observance. A committee of 15 was named by the chamber in August of 1957, and in March of 1958 Mayor Ralph W. Crego appointed a committee of six which incorporated as a nonprofit corporation. It included Councilman Horace J. Bradshaw, Councilwoman Lucile Belen, Albert C. Boyd, secretary-manager of the Greater Lansing Chamber of Commerce; H. Andrews Hays, vice president of the American Bank & Trust Co.; Paul A. Martin, publisher of the State Journal; Elton Tubbs, president of the Greater Lansing Labor Council; and, later, Harold Fildey, public relations director of the State Journal.

A contest was sponsored to develop a seal and slogan—and the picture of the seal was virtually reproduced with the construction of a log cabin on the city hall plaza this spring.

The city and its centennial were publicized with a huge float which was entered in a number of celebration parades throughout the State, including the one at the Mackinac Bridge.

Stamps bearing the blue and red centennial seal were sold in a citywide drive in November. Later in the same month the centennial directors signed contracts with the John B. Rogers Producing Co. of Fostoria, Ohio., which has since supplied professional personnel and know-how for the planning of centennial events.

Centennial Sabbath, February 15, officially marked the opening of the observance with the week devoted to the dedication progam and open house for the new city hall—with officials from all parts of the State attending.

The same date, February 15, 100 years ago marked the approval of the Lansing city charter by the legislature.

Then came the famous citizens banquet—with 26 presented at a formal dinner program in the civic center, the centennial fashion show presented by the women's division of the Greater Lansing Safety Council, the Arbor Day planting of the centennial tree, the 2-day century of music show at the civic center featuring local talent, the transportation and industrial show in conjunction with the history of transportation parade, a vintage car rally, and the innumerable events and activities throughout the 10-day climax which ends today, featuring every phase of the city's life.

Like a youngster who has enjoyed his first birthday party, the city can now draw a deep breath of relaxation after celebrating the passing of its first century.

UNESCO Sister-City Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the city of Boulder, Colo., is continuing to demonstrate the kind of friendly international cooperation between people of similar cities that ultimately will do much to build friendship and understanding among the peoples of the nations. I commend to the attention of the Members the latest friendly exchange between Boulder and Meppel of the Netherlands:

[From the Colorado Daily, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.]

BOULDER RESIDENTS SEND GREETING TO DUTCH CITY ON TAPE RECORDING

A friendly greeting from Boulder residents is on its way overseas to the Dutch city of Meppel.

The greeting, a tape recording featuring some of the Colorado city's civic and cultural leaders, is accompanied by a package containing such gifts as photographs, and typical work projects of elementary and secondary schools, as well as the university.

Produced by the radio-television department, the tape recording will be broadcast over Holland radio stations, as well as in school and civic groups.

The tape and gift package were placed with a representative of KLM, Royal Dutch Air Lines, last week in Denver. They will be flown to New York and placed aboard a KLM plane for shipment to the Netherlands.

The tape, consisting of messages and sound pictures of life in Boulder, is in response to a similar greeting from Meppel containing messages from Burgomaster and Mrs. Atonie Kleijn and several other Meppel leaders.

Other gift items being sent to Holland include a loaf cake baked by Mrs. W. Post van der Berg, of Boulder; some typical recipes used in Colorado kitchens; miniature rock collections; and photographs of the State of Colorado.

In charge of the tape recording in Boulder has been a group made up of Mrs. Ethel Auger, Boulder High School United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; Miss Helen Schlytern and Miss Barbara Williams, Casey Junior High UNESCO; and Mrs. Addison M. Talbot and George F. Reynolds, Boulder UNESCO Council.

The Boulder tape to Meppel is narrated by a 21-year-old student at the university, Miss Hendrika Dina "Ridi" Stolker. Miss Stolker is at the university majoring in premedicine. Her home is in Driebergn, Netherlands.

Conditions in New York Kept From New Yorkers by Paper Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include, therewith, the reproduction of an editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Journal as it appeared in the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier on Sunday, June 28, 1959.

The editorial, dealing with two editorials from the Shreveport paper, indicates how the paper curtain of the North suppresses its news and demonstrates how humanity is prevented from knowing what goes on in the New York jungle. When will the truths about conditions in New York be told to the people of New York?

REPORTING THE NEWS NORTH AND SOUTH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is the text of two editorials published in the Shreveport (La.) Journal June 22 and June 25, respectively. The editorials make clear the difficulties under which southern newspapers labor in their efforts to obtain full and complete accounts of racial crime in the North—accounts which are equal in scope to those readily made available to northern papers by southern members of press associations. Many southern newspapers, including the News and Courier, recently made efforts similar to those cited by the Journal.)

Last Friday the Associated Press teletype machines in the Journal's editorial rooms ticked out eight tiny paragraphs which related that a 14-year-old white schoolgirl in New York had been raped by a Negro.

After reading down to the sixth paragraph we learned that there were six Negroes involved—not just one. And, reading on to the seventh paragraph, we found out that the girl had also been beaten and dragged across the schoolyard—not merely raped.

In the meantime, not a line had been received from the AP's rival, United Press International. A few lines showed up later.

The lack of attention which the New York case was receiving as compared to that which was given the rape of a 19-year-old Negro coed by four young white men in Florida was all too typical. When a crime against a Negro is committed in the South, the northern press turns out en masse for a field day. Newspaper reporters, biased magazine writers, television cameramen with eyes trained for the seamy side of life, and motion picture photographers descend upon the scene and stage a little carnival of their own. When they're finished with their chores the South is smeared again.

But let a crime against a white person be committed by a Negro in the North and the silence is deafening. Seemingly, the wire services' prize-winning reporters suddenly become blind and paralyzed and are unable to write a single line about the horror which has occurred.

Cameramen are away on distant assignments and the ones left behind can't get their equipment into focus.

News magazines, which Gov. Orval Faubus of Arkansas says are printed for people who can't think, and picture magazines which he says are printed for people who can't read, are completely disinterested. We're used to this sort of treatment by now.

Still, the slighting of the New York rape case by the wire services Friday caused us to make one more protest. We ignored the United Press International but—with tongue in cheek—we sent the following telegram to New Orleans' Bureau of the Associated Press and to the AP's general offices in New York.

"Appreciate 2,000 words on gang-rape of 14-year-old white girl in New York. Want comparison between New York case, in which girl raped by one Negro while five others looked on, and Florida case in which Negro co-ed raped by four whites. Point out no brutality in Florida, while white girl in New York beaten and dragged to her fate. Appreciate dispatching Relman Morin (the AP's reporter who won the Pulitzer prize for smearing Little Rock) to scene. Interview parents. Get editorial reaction North, East, South, and West. Want full picture coverage. Contact president of the American Association of Citizens' Councils in Greenwood, Miss., for statement. Ask NAACP if any prayer groups, organized to seek justice for Negroes. Anything from Eisenhower? Please keep story running daily till settled. Please expedite."

Ridiculous requests? Not at all.

Every one of these steps would have been taken by the AP and UPI at the urgings of

northern newspapers if a 14-year-old southern Negro school girl had been raped by a southern white man on her school grounds in the South while five other southern whites looked on.

Our protest could not have been given better timing. Whether it had anything to do with subsequent developments we do not know, but by Saturday morning it was apparent the Associated Press was giving greatly increased attention to the New York rape case.

For one thing, the AP's reporters had discovered by Saturday that the 14-year-old white girl had been raped by three of the Negroes, instead of one, as originally reported. In addition, the AP had discovered that one of the six Negro gangsters involved in the attack had actually held the 14-year-old white girl while the three Negroes criminally assaulted her. And it had reaffirmed the fact that the girl was beaten and dragged across the schoolyard—adding the new information that she was also gagged.

But best of all was this additional Associated Press story which bares the hypocrisy of the northern press:

"NEW YORK.—New York newspapers, which gave considerable page 1 attention to last week's Tallahasse, Fla., race trial, Friday did not front-page the New York rape of a white teenager by six Negro youths.

"The Post gave the New York story a column on page 4. * * *

"The New York rape made page 10 of the Journal-American, page 21 of the World-Telegram, page 5 of the Morning Daily News, page 3 of the Morning Mirror, page 3 of the morning Herald Tribune, and page 11 of the Times."

We congratulate the Associated Press, the world's largest news gathering organization, on its awakening to the gravity of the New York rape case.

We still have no details from United Press International, but we are forwarding to UPI a copy of our telegram to the AP.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is the Shreveport Journal editorial published June 25.)

Now that the Associated Press and United Press International News Services are no longer asleep and there is at least a semblance of interracial-strife news flowing out of New York, it will be interesting to note the progress in the trial of four Negro rapists who assaulted a defenseless little 14-year-old white girl.

After 3 days of silence, United Press International finally came through Tuesday with a story of the rape. Revelations that the girl had previously been in a 10-minute "kissing session" with one of the Negroes stands as an indictment of the whole school integration scheme.

Although utterly ridiculous, the Negroes' request through their attorneys that the press be barred from their trial should not be surprising to anyone.

Having observed that the Supreme Court has overruled the U.S. Constitution in ordering the individual States to force white and Negro children to mix in the public schools, the Negro rapists probably figure the Supreme Court will uphold them in their demand that freedom of the press be abolished.

After all, the Negro rapists possibly have reasoned if the Supreme Court can outlaw the 10th amendment guaranteeing States rights in matters not delegated to the Federal Government, then there is no reason why it can't destroy freedom of the press as guaranteed in the first of the Bill of Rights.

The Negroes' attorneys argued that the rapists' chances for leniency were being hurt by newspaper publicity. For this reason, they said, no newspapermen—not even the northern integrationist variety—should be permitted in the courtroom.

Judge Milton Solomon, who deserves the Nation's praise for the manner in which he has handled the case thus far, quickly informed the Negroes' attorneys that the rapists would receive a fair trial in his court—that the presence of newspapermen would not influence the outcome. All Judge Solomon has to worry about now is a possible reversal of his decision by the Supreme Court—meeting in emergency session at the request of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The NAACP, of course, did not object to the great amount of attention which newspapermen gave to the Tallahassee trial of four young white men accused of raping a 19-year-old Negro coed.

The Florida rapists should watch the outcome of the Negroes' trial in New York. If the Negroes' attorneys should somehow get their wishes, then the Florida rapists could appeal for new trials on the grounds that newspapermen were present when they were found guilty and given life sentences.

Member Bank Reserve Requirements

SPEECH
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1120) to amend the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System against deposits and to eliminate the classification "central reserve city."

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment eliminates two features of the bill to which the Federal Reserve Board has objected: First, the elimination of the "central reserve city" classification of the New York and Chicago banks; and second, mandatory reduction in required reserves of these banks. It would leave in the bill the vault-cash provision, and it would leave in the bill the authority for the Federal Reserve Board to permit individual banks in New York, Chicago, and other cities to carry required reserves against demand deposits at the same level as is prescribed for country banks.

This bill, as the gentleman from California said, has no mandatory provision for the country banks, with respect to the vault cash. They are left out. In trying to drum up support for this bill they say that this is a country bank bill. This will help the country banks. But in writing the bill there is no requirement that the Federal Reserve Board must use vault cash as reserves at any time in whole or in part. In the New York and Chicago banks where these fellows are playing for keeps—they are not overlooking a thing—they got theirs put in. It is mandatory that by 1962 they have this reduction down to a 10 percent minimum. How can you justify not having the mandatory requirement for vault cash to be used by 1962 for the small banks and at the same time have it for the big city banks that profit more from our system than the banks of any other system of the Nation? I do not understand that.

So I urge the Committee to adopt this amendment. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The Serbian Struggle for Freedom Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 10, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, June 28, was a Serbian national holiday known as Vedovam, an event which marks the 570th anniversary of the Battle of Kossovo.

It is important today that all freedom-loving people understand the significance of Vedovam and its contemporary parallel in the Soviet-dominated countries.

Vedovam commemorates a defeat, a defeat which was so tragic that its repercussions have been felt for over 500 years. Its memory can still inspire the Serbian people to victory over repression.

It is not easy for those of us who are not brought up in the Serbian tradition to appreciate the real impact of the Battle of Kossovo unless we compare it to similar situations in Western history. To the Serbians, Kossovo was more disastrous than was Flodden to the Scots, a defeat in 1513 in which king and army perished; and it was more deflating to the empire than the Battle of Hastings was to England in 1066, a defeat which enabled a conquering race to impose its will on all England.

The decisive Battle of Kossovo was fought on June 28, 1389, against Turkey.

On that day, the Serbian forces met the Turkish Army on the fatal "field of blackbirds," in the plain of Kossovo, and lost the fight.

The echoes of the battle reverberated in all parts of Serbia, for from that day in the 14th century until early in the 19th century, the Serbian people were subjected to a suppression of their language, civilization, nationality, religion, and culture.

Domination by a foreign power did not subdue the indomitable spirit of the Serbians, and despite centuries of oppression, this proud people retained their national traditions and their love of freedom.

Today the Serbians are again enslaved, by the bondage of Soviet tyranny.

Many of these brave people were fortunate enough to escape the Communist regime, and I am proud to say that a number of them have settled in Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital that we realize the valiant history and freedom-seeking spirit of the Serbian people. The Serbians have faced and surmounted severe

difficulties with courage and strength; they have shown unconquerable loyalty and devotion to their traditions; and they have consistently demonstrated their independence of spirit.

Mr. Speaker, in calling attention to Vedovam and its importance as a Serbian national holiday, I express the firm hope that, on the 570th anniversary of the Battle of Kossovo, we may recall the past struggles of the Serbian people and not forget their present struggle to achieve freedom and independence.

Sound Vetoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial, entitled "Sound Vetoes," which appeared in the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star of June 30, 1959:

SOUND VETOES

President Eisenhower's statesmanship and courage are apparent in his firm vetoes of the wheat and tobacco bills. He has shown far greater concern for the best interests of the farmers and the national economy than has the Democratic-controlled Congress, which is intent on playing politics with the farm problem.

There is little prospect that either veto will be overridden by Congress, because neither bill was enacted originally by a two-thirds margin. There are enough sensible men in Congress to sustain the vetoes.

The wheat bill was another Democratic bid for farm votes at heavy cost to the taxpayers and scant benefit to the farmers. Under the measure, wheat acreage of individual farmers would have been reduced 25 percent in 1960 and 1961 and the Federal support price would have been raised from the present $1.81 a bushel to about $2.20 a bushel. The formula of cutting planting allotments and boosting price supports is a proven failure.

President Eisenhower said in his veto message that the bill prescribes for a sick patient another dose of what caused his illness. Return to discredited high, rigid price supports, he declared, would hasten the complete collapse of the entire wheat program.

The President's stand is strongly supported by responsible farm leaders. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, said recently that the wheat bill passed by Congress would further stimulate surplus production, increase the cost to taxpayers, and reduce farm income. He pointed out that farm income has declined under present Government price-fixing programs which encourage surplus production.

President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson are striving to reduce the surplus burden and restore the independence of the farmer by keeping price supports flexible and reducing them to move production into balance with demand. The administration has proposed that Congress either base wheat supports on previous market-price averages or give Benson authority to set supports between zero and 90 percent of parity. The present wheat program provides for 75 percent of parity on a total allotment of 55 million acres.

The greatest improvement in farm prices has been in commodities not subject to price control. Where the forces of supply and demand are allowed to work more freely, the farmers are doing better. Congress will not help the farmers until it lets natural market needs guide farmers in what they produce.

Annual Report of Dairyland Power Cooperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I received from Mr. John P. Madgett, general manager of Dairyland Power Cooperative, of La Crosse, Wis., a copy of their 1958 report.

The report represents the splendid way in which this cooperative is bringing improved and expanded electric service to more than 100,000 rural consumers throughout a four-State service area.

Over the years, Dairyland Power Cooperative, and others like it, have aided our farmers tremendously in helping them to weather the economic storms.

Through cooperative electrical service, for example, power and light have been brought to marginal areas not profitable for other power-providing interests. As a result, more American farm families today are enjoying the benefits which light and power through electricity can bring to the American home and farm.

We recall that, from time to time, cooperatives have been the targets of criticism.

We recognize, of course, that there is a need for fairness and equity in treatment of all segments of the economy—whether this relates to taxes, competition, or other factors.

Within their proper role, however, I believe the co-ops have—and should be afforded the opportunity to continue, and strengthen their constructive efforts to bring benefits to our farmers as well as others in the economy.

As an illustration of the scope of services being provided by cooperatives for rural America, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the annual report printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF OPERATIONS FOR YEAR 1958—GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT

Continued growth and development were significantly evident in the operations and activities of Dairyland Power Cooperative during 1958. New high levels were established in almost every category in bringing to farm people and rural businesses more electric power at lower cost.

REVENUES

Revenues from increased power sales reached a new high, being in excess of $8.4 million, or 11 percent over the year before. With member cooperative dollar purchases being 10.7 percent higher, they accounted for 93 percent of total revenues. Receipts from sales to member utilities were 14.7 percent higher.

ENERGY SALES

Systemwide energy sales were 9.1 percent greater. Member cooperatives increased their purchases by 11.2 percent, their requirements being in excess of 645 million kilowatt hours. Wholesale power sales of 106 million kilowatt hours to eight utility members were 3.5 percent higher. The demand for more electricity throughout the Dairyland service area is emphasized when we realize that sales to member cooperatives were almost six times greater than in 1947.

The almost 100,000 member consumers in the Dairyland system increased their average monthly usage of energy from 513 kilowatt hours to 562, an increase of 9.6 percent. Part of this increase can be attributed to the sustained cold of December. The usage that month was 22 percent higher than the year before. This experience illustrates that our system load is becoming more temperature sensitive. As indicated later in this report, our long-range plan studies show that the 15 to 20 years' loads are expected to be more than four times greater than at present.

GENERATION

Systemwide gross generation of power reached a new high, in excess of 861 million kilowatt hours, an increase of 7.5 percent. Steam stations produced 90.4 percent of this total, hydro stations 9.1 percent, with 0.5 percent coming from diesel. This was the fourth straight year that water flow in the Flambeau River was below average, even though hydro generation was one-fifth higher than in 1957.

The new 50,000 kilowatt reheat unit at Alma experienced its first complete year of operation and generated more than 334 million kilowatt hours, or 38.8 percent of total gross generation. This was more power than Dairyland sold to all member cooperatives during 1952. By using this largest and most efficient unit to the maximum, it is estimated that fuel cost savings of $185,000 resulted during the year.

This saving is reflected in yet another way. Although there was an increase in systemwide steam generation in 1958 over 1957 of 7.1 percent, yet there was an increase in coal consumption of only 8,900 tons, or 2.4 percent. With the addition of the 80,000 kilowatt Alma No. 5 unit scheduled for operation in the late fall of 1959, even greater savings are expected.

Generation of power

[In kilowatt-hours]

	Gross	Net
Steam:		
Alma	541,845,000	510,870,100
Genoa	3,039,100	2,407,600
Stoneman	238,091,700	221,659,600
Hydro:		
Flambeau	52,590,600	52,371,300
Ladysmith	10,153,700	10,138,250
Port Arthur	3,093,800	3,086,840
Thornapple	8,379,000	8,363,448
Diesel:		
Chippewa	117,600	66,300
Twin Lakes	4,159,400	3,963,100
Total generation	861,469,900	812,926,538

Dairyand's 1958 net margins exceeded $1.4 million and were the largest for any single year in its history, despite increased operating expenses induced by inflation. When related, however, to the size and scope of Dairyland's operations, these margins, however satisfactory, are modest. They represent 2.4 percent of the original cost of electric plant, or 2.1 percent of total assets. These margins build up member equity

which in the long run is highly important in terms of securing Dairyland's future. With increased investment in an expanding system, Dairyland's interest and principal payments will be increasing each year. In addition, it is important that we protect our reserves for depreciation to provide for eventual replacement of facilities.

COST OF PRODUCING POWER

The year 1958 brought realization to a long-sought goal. For the first time in Dairyland's 21-year history, 1-cent electricity became a reality. The net average cost per kilowatt hour delivered to the member cooperatives was actually .987 cents. This represents a reduction of 7.1 percent below 1957 costs and is 34 percent below 1947, which was 1.496 cents. It is noteworthy that during 9 of the last 11 years the cost was reduced, even though during the same period the cost of living was increased by 29.2 percent. As the farmers in the Dairyland system keep on finding that electricity does more for them while costing less, Dairyland is fulfilling its basic major objective of contributing to rural progress.

OPERATING EXPENSES

The auditor's statement of revenues and expenses portrays the overall financial operating picture for 1958. Operating expenses, when added to interest and other deductions, totaled $7,225,614, an increase of $289,911 or 4.8 percent. Operating expenses, considered separately, were $6,238,209, an increase of $216,563 or 3.6 percent.

Production expenses in generating plants amounted to $3,061,986, representing an actual decrease of 1.5 percent over the previous year. Two major factors account for this decrease: (1) increased efficiency because of the operation of the Alma No. 4 unit, and (2) decrease in net coal costs of an average of 19 cents per ton, or 3.1 percent.

Dairyland, for the first time, had its own fleet of barges operating during the navigation season of 1958 and was able to haul a considerable portion of its own tonnage requirements. Even though the fleet did not operate a complete season, it proved to be a profitable venture and should be even more so during the complete navigation season of 1959. These various savings offset increases in personnel and supply expenses. Steam production expenses amounted to 93.3 percent of total expenses in generation.

Total operating and maintenance expenses in transmission decreased $12,959, or 2.6 percent less than in 1957. Transmission line operating and maintenance cost per mile decreased from $156.40 in 1957 to $138.48 for 1958. Substation operating and maintenance cost per kilovolt-ampere increased slightly from 19 cents to 21 cents.

A major increase in operating expenses was the item of depreciation. $1,809,203 was charged for this purpose to operating expenses in 1958, a 15.5 percent increase over the prior year. This represents 21.4 cents per dollar received as compared with 20.6 cents in 1957. The statement of assets shows that Dairyland's total depreciation reserve at the end of the year was $10,786,491, an increase of 11.1 percent. Dairyland's total direct tax bill in 1958, as charged to operations, amounted to $313,377, somewhat less than the year before due primarily to property reassessment adjustments and increased charges to construction.

Interest and other deductions for the year amounted to a net of $987,404, or 8 percent over the prior year. Dairyland again, as it has throughout its 21-year history, met all principal and interest payments on time, and in addition has a cushion of credit, or payments ahead of schedule of $1,629,540. At the end of 1958 scheduled principal repayments to the Rural Electrification Administration aggregated $8,168,000. Interest payments made to date on outstanding loans amounted to $5,285,000—a repayment record which it is our every intention to maintain.

NEW CONSTRUCTION DURING 1956

During the year total expenditures for additions and improvements to the system were $6,266,000, of which 81 percent was for generation, 16 percent for transmission, and 3 percent for general plant. Major additions completed during the year were as follows:

1. Five 1,500 kilovolt-ampere distribution substations with connecting 69-kilovolt transmission lines were contructed as follows:

Member served	Approximate location	Miles 69 kilovolts
Lafayette	Argyle, Wis	6.38
Vernon	Hillsboro, Wis	5.55
Buffalo	Cochrane, Wis	10.77
Barron	Cumberland, Wis	8.59
Oakdale	New Lisbon, Wis	13.37

2. A 4.86-mile 69-kilovolt line and a 69-kilovolt bay addition to the Rochester transmission substation for an interconnection with the city of Rochester municipal powerplant.

3. A 3,000 kilovolt-ampere substation located near Mt. Carroll, Ill., for an emergency interconnection with Interstate Power Co.

4. Supervisory equipment was partially installed to operate 10 transmission substations by remote control from La Crosse.

5. Construction work began on the new 80,000 kilowatt reheat unit at the Alma station.

PLANT IN SERVICE

Dairyland requires large sums of money for initial investment. The construction program of 1958 exceeded $6¼ million which when added to scheduled expenditures of almost $9½ million during 1959, means a 2-year program of $15¾ million.

Classified and unclassified plant in service at original cost at the end of 1958 amounted to $59,610,438, an increase over the previous year of $3,029,115, or 5.4 percent. The average cost of plant in service per member consumer is $618, or $2,292,709 per member cooperative. At the end of 1947, electric plant amounted to $3,677,994. At the end of 1959, plant in service is scheduled to exceed $72 million.

Dairyland's pioneering diesel station at Chippewa Falls went on the line in March 1938. The five remaining units were sold during 1958 and are scheduled for removal during the summer of 1959. Facilities in service at the end of the year were as follows:

Generating stations

	Number of units	Total plant net capability in kilowatts
Steam:		
Alma	4	118,300
Genoa	4	14,700
Stoneman	2	51,700
Hydro:		
Flambeau	3	20,000
Ladysmith	2	1,800
Port Arthur	2	500
Thornapple	2	1,400
Diesel:		
Chippewa	5	3,400
Twin Lakes	4	9,600
Total generating capacity in service		221,400

Transmission lines

Voltage:	Length (miles)
161 kilovolts	166.62
69 kilovolts	865.29
34.5 kilovolts	1,334.69
Total	2,366.60

Substations

Type	Number	Capacity in kilovolt-amperes
Distribution	122	162,200
Transmission	15	169,500
Generating plant	6	390,500
Total	143	722,200

CONSTRUCTION PLANNED FOR 1959

The ever-increasing use of electricity throughout our service area requires continuous construction of new facilities. Major construction projects in 1959 include:

1. Completion of the 80,000 kilowatt Alma fifth unit scheduled for operation in late fall of 1959.

2. Existing 34.5 kilovolt transmission lines and substations serving the Lafayette Electric Cooperative, the Jo-Carroll Electric Cooperative, Inc., and one substation of the Grant Electric Cooperative will be rebuilt and converted to 69 kilovolt operation.

3. Approximately 54 miles of 60 kilovolt line and five substations will be constructed to extend Dairyland's service to the Winnebago Rural Electric Cooperative Association, whose headquarters are at Thompson, Iowa.

4. Construction of the Pine Lake interconnection near Baldwin, Wis.

5. Installation of voltage regulators, increases in transformer capacity, additional substation facilities for new outgoing distribution circuits, and other additions as required to maintain high standards of service to member cooperatives.

INTERCONNECTIONS

Dairyland continued its policy of making mutually beneficial interconnections with neighboring utilities which would defer the construction of transmission and generating facilities, reduce power losses, and provide sources of emergency power. They have contributed to the lowering of the overall cost of energy.

An interconnection with the Municipal Power System of the city of Rochester was placed in service on January 30, 1958. Two emergency type interconnections were completed during the year with Interstate Power Co. One of these near Mount Carroll, Ill., will provide emergency service for the Illinois and Wisconsin area southeast of Lancaster and will make it possible to maintain continuous service during the period that transmission lines and substations are converted from 34.5 kilovolt to 69 kilovolt operation. The other near Elkader, Iowa, supplies similar emergency service from Interstate.

Two additional emergency type interconnections are planned for completion in 1959 with Northern States Power Co., one near Viroqua, Wis., and one near Cameron, Wis. A new major interconnection with Northern States near Baldwin, Wis., is scheduled for service in July 1959. Studies are being made for possible new interconnections.

MEMBERSHIP

Member consumers during the year increased by almost 2,000. A systemwide membership of 100,000 became a reality, however, when in late 1958 Winnebago became the 27th member distribution cooperative.

A review of systemwide membership again emphasizes the completeness of area coverage in the service areas of member cooperatives. Those having service areas adjacent to growing cities continues to add more suburban householders—a trend which we believe will accelerate. Cooperatives in the tourist and resort areas continue to add to their membership with more seasonal users, both summer and winter. Two other continuing factors are (1) a few remaining farms are being connected to the lines for

the first time, and (2) farms continue to be consolidated or abandoned.

Barren County Electric had the distinction of adding about 150 members when they purchased the Farmers Light & Power Co., of Cumberland, Wis., a 40-mile system originally organized in 1919.

PERSONNEL

Dairyland continued to lay stress on its job training and safety program. The overall record for 1958 equals that of 1957, our best previous year. Although the 1958 accident frequency rate was a little higher, the severity rate was substantially lower, the combined rate being one-third to one-fourth of that which we experienced in our earlier years. Dairyland's motor vehicle accident rate was approximately one-third that of the national average for utility fleets.

The monthly average number of employees was 300, 11 higher than the previous year. Personnel turnover continued to be low, emphasizing again the career aspect of our employees' association with Dairyland. Effective as of February 1, 1958, a new 2-year agreement was negotiated with Local Union 953 IBEW, which provided for wage increases and increased fringe benefits.

Our employees continued to provide for their own savings and loan needs through the operation of DAPOCO, their credit union. At year's end 302 Dairyland employees were participating in the NRECA retirement and security program.

In late fall a group comprehensive health care plan was put into effect for all employees with Dairyland sharing 50 percent of the cost. This comprehensive plan insures adequate care for the hazards of illness and accident and gives additional security for our employees and their dependents.

* * * * *

PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

Work continued throughout the year on long range plan studies, which were started 2 years ago, the objective being to plan the best possible coordinated generation and transmission system based upon the expanding needs of member distribution cooperatives. All member cooperatives completed their distribution studies during the year. Dairyland engineers completed the AC network analyzer studies. All of this data is now being evaluated to determine the direction of investment 15 to 20 years in the future when loads are expected to be more than four times greater than at present. New system additions during the year were constructed in accordance with the long range plans.

Three major interconnections are being studied for the future. A 161-kilovolt transmission line from Alma north to Elk Mound will be used initially for an interconnection with Northern States Power Co. of Eau Claire. Two future 161-kilovolt interconnections with Interstate Power Co. are planned, one between Genoa, Wis., and Lansing, Iowa, and the other in the vicinity of Dairyland's Adams transmission substation.

Preliminary engineering and feasibility studies were completed on proposed pumped storage type hydroelectric stations along the Mississippi River between Alma and Genoa. Studies and negotiations with the railroad continued on the proposed hydroelectric stations on the lower Chippewa River. No conclusions have been reached in regard to the construction of any of these projects.

At year's end a new organization called the Eastern Missouri Basin Power Pool was being formed by the electric power systems having service areas in Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, and part of Montana. Its purpose is to promote to the maximum practical extent coordinated operations and joint planning of new facilities so that all parties may share in the benefits. The Dairyland system is in the pool area and is tied to other participants in the pool through its interconnections with Northern States Power Co. and Interstate Power Co. Study is being given to the possibility of a subpool with Northern States and Interstate.

Government Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Must We Delude Ourselves Into Disaster?" written by Hon. Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and published in the Reader's Digest for July 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUST WE DELUDE OURSELVES INTO DISASTER?
(By Maurice H. Stans, Director, Bureau of the Budget)

As the Federal Budget Director—and as an American and a certified public accountant—I must pass on to you a solemn warning. Unless we as a Government insist right now upon living within our income, we face certain inevitabilities. Either there will be more tax increases, piled on top of our already heavy tax load; or there will be a mounting national debt and growing inflation with disastrous rises in the cost of living and a dangerous weakening of our national strength.

Either way the prospect is menacing. Few of us want to pay more taxes. And all of us have been victimized by past cycles of inflation, the economic fever that jacks up the prices of everything we buy, that mercilessly drains our earnings and savings. Yet inflation is a manmade sickness, one we can combat—if every citizen recognizes the causes and does something about them.

Inflation feeds on the delusion that the Federal Treasury is a free-flowing well, that money from Washington doesn't cost anyone a cent. It is this something-for-nothing delusion that allows special-interest groups to smooth-talk the public into believing that all their Federal spending proposals are possible. This is why gigantic spending bills are passed without tax measures to pay for them. This is why astronomic national spending goes on regardless of the revenue that comes in and despite the efforts of economy-minded members of both parties in Congress. And this is why these pressure groups are trying to push us headlong into ever greater debt, heedless of the nightmare of inflation that would result.

The President, his Cabinet, all the rest of us in the executive branch feel it is essential that America wake up and face these grim facts. Behind this conviction is a significant series of events you should think about.

Despite our warnings a year ago against too much panicky recession spending, and in the face of dwindling tax receipts, Federal spending surpassed all expectations. Last September, when staff experts at the Bureau of the Budget came to me with sheaves of figures for the 1959 fiscal year, our worst fears were confirmed. The Government was piling up the biggest 1-year budget deficit in peacetime history—a staggering $13 billion. And, with a nearly $3 billion deficit from the year before, the Treasury for the 2 years was in the hole by almost $16 billion, or an additional new debt of $360 for every family across the land. The total national debt has risen to an all-time high of $285 billion, or some $6,400 for every family.

To add to our worries high Government officials returning from trips abroad met us with disturbing news. They told us that other nations were beginning to question America's financial stability, and its will to face up to dangerous fiscal practices that in the past had almost destroyed them.

Next, signs began to emerge of an inflationary psychology, influenced by the Government's deficit spending. The public, perhaps uneasy about the dollar, was tending to speculate rather than save, an attitude that could lead to boom and bust. This was serious. As Secretary of the Treasury Robert Anderson said, "If we ever reach the point where people believe that to speculate is safe but to save is to gamble, then we are indeed in trouble."

These were some of the compelling reasons why the President and his advisers considered that it was more imperative this year than ever before to get the Government out of the red. With the country obviously getting back on its feet and entering a prosperous period, here was a chance to shake off our deficit habit. I we couldn't do it now, when could we ever?

By balancing the budget there is still time to counter intolerable inflation—the force that has made hot dogs today more expensive than round steak in 1945, that has doubled the cost of bread and pushed the price of hamburger up 90 percent. For these are the back-door ways that inflation steals part of your earnings, your pension, your insurance, your life savings.

Take the citizen who put $100 in a savings account at 3 percent interest in 1939, setting it aside for old age. Today that $100 investment is worth $175, rewarding him with $75 in compounded interest. But how good is that money now when he needs it to buy groceries? In 1939 his $100 bought 1,266 loaves of bread, but today the $175 purchases only 999 loaves—a loss of 357 loaves for his prudence. That is not all. The $175 buys 127 fewer quarts of milk, 128 pounds less of leg of lamb, 215 pounds less coffee than did $100 in 1939.

Moreover, if future inflation were to occur at the rate which prevailed in the 7 years following World War II, the mattress you now pay $50 for will cost you $85 by 1966. A $4 man's shirt will be $6.40. The children's shoes you now lay out $6.50 for will cost $11.27.

Despite the plain evidence of what Government deficit spending and inflation have already done to our dollar, bills have been introduced in Congress this session that would burden the national debt by another $30 billion a year.

Federal expenditures have multiplied 25-fold in the last 30 years, and half of that is due to inflation. Today the combined governmental tax in this country—Federal, State, and local—claims more than 30 percent of our national income. How much more taxation can the people take? We must curb spending now.

We can't excuse ourselves on the ground that we don't know where spending cuts can be made. Vast sums can be saved in such

areas as farm price supports;[1] urban-renewal and slum-clearance projects, in which cities ought to carry at least half the load; benefits to veterans who have means of support and no service-connected disability; rural electrification (95 percent of our farms now have electricity); and public assistance, an emergency measure inherited from the 1930's, for which the Federal Government has needlessly increased its contribution so that now it far exceeds the State and local share.

The budget which the President gave Congress this year lists 18 ways to save your tax dollars. If they are adopted we can even look forward to cutting taxes, instead of increasing them. And if we are willing to do it we can certainly begin to cut our enormous debt and put the budget in order.

Yet too often when a penny is taken away from entrenched Federal spending programs, letters and telegrams deluge Congressmen. The voices of those who speak out against spending are lost in the tumult that the pressure groups drum up. That is why you heard wails of protest when the President presented his balanced budget. Special interests claim it cripples essential activities and threatens the economy. However, these are the facts:

The President's $77-billion budget for the fiscal year 1960, which begins July 1, 1959, provides more money for the Nation's military security than in any other peacetime year in our history. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, the National Security Council, the Secretary of Defense and the President gave exhaustive attention to our military needs. As a result 59 cents of every dollar in the budget goes toward national security. This budget also provides more money for water resources, scientific research, education, health and welfare than ever before. After all, $77 billion is not petty cash.

If, on the other hand, you wonder why our budget is so large, don't forget that it contains gigantic sums totally beyond budgetary control: for example, more than $8 billion in interest on the $285-billion national debt. Also, the budget is loaded down with heavy spending required by laws passed in previous years. Because of these inescapable commitments expenditures cannot help but go up by $2 or $3 billion in 1961 even if the President's 1960 balanced budget is approved. And if Congress goes over the $77-billion spending mark we will be on the way toward a $90-billion budget in a few years and a still greater national debt.

We, all of us, have the power to halt this ruinous race toward calamity.

If you are a businessman who believes Government spending must be cut to keep our enterprise system free, then you can make sure that you do not support industry groups driving for Government subsidies, direct or indirect.

If you are a union member who wants to keep your living standards high, you can fight against labor leaders who urge huge Government programs that rob your wages by forcing higher taxes or deficit spending and inflation.

If you are a farmer, veteran, or schoolteacher, or belong to any group that is asking for Government money or special treatment, stop and ask yourself whether the Nation's interests shouldn't come first.

If you are just a citizen who doesn't want economic calamity for yourself and your children, then insist on prudent government. To block the self-serving special interests that are ceaselessly driving us toward bankruptcy, I urge you to mobilize yourselves. Make yourself heard. Now. It is your own future that is at stake.

[1] See "What You Can Do About the Incredible Farm Scandal," p. 21.

"What's Wrong With U.S. Foreign Policy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 19, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of the Congress and the American people the excellent volume published by my good and intelligent friend, "Cy" Sulzberger, entitled "What's Wrong With U.S. Foreign Policy."

I am including among my remarks the report on the book published in the New York Times of April 7, 1959, as follows:

BOOKS OF THE TIMES

(By Charles Poore)

"What's Wrong With U.S. Foreign Policy," C. L. Sulzberger, challenges in the title of his new book. And one answer, of course, is that it has not made us as secure and beloved in the modern world as we should like—by a long chalk.

Nor has this country's foreign policy ever been able to do that. You have only to look into another book on our table, "American Diplomacy: A History," by Robert H. Ferrell, to see what a tough row to hoe the agrarians of our diplomacy have faced since our forefathers brought forth on this continent a new nation.

The American Revolution itself, the War of 1812, the affair of the Barbary Pirates, the Mexican War, the Civil War era, the War with Spain, the brinkmanship forced on Woodrow Wilson by Mexico's upheaval in this century's second decade and two World Wars are salient points in Mr. Ferrell's informing profile of our dynamic history.

Meantime we have had to contend with a thousand and one other challenges and chances. They pop up continually, all over the map. The scene may be Guam or Lebanon. The story may have a continuing thread to it. Such as? Well, such as the history of our relations with Japan, say, from Commodore Perry's visit there as President Fillmore's representative in 1853 (to open doors) to John Foster Dulles' visit there as President Truman's representative (that's right; President Truman's) in 1951 to arrange a treaty of peace.

MANY TREES BORE NO FRUIT

We never seem to have got all we wanted in our foreign relations. But neither, come to think of it, have other nations. The British and the French no doubt have grounds for believing right now that they deserve more ample places in the world than they find they have. And there must be bitter Bolshies in the Kremlin who are not, in P. G. Wodehouse's phrase, exactly gruntled by the failure of their agents to get Greece or France or Italy. Of course, a certain measure of disenchantment must have set in when the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact turned out so poorly. And now China seems to show traces of becoming a disquieting sort of payment-deferred menace to the Russians.

Mr. Sulzberger takes up far too many world problems in his book. You can't possibly hold them all in your mind at once. No more can you hold all the details of a Persian rug or the Yankee baseball team's farm system or a painting by Hieronymus Bosch. But the total effect impresses your consciousness effectively. And the fact that he has made his job for this paper a sort of continuous summit meeting with heads of government all over the map gives his book the authority of first-hand information about what's going on in the world.

He is as unsparing in criticizing a Republican administration's policies as he is in showing what was wrong with measures taken by their Democratic predecessors. He is aware of the differences that arise when members of the same party become embroiled—as when Harold Stassen has one idea about disarmament and John Foster Dulles another, or when Dean Acheson takes public issue with thought advanced by George Kennan.

The tendency to travel displayed by recent Secretaries of State is not, in his eyes, an unmixed blessing. When Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., completed his work in the formation of the United Nations and gave way to the gentleman from South Carolina, you may recall, someone said "the State Department fiddles while Byrnes roams." And when Mr. Dulles came on the scene, a Washingtonian suggested that his genius lay in an infinite capacity for taking planes.

What this country needs, Mr. Sulzberger suggests, is a more consistent, a more coherent, a more far-seeing foreign policy.

RESPECT, NOT POPULARITY

He says that:

"Bland steadiness in explaining our fundamental views will gain us much more than irked press-conference statements or frenetic special missions.

"It is not essential always to strive for action. In foreign policy it is better 9 times out of 10 to sit still than to do the brilliant thing.

"Charity rarely inspires love. Anyway, a craving for popularity is naive. What we should above all covet is respect.

"The time has come for new self-scrutiny, a reexamination not only of the style and methods of our policy but the objectives to which it aspires. And no such scrutiny can take place unless we assume a more humble position regarding ourselves, our Nation, and our faults. We must abandon a tendency to moral hectoring of others and an addiction to apocalyptic slogans designed, at best, to appeal to our voters. These frighten our friends at least as much as our enemies."

Or, as Mr. Ferrell puts it in his "American Diplomacy: A History," "One thing was certain, that foreign relations by the middle of the 20th century had become the central problem of the great republic of the New World."

Resolution of Jackson School District, Stark County, Ohio.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Jackson Local School District of Stark County, Ohio, has adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That we do not wish to avail ourselves of the offer of the National Defense Education Act, title 3, for the purchase of science, mathematics, and foreign language equipment and teaching aids, as it is against the policy of our board of education to accept Federal aid.

Members of the school board are R. M. Bent, president, R. G. Tilton, M. L. DeWalt, J. W. Gilmor, and Dr. J. A. Mack.

Mr. W. S. Essig, clerk, informs me that the resolution was adopted June 10, 1959, with one dissenting vote.

A Worthwhile Suggestion for Making the Use of Plastic Bags Safe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, several other Members of the House and I have recently introduced legislation designed to meet the threat that has been posed to American children by plastic bags entering American homes in increasing numbers in connection with laundry and drycleaning. On the heels of the mounting number of deaths attributed to this cause, the plastics industry and the laundry and drycleaning industries have undertaken extensive campaigns to alert parents to the dangers involved in these bags. In some cases laundries have even voluntarily given up the use of the bags rather than continue an unnecessary risk to little children. While this action has gone on, efforts have also been undertaken to develop a type of bag which would eliminate the danger involved.

In that connection, I have been very much impressed with an idea which was first publicly mentioned in an editorial appearing in the Schenectady Gazette of June 29, containing a suggestion made by a constituent of mine, Mrs. Robert Jetter of Schenectady. Mrs. Jetter's suggestion that the bags be constructed in such a way that they become automatically self-destructing as soon as they are removed from the clothing involved, is one which I think deserves the immediate attention of the plastics, laundry, and drycleaning industries and of all who have concerned themselves with this serious problem. The editorial follows:

PLASTIC BAG IDEA

The following letter was sent to us by Mrs. Robert Jetter of this city:

"Would it be possible or practical for plastic bag manufacturers to use a pull tape on their plastic bags similar to that used to open packages of cigarettes and gum? The drycleaner or laundry would seal the open end of the plastic bag after inserting the clothing, thereby making the pull tape the quickest way for the customer to open the bag. If the pull tape ran in a continuous diagonal line upon one side of the bag and down the other, the bag would automatically be made useless as a mattress cover, and in the case of smaller bags would not fit over a child's head.

"Perhaps this suggestion is not practical as it would make the bag too expensive for commercial use. Or maybe the plastic could not be torn by a pull tape. It is merely an idea this writer had after reading news articles concerning the potential danger of this handy new packaging material."

Mrs. Jetter is to be commended for thinking about the problem of plastic bags and coming up with an idea. Even if there are flaws in her suggestion, as she says there may be, we are happy to publicize her idea because someone else may think of a way to overcome the objections or think of a better method.

American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers—Department of Justice Announces the Filing of a Proposed Amended Order in the U.S. District Court in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is to be commended for its long, patient, and able attention in behalf of the 1,200 publishing concerns and 4,000 authors and composers in endeavoring to work out equitable rules and regulations in ASCAP's distribution of some $28 million annually which the society receives from licensing for commercial use the copyrighted material published by its members.

Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Small Business Committee, of which I am a member, held extensive hearings and issued a report on this subject during the 85th Congress. While it has been more than a year since these hearings were held and considerably more than a year that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has been working on the ASCAP matter, I personally believe the expenditure of time was in the best interest of the members of the society, as well as in the public interest. It is my thought that antitrust cases should be pressed forward as rapidly as possible, but, at the same time, the basic rights of the litigants must always be preserved, regardless of the time consumed in bringing a case to its conclusion. In view of the importance of the proposed order to the members of ASCAP, the dispatch with which the Antitrust Division has handled this complex matter is commendable.

I particularly desire to commend the earnest efforts of the present Acting Assistant Attorney General, Robert A. Bicks, who testified before our committee and who has so earnestly and conscientiously endeavored to work out the difficult problems surrounding the ASCAP matter.

For the information of the Members, I include the release of Attorney General William P. Rogers of June 29, 1959, which follows:

Attorney General William P. Rogers today announced the filing in the Federal district court in New York City of a proposed order directing the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers (ASCAP) to carry out in certain specific, detailed ways the terms of an antitrust judgment entered against the society in 1950. ASCAP is composed of approximately 1,200 publishing concerns and 4,000 authors and composers. The terms in question related basically to the rules and regulations of ASCAP governing the distribution to its members of over $28 million annually which the society receives from licensing the commercial use of the copyrighted music composed or published by its members. These licenses are to the radio and television industry and the more than 25,000 other users such as hotels, bars, skating rinks, and restaurants.

At the time the proposed order was submitted to the court it was pointed out that ASCAP after prefiling negotiations had agreed to the terms of the order. The court entered an order requiring the parties on October 15, 1959, to show cause why the proposed order should be entered and directed ASCAP to mail a copy of the proposed order to each member and the members may then make application to be heard pursuant to the terms of the show cause order.

The practices which the proposed order seeks to remedy, relate to six fundamental factors. These factors relate to the conduct of ASCAP in its dealings with its members or concern the manner in which it divided the amounts of its revenues due its publisher and writer members.

Thus: (1) The proposed order requires that ASCAP pay resigning members on the same basis as others when the society continues to license their works. Resigning members are thus permitted to continue licensing existing copyrights through ASCAP when a cowriter or publisher is also licensing the same work through ASCAP. But the resigning member is free to license new works through another organization.

(2) ASCAP would be ordered to conduct a scientific census or sample of performance of its members' compositions. The results of the survey must be weighted in proportion to what the society receives from the licensees where the surveyed performance occurred. A provision is included to permit reexamination by the court of the survey after 18 months of operation. A court appointed expert will report to the court and the Government on the design and operation of the survey and will prepare estimates of the accuracy of the samples of performances.

(3) Each ASCAP writer would be given an option to receive payment based on the results of the survey or in the alternative to receive payment based on such factors as a 5-year average of performances of recognized works and on the length of time the writer has been a member of ASCAP. (A "recognized work" is defined as one which has received performance credit in the ASCAP survey at least 1 year prior to the performance in question.) The proposed order seeks to assure the maximum feasible area of individual choice. An exception from these options is made for the top 100 writers in ASCAP. These writers may vote to deny themselves the option to receive payment on a per performance basis.

Each publisher member would be given an option to receive payment on the basis of the results of the survey. In the alternative, a publisher may take into account the length of his ASCAP membership and the number of performances of his recognized works.

The order contains detailed provisions governing payment for theme songs, background music on dramatic programs, advertising jingles, copyrighted arrangements of works in the public domain, and serious compositions of more than 3 minutes' duration.

(4) ASCAP would be directed to weight the votes of its members, if at all, only on the basis of the performance credits which they received in the survey. No member may have more than 100 votes. This is in sharp contrast with the existing practice where the publisher members having the most votes in 1957 had 1,469 votes and the writer

member having the most votes in that year had 5,116 votes. A progressively higher number of performance credits is required for each vote above 20. Provision is made to permit a minority of one-twelfth to elect a director. The 10 largest groups of affiliated publishing firms are limited to a maximum of slightly less than 41 percent of the total publisher vote.

(5) ASCAP would be ordered to keep certain records and make them available to any member upon various conditions. ASCAP must make the addresses of its members available to other members and it must inform the membership of all changes in its rules affecting distributions to the members. Provisions are included designed to speed up direct appeals to the impartial panel of arbiters. Other procedural safeguards are included to protect the rights of members in these appeals.

(6) ASCAP would be required to admit all qualified applicants for membership and to publicize the qualifications for membership twice a year in certain trade papers.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I witnessed the colorful retirement ceremony for Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chief of Staff of the Army. Impressive as this ceremony was, I watched it with much regret. The Department of Defense and the Nation have lost one of the most competent and capable military leaders of our time—a loss that this Nation can ill afford during these critical times. General Taylor now turns in his uniform, after a lifetime of service to his country climaxed by 4 years as Army Chief of Staff. Universally recognized as one of our greatest field commanders, he would at 57 seem to have many years of useful service left. He is one of the few men in high place who have had the courage to state his beliefs when those beliefs did not conform to policy. He has not hesitated to oppose the fiscal and manpower raids which have been made upon the Army. He has felt this policy was wrong, as, indeed, it was, and he has said so.

Time after time he has expressed the conviction that the Army must be kept strong because of the great danger of Soviet expansion through limited war. All U.S. experience since World War II, says Taylor, is right, but the administration fails to recognize it.

The most recent proof of the Soviet threat by means short of all-out war came from the Geneva Foreign Ministers' Conference. The Russians there demonstrated most clearly that they do not want to settle the Berlin and German unification questions now. They believe time is on their side in efforts to strangle West Berlin. Missiles and H-bombs cannot combat such pressures. The existence of a strong U.S. Army can be a very important factor in the considerations over Berlin.

America is losing a valuable soldier and with him the best chance of achieving an equilibrium of arms. However, this great soldier and scholar has left legacies which could materially assist in the security of this Nation. I would like to summarize what I believe to be the most important of these legacies.

First. It is hard to believe that a strategy dating back to World War II and retaining main dependence upon atomic attack is still valid in coping with the changed conditions of the world. A changed situation affecting our military strategy is the condition of mutual deterrence arising out of the Soviet possession of long-range atomic weapons. It has become increasingly clear that both sides of the power bloc have or soon will have the means to effect mutual destruction and, consequently, it seems increasingly unlikely that either side will deliberately resort to general atomic war. This fact does not mean, of course, that the Communist bloc will abandon those offensive and aggressive techniques which have been so successful in the past. Rather, it may be expected that the Soviets will present us with increased levels of provocation, feeling that if their aggressions have been successful during our atomic monopoly, they may take greater liberties with us now that we must respect their atomic strength. Events have justified this anticipation of increased provocation. The increased likelihood of limited war is obvious and in light of past experience it seems inherent in the problem of limited war that atomic weapons will have limited usefulness.

Second. In regard to the Army's capabilities, we have very material assets to cope with limited war. However, those assets are not sufficient. We must have a program—a five-point program—to improve our capabilities. First, we need to modernize weapons and equipment; second, we must improve the strategic mobility of our limited war forces; third, we should predesignate a certain amount of strategic air and sealift so that the Army knows what to count on in the early and critical days of a limited war situation; fourth, we need improved arrangements for joint planning and training, to include possibly the creation of a unified command; and, fifth, we should adopt a national program to advertise the fact that we are indeed ready to cope with a limited war.

The last point is on the formulation of the defense budget; as a member of the House Appropriations Committee I am intensely interested in General Taylor's thesis and I am sure that he is right and that the Department of Defense should accept his counsel. I will offer you my interpretation of General Taylor's ideas on the formulation of the budget. The time has come for a drastic overhaul in our strategic concepts and planning. We should start at the beginning, in the National Security Council, and redefine in clear and unmistakable terms the military objectives which must be met in order to obtain our national objectives. Then, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, initially without restrictive budgetary guidance, should be invited to establish the requirements for various categories of military forces, without regard for the service which provides them. These categories are the atomic deterrent forces, continental air defense forces, our oversea deployments, the mobile strategic reserves available for general or limited war, the forces required for antisubmarine warfare, and the strategic air and sealift necessary to afford rapid reaction in case of hostilities any place in the world. We need yardsticks of sufficiency for these categories, determined by our best military thinkers, to provide the point of departure for our overall military program. Once the criteria of sufficiency have been established, it will not be too difficult to determine the specific forces in terms of divisions, airplanes, missiles, and carriers required to meet them.

Such a procedure would inevitably result in increased attention being paid to the requirement for limited wars. I am personally a great admirer of SAC—Strategic Air Command—which maintains a readiness around the clock for the outbreak of general atomic war. We have no such command charged with responsibility for limited war. I have often regretted that thus far we have never established a unified command similar to SAC charged with the limited war responsibility. I do not believe that we will ever achieve the required limited-war readiness until some such command is established in the United States to which all services would allocate those forces available for limited war reaction.

In making these suggestions neither General Taylor nor I necessarily recommend vastly increased defense budgets. I feel that most of the objectives which I have in mind can be accomplished by a readjustment of the funds presently available to the three services. It is interesting to note that the so-called limited war forces are all applicable to general war, whereas the reverse is not true. By the same token, in adding to our limited war forces we are adding to our general war capability, but again the reverse is not true. The main point in adjusting our military policy would be to accept the fact that we cannot rely upon any single service or any single weapons system. Rather, we must be prepared for threats in many forms and be sure we have Armed Forces capable of providing the appropriate response. Continued preponderant reliance on massive retaliation is a dead-end strategy.

These then are some of the legacies left by this great soldier which if used could mean the difference of survival or defeat. In closing I can think of no better summation of the attributes and capabilities of General Taylor than those given by the President in presenting the Distinguished Service Medal to General Taylor and those cited in the scroll presented General Taylor by the Secretary of the Army. I offer these for the RECORD:

THE WHITE HOUSE.

The President of the United States of America presents the Distinguished Service Medal (Second Oak Leaf Cluster) to Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, U.S. Army, for excep-

tionally meritorious service as set forth in the following:

CITATION

"For exceptionally meritorious service and distinguished achievement as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, from June 30, 1955, to June 30, 1959. In this position of great responsibility, General Taylor demonstrated outstanding professional competence, selfless devotion to duty, and leadership of a high order. As a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, advising the President and the Secretary of Defense on matters of greatest consequence to the Nation's security, he has brought his wide experience and deep insight to bear on the deliberations of that body. He has made a major contribution to the work of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in providing for the strengthening of unified planning and operational direction of the Armed Forces. Within the Army, he has with foresight and determination put into effect far-reaching new concepts of military organization and devoted great effort to the modernization of the Army and to the readiness of Army forces as a powerful and effective component of our Military Establishment. Dedicated to the advancement of mutual security of the community of free nations, General Taylor has made an outstanding contribution to the high degree of combat readiness of other armies of the free world. In the performance of his duties, General Taylor has rendered service of the highest value to the Nation and has reflected great credit upon himself and our Armed Forces."

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

MAXWELL DAVENPORT TAYLOR, GENERAL, U.S. ARMY, THE CHIEF OF STAFF, JUNE 30, 1959

As you relinquish the office of Chief of Staff of the Army, and retire from the active military service after 37 years in uniform, your friends and colleagues unite in this testimonial reflecting the high honor and true esteem you have earned during a distinguished career which has significantly enriched the great tradition of the U.S. Army.

Throughout the years, in assignments of increasingly grave responsibility and critical importance to the security of the United States and the worldwide advancement of the cause of freedom, you have consistently demonstrated outstanding leadership, extraordinary skill in command, diplomacy, and administration; unerring judgment and dynamic initiative, splendid vision and foresight, remarkable breadth of knowledge and understanding, magnificent moral and physical courage under all circumstances, and unswerving devotion to the highest concept of duty.

In World War II, you were one of the pioneers in the development of airborne warfare, and wrote a magnificent combat record as Commanding General of the famed 101st Airborne Division, which you led with brilliant success in the airborne invasion of Normandy, the airborne invasion of Holland and the Ardennes and central Europe campaigns. Prior to the time you assumed command of the 101st Airborne Division, you had received the highest commendation for the manner in which you carried out an exceedingly difficult and dangerous mission through the enemy lines as a preliminary to scheduled airborne operations in the invasion of Italy. During the Italian campaign, you also performed with admirable tact and ability notably delicate diplomatic tasks as Chief of Staff of the Allied Control Commission.

Following the war, you served with great distinction successively as Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy, Chief of Staff of the European Command, first U.S. Commander in Berlin, and on the Army General Staff as Assistant Chief of Staff for Operations, and Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Administration.

Early in 1953, you assumed command of the 8th U.S. Army in Korea, and led it with outstanding sucess through some of the bitterest fighting of the Korean war. After the armistice, you supervised the building up of the Republic of Korea Army into a redoubtable 20-division force, and also initiated the Armed Forces Assistance to Korea program, which was a major factor in the rehabilitation of that war-torn land. Subsequently, you commanded all ground forces in Japan, Korea, and Okinawa as commanding general of the U.S. Army forces, Far East, and the 8th U.S. Army. At the time of your appointment as Chief of Staff of the Army, you were Commander in Chief of the Far East Command and the United Nations Command.

During the 4 momentous years you have served in the Army's highest military post, your manifold and fruitful efforts to increase its strength, effectiveness, and readiness as a major element of our Nation's defense have been of incalculable value. Among the achievements under your leadership in which you are entitled to take particular pride are: The formulation of the Army's comprehensive national military program, the implementation of a five-point program for improving our capabilities for limited war, and the development of a 5-year modernization program; the reorganization of all Army divisions under the Pentomic concept; the organization of missile commands; the establishment of the Strategic Army Corps as a highly mobile and powerful ready force prepared for immediate action in any part of the world; striking advance in all categories of Army missilery, and the development of space vehicles; the development of the Davy Crockett weapons system; success in securing the modification of restrictions seriously limiting Army development and utilization of missiles and aircraft; a marked enhancement of the quality and efficiency of Army personnel; the establishment of the Combat Developments Experimentation Center; the progressive strengthening and improvement of the vital Reserve components; the adoption of the Combat Arms Regimental System; the adoption of a new, lightweight rifle and machine gun; the stabilization of tours of duty, and the adoption of the new Army green uniform.

Throughout your service as Chief of Staff you have proved yourself a highly effective advocate of the Army, and a fighting champion of fully adequate national defense within and without the Military Establishment. You have greatly improved congressional appreciation of the Army's role and its requirements, and you have increased to a marked degree public awareness of the problem of limited war, and the importance of the Army's mission.

In every way you have set an example of courage, vigor, determination, professional capability, and force of character which will be a source of lasting inspiration to the entire U.S. Army. We join in wishing for you a long life, success in your every future undertaking, and the happiness you so richly deserve.

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

A STATEMENT OF THE ARMY'S PHILOSOPHY ON PARTICIPATION IN THE BUDGET PROCESS BY THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

A sound military posture for national security and the effective deterrence of war is composed of three interrelated and interdependent elements. These are (1) a national military strategy of flexible response to a wide spectrum of possible military actions against the background of a dynamic world situation; (2) agreed qualitative and quantitative criteria for force requirements in support of this strategy, as determined by the highest level of professional military advice; and (3) a distribution of the resources made available in the annual defense budget which is in consonance with the requirements of (1) and (2) foregoing. The latter is of vital import if our military strategy is to be meaningful, for it is the allocation of Defense resources which translates strategic concepts into military capabilities.

Normally, more than one service contributes to the strategic mission or tasks that must be performed. For example, the strategic nuclear retaliatory forces are composed of the Strategic Air Command supplemented by elements of the Navy, each using long-range aircraft and long-range missiles—the IRBM's and ICBM's—as the latter become operational. The continental air defenses of the United States are comprised of the interceptor aircraft of the Air Force, and the Army's surface-to-air missile units, augmented by the capabilities of the Navy and our Canadian allies.

From this, it would appear that the analysis of military requirements should be made on a defense-wide horizontal, functional basis, rather than in the vertically compartmented departmental structures of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Historically, this has not been the case. The development of force requirements, weapons systems, and supporting budgets have been accomplished on a unilateral service basis, as have the subsequent budget deliberations in the higher echelons of the Department of Defense and the executive and congressional branches. This has precluded a consolidated military analysis of strategic missions and tasks relative to the nature of the threat to our security, and has resulted in an apparent imbalance in the types and quantities of forces and weapons systems required for a national military strategy of flexible response.

As such a functional, horizontal analysis is properly a joint military action, the Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, has proposed a procedure for the consideration of the Joint Chiefs of Staff whereby the Joint Chiefs would directly participate in the process of developing the defense budget. This would be done as an included element of their joint strategic deliberations so that they can provide to the Secretary of Defense timely defense budget recommendations which are directly related to and in harmony with the military requirements and forces which the Joint Chiefs consider as essential to support our national security program.

Under the procedure recommended by the Army Chief of Staff, the military forces required for a sound posture of national security and deterrence are broadly classified into five functional, operational categories. These are (1) nuclear retaliatory forces; (2) continental air defense forces; (3) forward deployed forces; (4) strategic Reserve forces including the provision of strategic air and sealift; and (5) forces for maintaining essential sea and air communications.

Concurrently with the development of joint strategic concepts and plans, the Joint Chiefs would develop and forward for the approval of the Secretary of Defense, criteria of sufficiency for the broad functional categories of forces listed above. These criteria may be described as the yardsticks which are necessary to measure the adequacy of each category of forces to fulfill its missions in the light of the changing nature of the threat and the agreed strategic concept for countering the threat. To illustrate, in event of general war the strategic nuclear retaliatory forces have the mission of attacking deep strategic targets. An analysis of the number of targets which should be attacked and the operational factors involved—including enemy opposition, assurance of suc-

cess on each target—together with consideration of dates of availability of more efficient new strategic weapons systems, would provide a calculated measure of the numbers and types of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles required in this category of forces.

Using the approved criteria of sufficiency—as indexes of how much is enough to fulfill the missions of each broad category of forces—the Joint Chiefs of Staff would then prepare tabulations of the forces required from each of the military services and the necessary supporting logistical requirements. These forces tabulations would be grouped by the broad categories of forces earlier described, and arranged by priority of their strategic tasks within these categories. Following this, the force and logistical requirements would then be referred to each of the three services for the development of cost estimates within their respective fields of responsibility. These costed force tabulations, arranged by priorities in the five broad categories and in keeping with the strategic concept which they support, would then provide the Joint Chiefs with a firm basis for recommendation to the Secretary of Defense on the allocation of available fiscal resources.

The Army strongly believes that such a procedure which objectively relates the adequacy of all the Armed Forces to the support of the national policy for the deterrence of winning any war, general or limited, is an essential prerequisite to the economical achievement of a balanced, integrated military posture, based on the considered judgment of the Nation's professional military leadership.

Poison in Your Water—No. 137

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Smithtown (N.Y.) Messenger of April 9, 1959, entitled "New York State Can Make River Pure."

The article follows:

NEW YORK STATE CAN MAKE RIVER PURE

State Conservation Dept. officials are hopeful of lifting a long-standing ban on the taking of shellfish from the bottom of generously supplied Nissequogue River before too many tides.

A spokesman for the shell fishery management section of the Department said yesterday the promised 1-mile extension of outfall from Kings Park State Hospital into Long Island Sound should clear the river's mouth of pollution that has ruined shellfish crops in the waters for the past quarter of a century.

"We can't predict with certainty that the waters will be made pure," the State spokesman said, "but we have every indication to believe this will be the result."

Last week, Assemblyman Prescott Huntington of St. James advised the Smithtown Town Board that $400,000 has been included in this year's State budget to remove the hospital's sewage outfall line from the river.

Smithtown Supervisor Hamilton Potter hailed the announcement as good news. Last January, Potter joined L.I. State Park Commissioner Robert Moses in a plea to the State to do something about the sewage disposal. Moses said the fallout could possibly pollute waters around State operated Sunken Meadow Beach in Kings Park, a facility used last summer by about a million persons.

NATO's 10th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent statement of June 9, 1959, prepared by the Committee on Juridical Institutions of the Catholic Association for International Peace, commenting on the 10th anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATO'S 10TH ANNIVERSARY

(Statement by the Committee on Juridical Institutions, June 9, 1959)

The 10th anniversary of the foundation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been the occasion for an almost unanimous vote of confidence for its achievements and prospects by responsible students of contemporary international relations. It is eminently appropriate that the Juridical Institutions Committee of the Catholic Association for International Peace join in this vote of confidence.

As a military arrangement NATO has been, on the record, a marked success. It has held the boundaries of the non-Communist world in Europe, boundaries which were very unstable in 1949. Indeed, the shield of NATO has become a sine qua non of the defense arrangements of the free world while at the same time serving as a model for similar arrangements in other areas. The progress achieved in the NATO system with respect to interallied cooperation and the development of coherent strategy and tactics for defense against communism is by now well known. In fact, it is often remarked that the greatest proof of the efficacy of NATO is to be found in the persistent efforts of the Communists to break it up, efforts which, as we know, are increasing daily.

In the political sphere, NATO has dramatically widened the basic combination of allies—the United States, Great Britain, and France—to encompass 15 states. It has brought together former enemies and it has survived serious contemporary disputes between its members, as in the case of the Cyprus controversy. More important than the peaceful solution of such differences, NATO has clearly begun to develop the characteristics of an institution for the transaction of serious international business. The combination of free criticism followed by acceptance of compromises which has marked its debates, notably over the use of tactical nuclear weapons, shows promise of achieving that mixture of representation and responsible decision making which differentiates an effective organization of any kind from a mere collection of uncoordinated entities. Out of this process has emerged something which may turn out to be the greatest contribution of the organization—the "NATO way." The "NATO way" is that intangible psychological habit of cooperation which cannot be accurately defined or evaluated but which is nevertheless clearly identifiable as an indispensable basis for fruitful international action. As late as 1945 the wartime cooperation of the United States and Great Britain was hailed as remarkable. In 10 years of the most difficult efforts to maintain an espirit de corps in face of the frustrations of containing Communist imperialism, NATO has achieved a comparable unity in spite of difficulties of language, temperament, and national outlook.

We should not forget, moreover, the achievement of the NATO powers in the field of international law. The problems raised by the continued presence of foreign troops in the member states when they are technically at peace with the Communist world have been unprecedented. The solution in large measure of those problems through the development of the status-of forces-agreements system has been a singular contribution to international law while at the same time resolving many difficulties of constitutional law within each member state.

As an international organization, therefore, NATO has achieved in the fields of international security, diplomacy, international administration, and international law most of the things which the CAIP Committee on World Order and Subcommittee on Juridical Institutions, in their joint policy statement of May 1949 ("The U.S. and the North Atlantic Pact") hoped it would achieve. In large measure it has filled the breach left by the collapse of the original United Nations security system resulting from the reflection of East-West conflict in the Security Council. Moreover, NATO has vindicated the faith of the framers of the CAIP statement of 1949 by remaining within both the spirit and the letter of the provisions of the United Nations Charter for collective self-defense.

This is not to say that NATO does not have room for improvement. There is a constant problem of maintaining the determination of all members to keep the shield strong. It is sometimes difficult to persuade a member state that it must forfeit ephemeral advantages promised by independent action in order to contribute to the staying power of the organization as an ever-present, every-ready defense system. States which are grimly determined in the face of a threat such as the Berlin crisis tend to lose their interest when the Kremlin shifts its tune to a more mellifluous strain. As in the United States, the temptation to sacrifice defense for budgetary considerations is also ever present. Thus, the real strength of NATO's forces, while enough to give an aggressor pause, is far below realistic levels, and there is some question as to whether its chain of command has yet been sufficiently simplified to permit prompt and effective action.

As we consider the overall picture of NATO, however, it may well be that its greatest contribution has been and will be its realization of a higher unity within the area which comprised a good deal of ancient Christendom. It was from this Christian community that the institutions of modern international law and organization largely developed. In a world where respect for international law and organization is retarded by deep ideological rifts, there appears to be good reason to turn to this community for inspiration and progress in building a true international juridical order. Jacques Maritain has warned us that it is illusory to reach for a higher level of unity among governments until we have that psychological, indeed, spiritual, unity among human beings which must always precede a successful political commu-

nity. We may hope that NATO, in addition to its services as an international security organization, will contribute increasingly to the attainment of such a higher spiritual unity in the free world.

Centennial Celebration at Waukegan, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that due notice be given and due honor paid to the city of Waukegan, Ill., which has just celebrated its 100th anniversary. Its glorious centennial celebration, entered into with glad hearts by present inhabitants and many from afar, covered 10 days of significant events commemorating the growth and progress of this great city.

Thoughts turn appropriately to the early history of Waukegan. Excavations reveal that the city lies in a region first populated by the Moundbuilders. The earliest historical reference, however, points to the possession of the land by the Potawatomi Indians who came down from the Green Bay territory with Father Marquette in 1674. Legend says that the area was also visited by LaSalle and Hennepin in 1679. Old records indicate that a French trading post was established at Waukegan about 1695, and a 1783 map of the Northwest Territory shows only two points on the western shore of Lake Michigan—Chicago and Little Fort, the name which Waukegan bore during the first 8 years of its corporate life.

Lands around and including the present Waukegan area were ceded to the U.S. Government by the Indians in 1829, and white settlers began moving in during the 1830's. By 1847, Little Fort had 300 dwellings and business places and a population of 1,234. In the same year, the Congress appropriated $4,000 to build a lighthouse at Sheridan Road and what is now Water Street, atop the bluff overlooking Lake Michigan.

In 1849, the citizens voted to change the name of the village from Little Fort to Waukegan. In 1859, by an act of the State legislature the village of Waukegan was given the status of a city under a special charter, providing a set of powers and responsibilities for self-government.

Today, Waukegan has an estimated population of 52,000. Some 25,000 persons are employed in 100 manufacturing enterprises in the immediate area and 1,027 retailers do business in the city.

Serving some 17,800 families in the Waukegan area are 39 churches of all faiths. In the city of Waukegan itself, under the jurisdiction of the city school system, there are 16 K–6 elementary schools and 2 junior high schools. The existing township high school currently is in the process of building a second high school building on the city's west side. In addition, there are five parochial elementary schools and one parochial high school. Waukegan residents have a total of more than 19,600 telephones and the number of motor vehicle registrations within the city total 13,000.

The Waukegan of today abounds with vitality and vision. The rapid growth of industry and the expanding population, including sturdy representatives of many nationalities, cultures, and faiths, point to phenomenal future development and progress. Above all, its possession of a harbor available for use as an ocean port following the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway indicates to all of us that no limit can be placed on the future of Waukegan. Reference can also be made with gratitude to the part that a great newspaper, the Waukegan News-Sun, has played and will continue to play in the sound development of the city. And those of us who know this city and its people rejoice in the assurance that despite the great growth and development, its essential character as a city of homes, of schools, of churches, where life is good, will never change.

To mark the 100th year of Waukegan as a city, the civic, religious, industrial, and military groups have worked together to make the centennial celebration one to be long remembered. Although verily every inhabitant seemed to take individual responsibility, the actual leadership of the celebration was entrusted to the following:

The president of the board of directors and of the committee chairmen was Glenn G. Boyd. The active general chairman was Richard Kennedy. The following alphabetical list of other officers and committee chairmen has been sent me: Taisto (Ti) Aho, A. H. Anderson, Rosemary Anshuler, Oranda Bangsburg, Mrs. Walter Barndt, Thelma Beaubien, Robert Beckmann, Gunnar Berg, William Bergmann, Mrs. Harry Breger, Theresa Brown, Don Buhmester, Frederick Burgess, Ed Callahan, Dr. George B. Callahan, Leo Carvis, Augie Christensen, Helen Christenson, Tony Christopulos, Seymour Cohn, Mrs. Bess H. Cook, Dolly Curlee, George Davison, Bert Diamond, Pat Durkin, Jack Ehemann, Jack Emerick, Harris Estes, John Faubel, Harry W. Finch, Richard Flagg, Ellis E. Fuqua, Mrs. Gus Gorgan, Otto Graham, Ross Grana, Glenn A. Gunderson, Ed Holmberg, Jr., Robert Hutchins, Joe Irvine, Stan Jaronik, R. L. Jones, Merle M. Kauffman, Charles H. Kaye, D. F. Kirk, Mrs. Garfield Leaf, Mrs. William Lewis, Mrs. Max Litschin, Norman Litz, A. B. Marchant, James W. McCulla, Stewart McDonald, Cecil Miller, J. L. Miller, Robert Morris, Robert Morrison, Boyd Mulder, Fred Nicola, Herman Nies, William O'Meara, Charles Parsons, Leo Porett, Marge Porter, John Prowett, Joseph G. Rayniak, Marvin Ross, Mayor Robert Sabonjian, Bill Scott, Tom Shroeder, Mrs. Gordon Simmons, Fritz Sorenson, James Stiles III, Henry Tonigan, Larry Turner, Lloyd Van Deusen, Bob Vogel, Robert Weismantel, Brad West, and Robert Williams.

The over 2,000 citizens who worked on one or more centennial committees unfortunately cannot be listed in full.

Months were spent in preparation, so that during the glorious 10 days the presence of bearded gentlemen and hoopskirted ladies in Civil War costumes appeared to be natural inhabitants of present-day busy streets.

The opening day, Centennial Queen's Day, saw the premier performance of the mammoth historical spectacle, "By These Waters," portraying in drama, comedy, and music the highlights of Waukegan and Lake County history.

The biggest parade of the centennial, featuring floats, marching units, drum-and-bugle corps, and antique vehicles of all descriptions, highlighted Lake County Day on Saturday, June 20.

On the morning of Sunday, June 21, Religious Dedication Day, churches of all creeds in the Waukegan area observed the centennial with special services. An all-community, interdenominational observance, honoring the religious growth of the community and dedicated to "the Glory of God, the Fatherhood of God, and the Brotherhood of Man," was held that evening under the stars at Weiss Field. At this centennial interfaith observance, it was my privilege to address the gathering.

Young America Day, on Monday, was, of course, marked by events for the youth of the community and was climaxed by a young America street dance and gigantic fireworks display.

On Tuesday, June 23, Waukegan celebrated All America Day, with national festivals, centennial folk dances, and music.

Armed Forces Day on Wednesday was highlighted by military exhibits of equipment, materiel, and missiles and a giant military parade. The U.S.S. *Worman* in Waukegan Harbor welcomed the public aboard. The Lake County Council of the Navy League of U.S., J-M Club sponsored international friendship night in honor of the foreign officers representing the Armed Forces of the free nations of the World.

Thursday, Pioneer Day, brought back to Waukegan one of its favorite sons, Jack Benny, who was, of course, most heartily welcomed and acclaimed.

Friday, Industrial Progress Day, offered historical exhibits and window displays featuring the old, the new, and the future.

Saturday, June 27, was dedicated to the Waukegan of tomorrow. A time capsule was buried with appropriate ceremony on the corner of Courthouse Square. Above was placed a marble slab with a bronze marker identifying the capsule and stating that it would be opened at 11 a.m. on June 27, 2059. The steel capsule contained many documents and mementos of present-day activities, together with personal notes from any citizen who wished to include in the capsule a message of his own choosing, directed, if desired, to descendants of that day.

Probably the spirit of this centennial was best expressed in the following striking words of Robert Hutchins of the Waukegan News-Sun:

Waukegan, Ill., this year is observing its 100th anniversary as a city. The centen-

nial celebration, however, is not one in the sense that it is the anniversary of the arrival of the first settler, or the original organization of a group of people into a corporate community.

Rather it is a recognition that a government of laws can be far more enduring than any government of men. It is the charter which originally created Waukegan as a city that is 100 years old this year. Parts of basic concepts contained in this charter, granted by the General Assembly of the State of Illinois on February 23, 1859, still govern unique and vital aspects of the municipal government of Waukegan.

It is a recognition also that the drafters of the charter and the citizens of Waukegan who subsequently approved the charter in a public referendum on March 21, 1859, had built well, and had provided for their descendants and those who came to the city at a later date a basic framework of government that has allowed her citizens to grow and prosper. * * *

Today, the more than 50,000 citizens of Waukegan are looking backward to recall the varied cultural heritage of the American people of this city. And at the same time, they are looking forward to a future bright with opportunity for growth—a city which stands in the heartland of America, but also, by reason of its location on the Great Lakes, stands at a new gateway to the world.

Chance To Display Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we all hope fervently for the success of the Geneva talks which are scheduled to resume on July 13.

Many judgments have been passed as to how successful any meeting at the summit would be, based upon accomplishments at Geneva to date. One plan has been set forth to hold a meeting at the NATO foreign ministerial level prior to resumption of the Geneva meetings, in addition to the consultations which have been carried on within the North Atlantic Council continuingly. The object of such a meeting would be to further unify the Western powers' position in the Russian eyes. In this connection, I set forth the following noteworthy and thoughtful editorial from the Miami News of Miami, Fla.:

CHANCE TO DISPLAY UNITY

There is much merit in Italian Foreign Minister Giuseppe Pella's proposal that the foreign ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries meet before the Geneva talks are resumed July 13.

Such a meeting would afford an excellent opportunity for a demonstration of Western unity at a time when the Soviet Union is apparently gambling on disunity.

There are some good reasons why the Russians believe the Western alliance is coming apart at the seams. At the Geneva talks on the Berlin controversy, the United States, Great Britain and France were not always of one mind. This must have been evident as Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko talked separately with the allied foreign ministers.

Since the recess in the Geneva talks, Secretary of State Christian A. Herter has told the American people that nothing has been yet accomplished at Geneva. He ruled out a summit meeting based upon Geneva accomplishments.

On the same day Mr. Herter spoke, British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan told Parliament that there had been a degree of success at Geneva. He said he was hopeful of a summit meeting. Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd subsequently reported on the Geneva talks in a similar vein.

A NATO foreign ministers' meeting before July 13 could ratify the West's position and serve notice on Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev that the whole West supports the Big Three position.

After all, if war should come over Berlin all the NATO nations will have to fight it.

Atomic Waste Disposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the proposal by the Atomic Energy Commission and other Federal agencies to dispose of atomic waste material by dumping it into the Gulf of Mexico has caused great uneasiness among the people who live along the gulf coast of Texas, together with their representatives.

Atomic energy and the resulting radioactive waste material are fearsome and comparatively unknown quantities to the layman. He knows only that they contain something extremely dangerous and with far-reaching consequences.

When the proposal to dump the waste into the gulf was first made, I joined with many colleagues of mine in strenuously objecting to it until the time arrived when the Atomic Energy Commission and other Federal agencies could thoroughly dispel the concern of the general public. That time has by no means arrived.

The feeling of the more-or-less helpless general public is reflected in an excellent editorial appearing in last Sunday's the Galveston News. I commend it to the careful consideration of Members of Congress and of the Federal agencies involved.

The editorial follows:

ATOMIC WASTE DISPOSAL

The problem of the disposal of low intensity atomic industrial waste has become one of prime interest to the people of Galveston, and the entire nation.

The fact that the Atomic Energy Commission may license a Houston firm with permission to deposit atomic waste material in the Gulf of Mexico some 150 miles offshore from the Texas coast has brought complaints from Galveston and other sources.

Even scientists are by no means agreed about various facets of atomic fallout, waste disposal, and certain harmful effects of ordinary radiation from radioactive substances.

It is only natural, therefore, that the masses, public officials and some of the atomic experts themselves should feel doubtful about the advisability of dumping radioactive material into the ocean anywhere, let alone fairly close to the shores of the Gulf.

Even a layman well knows that deterioration of almost any material containing atomic waste matter is certain to result in a matter of years or decades if it is submerged in salt water, or even near it.

Who wants to take a chance on the judgment of some scientists to the effect that by the time the proposed containers deteriorate, the atomic waste matter will have lost most of its lethal effects?

And if our own gulf fisheries and other activities and even lives were not immediately endangered by the disposal plan, how does one think the people of northern Europe, whose climate is tempered by the Gulf stream, would feel about taking a chance on this lethal material being deposited in their "weather-conditioning" current.

The Government of Mexico was quick to join Texas officials and other doubters in opposition to the Gulf disposal plan now before the Atomic Energy Commission. Doubtless, European lands will be heard from next.

On behalf of at least one interested element of our population, the people all along the Gulf coast, we urgently suggest that the AEC and other responsible authorities of our Government give the atomic waste disposal problem a great deal more study.

Amending Mutual Security Act of 1954

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 18, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7500) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Virginia to require that the General Accounting Office and congressional committees be permitted to have access to the files and records of the International Cooperation Administration with respect to the administration of the foreign-aid program.

My record has been clear in asserting the right of the Congress to obtain information from the executive branch of the Government. I have denounced the growing tendency in the executive branch of the Government under both Democratic and Republican administrations to withhold from the Congress and its committees information concerning its operations.

There has been an effort on the part of spokesmen in the executive branch to establish by assertion a so-called privilege in the executive to withhold such information. I have discussed this matter extensively in an exchange of correspondence with the Attorney General, and my remarks will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows: March 10, 1958, pages 3280–6; March 31, 1958, pages 5239–41; April 16, 1958, page 5864 and page 5877.

His Statesmanship Is Lauded—Dwight Eisenhower Becomes Skilled in Presidential Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Holmes Alexander, entitled "Dwight Eisenhower Becomes Skilled in Presidential Role," which appeared in the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic of June 29, 1959:

HIS STATESMANSHIP IS LAUDED—DWIGHT EISENHOWER BECOMES SKILLED IN PRESIDENTIAL ROLE

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Two questions loom for the 1960 campaign—and the second of the two is more important than the first. Who's going to be elected? Where will the country find as good a President as Dwight D. Eisenhower has turned out to be?

Let us admit that Mr. Eisenhower started rather shakily as a campaigner and as President—but as of today he has become the unsung master of his trade and a champion in the game which he took up in the evening of an entirely different career. If this fact is not more often reported from Washington, it is because the focus is on the problems rather than the personality, and because most of us are usually too busy chopping wood to break into rhapsodies over the forest.

My own eyes were lifted for the longer view in recent months because both living former Presidents have lately visited this city. Mr. Truman bounced in and out, brushing off a White House invitation to dine, and testifying like Sir Oracle before a Senate committee on the subject of the 22d amendment repealer. Mr. Hoover came in and went quietly, with wise, grave words at the dedication of the Robert A. Taft memorial. Mr. Truman insisted upon his historical greatness with every syllable and gesture. Mr. Hoover contended that "greatness" of men does not much matter in a true republic.

Both men served to put the same conviction in the observer's mind. It was this: While Presidents Hoover and Truman served well enough in the White House, no living American has seen a better President than Dwight Eisenhower has been.

It is a conviction which few of us here could have mustered a year or two ago. Also, it is a belief which might not assert itself in the mind of a reporter who saw and heard President Eisenhower day after day. My own work is such that I catch only every third or fourth press conference and hardly go to the White House more often than once a year. It happens that I was just back from a fast dash to West Germany when I attended the June 17 conference and had not laid eyes on Mr. Eisenhower for some time.

For these reasons the impressions were firmer and more clean-cut than would otherwise be probable. Barely once or twice in the question-packed 30 minutes did Mr. Eisenhower misspeak himself, as he so frequently used to do. None of his sentences lost their predicates and swam away, as often used to happen. He did not duck any questions, and did not take off in a haze of moralizations. On the contrary, the President not only fielded every query within reach, but he did something that Mr. Truman was incapable of doing, and which Mr. Hoover evidently did not attempt.

Mr. Eisenhower gave to a majority of his answers a quality that a literary critic has called high seriousness. The responses went beyond bare fact. They became interpretive, revealing, philosophical commentaries on Presidential procedure and constitutional affairs. Paraphrased for the sake of brevity, here are some samples of the President's ideas—points which possess, I think, an actual historical, textbook value in their separate fields:

What should be the Federal Government's position when a labor-management dispute threatens to tie up a basic industry, such as steel? The President did not care for the grandstand play of calling union-industry representatives to the White House. He said there was an unfortunate historical precedent for this sort of thing which had ended in a Government attempt to seize the steel industry.

Later, the President responded with beautiful graciousness to a question and turned his reply into a constructive idea. St. Louis Post-Dispatch Correspondent "Pete" Brandt asked if governmental facilities could not be used to the public straight on rival claims by union and industry as to profits, price structure, and productivity. Mr. Eisenhower called this "the most intelligent question" he had heard on the subject. The President added that he would try to follow up the suggestion of Government truth-seeking.

What was the significance of a Communist fighter plane attack upon an American Navy bomber off Korea? The President declined a chance to demagog by saying: "I always try to stay away from motives."

This was his statesmanlike way of saying that even a Communist action should not be judged without evidence.

What were the prospects of a summit meeting? The President deplored the idea that modern heads of state should meet (as Russian Emperor Alexander and French Emperor Napoleon once did, he noted, on a raft in the middle of a river) and attempt to settle the affairs of the world. He pointed out that the American head of state had regular duties at home, and that the foreign ministers of all free countries were clothed with sufficient authority to deal with matters which came up at foreign ministerial conferences.

These are only a few of the several nuggets of genuine political analysis which President Eisenhower dropped at a single press meeting. A year or two ago he was not capable of such a rich yield. Mr. Eisenhower, toward the end of his tenure in office, is reaching a high and unexpected plateau of performance.

American Educational System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 23, 1959

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, the education of our children is one of the most important activities of government. By and large, this has been a responsibility of the States and local governments with minor assistance from the Federal Government in the form of grants.

Recently I received a letter from Mrs. C. L. Faust, a resident of Jackson, Mich., who arrived in this country from Germany in 1955. Mrs. Faust completed her education in German schools.

Not long ago one of Mrs. Faust's sons sought to take an overload of five subjects instead of the standard four at Jackson High School. Before he was permitted to do so his parents were required to give their consent because such an overload, said school officials, might result in a breakdown. The episode stimulated Mrs. Faust to write a letter to the principal of the Jackson High School expressing her views on the American educational system in the light of her own personal experience in Germany.

Mrs. Faust's letter is so well written and contains such a logical and thoughtful analysis of our educational system that I believe it should be brought to the attention of my colleagues as well as educators and parents. Therefore, I incorporate it at this point in my remarks.

APRIL 11, 1959.

Mr. W. EARL HOLMAN,
Principal, Jackson High School,
Wildwood Avenue, Jackson, Mich.

DEAR MR. HOLMAN: This letter is a belated expression of a series of thoughts, retained and considered for a long time, and brought out yesterday upon my husband's having to sign the statement, required by high school, that we will assume full responsibility for our son Rainer's taking on the overload of five subjects instead of four; for the necessity of study at home; and for possible failure or breakdown.

I do not intend this to be unconstructive criticism, but sincerely hope that you may have an opportunity, as the head of the largest school of the city of Jackson, to take this letter with you to one of the educators' conventions, held regularly in the State, and present a (former) foreigner's view of a problem that has never as yet surpassed the state of discussion.

To introduce myself, I was born and raised in Germany, living there until I came to this country in January 1955 with my mother and two sons of 10 and 11 years of age. Purpose of the change—to give these two boys the chance of the great opportunities in the widest variety of fields of endeavor possible, a matter, which became more and more of a problem in small Western Germany with the steadily increasing population in its limited geographical area. There appeared to be no logical outlet to take care of such organic growth. We have found a most happy new home in these United States and have become citizens last summer. And there is only one item that mars that pleasant picture—the schools. Knowing what I know now about our U.S. school system, and disregarding every other wonderful aspect of our lives, this is the point that set me to wonder whether I should not have waited to take this great step into emigration until both my sons had graduated from their German high school.

To give you a picture of the German educational system, here is a small outline of the types of schooling established over there. And, before giving these details, I must say that every child, unless entirely ungifted in the fields of learning, or uncared for (the latter is very rare) chooses one profession or another, be it academic, clerical, mechanical, manual, or other.

1. Academic type of education: (a) 4 years of grade school; (b) at age 10, rigid examination for admission to high school (9 years), graduation at age 19; (c) university.

2. Business type of education: (a) 8 years of grade school, (b) 2 years of business school (in all business fields, such as accounting, clerical, etc.).

3. Girls' full education without academic aim: (a) 4 years of grade school, (b) 6 years of high school with graduation examination.

4. Education for trade (skill—plumber, electrician, steelworker, etc.): (a) 8 years of grade school, (b) apprenticeship with proper examination, and then up in the trade from there.

The high schools vary in type, adapted to the different types of academic requirements. For example, young people aiming to become lawyers, doctors of medicine, ministers, etc., will chose a school which offers such languages as Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and so forth; others will choose a school that offers such languages as Latin (which is almost impossible not to find in a high school), English, and French. Coeducation is quite rare and rather limited to smaller towns and villages.

In every type of school, mentioned above, every subject is mandatory, and the number of subjects is gradually increasing through the years, reaching its high in the last 3 years of high school (academic career). I am attaching a detailed curriculum of my own school, which should be of great interest and concern to any educator in this country. And I wish to add that I am a happy and very healthy woman, in no way overworked at any time by this pattern of upbringing. I am running a large home with 3 teenage children and am a full-time secretary. To prove the point—in spite of this seemingly rigid schedule of learning, we had lots of time to play. In summer, school was held from 7 a.m. to just before 1 p.m.; in winter, from 8 a.m. to just before 2 p.m.—no unnecessary studyhall or lunch periods. We brought a sandwich and some fruit for the recesses, and had opportunity to supplement this with milk or chocolate milk in a very pleasant place provided therefor. I was home by one-half after 1 or 2 p.m., depending on the season, had my main meal of the day (not hotdogs or hamburgers), took a brief nap, or just did nothing at all for an hour or so, then sat down to 2 or 3 hours of studying, depending on the amount of assignments. Then I was free to play tennis, swim, get out on my bicycle, skate, play pingpong or took music lessons. The evening meal was served at about 7 to 7:30 p.m.; in between there was tea and sandwiches. Bedtime was arranged by age: 8 p.m. up to age 12; 9 p.m. up to age 14; 10 p.m. until end of school years, exceptions only for social events. Dancing school started at age 15; "coming out" officially at age 18.

There is one thing that, it seems to me, is the deciding factor in the comparison of the schools of belief—the European and the American. The concept of freedom, the most cherished basis of our U.S. way of living. It is my strong conviction that, until maturity, no human being is fully equipped for what they believe is freedom. I rather think that freedom with proper and inconspicuous control is the right solution for a growing youngster. And this is so easy to achieve (exceptions always considered), when education begins the first day of life, not at age 8, when the fertile soil has dried out and, suddenly, what was right for years, is supposed to be wrong.

Any type of commodity in life comes too easily to an American child. Most anything that is a precious value to a European kid, is a self-understood, everyday thing to an American child. At age 2—for a boy—it's a tricycle, age 5, a bicycle, replaced by new and faster ones, as they grow, at 14, a scooter, at 16, a car. In between, cowboy games, BB guns, comic books, television, records, horror movies, steady going and—boredom. If a European child's parents are well to do enough to provide for some of these things, they are still appreciated as a great gift. But the young minds are occupied with such a great variety of things that the constant desire for being entertained and kept excited will never exist to such extent.

Europeans, at an average, do not lead a Spartan life at all. They know and like luxury as well as we do. But they own one precious property—discipline, not only of the body, but also—and significantly—discipline of the mind, a trait I find sadly lacking in the United States. Also, from childhood on, they learn to appreciate the deep values of fine art—such as true music (not rock 'n roll), poetry, and the like, which deepen character and both broaden and cultivate the mind.

Most certainly, there are outstanding, excellent, good, fair, average, and below-average people everywhere in the world; but I feel, if a country, as the United States, by virtue of its almost unlimited resources, becomes a born leader of the globe, it must not neglect the great and profound truth of the definite obligation that goes hand in hand with the assumption of such leading status. Such country must produce the human intellectual basis, capable of carrying on the leadership, and not resting upon the glory of pioneer generations who made all of this possible by their great spirit.

As it is now—instead of promoting the gifted students in our schools, and trying to educate those less qualified to the best possible extent, the intellectually inclined student material is pulled down to a degrading average level, that proves fatal to any individual ambition and initiative a youngster can muster on his or her own (and I have proof of this in three children of my own, 14, 15, and 16 years old).

There is so much discussion at all levels about the teacher problem. There are not enough teachers, and those we have are underpaid. Result—who wants to make teaching a profession, who plans to lead a successful and gratifying life?

The financial problem first. I strongly believe it would be a great step forward if, in building new schools, architects and planning educational institutions would consider reducing the extent of almost luxurious comfort provided for the pupil, such as huge classrooms, studyhalls, lounges, cafeterias, beautiful swimming pools, etc. I know by personal experience that such things are not a necessity. Our high school was large and beautifully designed, perfectly serving its primary purpose—simply to be an efficient institution of learning, and we all were perfectly healthy and happy schoolkids. Our school did not have a pool—how terrible. Instead, we held our school swimming at a pool, strictly reserved and built for schools of the city (population 360,000), in an ultramodern swimming-pool building, owned by the city. In the school building, each class is assigned a permanent classroom to which the teachers come for the various subjects. The only times we moved were to biology, chemistry, physics, music, and art class, the first three built in amphitheater shape and equipped with laboratories. Even though we were girls, our gym held every type of athletic and gymnastic equipment, and we had to use it, too—good or bad at it, we had to. In summer, it was track—dash, long-distance run, shotput, javelin, broad and high jump discus, all sorts of ball games, etc. And we did grow up to be graceful, but strong and well-disciplined, too, and we did not have to be chauffeured every place we had to go—we walked or used the bus or a streetcar. I should like to say that my entire growing life never knew a dull moment. (Overloaded in learning, by U.S. standards, as I was then, I easily won my first junior championship in tennis at age 14. I obviously was strong enough and had time to train.)

The other teacher problem is—how can youngsters be taught to the extent mandatory, when the system does not provide an education that could possibly produce the caliber of teacher needed for such purpose?

My personal thoughts of improving matters are:

1. Go right ahead and overload the kids with a reasonable, and increasing, number of subjects. They can very easily stand it.

2. Get away from the electives. Kids want to play all the time; but once they get used to a certain pattern of living—learning and playing, they most easily adopt it and get along fine.

3. Break down the educational system into the proper categories that suit the true needs of the economy of the country and of the different personalities.

4. Build a little more modest schools, rather than the shiny exhibition places we now get, and divert the money saved into the teachers' salary channels.

5. Break down the vacation periods into a more suitable pattern. The very basis of our present-day vacation schedule has, I am sure, to do with a rather outdated concept of helping in the harvest. Comparing the number of vacation weeks in the United States and in Europe (with small variations, of course), they are the same and were as follows, as I remember them:

[In weeks]

	United States	Europe
Fall vacation		2
Christmas vacation	2	3
Easter vacations	2	3
Whitsuntide vacations		1
Summer vacations	11	6

It is easy to see that the European scheme provides for a much better balanced learning-resting tenure.

Since about 1 year now, both my sons, who are 15½ and 14 years old, have been worrying over the fact of what they might finally decide to make their career. They had to take "aptitude" and "interest" tests. They have been urged, since age 12, to elect their subjects to well-found their future. Just look at what I had to learn with no choice at all; but, at age 19, I could sit down comfortably, well-equipped for any career, and could choose at that point just what that career would be. I could go through my school years, entirely unburdened by worries about the distant future—how can an adolescent definitely make up his or her mind about such things in those years of much publicized changes, restlessness, and growing pains? If he or she does, 3 years later, their thinking and their physical makeup may have changed completely. One may want to become a lawyer instead of a mechanical engineer; another a steelworker instead of a carpenter. Then what? The curriculum had to be built around the idea of a 13-year-old and will no longer fit that of a 17-year-old. Exactly, how much unnecessary pressure on youngsters' minds could be eliminated by making them do things, rather than letting them choose them. Even though they pretend to be so free and so independent, you might find that they are quite glad to have decisions made for them, even though they do not consider it very smart to admit it.

This is a rather extensive discourse. But the card of "assuming responsibility," signed for our son yesterday by Mr. Faust, gave me a very concrete basis for finally saying out loud—as may be seen by the carbon copies of this letter—what has bothered me ever since I came to this country. I am one

small voice only, and convenience is a great foe; but I do not give up hope for betterment, as I believe firmly that the situation our "fine" world is in, warrants more effective action than committee discussions and House-floor filibusters can provide.

Thank you for reading it all. It is but a brave effort to put across something that seems to be obvious to most progressive countries except our own.

Sincerely,

ERIKA F. FAUST.

CURRICULUM OF HIGH SCHOOL (CHEMNITZ, GERMANY) FOR LAST 3 YEARS (GRADUATION AGE, 19)

Six school days a week; all subjects mandatory; additional subjects may be taken, if desired.

Five recess periods during the morning: Three, 5 minutes each; two, 20 minutes each. Two afternoon periods of 2 full hours each.

(a) Laboratory (biology, chemistry, or physics).

(b) Athletics.

Subject and number of periods[1] *in the week*	
German	4
Latin	4
English	4
French	4
History (of the world), civics	2
History of arts	1
Geography	2
Biology (plus two afternoon laboratory periods)	2
Chemistry (plus two afternoon laboratory periods)	2
Physics (up to and including astral physics)	2
Mathematics (up to highest degree of mathematics)	5
Philosophy (last year only)	1
Religion (all-of-the-world creeds)	2
Music	2
Art	1
Athletics (plus two afternoon periods)	2

[1] Every period was 50 minutes long.

Member Bank Reserve Requirements

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1120) to amend the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System against deposits and to eliminate the classification "central reserve city."

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, and to some extent today, the membership, I am quite convinced, enjoyed a good deal of the discussion. I am sure they appreciated it. The distinguished gentleman from Texas was in wonderful form. He made a number of rather shocking and astounding statements, some of which may have been considered as misleading or, let us say, easily misunderstood, and some not quite in accordance with the facts. Because of the apparent enjoyment of the membership, I am a little hesitant to set the facts straight and thus disillusion the Members.

But let us have no misunderstanding. Some of his statements sound so plausible I am convinced he believes them. The gentleman has repeated them so often he has come to believe them himself. I credit him with complete sincerity, but I charge him with great misunderstanding.

Let us examine some of the facts. The very distinguished gentleman has repeatedly asserted that these $15 billion worth of U.S. securities have been paid for and could be retired. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, they have been paid for, but who paid for them? By whom were the paid for? Why, the people who bought them, and the people who bought them paid the Treasury for them. The Treasury does not own them. The Treasury has sold them, the Treasury has received the money. Of course, if any one of the bonds or securities had been handed around among various dealers, from dealer to dealer, they would have been paid for, several times, maybe 10 times. But still the Treasury does not own them because the Treasury has not paid for them. The Federal Reserve Bank owns them because they have paid for them. That statement that we want to retire them because we own them is quite a general statement, and it is misleading because the Treasury does not own them. The Federal Reserve Bank owns them. I think we should get that clear. The Treasury has been paid for them.

The gentleman said that they could be transferred simply by a bookkeeping transaction and canceled by the Treasury. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, that is quite a statement. The Federal Reserve Bank like any other bank has to stay in balance and solvent. It cannot give away $15 billion worth of assets unless it can also reduce its liabilities by a like amount. It would be bankrupt overnight. Those securities, the $25 billion that they hold plus the $20 billion gold certificates, are needed to back up the $27 billion worth of Federal Reserve notes—that is the cash currency that you saw—plus $20 billion worth of reserves on deposit. These assets are needed to back up the liabilities.

But again, viewed from the Federal debt angle, if we could pay $15 billion worth of debt simply by printing that much unbacked currency, why not do it all? Why not print $280 billion worth? Just think of the savings in interest and the headaches and the grief and everything. We have today some $28 billion of currency in circulation outside of banks. If we started the printing presses and printed $280 billion worth and put it into circulation, the present dollar would quickly drop to less than a dime in purchasing power. It happens that is a coincidence between the $280 billion debt and the $28 billion worth of present currency outside of banks.

Remember in this matter of depreciation of the currency the German prewar mark and the French franc, the Italian lira, and Brazilian cruzeiro, the Chilean peso, and, yes, recently the Bolivian boliviano. True, the Federal Reserve does not need just now all of the $26 billion securities it has as a backup, but it must have a margin for safety and a surplus. They must have a generous margin of safety because we have got to be sure of the future.

But, there is another very important function of the Federal Reserve, for the Federal backlog of securities, and that is the most important operation known as the open market operation. Suppose with the present boom—and it is a small boom, shall we say, but suppose the present boom perhaps by uncontrolled Federal spending or an uncontrolled wage price spiral should turn into a really wild spiral of inflation. How then can it be brought under control? Raising reserve ratios? Yes. Stiffening rediscount rates? Yes. But, more than either of these, selling securities in the open market. For every billion dollars sold on the market a billion dollars goes out of circulation into the Federal Reserve bank. A billion or two taken out of circulation will go a long way toward controlling a wild spiral. The less money there is in circulation in proportion to the supply of goods and services, the more the dollar is worth and the sooner prices and the cost of living stop jumping.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The $15 billion referred to here, in order to cancel out those bonds, would take out of circulation $15 billion worth of currency, would it not?

Mr. HIESTAND. It would either have to do that or something else like it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Well, if it did not take out $15 billion worth of secured currency, it would then put in $15 billion of unsecured currency.

Mr. HIESTAND. Yes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Then we would have two types of currency in the market: $15 billion of greenbacks unsecured and the balance would be secured currency.

Mr. HIESTAND. The gentleman is exactly right. I thank him for his contribution.

Now, the gentleman from Texas claims we would save money by the transfer and cancellation of these bonds. But, would we? The bank today turns over 90 percent of its earnings to the Treasury annually. Furthermore, since there would be little, if any, transfer of securities, there would be no perceptible reduction of earnings.

It is claimed that such a reduction of reserve requirements would be a sudden bonanza in profits to member banks. True, it would enable banks to accept more deposits and make more loans. But, where will the deposits come from, other than from the gradual growth of the economy, a bank's loans and investments cannot grow faster than its deposits. Furthermore, to assure liquidity a portion of its increased deposits must be invested in Government bonds. Those have to come from other sources than the Fed. Growth in deposits and investments requires increased payroll

and facilities. Rising costs have been keeping pace with growth and the earnings ratio all through this growth has held close to an even 8 percent of capital accounts. Increased income taxes of member banks—that is, at 52 percent—would gain the Treasury as much as any slight loss of earnings from the Federal Reserve.

The gentleman claims that the Fed now has authority to increase the money supply by $386 billion. In this I suggest, Mr. Chairman, he is completely in error, and this is why. With large growth in demand deposits, increases in currency naturally have to occur. Currency is now $31 billion. That is, including the $28 billion outside banks, roughly 20 percent of the privately held money supply. For a growth of $386 billion, according to history, an added $30 billion currency would be required. Under the law 25 percent backing in gold is required. For that $30 billion currency $7.5 billion additional gold would be required in addition to the present $6.8 billion required for the present $27 billion Federal Reserve notes, making a total of $14.3 billion gold.

With such growth, time deposits now $64 billion would increase by $180 billion, requiring at 3 percent, an additional reserve of $5.4 billion plus $1.6 billion backing or a total of $1.8 billion gold reserves. A total of $356 billion growth; that is, the $386 billion minus the $30 billion currency, in demand deposits would require, in addition to the $18 billion reserve requirements on the present $100 billion demand deposits, $44 billion added reserve requirements which, in turn, would need gold certificate backing of an added $11 billion.

Total gold requirement to back $386 billion deposits would be $27 billion. That is in addition.

It figures out this way: $14.3 billion for the currency, $1 8 billion for the time deposits and $11 billion for demand deposits. Thus $386 billion growth in money supply on the present $20 billion gold is completely impossible. Where would this added $20 billion worth of gold come from?

True, irresponsible policies on the part of the Federal Reserve could wreck the money supply, but that could be done under present law, and I submit that the Federal Reserve has retained an objective position, a carefully judged position, a carefully maintained and conservative position, over the years. It has been a tower of strength to our economy.

The gentleman claims that counting vault cash as reserves was tried and found wanting. This is not in accordance with the facts. We did count vault cash as reserves for many years. In 1917 they were called in because of the need to centralize the existing gold supply. It was a war measure. Gold is no longer in circulation. It presents no obstacle today.

It is said that the object of this bill is to lower reserve requirements. The facts are that the bill's objective is to remove structure inequities and difficulties of administration. That is shown in the hearings. Also, to provide for long-term growth of the economy.

The gentleman has always professed his endeavors in behalf of small business and small banks. Why, indeed, should he insist that the present disadvantage to small banks and country banks be continued and perpetuated? I suggest that we should correct these things now.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. That $386 billion increase was included in a proportionate growth in our economy. But that is looking far into the future. What I really wanted to bring out with the gentleman is the fact that when the Federal Reserve bought these bonds, the Federal Reserve paid Government money for these bonds.

Mr. HIESTAND. May I suggest to the gentleman that all money is Government money, that this money was not owned by the Treasury, it was owned by the Federal Reserve?

Mr. PATMAN. It was owned by the U.S. Government, the people. You see, the Federal Reserve banks create money on the credit of the people. They created this money to buy these bonds.

Mr. HIESTAND. They created it in accordance with the law, under limitations. But this was paid for, dollar for dollar out of the Federal Reserve, not out of the Treasury.

Mr. PATMAN. The Federal Reserve belongs to the Government of the United States.

Mr. HIESTAND. Exactly.

Mr. PATMAN. It is a part of the Government.

Mr HIESTAND. And that reasoning is right at the bottom of the gentleman's whole philosophy.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. HIESTAND. That all Government agencies are in one pot. That, I submit, is a wrong basic principle. The Treasury has been paid for these bonds. It has not paid anybody else for them. The bonds did not belong to the Treasury, they belonged to the Federal Reserve and we cannot transfer them without disaster.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is incorrect if he assumes that the Federal Reserve bought these from the Treasury. The Federal Reserve cannot buy bonds from the Treasury.

Mr. HIESTAND. I stand corrected. They have to buy them in the open market.

Mr. PATMAN. All bonds must be bought in the open market.

Mr. HIESTAND. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. The Federal Reserve, which is a part of this Government, issues a part of the Government's own money to buy these bonds.

Mr. HIESTAND. I submit the gentleman is completely incorrect in the last part of his statement.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, that is a point on which we differ.

Mr. HIESTAND. The Federal Reserve paid cash for those bonds. They belong to the Federal Reserve and not to the Treasury.

Mr. PATMAN. They did not pay cash, but got them on the credit of the United States.

Mr. HIESTAND. Well, it is all the same.

Mr. PATMAN. And it was the Government's credit.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I am quite convinced that this is a good bill. It is a sound bill, and a very progressive bill. It is a bill that plans for the far ahead future. It is a bill that will remove inequities and will give the country banks a better break in comparison to the big city banks. I believe it should be approved. I believe it should be approved without any amendment whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Proud of Our National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, this great body needs no reminder of the contributions which the National Guard has made in terms of our national welfare and safety. Its accomplishments are well known to all of us. None of us here will forget its instantaneous response in times of national crisis, its answer to distress calls in lesser domestic emergencies such as natural disasters, riots, catastrophes, and so forth. And it continues to guard our country's safety through its excellent training program of our citizen soldiers. The knowledge and stamina and skill which are indispensable if we are always to maintain a constant state of readiness can be derived only from consistent and thorough training such as the National Guard provides.

We as a nation are proud of the National Guard and I was happy to see the tribute which a local hometown newspaper recently paid to this outstanding organization.

I ask unanimous consent that the attached editorial from the Elizabeth Daily Journal of July 1 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROUD OF OUR NATIONAL GUARD

Union County's National Guard units are on active duty, although they are engaged only in their routine summer maneuvers at Camp Drum in the undulating terrain of upper New York State. Casualty lists are not streaming homeward daily and even when they are reported will be attributable primarily to blisters, a touch of sun, and the ill-humored response of muscles to Army activity.

Two weeks in the open in a zestful atmosphere is no hardship and it harbors little similarity to the fatigue and discomfort of combat conditions. Neither is it a summer holiday in luxury and idleness.

Summer maneuvers exact much from the citizen-soldier, although he has been preparing for months and has time for rest and a bit of recreation. Mechanization in the Army is not the automation of civilian industry and the new tools of the fighting man's trade always seem to introduce new work. This the guardsman recalls quickly, if he was in camp in prior years, or absorbs sharply in his first experience.

These details of summer camp are a segment of the program of developing citizen-soldiers trained and equipped for instant response in a national emergency. They are the testing of the training and the drills of the preceding months and the awakening of the lessons of preceding camps. Summer camp includes a lot of fun, but basically it is a rehearsal in the serious and lethal business of soldiering, a duty required all too frequently of every American.

America always has eschewed the Old World policy of huge professional armies, trusting instead the willingness and the ability of its citizens to answer a call to arms. More and more the mere readiness to respond is inadequate for the job then at hand. Knowledge and skill and stamina are indispensable, and these derive only from consistent and thorough training. These the National Guard endeavors to instill into those young men who recognize their obligation to their country and hence the guard becomes the first to dash to the support of the regular forces.

The National Guard was called out for the trouble on the Mexican border, it went to France with the AEF, it circled the globe in World War II, and was in the Korean police action. Those major exploits overshadow duty in a variety of lesser domestic emergencies—natural disasters, riots, catastrophes. The people of Union County are proud of their citizen-soldiers now afield at Camp Drum; they have abundant reason for that pride.

Toward Understanding India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, in recent years a gradual reevaluation of Indian-American relations has been taking place. I like to think that misunderstandings of our position are slowly being clarified in India, and that a greater appreciation of India's role in Asia is steadily growing here.

The June 25 issue of the Christian Century contains a thoughtful article entitled "Toward Understanding India," which should help immeasurably in precisely that direction.

The author, Arthur McLean Stillman, is an informed observer who spent 2 years—1955 to 1957—in India as Second Secretary at the American Embassy in New Delhi.

I congratulate him on this balanced and effective presentations, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include his article as follows:

TOWARD UNDERSTANDING INDIA

(Arthur McLean Stillman)

Americans should appreciate that despite points of disagreement with Indian foreign policy, their Nation has an important stake in India's future.

Since 1951, the U.S. Government has extended over $1.5 billion in grants and loans to India. The magnitude of this assistance is symbolic of American interest in the continued freedom of that great Asian nation. Many Americans, however, still do not understand the necessity or desirability of such largesse. They realize that India is economically handicapped, though only those who have seen it firsthand can fully comprehend the extent of the poverty and misery of her people. But they have little understanding of the dramatic political and economic developments which have occurred in India during the 11 years of her independence. Some Americans feel that India has moved too close to the Sino-Soviet bloc, and that she is too ready to criticize the West unduly. They consider unrealistic the neutralism of her foreign policy in a world where the line between freedom and communism is being drawn with increasing sharpness.

Since U.S. policy has called consistently for support of India's economic development, it is important that Americans better understand the bases for that policy, and realize why they have a vital interest in India's future.

DEDICATED LEADERSHIP

Under the idealistic influence of Mahatma Gandhi and the political leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru, India emerged as a republic within the British Commonwealth of Nations on August 15, 1947. The Indian constitution, proclaimed on January 26, 1950, is patterned after a combination of British and American governmental structures and contains guarantees of freedom and protection of the individual common to Anglo-American jurisprudence.

Two general elections have been held under this constitution, in 1951 and in 1957. In both, despite challenges from extremists of Left and Right, Nehru's Congress party, standing for moderation and democratic principles, was victorious nationally and in an overwhelming majority of the States. The election of a Communist government in the State of Kerala in 1957 has been the principal note of dissension, though there are indications that the rank and file of Kerala's voters turned to the Communists primarily in protest against the instability which had continually plagued that state's government.

The dedication of India's leaders to the maintenance of a democratic system and the support by the people of that type of government are reasons enough to command moral and material support from the United States. India is demonstrating throughout Asia that a society based on democratic principles offers an alternative to communism, and that such a society better serves human aspirations than does totalitarianism. Her differences with the West over foreign policy should not be permitted to obscure from the rest of the free world the fact that India is still a free and democratic nation.

THE 5-YEAR PLANS

The problems of economic development in a country whose more than 400 million people have a per capita annual income of less than $60 are enormous. However, despite seemingly insurmountable obstacles, the Indian Government has moved ahead ambitiously and optimistically in an attempt to transform an underdeveloped, agricultural economy to one based on modern industry. The first 5-year plan of economic development, entailing an outlay of about $8.5 billion, was completed in 1956. Certain phases of this plan were highly successful, although acute problems remained unsolved.

The second 5-year plan, launched in 1956, envisages an expenditure of $15 billion. Serious obstacles to the effective and timely implementation of the plan have been imposed by such factors as inflation, the Suez crisis, and exceptionally heavy withdrawals of foreign exchange reserves. In the face of suggestions that the plan be substantially modified or its life span extended, Prime Minister Nehru has steadfastly maintained that its fulfillment within the period envisaged is vital to India's future development.

The fact that India has undertaken such bold measures to improve her economic position calls for our sympathetic understanding. The Indian Government has mobilized domestic resources to a very large degree and has pursued a course of balanced economic development. While Indian officials have been reluctant to request foreign assistance, feeling that this would compromise India's independent foreign policy, they have nevertheless welcomed and appreciated the help extended by other countries.

Since 1952 the United States has been the principal foreign participant in the development of India's economy, and the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations and CARE have made notable contributions to her people's welfare. In addressing the annual conference of the U.S. Technical Cooperation Mission in India on November 20, 1957, Prime Minister Nehru declared that India was grateful to the United States for all the aid she had received over the years. He said that he wants American cooperation in the "mighty adventure" of building a new India. American technicians in agriculture, health, industry, engineering, education, and community development have worked with Indian colleagues in an effort to bring about the economic transformation so earnestly desired by the nation. Substantial sums of dollars have been utilized for steel, for industrial and transportation equipment and for imports of food grains. A spirit of friendly cooperation has developed through the technical assistance program, and American techniques have made a significant impact. The United States has firmly supported the efforts being made by the Indians to make use of their own resources and skills. The ambition shown by the leaders of India in seeking to provide a better material life for their people is worthy of note by Americans who would understand the bases for continued assistance to India.

Whereas in the political and economic spheres it is not difficult to recognize the desirability of close cooperation with India, in the area of international relations Americans are often bewildered and concerned when they see the course India is pursuing.

NEHRU'S FOREIGN POLICY

Prime Minister Nehru has consistently maintained that India must follow an independent foreign policy, eschewing power blocs, and that the basis of Indian policy must be predicated on peaceful coexistence with all countries regardless of their political character. This policy is based not only on the realistic contention that India must devote her major effort to economic rather than to military development but on the belief that a peaceful world order can be achieved only by dissolution of power blocs, disarmament, and pledges of good faith on the part of all nations that they will not resort to aggression.

India's neutral position is not substantially different from that pursued by our own country prior to World War I. Americans can more readily understand this position if they recall their historical desire to be free of European conflicts and to devote their full effort to solving internal economic problems.

Harder than neutralism for Americans to appreciate, however, is the support which India has appeared to give to international positions taken by the Sino-Soviet bloc and her frequent criticisms of American policy. Examples of this support are India's championship of admission of Communist China to the United Nations, her general agreement with Soviet proposals for suspension of nuclear tests without regard to adequate inspection procedures, and her constant criticism of SEATO and the Baghdad Pact.

India feels that since the Communist regime has effective control over the mainland of China, that regime should represent the Chinese people in the United Nations. She feels that admission of Communist China into the world body would bring about more international harmony and greater stability in Asia. Whether recent developments in Tibet will lead her to reassess her policy toward Communist China is uncertain, though it appears that Prime Minister Nehru does not wish to take any action that would compromise friendly Sino-Indian relations.

Indian leaders have long maintained that nuclear test explosions should be terminated. Some Indians have considered this objective so important that they have criticized the United States for refusing to accept Soviet proposals for test suspension even though those proposals do not include inspection safeguards. While nuclear tests are presently suspended de facto, there is no guarantee that this situation will continue. If tests should be resumed divergencies may again arise between the American position, which holds that inspection is vital to suspension agreement, and the view of those Indians who hold that good faith should be accepted as the basis for insuring compliance.

Relations between India and Pakistan have been strained because of a number of basic differences, as the dispute over Kashmir has dramatically illustrated. India has strongly resented the military assistance the United States has extended to Pakistan and the inclusion of that country in the SEATO and Baghdad alliances; she feels that these actions unduly strengthen Pakistan, thereby leading possibly to armed conflict over Kashmir. Prime Minister Nehru has said that while he does not question American motives, he does question our judgment in furnishing military aid to Pakistan. This issue has tended to dominate all others in Indian thinking; it makes close cooperation between India and the United States extremely difficult.

As a result of its experience with the Communist world since the end of the war, the United States has become convinced that collective security is basic to national survival and that a position of strength is essential to the continued independence of countries in the free world. While the United States respects the right of nations to remain neutral in the cold war, it will not alter this basic assumption, which it believes will preserve and extend freedom and individual dignity.

COMMON OBJECTIVES

Although U.S. and Indian policies diverge in important respects, it is nevertheless important that people in both countries realize that their ultimate objectives do not differ. Both want a peaceful world order, but both seek this end by methods dictated by their own national interest.

India and the United States can and do work together, of course, despite their differences on certain issues. During the 12th General Assembly of the United Nations, the two countries voted together on important resolutions calling for study of the effects of atomic radiation and for enlargement of the disarmament subcommission. The United States warmly supported a resolution proposed by India, Sweden, and Yugoslavia which urged the nations to "make every effort to strengthen international relations and to develop friendly and cooperative relations and settle disputes by peaceful means as enjoined in the charter." Appreciation of the general similarity of outlook on the part of India and the United States was expressed by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge in an address to the Indian Council of World Affairs February 14:

"It might surprise many people both in India and the United States to realize how often in the United Nations our two countries have agreed. In the past 5 years India and the United States have voted the same way in 45 major rollcall votes in the United Nations General Assembly. They have included resolutions on the all-embracing question of disarmament; on the treatment of people of Indian origin in South Africa; on the atoms-for-peace program, in which India has played a most distinguished part; on the effects of atomic radiation; on Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria; and, finally, on the Middle East crisis. In that crisis, in which peace hung in the balance, India and the United States voted together on eight separate resolutions and worked together all the way. * * * Mention is seldom made of our common belief in the dignity of man and the necessity of freedom; our adherence to the view that government exists to serve the people and that the people are not pawns of the state; our common belief that strong and successful states can be built on a foundation of many races and many creeds; our conviction that material progress can take place without sacrifice of civil rights; and our common belief that the job of the government is to work for peace and a better life."

It is important for Americans to realize that two of the greatest assets of the free world are the diversity of its members and the freedom allowed for mutual criticism and independence of action. If members of the free world were automatically to agree with all American policies, precious independence and sovereignty such as are denied to the Communist satellites would also be lost to the free world, thereby seriously undermining its moral strength.

The United States has a unique opportunity to support India in one of the most significant undertakings in the postwar world—transformation of an impoverished nation of 400 million persons into an industrialized nation wherein improved living standards will be possible. The instinctive humanitarian nature of the American people, coupled with compelling political reasons, should result in substantial support for continued aid to India. American economic and technical assistance can enable India to maintain an example of freedom and economic progress throughout Asia. India and the United States have common ideals and common objectives. Both desire a world society in which free men can live in security. If people in both countries appreciate that basic fact, understanding will be possible despite differences.

Member Bank Reserve Requirements

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1120) to amend the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System against deposits and to eliminate the classification "central reserve city."

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, S. 1120 presents one fundamental question to the House today. Is the bill a relatively simple bill designed to give the Federal Reserve System permissive, discretionary power to rectify certain inequities in the banking system.

Or, is the bill a gigantic fraud designed by some malevolent genius to force the Federal Reserve to give away $15 billion of Government assets?

Mr. Chairman, I want to state as emphatically as I know how that if I believed for one moment that this bill was anything like the gigantic giveaway that its opponents claim, I would have opposed it vigorously in subcommittee, in the full committee, and I would oppose it today on the floor of the House.

I do not believe that it is such a bill.

I have great respect for the opinions of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. For that reason I listened very attentively to his testimony before our subcommittee. I have also heard his testimony before the Rules Committee and have read his speeches before the House.

However, Mr. Chairman, the testimony before our subcommittee of the very responsible and knowledgeable witnesses in this field was unanimous in support of this bill.

This testimony and the opinions of my learned and experienced colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee convinces me that S. 1120 is what I thought it was and what the other body thought it was—a reasonable, moderate proposal for improvement in our banking system.

This bill will not do what its opponents charge.

What is the position of the opponents? On page 9 of the report accompanying the bill in the dissenting view, it is said:

> Under this bill the Fed will have authority to reduce required reserves of the private banks by a total of $11.3 billion. This means that the Fed could transfer to the banks $11.3 billion worth of these obligations immediately.

This assertion is true, but misleading, because under existing law, without the enactment of S. 1120, and under the theory proposed by the minority, the Fed has had for many years and now has the authority to reduce required reserves of the private banks by a total of $9.3 billion. Therefore, this bill merely increases the theoretical power of the Fed from $9.3 billion to $11.3 billion.

How do the opponents of this legislation compute the figure of $11.3 billion? As shown from the table on page 27 of the report, the opponents assume that the Federal Reserve will reduce the reserve requirement for time deposits to 3 percent. This would free $1 billion of reserves. The misleading thing to note is that this amount can be released under existing law and S. 1120 makes no change whatsoever with respect to reserve requirements for time deposits.

The second assumption made by the opponents is that the Federal Reserve will reclassify all banks, central reserve city banks and reserve city banks, as country banks and reduce their reserve requirements to the statutory minimum for country banks which is 7 percent.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORHEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BARR. That, in effect, would mean that the Federal Reserve Board could change the classification of, say, a bank like Chase Manhattan or the First National City, two of the greatest banks in the United States, to the same status as a bank in a small town in the State of Indiana; is that not correct.

Mr. MOORHEAD. That is the assumption made by the opponents of this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORHEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I have made no assumption like that. I have not assumed that at all. And, I think the gentleman overlooks the fact that there are two ways that the bonds can be acquired, either on a ratio of 2 to 1, 7 to 1, or even 20 to 1.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I refer as authority for my assertion to page 27 of the report, which, in the dissenting views prepared by the gentleman in the second column there appears:

> Central Reserve city banks, New York and Chicago, percent minimum required reserves under proposed bills—7 percent.

That is the reason for my assertion. This would mean freeing approximately $8.3 billion of reserves. There is absolutely no basis whatsoever for assuming that the Federal Reserve would take this ridiculous step. Furthermore, under existing law the Federal Reserve could conceivably redefine Reserve cities and central reserve cities in such a way that all banks would qualify as country banks and the statutory minimum reserve requirement of 7 percent could thereby be fixed for all banks.

In other words, under the existing law the Federal Reserve could release $9.3 billion of reserves, and if S. 1120 were enacted, the Federal Reserve could release an additional $2 billion of reserves.

The Federal Reserve has not used its theoretical power to release reserves of $9.3 billion, and there is no reason to believe that if this bill is enacted the Federal Reserve will use its theoretical power to release $11.3 billion of reserves.

If this legislation permits a giveaway, so does existing legislation which has been on the statute books for years.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the Federal Reserve Board, when it releases reserves, is not doing so to perpetrate a fraud on the American public. It will do so to meet the demands of the customers of the banks, of every Member of this House.

I would like to point out what the demand for money is today from bank customers, farmers, businessmen, from small industrialists, from private individuals. I would like to point out that the demand for private money in the gentleman from Texas' own district is at an alltime high. That is the Dallas Federal Reserve. Take the farm belt, St. Louis, Minneapolis, Kansas City. It is at an alltime high. In the Pacific coast it is at an alltime high. In the Southeast, Richmond, the demand for private money is at an alltime high. The only place they do not need money today is in New York.

Mr. MOORHEAD. It is my position that if this legislation permits a giveaway, so does existing legislation under which the Federal Reserve System has operated since the beginning of its existence. In other words, this bill does not, as its opponents charge, make a fundamental change in the Federal Reserve law.

This bill does no more than make a simple, but important, modernizing change in Reserve requirements.

What will this bill actually do and is it good legislation?

This bill would modernize some outmoded provisions of the law relating to the reserves that member banks of the Federal Reserve System are required to maintain against their demand deposits.

This modernization is needed, as has already been explained by the able subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

The principle change would make it possible, in time, for member banks to count vault cash in satisfying reserve requirements. The present law on treatment of vault cash was enacted in World War I to centralize gold reserves. It became completely outmoded when the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 prohibited private holding of gold in monetary form. This provision will place member banks in a fairer competitive position with the State banks, almost all of which are permitted by State laws to count vault cash as reserves.

It is a reform which would help small banks, which in turn would help small business.

I know that most Members of this House are vigorous supporters of small business. If we are for small business, we should be for small banks because small banks serve small business. Active, vigorous small banks are needed in our economy to foster the growth of small business generally.

Because this legislation will aid small business by aiding small banks and because it will provide for a fairer, more workable system of reserve requirements, geared to meet the expanding credit needs of this country, this legislation should be adopted.

Retirement of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this country knows no finer military historian or critic than Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall. I am delighted that he has recorded a dramatic day in the distinguished career of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, and I ask unanimous consent that an article he has written, entitled "Last Hurrah Day Early for Retiring Army Chief," which appeared in the Detroit News on June 30, 1959, be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I make this request in the belief that the widest circulation possible is deserved by the writer and his subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAST HURRAH DAY EARLY FOR RETIRING ARMY CHIEF

(By Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall, Detroit News Military Critic)

FORT CAMPBELL, KY., June 30.—Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the "Quiet Eagle" and great daddy of all the "Screaming Eagles," did his recessional here yesterday.

According to the official calendar, the Chief of Staff of all the Army will be retired today at Fort Myer, Va., amid formal pomp and circumstance, as is the Washington custom.

Don't believe a word of it. The event is 24 hours too late. As happens so frequently in military matters, the Capital is running somewhat behind the troops and the country.

Taylor turned in his fighting suit yesterday to the booming of the largest, last hurrah ever heard by an American general. The show staged today within stone's throw of God's orchard at Arlington is merely one for the road as he happily sheds his bureaucratic vestments.

All of the grandeur and misery of spirit which may attend a man when he finishes his life's main work, with scarcely a moment to reflect on wins and losses because others are so loudly cheering the score, Taylor knew here yesterday.

For a few fleeting, precious hours, he was back with his own and the sunlit air was heavy with adoration, flowing both ways like an electric current.

The cast for the occasion was the "Old Man" and his progeny, the Taylor-made 101st Airborne Division, trouble-shooter for the Nation. They might well have been singing to each other: "You made me what I am today, I hope you're satisfied."

But the theme song was: "I Have a Rendezvous With Destiny," the division air. It seemed to fit. For though Taylor would have to sing it in the past tense, his "Screaming Eagles" kept marching on as if toward the sound of guns.

PRIME DIVISION

It is a prime division. It could move out ready for battle by today's sunset. Its manner, look, and action suggest that it has plumbed the secret of the old division's power, imparted it by Taylor.

His rule: "Make surprise your watchword; if you are but a handful, go forth and hit."

Boldness shone in the review, which was not simply a march past by 12,051 soldiers, their fighting vehicles, guns, and guidons, but a review of Taylor's richest years.

OTHER TOUCHES

Before a man moved out, all regimental flags and colors moved front and center in closed line directly to the stand. There the banners with their battle streamers were dipped to the chief who had made each streamered name spell victory.

There were other spectacular touches, worthy of the late Cecil B. De Mille, but supplied by Maj. Gen. W. C. Westmoreland, the present commander.

After the division light planes had raced past the stands spilling, red, white, and blue smoke, three large choppers followed, spelling out the words: "Good Luck—Chief."

Coincidentally occurred the day's one small tragedy. The division's feathered mascot, named Max D. Eagle, gave up the ghost, a victim of sunstroke. But he was a patriotic eagle; he saw the show through.

Later there was iced tea wassail and luncheon in the clubhouse. While the regiments paraded, a background voice told the battle feats of each under Taylor's hand. That was enough solemnity for 1 day.

OFF BALANCE FIRST TIME

Over the tables the background voice kidded Taylor, that greatly dignified soldier. For maybe his first time in the Army, he stayed off balance, moving between a choke-up and deep belly laughter.

But the details hardly reflect the mood. It was a day for sentiment and so had to be, since the laws of the heart are not the laws of history. The hour was ripe for recalling his almost boastful words at war's end: "I made this division; it is mine."

Old Eagles who had stood the fire with him Carentan, Nijmegen and Bastogne came homing to Fort Campbell to validate those words. Names like Kinnard, Higgins, Moore, Michaelis, Sink, Harper, and Chappius got their luster under him while young. Most are generals now or soon will be.

HONOR GUARD

Of the new division, 50 formed an honor guard, to lead the march past and then join Taylor in the reviewing stand. All but a few higher noncommissioned officers. That is all of the original 101sters who still wear that patch on the left shoulder.

Even so, the rest of the new legion, which Taylor has never led in war, alined and strode as if knowing that it was under father's eye, with its number embodying all that Taylor loves best within the Army.

In cadence, the "Old Man," who still has the lean look and hard stride of youth, kept saying: "Wonderful, wonderful, aren't they wonderful?"

REVIVES NUMBER

In this lay no exaggerated pride on either side. At war's end, the 101st, a nonpareil in combat, as good its first time in battle as at the close, was dismantled while still in Europe. Taylor thought he had assured its preservation and the bureaucratic defeat rankled.

One of his first acts after becoming boss of the Army was to reconstitute the 101 number as spearhead of the U.S. airborne. Amidst his frustrations and disillusionments, this one part of his handiwork shines like a star, the perfect model for an army which may someday be tuned to the grave needs of this Republic.

But few of its ranks will ever thrive under a self-discipline equal to Taylor's own. The main life task is over. In the immediate aftermath, he'll write his memoirs. Thereafter he would like to find a place in the university world.

This is not as he imagined it would be. Always he looked at far horizons. In youth, he believed that he would be chief of the Army some day and he drove himself unsparingly to get there.

UNSKILLED AT RELAXING

He never learned how to rest or relax, except in hard physical exercise or by getting his full sleep at night, which he did even in combat.

During operations in war, while moving by jeep or plane, he rode book in hand, a language text or manual, to improve his mind and conserve every minute.

By sheer intellect and diligence, he gained his pinnacle, but it did not glisten as his young eyes had seen it. The power to control and to build high was no longer vested in the office. Above it was a ponderous bureaucratic mechanism, made inert by its own overstructuring.

MANY ROADBLOCKS

No one really had power and those who held its fragments were loath to use them to decisive ends. The chief of the Army, and above him, the Secretary, had no touch with the President, and the downed lines could not be restored.

From the view at the top, the landscape piled roadblocks on entanglements with no open highway.

There remained the right of protest. He went as far as dignity and a soldier's oath permitted. It could not be far enough to gain the ends he sought for the Army in the national behalf.

Quitting too early, Taylor must feel that he failed in what counted most. But for once, his Army will not concur.

Honor is his today as never before because he tried, and the heir to his task must also try at the same risk of defeat, if the once great Army is newly to insure its abiding obligation.

Modern Superhighways Paying Off in Safety Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 19, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Modern Superhighways Paying Off in Safety Fight."

MODERN SUPERHIGHWAYS PAYING OFF IN SAFETY FIGHT

With the National Safety Council reporting another alltime low in traffic fatality rates—5.6 per 100 million vehicle-miles in 1958—evidence continues to pile up that the growing Interstate System of limited-access superhighways already is making an important contribution to highway safety.

Many factors underlie the steady improvement in the fatality rate, which has dipped to record lows in 9 of the past 13 years. Involved are the concerted efforts of car and truck makers, traffic engineers, enforcement officials, the organized campaigns of a multitude of local, State, and national safety groups—but improvements in highway design and the accelerated pace of highway construction have been particularly significant.

When the Interstate System was under consideration by Congress, a strong point in its favor was an estimate by U.S. Bureau of Public Roads experts that the network would carry as much as 20 percent of all U.S. traffic and save as many as 4,000 lives a year. Recent reports from States operating the first few thousand miles of highways built to interstate standards lend strong support to this prediction.

Topping the list is the report from the New York Thruway Authority, revealing a record low rate of .88 fatalities per 100 million vehicle-miles in 1958 (down from 1.94 in 1957).

The older Pennsylvania Turnpike showed a rate of 3.3 in 1957.

The New Jersey Turnpike and that State's Garden State Parkway reported 1957 rates of 1.99 and 1.3 respectively.

The Northern Indiana Toll Road shows a coumulative experience of 3.8 fatalities per 100 million vehicle-miles since it opened in 1956, compared with the State average of 5.8 in the same period.

A 13-State network of toll roads extending from New England to the Midwest contributed only four fatalities to the July 4 total—after having completed the Memorial Day holiday without any fatalities at all.

A nagging fly now buzzing around highway-builders' heads, however, may wind up in the ointment for a 2-year stay unless Congress can devise an effective repellent.

Under pay-as-you-go provisions built into the legislation through which the Federal Government will pay 90 percent of the cost of the Interstate System, it appears possible that no Federal funds at all will be available in 1961 and only $300 million in 1962—a drop in the bucket compared with estimated total needs of $4.7 billion for those years. Further, increased construction costs and other factors may leave the program more than $13 billion short in following years unless more money can be allotted.

Federal lawmakers are working on the problem now, with a stopgap solution possible while they study the long-range shortage.

Major factors that combine to make possible safety records such as that of the New York Thruway are rather widely known: Separation of opposing traffic lanes; limiting the number of entrances and exits and designing these to blend incoming and outgoing traffic smoothly into the main traffic flow; elimination of all street, road and rail crossings at grade; elimination of pedestrian traffic, usually a major contributor to fatality statistics; elimination or near-elimination of highway-bordering business establishments.

Not so widely understood may be the plus factors that include: Extra-heavy police details, with strict enforcement of speed limits and other safety rules; in many cases, quick inspection of the mechanical condition of every vehicle seeking entrance and rejection of those obviously unfit; use of such "extras" as reflective striping at interchanges and along the highway edges; liberal use of deflecting guide rails around bridge piers; special service crews to clear disabled cars from the highway, and continuous attention to roadway maintenance.

Many advantages of the Interstate System were cited to the Nation's lawmakers when testimony was taken in 1953 hearings. The Automobile Manufacturers Association listed, after safety, the elimination of billions of dollars in wasted time, vehicle wear and property damage caused by inadequate highways. Testimony by the armed services stressed the value of good roads to national defense.

As low fatality rates continue to be recorded on the superhighways, however, it becomes increasingly more apparent that the biggest benefit of the new Interstate System will be greater highway safety.

Basic Misconceptions in U.S. Military Thought on the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I recently read in the Ukrainian Quarterly, an internationally known source of authoritative information on the Soviet Union, an engrossing article by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a professor of economics at Georgetown University.

Dr. Dobriansky ably outlines the thesis that the deep nationality divisions within the Soviet Union seriously impair the effectiveness of the Red Army.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his article, entitled "Basic Misconceptions in U.S. Military Thought on the U.S.S.R.," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BASIC MISCONCEPTIONS IN U.S. MILITARY THOUGHT ON THE U.S.S.R.

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

In the past 2 years there has been an increasing amount of literature written for public consumption in the United States on the vital subjects of Russian Communist military strategy and the armed forces of the Soviet Union. A careful survey of the literature discloses the fact that much of the material adequately equips the reader with satisfactory descriptive accounts of these subjects. * * *

* * * * *

However, in this growing body of military literature dealing with the Soviet Union one is struck by the existence of a defective conceptual framework. The defects are primarily attributable to a marked unfamiliarity with some fundamental facts in the situation.

The three important cases examined below will, I believe, impress the reader with the basic misconceptions upon which their treatments of the military power and resources of our enemy rest. Two of the cases are privately written books, the third is an official report of the Department of the Army. The two books are used extensively in our highest military institutions. * * * But certainly more important than either of these cases is the official Army report. * * *

Before plunging into this analysis it should be borne in mind that the prevalence and general acceptance of these misconceptions can lead to extremely serious consequences. One needn't tax his imagination to visualize the costs in human life and material equipment that would result from a blind adherence to these misconceptions. * * * Both Napoleon and Hitler worked on false conceptual premises with reference to the subjugated nations of Eastern Europe and central Asia and both, despite their imperialistic designs, met with disaster. With motivations of only self-defense and fitting retaliation it is quite possible for us, operating on the same premises, to meet an equal fate.

In addition, it should be observed that these particular defects in military thought about the Soviet Union are ultimately but a reflection of fundamental errors in our political understanding of the U.S.S.R. Fortunately, in our highest military institutions there is a firm methodologic awareness that significant military thinking cannot be pursued in a vacuum. The heavy ingressions of economic, political, and other factors have to be weighed and accounted for before sound military generalizations and conclusions can be formed.

When it comes to the Soviet Union, the environment of our mortal enemy, this awareness becomes unfortunately beclouded by an uncritical acceptance of conceptual forms which are standardized by a nonmilitary department. * * *

This observation on our current military thinking can be easily substantiated. The three pieces of evidence considered here should prove to be sufficient. For the perceptive reader they should indicate far more than what they actually contain. * * *

THE KISSINGER OUTLOOK

The first case to be considered is the work by Henry A. Kissinger on "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy." * * * Our comments on this work are directed at the couple of chapters devoted to the Soviet Union. They need only be brief since the work itself concentrates on other topics of military and political policy. However, these critical comments are essential in character for much that is advocated by the author as a proper buildup in policy and operation is ultimately predicated upon his understanding of the enemy as disclosed in the two chapters. * * *

A critical examination of chapters 10 and 11 immediately shows the defective nature of Kissinger's outlook toward the peculiar character of the enemy. His outlook is the unrefreshing and borrowed orientation of the Department of State with its characteristic occupational bent toward status quo stability and equilibrium as concerns the Soviet Union. For those who stress an imaginative penetration into the real historical forces operating in Eastern Europe and so-called Soviet Asia, much of the ostensibly philosophical material on Communist doctrine in these chapters may be regarded as practically useless. * * *

The author comes up with the usual fundamental errors that distort his framework of reference, one which is supposed to guide U.S. military thinking. Russia, for him, is the Soviet Union. Throughout his discourse the two are erroneously identified. One would think that the lessons of Napoleon, Wilhelm, and Hitler never existed. In one place, for example, he states that "The emerging middle class in Russia may, of course, in time ameliorate the rigors of Soviet doctrine" (p. 357). One may well ask "What middle class is emerging; and if there is one, what effect could this have on the traditional imperio-messianic bias of the Russian Nation?" This is the real and significant element, not the contrived misleading item of "Soviet doctrine." * * * From these few examples, particularly the basic misidentification of the U.S.S.R. and Russia, one can logically deduce what the tactical planning boards and maps look like for purposes of so-called strategic bombing and the like. Inadvertently, we would be winning the war for the enemy. This has been done in the past. * * *

From the above errors it follows, of course, that there is no perspectival conception in Kissinger of the multinationality of the armed forces in the Soviet Union. The absence of such a conception in turn closes the door of further thought along imaginative lines of methodical preparation for the early and spontaneous disintegration of these forces in the event of war, whether global or limited. * * * Kissinger makes the forceful point that Russian training emphasizes the political and the conceptual, which unfortunately is a lagging feature of our own. However, due to his evident unfamiliarity with East European history, he fails to appreciate the fact that totalitarian Russian doctrine has always given scrupulous precedence to political and psychological pressure over direct military action. What we witness today in many areas of the free world was started by Moscow 500 years ago. The cold war is an old Russian institution, not a product of Marxism or even Russian Leninism.

THE GARTHOFF TREATISE

The second book is titled "Soviet Strategy in the Nuclear Age" and authored by Raymond L. Garthoff. In contrast to the Kissinger work, this treatise concerns itself almost exclusively with the military strategy and armed forces of the Soviet Union. Its tone is predominantly expository and descriptive. * * * On the basis of USSR sources, the author persuasively demonstrates that even in this thermonuclear era the military high command of the USSR continues to adhere to the classical military strategic concept that victory lies in the decisive and complete defeat of the enemy's armed forces. Flexibility and balance punctuate USSR military thinking. * * *

Here, as in the previous case, certain basic misconceptions emerge to distort the analysis in Garthoff's treatise. The distortion becomes even graver in view of his apparent acceptance of Moscow's belief that a nuclear exchange would involve a canceling out of initially expressed power. This phase would be a crucial one but not decisive. Yet, despite the swing of military balance to ground forces in which the USSR enjoys a distinct superiority at this time, this first phase would be marked by havoc, and with this condition one begins to wonder whether the armed forces of the USSR would remain in the compact and loyal condition that Garthoff uncritically assumes throughout his treatise. Again, past experience shows that this would not be the case. For Garthoff, too, the USSR is in effect Russia, the forces are "Soviet forces," and, quite fallaciously, we are supposed to regard them as unified and integrated nationally as we had in the past the enemy forces of Germany, Japan, and Italy.

* * * * *

The author's constant use of the reference term "Soviets" blurs and conceals the multinational character of these forces. It brushes aside the fact that twice in this century such disintegration took place along national lines and with scarcely any external inspiration and aid. Here, too, with evidently no grasp of centuries of Russian cold-war activities against Moscow's neighbors, the author fails to perceive the historical and traditional basis of Moscow's strategic concept. He predicts that in 1970 this concept will remain unchanged and states that the "new political strategic concept of deterrence plus pressure is accompanied by military preparation for any kinds of wars." The plain fact is that this concept is not new in Russian history. As far back as Ivan the Terrible precedent emphasis has always been placed on the political, the psychological, the subversive, and when the object of prey has been sufficiently paralyzed the military would move in. Underlying this allegedly new concept has been Moscow's own frequently verified estimate of the intrinsic unreliability of its armed forces. This estimate is founded on historical experience and is fully justified by the empire nature of the Soviet Union. It is truly amazing that this fundamental factor is not even considered by our current thought. But false conceptions are like dikes which can only be pierced by time and stress.

* * * * *

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY ASSESSMENT

If these basic errors were confined to the field of private inquiry and study, the situation would not appear so ominous. But, as indicated above, this is not the case. On May 15, 1958, the Department of the Army publicly released a study of "The Soviet Army." This assessment of the military forces in the U.S.S.R., consisting of 14 pages in all, obviously purports to treat of basic essentials.

* * * * *

With regard to technical military and technologic essentials, the treatment in the assessment appears to be comprehensive and persuasive. It follows traditional Western lines of military analysis and evaluation which, as shown below, can be most misleading in relation to the Soviet Union. The

usual emphasis is placed on quantitative magnitudes and technologic types.

* * * * *

General inferences drawn from simple technologic facts, which are considered in void of other determining factors, are hazardous enough, but to base a whole assessment on such an erroneous methodology, especially with reference to the Soviet Union, is clearly unwarranted. A critical reading of the report shows this to be the case. It shows the presence of an almost exclusive technologic and quantitative determination of the value of the armed forces in the Soviet Union, supported at the margin by several fallacious assumptions in history and contemporary politics.

* * * * *

This report plainly employs concepts and assumptions which not only fail to conform with fact and reality but also lead to false conclusions. If these misguiding concepts and assumptions are indicative of the dominant thinking in the Department of the Army about the enemy, then one cannot but wonder as to what extent we have come to learn the nature of the enemy, the composition and quality of his forces, the real subordinate role of these forces in his expansionist foreign policy, and the pointed lessons of both world wars on the East European front, not to mention those of Russian military-political policy in the imperialist tradition of Moscow.

Since words and concepts are the mirrors of one's understanding, let us examine the dominant ones of this report. First, the title of the report is "The Soviet Army" and at the very outset, on page one, referring to it, it is stated that "In this capacity, it is prepared to inforce the national policies of the Soviet Union and the international ambitions of world communism." Lest one quickly counter that "this is just a matter of semantics," it is well to bear in mind that the art of semantics itself deals with the meaning of words. The monolithic terms used here would lead us to believe that the armed forces in the U.S.S.R. are like the nationally united forces of Japan and Germany against whom we fought. Nothing could be further from the truth. The outstanding fact is that there is no national integrated Soviet Army. Approximately 43 percent, very likely even more, of the armed forces in the U.S.S.R. is made up of non-Russians derived from various nations now held captive in the Soviet Union.

It is not intended here to elaborate upon this crucial fact in terms of demography, history, and politics. Data in these fields are available for the asking. Instead, one begins to wonder again whether the writers of this assessment ever probed into the causes accounting for the disintegration of the forces of the Russian Empire in 1916 and also in 1941 under the legalistic guise of the Soviet Union. Among many significant questions which can be raised, one may ask, "Why in the face of constitutional provisions for war ministries in the various republics of the Soviet Union does Moscow rigidly follow the policy of dispersing non-Russian military personnel into areas away from their respective native lands and of preventing at all costs the formation of compact and nationally united Georgian, Lithuanian, Ukrainian and other non-Russian divisions?" Complete and satisfying answers to this and cognate questions can only be found in the historically uninterrupted struggle of the non-Russian nations against imperialist Russian domination. Although the West has not fully understood this, this fundamental and grave weakness in the unnatural body politic of the U.S.S.R. afflicts its multinational armed forces, too.

In the light of these few fundamental considerations, accuracy in thought and concept would cause us to entitle a work of this sort "The Multinational Armed Forces of U.S.S.R." This would semantically, and thus meaningfully, negate Moscow's purposeful usage of Soviet which we inadverently and at disadvantage to ourselves have adopted. Little is it realized that in the same way the Czars, from Peter down, employed the term Russian to cover every colonial acquisition of Russia, the Russian Bolsheviks, at the very beginning of Russian Communist aggression in 1918, skilfully introduced the generalized use of Soviet to conceal from the outside world their early imperialist acquisitions of a number of newly independent non-Russian states. Specially for free world consumption and thought habituations. the Russian masters have consistently urged and stressed such terms as "the Soviet people," "the Soviet man," "the Soviet Army," etc., with the obvious and apparently successful aim of creating the impression of real union, a oneness of forces, and a monolith of strength in the U.S.S.R. * * *

However, what one would clearly be unable to find in any Russian Communist literature is such a thoroughly incongruous and inept usage as "the national policies of the Soviet Union," which appears on page one in the report. By force of political circumstance Moscow cannot help but recognize the multinational character of its shaky empire. One would think that by force of self-interest and thus sympathic study we would recognize the same. Moreoevr, whether world communism has international ambitions or, in realistic terms, these ambitions of world domination are nurtured by Russian Communist totalitarians with a national tradition of over 500 years, is rapidly vanishing as an issue in many areas of advanced thinking on these subjects. Here, too, one would think that the prime slogan in the recent Hungarian revolution, "Russki Go Home," would have suggestively led many to realize that ideologic communism is another tool in the arsenal of traditional Russian expansionism and "cold war" activity. It is perhaps sufficient here to suggest the reading of the Marquis Astolphe de Custine's classic, "Journey for Our Time" (New York, 1951) for one to appreciate that the basic institutions of Russia itself have scarcely changed in the past 100 years.

A further point of essential criticism may be directed at a statement appearing on page 14 in the report: "This formidable war machine is in a constant state of military readiness to fulfill any tasks which Soviet policy may require of them. They are subjected to effective political control." It is readily recognized that it is sounder to overestimate the enemy and prepare to meet his challenge in these terms than to underestimate him and find oneself ill-prepared. Despite this, however, in the complex of politico-military interrelationships an overestimation exaggerated by adjectives, as underscored above, can create many false impressions with unfavorable political effect. This approach, which admittedly has practical use for domestic objectives, provides unwarranted leverage to the enemy in his cold war demands and diplomatic offensives.

Again, for students of imperial Russian history all this is not new. In the 19th century and up to World War I, for example, the cold war activities of St. Petersburg succeeded in having the West believe that the armed forces of the Russian Empire constituted a formidable steamroller, a term which evolved into general use. So long as there was no major conflict, the illusion built up had enormous political effect. When the wholesale debacles of the Russo-Japanese War and World War I occurred, this illusion came into full view for those who asked "Why was this so?" This report plainly supports the resurrection of the steamroller illusion.

The conclusions to be drawn from these criticisms obviously run counter in some degree to those stated on page 14 in the report. First, the U.S.S.R. war machine is not as formidable as Moscow would have us believe. The Hungarian revolution itself provides us with the most recent evidence of significant Ukrainian desertions from the so-called Soviet Army, hundreds joining the patriots in Budapest in pursuit of a common cause. Second, by their very nature these forces are hardly able to fulfill any tasks posed by Moscow. Fully conscious of its own history and past policies, Moscow, more than anyone else, knows how fundamentally unreliable its polyglot forces are; and in the tradition of Russian imperial policy, it exerts maximum effort in avoiding any major commitment of its own forces. Third, these facts and more cause one to disaccept the groundless assumption that these forces are subjugated to effective political control or that political activity in the armed forces is intensive and influential.

On the basis of these critical conclusions the threat to the free world which the Soviet Army today presents is, contrary to the assessment, not so obvious. It is concluded in the assessment that "The Soviet Army is capable of * * * supplying manpower as 'volunteers' and providing material support for operations in areas roughly contiguous to the Soviet Union and vulnerable to Communist exploitation. The Soviet Government can do any of these confident in the knowledge that initially it is the only major power in the world today which has the great preponderance of ground forces in being."

This conclusion is, of course, logically based on the contents of the report and their implied steamroller illusion, but it is unfortunately not based on evaluated fact. Indeed, the major elements of this conclusion serve to support some propaganda themes employed by Moscow.

Repeating one of the first criticisms in this analysis, the concept of capability embraces not only quantitative content but also, and in this case more important, the qualitative as well. To repeat further, concerning the U.S.S.R., the qualitative element refers not only to the skills of military training but also—and again more important—to the national and political diversities of the armed forces. In this realistic light Moscow is not as capable as it may seem to provide "volunteers," which, despite its propaganda boasts, it has not done when opportunities presented themselves. Moreover, as in the Hungarian case, its provision of material support was not without gaping holes which furnished the West with decisive opportunities for which it proved to be ill-prepared.

In conclusion, the assessment given by the Department of the Army is to a regrettable degree out of context in relation to East European and central Asian realities. In this fundamental connection it is misleading and could be put to effective use by Moscow propagandists. Its broad equalitative significance is virtually nil. It offers further evidence of the critical lag in American thought concerning not only the Soviet Union but also the intertwined relationships between the military and political factors in the modern scene. In the U.S.S.R. as in the previous Czarist Russian Empire, such relationships are basic to any assessment.

As Hobbes once pointed out, "Force and fraud are in war the two cardinal virtures." Whether in a cold war or hot one, the Russians surpass all in the second virtue. In this they are sustained by the perpetuated and lingering misconceptions that Westerners have of their empire. Our current military thinkers are abetting their skillful play on fraud.

The Philadelphia Textile Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the development of textiles in America was a tremendous stride forward in our country's march toward its present world industrial status.

For this reason, I think it appropriate that a brief outline of the development and growth of the Philadelphia Textile Institute, the first and largest school of its kind in the United States, be brought to the attention of the Congress and the American people. The institute, which was established to engage in research and teaching of manufacturing skill and the art of design, is celebrating this year its 75th anniversary. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement concerning the growth of the institute as prepared by Mr. Alan M. Richter.

THE PHILADELPHIA TEXTILE INSTITUTE

The Philadelphia Textile Institute was founded in 1884 and represented the first and most important effort that had been made in the United States to offer classroom instruction directly applicable to textiles. The realization that such an institution was of absolute necessity occurred following the Philadelphia Centennial International Exposition in 1876. The exposition plainly showed that European products, particularly in textiles, were far superior to those being produced in the United States.

Mr. Theodore Search, a member of the firm Erben, Search & Co., yarn manufacturers of Philadelphia, was largely responsible, in 1882, in establishing the Philadelphia Textile Association whose primary object was the promotion of textile education in the United States. These industrialists were well aware of the progress of textile schools in Europe and recognized that the United States could not hope to maintain the best markets for its textile products unless these products combined the highest skill in manufacturing and the best taste in design. When the association failed to reach its goal of $50,000 needed to start the school, Search contributed generously and also assumed some of the teaching responsibility.

This project was made known to the trustees of the Pennsylvania Museum of Art who agreed to absorb the new school as one of its departments and placed at its disposal rooms in the Industrial Art School, then located at 1336 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A few short years proved conclusively that this new educational undertaking was not only a great addition to the textile manufacturing community of Philadelphia but an element of strength to the entire country. Friends of the enterprise visited the best schools in Europe in the interest of the institution and many foreign methods and procedures were adopted and put into practice.

In 1893, because of the increased enrollment, it became necessary to acquire larger quarters and the institution purchased a building on the northeast corner of Broad and Pine Streets, Philadelphia, Pa. The new building contained accommodations for over a thousand students and remained the home of the institute for the next 56 years.

In 1941, the 58th year of existence of the Philadelphia Textile Institute, was a notable one. It was in this year that the State of Pennsylvania first authorized the school to grant the degree of bachelor of science in textiles to graduates who satisfactorily completed the 4-year course. At the suggestion of the Alumni Association, the word "school" was replaced by the word "institute" in the title of the college and the college became known as the Philadelphia Textile Institute.

In 1943, the committee of instructions, which had served in a dual capacity for both art school and the textile school of the parent Philadelphia Museum of Art, the new name for the old Pennsylvania Museum of Art, agreed to the formation of separate boards of governors of the two schools.

This was done because the growth of both schools plus their individual differences created complications making administration difficult by a single group. This creation of a separate board of governors for the college was the beginning of movement that was to be culminated in the complete separation from the museum of art in a very few years. Members of this new board of governors felt that the time was ripe to find other quarters for the institute. Before making any commitments it was realized that a tremendous amount of money would be needed for such a venture, and out of this came the creation of the Philadelphia Textile Institute Foundation, 2 nonprofit corporation devoted to the advancement of textile education. In June of 1944, after months of preliminary organization, corporate papers were granted to the foundation.

A campaign was started to supply the funds so necessary to allow the institute to obtain other quarters. The Foundation in 1946 purchased a 12½-acre site in Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., for the college's new home. Two years and over a million dollars later, in September 1948, ground was broken for the new building. In April 1949, 90 percent of the building was finished for the cornerstone laying ceremonies. On October 6, 1949, the building was completed and ready for occupancy and classes began. The new Hesslein Library, constructed concurrently, was finished soon afterward. It was shortly after moving to its new location that the college was incorporated and separated completely from the Philadelphia Museum of Art.

In 1954, the Philadelphia Textile Institute took another step in the expansion and improvement of its facilities when, in October ground was broken for the new residence hall. The dormitory houses 150 students and contains 4 common rooms. In 1957 a wing was added to the Hesslein Library.

In 1955, there occurred the realization of one of the major educational goals. The college was accepted for membership in and fully accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. At this writing, the Philadelphia Textile Institute is authorized to grant the bachelor of scince degree in textile engineering, textile management and marketing, fabric design, and textile chemistry and dyeing, and, as mentioned, is a fully accredited technological educational institution.

The fifth structure, a student union building, is currently under construction. This badly needed addition will give the institute the major facilities to insure a well rounded educational program.

Today, the Philadelphia Textile Institute continues to be recognized locally, nationally, and worldwide as having the finest educational programs to be found in textile education. The graduate of Philadelphia Textile Institute is not limited to a career in textiles. The curriculums in chemistry, in management and marketing, and the technological curriculums prepare him for graduate study or for a wide and rapidly increasing number of positions with chemical corporations, retailing posts, and clothing manufacturers as well as the whole range from art to production throughout the textile industry.

The department of chemistry prepares students for the textile and related industries such as synthetic fiber, chemical, plastic, paint, etc. The aim of the department is to provide the student with an understanding of the basic fields of chemistry and the major fields of textile chemistry. He also has available the facilities of a complete dyeing laboratory.

In basic research the textile chemist may be concerned with modifying the chemical structure of existing fibers or synthesizing new fibers, new dyestuffs, new finishing agents, etc.

In development the textile chemist searches for methods of dyeing and finishing new fibers, while constantly looking for better methods of treating existing fibers. He must also help determine the uses for which a fiber is best suited. For example:

1. Why is nylon used for tire cord when Fortisan is stronger?
2. Why is asbestos and not fiberglass used for insulating jet enginees when both are mineral and fireproof?
3. What fibers, because of their chemical and physical properties, are suited for artificial arteries—teflon, vinyon, dacron, etc.?

There are a host of unsolved problems, and older problems awaiting better solutions, and there are far too few men now available in the area.

In sales engineering the textile chemist is concerned with solving technical and production problems of his company's accounts.

In production a textile chemist must help keep his company abreast of recent developments. Usually the wet processing operations of a textile plant are under the jurisdiction of the plant chemist.

In technical sales the textile chemist, not simply an order taker, sells his service as well as his product.

The course in textile management and marketing is offered to meet the expanding need for capable managers and executives in the merchandising and marketing of textiles. The opportunities available to young men and women are unequalled in any other field today—the graduates can look forward to an interesting future with a rapid rise to success without the need for graduate study and long competitive years in each position held.

The unique combination of liberal arts, business and technical subjects in this unusual course avoids over-specialization and provides the broad base of education so highly sought for by employers throughout the business world today. In no other field or program of study can this be accomplished in 4 years of undergraduate work. In the outline of the course there is a fine balance of management essential with the humanities—the subjects that develop the disciplines needed to assess the human situations that arise daily. These elements are nicely integrated with sufficient textile technology for the graduate to understand and evaluate the things as well as the people with whom he or she works.

Graduates of the management and marketing course will be of immediate value to the diversified textile industry—in administrative positions, in manufacturing, or in the challenging and fascinating areas of promoting, buying, or selling of textile products.

The first year of the fabric design curriculums encompasses a general course giving the student a chance to become accustomed to college life while studying academic subjects. Specialized studies and laboratory experience are added in the second year. Knowledge and skill, the tools of the fabric designer, are both artistic and technical. Fabric design courses train the student in the technology of weaves, fabric analysis, and construction, together with the knowledge of yarn types, sizes, uses, and the fabrics which are made of yarns.

Learning to plan on paper a fabric which will be produced in a loom is one goal of these studies. Yarn manufacture—limits of yarn sizes and types according to the spinning system—is demonstrated in lectures and laboratories. The fabric designer must also be informed about the methods of adding color to textiles—at all stages and for all of the raw materials. Studies in dyeing and printing combine the color ideas of the artist with the practical aspects of application and duplication.

Art, color design, and textile technology challenge the creative abilities of the future designer. And with all of the equipment available for experiment in any area of fabric design, you may test your ideas for their practicality, as well as for their originality. Art courses such as: color, design, nature study, form, and composition help the student explore methods of design creations. Application of these methods to specific problems follows in the textile, fashion, and interior design periods.

Textile engineering covers the manufacture of substances from basic materials through controlled chemical and physical change and through controlled mechanical alinements and transformations to fiber, to blend, to top, to sliver, to yarn, to fabric, woven or knitted, through the chemical and physical changes of dyeing and finishing to the fabric for use in a wide variety of subsequent forms.

Operations are combined in sequence to form a manufacturing process. Process control and instrumentation are increasingly important to provide automatic, manual or combined manual-automatic supervision of a process, particularly in dyeing and finishing.

Processes include making of fibers from cellulose, resins, glass, ginning of cotton, scouring and carbonizing of wool, retting of flax, carding, blending, gilling, drawing, spinning, weaving, knitting, dyeing, finishing. Most of these processes involve fiber length, strength, crimp, and many physical and chemical, qualitative and quantitative characteristics of fibers for selected end uses of fabrics.

Knowledge needed to work in the field includes mathematics, quantitative and qualitative analysis, inorganic and organic chemistry, physical chemistry, physics, mechanics, textile design, fabric structures, yarn-manufacturing systems, weaving, textile mill equipment.

Accessory techniques may be those used by the mechanical, electrical, chemical engineer, by management engineers, or by the physicist.

Textile engineers could work in any of the following activities: research design, development, testing, procurement, production, construction, operation, administration, teaching.

The credit for the development of this great college belongs to many people, both in and out of the textile industry. Philadelphia Textile Institute, with a great heritage, is fast approaching a period in its history incomparable with any that has passed.

Our Scientists Know How To Release Atomic Energy—Will Our Political Leaders Know How To Use It Wisely?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two stories I sent back from Geneva last fall reporting my observations as a congressional adviser to the American delegation to the Second International Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy—and some reflections thereon.

The stories follow:

REPORT FROM GENEVA

I. AMERICAN SCIENTISTS LEAD THE FIELD—SEPTEMBER 6, 1958

This International Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy at Geneva is the finest job of salesmanship for anything American that I have seen anywhere.

The U.S. scientific exhibits are walking away with the honors. Both the general public and the scientists themselves are voting with their feet. At any hour of the morning when only delegates are admitted to the exhibit hall, and in the afternoon when it is open to the public, there are many more visitors in the U.S.A. exhibits than in all the others combined.

One reason is the superiority of the exhibits themselves. Instead of long, printed descriptions of American accomplishments, frequently the machines themselves are here. Another is that the devices are live and working. When the actual machine could not be transported or reconstructed here, there is an animated portrayal on a screen, or a miniature, or an opened-up model in motion showing just what is happening inside.

Still more impressive to the visitor, especially to the scientific delegate, is the fact that at the machine to operate it and explain it in person is, in so many cases, the Americans who designed and developed it. It is interesting to watch the faces of these top scholars, professors, inventors from all over the world as they read the nameplate worn by each American and realize that the ordinary looking gentleman, generally in his thirties or even his late twenties, who will answer questions about the gadget is the great Doctor So-and-So of Los Alamos or Oak Ridge or Caltech, whose papers they have read with admiration. It is the equivalent of the movie-goer coming face to face with Cary Grant or Elizabeth Taylor.

Someone showed a stroke of genius when he placed a blackboard alongside most of the major devices demonstrating discoveries of principles in basic physics. So you see Dr. Stalinsky of the Soviet Union or an earnest student from Germany furiously drawing diagrams or writing equations as they argue it out with the American scientist, oblivious to the milling crowds around them.

Another 10-strike was the recruitment and training of about 50 attractive young women as guides. Most of them are Swiss medical or technical students, although some, including 3 or 4 Negro girls, are from the United States. They all speak French and English. The Swiss girls speak German and Italian also. There are others speaking Spanish, Russian, the Scandinavian languages, and a few others. So, almost any group of visitors finds a girl ready to show it through the American exhibits and explain them in the group's own language. The girls were given about 3 weeks of training by someone who succeeded remarkably in teaching them either an understanding of complicated processes or language that will explain the essentials—plus an enthusiasm for the new world being revealed that is contagiously convincing. They have a patter that would do credit to any Gray Line bus guide.

One of the most popular features is the 4 miniature theaters in which visitors can see one or another of 27 new technical films, 5 to 25 minutes long, with earphones describing in English, French, Spanish, and Russian the process being shown in color on the film.

Another crowded spot is the literature center. A whole wall is lined with books written by Americans on all aspects of atomic energy. One does not realize how much has been done in this new field until it is seen assembled in one place. The books, technical journals, a card catalog of all publications are all available for browsing by delegates. And they stand in lines to do so. The free literature table is swept bare as fast as the piles can be replaced. Both students and older men go away carrying pounds of printed material to study in laboratories from Japan to Romania to Argentina.

In the past I have often been critical of U.S. information centers in the various capitals of the world, because, in general, they were inferior to those of the Russians. The latter were better organized, better staged and lighted, more attractive; ours tended to look like the rows of ears of corn at a county fair. But the roles are certainly reversed in this conference. Our exhibits are superbly arranged, dramatically displayed, with simple, matter-of-fact descriptive legends. Not a word of self-praise, extravagant claims, or criticism of others.

In contrast, the Russian exhibit is largely photographs, diagrams, or architects' drawings with legends proclaiming what they say they have done or are about to do; or what they say others have said in praise of Russia's wonderful work for peace. A picture of the Red Square is thrown in, emphasizing that it is more a propaganda show than a scientific exhibit. The only place that I ever saw as many as a dozen people gathered was around a replica of Sputnik I. Just why that should be exhibited in a conference on peaceful uses of the atom was not explained.

The performance makes an American proud of his country. It renews one's hope that maybe we can get someone to do as good a job for American ideas, culture, values, motivations as these scientists are doing for American science.

II. WILL OUR DEMOCRACY KEEP ABREAST OF SCIENCE?—SEPTEMBER 9, 1958

There is a marked contrast between the scientists from all countries who are attending the International Conference in Geneva on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy and the political leaders of the same countries whom I was privileged to observe and work with while serving as a delegate to the United Nations General Assembly in New York a year ago.

Here are some general differences, of course with a good many individual exceptions:

The scientists overwhelmingly are young men; the U.N. delegates are predominantly older men, except from a few of the newly independent countries.

The scientists are full of enthusiasm and confidence about the future; most of the U.N. delegates seem tired, defeatist, even cynical about it.

The scientists care little about personal rank or protocol; they give credit to whoever is doing the best work, regardless of his nationality or the smallness or obscurity of his laboratory or his institution. The political leaders tend to be inordinately jealous of rank, position, personal prestige.

The scientists are bent only on finding ways to solve whatever problems arise; the political leaders are eloquent in explaining why the problems cannot be solved. They never have been solved, have they?

The scientists approach scientific problems as human beings searching for all facts that can be proved to be true; the political leaders approach their problems of what to do about the scientists' discoveries principally as partisans of differing political systems. Might it shake our side's position if we were to admit some validity to the other side's achievements?

Yet it is these political leaders who will determine how the scientists' remarkable accomplishments are to be used.

In such a frustrating and disturbing situation, a first urge might be to throw out the old, tired, defeatist political leaders and let the younger, more flexible minds which created the new machines decide how they are to be used.

And yet the evidence is not convincing that men who are outstandingly successful as scientists will be equally able in the political field. Everyone knows of the brilliant and dedicated doctor or professor touched with genius in his own realm who is at the same time notoriously incompetent in running his ordinary affairs. He has superior knowledge and ability in a specialized field; he does not necessarily have superior wisdom or commonsense.

Only 2 decades ago we saw gifted men in Germany—outstanding leaders in science, the arts, business—who at the same time followed and cheered a madman. Some outsiders protested in unbelief, "But the Germans are so highly cultured, they love beautiful music, they weep over moving passages in literature." True. The same people also threw human beings into furnaces for no reason except their race.

The unanswered question is whether men who examine everything critically in the scientific field will be equally critical and courageous with respect to political dogmas.

If they will be, then the tens of thousands of first-rate scientists that the Soviet Union has been feverishly training will reject the political theories and policies of those presently in charge and will pull down the tyrants.

Doubtless most of us in the West have believed, or at least desperately hoped, that such will be the case, that human beings given freedom of thought in one field will demand equal freedom in all other fields. Yet we must admit that it is by no means certain.

Some educators have long maintained that mental skills, habits, disciplines in one field are not transferred to other fields. And it is clear that scientists have put their abilities at the disposal of despots in pursuit of crazy ideas and cruel objectives about as often and as willingly as ordinary people have.

There is no easy way out for us. The common folks cannot shift to the scientists who released the new powers the responsibility for deciding for what purposes they are to be used. In a democracy that terrible responsibility falls on all of us. We must be willing to give time and effort to becoming informed on these matters of literally life and death importance, and to lead in finding the necessary political solutions.

Most political leaders probably tend to follow more than to lead, to reflect more than to create public opinion. This means that in a democracy, government leaders will not long get very far ahead of or away from what they think the people are thinking.

If the politicians are defeatist or unwilling to work as eagerly for change as the scientists are, it is because the politicians believe the people want most of all to maintain their own fairly comfortable status quo. They want more to relax than to be disturbed.

The research worker generally combines strict mental disciplines regarding the known with a certain openness of mind that approaches anarchy of thought regarding the unknown. But the political leader charged with preserving a nation recoils from the slightest suggestion of any anarchy anywhere.

The scientist pursues the unfamiliar; the political leader clings to the familiar, because the people seem to want him to.

Perhaps another reason for the differences in approach is the fact that the scientists deal largely with substances and forces that can be weighed or measured, however tiny or elusive. There is something tangible to pursue. But how can an emotion be measured? Or a desire, or a prejudice in the human mind?

Or perhaps these are not in the mind at all, but are reactions in the heart—as that term is commonly understood.

And, if so, what are the things that influence the human heart? Tradition does. Environmental conditioning does. Religion does. But are the historic religions that teach tolerance, kindliness, brotherhood influencing men today in many parts of the world as powerfully as the religions of nationalism, racism and communism are? And these latter teach intolerance, exclusiveness, unbrotherliness.

The more one sees and reflects on the awful potential for good or ill in the new knowledge of how matter was put together in the first place, and how it now, for the first time, can be both taken apart and put together by man, the more inescapable and sobering is the realization that our tasks as a people in deciding what to do with these terrible powers are far more difficult than were the tasks of the scientists in discovering how to release them. Will we do as well as they are doing?

Our present numbness in the presence of such a responsibility is perhaps inevitable. Certainly it is understandable. Within one 40-year period we have been thrust into the air age, the electronic age, the atomic age, and now the space age.

How can human beings hope to digest so much so fast? Yet digest it we must. There can be no survival for those who fail. I am confident that we can, if we will, play our part with as great success as the scientists are playing theirs—and with great benefit to all mankind.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*—Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*—Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*—408 A St. NE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah.*
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*—The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*—The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*—Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*—4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*—2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho.*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho.*
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*—3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska.*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*—3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*—4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*
Langer, William, *N. Dak.*—2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio.*
Long, Russell B., *La.*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa.*—4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah.*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*—122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*—The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine.*
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*—4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John J., *Del.*
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex.*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*—Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio.*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS JUSTICES ASSIGNED TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Laredo, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Rio Grande, the boundary between Texas and Mexico, was first bridged in 1889. This first international bridge was constructed at Laredo, in southwest Texas, but Laredo has always been the major point of crossing the river, even before Texas had won its independence from Mexico.

Laredo has shown tremendous growth since the beginning of the 19th century, and commerce between the United States and Mexico has increased correspondingly. Laredo is a delightful city with a colorful history as one of the largest and most successful Spanish settlements in Texas. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from Texas Business Review recording this history of Laredo and the city's rich promise for the future.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIVERSIFIED ECONOMY BUILDS OPTIMISTIC FUTURE FOR LAREDO

(By Charles R. McCord)

On May 14, 1755, Thomas Sanchez de la Barrera y Gallardo, acting in the name of Spanish colonizer, Jose de Escandon, founded the settlement of Laredo on the north bank of the Rio Grande some 200 miles northwest of the river's mouth. Until his death in 1796, Sanchez, holding concurrently the offices of chief justice and alcalde, was in effect the one-man government of the new settlement. Within the term of his administration, Laredo became the largest and most successful permanent Spanish settlement in what is now southwest Texas.

From an initial population of about 85 in 1755, by 1800 Laredo had grown to be a then impressive community of about 1,000 and had established itself as the major point of crossing on the Rio Grande between El Paso del Norte and the Gulf of Mexico.

As a condition of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which terminated the hostilities of the Mexican War in 1848, Mexico agreed to recognize the Rio Grande as the international boundary and thus relinquished all claim to Laredo and all other Mexican settlements north of the river. Laredo was at that time designated as the seat of government of the newly created Webb County.

But the movement of people and goods is apt to follow the easiest and most accustomed route, regardless of political decisions. The boundary relocation effected by the treaty did not appreciably alter the course of commerce in the area, for it did not depreciate the comparative advantages of the river crossing at Laredo.

The new international division simply created a need for a new Laredo on the south side of the river. The importance of the river crossing itself—Laredo—Nuevo Laredo—as a major point of confluence of traffic between Mexico and the United States was never diminished; rather, it grew steadily as commerce between the nations increased through the years.

The Rio Grande was first bridged at Laredo in 1889. Until then passage across the river had been by ferry. The two predecessors of the present international bridge had unhappily brief careers—the first was destroyed by fire in 1920, the second by flood in 1954. The present bridge, an impressive four-lane span, was built on a scale sufficient to handle the tremendous flow of vehicular and pedestrian traffic that crosses the river each day.

The population of Laredo has increased steadily throughout the history of the community. As measured by percentage increase of population, the city experienced its most dramatic growth during the decade of the 1880's.

In 1881 both the Corpus Christi and Rio Grande (later the Texas-Mexican) and the International-Great Northern (later the Missouri Pacific) Railways completed the construction of their tracks into Laredo. Here, as in the West generally, the advent of the railroad was a powerful economic stimulus.

From 1880 to 1890 Laredo's population rose from 3,521 to 11,319, an increase of 221 percent. The years of World War I were Laredo's next period of explosive growth. From 1910 to 1920 its population increased approximately 53 percent, from 14,855 to 22,710.

Since 1920 Laredo has shown substantial percentage, and increasingly significant absolute, increases in each population census. The most reliable estimates available place the current population of the city at approximately 65,000.

As the population of Laredo has grown through the years, it has come to represent an increasingly larger portion of the total population of Webb County. At the turn of the century only 61 percent of the people of Webb County resided in Laredo. In 1957 it was estimated that the population of the city comprised, roughly, 93 percent of the population of the county as a whole.

The growth of Laredo has been paralleled by the expansion of her sister city across the river. In fact, most estimates now indicate that Nuevo Laredo's population slightly exceeds that of Laredo. It is now quite likely that the two cities together form a metropolitan area of approximately 140,000 population.

Webb County is located in the central western portion of the south Texas (or Rio Grande) plain, a subregion of the Texas coastal plain. The topography and vegetation of Webb County is typical of that which has caused much of the south Texas plain to be called brush country or Monte.

The land, rising from the river in gentle undulations, is covered by a dense growth of bunch grasses, cactus, and scrub. With the exception of a narrow band of irrigated truck farms on the alluvial shelf along the Rio Grande, the great expanse of the country is given almost exclusively to large-scale cattle ranching.

The southern portion of the South Texas Plain, including Webb County, has the longest summer and mildest winter seasons of any area in the State. The climate of Webb County is dry and warm with an average annual rainfall of 19.27 inches and a mean annual temperature of 72°. The irrigated farms of Webb County are favored with a 293-day growing season, only about 85 days of which, on an average, are cloudy.

In its natural state, the Rio Grande is not an unqualified blessing to Laredo. The river's flow—fluctuating from flood stage to a mere trickle—is too erratic for it to be an ideal municipal water supply. At present, there are two projects in advanced stages of planning, either one, or both, of which would solve Laredo's water problems for the foreseeable future.

One of these plans is to use Lake Casa Blanca as an off-river storage reservoir. By this plan, the city could borrow water from the reservoir in time of need and repay the amount borrowed whenever the Rio Grande was again running high. Lake Casa Blanca was created in 1950 by the construction of an impounding dam across Chacon Creek just northeast of the city limits. Apart from its possible function as a storage reservoir, the lake now provides the people of Laredo with an excellent recreation area.

The other plan, and it now appears the one most likely to be effected, consists in attacking the problem of the river's uncertain flow. This now much-publicized project, the Diablo Dam, will be a huge international dam on the Rio Grande near its confluence with the Devil's River a few miles northeast of Del Rio.

The Diablo Dam is one of the three such projects proposed in a treaty signed by the United States and Mexico in 1944. The Falcon Reservoir in Starr and Zapata Counties is the only one of these projects realized thus far. It is estimated that the Diablo Dam, as now planned, would produce a total storage capacity of 5,977,000 acre-feet, making its reservoir the largest in Texas. Construction of this great multipurpose dam would provide a permanent solution to the water problem of Laredo and would be of great value to the cities downstream.

Though the economy of Laredo is basically oriented to the functions of an international port, it has a modest, but growing, industrial sector. Through their chamber of commerce and industrial development committee, the business and civic leaders of the community are actively soliciting new industry for Laredo. City officials are also aware of the need for a more diversified industrial base for Laredo's economy.

The city planning commission has recently proposed an industrial zoning ordinance which would encourage, and set the conditions for, an orderly industrial development in the city.

Just north of the Laredo city limits, Texas Mining & Smelting, a division of the National Lead Co., operates the largest antimony smelter in the world. For years this smelter has been a major employer in Laredo. It smelts ores imported from Mexico, the leading supplier of this strategic raw material to the United States.

Another major industrial employer in Laredo, and one of ever growing significance, is the apparel and textile products industry. The principal manufacturer in the textile products category is the Texas Harvest Hat

Co., a firm whose products have been well known for years in international markets.

The leading firms in the apparel category are the Laredo Manufacturing Co., Amedee Frocks, Inc., and Salo Manufacturing Co. Together, these four leading concerns employ approximately 500 people. There is an abundant labor supply in Laredo particularly suitable for industries such as these, and electric power and natural gas are also available at attractive rates.

The principal minerals of Webb County are brick clay, sand, gravel, cannel coal, oil, and natural gas. As sources of income and employment, by far the most significant of these are oil and natural gas. Natural gas was discovered in Webb County in 1908, and in 1920 O. W. Killam brought in the county's first oil well.

The total value of mineral production in Webb County, largely from sales of oil and natural gas, was $7,368,590 in 1957.

The center of activity in petroleum and natural gas production is Mirando City in the southeast corner of the county. However, Laredo businesses receive a considerable income in providing goods and services for mining employees working in the oil and gas fields of Webb, Duval, Jim Hogg and Zapata Counties. The Texas Employment Commission estimates that, on the average, 375 workers were employed in Webb County in 1958 in mining, quarrying, and oil production.

In addition to manufacturing and mining activity, agricultural production makes a large contribution to the economy of Webb County. According to 1958 estimates of the Texas Employment Commission, approximately 13 percent of the persons employed in the county were engaged in agriculture. Though irrigated truck farming is an important element in the agriculture of Webb County, as a source of income to the area cattle ranching is of far greater significance.

The value of all farm products sold from the county in 1954 was $5,784,812. Of that total, $4,020,067 or 70 percent, derived from sales of livestock and livestock products. The value of all crops sold was $1,763,545, or 30 percent of the total.

Vegetables—primarily tomatoes, onions, and melons, but also including lettuce, peppers, spinach, broccoli, carrots, beets, sweet corn, mustard greens, grapefruit, oranges, and limes—accounted for 87 percent of the value of all crops sold in that year.

Laredo is served by two railways, the Texas-Mexican and the Missouri Pacific. Freight and passengers entering Mexico by rail are transferred at the river to the equipment of the Ferrocarriles Nacional de Mexico. The city also receives the traffic of three U.S. highways and one State highway. At Laredo these highways tie into the much-traveled Pan American Highway, which provides a popular route to Mexico City via Monterrey.

When present road construction is completed, Laredo will communicate with the national Interstate and Defense Highway Systems through a four-lane divided highway to San Antonio. The completion of this project is certain to bring a considerable increase in tourist traffic through Laredo.

The city is also served by air through the facilities of the Laredo Air Force Base where flights of the Trans-Texas Airlines are serviced. Tourists traveling by air can continue into Mexico on a flight of the Campania Mexicana de Aviacion, which operates a terminal in Nuevo Laredo.

Laredo Air Force Base was constructed during World War II to be used as a flexible gunnery training base. It was closed after the war in 1945, but on April 1, 1952, the Air Force reactivated it as a field for basic single-engine pilot training. There are now about 2,400 military personnel at the base and its operations give employment to approximately 650 civilian workers. A recent report from Washington indicates that there will be no change in the status of the base in the foreseeable future.

The recent growth of Laredo's economy is indicated by some of the commonly used measurements of business conditions. Total value of retail sales for the Laredo metropolitan area in 1950 was $46,441,000. In 1957 this value had increased to $52,814,000. The value of authorized construction rose from $1,102,000 in 1950 to $3,946,499 in 1957, and in that same period bank debits increased from $214,800,000 to $282,092,000.

It is estimated that in 1958 the total population of the Laredo retail trading area was 472,460. This market area includes several of the surrounding Texas counties and extends into Mexico as far as Monterrey. Laredo has 42 merchant wholesalers employing about 40 persons, and 17 sales agencies, brokers, and petroleum bulk stations with employment of approximately 240.

The extent of commerce between Laredo and Nuevo Laredo is suggested by the very large number of automobiles and auto passengers that regularly cross the International Bridge in both directions—in 1958, for exemple, 1,529,463 automobiles carrying 5,530,805 persons crossed into Nuevo Laredo, and a slightly greater number of both crossed into Laredo from Mexico.

Traffic on International Bridge, in fact, has increased at an average annual rate of nearly 10 percent in recent years. Part of the increase, of course, was craused by a greater number of tourists traveling to the interior of Mexico and the United States, but by far the greater portion of the traffic was composed of businessmen, laborers, and shoppers that daily crossed from one side of the river to the other and frequently back again in the same day.

A greater dollar volume of goods moves between Mexico and the United States at Laredo than at the other port on the two nations' common boundary. Laredo import customs collections exceed $4 million annually.

Last year, a daily average of over 180 railroad cars of freight crossed into Mexico from the United States at Laredo; there is also a very large amount of goods transportation by truck.

The city continued to be the leading port of entry for tourists going into the interior of Mexico in 1958, when it recorded 58,267 tourists' cars and 151,588 tourists crossing the border.

To accommodate the great number of tourists passing through Laredo, there are 4 hotels and 23 motels with a combined capacity of 1,100 rooms. The present trend in motel construction in Laredo is toward the large self-sufficient luxury-type operations, such as is now exemplified by the Sands Motel at the northern edge of the city on U.S. Highway 81. All indications are that the most dynamic element in the city's economy in future will be the rapidly expanding service industries catering to the tourist trade.

By no means all the tourists that come to Laredo are merely passing through; the varied recreational opportunities that the city offers—hunting, fishing, water sports, golfing, horseback riding, bullfights—attract tourists on their own account. They also help to create a positive community atmosphere that can be a major factor in future industrial growth.

Fine theaters, civic concerts, a first-rate school system (including private and parochial schools and fully accredited Laredo Junior College), good hospitals, a moderate tax rate, and a cooperative, progressive municipal government and chamber of commerce also contribute to an outstanding environment for future business and industrial growth.

The continued rapid industrial and economic growth of Mexico, and a consequent sharp rise in its commerce with the United States, is safely predictable. It is reasonably certain, therefore, that Laredo will retain indefinitely its established position as a leading port on our southern border.

Projected improvements in the highway systems of both countries, with Laredo as a major exchange between these systems, will encourage still further the flow of tourists and goods through the city. Benefits accruing from this rising flow will tend to encourage the growth of those sectors of Laredo's economy not directly related to the city's function as a tourist and transportation center.

Marvels of the American Outdoors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, few of us truly appreciate the marvelous American outdoors, particularly when we are confined within marble halls and corridors as much as are Members of the Senate. Yet we of the Senate have jurisdiction over the public lands, wildlife, fisheries, and forests of many parts of the American West.

Nelson Reed, of Klamath Falls, Oreg., in the great southeastern uplands of my State, is a gifted writer in the field of nature lore. He has written a poem entitled "Before You Know It, It Will Be Fall," in which he heralds the wonders of wildlife in the vast outdoor solitudes and wilderness of Oregon.

I ask unanimous consent that the poem by Mr. Nelson Reed be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEFORE YOU KNOW IT, IT WILL BE FALL

When the algae's thick on the upper lake
And the leaping rainbow leaves a wake,
And the velvet's gone from a big buck's horn,
And the china's cackle at early morn,
Reminds the doves, they soon must leave,
The summer has only a short reprieve.

When the little creeks can run no more,
And the big blue grouse gets up with a roar,
And the mountain ash is a painter's dream,
In a mirrored lake without a seam,
And the lazy brook trout, fat with spawn,
Tell you plainly the summer has gone.

When over the marsh's gray twilight,
Young ducks are trying their wings in flight,
And the ground squirrels all have gone to bed,
And some of the leaves are turning red,
And the coyote pack has a different call,
For the pups are grown—it will soon be fall.

When the honkers fly at rosy dawn,
And the spots are faded from this year's fawn,
And the evening sun tints a dusty sky,
And the morning mists come drifting by,
And the mountain quail begin to call,
Before you know it, it will be fall.

—*Nelson Reed.*

Tribute to Floyd Waldo Duffee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Floyd Waldo Duffee, a University of Wisconsin engineer, recently received recognition from Cornell University for his work in devising technological advances which, among other things, lighten one of the heaviest and most burdensome tasks in the world, pitching hay from the ground onto the hay wagon.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial tribute from the Green Bay Press-Gazette to Duffee be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette, July 3, 1959]

THE MAN WHO LIFTED THE FARMERS' BURDEN

Farmers who labored to put up the huge Wisconsin hay crop a couple of decades ago will approve heartily the award of the Cyrus Hall McCormick Medal to Floyd Waldo Duffee, a University of Wisconsin engineer, for distinguished achievements in agriculture. Duffee received a medal recently at Cornell University, specifically for his work in relieving farmers of much of the back-breaking toil long associated with putting up the hay crop.

Today Wisconsin produces about 8 million tons of hay a year, all of which would have to be handled at least once by a farmer with a pitchfork if it were not for Duffee's skillful work to lighten the farmer's toil.

Think of the thousands of men with pitchforks that would be required to move 8 million tons of hay from the ground onto hayracks. These men are gone from the farm because of Professor Duffee's skill in developing machines to do the job and do it better.

As an example of his work the early ensilage machines were greatly improved because he made a careful study of the ones that clogged and failed to blow cut corn into the silos and the successful ones that did send it up as they were supposed to and made his report to the machinery manufacturer. The result was high speed precision ensilage machines which handle the corn crop speedily, and without long delays for repairs. He later adapted the ensilage cutting machine to a forage chopper which moved down the field cutting the hay and shredding it and blowing it back into a wagon ready to move to the barn for storage. As a result of his work there are machines now available which harvest a large percentage of Wisconsin's forage crops including much of the corn without a pitchfork being used.

He developed other machines which picked up hay from windrows, crushed it anl split the stems to hurry curing. Later he showed farmers how to dry the hay in the mow by blowing air into the storage space with fans and ducts. As long ago as 1921 he prevailed upon electric utilities to buy and equip a complete dairy and poultry farm near Madison. There the utilities showed all manner of electric power devices in action and convinced farmers that they could save money by using them. Since then electricity has been the farmers' "low cost hired man" and the demand for electricity has mounted rapidly since.

Duffee has noted that most of the field work on the farms has been mechanized, and he is now reported to be working on the electric augers which will carry feed such as chopped hay or silage from its storage place to the animals without the aid of the man with the pitchfork.

Duffee's work, of course, can be tied in with some of the modern farm problems. The departure of many farmers from the soil is due to the fact that they are no longer needed there. Many of them are not needed because of Duffee's inventiveness and thus while he has relieved farmers of back-breaking toil it may also be said that he has helped to relieve many farms of many farmworkers. On the whole, however, it is quite likely that most farmers would prefer the problems they have today to those of the early twenties when the strong back was an important qualification for success in farming.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Address by Hon. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, in Rockland, Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on Saturday, June 20, 1959, my distinguished colleague, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, was the featured speaker at the Maine Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner in Rockland, Maine. He was a welcome guest and made a deep impression upon Maine citizens with his warmth, his friendly interest, and his objective and informed analysis of some of the problems confronting our country. It is my priivdege to ask unanimous consent that his address on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR STUART SYMINGTON, AT THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DINNER, ROCKLAND, MAINE, JUNE 20, 1959

It is a real privilege to be here in Rockland tonight. You Democrats of Maine show great ingenuity in holding this dinner at one of the most beautiful sea resorts in New England.

And as a Democrat, I wanted to come to Maine to meet the people who brought about the "Maine miracle."

Last November you elected your second Democratic Governor in a row, two Democratic Congressman out of three, and the first elected Democratic Senator in your history.

The Democrats of the State of Maine have won these victories by giving the people responsible and responsive government in the interests of all.

And your leaders personify that formula for victory.

We in the Senate consider it a privilege to have as a colleague your great former Governor, ED MUSKIE. He is, as you well know, a man of principle, of kindness and of courage. He is going to be one of the real statesmen of our generation.

It was our pleasure to have Senator MUSKIE as our guest in Missouri a few months ago, when he spoke at our leading Democratic dinner.

It must also be gratifying to you that the Governor's office in Augusta is now occupied so very ably by your new Governor, Clinton Clauson.

He has developed a sound financial program for your State, and won for it the approval of the legislature.

Under Governor Clauson's administration, your superb Democratic program for highways, mental health, and education are going to go a long way.

These are the kinds of investments in progress the shrewdest Yankee would be proud of.

That philosophy of government is also represented in the House by your Democratic Congressmen: FRANK COFFIN, whom my colleagues from Missouri tell me is one of the hardest-working Congressmen in Washington; and JIM OLIVER, your newly elected Representative, already building a fine record, and with it a bright future.

These men, working together, are doing a fine job to help build up Maine's economy.

This is a State of abundant potential. Great riches lie in your forests; in your mountains; in your soil and fishing waters; but most of all, in the skill of your people.

Moreover, while Maine may be set off from the center of America, it is in the cockpit of the Atlantic community. Maine is almost equidistant from the west coast and the English Channel. This is a strategic position for both defense and peaceful international trade.

With these natural blessings, the only remaining ingredients for prosperity are leadership, vision, and the willingness to make investments in Maine's economy.

And this is just where Republican government differs from Democratic government.

The Democratic Party considers our economy as a whole, and realizes that the development of any part of it contributes to the prosperity of all.

From the day Thomas Jefferson negotiated the Louisiana Purchase and doubled the area of our country, the Democratic Party has consistently believed in and worked for increasing investment in America's growth.

The superiority of Democratic philosophy is shown by results.

Take the current situation: American families would have more money in their pockets and more available for investment today if the Republican administration had encouraged national growth.

If the Nation's rate of growth under the Republican Party had equalled the record made by the Democratic Party from 1947 to 1952, the average family would have been better off by $2,800.

This means $465 more family income each year for purchases, for recreation, education for the children, or for savings.

In addition, a Democratic standard of growth would have provided $31 billion more for our farmers and $39 billion more for private investment.

We hear a great deal these days about inflation—and certainly we should guard against it.

But the poor business management by the Republican government has cost American wage earners much more in recent years than inflation has, and dealt even more cruelly with those who are retired.

By cutting back investment in our resources, our people and our businesses, the Republicans have shown a lack of confidence in the very factors that have made our country great.

The policies of this administration have cost us the growth we must have to remain prosperous and secure.

Let me cite a few examples:

Failure to start new projects for resource development, despite consistent historical proof—TVA, Bonneville, and such—that such projects create great new income opportunities for underdeveloped parts of the Nation.

Failure to rehabilitate depressed areas, a policy which has perpetuated waste of manpower, plants, and managerial ability in many parts of the country.

Opposition to adequate slum clearance and urban renewal legislation, despite exhaustive proof that $1 of such Government investment returns $10 to $15 to the private economy.

Instead of making investments for a growing economy, the administration would have us spend the taxpayer's money for higher interest rates on Government bonds—a long-term charge against the Treasury which benefits only a tiny minority.

Republican high interest rates take money out of almost everybody's pocket—by increasing taxes, cutting down industrial investment, limiting employment opportunity, and curtailing research and development for the future.

I can think of no more wasteful spending than that involved in the tight money policy.

We Democrats in Congress will oppose unnecessary spending.

The Democratic Congress stands ready to support the President on any sound program of investment in the American economy.

With our population growing by 3 million each year, we must develop all our Nation's wealth, or face a decline in our standard of living.

To foster economic development, I recommend the following steps:

1. Appropriate action to keep down interest rates rather than push them up, including loans for essential business and local projects, when funds are not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

2. Increased investment in the education of our children, in a way that does not involve Government controls over the educational process itself.

3. Acceleration of slum clearance and public housing projects where private funds and private interests will not, or cannot, do the job adequately.

4. Elimination of waste in Government, particularly in defense and agriculture. The billions saved can be invested in our growth, or used to decrease the national debt, or reduce taxes.

5. More effective enforcement of the antitrust laws, and if necessary, stronger laws. The Government should guard continuously against economic concentrations and monopolistic elements, as they depress growth, raise prices and destroy small private enterprises and private initiative.

These programs will cost money, of course. The administration says we cannot afford them, unless we want to run a deficit or raise taxes.

But from my observation of the way this Government is being run, I believe that if we cut out the waste, funds will be freed for all these purposes.

As example: Last year, this country spent billions on weapons systems which are obsolete. As a result, most of this money was wasted.

Look what this Nation could have done with this money:

Built schools, for the education of our most precious resource.

Increased grants to the aged, the physically handicapped, and the needy.

Built more hospitals, under the Hill-Burton Act, like the one you have right here in Rockland.

Provided funds for our depressed industrial and agricultural areas, so that chronic unemployment need not plague this, the richest country on earth.

Modernized our airports in cities like Portland, Augusta, Lewiston, and Bangor.

Undertaken needed programs for water resource development and water pollution control.

America's economic strength is just as essential to freedom and peace as our physical and spiritual strength.

We can maintain and increase it if we make these wise investments in the future of America.

Through sound Democratic programs, administered with attention to the principles of business management, we can build that strength we need to keep our country free.

Dedication of Cumberland Gap National Historical Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, on Independence Day last Saturday, July 4, 1959, there was a dedication ceremony at the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park near Middlesboro, Ky. Within the confines of this park the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia join. This is the largest historical national park in the United States comprising more than 20,000 acres.

The Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, was the principal speaker on this historic occasion. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the junior Senator from Kentucky were all present, as were prominent political and civic leaders from all three States. The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], was there on Friday, July 3, on the occasion of the visit of the Vice President.

The development of this park is a fitting tribute to the significance that the Cumberland Gap played in the history of our western migration and the building of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the address given by the Secretary of the Interior be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FRED A. SEATON AT CUMBERLAND GAP NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK DEDICATION, MIDDLESBORO, KY., JULY 4, 1959

It is a great honor to join with you today in the dedication of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park.

Those of us who are gathered here have only to look about to see at a glance that this is a place of great scenic beauty. As we look, we are reminded of something else: that this is a place hallowed by history—the history of an expanding, restless people, exploring whatever was ahead, crossing old boundaries, breaking trails and building new roads through the wilderness, putting high mountains behind them, and pushing ever on westward.

Ours has been a glorious and a proud past, and what we are to do here today only takes proper recognition of a facet of that fact. Physical evidence of similar American history is now preserved in many areas under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior. For example, there is Harper's Ferry, W. Va., with the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal and the B. & O. Railroad running west; at St. Louis, the site of the new Jefferson National Expansion Memorial; at Fort Laramie and Scotts Bluff on the old Oregon Trail.

It was Thomas Walker, an ancester of Kentucky's distinguished junior Senator, THRUSTON B. MORTON, who made the first recorded passage through Cumberland Gap on April 13, 1750. Probing northward into what was to become Kentucky, it was he who built there in the wilderness the first known white man's dwelling, a log cabin.

Nineteen years later there was to follow one of the storied and almost legendary figures of pioneer America, Daniel Boone. Traveling through the gap, fighting hostile Indians and exploring the rich and awsomely beautiful Kentucky countryside, he failed in his first attempts to settle there. In 1773, he had the heart-rending experience of losing his son James in an Indian attack, only to return 2 years later, hacking his way with the aid of 30 axmen through forests and swamps and over the Cumberland Mountains. He finally succeeded in driving through the 200-mile Wilderness Road and setting up at its far end a fort named Boonesborough.

That road once opened, travel could begin for the general populace. By 1783, a wave of 12,000 settlers had spread out into Kentucky. By 1791, when Kentucky became a State, it was the home of 100,000 souls. At the opening of the 19th century, the new State had more than twice that population, and many had traveled Boone's Wilderness Road, including among their numbers the undistinguished grandfather of one who was later and forever to be remembered as Abraham Lincoln, the great martyred President of the United States.

To recall to mind these facts as we stand on this hallowed ground surely prompts us to seek to acquire some of the drive and courage and vision of those early explorers and pioneers, qualities which helped make us great as a nation and qualities which we must never lose if we are so to remain.

It is incumbent upon us to preserve outstanding historical and scenic places for ourselves and posterity.

Fourteen such areas have been added to the national park system of this Nation since January 1, 1953.

All are nationally important, and all are different in character. For example, one is the Booker T. Washington National Monument in Virginia; another is the Thomas A. Edison Laboratory National Monument in New Jersey. A third is the 25,000-acre Cape Hatteras national seashore recreational area in North Carolina. Still another is the Independence National Historical Park in Pennsylvania, established just 3 years ago today. And there is the first new national park since 1949, the Virgin Islands National Park which was established December 1, 1956.

We plan to continue to add areas that deserve to belong to the systems, including the Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park—an elongated area stretching 185 miles up the Potomac River from the District of Columbia to Cumberland, Md.

We can all take satisfaction that as a result of these additions, and others, our national park system now includes 182 areas covering a record number of acres—almost 25 million.

This system is one of the proudest possessions of the American people, and it is one which has served as a model for several nations of the world. It ranges from one of the largest—Mount McKinley National Park—in Alaska to the newest in the Virgin Islands, from Acadia National Park in Maine to Death Valley in California. It includes the site of Jamestown, Va., where the first English colonists settled on this continent; the battlefield at Yorktown, Va., where American patriots finally won their long and hard struggle for independence. And within it are such scenic wonders as those of Yellowstone, Bryce Canyon and Yosemite.

This unparalleled group of national parks, historical sites, national monuments, and military parks is for all to enjoy. They represent an important part of our heritage, and they were won for us by farsighted, aggressive men and women in and out of the Government. The Department of the Interior, with the full backing of President Eisenhower, is determined to leave this system greater—far greater—than we found it.

That is why, in 1956, we launched a sweeping 10-year program to build new buildings, more parking areas and other facilities; to repair roads that had fallen into disrepair; and to construct and maintain all sorts of new facilities to make possible more outdoor recreation and enjoyment for ever greater numbers of people. That program bears the name Mission 66. It will long be remembered, I think, as a milestone in conservation achievement.

Mission 66 will go a long way toward taking care of the needs of the increasing numbers of people who come to such areas as Cumberland Gap every year—a number estimated to reach nearly 80 million in the year 1966. But I must warn you, Mission 66 is an effort—it can never be a guarantee, even though it today enjoys an almost unprecedented bipartisan backing in the Congress and the overwhelming support of the American people. The continuing job of preserving this Nation's historic and scenic treasures will necessarily fall, again and again, on the shoulders of every living generation.

As we dedicate this magnificent national historical park today, let us also rededicate ourselves to a full share in the continuing struggle for the preservation of such places of beauty and of history.

By so doing, we shall help assure that those who come after us will have no less opportunity than do we to know the greatest natural beauty of this land of ours and to feel, as we can here today, the power and thrill of our historic heritage.

Montana: An Uncommon Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the depression of the 1930's, Joseph Kinsey Howard wrote a book entitled "Montana: High, Wide, and Handsome." It was the best book which up to that time had been written about the Treasure State.

This year, K. Ross Toole has written a book entitled "Montana: An Uncommon Land." It is likewise an excellent book in its indication of just what it is that makes Montana. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a review, written by Stewart Holbrook, and published in the New York Times of July 5, 1959.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGH, HANDSOME, REMOTE

Montana: An Uncommon Land. By K. Ross Toole. Illustrated. 278 pages. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

(By Stewart Holbrook)

There is little or nothing moderate about Montana, the fourth-largest State, stretching 650 miles across the northern plains and the Rockies, a region beuatiful and grim, parched, windbeaten, lonely under its big sky and in its seemingly infinite distances. Within the State live some 660,000 people. It is, indeed, an uncommon land and K. Ross Toole, among whose forebears were several of its outstanding pioneers, knows it well from genesis to the present.

Though he obviously loves his native State, Mr. Toole is no chauvinist. This excellent book is unlikely to bring about any considerable influx of potential settlers. It is possibly significant that its author, after many years in Montana, now lives in New York, where he is director of the Museum of the City of New York.

The Montana story is brief, explosive, often tragic. Its many villains have been as villainous as one could wish, yet the greatest crime of all appears to be due to the State's remoteness from the main stream of American life. Its wealth was of such nature that it could be converted into cash only "by devices and methods created and paid for outside of the region. Its raw material could rarely be fabricated on the spot because of the simple economics of distance." And, too, there was always the malevolent climate.

It has been thus from the first. Beaver, beef, sheep, gold, silver, copper, oil and, to a lesser extent, lumber and wheat, one and all have to be moved immense distances before reaching the ultimate market. "Distance meant cost," Mr. Toole writes, "cost meant capital, capital meant absentee ownership, absentee ownership meant * * * operation in the essential interest of outsiders with local interests a very secondary consideration." This is putting it on the line.

There were villains of wheat, of the range, of the lumber empire. Mr. Toole deals with these, but of necessity he must also deal with the life and times of the mine barons. No few of these fellows were attracted to the region first by gold and silver, but they soon discovered that the big money was to be in copper. Here in copper is the thumping great story of Montana's bloodstream. Copper means butte, where the mines cluster; and Anaconda (city), where the world's tallest stack rears up from terrain as terrible as could be imagined, stands for the smelter of the A.C.M., or the Anaconda Copper Mining Co.

The struggles for dominance in copper constitute in large part the economic, political, and social history of the State. Men named Marcus Daly, William Andrews Clark, and F. Augustus Heinze mustered small armies composed of front men, backroom men and newspaper editors, together with crews of assorted goons, to fight battles remembered as the wars of the copper kings. There were no rules. The weapons used were venal courts, district attorneys, legislatures, and police, while the common soldiers fought underground with dynamite, steam, hot water, and slaked lime. When the smoke at last cleared, the A.C.M. was seen clearly to be Montana's dominant and often dominating corporate influence.

During and since the copper wars, labor was periodically in upheavals of internecine struggle that matched anything known anywhere. The Western Federation of Miners and the Wobblies (the IWW) staged dynamite attacks and gun battles as fierce as those of the copper kings. Meanwhile, several of the big deep mines were hit by disasters of fire and explosion. The mile-high copper hill came to be known as bloody butte.

Later came another major tragedy, a result of the promotion by landowning railroads of homesteads in the shortgrass country. The homesteaders flocked in by the thousands. They plowed deep, they sowed, and they went broke. One sees their relics in the form of abandoned shacks, swaybacked barns and miles of rusting barbed wire, through which the everlasting wind moans while it piles tumbleweed against the melancholy strings.

Still later came oil strikes, and the tourists. Mr. Toole mentions both, though without much enthusiasm, as having possibilities. All he is certain about is that Montana is still high, wide, handsome, and remote. "There are many ways of looking at it," he writes, "and many ways of feeling about it. And there is room for all the ways."

Sustained Yield Management in National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a most thoughtful editorial on forest conservation was printed on the editorial page of the Oregon Journal, of Portland, on June 24, 1959. The editorial was entitled "Resource We Can Have Forever." The editorial takes as its theme the basic importance of sustained yield management of our timber resources. I was particularly pleased to note that the editorial emphasizes a recent statement by Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, that his great agency will not allow the national forests to be overcut or decimated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Journal, of Portland, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOURCE WE CAN HAVE FOREVER

In days past, there were men who believed that trees grew only to be cut. There were others who believed that putting the ax to a tree was a desecration of nature's handiwork and was an essential evil.

Today one can find, we suppose, persons in both categories, but they are much fewer and the area of disagreement between the timber cutter and the conservationist is much smaller than it used to be.

If one were not aware of this already, he would have learned it at the citizens' con-

ference on Pacific Northwest forest resources at Reed College last weekend.

On the program were spokesmen from widely diverse interests, but running through the conference was the theme that our forests are an asset which must be managed on a basis that we will always have them, not only for the production of the timber, but for the protection of our water resources, the providing of a habitat for wildlife and domestic animals and the offering of vast playgrounds for outdoor recreationists.

At present, timber in the Pacific Northwest is being cut faster than it is being replaced, but representatives of private industry point with great pride to the giant strides which have been made in "tree farming" and predict with confidence that timber growing and cutting will be brought into balance.

Some of them disagree with the custodians of our public timberlands on the rate at which old growth timber should be cut to make way for new forests, but few of them could take issue with the declaration of Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, that, "regardless of pressure, we will not overcut the national forests; we will not reduce rotation ages below what is technically desirable simply to rationalize increased cuts * * *." Conflicts exist in the use of the forests, but, as McArdle pointed out, "increasingly on the national forests we are demonstrating that many of these often-conflicting uses can live harmoniously side by side."

One of the most striking examples of this was given by Earl Coe, director of the Washington State Department of Conservation. Unwise timber cutting is inconsistent with watershed protection, he said, but controlled logging has been practiced in the Seattle watership for 43 years, and scientific studies have proved that this has actually enhanced water supply.

The U.S. Forest Service has long recognized the importance of recreation in its forest management. Increasingly, the private companies are making their lands available to the recreationist, including the hunter, the fisherman, the picknicker. The need for more recreational use in all categories of forest lands was told by C. J. Olsen, director, Utah State Park and Recreation Commission, who described in dramatic terms the "explosive" rise in leasure use of outdoor resources.

It is often said that Oregon suffers by its great reliance on timber as the bulwark of its economy. This is true. Oregon needs more diversity. But it is not true that we must inevitably accept some day the loss of our timber resource. Better management and better utilization are writing a new chapter in timber. Those engaged in it confidently believe this is a resource we can have forever, with all of its multiple values which all of us share.

Employment of Former Army Officers by Defense Contractors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a wise and morally sensitive editorial from the Milwaukee Journal on the legislation recently introduced by Senators DOUGLAS and JAVITS, to prohibit former Army officers now employed by defense contractors from selling weapons to those who took over their military jobs.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, July 2, 1959]

INVESTIGATE CHARGE THAT UNITED STATES IS PRESSURED INTO OBSOLETE ARMS

Senators DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and JAVITS, Republican, of New York, have introduced legislation to prohibit former Army officers now employed by defense contractors from selling weapons to those who took over their military jobs.

The bill would bar officers from selling anywhere in the Pentagon for 2 years after retirement. It would prohibit purchases from companies which use such officers in violation of the bill's provisions.

The Senators are concerned with the possibility of questionable ethics in which some former officers are drawing fat salaries for their Pentagon contacts, and using friendship as a basis for getting the kind of purchase decisions that benefit their employers.

Meanwhile the House Armed Services Committee prepares to look into the problem. There is basis for investigation. Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, retired from his post as Army Chief of Research and Development, has said: "Industrial pressure is causing decisions to be made in favor of [weapons] systems that are already obsolete." And former officers are playing a role in that pressure. There are at least 721 of them on the payrolls of the 100 top contractors. Some are being paid as much as $75,000 a year.

The problem here does not concern those officers hired for legitimate purposes. Obviously, many defense contractors are anxious to get the services of real experts who can help them perfect their products. And among the retired officers are many experts who help not only their new bosses but the Nation to the extent that their knowledge helps produce better military weapons.

But when, and if, officers are used as lobbyists or influence peddlers, it becomes a different matter. It becomes a matter of ethics. And it is important that the Nation find out the extent to which such practices exist.

The House investigation, if it is conducted as fairly as Chairman HÉBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana, promises, can get the answers. And it is upon such answers that any legislation should be based. No one's interests would be served by barring former military officers from proper use of their experience and knowledge. But everyone's interests would be served by stopping any use of these retired officers in pressuring former friends to look with favor upon their new bosses.

The decision on what type of arms to buy should be made by objective military experts and their expert determination of what is best. If such decisions are based on friendship and pressure, they are not only unethical but dangerous to the national security.

Public Opinion Poll, 13th District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, because of the interest expressed by so many of the Members, I am happy to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today the results of a recent questionnaire seeking a scientific sampling of the current opinion within the 13th District of Illinois on 33 leading issues.

Signed returns, totaling 15,650, received from all sections of the district gave the following results:

Public opinion poll tabulation from MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, Representative in Congress, 13th District, Illinois

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you believe that it is essential to balance the national budget?	85.1	11.7	3.2
2. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to make mandatory the balancing of the budget?	52.1	39.0	8.9
3. Do you favor a constitutional amendment limiting taxing and spending powers of the Congress?	61.4	31.7	6.9
4. Do you support a mandatory annual payment on the national debt?	69.0	20.7	10.3
5. Do you favor granting the President a blanket item-veto authority?	32.7	43.7	23.6
6. If revenues do not meet the cost of the 1960 budget, should—			
a. The national debt be increased?	8.0	46.9	45.1
b. Taxes be increased?	18.4	39.6	42.0
c. Nonvital Government programs be eliminated? (If "Yes," what programs would you eliminate?)	79.0	3.5	17.5
7. If there should be a budget surplus, do you prefer—			
a. Tax cut?	32.9	26.9	40.2
b. Reduction in the national debt?	76.6	5.2	18.2
8. Do you favor the repeal of wartime-imposed excise taxes?	68.5	21.8	9.7
9. Do you favor an increase in the Federal gasoline tax from 3 cents to 4½ cents to provide needed funds for the Federal highway program?	39.0	55.0	6.0
10. Do you favor gradual transfer back to States and local communities of complete responsibility for local needs (education, slum clearance, old-age assistance, sewage-treatment plants, etc.) assuming a transfer of some tax sources from the Federal Government?	75.2	18.5	6.3
11. To meet educational needs, do you approve—			
a. Continued reliance on local and State support of education?	77.3	9.8	12.9
b. Federal grants to States for school construction?	29.1	48.4	22.5
c. Federal grants to States for teachers' salaries?	22.2	55.2	22.6
d. Federal aid for scholarships?	35.3	41.3	23.4
e. Providing some method, perhaps through tax benefits, for individuals and business to finance expanded education?	55.7	20.8	23.5
12. Where economic changes have resulted in decreased industrial activity and unemployment, do you prefer—			
a. Federal funds to solve the problem (such as Aid to Depressed Areas Act)?	25.6	44.6	29.8
b. State and local efforts?	75.6	7.6	16.8
13. Do you favor adding medical services under the Social Security Act, to be financed by increased contributions by employers and employees?	26.9	67.1	6.0
14. Do you favor lowering the retirement age of both men and women under social security, now 65 and 62, respectively?	31.7	63.7	4.6

Public opinion poll tabulation from MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, *Representative in Congress, 13th District, Illinois*—Continued

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
15. At present, a person drawing social-security benefits is prohibited from earning in excess of $1,200 annually. Do you believe this limitation should be removed?	72.7	21.1	6.2
16. Are you in favor of expanding public power (TVA, etc.)?	20.9	65.0	14.1
17. Do you favor increasing the present 2 percent interest rate charged REA co-ops on funds borrowed from the Treasury?	58.9	14.1	27.0
18. Do you favor—			
a. Elimination of all agricultural price supports?	64.5	15.3	19.3
b. Sliding-scale supports of from 60 to 90 percent of parity?	21.5	29.6	48.9
c. Fixed supports at 90 percent of parity or above?	3.6	40.9	55.5
19. Should foreign aid be—			
a. Continued at present levels?	24.5	37.5	38.0
b. Cut sharply?	52.9	17.0	30.1
c. Expanded?	6.5	41.8	51.7
d. Ended?	17.8	34.7	47.5
20. Should less money be spent on military and more on economic aid under the mutual security program?	35.6	40.7	23.7
21. Do you approve of the President's "food for peace" proposal, utilizing surplus agricultural commodities?	80.8	8.0	11.2
22. Do you favor increasing the use of private capital and repayable U.S. loans for foreign aid?	59.1	19.5	21.4
23. Do you approve of the proposed summit conference?	68.1	16.6	15.3
24. Do you approve of our firm stand with respect to Berlin?	92.0	3.6	4.4
25. Would you favor diplomatic recognition by the United States of Communist China?	23.4	64.7	11.9
26. Do you favor repeal of that section of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits States to enact their own right-to-work laws?	27.7	59.0	13.3
27. Do you favor a law guaranteeing union members a secret ballot in the election or removal of union officials and in other vital union matters?	92.2	4.7	3.1
28. Do you favor the prohibition by law of secondary boycotts and organizational picketing?	72.8	16.3	10.9
29. Would you favor extension of coverage and increase in the minimum-wage law to $1.25 per hour?	51.0	35.8	13.2
30. Do you favor a Federal fair-trade law?	32.1	45.6	22.3
Would you leave enactment of such laws to States, as at present?	50.0	18.2	31.8
31. Do you favor a Federal law enacting the principle of equal pay for equal work without discrimination on account of sex?	52.4	36.1	11.5
32. Do you think that the non-Communist affidavit and loyalty oath required of recipients of funds under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 should be eliminated?	18.5	72.9	8.6
33. Are you in favor of stronger civil rights legislation?	46.0	37.0	17.0

Interest on Government Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of several pregnant and unanswered questions about the President's drive to knock out the 4¼ percent ceiling on long-term Government bond interest rates so that these rates can be shoved up, is this: Does not selling long term bonds at sky-high rates freeze the Federal taxpayers into paying this higher interest cost for many future years, although there is every likelihood, on the basis of all historical experience, that these rates will drop soon and sharply?

The Capital Times of Madison, a fighting and alert newspaper, puts this question very cogently, in a recent editorial, and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

HIKE IN INTEREST RATE SHOULD NOT FOLLOW RAISE IN DEBT LIMIT

President Eisenhower has signed a bill which raises the legal temporary ceiling on the national debt to a record peacetime level of $295 billion. At the same time, the bill authorizes raising of the permanent ceiling to a new level of $285 billion.

The temporary limit will be in effect until June 30, 1960. The permanent ceiling will then be in effect, unless Congress authorizes a new change in the temporary limit.

Mr. Eisenhower had requested the legislation which he signed into law. He had warned that unless the limit was raised it would have been frozen at a figure $2 billion dollars below the amount actually owed by the Government.

Given the circumstances, perhaps the boost in the debt limit was inevitable. But there is a consequence of this which should be recalled now.

When the President asked Congress to raise the debt limit he also asked it for a companion bill which he said should be considered as part of single package.

In this proposal Mr. Eisenhower requested permission to allow the Treasury to pay higher interest rates for the money it borrows. He asked Congress to repeal the 41-year-old law which sets a ceiling of 4½ percent on the interest which the Treasury pays to bankers and other lenders from whom it borrows money when it sells them U.S. bonds which run for more than 5 years.

Mr. Eisenhower said such a boost in rates is necessary. Interest rates in general are high, he said, and the Treasury is forced to compete for loans with other borrowers who are paying the higher rates.

He also wants to float more long-term loans, which would expire in more than 5 years, so that the Treasury would be able to manage its financing in a more orderly way than is possible with short-term loans.

We find this reasoning a little strange, to say the least. What he is proposing is that the Treasury embark on a long-range program of heavy borrowing at a time when, by his own admission, interest rates are extremely high.

What would happen to the president of a large corporation who recommended such a course to his board of directors? Is it logical to do your heaviest borrowing at a time when you know you will have to pay the most for your money?

It seems to us that Congress should not feel bound to consider this request as part of the package on the raising of the national debt. For passage of the increase in interest rates would make it certain that the national debt would have to be raised again.

Youth Conservation Corps Receives Further Support From Organizations and Individuals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 812, a bill which would establish a Youth Conservation Corps for the dual purpose of conserving the Nation's human and natural resources, I have been quite pleased to continue to receive cogent endorsement of this bill from many individuals and organizations.

The American Recreation Society, a group which has contributed much to the conservation movement in our Nation, has forwarded me a resolution indicating full support of the YCC. Pomona Grange of Union County, Oreg., has also sent me a resolution endorsing the principles of S. 812. Mrs. Dorothy Shore, chairman of the East Multnomah County Democratic Forum Women's Activities Committee, has written me informing me that her organization has voted unanimously to go on record in support of S. 812.

I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD together with a fine letter from Mrs. H. E. Lightburn of Salem Oreg., favoring establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps.

There being no objection, the resolution and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF UNION COUNTY POMONA GRANGE

Whereas in our American economy we have little opportunity for boys to find and legally hold jobs, particularly city boys in vacation months,

Whereas idleness breeds delinquency: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That a program similar to the CCC be provided for these boys; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished our congressional delegation.

HENRY WEATHERSPOON,
Master.

LAURA E. BATES,
Secretary.

Adopted by Union County Pomona Grange at their regular meeting June 27, 1959.

JUNE 25, 1958.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: The Women's Activities Committee of the East Multnomah County Democratic Forum voted unanimously at their June meeting to go on record in support of the program for Youth Conservation Corps (S. 812).

It was the consensus of opinion of our group that the benefits of this proposed program would be twofold; to give wholesome

employment to young boys as well as to conserve the beauty and promote the usefulness of our natural surroundings.

Our recommendation of support of S. 812 will be presented to the East Multnomah County Democratic Forum for their action.

Sincerely,

MRS. DOROTHY SHORE,
Chairman, East Multnomah County Democratic Forum, Women's Activities Committee.

SALEM, OREG., *June 20, 1959.*

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We read with interest an article which appeared in the Oregonian, June 16, 1959, concerning the bill authorizing a Youth Conservation Corps. It seems as though it would be a very worthwhile thing and one in which all would surely benefit.

The fact that it serves a twofold purpose makes it something to give serious thought to. The young people of today do not have enough to do constructively; nothing is left to their imagination and ingenuity. Parents, in many cases, do not or cannot take the time to discipline the child which makes for an unhappy and frustrated boy or girl. That, plus the fact that so many seem to find it hard to do something in a positive vein instead of a negative one, has a lot to do with the situation as it is today. I do think, however, that if all the good things which are done by the youth of today were played up, they would far outnumber the less desirable.

If for no other reason than for the "human resources found in the youth of our cities and towns," I believe this bill should be given more than just a passing thought by everyone. If nations can spend billions on defense measures, it seems to me that our first line of defense should be the youth, for it has been said that the strongest chain is only as strong as the weakest link.

It goes without saying that the conservation of our natural resources is very important to all of us, both from an economic standpoint and also from a recreational standpoint. This may sound a bit philosophical, but I sincerely believe that anyone who works or plays in our forests and parks cannot help but be a better person for it.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. H. E. LIGHTBURNE.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF S. 812, BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS, BY HOWARD JEFFREY

The American Recreation Society, representing 5,154 recreators throughout the Nation, urges support of this legislation. We believe it is important to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and advance the conservation, development and management of national resources, of timber, soil, and range, and of recreation areas.

With the massive surge of outdoor recreation already underway, need for the provision of more abundant opportunities for recreation and inspiration are necessary for our Nation. These facilities would be built by youth.

The well-being of youth and the well-being of these outdoor recreation areas are essential. Indeed, it is fortunate that the needs of our outdoor recreation areas and the needs of our people fit so well together. Youth is made healthy and vigorous by work in the forests. Our youth represent America's future. Their work will be guided by older hands who have the cumulative knowledge and ideals of our culture. We need this legislation to build and rebuild our youth as well as our outdoor recreation resources. This legislation will help to shape the destiny of both, and thus contribute materially to our national security.

We, in our work in recreation, know that the linking of healthy recreation and work are two absolutely essential ingredients of building the right character. Character is the hope of men and of nations. Possessing it, there is the will to do the things that make for both the individual and the general welfare. Undesirability in citizenship is equal to the percentage of inefficiency in work and degeneracy.

Under competent leadership, young men keep their hands and brains active in doing things worthwhile, spending their leisure hours in worthy pursuits. We know this to be true from the history of the Civilian Conservation Corps of more than 20 years ago. We also know that no other program was so universally accepted and approved by the Nation. We would only urge that the committee expand the intent of this bill and make this opportunity available to more youth than are indicated. We would wish that all of our youth in terms of conservation could get off the city streets and spend their time in a healthier environment to their own benefit and also to the benefit of our lands, parks and forests.

Our members today still hear the story from those who had the benefit of the Civilian Conservation Corps experience. They believe that their lives were given a new start up the ladder to a better life. We cannot leave youth stranded before the closed doors of opportunity.

As a nation we have fallen far behind in meeting recreation needs. We are not only making it difficult for our generation to use its leisure time profitably but are jeopardizing the prospects of future generations.

We urge congressional acceptance of S. 812 and the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps. We urge this so youth may advance in life as good citizens. We know that the provision of opportunity for healthful training and employment will help many. Some individuals who will join this program are capable of being seniors in any college and university throughout the Nation. Others will be illiterate and need the help provided by this bill.

We have all seen along our eastern seaboard the development of State park areas and national park areas by youth. We know that facilities which were established long ago are now 68 percent overloaded and that very little in the way of rehabilitation or the building of new facilities has been accomplished in spite of the fact that for the first time, just a few years ago, Senators and Congressmen made possible additional funds for the maintenance and needed sanitation. We would urge that the developing, managing, protecting of recreation areas by the enrollees of the Youth Conservation Corps fulfills the responsibility of the Nation's citizens which the Federal Government must maintain.

You have heard from the Governors of States where unemployment exists and critical personal situations are rampant. To preserve the good character and health of the teenagers in these States, the members of the American Recreation Society urge passage of this legislation which will aid in the work ability, the education, and knowledge worthy of recreation.

We would also urge that when the members of the Youth Conservation Corps return to their own communities an incalculable benefit would come to these individuals, to their families, and to our American institutions if they were welcomed back by representatives of local organizations, dedicated to all forms of young people's work, assisted in securing employment or useful activity, and introduced to the best life to which they are capable of responding.

We would urge that followup practices be established so that the benefit of this fine experience will not be lost and its firm establishment not be left to chance.

Respectfully submitted.

HOWARD JEFFREY,
Executive Director,
American Recreation Society.

President Eisenhower Should Pay Off the National Debt and Save Taxpayers Billions of Dollars in Taxes

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in his 1952 campaign President Eisenhower promised to "tidy up" the national debt, but the national debt has actually risen from $266 billion to $285 billion during the 6 years he has occupied the White House. This tidy little increase of $19 billion means an actual increase of $760 million in interest each and every year from now on.

If the national debt were retired the interest we now pay, nearly $9 billion a year, would not have to be paid. This would save the average taxpaying family head some $275 in taxes each year which he could apply elsewhere.

The President wants to fight inflation, at least he says so. Here is the very best way to fight inflation that I know of. But he is probably only giving lipservice to this idea, as he did in the case of his 1952 campaign promises on reducing the national debt.

All of us want to fight inflation and to insure the continued growth of our country, but, as Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON told the Senate on June 29, 1959, in commenting on the Cabinet committee report on this subject issued a few days ago—

> Nowhere does the report cover adequately one of the most serious aspects of inflation, that is, mounting costs of money. Few things have contributed so much to inflation as rising interest rates. The only thing the report says specifically about this question is that the sky should be the limit on interest rates.

In an editorial suggestively, but accurately entitled "Words, Words, Words," the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald on June 30, 1959, said:

> The Nixon committee's interim report on how to promote "price stability for economic growth" (how deceptively that "for" bridges the chasm) is certainly one of the most redundant, uninspired and generally useless documents lately to come off the Government's mimeographing machines.

More is needed to fight inflation than unkept campaign promises and restatements of the obvious by such instrumentalities as the President's Cabinet Committee on Price Stability. Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR. of Pennsylvania, made this point on Tuesday, of this

week, when he declared on the floor of the other House that—

I would point out, however, that the principal danger of inflation, as the last few days have indicated, results from the actions of our friends on the other side of the aisle, who have been unwilling to vote to close the loopholes in our tax structure. To close these loopholes would help balance the budget, help reduce the national debt, help stabilize the bond market, and, generally speaking, have a strong anti-inflationary impact.

Mr. President, I close by suggesting to my friend from Connecticut and to various others of my friends across the aisle that though they talk about balancing the budget, their primary objective is not really to balance the budget; their primary aim is to see to it that we do not, under any circumstances, get more revenue into the Federal Treasury than the $77 billion that has been projected, and that we then cut back national defense and important domestic programs in order to meet that sacred figure of $77 billion, a position which I must say, is pretty well discredited in the country today.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to eliminate the special treatment of certain items for income tax purposes and to provide that the savings resulting therefrom shall be used to retire the huge public debt. My bill is H.R. 8022.

The public debt cannot be retired without the adoption of positive legislation, such as I have introduced, which will make sizable funds available annually for this purpose. I propose to obtain these funds from the following sources:

My bill would lower the special allowance for oil and gas companies from 27½ percent to 15 percent. The adoption of this part of my plan would result in raising approximately $325 million annually in additional governmental revenues.

Conservative estimates point out that approximately $1.5 billion in dividends paid out are never reported as income. My second section of the bill withholds the basic tax of 20 percent at the source, and this section would, if adopted, bring in an estimated $240 million a year.

Another section provides for the repeal of section 24 and section 116 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. These are the sections which allow credit against tax and exclusion from gross income for dividends received by individuals. It is estimated that the removal of this privilege will produce approximately $400 million a year in additional revenue for the Federal Government.

My bill also deals with expense account spending, and in this connection provides for additional information on certain income tax returns and prohibits the deduction of certain expenditures as trade or business expenses.

It appears that from $5 billion to $10 billion are being spent annually on excessive expense accounts, which are claimed as business expense deductions for income tax purposes.

A large portion of these expenditures should not be allowed as business deductions, and the enactment of this section of my bill would result in raising at least $800 million in additional taxes each year.

The tax allowances which my bill would disallow include such things as entertainment at nightclubs, theaters, sporting events, maintenance or operation of yachts and seasonal or vacational lodges and houses, gifts, dues or initiation fees in social organizations, and traveling expenses to conventions outside the United States.

These provisions of my bill are the result of an article in the Yale Law Journal of July 1958, which pointed out that in cities like New York, Washington, and Chicago it is safe to say that at any given moment well over half the people in the best hotels, restaurants, and nightclubs are charging the bill as an expense of their company. Uncle Sam pays 52 percent of the cost of theater tickets and nightclub expenses submitted by the new aristocrats of the expense account dodge.

There have been a number of rulings by the Internal Revenue Service that have been widely cited as showing the ridiculous lengths to which the present tax laws have been stretched. I would like to call to your attention one or two of these cases which, I think you will agree, conclusively demonstrate the need for the kind of legislation which I have introduced:

First. In one recent case the $17,000 cost of a big game hunting trip in Africa was held to be a business expense. The fortunate businessman-hunter took his wife with him and their trip included visits to several European capital cities.

Second. In another case a prominent movie star was allowed to deduct as ordinary and necessary business expenses, the costs of the following gifts: to her director a $920 silver tea set and coffeepot; to her agent a $775 oil painting; to her dress designer an $810 gold necklace and gold clips.

Third. Other publicized rulings have included as deductible business expenses all or part of the cost of food and liquor at nightclubs, tickets for hit musicals, expenses of attending the Kentucky Derby, the Mardi Gras, football games, country club dues and initiation fees, the cost of maintaining seasonal residences, the cost of yachts, and the costs of hunting lodges.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR., one of the sponsors of legislation to plug tax loopholes declared that—

Permitting this type of tax deduction lowers public moral standards and results in an utterly unjustifiable reduction of the revenue which the Federal Government is entitled to receive.

I am completely convinced that my bill, H.R. 8022, will do what the President has so far manifestly been unable to do—that is, reduce the national debt and stop the present ruinous inflation.

I hope President Eisenhower and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will strongly support my new bill. I have every confidence that the members of my own party in the House will do so.

Our Farm Surpluses Can Be a Blessing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Des Moines (Iowa) Register recently carried an article on farm surpluses by the former Secretary of Agriculture, Henry A. Wallace.

Mr. Wallace presents a fair picture of our surplus problem and gives proper credit to the administration for its efforts under Public Law 480 to reduce these surpluses and get them into the hands of our friends overseas.

He makes a good point about learning to live with our surpluses. I agree that they should be regarded in the light of a blessing rather than a curse and feel that through research and application of scientific principles we can make more uses of our farm products and develop better and less expensive ways of storing them.

Because I feel that many of my colleagues will find Mr. Wallace's remarks an interesting and fair appraisal of the surpluses and their value to us, I asks unanimous consent that the article be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

OUR FARM SURPLUSES CAN BE A BLESSING

(By Henry A Wallace)

(Mr. Wallace, one of Iowa's better known native sons, today describes himself as "an editor and plant breeder." He was Secretary of Agriculture (1933–1940), Vice President (1941–45) and Secretary of Commerce (1945–46). His influence on farm policy in the 20th century has, perhaps, been second to none.)

SOUTH SALEM, N.Y.—Forty years ago, in the farm paper of which I was then editor, I began hammering for what I called the ever-normal granary.

In 1938, as Secretary of Agriculture, I had the satisfaction of seeing the ever-normal granary enacted into law with flexible loans ranging from 52 to 75 percent of parity, depending on the size of the new crop plus the old carry-over. Not only were there flexible prices but there was provision to cut down the acreage of the crops in surplus.

Knowing the possibility of war and bad weather, I insisted that in setting up the normal size of carry-over we go far beyond what had been looked on as normal in the days of the so-called free market. I had always felt that the old system made for wide swings in prices, which were bad for both producer and consumer.

Moreover, in case of war we would be caught dangerously short.

During the past 6 years the ever-normal granary has been made into an abnormal granary with supplies under Government loan or storage nearly four times as great as when the present administration took over.

AN EFFORT TO CHANGE URBAN ATTITUDE

I regret seeing the farmer kicked around by the city press as a result of the huge Government investment in these vast surpluses. The city taxpayer is very sensitive

these days and rightfully so. Any politician or editorial writer who denounces the huge agricultural appropriations meets a hearty response on the part of four out of five people.

The purpose of this article is to change city attitudes with regard to farm surpluses and the security of the United States and the welfare of the world.

In 1938 I felt that any surpluses we built up would come in mighty handy to protect us in case of war. In 1959 I feel trebly so. Our surplus corn and wheat is mostly stored in places where it would not be seriously contaminated even by atomic bomb fallout.

In brief, we may say that the fact of our agricultural surpluses, properly stored, will determine the outcome of the next war. Realistically, as a matter of pure military security, we may say that the nation which builds up $100 billion worth of military surplus is surely justified in building up $10 billion worth of agricultural surplus. Remember that extensive exploding of hydrogen bombs would rapidly make farm animals and growing crops exceedingly dangerous to eat.

The extensive storage of wheat, corn, grain sorghum, dried milk, and dried egg surpluses, then, becomes the determining factor in survival. I do not think we shall have an atomic war, but I do say that a nation which spends $40 billion a year on its military effort can well spend one-sixth of that amount storing surplus food in the right places.

Frankly I hate to use this kind of argument because its pessimistic implications are so great. In the final showdown of a world holocaust, after the military had done their most horrible worst on both sides, uncontaminated food would undoubtedly be the final arbiter. For myself, however, I would rather use our food surpluses in foreign lands in a really big and imaginative way.

It must be said in defense of the Eisenhower administration that it has used Public Law 480 to dispose of perhaps $2 billion worth of farm products in exchange for foreign currencies. It has also given away roughly $1 billion worth. Without the farm product loans and the operation of Public Law 480 to market stuff abroad, the chances are that corn today would be down to 35 cents a bushel and wheat to 50 cents a bushel, with livestock products proportionately down.

FARMER'S INCOME IS LOWER

But in spite of all that the Eisenhower administration has done the fact remains that in recent years the income of the average farmer has come down 10 or 15 percent at a time when the income of the average worker has gone up 20 to 30 percent.

The trouble is that the farmer has increased his efficiency faster than the worker in town. He works harder. He works longer hours, and his share of the consumer's dollar has been steadily cut. Our population increases at the rate of 1.7 percent a year but our agricultural output increases at the rate of 2.7 percent a year.

The farmer today has less than half as much income as the people in town. During the decade before I became Secretary of Agriculture I spoke to dozens of audiences saying that the farmer must have the moral, legal, and economic equivalent of what the tariff and the corporate form of organization and other subsidies give to industry and the labor union gives to labor.

To the best of my knowledge, every modern nation in the free world has a system of putting countervailing power from the government at the disposal of the farmer. And now throughout the Western nations surpluses build up, as production outruns demand and prices slip more and more. Russia and China, which have been woefully backward in their agricultural production methods, now give signs of sudden and great changes.

A CHALLENGE FROM KHRUSHCHEV

Khrushchev has challenged the United States to outrun Russia in the economic world on the road to peace. Let us respond by challenging Russia to join the Western world, through the United Nations, in putting the agricultural surpluses to work to end world hunger. Let our battlecry be, "End World Hunger by 1970."

Today hunger is growing in one-third of the world, whereas in the United States, Canada, Australia and Western Europe surpluses grow ever faster. Undoubtedly the United States can do more to bridge the gap between the hungry and the surplus areas than any single country. But the United States cannot do the job by herself. Even is she could, her motives would be suspect. Ideally it is a United Nations job, a job for a revived and revised UNRRA.

AN INTERNATIONAL GRANARY

Probably there should be an international ever-normal granary with an international plan for food distribution. The nations putting surpluses into the international granary should have voting power somewhat proportionate to their contribution. However, the hungry nations on the receiving end should have veto power with regard to the method of distribution. If the hungry nations propose distribution plans which obviously lead to graft and waste, the surplus-producing nations should have the right to turn down such plans.

How much capital should the international ever-normal granary have? Who will provide it? How cheaply should the international ever-normal granary sell to the hungry nations? Obviously there should be very wide latitude given the management but general rules must be laid down in advance.

If the U.S. Congress reaches the conclusion that it is too complicated to operate an international ever-normal granary, with or without Russia, then I say it is still possible to make our surpluses a blessing. In such case we must approach the problem in a far bigger way than we have hitherto.

FOOD SURPLUSES HERE TO STAY

I do not criticize the present administration for the way in which it has built up such enormous surpluses, provided it now gets busy on a really comprehensive plan—national or international. The time is far later than the administration seems to appreciate.

The very heart of the U.S. agriculture is that combination of feed grains like corn on the one hand and livestock products on the other. This part of agriculture is headed for the most serious and continuing build-up of surpluses, at a time when wheat surpluses have reached the point where they are almost unmanageable.

The administration thinks it can reduce surpluses by lowering the price to the farmer. This may be true in the case of specialties like eggs or potatoes but it is not true of corn, wheat and cotton. Many thousands of farmers may be ruined, but someone else takes over the land. The farmers grow fewer and the farms grow larger. The problem remains essentially the same.

The surpluses are here to stay and we must learn to live with them in a big and constructive way, taking into account our security needs and the mounting hatred of the hungry peoples for those who are better off than they. If we are convinced that our safety lies in this direction, we can slowly but surely work out the mean and difficult details of putting together a program.

From a narrow agricultural point of view I say to the farmer as I said repeatedly 35 years ago: "You must have equivalence of bargaining power. You must get it from Government as others have. If the Government handles your great surpluses constructively, the market will give you a living price. Fight those who urge that more farmers be driven off the land. Such persons are undermining our Nation's security and balance."

Pools of Jobless Remain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, those of us in Congress representing districts with pockets of chronic unemployment have no difficulty in agreeing with the viewpoint of Sylvia Porter in her column appearing in the July 4 issue of the Washington Evening Star entitled: "Pools of Jobless Remain."

In inserting this column in the RECORD I do so in the hope that it will be read by every Member of Congress who will in turn assist those of us who are trying to get action in the House on the Senate-approved bill, S. 722, now tied up in the House Rules Committee.

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH

(By Sylvia Porter)

POOLS OF JOBLESS REMAIN

At this moment of high and rising prosperity almost 11 percent of all those able and willing to work are still jobless in 179 areas spread across 29 States in our land.

There is no question whatsoever about the power and breadth of today's business upswing, no doubt that our economy is surging to new heights.

Yet, while the rebound from the 1957–58 recession has slashed average unemployment in the United States to under 5 percent of our work force, the bitter facts are:

1. The boom has hardly touched the pockets of joblessness in cities hit by major industrial upheavals or migrations in recent years.

2. A full one-third of this nation's unemployed men and women are concentrated in these 179 chronically depressed areas.

3. Many of these cities hit by all-out depression long before the general economic downturn of 1957–58, and the nationwide recession made an already bad situation worse.

4. As an indication of the chronic nature of the unemployment, the area with 23.1 percent of its workers jobless in May, the highest unemployment rate in the country—Biddeford-Sanford in Maine—has been on the Government's official "labor surplus" list since 1954. In Providence, R. I., unemployment in May topped 11 percent, and this major city has been on the sick list since 1951. In Atlantic City, N.J., unemployment exceeded 15 percent, and this world-famous resort city has been in trouble since 1952. So it goes.

NO FLY-BY-NIGHT TOWNS

These are not ghost towns. These are not fly-by-night communities dying because of the stupidity or greed or laziness of their own citizens.

Rather these are communities with proud histories, well-built schools, established road and water systems, all essential facilities.

These are cities which actually are suffering from progress itself—changes in technology within the Nation, switches in production from the old to the new, development of new methods of operation, new processes. And while dotting the unemployment map are centers of coal mining, textile and metal manufacturing, also on the distressed list have been and still are, automobile and even aircraft production cities.

Let's face it. If an upsurge 14 months old and of this strength still leaves us with so many valleys of trouble, there is little chance that anything short of a great boom will erase them.

Let's face this too. Many of the jobless in these areas are too old or too set in their ways to move to booming regions. Large numbers don't have the skills and aren't now capable of learning the skills other regions are demanding. Most don't have the money to finance a move even if they dared try it.

CITIES CAN'T FILL GAPS

The cities of the most prolonged and worst distress simply haven't had and don't have the capacity to fill the gaps created in their economic structures by the decline of what were once basic industries, the migration of major corporations.

So, finally, let's face the one decent answer—a program of technical assistance, loans, and grants under which the Federal Government can help States and localities redevelop the distress regions.

The Senate already has passed an area redevelopment bill which would provide a few millions and the organization for this aid. The bill is making its way at molasses speed through the House Rules Committee. But just as the President vetoed an area redevelopment bill last year because it gave more than he requested, so he is likely to veto a bill this year—unless there is agreement in advance on details.

The legislation should be put on the books without delay. It will be a black mark against all of us if we permit our Government again to default on our responsibilities to aid our blighted areas.

Hazleton (Pa.) City Council Urges Home Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the city council of Hazleton, Pa., on June 26, 1959:

Be it resolved by the Council of the City of Hazleton, Pa., That the city of Hazleton approves the legislation now pending before the Congress, assuring local government, by granting home rule to the District of Columbia; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Congressman from this District and the U.S. Senators from Pennsylvania.

Adopted by council this 26th day of June A.D. 1959.

S. THOMAS CAPPARELL,
Mayor.

Attest:

FLORENCE M. WEST.
City Clerk.

Garrison Diversion Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a resolution adopted by the North Dakota Water Users Association on June 19, 1959, which points out the necessity for the full appropriation for preliminary work on the Garrison diversion unit. I concur fully in their presentation and trust that the budget estimates for this project will be restored:

RESOLUTION OF THE NORTH DAKOTA WATER USERS ASSOCIATION URGING RESTORATION OF INVESTIGATIONAL MONEYS FOR BUREAU OF RECLAMATION FOR THE GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT OF NORTH DAKOTA FOR FISCAL YEAR 1960

"Whereas the Pick-Sloan compromise for the Missouri Basin development provided for the irrigation of 1 million acres of North Dakota land in exchange for approximately half a million acres taken from production and the tax rolls; and

"Whereas this agreement was accepted in good faith by the State of North Dakota as reflected by action of three sessions of the State legislature, as well as by affirmative action of voters and taxpayers; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation, through their investigations, have discovered sufficient acreages and have engineering plans which provide for development of areas over a 70-year period; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation is presently engaged in firming up more detailed land classification, topographical mapping, and engineering for canal, lateral and drainage layouts, cost estimates, and further economic studies in order to refine the project plan report complete in 1957 which indicates the economic feasibility by all rigid standards; and

"Whereas North Dakota, through its legislature, enacted legislation providing for the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District which has been activated and is presently cooperating with farm operators and six organized irrigation districts for the purpose of completing repayment contracts on a partnership basis in order to assure an expeditious program if and when construction moneys are made available; and

"Whereas the U.S. House of Representatives reduction of the recommended Bureau of the Budget estimate of $550,000 to $300,000 for the Garrison diversion unit, will impair and seriously hinder the efficiency of scheduled work because of disruption of the Bureau of Reclamation's technical staff, and thus will bring added costs to the National Government because of added delays: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the North Dakota Water Users Association, a statewide organization founded for the purpose of assuring orderly and maximum development of all of North Dakota's water resources*, That the U.S. Senate Committee on Appropriations restore the $250,000 reduced by the House of Representatives for the Garrison diversion unit and urges that the conference committee on public works appropriations for 1960 sustain the full amount because it is in the economic interest of not only North Dakota, but the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of said resolution adopted by the North Dakota Water Users Association be transmitted to the U.S. Senators WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG, of North Dakota; and Senator CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the U.S. Senate Committee on Appropriations, and to U.S. Representatives QUENTIN N. BURDICK and DON L. SHORT, of North Dakota, and to the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, U.S. Representative and chairman of the House Committee on Appropriation."

The above resolution was adopted by the executive committee of the North Dakota Water Users Association at Bismarck, N. Dak., on June 19, 1959.

L. C. MUELLER,
President.
OSCAR BERG,
Executive Secretary.

Plains (Pa.) Rotary Club Honors U.S. Marbles Champ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Thursday, July 2, 1959:

U.S. MARBLES CHAMP HONORED BY ROTARY

Matthew Wysocki, 13, son of Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Wysocki, 71 Skidmore Street, Hudson, the new National Marbles Champion, was paid tribute last night by the Plains Rotary Club at a meeting in the American Legion post home.

The new titleholder, who was the Times-Leader Evening News Marbles Champion and was sent to the national competition by the Times-Leader Evening News, was honored by the Rotary Club in conjunction with numerous civic and service organizations of the community. Representatives of the Plains Board of Commissioners and School Directors were also on hand to pay tribute.

Rotary President Hugh A. Walsh opened the festivities by introducing program chairman Irving Kirshner who introduced the men that knew the youthful Wysocki best, the Wyoming Valley Playground Association director, Joseph Kane, who is also a member of the six-man National Marble Tournament Committee from Asbury Park, N.J. Kane gave a graphic description of Wysocki's rise from Luzerne County marble champ to national champ.

KANE CITES WINNER

"You have a youngster you can be proud of in Matty Wyspcki," Kane said. "His nerves were of steel and his courage great as he coolly and calmly subdued all competition. Before going to Asbury Park we were asked to bring home a champion. That was a tall order, but Matty is a true champion. His constant practice sessions paid off. You must remember there are almost 1 million boys playing marbles in the United States. Forty of the best in the Nation were at Asbury Park." Turning to a humorous side of the championship, Kane continued saying. "Perhaps the most dramatic moment at Asbury Park was when that girl marble shooter beat our Matty one game after losing 22 games. Matty must have been looking into her eyes."

Kane concluded by lauding the Rotary for its constructive part in promoting events such as this one. Dr. Walter F. Kozik of the Rotary introduced the many guests present.

Rotary President Walsh presented the gifts to Wysocki from individuals and organizations. Edward Lee, manager of the Sans Souci Park, invited the champ and his family as his personal guests any Wednesday afternoon with everything on the house. Plains Sport Shop presented him with a gift. Township commissioners and boosters gave a bond and also presented a wallet to young Richard Kimsal, the Wilkes-Barre Township youth who was county runner-up in the Times-Leader tourney and who was sitting at Wysocki's side last night. A congratulatory card from Miss Rosalie Moran, principal of the Cotton Avenue school building when Wysocki attends, was read; also telegram from Gail B. Young, governor of Rotary International; an invitation from Ben Sterling, Jr., of Rocky Glen Park for free rides; gift from John B. Stetz, clothier, who was present at Asbury Park when Wysocki won the championship; bond from the Yankee Dugout Club of Hudson; request from Michael Loptao, Pittsburgh, asking the champ to send an autographed picture of himself and one marble from the championship game for his international all sports gallery, and a congratulatory message from Judge Bernard Brominski.

GUESTS PRESENTED

Among the guests introduced was the champ's father, Stephen Wysocki. Boni Sabatini, the township's marble tournament director and Rotarian told how Wysocki's early practice sessions near the high school's football field paid off. "Proper coordination and steel nerves are needed for the feat accomplished by Wysocki." He concluded with an observation that Sweden for the first time has a world's champion in Johanssen and Plains Township for the first time in its history also has a world's champion.

Highlight of the evening was the reading of a resolution from the Senate of Pennsylvania, introduced by Senator Martin L. Murray. It was signed by secretary of the senate, Edward B. Watson, and in part read: "The new national marbles king is a young Pennsylvanian, Matthew Wysocki, of Plains Township."

"Crowned champion by taking 11 games of a 21-game playoff, 'Knuckles Down' Wysocki was presented with a 21-inch trophy by the mayor of Asbury Park, N.J.

"Matthew Wysocki has brought honor to himself, his family, his community, and his State and has demonstrated the qualities of a true champion.

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of Pennsylvania hereby extends its hearty congratulations to Matthew Wysocki on his outstanding attainment."

Those present were: S. Pelak, Elia J. Cross, Herman Barbacci, Joe Brulo, John J. Baller, John Yeosock, Bill Sincavage, Charles Filippini, Gene Berti, Paul Motsko, Mario Rocconi, William Jones, Stanley Rowny, Joseph Trosko, Michael J. Mikelski, Robert Juzwiak, Steve Tokach, Clem Falchek, John T. Hughey, Stanley Petroski, Joseph Mlodzinski, Lawrence Moretti, Boni Sabatini, Supervising Principal M. V. Hughes, Ed Henry.

Stephen Wysocki, father of champ; Al Karaska, supervisor of the Wilkes-Barre Township marble tournaments, who accompanied Wysocki to Asbury Park; John Juback, Irving Kirshner, Joseph D. Kane, Richard Kimsal, Matthew Wysocki, Hugh Walsh, Simon S. Russin, John F. Goobic, Leo Pensieri, Dr. Walter F. Kozik.

Rotary songleader was Elias Cross, with Frank Malachesky at the piano. The program concluded with the pledge of allegiance by the assembly.

Let George Do It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, one of the most dedicated of our country's aviation leaders is George Haddaway, publisher of Flight magazine, president of the National Pilots Association, president of the Texas Association of Sigma Delta Chi, a founder of the Aviation Writers' Association, and one of our delegates to the Moscow meeting of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale this year. He was a leader and one of the strongest advocates of legislation leading to establishment of the Federal Aviation Agency. He lives in Fort Worth, Tex., when he is not doing a job somewhere else. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a feature article published in the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, which gives him part of the recognition he deserves, in a well-done journalistic tribute.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET GEORGE DO IT—AND HE WILL

(By Clardy McCullar)

Russia is the destination this week of a sandy-haired Dallas publisher who might be called an international commuter.

His work and his hobbies send him on scores of flights all around the United States and over the globe each year, and the traveling helps explain why he is better known almost anywhere else than in Dallas.

As one of the leading and loudest voices in general aviation (which takes in everything but military and airline flying), the 49-year-old native of Fort Worth edits and publishes Flight magazine. Small by most standards, Flight is generally recognized as one of the most effective forces in its field.

George Edward Haddaway's friends may have started the cliche, "Let George do it."

His friends, and there are legions of them, are constantly calling on him to head up an aviation committee or project, a church drive, a journalism group or to plan a party.

Just 2 weeks ago in Galveston he was elected president of the Texas State Association of Sigma Delta Chi, the professional journalism fraternity. With the honor he got the job of planning the association's convention in Dallas next spring.

He will go to Moscow as an American delegate to the 52d annual meeting of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale, the world's most important aviation organization. He will speak as vice president of the National Aeronautics Association and as president of the National Pilots Association. Up for discussion will come the complex question of what kind of electronic navigation system can all planes use all over the world and the problem of certifying flight records.

Flight navigation is a large part of aviation's current big headache: How to keep planes from running into each other.

Long concerned with this problem, Editor Haddaway in 1957 wrote a report suggesting how airspace should be assigned to nonmilitary and nonairline planes for President Eisenhower's Aviation Facilities Planning Committee. He helped found and was chairman of the General Aviation Facilities Planning Group which linked 12 national aviation organizations so all could have a say in the report. Now continuing as the General Aviation Council, the group cited Haddaway for his report.

He also served as chairman of the Aviation Development Advisory Committee for five administrators of the old Civil Aeronautics Administration, which became the Federal Aviation Agency last January.

And the American Association of Airport Executives think so much of his work he has been made an honorary life member.

His advice is so respected in the field that two aircraft makers moved to new plants on his word. He recently saved a Texas airplane company from bankruptcy by finding funds for it, although his own ideals keep him from investing in such a firm because it might influence what he writes in his magazine.

Journalism runs in his family. His grandfather was a newspaper publisher in Maryland, but his father left the paper to prospect for gold in Colorado and managed a railroad in Mexico before moving to Fort Worth in the 1890's.

Rochester Haddaway, his father, was an inventor who believed in the future of Texas. He put most of his money into land and had run up nearly a million dollars at the time of his death in 1953 at the age of 84. He was no spendthrift, but he believed in putting good food on the table and helping his children get an education.

He sent George $50 a month when he was at the University of Texas. But George, who also had an Eagle Scout scholarship, was following an early enthusiasm learning how to fly, and that cost $40 an hour. So he pressed pants for Phi Gamma Delta frat brothers to get the money for that. He first got interested in aviation when his mother (the former Mary Sherman, who still lives in Fort Worth and is 86) and an aunt entertained World War I Canadian air cadets in Forth Worth.

"They'd be at our house on the weekend, and on Monday several of them would crack up and die," he recalls.

He also had a neighbor a little later, Dutch Bartgis, who was an early barnstormer. He took George on many flights in old Jennies in the 1920's.

George just missed by a few points being a Phi Beta Kappa at the university. He took every Frank Dobie course he could, and has an autographed copy of everything Dobie has written in his library, which also includes some rare aviation books.

He probably had more fun than anyone else at the university, and he still loves fun. He is a cornerstone of the Quiet Birdmen, a publicity-shy group of longtime fliers dedicated to the kind of fun people in aviation seem to relish.

Ships and the sea fascinated George, too, and between semesters at the university he shipped as a merchant seaman. He got his pilot's license in 1928 and his bachelor of arts degree in 1930. By that time the depression had hit, and he couldn't get a job anywhere, despite Dobie's help. So he was a seaman for 2 years.

His father wanted George to follow in his footsteps and little understood the flying and the sea. But the family (an older brother and sister and a younger brother, in addition

to his parents) finally decided he was no black sheep.

Journalist Haddaway started his magazine in Fort Worth in 1934. He moved it to Dallas in 1939, so he could get more business, a motive even his friend Amon Carter understood.

He has spent as much time working for aviation in general as he has on the magazine. It was a struggle for years to get aviation the attention he was sure it deserved. He organized many aviation meetings like the airport management and operations conference series flight cosponsored with the University of Oklahoma, with the cooperation of the CAA.

Believing that war was near, he helped found the Civil Air Defense Service, forerunner of the Civil Air Patrol, in September 1941. He commanded, as a major, a CAP submarine defense base in Baumont, won the Distinguished Service Cross.

Many citations, certificates, and plaques have come to him, but he is proudest of being national Aviation Man of the Year in 1957.

Like his father before him, he is a devout Episcopalian. His family was one of the five which founded St. Luke's, and last Friday he helped lay the cornerstone for a new building, for which he served as finance chairman. He also served as building committee chairman for the Episcopal chapel at SMU.

He was a founder of the Aviation Writers Association, and is a past president. He has persuaded many papers to put writers on aviation news and taught them to be good aviation reporters. A charter member of the press club of Dallas, he has also been its vice president. He was president of the Dallas professional chapter of Sigma Delta Chi in 1954.

He has entertained a stream of foreign journalists visiting Dallas in recent years and works with the Dallas Council on World Affairs. He also belongs to the Texas Historical Association, the Wings Club of New York, the OX-5 Club, the National Press Club in Washington, and the Texas Ex-Students Association.

He lives with his wife, the former Gwendolyn Adelaide Sanders, and their five children at 9411 Hathaway Road. The children are: Gail Elizabeth, 19, an undergraduate at the University of Colorado; William Rochester, 16, in his third year at Phillips Exter Academy in New Hampshire; John Arthur, 15, a first-year cadet at Sewanee Military Academy in Tennessee; James Laird, 12, and Mary Anna, 10, students at John J. Pershing School here.

Tribute by Salem Statesman to the Late David C. Epps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a moving and deserved tribute to the late David C. Epps, chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee of Oregon, was published on the editorial page of the Salem Statesman of July 1, 1959. The Statesman is edited by ex-Governor Charles A. Sprague, one of our State's most distinguished chief executives. He has described Mr. Epps as a man of sincerity and dedicated liberalism. The description is accurate.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Salem Statesman of Salem, Oreg., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVE EPPS

Dave Epps was one of the ardent liberals of the 1930's, and while he settled down to work in party (Democratic) harness he remained firm in his liberal faith. He was one of the young men who worked to make over the Democratic Party in Oregon, rising to State chairman himself and leading the party in the successful campaigns of 1956 and 1958. His death at the comparatively early age of 51 removes not only an active political figure but a man who made his way in the business world, who made many friends and who held the respect of those who might disagree with him in politics because they recognized his sincerity. He will be missed by his party and by the larger community of Oregon where he lived and labored.

Milwaukee Journal Commends High Court for Upholding Right To Confront an Accuser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal warmly commending the Supreme Court for the blow it struck for American justice in the Greene case, that knocked out an arbitrary procedure that had threatened 3 million workers in defense plants with discharge from their jobs without due process of law.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHT TO CONFRONT AN ACCUSER

The Supreme Court in an 8 to 1 decision has held the Government's industrial security program to be invalid on the grounds that it has no authorization in law.

Thus is struck down another arbitrary and unfairly applied procedure that affected 3 million workers in defense plants and threatened them with loss of jobs without due process or the opportunity for simple justice. This is another blow at secret informers who are protected from being confronted by those they accuse.

Although the Court did not decide the case on constitutional grounds, Chief Justice Warren strongly intimated in the Court's opinion that security proceedings must insure a basic right of confrontation. Four of those who supported the majority opinion showed the Court's normal reluctance to decide cases on constitutional grounds if other grounds are available. They concurred in the Chief Justice's opinion but pointed out that they felt he had gone too far into the constitutional question.

The case before the Court was a particularly notorious one. William L. Greene, an engineer and former vice president of an engineering and research firm, was fired by that firm when the Navy contended that he was a security risk. The firm had been making an aircraft flight simulator for the Navy—and Greene had designed it. The situation was ridiculous on the face of it. The Navy was saying in effect that it wasn't safe for Greene to know anything about something he had built. It was like telling a composer that he had no right to remember his own composition.

Protecting Humanity From Radioactive Fallout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that today citizens in the United States, and throughout the world, are deeply concerned about the possible effect on humanity of oversaturation of the atmosphere with radioactive fallout.

Recognizing the dangers that higher proportions of radioactivity in the atmosphere pose for life on the globe, it is of course particularly important that we continue, as diligently as we can, to try to find ways and means for lessening these hazards.

At Geneva, U.S. representatives have tried diligently, unfortunately without success, to reach safeguarded agreements—and I stress safeguarded—for halting nuclear tests which, regrettably, continue to add to the degree of radioactivity.

Throughout the United States measuring points have been set up to obtain as accurate a picture as possible of the amount of strontium 90, for example, which is falling upon the earth.

According to experts, strontium 90 is by far the most dangerous of radioactive fallouts from nuclear explosions. Because milk has been used, from time to time, to measure levels of radioactivity, there is unfortunately growing in the public mind the idea that milk is more highly radioactive than other foods.

According to a recent report in the Farm Journal, however, today's milk actually contains only about one-tenth as much strontium 90 per unit of calcium as do cereal grains and vegetables. This is especially significant since milk supplies about 80 percent of the calcium in the American diet. According to this report, milk is still the safest source of calcium in this atomic age. To put the overall picture relating to radioactivity in food in proper perspective, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles: First, "Milk Safe from Atomic Fallout", from the July issue of the Farm Journal; and, second, "Scientists Are Keeping Close Track of Strontium 90 in All Food Items", from the June edition of Pure Milk News.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILK SAFE FROM ATOMIC FALLOUT

The amount of radioactive strontium 90 in milk is still infinitesimal—nowhere near the concentration estimated to be harmful to humans.

And the possibility that the amount will ever become dangerous is extremely remote.

But if it should, we can filter out about 90 percent of the strontium 90 by forcing the milk through an ionizing device that works on the same principle as a home water softener.

This reassuring discovery—a major breakthrough in the effort to safeguard our food supply—was made by a team of scientists from the University of Tennessee and the Atomic Energy Commission. They announced it at the American Dairy Science Association meetings in Urbana, Ill., on June 15.

Strontium 90 is by far the most dangerous radioactive element in the fallout from nuclear explosions. It's extremely long-lived—loses only half of its deadly radioactivity in 28 years. Harmful amounts can cause bone cancer and leukemia in humans.

It gets into milk—all other foods, too—because chemically, it is almost identical to calcium. The strontium 90 falls on the leaves and accumulates in the soil. The plants—unable to tell the difference between it and calcium—take in both.

Fortunately, less than 5 percent of the strontium 90 in the forages that a cow eats ever shows up in her milk. The other 95 percent is eliminated by the cow's digestive system.

So today's milk actually contains only about one-tenth as much strontium 90 per unit of calcium as do cereal grains and vegetables—is already the "safest" source of calcium in this atomic age. That's comforting, since milk supplies about 80 percent of the calcium in the American diet.

And this new discovery indicates that it will continue to be even if the amount of fallout reaches harmful proportions.

Said the research team in their announcement: "The process is not yet ready for commercial use; there are many questions yet to be answered. However, should the need arise, we believe that the basic process could be used by commercial dairies for removing radioactive strontium 90 from milk."

SCIENTISTS ARE KEEPING CLOSE TRACK OF STRONTIUM 90 IN ALL FOOD ITEMS

Periodic reports by the U.S. Public Health Service in regard to the levels of radioactive in air, water, and food make it evident that radioactive fallout from atomic explosions is a problem which cannot be dodged or minimized today or for generations to come.

The problem has its roots in the natural law of self-preservation which has persisted since caveman days. Today, however, that law governs more strongly, perhaps, than in Alley Oop's time. Mankind has gone the limit in trying to protect itself and is now trying to find out what it must do to save itself from the things it has created for self-protection.

Apparently whenever either uranium or plutonium atoms are split in the course of a nuclear explosion they release in the atmosphere a number of radioactive fission fragments. Some are short lived, decaying in a few minutes, days, weeks, or months. Others are long lived, lasting for many years.

One of the most troublesome of these fission products is an element known as strontium 90. It has an average life of 40 years. Its chemical properties resemble calcium, the element present in bone tissue. When present in the air it increases the natural background radiation to which all living things are exposed.

It is absorbed by the plants which human beings and animals eat. Scientists are concerned that if it is accumulated in amounts beyond a maximum permissible dose it may lead to bone cancer and leukemia. Therefore, the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurement has set maximum permissible limits for lifetime exposure of the individual to specific radiation and radioactive materials.

The committee established a permissible level of strontium 90 for all items of the diet, including water, meats, vegetables, and bread as well as milk.

Why all the publicity, then, about strontium 90 in milk—when all foods containing calcium are involved?

The reason is that milk was selected for testing for strontium 90 because it is produced every day in all sections of the country and it, therefore, considered the most practical food to sample.

To date, the tests conducted in the milk sampling program have shown that the amount of strontium 90 present is far below the permissible level suggested by the National Committee on Radiation Protection. In fact, the committee has recently issued word that the human body can tolerate twice as much strontium 90 as previously had been regarded as acceptable.

Scientists point out that milk contains less strontium 90 per unit of calcium than do cereal grains, vegetables, and meats because the body of the cow discriminates against it during the formation of milk. Some foods, they say, may contain up to 10 times more strontium 90 per unit of calcium than does milk.

These facts have been obtained from writings of scientists and information from the U.S. Public Health Service. Dairymen can put them to good use in conversations with consumers who may have been frightened by the publicity milk has received as a result of the strontium 90 tests.

New President of Wyoming Seminary Preparatory School, Located at Kingston, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Friday, July 3, 1959:

MOSES WELL SUITED FOR SEMINARY POST

When the board of trustees of Wyoming Seminary meets on Monday to confirm the appointment of Benjamin Hopkins Moses as seventh president of the 115-year-old college preparatory school, it will bring to the service of education in Wyoming Valley a man whose talents and training eminently suit him to the office.

Mr. Moses is a graduate of Wyoming Seminary in the class of 1930 and holds undergraduate and graduate degrees from Syracuse University. His administrative experience in the field of education, to which he has devoted himself for a quarter century, was obtained as assistant dean of men at Syracuse University, director of admissions at Harpur College, and director of student records at Yale University, from which post he comes to Wyoming Seminary. In addition, he has served in positions of leadership in many civic and philanthropic enterprises.

A fact that strongly recommends him to the new post is the knowledge that he is thoroughly familiar with the history and traditions of the school as a former student and friend of the last three presidents of Wyoming Seminary.

A native of Scranton, Mr. Moses has known President Ralph W. Decker since boyhood. They were contemporaries at Wyoming Seminary where Mr. Moses had the rare distinction of acting as chauffeur to the late Dr. Levi L. Sprague who occupied the president's office from 1882 to 1936. During his student days, Mr. Moses was also well known to President Emeritus Wilbur H. Fleck, who served as dean before succeeding to the presidency at the death of Dr. Sprague.

His brilliant background in the field of education and familiarity with the school he has been chosen to head, make Benjamin Hopkins Moses a worthy successor to Dr. Ralph W. Decker and one who can be counted upon to perpetuate the quality of leadership which has established Wyoming Seminary in the forefront of secondary education.

Tribute to the Late Commodore Samuel Tucker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the story of an almost forgotten naval hero of the American Revolution, written by Mr. Earle W. Gage of Jamestown, N.Y., and printed in The National Republic in December of 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLORY THAT LED BUT TO THE GRAVE—COMMODORE TUCKER SANK 62 ENEMY SHIPS, CAPTURED 600 ENEMY GUNS, BUT DIED IGNORED BY THE REPUBLIC FOR WHICH HE SO BRAVELY FOUGHT

(By Earle W. Gage)

American seamen, from colonial days, through World War II and since, have lifted American seapower by their seaboots, from zero to world preeminence.

Perhaps because the Colonies were struggling desperately for economic capability during and after the Revolution, adequate rewards, and recognition were impossible for many of the early maritime heroes whose deeds merited far greater recognition than they ever received in life.

Commodore Samuel Tucker, buried in an obscure part of the little country cemetery of Bremen, Lincoln County, Maine, is one of the outstanding examples of the frequently repeated charge that Republics are ungrateful. His flat, untended headstone is simply marked "A Patriot of the Revolution."

It is true that President John Adams, paying tribute to Commodore Tucker said, "His biography, even at this day, would make him a conspicuous figure in naval annals of the United States."

Young Tucker, born in Marblehead, Mass., in 1742, answered the call of the sea at the age of 11, as a cabin boy on the *Royal George* an English sloop-of-war. By the time he was 17 he was second mate on a vessel sailing out of Salem. He made a creditable

record aboard this ship, on one occasion, when the captain was drunk, clearing away from pursuing Algerian corsairs, to escape, and save the vessel.

In 1763, at 21, he married Mary Gatchell, of Marblehead, and became master of a merchantman. When the Revolutionary War broke out he was in London, where he was offered his choice of a commission in the British Army, a command in the British Navy, or a high civilian job.

True to his American colonial blood, the young seaman flatly refused to join any British service and to become a traitor to his homeland. He cried out to the enlisting officer, "Damn His Most Gracious Majesty. Do you think I would fight against my native country?"

A friend, who happened to overhear the outburst, stepped forward and urged Tucker to retreat to the outdoors, and advised him to quickly leave England before his certain arrest. Captain Tucker immediately left London, traveled some 15 miles into the country and stopped at a tavern. He discovered a brother sailor kept the place and told him what he had done and, upon being assured that his statement against the King would bring quick, certain arrest, asked to be hidden just as officers rode up.

After the tavernkeeper had sent the soldiers on their way, Tucker made his way to the coast and, by a rare piece of good luck, shipped aboard a vessel in which a distinguished Philadelphia merchant, Robert Morris, was interested. During a furious Atlantic storm, when it was expected that the vessel would go down with her valuable cargo, Tucker, by his skill, saved the ship. Out of gratitude, Morris introduced him to Gen. George Washington, who recognized Tucker as a man the young and struggling American Navy could well put to service. He was named commander of the armed schooner *Franklyn*, and sent to sea.

From the very outset his raids on British shipping were a success, affording the Colonies supplies from captured British vessels, whose cargoes of arms, ammunition, and supplies were a bonanza in the storm and stress of 1775–76.

From the *Franklyn*, Captain Tucker was soon transferred to the command of the *Hancock*, another vessel of similar type. In a year he had captured from 30 to 40 British vessels, and won a commission as commodore, under the signature of Samuel Adams.

Through the year 1777, Commodore Tucker carried on similar raids with the *Boston*, to the command of which he had been appointed by President John Hancock. In February of 1778 he fulfilled the important mission of transporting John Adams and his 11-year-old son, John Quincy Adams, to France, when Adams was sent as an envoy from this country. That Commodore Tucker was entrusted with such great responsibility when the high seas were full of danger, not alone from the elements, but from the numerous men-of-war which infested the Atlantic, is an indication of the appreciation of and trust in his ability.

En route, they were twice chased by formidable opponents. They captured one frigate with a valuable cargo, and weathered a terrific storm in which the ship was partially disabled. Mr. Adams landed safely in Bordeaux. To this voyage Hon. Peleg Sprague, in 1826, made reference, in the eulogy on Adams and Jefferson, as follows:

"Mr. Adams was removed from the Congress to other scenes of important duty and usefulness. In August 1778, he was sent to Europe as commissioner of peace. The public ship on board which he embarked was commanded by the gallant Commodore Tucker, who took more guns from the enemy during the Revolutionary War than any other naval commander, and who has been far less known and rewarded than his merits deserved.

"One occurrence on their passage is worthy of relation as illustrating the character of both. Discovering an enemy's ship, neither could resist the temptation to engage, although against the dictates of prudent duty. Commodore Tucker, however, stipulated that Mr. Adams should remain in the lower part of the ship as a place of safety. But no sooner had the battle commenced than Adams was seen on deck with a musket in his hands, fighting as a common marine. The commodore preemptorily ordered him below; but, called instantly away, it was not until considerable time had elapsed that he discovered Mr. Adams still at his post, intently engaged in firing upon the enemy. Advancing, he exclaimed, 'Why are you here, sir? I am commanded by the Continental Congress to carry you in safety to Europe, and I shall do so'; and, seizing Mr. Adams in his arms, he forcibly carried him from the scene of danger."

So widely did this report of Commodore Tucker's gallantry and success spread, not alone among the Colonies, but in England, that his actions became daily talk among British officers, who, at last, connived to bring his career to an end. The British fitted out a frigate even larger than the *Boston*, and sent her forth with a hundred picked men. Commodore Tucker, ever alert, learned of the project; when the British vessel ran across him he met her under English colors. The British captain hailed him, "What ship is that?"

"Captain Gordon's," replied Tucker, who knew that Gordon's English ship was modeled after the *Boston*.

"Where do you hail from?"

"New York," replied Tucker.

"When did you leave?"

"Four days ago. I am out after the *Boston* frigate, to take that rebel, Tucker, and I'm bound to take him, dead or alive, to New York."

"Have you seen him?" anxiously queried the English captain.

"Well, Ive heard of him," rejoined Tucker. "They say he's a hard one to catch."

In the meantime, the men on the *Boston* had been bringing their vessel into a position where they could rake the decks of the enemy. Every man was at his guns. Just then Tucker was recognized by one of the enemy's crew, who shouted from the topmost mast a warning to the British captain. Tucker gave the order to his men:

"Down with the British flag and hoist the American colors."

Turning to the enemy, he shouted to the captain, "The time I proposed talking to you has ended. This is the *Boston*, frigate, and I am Samuel Tucker, but no rebel. Fire or strike your colors." The British captain saw the advantageous position of the Commodore and wisely took the only course open to him. Not a shot was fired and thus did the British fail in their undertaking, and the English captain returned home in disgrace.

Commodore Tucker played a conspicuous role in the naval operations at the siege of Charleston, S.C., when he rendered valuable service in the demolition of the Beacon Lighthouse and Fort Johnson. After 30 days' siege, he was one of the commanders to surrender, though it is said he was the last to strike his flag, saying, "I don't think much of striking my flag to your present force, for I have struck more of your flags than are now flying in this harbor."

Upon receiving his parole, Tucker returned to Boston and soon was in charge of another sloop-of-war, the *Thorn*, on which he continued his record-breaking raids and capture of British ships until his own last vessel fell into the enemy's hands. Again he managed to escape to Boston. By this time he had acquired much wealth and occupied a house on Fleet Street, close by Governor Hutchinson's residence.

After 6 years of affluence, he lost his property and again he returned to Marblehead vainly endeavoring all the while to secure from Congress "arrears of pay on account of services rendered his country." He tended a grist mill and granary until, in 1792, he purchased a farm in what was then Bristol, Maine, to which he brought his wife, aged mother, and widowed daughter. The place is now know as Bremen, and was incorporated in 1828. There Commodore Tucker lived as a farmer and taught navigation until his death in 1833.

During his active service in the Navy, during the Revolution, Commodore Tucker captured 62 British ships, 600 pieces of cannon, and 3,000 prisoners, besides a king's ransom of cargoes which aided the struggling American forces in feeding and clothing their armies.

In the War 1812, when British privateers and war vessels were devastating American commerce along the Maine coast, though Tucker was aged and whitehaired, he commanded a schooner, armed with two brass cannon from the fort at Wiscassett, chased and captured the privateer *Crown*, and cleared the Maine coast of all the war vessels of the enemy.

Denied the fortune that belonged to him from his share of the prizes he captured, he applied for compensation to the Congress and after years of dillydallying, the politicians reported that he was deprived of his just earnings because of the statute of limitations, so Tucker died an unsung hero and in poverty, and today sleeps in an almost forgotten grave, marked by an untended, crumbling headstone.

Mrs. Frederick Hillman, of Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Friday, July 3, 1959:

MRS. FREDERICK HILLMAN

With the passing of Mrs. Frederick Hillman, a distinguished member of the community, it is comforting to her friends to know that she was repeatedly honored during her lifetime for contributions to the welfare of Wyoming Valley. Currently, due note has been taken of her role as the founder of Junior League of Wilkes-Barre, known at its inception in Wilkes-Barre under the name of Junior Aide. When the chapter was marking its 25th anniversary earlier this year, tribute was paid to Mrs. Hillman by members as the one who had conceived the idea of making a place in this community for an organization whose purpose was to foster interest among its members in social, economic, education, cultural, and civic conditions and to train its members through volunteer service. When the league addressed flowers and greetings to Mrs. Hillman during the 25th anniversary period it was in lasting recognition of Mrs. Hillman's inspiration from the beginning.

Mrs. Hillman served as the first commissioner of Wyoming Valley Girl Scout Council. She was its head for a number of years and resigned about 10 years ago as a member of the board of directors after 25 years' service.

Even after retirement her deep and enduring interest never lagged. She kept in touch with officials and by telephone or through letters contributed to advancement of the council her astute knowledge gained through years of experience.

Until recent years Mrs. Hillman's activities in cultural, philanthropic, and civic organizations were numerous. They took many useful forms.

Her husband will be recalled as a prominent lawyer and financial authority, and her father, Dr. Joseph Murphy, was an outstanding Wilkes-Barre member of the medical profession.

Texas Press Association Opposes Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE M. KILGORE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, the Texas Press Association held its 80th annual convention down in Brownsville, Tex., recently and during the business proceedings adopted the following resolution opposing Federal fair trade legislation:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE TEXAS PRESS ASSOCIATION AT ITS 80TH ANNUAL CONVENTION IN BROWNSVILLE, TEX., JUNE 25–27, 1959

Whereas there is now pending in the U.S. Congress a so-called Federal fair trade law being H.R. 1253 and S. 1083, which would allow manufacturers to fix the prices to be paid by consumers throughout the United States for merchandise sold through all local merchants, including the consuming public of the State of Texas; and

Whereas such price-fixing legislation has been strongly opposed by all responsible departments of the Federal Government, including the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission, because such legislation would be extremely costly to the consuming public and would eliminate price competition in the marketplace on all merchandise distributed nationally and would, in the opinion of the Justice Department, require a small army of Federal enforcement agents to compel compliance with any such law; and

Whereas the State of Texas has never weakened its antitrust laws by permitting so-called fair trade price fixing and in the opinion of the attorney general of Texas any such law would destroy the effectiveness of our State antitrust laws and would extend Federal regulation into the local retail commerce of this State without justification; and

Whereas the Texas Press Association has consistently opposed efforts by the advocates of price-fixing legislation to increase the daily cost of necessities to the consumer and has always sought to preserve and perpetuate the sound principle of free and open competition in the marketplace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Texas Press Association hereby expresses its unalterable opposition to the passage of any so-called fair trade law; and further, be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives from Texas and to Senators LYNDON JOHNSON and RALPH YARBOROUGH.

Respectfully submitted by your resolutions committee.

ROWLAND R. PETERS,
Nocona News.
JAMES E. CORNISH,
Post Dispatch.
CARL R. MILLER,
Raymondville Chronicle.

How To Save Lives on the Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, on July 7 the Supcommittee on Health and Safety will begin hearings on legislation designed to promote traffic safety.

I would like to invite the public and every Member of Congress who is interested in this terrible problem to attend these hearings.

In this connection, I wish to include in the RECORD the following article which appeared in the Boston Herald of June 20, 1959:

SAFETY EXPERTS SURE THEY CAN SAVE LIVES

(By Noah Gordon)

Fifteen thousand lives now lost each year in automobile accidents could be saved if the advice of traffic safety experts were heeded.

This is the opinion of John Moore, director of automotive crash injury research at Cornell University.

PLAN SYMPOSIUM

Moore was 1 of 17 safety authorities who met yesterday at Harvard Medical School to plan a symposium on the evaluation of survivability in automobile accidents.

The proposed symposium, to be held for 3 days at Harvard Medical School in the spring of 1960, would bring together in Boston from 50 to 100 of the Nation's leading safety engineers, medical authorities, and policymaking members of the automobile manufacturing industry.

"The reduction of 15,000 deaths annually could be accomplished within the next 10 years," Moore said. "And there is no telling what we would do with the annual injured figure of 4,700,000," he said.

According to Prof. J. Stannard Baker of the Northwestern University Traffic Institute, chairman of the planning committee, the symposium will deal with injury prevention rather than accident prevention.

According to the safety experts, each accident is made up of two distinct collisions. The first consists of impact of automobile on automobile, or vehicle against tree, wall, fence, etc.

The second is that of human being against some other mass.

"The meeting will result in a published summary which we hope will be a landmark of its kind," Professor Baker said. Data accumulated during the symposium could effect the design of cars and highways, according to the safety men.

It is possible to build a safe economical automobile, Moore said yesterday. "An automobile can be stylish, sexy, absolutely salable and yet perfectly safe," he said.

Pleasing appearance need not be sacrificed on the altar of safety, he emphasized. "There is no reason why the knobs on my washing machine shouldn't be appealing to my wife—and still not electrocute her," he said.

The people who solve the problems of automotive safety are not those in the research facilities, Moore said, but instead are "the people who make the product."

FOUR ADVANCES

Since 1956, he said, there have been four significant safety advances in the construction of the American car. They are a door latch which does not fly open easily on impact, positioning of the steering-wheel post away from the driver's chest, padded dash boards, and seat belts.

"Seat belts alone," he said, "could reduce injuries by 35 to 60 percent."

Prof. Derwyn Severy of the Transportation and Traffic Institute of the University of California told reporters that the automobile industry has failed to adopt any significant amount of innovations developed by safety researchers.

"Considering work which has been done in the past 10 years, you'd have to look for results in the automobile with a magnifying glass," he said. "This is not encouraging."

Other experts of the planning committee meeting included Richard O. Bennett of the National Association of Automotive Mutual Insurance Companies; Dr. Charles B. Burbank of Boston; Dr. Virgil G. Casten, chairman of the Committee on Prevention of Accidents of the Massachusetts Medical Society; Harry C. Doane of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, Detroit; Dr. F. Gaynor Evans, department of anatomy, Wayne State University; Dr. John J. Flaherty of the National Safety Council; and Dr. Richard Ford, chairman of the Harvard Medical School Department of Legal Medicine.

Also Dr. James L. Goddard, chief of the accident prevention program of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Arthur S. Johnson, vice president, American Mutual Liability Insurance Co., Wakefield; Dr. Ross A. McFarland, professor of environmental health and safety, Harvard School of Public Health; Alfred L. Mosely, department of legal medicine, Harvard Medical School; Representative Kenneth A. Roberts, Democrat, Alabama; Prof. John J. Ryan, Department of Engineering, University of Minnesota; and Col. John P. Stapp, USAF, Air Research and Development Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio.

The Brookings Institution Has Taken No Stand For or Against S. 1120, the Bill To Reduce Reserve Requirements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 29 I put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and excellent letter from Dr. John G. Gurley, a distinguished economist, expert in the field of money and banking, and a member of the senior staff of the Brookings Institution. Dr. Gurley said that he was opposed to S. 1120 and specified three quite persuasive reasons for his opposition.

His letter is to be found at page 11067 of the RECORD for June 29. I now have a telegram from Robert D. Calkins,

president of the Brookings Institution, pointing out that the views expressed by Dr. Gurley are his own views and not necessarily those of the Brookings Institution, which has not considered the merits of S. 1120, nor taken any stand on the bill. That was my clear understanding from the beginning, and I thought certainly that Dr. Gurley's letter showed on its face that he was expressing his views and not speaking for the Brookings Institution. However, I presume that Dr. Calkins wishes to make this point doubly clear. His telegram is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Please understand that the Brookings Institution has taken no stand for or against the bill to reduce reserve requirements. Any views expressed on this subject by Dr. John Gurley of our staff were of necessity personal views and not those of the Brookings Institution, which has not considered the matter or issued any statement on the subject.

ROBERT D. CALKINS,
President, the Brookings Institution.

John Huss Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, John Huss was one of the most famous of Czechoslovaks of all time, who late in the 14th century became the best known defender of the freedom of conscience. He was the torchbearer and forerunner of many gallant men who advocated and fought for religious toleration and freedom. He is justly considered the pioneer of the Reformation movement in Europe.

John Huss was born in the small Bohemian town called Husinec, near the Bavarian frontier, in 1369. He was educated at the University of Prague. In 1398 he was appointed for a teaching position there, and from then on his rise was rapid. In 1401 he was made the dean of the faculty of philosophy, and in the following year he was elected president or rector of the university for the usual 1-year term. At the same time he was chaplain of the famous Bethlehem chapel, and from its pulpit his views on religious toleration and especially his criticism of the abuses of the clergy became well known. For holding clearly unorthodox views, and for expressing them forcefully in public, he was reprimanded, then deprived of his position in the university, and finally was forbidden the exercise of his priestly functions. Some time later, by a turn of political events, Huss regained his lost prestige and again was elected president of the university in 1409. But the authorities began to persecute him once more. He was excommunicated by the archbishop of Prague, banned from the city, and a papal interdict was laid against all places offering him shelter. In 1413 he was led out of Bohemia to Constance—in southwest Germany. There he was tried by a council and found guilty of holding and preaching erroneous, heretical, and revolutionary views. Upon his refusal to recant these views publicly, he was sentenced to die on July 6, 1415.

Today the 544th anniversary of the death of that illustrious and eminent man is properly celebrated as a Czech holiday. I gladly join in the observance of that holiday celebration and pay my respects to the blessed memory of a really great champion of the freedom of conscience and of religious liberty.

The North Still Has Much To Do To End Bigotry, Discrimination, and Racial Tensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is always easier to see the mote in the other fellow's eye than in our own. So it is with race relations in this country. Many in the North find it more convenient to berate the South than to correct discriminatory conditions in the North. It is, of course, politically safer for a northerner to assail Little Rock than Leavittown.

A courageous northerner, Representative CHESTER BOWLES, of Connecticut, spoke recently before the Health Welfare Council here in Washington, and his speech has ben reprinted in the New Republic of July 6. Its title speaks volumes. It is in the form of a question: "Has the North Clean Hands?"

Representative BOWLES has asked, searchingly:

> Almost any northern community that honestly examines its own racial relations will realize how far it is from living up to its professed ideals. And once we see what is missing in our own cities and States, we will be less inclined to feel that it is enough to denounce the foolhardy actions of white extremists south of the Mason and Dixon line.

CHESTER BOWLES points out that only nine States outside the South have adopted antidiscrimination legislation affecting publicly assisted housing. Yet there are 39 States beyond the borders of the South. Only 19 of these States have established fair employment practices laws to end unfair discrimination in employment. I am glad that my own State of Oregon was fourth in the Nation to enact such legislation, and I am proud that I was the first member of the Oregon Legislature ever to offer an FEPC law for introduction. My wife Maurine and I participated actively in these efforts to end discrimination at the State level, where we both were members of the Oregon State Legislature.

But I heartily endorse what Representative BOWLES has written about seeking actively to end injustice, inequality, and discrimination against Negroes in the North rather than confining ourselves to hurling wrath at the South. Let us not be too particular about the other fellow's backyard at the expense of letting our own go untended. I deplore the white supremacy councils and the bigotry of certain areas of the South, but I also believe there is much still to be done in the North in the realm of racial tolerance, decency, and fairness.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New Republic of July 6 by Hon. CHESTER BOWLES, of Connecticut, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAS THE NORTH CLEAN HANDS?
(By CHESTER BOWLES)

Half of all American Negroes now live in the North. There are five times as many Negroes in Chicago as in Birmingham, four times as many in Detroit as in New Orleans, six times as many in Los Angeles as in Miami. Yet many northerners still smugly look at racial discrimination as a sectional problem, condemning what they consider to be the slow pace of integration in the South, while remaining indifferent or nearly so to the discrimination all around them.

There are 39 States outside the South. Only 19 have established fair employment practices commissions, 3 of them without any enforcement powers. In 20 other nonsouthern States, there has been no legislative action on employment discrimination at all. Only nine States outside the South have adopted antidiscrimination legislation affecting publicly assisted housing. In 30 other nonsouthern States, no official action to end housing discrimination has occurred.

Some cities such as New Haven and Pittsburgh are now taking far-reaching steps to rebuild themselves, including the slum clearance and human rehabilitation essential to the easing of racial tensions. But in many northern cities the professed equal protection of the laws still hides extensive segregation in fact—by residential exclusion, and by the natural selection of poverty. In few of our major northern cities do more than 20 percent of the Negro students attend school with white children.

Almost any northern community that honestly examines its own racial relations will realize how far it is from living up to its professed ideals. And once we see what is missing in our own cities and States, we will be less inclined to feel that it is enough to denounce the foolhardy actions of white extremists south of the Mason-Dixon line. Nothing will speak more persuasively to the South than a better example among the too ready critics in the North.

The Constitution is colorblind. The 14th amendment does require the end of racial discrimination in all parts of our public life. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, endorsed overwhelmingly by the people of the world, affirms this as one of the first principles of world order. Moreover, our Constitution will be enforced. The Supreme Court has ordered desegregation with "all deliberate speed," and Negro litigants will see that this is complied with; the new Negro, arising in the South and elsewhere, will supply all the litigants necessary, no matter what pressures are organized to stop him. Regardless of what party is in power, the observance of the law ultimately will prevail.

And of course law itself is a powerful teacher. The end of segregation in the Armed Forces, in the Nation's Capital, and on interstate trains did more to convince

many skeptics that integration in these made sense than any amount of talk could have done.

There appears to be a temptation, however, to rest on the oars of lawyers and judges and say that this is all now a matter of law and order. The President seemed to say precisely this when he stressed that he has told no one, not even his wife, whether he thinks the Supreme Court desegregation decision was right or wrong.

But court orders alone will not suffice to to change the minds and hearts of people.

The great hope is not for a reluctant and grudging acceptance of the inevitable force of the law. Our hope is that recognition of historical necessity will encourage an increasing effort to bring the various elements in each community into harmony.

If this were merely a legal issue between those who believe in upholding the law and those who seek to circumvent it, then there would have been no issue until the Supreme Court acted in 1954. But this turns the problem upside down. The Court acted because the constitutional guarantee of equality involves the deepest political principles of this Nation and because there was a moral issue presented which went to the heart of our Bill of Rights and our Christian civilization.

The law does not get its sanction merely because it is the law. It wins support because it embodies the moral purpose of society, and the task of political leaders, and of all who want to establish equal rights, is not only that of invoking and carrying out court decisions but also of convincing people that they are right.

That is why the proposal for an independent Federal agency like the Community Relations Service advocated by the Senate majority leader could be so important. Conciliation, provided it is consistent with the guarantees of the Constitution, is precisely what is needed to help the law.

The spectacle of Negro children in Little Rock, in Clinton and Sturgis and Nashville and in the integrating cities of North Carolina walking quietly but bravely to and from school through jeering, angry mobs shocked all Americans, as it did people around the world. When one remembers the fears of childhood—of changing to a new school, even when everyone is friendly and of the same race—one can imagine how these lonely Negro children felt in the midst of unfriendly white crowds.

Yet is not the old prophecy coming alive again? Are not the children leading us now? And not only the Negro children, but white children as well? In almost every city and town in the South where school integration has begun, the children are making out all right together. "If the grown-ups would just leave us alone, there would be no trouble," said a white student in Little Rock.

But many white southern grown-ups are still content to say that the problem will take a long time to solve and that the Negro must be patient, perhaps forgetting that a lot of time has already passed.

It is 96 years since Emancipation, 183 years since a southerner wrote the Declaration to which this Nation is dedicated. That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, and that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men—these are not just the words of Thomas Jefferson. They are the political creed of this country.

However, the white southerner has a case he can and should make. Generations of slavery, second-class Negro citizenship, inferior schools, houses, and jobs are now plaguing us in the form of high rates of disease and crime and a low level of education in areas where Negroes predominate. To be sure, such demoralization is also the state of much of the rural poor whites of the South and Puerto Ricans brought up and trapped in our congested urban slums. But the Negro has been an outcast longest, has suffered most, and is now the most extreme example of a problem facing the whole country.

This argument is, indeed, a good reason for doing many more remedial things than integrating schools. But it is no reason for perpetuating the very conditions which produce the demoralization in the first place.

Take a county where a depressed Negro population outnumbers the white two or three or four to one. If that Negro community is ill-housed, ill-fed, ill-clad, if it is sick, ignorant and angry, can a relatively well-off white minority be safe in any meaningful sense of the word? Or take a big southern city. If half of the town is a Negro slum, breeding uneducated bitterness, juvenile crime, and racial violence, what kind of community will this be for the white people who say they want to live there?

The lesson is clear: The new South that is now taking shape has no room for low and inhuman standards of life for anyone, and instead of using demoralization as an excuse for doing nothing about integration, it should cause the southern moderate to insist that a vast amount more must be done in a number of fields.

By proposing a far-reaching program to end the demoralization of much of the Negro community and of the poor whites, including slum clearance and measures for adequate housing and public health, the white south can then ask the Negroes, the courts, and the rest of the country to accept a realistic pace for school integration: perhaps beginning only in the first grade and at the college and university level, with a voluntary transfer system, with even segregation by sex in some areas where co-education adds to the fears about integration. But by holding back, southern moderates leave the field not only to the white demagogs but to future Negro demagogs.

So far Negro leadership has been on the whole remarkably intelligent and restrained and the Negro people have accepted its counsel. A new Negro is standing up in the South and elsewhere. His expectations may not all be met, but some good and true men of the white South must meet him face to face, must talk with him and understand him. Without such a minimum response, it is too much to expect that the majority of Negroes will forever stand by the moderate ministers of the Gospel and the well-trained lawyers who now speak for them.

Let's face it: In many churches in America, a minister who goes against the prevailing sentiment of his congregation risks his job as much as the politician who alienates his constituents. Many bishops and ministers in the South have spoken against violence and in favor of law and order. But is this enough?

There will be violence, and the law will be frustrated, unless the two sides in the racial conflict now splitting every southern community begin to communicate again with each other, to negotiate, to reason together, to find common remedies. Is this not the time for the white and Negro ministers of every southern community to form a continuing roundtable conference dedicated to finding Christian solutions to community racial problems?

For, after all, no country should be in a better position than the United States to solve this problem this way. Not only do we have nearly two centuries of democratic experience behind us, but the racial groups in this country, particularly in the South, have the great good fortune and blessing to share the Christian faith.

In our hearts we know the final answer. We know that we have done those things which we ought not to have done and left undone those things we ought to have done. We know that the pride of race, the fear of the strange and the different is one of man's original sins—that it has been fully erased from man's mind nowhere; that the sins of the fathers are visited on the children.

But we also know, as Lincoln said, that the Declaration of Independence "gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world. It gave promise that in due time the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all should have an equal chance."

My own perspective on this problem has been, I confess, affected by looking at it for some time from the other side of the globe. As a former Ambassador to India, I know how spectacularly American prestige rose as a result of the Supreme Court desegregation decision. While touring Africa 4 years ago, I sensed again how vital a successful solution of our racial troubles is for our future relationship with the two-thirds of the world's people who are colored. In the winter of 1957 in South Asia, I saw the enthusiasm generated by the successful conclusion of the Negro's bus boycott in Montgomery, Ala. Later in the Soviet Union, I saw the Communists take full propaganda advantage of the bombing of Negro churches in the same State.

No one but a cynic would argue that we should suddenly become interested in equal rights for Negroes merely because our propagandist position in the world would be helped by such progress. Nevertheless, it remains more true today than it was 1947, when one of our distinguished former Secretaries of State, Henry L. Stimson, wrote:

"No private program and no public policy in any section of our national life can now escape from the compelling fact that it is not framed with reference to the world; it is framed with perfect futility."

Finally, I should like to suggest that all of us can learn much from a study of that incredible man, Mahatma Gandhi.

There were always two sides to Gandhi's program. One was direct resistance to unjust laws or practices. The other was constructive popular action to create the conditions of justice. He began his career before turn of the 20th century in the Union of South Africa, where he went as a lawyer for some Indian traders. In 1893, South Africa was a land run by some million Europeans who sat on top of some 5 million Africans who had almost no rights at all. In addition, there were 100,000 Indians, most of whom had been recruited as cheap labor for the white plantations and mines. Soon after he reached Pretoria, the young man of 24 invited all the Indians in the city to a meeting. He urged them to fight racial discrimination but without hating or hurting their opponents. And since their aim was to reason with the whites, the first thing they should do, he said, was to consider the reasons given by the whites for their discrimination.

To the Indian merchants before him, known for slick dealings and sharp bargainings, he proposed complete truthfulness and more concern for the poor. He called on all Indians to do something to improve the unsanitary conditions in the Indian sections of town. Why wait for legal victories for the necessary drain cleaning, he asked. We can't blame the whites for all our troubles, he argued. Perhaps we can't by ourselves end all the poverty in which our people are trapped, but if those of us with some money and some education will join in, the slums can be cleaned up, freshened with a coat of paint, and made habitable; illiterate adults can be taught to read; volunteer schools can be provided for the children of the poor. And he began to build the institutions to do these constructive tasks.

In 1913 he returned to India after negotiating a settlement with Prime Minister Smuts

who once jailed him but later came to say to him, "I am not worthy to stand in the shoes of so great a man." And for more than 30 years in India, Gandhi pressed his constructive program of village improvement, the end of untouchability, and the reform of individual lives.

The bus boycott in Montgomery carried out with dignity and restraint represented an adaptation of Gandhian principles in democratic America. "We are seeking to improve not the Negro of Montgomery but the whole of Montgomery," said Rev. Martin Luther King on the occasion of the formation of the Montgomery Improvement Association which conducted the boycott. Instead of merely sitting by until the Supreme Court ruled bus segregation unconstitutional, the Negroes of Montgomery in amazing unity carried out a courageous, peaceful, direct action which took the Nation by surprise. It served as a kind of electric shock treatment shaking Negroes and whites alike from their lethargy. The long-term effects of this Gandhian-type action on the white conscience may take time to register. But it had an immediate effect in changing the Negroes.

Perhaps the change is best reflected in the story of the old Negro woman who, when asked if her feet were not tired from plodding so many miles each day to work replied, "Brother, for a long time my feet have rested, but my soul's been tired. Now my feet are tired, but my soul is resting." In this light, with good cheer, we can move ahead with all deliberate speed.

Western Pennsylvania's Spelling Champion, Miss Jean Jones, an Eighth-Grade Student From Munson, Pa., Was Among the 70 Champion Spellers Participating in the 32d National Spelling Bee Held Recently in Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the oldfashioned spelling bee that early became identified with the history of the little red schoolhouse in America has since been elevated to a place of national importance due to the revival of interest in spelling bees sponsored by the Scripps-Howard newspapers and scores of independent newspapers who joined in conducting annual spelling bees on local, district, and national levels.

One of the cooperating independent newspapers located in my congressional district is the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress edited by Mr. George A. Scott and published under the direction of Mr. William K. Ulerich, one of the well-known newspaper publishers in Pennsylvania.

This year, the Progress conducted a series of spelling bees in my congressional district and the winner, an eighth-grade student, Miss Jean Jones, of Munson, Clearfield County, was entered in the finals at Pittsburgh where she emerged as champion speller of western Pennsylvania. By virtue of her achievement, Jean Jones was among the 70 contestants who entered the National Spelling Bee at Washington, D.C., the week of June 8. Miss Jones was accompanied to the Nation's Capital by her mother, Mrs. Lenetta Muirhead; her teacher, Miss Ethel McCully, and the Progress and Pittsburgh Press representatives, Mr. and Mrs. George A. Scott and Mr. and Mrs. Joseph J. Williams.

Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege for Mrs. Van Zandt and me to greet and congratulate Jean Jones in person upon her arrival with her party at the U.S. Capitol on June 8 and to wish her good luck in her impending battle against the cream of the crop of spellers in the Nation.

The following editorial from the June 12, 1959, issue of the Washington (D.C.) Daily News sums up in the last paragraph what is in the minds of everyone in reflecting upon the beneficial results that accrue from stimulating interest in the art of spelling. The editorial concludes with this salute to the 70 spelling champions—"Hooray for these kids! And as for you youngsters, be proud of yourselves. No one of you was a loser."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, June 12, 1959]

OUR SPELLING WHIZZES

We hope every word of this comes out with substantial orthographic accuracy, because it is addressed to the Nation's best spellers, junior division, of 1959.

Congratulations to Joel Montgomery, 12-year-old seventh grader from Denver, winner of the national spelling bee conducted by the Scripps-Howard newspapers and others associated in the annual contest.

And our compliments to the 69 other boys and girls from all over the country who took part. They're all champions, as our Dick Peters said, or they wouldn't have been in those national finals.

They're an enviable crop of youngsters who can handle such jawbreakers as miscible, catechumen, fanfaronade, ephelis, and viniaigrous—to mention just a few which would have stumped us.

To a special extent, you might say that we are in the spelling game ourselves, but then try to name any vocation, avocation, or undertaking wherein good spelling isn't revealingly useful. To be sure, it doesn't come easy. We read of one contestant who finished high up; her father proudly said there wasn't a television in their house. That may or may not be a clue to the old-fashioned business of really digging in to a thing. That's the essence of spelling.

Hooray for these kids! And as for you youngsters, be proud of yourselves. No one of you was a loser.

Mr. Speaker, to give some idea of the wholesome experience gleaned from these annual spelling bees, I wish to incorporate at this point the following news articles by George A. Scott, editor of the Progress, as they convey the impressions made not only on the contestants but also on the adult population that accompanied them in their quest for national honors in the annual spelling bee. In this connection, Editor Scott of the Progress who conducts a weekly column titled, "The Monday Wash," which is deservedly popular with Progress readers deemed the 1959 spelling bees of such importance that he devoted his entire column of June 15, 1959, to an interesting resume of this year's battle of words. The articles from the Progress follow:

[From the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress, June 12, 1959]

JEAN JONES PLACES 22D IN SPELLING BEE COMPETITION—MISSES IN NINTH ROUND

(By George A. Scott, editor)

WASHINGTON.—Western Pennsylvania champion Jean Jones' dream of winning the National Spelling Bee title ended in the ninth round here yesterday, but she nonetheless finished a very creditable 22d in the field of 70 spellers.

The Munson School eight grader stumbled on the word "mendicant," which she spelled "mendecant," after successfully spelling eight words given her previously by word pronouncer Benson S. Alleman. Her earlier words were "eagle, campus, prospectus, inchoate, caitiff, viscid, denouement, and caliginous."

Until she faltered on "mendicant", Jean seemed to have things well under control and her misspelling of "mendicant" came as a surprise. She did exhibit a nervousness as she started the afternoon round with the comment "Well, I suppose I'll be next."

Jean took her elimination philosophically and without tears although she was obviously disappointed. On hand to comfort her were her mother, Mrs. Lenetta Muirhead and her teacher, Miss Ethel McCully, and the Progress and Pittsburgh Press representative, Mr. and Mrs. George A. Scott and Mr. and Mrs. Joseph J. Williams.

Although she is out of the bee competition, Jean will have plenty to keep her busy before she returns home Saturday. This afternoon all of the bee contestants and their escorts will visit Mount Vernon and Alexandria, with a boat ride on the Potomac as part of the trip. Tomorrow morning the contestants will visit the Government Bureau of Engraving and Printing and will take a barge ride on the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal.

The climax to the week of activity will come tomorrow night with the annual awards dinner. Jean will receive a cash award of $25. Saturday morning, Jean and her party will fly back to Pittsburgh on a Capital Airlines Viscount and will return to Munson via automobile that afternoon.

Six girls and five boys remained in the bee when the competition was resumed this morning. They included two Pennsylvanians, Susan Kirssin, Shippensburg eighth grader representing the Harrisburg Patriot-News, and Robert Crossley, who represents the Norristown Times-Herald and who finished 14th last year.

Eleven rounds of spelling and 498 words were required to reduce the field from 70 to 11 yesterday. The toughest round, from the standpoint of eliminations, was the seventh, last of the morning session, when 14 youngsters went to the sidelines.

Indicative of the tension that existed among most of the spellers was the first speller eliminated, eighth grader Jean Waycaster of Sophia, W. Va. Jean was back for a second try after finishing 43d last year, but went down on the word "lavender" in the first round.

One of the bee's favorites, Henry Feldman of Oak Ridge, Tenn., who finished 12th last year, was eliminated in the 10th round on the word "cognosce." Other words which felled spellers in the late rounds included "onomatopoeia, cedilla, ferriferous, meretricious, feral, and geophagy."

Yesterday's competition was conducted with a minimum of arguments. A check of a tape recorded disclosed that one boy had misspelled "dentifrice," but the judges agreed that the pronouncer had mispronounced the word and ordered that the youngster be given a second word. Two or three spellers were rung down by the judges

for delays in spelling words and one youngster fell prey to the seldom-used rule that once having started a word the speller cannot change the letters already pronounced.

[From the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress, June 15, 1959]

THE MONDAY WASH

(By George A. Scott, editor)

(Good evening. Notes from the diary of a reporter accompanying Spelling Bee Champion Jean Jones, of Munson, to the National Spelling Bee at Washington, D.C., last week.)

Monday: Up early for the 18-mile taxi ride to the greater Pittsburgh airport from the Pittsburgher Hotel, where Jean had experienced her first night in a hotel. Party of five filled cab to capacity, especially since all of the traveling bags had to be loaded on the front seat beside the driver, brandnew cab, but the company hadn't given the driver the key to the luggage compartment. Met Pittsburgh Press Promotion Editor Joe Williams and Mrs. Williams at the airport, where Joe had arranged for early boarding of the Capital Airlines DC-4 so that departure pictures could be taken. Aloft at 8 a.m., Jean, her mother, Mrs. Lenetta Muirhead, and her teacher, Miss Ethel McCully, were experiencing their first airplane ride. Flight Stewardess Barbara Rhoades went right to work serving breakfast to the some 70 passengers. Williams took Jean up to the cockpit of the plane where she met Flight Captain Tronovich, who explained plane's controls to her.

Jean met her first spelling bee rival before she even entered the Mayflower Hotel, headquarters of the week's activities. Struck up a friendship with Marilynne Myers, 13-year-old Memphis eighth grader, and they were constant companions the rest of the week. Even finished close to each other in the national bee, Jean 22d and Marilynne 19th. Hardly had time to get settled in our hotel rooms when we were off to the Capitol for greetings by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, picture-taking on the Capitol steps and lunch with Congressman VAN ZANDT'S gracious wife in the House restaurant. Back to the hotel. Jean, her mother and teacher off on the first of five special tours for the contestants and their escorts. We dropped into the Associated Press Washington office, where we once worked for nearly 3 years back in the midforties. Found 15 to 20 onetime fellow workers still there and wound up spending a couple of hours visiting from one end of the office to the other. First time we'd been in the office since we left there in June of 1947.

Dinner in the Presidential room of the Mayflower. Delicious food and deluxe atmosphere but tough on the pocketbook. After that a 2-hour get-acquainted or renew-acquaintance party for the escorts. Joe Williams, a veteran at taking champions to the National Bee, insisted Jean should have an autograph book and we finally found one in a drugstore a block from the hotel. Rest of of week Jean was busy getting autographs and her book was filled by Saturday.

Tuesday: Tours kept Jean and her mother and teacher busy all day, but we all got together for dinner in the hotel's "Rib Room" where the steaks are mammoth and delicious. It was early to bed for Jean and the other contestants.

Wednesday: S-Day for the contestants and "S" for Suspense-Day for their sponsors and escorts. Practice round that didn't count started off the spelling and then the chips were down. Fifty-two came through without error before the first contestant was eliminated and two more dropped out by the end of the first round. Sixth-grader Tommy Lewis of Albuquerque, N. Mex., was the only drop-out in the second round and he fell prey to the rule enforced only in the National Bee, which states that a contestant cannot change the letters once pronounced. Given the word "blossom," Tommy started out "b-o," then realized his mistake but it was too late. Judges rang the bell on another speller in a later round when she took too long in trying to spell "camaraderie." Seventh and last round of the morning session was toughest for contestants, 14 were eliminated, 6 of them in succession.

Boy versus girl competition was an interesting sidelight throughout the bee; 37 girls and 33 boys started and by noon the advantage had shifted to the boys, 16 to 12. Girls were back in control, 6 to 5, by the end of the afternoon round, but 4 of the top 5 spellers at the end of the bee were boys. Best showing boys have made in years.

Thursday: Up early again for the 8:30 a.m. start of the final rounds. Joe and Mrs. Williams, Jean, Mrs. Muirhead and Miss McCully reported a wonderful dinner at Gusti's an Italian food restaurant, the night before. We'd had dinner with our daughter and son-in-law, who drove down from Baltimore.

With the $1,000 first prize plus $500 for second and $250 for third place riding on each word, this morning's competition was tense and rugged. Very first word pronounced caused a hassle; Chief Judge Dr. Belmont Farley of the NEA (retired) suggested that "Capias" could be pronounced with a broad "a" and the Topeka, Kans., representative protested before the end of the round that he had tipped off the spelling of the word to the contestant, Betty Jo Abel, of Canton, Ohio. Judges then ruled that Betty Jo must spell another word, "triumvirate," which fortunately she did. Her newspaper representative then wanted to know if "this is a spelling bee or a pronunciation contest?" Curiously, Betty Jo lodged a protest of her own after she had gone down on "cacolet," which she spelled "cacolette," but her inquiry came after the round was completed, too late for consideration under the rules.

Sentimental favorite of the audience and most of the press was Robert Crossley, quiet but personable youngster from Center Square, Pa., representing the Norristown Times-Herald. Robert drew and spelled successfully such words as "smaragdine"; "bifurcation"; "syzygy"; "proscenium"; "contumelious," and "quincunx" to reach the final spelldown and each word he spelled brought a thunderous applause from the audience. Less enthusiastic was the applause, given all contestants when they were eliminated, which was received by fifth place winner Roger Cunningham, an 11-year-old seventh grader from Kenova, W. V., who had squirmed, jitter-bugged, and motioned to the audience in his seat while the others were spelling and had made a production of each word he spelled.

Spelling was forgotten Thursday afternoon by a 5-hour trip to Mt. Vernon and Alexandria and another tour Friday morning to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, plus a trip on a Chesapeake and Ohio Canal barge. Sportsmanship and congeniality of the youngsters was impressive and heart warming. Too bad grownups can't accept defeat and congratulate the winner as easily and sincerely as did the 11- to 15-year-olds in Washington.

Friday: Tour took most of the day, but we worked in a shopping trip with Jean, her mother and Miss McCully Friday afternoon that left us exhausted and our good wife, who well knows our disinterest in shopping trips, marveling. * * * But we enjoyed it, despite 90-plus temperature on the streets and crowded Washington stores, because our "tourists" enjoyed themselves. Climax of week was awards dinner at night at which Scripps-Howard Spelling Bee Director Dick Peters handed out the cash awards (Jean received $25) and told the crowded ballroom that this year's spellers were "by far the nicest bunch of youngsters" of any National Spelling Bee. Jean marked up another "first," her first corsage, which was a beautiful arrangement of baby rosebuds presented her by the Progress and the Pittsburgh Press.

Saturday: Up early again to check out of the hotel and taxi to the National Airport, where we boarded a Capital Airlines Viscount for the trip back to Pittsburgh. A Japanese group apparently was meeting at the hotel that day and one woman must have come down to the lobby straight from bed. She wore a kimona. Rain clouds forced pilot to take big plane up to 11,000 feet or higher and Jean had some real qualms as we flew through clouds that blotted out everything else. Some others of the party found the occasional air bumps equally disconcerting. Back in Pittsburgh, we almost were trapped by a bicentennial parade, but fortunately our parking garage was out of the parade zone. Exhausted by the big week, Jean slept with her head on her mother's shoulder part of the automobile ride from Pittsburgh to Clearfield. Tired but still thrilled over her big week, Jean couldn't pick out any one thing that thrilled her most. But we know that she and her mother and Miss McCully had had a big time. So did we.

One Hundred and Eighty-first Anniversary of the Battle and Massacre of Wyoming, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Friday, July 3, 1959:

COMMEMORATION SERVICE

We have today reached the 181st anniversary of the Battle and Massacre of Wyoming. It will be marked by a commemoration service—the 82d annual assembly of its kind—Saturday morning, July 4, at 10 at Wyoming Monument. Maj. Bruce Payne, president of the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society, will be chairman, and Justice Benjamin R. Jones of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court will give an address on "The Legal Implications of the Settlement of the Pennsylvania-Connecticut Territorial Dispute."

Many distinguished speakers have graced the platform at the annual exercises held for many years on July 3. An early highlight was reached when, on the 100th anniversary of the battle, President Hayes was the orator. In succeeding years other eminent men distinguished in public life or as historians have spoken on the hallowed field, none of them perhaps more eloquently than former Gov. Arthur H. James who as the speaker in 1947 became the first of the Commonwealth's long list of Governors to appear on the platform at the annual exercises at the monument.

By consulting the program and the committees and members listed thereon, we observe that the record of devotion to a patriotic endeavor is being maintained at a high level. Shown thereby also is the fact that the Battle of Wyoming is faithfully remembered by the present generation as a turning point in the early history of our country.

Tomorrow will not only mark the continuance of a fine tradition but also the beginning of a new era in the appreciation of Wyoming Valley's history. The audience at the monument exercises and the public at

large are invited to inspect Swetland Homestead. In its architecture, associations and furnishings the Homestead symbolizes the development of a family, a community and a rapidly disappearing way of life in America. Mrs. Franck G. Darte is to be congratulated for providing the Valley with both a tourist attraction and an authentic teaching museum for our students and citizens.

A Doctor Talks About Traffic Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, outstanding members of the medical profession are showing increasing awareness of the responsibility of the profession in the prevention of automobile accidents and in the prevention and the care of resulting deaths and injuries.

One of these outstanding doctors is Fletcher D. Woodward, M.D., department of otolaryngology, University of Virginia School of Medicine, Charlottesville, Va.

Dr. Woodward wrote an article entitled "Automobile Accidents," which appeared in the March issue of Medical Times. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article and I urge its being read by every Member:

AUTOMOBILE ACCIDENTS

(By Fletcher D. Woodward, M.D., Charlottesville, Va.)

Believe it or not the public is not yet interested enough in the prevention of automobile accidents with their resulting injuries and deaths to do anything about it. This attitude, no doubt, is the result of two things, the lack of knowledge from the lack of education and the human trait of believing that: "Such things only happen to the other fellow, not to me, for I am a safe and careful driver." However, since there is a crash every 3 seconds with 1 death and 25 injuries every 10 minutes, enough families will soon experience enough tragedies to enlist their active interest and support in preventive measure and in the enactment of adequate laws to curb this growing carnage.

The police see the broken bodies, the dead and the stark tragedy on our highways and learn to dread traffic crashes and especially holiday traffic and much as the doctors do who are called upon both night and day to pronounce death or to work long hours in the repair of these terrible injuries.

Automobile crash victims now constitute 8 percent of all hospital admissions and 20 percent of these are classified as from severe to critical. The repair of these injuries is one of the most frequent surgical procedures now performed in our hospitals.

The insurance companies are deeply concerned, too, in this problem, for the repair of the present-day chromium monster is nearly twice what it was a few years ago, and, in addition, they are confronted with the rising tide of hospital and disability costs plus liability costs.

The automobile companies have been so concerned with pleasing and selling to the 12-year-old mentality that they have ignored both the human occupant and the insurance company. The legal profession is also actively concerned, especially because of the mounting awards granted by juries in case of death or injury. Since the manufacturer is primarily interested in selling cars for dollars, he is not interested in providing safety features, nor in basic research in safety, because of the increased cost, and although many such items as hood ornaments, chrome trim, clocks, and other expensive extras could well be eliminated to partially compensate. He frankly says he does not intend to do anything unless the public demands it. When one considers the vast sums of money earned by the automotive industry over the years, he is astounded as to how little has been spent in basic safety research for the prevention of deaths and injuries.

In all ours wars less than 1 million men have been killed. The automobile counted its one-millionth victim some 5 years ago, and the number has been rapidly increasing since with increased speed and horsepower.

In 1925 there were 20 million cars, and the death rate was 19 per 100 million miles. In 1955 there were 60 million cars, three times as many, but the rate had been reduced to 6.4, a most commendable improvement. This was due to the indefatigable work of the many fine local, State, regional, and national safety organizations and the manufacturers.

Unfortunately, the total number of deaths and injuries is slowly but steadily increasing each year, and the rate of 6.4 deaths per 100 million miles is practically a static figure, and only by running hard can we hope to stand still. Something new must be added if we hope to cut this rate appreciably or reduce the number of deaths and injuries due to the rapidly increasing number of vehicles on our highways.

The doctor feels that he can help in the solution of this problem both as a physician and as a citizen by studying it from a medical standpoint and applying the remedies which are now available.

The leading cause of death in this country is cardiovascular disease. Second is cancer. But close behind are automotive deaths. If figured on man-years of life lost, for the first two are primarily diseases of the older age groups whereas the automobile rate is highest in youth, hence the man-years of life lost are great.

We feel that we now have enough facts, which if employed, would reduce the deaths and injuries 50 percent or more and, while at the same time, converting many of the more serious injuries to those of a relatively minor nature.

If doctors had waited until all the facts were known before starting the control of such scourges as smallpox, typhoid, diphtheria, malaria, syphilis, and poliomyelitis, as examples, their control would have been long delayed.

We realize the importance of basic research in the ultimate solution of these problems but, until these facts are at hand, we can use the remedies we now have in a practical clinical way and immediately begin the control of what we now feel to be the number one health problem of this country and, at the same time, carry on and encourage basic research in all the many phases of the problem to hasten the final solution.

The greatest cause of crash deaths is the drinking driver. He accounts for 50 percent or more of them. The next is speed and reckless driving, which accounts for 30 percent or more.

The remainder are caused by many things, such as mechanical failure, physiological states such as sleep and fatigue, pathological conditions as epilepsy, diabetics taking insulin and cardiovascular disease; also, drugs, emotional disturbances and many other conditions too numerous to list at this time.

As a result of Cornell and other crash studies we know that the most frequent source of death or injury in the car is: (1) The steering assembly; (2) ejection; (3) dash and windshield; (4) back of front seat and so on. The most frequent body areas affected are: (1) Head and neck; (2) chest; (3) extremities and so on.

To initiate control of this number one health problem we would like to recommend:

1. Education. In spite of sputnik and the hue and cry for our schools to emphasize mathematics and the sciences, I would like to speak a word for the languages and humanities, for as has been said, "Reading maketh a full man." In order for our youth to live to this desirable state I would like to urge the State boards of education to see that all public, parochial, and private schools initiate compulsory driver training courses which are far more important than many courses now emphasized, such as home economics, art, music, and physical education. They should provide both an adequate curriculum and behind the wheel instruction. Such schools should also be available to the public for the instruction of beginners, those referred by the court and for those whose licenses have been suspended or revoked. A certificate from such a school should permit a youngster to apply for a license at 16 instead of 18, which should otherwise be the minimum age limit. It could also earn lower insurance premiums and permit at times those whose licenses have been suspended or revoked to take the course and then reapply for a new license. These schools would be invaluable in teaching safety from all angles with emphasis on the danger of driving while drinking, on speed and recklessness and on the value of safety features of design as well as safety belts or shoulder harnesses.

2. (a) Since the average individual suffers impairment of driving skill at blood alcohol levels of from 0.03 to 0.05 percent, let's make 0.05 percent the critical level for conviction instead of 0.15 percent. The latter is a far too generous figure.

(b) A chemical breath test should be mandatory in all cases where driving when drinking (not intoxicated) is suspected. This test would free the innocent, as well as help convict the guilty. The alternative to such a law is the implied consent law as has been provided in New York and other States.

(c) The result of the chemical test should be accepted as primae facie evidence.

The present laws exonerating a driver of drinking and driving with a blood level of less than 0.05 percent are proper.

There should be enacted a new set of laws to cover those with a blood level of from 0.05 to 0.15 percent. This is the range of the social drinker. These laws should be mandatory and tough enough to stop the driver who is not drunk and thinks he is perfectly capable of handling a car in our modern high speed traffic. The results consistently prove him wrong. For the first offense, perhaps, a $100 fine, a few hours to 1 day in jail, and a 30-day suspension of his driving permit would be proper. For the second offense a $500 fine, 10 days in jail, and a license suspension for 1 year. For the third and final offense a $1,000 fine, 30 days in jail and a permanent revocation of his license.

For those whose alcohol blood levels are above 0.15 percent the laws should be really tough. Perhaps, for the first offense a $100 fine, 10 days in jail, and 6 months suspension of a license. For the second and final offense a $1,000 fine, 30 days in jail, and permanent revocation of his license. Many States have found a point of demerit system is the best solution to these problems of suspension or revocation of a license.

In answer to the many arguments pro and con in this complex problem the physician is not interested in whether the degree of intoxication is reached on an ascending or descending curve of intoxication; he is not concerned with the type or rapidity of consumption of the alcoholic beverage or whether consumed on a full or fasting stomach; he is not concerned with whether the individual is a beginner or an experienced drinker. He is only concerned with the fact that no one should operate an automobile in our modern high speed and complex traffic patterns who has an alcohol blood level of 0.05 percent or higher.

All of these laws should be mandatory and not left to the discretion of the judge or consulting physician for both have failed miserably in the past.

3. Since speed and reckless driving are causative of some 30 percent or more of crash deaths, I suggest more State police, that the public be educated to support them, and cease playing cops and robbers on the highways, and that tougher laws be enacted and made mandatory.

We should endorse the speed limits suggested by the National Safety Council for uniform adoption. These limits are 60 miles per hour for day, 55 miles per hour at night and 35 miles per hour in urban zones, all with a 5 mile per hour tolerance. Dual lane and other modern highways should likewise have a minimum limit of 40 miles per hour.

It is suggested that the first offense in this category carry a $100 fine and a 30 day license suspension; the second offense a $500 fine, 6 months license suspension and from a few hours to 1 day in jail; the third offense a $1,000 fine, 12 months license suspension, and 10 days in jail; the fourth and final offense a $1,000 fine, permanent revocation of the driving permit, and 30 days in jail.

The laws punishing both the drinking driver and the reckless speeder must be made tough, for driving a motor vehicle is a privilege and not a right. Nor should sympathy be wasted on the so called hardship cases for you may be his next victim. He knows the penalties for each offense whether set by mandatory laws or as a result of the point or demerit system and no deviation can be allowed if the number of deaths and injuries is to be curtailed.

4. Since some crashes are unavoidable and others inevitable it is important that the machine itself be designed and safety features provided to protect the occupants. At the present time the destiny of thousands rests in the hands of a comparative handful of men, the designers and engineers who plan next year's cars without benefit of medical advice or consultation.

The Committee on Trauma of the American College of Surgeons has been concerned with the importance of safety design of the vehicles and the provision of safety features as standard rather than optional equipment and their efforts have the wholehearted support of all physicians and particularly of the American Medical Association Committee on Medical Aspects of Automobile Injuries and Deaths.

The American Medical Association committee is primarily interested in the medical aspects of the problem but, as a result of their studies and the reports of research groups such as the Cornell Study Group, it has placed design high on its list of objectives. The reason for this decision is that 12 miles per hour seems to be the critical speed. For, at this speed the average steering wheel collapses leaving the steering post as a lethal projection and no one can protect himself from death or injury.

If thrown out of the car his chances of getting killed or hurt are five times greater than if he had remained inside the protective shell of the vehicle.

The seat belt, or preferably the shoulder harness, is the one best safety feature that can be provided at this time and, if worn, may well prevent some 60 percent or more of deaths and injuries. The belts should be anchored to the floor of the car and must meet the safety specifications of the Society of Automotive Engineers. If belts are not provided as standard equipment provision for their attachment should at least be provided.

Many suggestions have been made which would contribute to passenger safety at little extra cost for the manufacturer. Among these suggestions are a collapsible steering assembly, or Ford's deep dish steering wheel with a broad steering post covered with protective crash padding, the same type of padding over the dash, back of the front seat and other dangerous areas in the car, seating of the front seat passenger farther away from the dash, firm anchorage of seats, visual or audible speed signals, safety door locks, polarized headlight lenses and an oppositely polarized spot on the windshield to prevent night headlight glare and blinding, better designed windshields from an optical standpoint, high seat back extensions to prevent whip lash neck injury, a recessed shelf behind the back rest to avoid injury from secondary missiles, less chrome and other reflecting surfaces, eliminating projecting knobs, buttons and levers, also shock absorbers for bumpers or energy absorbing material in the front end and many other features. Most of this extra cost could be compensated for by less chrome, the omission of hood ornaments, clocks and radios and many other accessories as standard equipment. As I have said before, one is astounded as to how little has been spent on safety research by the manufacturers compared to the vast sums received from the sale of their product. The continuing research by Ford is commendable and is the one ray of light discernible at this time. These things must be provided, if not voluntarily by the makers then by Federal or State legislation, demanding certain safety features if their product is to be sold in interstate commerce.

Consultation with the medical profession on the aspects of human engineering as related to automotive engineering would soon establish many related facts which would bear fruit by reducing deaths and injuries at the time of a crash and convert many of the severe to critical injuries to those of a relatively minor nature.

5. Physicians in their dual roles as citizens have suggested that three classes of driver permits be granted: (1) private vehicles; (2) commercial vehicles; and (3) passenger carrying vehicles. Each individual could thus acquire one or more such permits depending on his vocation and desire and if suspension or revocation of a permit is ordered by the court it could apply to all three categories or to one or more depending on the offense or series of offenses. For instance, a truckdriver could continue to drive his truck but would be barred from driving his private car.

Reexamination should be required every 3 years for class 1, every year for classes 2 and 3. This would also apply to schoolbus drivers and those past age 65. The automatic reissue of driving permits every few years should cease for under this system the only requirement for reissue of a permit is to be alive.

Physicians have also suggested that referral medical clinics be established by cities, towns, and counties to be staffed by doctors appointed by local medical societies with consultants available in psychology and the medical specialties. It would be their duty to pass on the physical and mental fitness of those referred to it by the court, the police, or other physicians. Their opinion would be particularly valuable in consideration of the licensure of repeat offenders.

State medical societies are appointing traffic safety committees to serve as consultants to State legislatures and licensing authorities on medical aspects of licensure.

The American Medical Association recognized its responsibility in this field and through its committee on medical aspects of automotive crash injuries and deaths has prepared three pamphlets: (1) "Are You Fit to Drive?" written in lay language and illustrated for the instruction of the patient whose condition may pose such a query. (2) "A Medical Guide to the Physician" to determine a patient's fitness to drive. This pamphlet covers the medical aspect of the problem for the first time and serves as a reference to the physician when confronted with a patient who has a problem concerning a physiological state, a pathological condition, emotional disturbance, drug therapy, or alcohol. (3) "A Guide to Examining Traffic Officers" is being prepared now and will set definite physical standards.

Of course, the physician's first duty is to render adequate definitive treatment to the injured and of these results he is justifiably proud for those of World War II were much better than those of World War I. There was also further improvement during the Korean conflict. These results were due to advanced surgical and anesthetic techniques, chemotherapeutic and antibiotic drugs, improved methods of blood transfusion, better transportation of the wounded, and nursing care.

In civil life he is interested in seeing that first aid care and emergency transportation is adequate and available and that properly trained and equipped rescue squads are established.

In spite of his accomplishments in the care of the wounded his main interest as in all other major medical problems is in prevention and to obtain this goal he advocates:

New laws to curb drinking drivers;

Proper and uniform speed laws;

Minimum safety features in design and equipment as standard and not optional features;

Referral medical clinics;

Three classes of permits for private, commercial and passenger carrying vehicles;

Driver education schools for the public and in all public, private, and parochial schools;

A study of the newer laws of our more progressive States;

Point or demerit system;

Education of our youth, the public, the legislator, and the traffic court judge so that new and proper laws will be enacted, observed, and enforced;

The employment of more State police and for the public to stop playing cops and robbers;

Further engineering studies of highways and all related factors as well as of the machine itself; and

More time and money in basic safety engineering research.

But, for the present let's employ the information we now have for by doing so the deaths and injuries could be curtailed substantially, perhaps by 50 percent or more.

CONCLUSION

I would like to quote a statement from Col. C. W. Woodson, Jr., superintendent of Virginia State police, which is as follows: "With modern traffic what it is, pleasure driving has ceased to be. Survival on the highway today calls for a mechanically perfect vehicle and a driver who is mentally alert, in good physical condition, and aware of the dangerous task he is performing." And, I would like to add that the car should

have proven and built-in safety features in case a crash should occur.

The physician is proud of his definitive care of the injured but he does not feel that his duty as a citizen and a physician has been fully discharged until preventive measures have become a fact and are reflected in the daily gruesome statistics of the public.

Proposed Study of the Nation's Tax Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include Keenotes which was released today:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE, of West Virginia)

The end of the 1958-59 fiscal year on June 30 with a deficit of about $10 billion once again focuses attention upon the Nation's financial situation. Certainly a deficit of this magnitude makes it all the more unlikely that present tax rates can or will be reduced in the immediate future.

However, the House Ways and Means Committee will hold hearings on the Nation's tax structure this fall which may lead the way to relief for the Nation's taxpayers.

The committee is concerned, along with many other people, over large amounts of income which are escaping taxation each year.

Some reports place the amount of money which escapes taxation at $26 billion. This means that about $5 billion in revenue is lost to the Nation each year.

If the full amount of this lost revenue could be recovered by the Federal Treasury, this would make it possible to cut everyone's personal income tax by 13 percent without any loss in revenue. Or, it would be possible to increase the personal exemption from $600 to $800.

There are many loopholes in present tax laws. The Ways and Means Committee will examine all of these loopholes and see what might be done to eliminate them.

Certainly, individuals who are subjected to the present high tax rates are entitled to demand that everyone be treated alike. There has been much talk about abuses of expense accounts—such as charging a big game hunting trip to Africa as a business deduction.

Many tax officials contend that if the Internal Revenue Service could audit more returns hundreds of millions of dollars could be collected in additional tax revenue. It is estimated that $3 out of every $5 of all money paid in interest to individuals is never reported on tax returns. Also, many dividends from stocks are said to go unreported. At present, 4 percent of dividends are exempt from income tax. The provision is under heavy fire in Congress and should it be repealed the unreported dividends could cost the Treasury substantial amounts.

The proposed study by the Ways and Means Committee will be the first attempt in many years to meet this problem of tax loopholes head on. Chairman MILLS Democrat, of Arkansas believes that it may be possible, by closing loopholes and collecting taxes on income which is now tax free to provide tax relief for many wage earners.

There is no doubt that the man on a salary, who has his tax withheld, is hardest hit by present tax laws. With no other income, he cannot take equal advantage of deductions and exemptions. It is only fair that the same strict requirements imposed upon the salaried worker be extended to all other segments of our population.

A revision of tax laws, which maintain revenue at present levels by ending loopholes and evasions, may be the only hope for tax relief in the immediate future.

A Time for Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 23, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, there is much misunderstanding and much misleading oratory on so-called tax loopholes—especially concerning the oil depletion allowance. To me, this calls for real understanding, as explained in the able editorial of the Los Angeles Times for June 28. Under leave to extend my remarks, the editorial follows:

A TIME FOR UNDERSTANDING

There are ceaseless pressures in Congress to tamper with the depletion allowance, the key device for restoring our dwindling oil reserves.

A BASIC NECESSITY

There is a widespread and mischievous misunderstanding about the depletion formula, which is basic to our defense and even to our standard of living.

Those who would reduce or eliminate the depletion allowance say they seek to close a glaring tax loophole. But the basic facts remains: our civilization still floats on oil, and we must be sure adequate encouragement is provided to the oil industry to continue its oil explorations.

New uses for petroleum products are helping to use up reserves at a rate that by 1957 had exceeded the rate of new discoveries.

Thanks to the present depletion allowance, oil explorers are encouraged to seek ways to reverse the diminishment of supplies. Without the allowance much of the search could not be financed, unless there were a substitute kind of revenue, such as higher gasoline prices.

THE BETTER ALTERNATIVE

The depletion allowance appears the better way: it lets an oil producer claim exemption for up to 27.5 percent of his gross expenses before paying income tax, on grounds that extracted oil or gas is capital that is depleted when sold.

The allowance alone is inadequate for exploration. To each dollar gained through allowance, the producer must add two more—from retained profits or from new investment—to carry on the long-odds speculation known as drilling for oil.

The current odds are nine to one against a producing well. They go up to 50 to 1 against a well being moderately successful, that is, yielding a million barrels before running dry.

Expenses are rising beyond the 87 percent that drilling costs represented in the wellhead price of a barrel of oil in 1957.

The margin for potential profits is hardly enough even for large operators. Yet the large operators are in the small minority: of 16,000 prospecting, nine-tenths have fewer than 10 employees; only 53 have 500 or more. The largest single company produces only 5 percent of the Nation's output of petroleum.

MODERATE EARNINGS

Those who think the oil industry ought to bear more of the tax burden, Federal and State, are not supported by a survey or 22 years ending in 1957: a representative group of oil companies earned 9.6 percent annually on net worth, compared to 10.7 percent for all manufacturing companies.

Without a depletion allowance or higher retail prices, it is hard to see how companies could continue to look for oil: in 1957 they poured $2.2 billion into dry holes in the United States alone.

Costs are increasing as wells go deeper. Those going down 15,000 feet or more increased from 1 in 1938 to 192 in 1958. Cost has gone up from $14 a foot for the first mile to $110 a foot to 22,000 feet. One was sunk to 5 miles, and it was dry. Nobody gets a depletion allowance for a dry well.

One well, striking oil at 21,000 feet, will probably require 8 years to get back costs before profit begins—if the well doesn't peter out meanwhile.

Efficiencies in the business have enabled these added costs to be shouldered, while the price of gasoline, for instance, has gone up only 5.9 percent, exclusive of taxes, since 1949. The costs of materials, services, and wages have jumped far in excess of that, according to a survey in Steelways.

Moreover, oil yields in taxes to Federal and State treasuries about $1 of every $9.50 in the Federal budget—more to the several governments than to all stockholders.

Madison Capital Times Praises Congressman Patman's Opposition to Vault Cash Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 17, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from a recent edition of the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times praising Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN'S determined and well-informed opposition to the administration's vault cash bill. The Capital Times also makes favorable mention of Congressman GERALD FLYNN'S position on this legislation:

PATMAN NEEDS SUPPORT IN HIS FIGHT AGAINST BIG GIVEAWAY

A strange story of double-talk, obscurantism and audacity was exposed Monday in the Capital Times by Ron May, our Washington correspondent.

It seems that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has given its approval to a bill that nobody but two men in the entire Congress can understand. These two are Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, and Wisconsin's own GERALD FLYNN, Democrat, of Racine.

PATMAN, particularly, has been fighting this bill for many months. Persistently and doggedly he went through all the fine print and studied all the possible ramifications. When he had finished his research he announced his conclusion: the bill amounted to a $15 billion giveaway in Government bonds by the Federal Reserve System to big bankers.

PATMAN has extreme difficulty in getting anybody else excited over the proposal. Nobody, it seemed, understood what it was all about.

Furthermore, the Federal Reserve Board announced that perhaps the bill might permit a giveaway, but they didn't intend to use it that way. This, apparently, satisfied those who were too lazy to find out for themselves what was involved.

This week, however, PATMAN got some impressive support for his position by several of the leading economists in the Nation.

Among these was Dr. Arthur P. Becker, chairman of the economics department at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Dr. Becker has studied the bill carefully, and in a letter to PATMAN he gave his conclusions: the bill was a gigantic giveaway. He urged the House, which now is considering the bill, to reject it.

To Dr. Becker's analysis was added that of Dr. Seymour Harriss, chairman of Harvard's Economics Department, and Dr. Alvin Hansen, Harvard's renowned banking expert. Their conclusion coincided exactly with that of Dr. Becker: the bill provides for a $15 billion giveaway.

Exactly how the giveaway is achieved is a complicated thing. Essentially, what is involved is a lowering of reserve requirements for private banks, which has the effect of creating more money for them.

In order to offset a runaway inflation because of this, the Federal Reserve would be forced to sell about $15 billion in Government securities.

Since the big banks would be buying these securities with money created for them by Congress, these U.S. obligations would, as Dr. Becker has pointed out, in reality be given free to the banks.

Representative PATMAN is, we will concede, an able and unusually intelligent Congressman. The taxpayers owe him a great debt for sticking with this issue so tenaciously. But is it possible that he is the only man in the Congress who has been able to understand the essence of this giveaway bill?

Just what are the rest of our Representatives doing in Washington? It looks to us as if they all need a forceful reminder from the voters back home that they had better get down to business.

Appraising the Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the within editorial, "Appraising the Deficit," appearing in the Washington Post of July 5, 1959, pointedly states the poor financial record of the 6½ years of the Eisenhower's administration. The editorial follows:

APPRAISING THE DEFICIT

As the last Eisenhower administration enters its last full fiscal year, it can hardly look back upon its performance in the financial field with much satisfaction. Judged by the administration's own standards, the 6-year $20 billion net budget deficit, the 10-point peacetime rise in the cost of living, the decline in the rate of national economic growth and the failure to improve the structure and management of the Federal debt amount to a disparity between its hopes and its accomplishments of considerable proportions.

But it would not be very instructive to appraise the $12.5 billion deficit for the year just closed in the terms which the administration itself persistently uses. There is much more to the business of government than the Treasury's ledger sheets and the Consumer Price Index. Indeed, this administration's fixation with these and certain other limited measuring sticks has probably accounted for much of our recent fiscal troubles. These have stemmed from an inadequate flow of revenues to the Treasury, leading to the imposition of tight, arbitrary ceilings well below what needed to be spent on defense and important domestic programs and resulting in the deficits which have marked all but two of the Eisenhower years.

In retrospect it appears that the tax reductions of 5 years ago, however much they may have contributed to recovery from the recession of that period, should not have been permanent. They were taken at a time when, by drawing heavily upon past appropriations, the administration made it appear that spending could be greatly reduced. This very quickly proved an illusion, but the tax rates were not restored. Had the reductions been made temporary, specifically tailored to combat recession like the temporary tax cut favored by this newspaper a year ago, the later investment boom might have been moderated and last year's decline been less severe.

Even with reduced rates, however, the tax structure might have produced more than enough to offset the net deficit and to provide for a more adequate defense and domestic budget today had budget and monetary policy been geared to promote a higher rate of economic growth.

This judgment of course benefits from hindsight, and if the administration now showed a greater willingness to reappraise what has happened and to learn from it, there would be less occasion for reproach.

Hard on the heels of a record peacetime deficit, however, its spokesmen still hint of tax cuts before the next election. Confronted with rising prices, they still reject taxation as the best and obvious inflation remedy. Surrounded with urgent and informed pleas for greater defense, foreign aid and domestic spending, they still seem to see no opportunity for the budget to grow with the Nation. Refinancing the debt on a hand-to-mouth basis, they offer nothing better than a mechanical, short-term remedy—an increase in the interest burden, itself an inflationary if presently unavoidable step.

With the recovery from last year's recession by no means complete, a modest deficit in the 1960 budget would hardly be a cause for alarm. The most liberal proposals so far made by responsible groups for schools, housing, foreign economic aid, and defense—to name some of the most critically short-changed areas—would not produce anything like the deficit just incurred in the past year. By closing some of the more glaring tax loopholes and providing some little Federal Reserve support for the bond market to ease interest costs, it is possible that no deficit financing would be needed to provide an adequate and realistic budget for the coming year. Then, if taxes cannot in an election year be adjusted to produce greater revenues and faster growth, thoroughgoing tax reform could become the first order of business for the next administration. This way, we think, lie both the monetary stability and the more rapid growth which the Nation must achieve.

Historian Crusade Lacks Objectivity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal American of Monday, July 29, 1959:

HISTORIAN CRUSADE LACKS OBJECTIVITY

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The assumption must be that an historian is objective. His task is to discover the facts of man's existence upon this earth, to collate and correlate them, to record them, and sometimes, as Toynbee has tried, to make them into a system. When an historian writes, as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., did, that he is "engaged in a private crusade to exterminate this particular myth that Herbert Hoover offered cooperation to Roosevelt in the weeks between the election and inauguration in 1932–33," he, Schlesinger, ceases to be an historian and becomes a propagandist.

Four men were engaged in the conversations concerning the cooperation under discussion. They were President Herbert Hoover, President-elect Franklin D. Roosevelt, Ogden Mills, and Raymond Moley. Of these four men, Herbert Hoover and Raymond Moley are alive. Concerning these events Hoover and Moley have written.

Schlesinger, at the time of these events, was 15 years old; he was not an intimate of these men and therefore can only know what transpired from a selected documentation of the case.

A journalist would interview Herbert Hoover and Raymond Moley, the two survivors of the conference; perhaps an historian rejects the testimony of the living and only deals with documenation. On February 17, 1933, Herbert Hoover wrote a long-hand letter to Franklin D. Roosevelt, which read:

"A most critical situation has arisen in the country of which I feel it is my duty to advise you confidentially. I am therefore taking this course of writing you myself and sending it to you through the Secret Service for your hand direct as obviously its misplacement would only feed the fire and increase the dangers."

Further he wrote:

"I do not refer to action on all the causes of alarm, but it would steady the country greatly if there could be prompt assurance that there will be no tampering or inflation of the currency; that the budget will be unquestionably balanced, even if further taxation is necessary; that the Government credit will be maintained by refusal to exhaust it in the issue of securities.

"I am taking the liberty of addressing you because both in my anxiety over the situation and my confidence from 4 years of experience that such tides as are now running can be moderated and the processes of regeneration which are also always running can be released."

LEADER OF THE BRAIN TRUST

Senator Carter Glass, of Virginia, agreeing with Hoover, refused to become Roosevelt's Secretary of the Treasury, because of similar fears. Raymond Moley was at that time closest to Roosevelt. He had been the lead-

ing person of the so-called Brain Trust. In his book, "After Seven Years," Moley deals fully with this situation. He accompanied Roosevelt to the White House for the conference with Hoover and Mills. This is what Moley says of Hoover's statement to Roosevelt:

"Before he had finished, it was clear that we were in the presence of the best-informed individual in the country on the question of the debts. His story showed a mastery of detail and a clarity of arrangement that compelled admiration."

The entire chapter on this subject in Moley's book needs to be read for a full, historical appraisal of Hoover's enormous effort to save the country's economy during the interregnum between November and March, that is, between election day and the inauguration.

I refer to this one instance because it is so fully documented and two witnesses are alive to give testimony. There was another conference on January 20, 1933, at which Hoover, Roosevelt, Secretary of State Henry Stimson, Secretary of the Treasury Ogden Mills, Ambassador Norman Davis and Raymond Moley were present. In fact, a joint statement was issued at the time.

In the curious document from which I quote, the historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., says:

"What kind of cooperation was this? Cooperation from a defeated President ought to consist of an effort to help the President-elect put his program into effect. Hoover's tenders of cooperation consisted instead of demands that Roosevelt repudiate the program on which he had been elected and accept Hoover's."

I wonder if, in his busy life, the historian has had time to look at the Roosevelt program of 1932. It had to do with beer and economy in government expenditures. It was nothing like the Roosevelt program of 1936 and 1940. It is the second New Deal Schlesinger is thinking about.

Donald Comer Writes Assistant Secretary Kearns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received in the mail a letter from Mr. Donald Comer, chairman of the executive committee of Avondale Mills, one of the outstanding textile manufacturing concerns in the Nation, whose head offices are located in my home district of Birmingham. The letter is addressed to Assistant Secretary of Commerce Henry Kearns and points up eloquently the great need for relief from many adverse conditions threatening our American cotton industry today. With the thought that the Members of this House will benefit from the factual information and the sound views contained therein, I am pleased to insert this letter in the RECORD under leave heretofore granted:

AVONDALE MILLS,
Birmingham, Ala., June 16, 1959.

Mr. HENRY KEARNS,
Assistant Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KEARNS: Following up my letter to you of June 12 from Eufala, Ala., I wish to review with you our foreign trade program as it affects textiles now, and as it may affect them in the future. I am writing you because of what you said in your speech at Waco, Tex., on May 4 to the American Cotton Congress, copy of which you sent me.

We of the textile industry feel that we are in the same boat with the farmers for better or for worse. We are partners with them in the National Cotton Council for the protection of our common problems. We believe that the American economy depends upon a prosperous agriculture, and that we, the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick-maker are geared to that prosperity, and I know of no one who, in all the years of his life fought harder in defense of this truth, than my father. I know of no farmer, having prepared his pasture for his own cows, who didn't put a fence around it to protect it from strays across the road whose owners either have not anticipated such needs or who were hoping for some intrusion or some giveaway on the part of his more provident neighbor.

You speak as Assistant Secretary of Commerce, so I think I should explain just why I take the responsibility to speak for the industry. I am at present chairman of the executive committee of the Avondale Mills, Birmingham, Ala.; I am chairman of the board of Cowikee Mills, Eufaula, Ala. These two companies spin approximately 165,000 bales of American cotton, and had their beginning in 1897. They operate under a profit-sharing plan that had its beginning in 1938. After 4½ years' service in the Spanish-American War, I resigned from the Army and joined my brother Fletcher in the management of our father's 30,000-acre cotton plantation in Barbour County. Later, we both left the farm and came with Avondale. In your speech you spoke of the "inseparability of world trade and King Cotton." The price of cotton at that time did not permit a successful operation of anything approaching a fair income to the cotton farmer. As you may recall, our cotton at that time largely went abroad at world prices, and the money was spent by the cotton farmer for things made in the North behind a protective tariff.

Mr. David Lilienthal, while Chairman of the Atomic Commission, made a speech before the students of the University of Alabama, saying that if our Government had been as considerate of the cotton farmer as it had with the industrialist, people like the Comers would have continued growing cotton instead of spinning it. Most of the Comers' plantations were sold, and now are largely growing pine trees and pasture grasses. The Comers have moved to town and the management of our mills is now more actively in the hands of my youngest brother, Hugh Comer, my nephew, J. Craig Smith, and my son, Donald Comer, Jr. Hugh, Craig and I are all past presidents of the American Cotton Manufacturers Association.

In 1937 our textile industry began to feel the impact of increasing Japanese imports. President Franklin Roosevelt increased the tariff rate 50 percent, which was all the law allowed, but to no effect. As a result, with the blessing of our Government and the Japanese Government, a mission of American textile executives went to Japan to discuss the situation with the Japanese textile industry. The chairman of this mission was Claudius Murchison, president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Association, and the other members were Mr. Harry Harry Bailey, Mr. Cason Callaway, Mr. Bob Philip, and Donald Comer. We went to Japan and after some days of conference agreed with them on a quota of 100 million yards a year. At that time Japan had about 12 million spindles and we had 27,750,000. This agreement remained in effect until December 1941, when the war started. During the war the Japanese industry was very largely destroyed. It was either bombed out or they voluntarily melted down their spindles and looms for war needs.

After the war, General MacArthur asked for a committee of American textile people to come to Japan and help them reestablish their textile industry. So a committee of three was sent over under Dr. Jacobs, then president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Association, Mr. Fred Symes, and Donald Comer. General MacArthur congratulated us on our helpful suggestions. The U.S. Senate implemented our recommendations for providing a revolving credit fund, then there was a very quick revival of the Japanese textile industry. No one was more surprised than I was when this reborn industry began immediately shipping their unwanted and unneeded goods into this country in uncontrolled quantities. Local protests resulted in a voluntary quota fixed by the Japanese, and this matter has become aggravated in recent months because Japan has been over here insisting on increasing this quota. My interest became immediately involved because of a statement from you that "you considered the increase fair to both sides" and further quoted as saying: "Reciprocal trade between United States and Japan vital."

You may recall the article in Life magazine on June 23, 1958. It dealt with industry in Steubenville, Ohio: The Weirton Steel Co. there was shipping tin plates to Japan, and Japan was balancing the trade by shipping us chinaware, which shut down the local chinaware businesses. A local Ohio power man was quoted as saying: "The free world and the friendship of Japan are a damned sight more important to me than a few factories." I mention this particularly because in your speech you refer to Japan balancing her purchases of cotton and other raw products, by shipping us textiles, plywood and fine china. The chinaware was closing down the mills in Steubenville, Ohio: her plywood has shut down 50 percent of the hardwood plywood industry in this country.

Foreign trade, which should be directly under your Department, is presumed to be operating under a so-called reciprocal trade program. I asked you for your definition of "reciprocal" and your reply was: "An arrangement by which all parties to an agreement benefit to as near an equal degree as possible." I am not sure whether your word "parties" mean the State as a whole, or individual industries within the State.

In other words, I am not quite sure whether you are arguing that for the good of the whole we should sacrifice some American industry in order for some foreign industry to live. I mention this because the administration has been accused more than once in the handling of the reciprocal trade program of considering our textile industry as expendable. You know we saw the silk scarf industry in New York expended for the benefit of the imports from Japan: we saw the tuna fish industry of California expended for the interest of Japan's: the velveteen industry is fighting for its life, and the plywood, textile, chinaware and other industries are threatened. You say that there are some industries that possibly need some protection, and that some protective actions can be justified, and you refer to the fact that Congress has provided ample apparatus for relief.

The President himself, in his letter to Congressman MARTIN of Massachusetts, promised that his reciprocal trade bill would be administered without injury to a single American industry, and he himself cited these protective clauses that you mention. You surely haven't forgotten that the New England fisheries, threatened by cheap imports from Iceland, were granted the

right of a tariff protection from the Tariff Commission, but the President refused to provide the protection recommended by the Tariff Commission. These facts were put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama. Your speech, of course, was to the cotton farmer, and in this whole program the need for an export market for cotton has been dangled before our cotton farmers. Under AAA the cotton farmers got their first Government protection. They were guaranteed parity. The purpose and plan was fair and long overdue, but its administration has been wrong from the beginning, and so recognized by everybody today, I think.

In giving the farmers these parity prices, which were away above the world prices, there has accumulated in our warehouses millions of bales of cotton. American mills pay the parity price. The foreign mills have now for some time been sold this surplus cotton at world prices, and this cheap American cotton in a Japanese mills, spun by Japanese wages, is coming back into this country at reduced prices, and in quantities still left to the whim of the Japanese exporter. The wheat farmers provided that their surplus, grown under this AAA program, if and when sold abroad at reduced prices, could not come back into this country in any form, and surely everyone will agree that it is only fair that the same restrictions should apply to cotton, and this is terrifically important at this immediate time, because the Government is considering a further reduction in price of our cotton to the foreigner.

We are taxed to encourage the farmers to increase their production of cotton at parity price, which can only be sold at a loss to the foreigner in competition with world prices, and without any restrictions of our own against this cotton coming back into this country at cut prices to supply my customers, to slow down my mills, and reduce my purchases of cotton at parity prices.

May I quote a paragraph from the New York Daily News Record, which was reprinted in the Underwear News: "It appears likely that the ROK will dip a cautious toe into the cotton fabrics market this year, with export of 10 million yards of heavy sheeting to the United States. That represents a single purchase by the American Uniform Co., Springfield, Tenn., for the manufacture of waiters' uniforms and similar articles. The cloth is 38 inches wide, bleached and priced at 14.5 cents a yard. On the financial side, there is a distorted rate situation. Since all of the raw cotton comes through U.S. aid channels, it is paid for at the official rate of 500 Hwan to the dollar. The going rate within the country is actually about 1,000 to 1, meaning that spinners are getting their cotton at half price, in effect, in addition to the fact that the price is subsidized to begin with under the United States surplus disposal program." When we quoted this same customer at that time our price was 19½ cents per yard.

In our foreign-aid program we gave our farm surplus food away to feed the hungry people: why not pay the Japanese to take our surplus cotton, turn it into cotton goods, and give these cotton goods away to the naked people in the world? I suggested such a program to Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, and his reply was we were not "realistic." I think it's much more realistic than letting them come back here and shut my mills down. Our argument has been that if this country owes Japan anything, the whole country should pay for it and the burden should not fall on just one or two industries. I still feel that we should encourage more travel to Japan and let our tourist dollars help bridge this gulf. It's a beautiful country, with friendly people: I know because I've been there three times.

The reciprocal trade program was first sponsored by the late Secretary Hull, and he's been quoted many times as explaining what the program meant: shipping what A nation has in overabundance that B nation needs, and taking in pay what B nation has in overabundance that A nation needs with some three-way trading. Japan wants to buy our cotton, which she needs, and wants to pay for it with her cotton goods, which we don't want and don't need. I don't call that reciprocal, do you? I call that just a gift, and in this case I think it's giving Japan something that belongs to me and my textile associates. This purchasing power was built up largely by the earnings of the American worker, and we must spend it largely among ourselves, and across our borders only, for what we need and do not have. None of us can spend it for things imitating a home product, just because they are cheaper, only cheaper because of cheap foreign wages. Our Government has no right to trade it across the water for this and that and shut down a home industry. Japanese raw silk for our raw cotton would be a natural. Over the years we have built our mills, and spread our money in advertising, developing, and encouraging the use and need of what we make. This expense went into our operating, and Japanese goods come in free, under our umbrella.

Our industry cannot live under this kind of competition. You say that present imports are only a small percentage of the whole. It's cheap prices and the threat that's disturbing our price structure and our production planning. We have no war today, but we are spending $40 billion just in case. It's Japanese and Hong Kong goods today: it's all Asia and Africa and the rest of the world tomorrow. Japan not only weaves cloth—she manufactures the looms and spindles, and she is supplying China and Southeast Asia as fast as she can with these looms, and we'll be hearing from them in due time.

You speak of the need of foreign trade, and you mention raw products, which we all agree we need, and there's nobody objecting, certainly not the textile industry, to your acquiring and stockpiling of our needs of such things as tungsten, antimony, bauxite, beryl, graphite and iron ore. There's no objection, Mr. Kearns, from anywhere that I know of, to such imports, and that's what we are talking about. In this case Japan is buying raw products—cotton and wood pulp from us—and selling us the finished product, of which we already have in overabundance. Let me quote from the annual report of the Singer Sewing Machine Co. They speak of the competition in this country with sewing machines made in Japan, produced at cheap labor rates, saying: "The Anderson (S. C.) and Elizabethport (N. J.) plants are fighting for their lives. Closing of the plants is a possibility if protection from imports cannot be provided. There's a possibility of moving them abroad. This question is particularly pertinent in view of the complete lack of reciprocity in sewing machine trade with Japan, that the Japanese Government for many years has barred the import of household machines made in the United States, and has generally restricted imports of industrial machines to types not made in Japan. They have always followed this policy of complete one-way trade." The Rockwell Manufacturing Co. of Pittsburgh, manufactures auto forgings, taximeters, etc. Mr. Rockwell told me that competition from imports had forced him to buy two plants in West Germany, and we know he is not the only one.

One of the Japanese textile spokesmen wrote to the Cotton Trade Journal, in Memphis, Tenn.: "Why wasn't Mr. Comer willing to live and let live?" My reply to that was that: "I was willing to live and help live, not just live and let live," as indicated by my acceptance of this voluntary Japanese quota. I also asked if they had permitted the velveteen industry or the tuna fish industry to live and what they were doing to the chinaware industry and the plywood industry; and what they bought from us of which they already had an overabundance. If, for the good of this Nation, Congress decided that foreign trade should be acceptable, by which one industry might be hurt in order that some other industry might profit, the right to life or death for an American industry should be retained in the hands of Congress and not turned over to some bureau chief in Washington.

I understand that we wanted airbases in Iceland, so that New England fisheries pay the price. I also understand that we want Japan as an ally against Soviet Russia. Billy Graham says: "Only religion will stop communism."

The Senate committee that recently investigated this whole textile problem issued a very helpful report. There was lots of testimony. You'll even find a statement from me on page 1889, part 5, of this report. I'd like to quote Mr. Charles Cannon, who appeared before this committee: "We think that the rules, regulations, and expense to which we have been subjected indicate that the bureaucrats in Washington feel that if the textile industry could be liquidated in this country, which would then depend on foreign countries to produce its textile needs, the United States would probably be better off."

We were encouraged by a statement by Mr. Robert C. Jackson, of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute: "Foreign trade admitted harmful to industry. Government officials are becoming more aware of the harmful effects of our foreign trade program upon some U.S. industries. The policy that is now causing so much concern is the added subsidy expected to be placed on cotton in the near future which would subsidize the foreign buyer by 8 cents a pound. This would mean that foreign manufacturers would be able to buy American-grown cotton 8 cents cheaper than domestic mills could buy it." This is expected to take place August 31.

I have written to the Saturday Evening Post, Life, Time, and Fortune magazines, Reader's Digest, the New York Times, and the New York World-Telegram and Sun. I consider we are in a fight for the life of the textile industry in this country, and heaven help us if we can't have the full understanding and cooperation of the Department of Commerce.

Please don't let us lock the barn after the horse has gone.

I hope you read this even if you have to take it in easy stages.

I am enclosing a copy of our annual report for 1958, and making it a part of this letter. Also enclosed are several news items headings which have recently appeared in the various newspapers.

Yours very truly,

DONALD COMER,
Chairman of the Executive Committee.

Los Angeles Times, June 8, 1959: "Foreign Crews May be Used on Tuna Clippers."

N.Y. Daily News Record, May 7, 1959: "Japanese Exports of Sweaters to U.S. Rise 50 percent in 3 Months."

N.Y. Daily News Record, June 10, 1959: "Japanese Eye '60 Quota Rise on Velveteen, Woven Apparel."

N.Y. Daily News Record, April 27, 1959: "Japan Seen Hiking Variety of Knitwear Sent to United States."

N.Y. Daily News Record, June 8, 1959: "Import Rules Urged to Curb Big Influx of Textile Goods."

N.Y. Daily News Record, June 9, 1959: "Hong Kong Shirts to United States in March Same as February."

N.Y. Daily News Record, June 11, 1959: "Talmadge Sees Import Competition Tougher Shortly."

N.Y. Daily News Record, June 2, 1959: "Japan Underwear Export to United States in 1st Quarter."

N.Y. Daily News Record, June 8, 1959: "Import Rules Urged to Curb Future Inrush of Textiles."

N.Y. Daily News Record, May 7, 1959: "Kearns Confers With Retailers on Hong Kong Goods Imports."

N.Y. Daily News Record, May 7, 1959: "10 Percent Reciprocal Cut in Textile Duties Seen GATT's Goal."

Southern Textile News, May 9, 1959: "Cotton Industry Provides Fifth of Alabama Jobs."

The Sylacauga Advance, June 11, 1959: "Crucial Date for Cotton Industry Will be August 1."

The Birmingham News, June 2, 1959: "Steel Item Imports Cut Deep Into Sale of U.S. Production."

The Alabama Journal, May 12, 1959: "Dire Warnings of U.S. Market Peril Belittled."

DuPont Chambers Works News, May 1, 1959: "U.S. Government Coaches Foreigners on how to Capture American Market.

Southern Textile News, May 30, 1959: "Textile Industry Ranked 20th in 1958 in Profit from its Net Sales."

The Birmingham News, June 12, 1959: "Lack of Discretion—We are somewhat critical of Tom Dewey's offer of a $200,000 fee to represent a foreign Government (Japan) in this country."

The Cotton Trade Journal, May 22, 1959: "Hong Kong Order from Japan Set at $875,000."

The Cotton Trade Journal, May 8, 1959: "Blunt Statement by Japan Mills Aimed at United States."

The Cotton Trade Journal, May 15, 1959: "Japan Quotas More Rigid, Says Report."

America's Textile Reporter, May 7, 1959: "NKOA Official Raps Eisenhower Regime on Japanese Imports."

The N.Y. Times, June 16, 1959: "Huge Rise Forecast for Shoe Imports."

N.Y. Daily News Record, June 11, 1959: "Talmadge Sees Import Competition Tougher Shortly."

Paying for Detroit Metro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues will recall my efforts to alert the old Civil Aeronautics Administration to the waste and high cost involved in shifting terminal facilities for 11 civil airlines from Detroit's Willow Run Airport to Detroit-Wayne Major Airport.

During a 1955 Detroit meeting of the Airport Use Panel, a segment of the Air Coordinating Committee, Federal officials scoffed at certain cost figures attached to the move and even encouraged Detroit and Wayne County officials to waste even greater amounts of tax money of their own with additional huge grants of Federal airport aid.

I attach the following editorial from the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News to indicate how close many of us were in assessing the actual cost of the airlines' move:

PAYING FOR DETROIT METRO

Wayne County Road Commission members are giving representatives of the seven airlines still operating at Willow Run the bad news about costs of following American, Northwest and four other lines to Detroit Metropolitan Airport. Cost of expansion of the former Wayne-Major Airport to accommodate the additional airlines has been estimated at $28,500,000.

The terminal building at Detroit Metro would be doubled in size; two runways would be lengthened to 10,000 feet; parking capacity would be boosted from 1,400 to 4,000 cars; hotel facilities would be increased by 38 rooms, and the number of loading gates would be increased from 14 to 55.

The seven airlines considering a move to Detroit Metro complain that they are to be asked to pay an average of $4.75 a square foot for terminal expansion, while the six lines already there pay only $2.48. The road commission says rising costs of labor and materials account for the greater costs which must be paid by the seven still operating at Willow Run.

All of this, of course, is what Congressman GORGE MEADER, of Ann Arbor and others said at the time the Wayne County group was making a pitch for Federal funds for Metro, at the exepnse of Willow Run. Representative MEADER pointed out that duplication of airport facilities, with the only real advantage for Metro being its location a few miles nearer Detroit, would be costly, and that the taxpayers would be forced to foot the bill in one way or another. The Wayne County Road Commission had invested vast sums in Wayne-Major and had to justify the expenditures by selling its airport to the airlines. American Airlines gambled on the apepal of an airport nearer Detroit and won. The other airlines either have moved or are considering moving, although it is likely to be several years before they can all be accommodated at Detroit Metro.

Detroit Metropolitan Airport is more modern than Willow Run, despite the substantial improvements for passenger comfort made at the University-owned airfield. Apparently the luxuries offered by Metro accommodations are what air travelers want; otherwise the fight put up to keep the airlines at Willow Run would have been more successful. The outcome only proves once again that economy is not a strong argument these days, particularly where any tax moneys are concerned.

Coal for the Nation's Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the Nation's second largest coal-producing congressional district, I strongly feel that officials of the Curtiss-Wright Corp. are to be highly commended for their farsightedness, their interest and research into the uses of bituminous coal. The successful efforts of this organization will result in good news for every individual interested in our miracle mineral.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I have full confidence that the experiments of Curtiss-Wright Corp. underway at Quehanna, Pa., will result in major new markets for bituminous coal—the effects will be practically unlimited. Therefore, I include a superbly written article on this outstanding research "Coal for the Nation's Roads," which appeared in the July 1 issue of the United Mine Workers Journal. I commend this factual report, written by the editor and assistant editor, to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress:

COAL FOR THE NATION'S ROADS

(By Justin McCarthy and Rex Lauck)

QUEHANNA, PA.—Soft coal may soon be paving the Nation's highways and shooting rockets to the moon.

Along with other representatives of the UMWA, the coal industry and coal trade publications, we visited this fabulous research center of the Curtiss-Wright Corp. on June 24 to witness the work that has been done to transform king coal into a road-paving material that will outlast and outperform petroleum-based asphalt and even concrete.

And Curtiss-Wright researchers are enthusiastic enough about their product so that they think it may be possible to use the new material as the long-sought solid propellant to fuel space rockets.

Potentially, if present experiments pan out, 2,200 tons of coal may be needed to surface a mile of road. The current laboratory-proven road binders will require at least 100 tons of additional coal production per mile of coal laid.

The use of coal as a road-paving material is not a new idea. Dr. H. J. Rose, vice president and consultant of Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., started experimenting with his theory that soft coal could be dissolved in heated coal tar 40 years ago. Rose, who was among those visiting the Curtiss-Wright research division here, said all authorities had been stating for years that you simply could not dissolve bituminous coal.

But Rose did. He heated coal tar to approximately 600° F. and then dropped in some chunks of soft coal and stirred the mixture.

The coal chunks literally disappeared.

DEVELOPMENT AWAITED DYNAMIC LEADERSHIP

Why then, we asked, was nothing much done with this discovery for so many years? The answer, Dr. Rose explained, was simply that the necessary money was not available at the time to develop and commercialize the new product.

It took the dynamic industrial leadership of Roy T. Hurley, president and chairman of the board of Curtiss-Wright, and the patient work of a team of the company's researchers and technicians headed by E. O. Rhodes under project director S. H. A. Young to develop the project to the point where it would be commercially feasible.

Curtiss-Wright made the first announcement of the development of the new blacktop, road-paving material early this spring. So, we wrote a letter to Hurley and asked him for information. The company's director of public relations and advertising, Arthur J. Donnelly, sent us a news release and a brochure describing the new material.

Subsequently, we were visited by G. Fred Brackett, a Curtiss-Wright staff representative, who explained why his company, known principally as a manufacturer of aircraft engines, had become interested in new uses for coal.

The soft coal industry can again thank Roy Hurley for initiating his company's coal research project. The town of Quehanna is nothing more than the Curtiss-Wright re-

search center. It was established in 1955 on a tract of land acquired from the Commonwealth during the administration of former Gov. George M. Leader. The agreement between the company and the State was that in return for the State's making the land available the company would include in its activities research aimed at developing new uses for coal.

Quehanna, situated 20 miles northeast of Clearfield, Pa., is in the heart of the central Pennsylvania coalfields, an area that has suffered economic distress for several years.

The new soft coal road material is not yet being manufactured on a commercial basis. But Kentucky, the Nation's third largest coal producer, is so enthusiastic about it that the State has signed a $200,000 contract to build a pilot plant to make the material in Frankfort. The plant will be completed in 2 months. The soft coal road binder manufactured there will be made from all types of Kentucky coal, which will first be tested at Quehanna.

The equivalent of 8 to 12 half-mile long strips of the new material will be laid out on highways, airport runways and city streets through the State to determine, over the next year and under actual highway conditions, its durability compared with asphalt.

Curtiss-Wright will not manufacture the road binder but is seeking to lease its method to potential manufacturers, including coal producers, interested in making the material. The company also is negotiating with a number of other coal-producing States to interest them in setting up test operations similar to that being carried on by Kentucky. It would certainly seem logical that Pennsylvania and West Virginia would be the next States to set up pilot plants for the manufacture of the binder.

What we saw in Quehanna convinces us that the new material can revolutionize the roadbuilding industry and probably will provide a vast new market for soft coal. The potential is so great that the manufacture of this road binder from coal may become soft coal's second or third largest market after the electric utilities and steelmaking.

Before witnessing the laboratory tests of the new material, we listened to a briefing by Rhodes, the brilliant Curtiss-Wright researcher who developed the material.

Rhodes said that asphalt, made from petroleum, is the Nation's most widely used road material but that it has many disadvantages. Coal tar is also widely used as a road-surfacing material, but it, too, has some disadvantages.

Asphalt, for example, becomes very slippery in rainstorms. Asphalt is soluble in petroleum products such as crankcase oil and gasoline. One of the major problems of the Nation's airports today is the constant repair necessary to asphalt runways used by jet planes. Jet fuel sprayed by the planes onto the runways during takeoffs and landings is very damaging to the asphalt.

Coal tar has the very practical disadvantage of costing more than asphalt which is a true waste product, like residual oil, and can be sold as cheaply as the market demands. This is partially counterbalanced by the fact that asphalt varies greatly in quality, while coal tar is a uniform product regardless of where it is made.

ASPHALT CRACKS UP UNDER POUNDING

Asphalt cracks up under the heavy pounding of trucks and automobiles. And when it cracks up it does not "flow" back together again and thus has to be repaired. Coal tar surfacing, on the other hand, has good skid resistance and will "flow" back together again when it has been damaged.

Asphalt hardens and becomes brittle with age and has to be replaced. Coal tar surfacing, while it has very poor resistance to high temperatures and will melt in a hot sun, is resistant to water and dissolving by petroleum products.

But the hot blasts of jet engines will melt coal tar surfacing on airport runways so that the tar separates from its aggregate, such as gravel or limestone.

With these advantages and disadvantages in mind, Rhodes explained, Curtiss-Wright set about developing a material that could be produced by existing hot mix equipment, such as is used to lay asphalt or coal tar surfacing, and that would have the advantages of both without any of the disadvantages.

Starting with the knowledge gained many years ago by Dr. Rose, namely, that coal is "digested" by coal tar when the tar is heated to a certain temperature, Rhodes and his fellow researchers and technicians produced a road binder. The binder was then mixed with limestone that had also been heated.

Rhodes then set about putting the new road material under all kinds of severe tests to check its ability to hold together.

The material, made from various kinds of bituminous coal and limestone found in the Quehanna area, was tested for its ability not to separate when immersed in petroleum products, such as jet fuels, motor oil, and gasoline. It held together. Asphalt fell apart.

It was tested for skid resistance. Compared with asphalt it was highly resistant to skidding, having a sort of sandpaperlike surface.

It was pounded to find out whether it would crack. Its ability to withstand such treatment was much greater than that of asphalt.

As much as 4,000 pounds of pressure was applied to it in a testing machine before it broke. This is more than twice the pressure necessary to cause a breakdown in asphalt.

It was subjected to extremes of both cold and heat and stayed solid and hard. It was soaked in water and did not fall apart as asphalt road materials do. Following Rhodes' briefing on the new material, we visited the test laboratory to watch Curtiss-Wright technicians putting the new road material through all of these tests. What we saw left no doubt in our minds that the new soft-coal-based road material will do just exactly what it is supposed to do.

In addition to its potential use as a road material, the material also may be used for roofing, shingles, floor tiles, tar paper, waterproofed kraft paper, drainpipes, conduits, automobile undercoating and many other products. Approximately 1,000 companies in Pennsylvania, alone, are producing products in which this new material could be used.

So far, only the type of coal found around Quehanna has been used to make the material. However, Dr. Rose told us there is no reason that other types of coal might not be used as new experiments are carried out and the process of manufacturing the material is perfected.

It makes no practical difference what sort of aggregate is mixed with the binder. In addition to limestone, gravel or slag could be utilized, for example.

The new Curtiss-Wright binder will not require any changes in present equipment used in preparing or using blacktop paving materials. It can be combined in existing hot mix batch plants, and, in actual road construction or resurfacing, will be handled in the same equipment now used by State and municipal road departments and blacktop paving contractors.

COAL BINDER PASSES SEVERE TESTS IN LAB

All the severe laboratory tests to which the new material has been subjected indicate that it will have a much longer life and will require considerably less maintenance than present asphalt surfaces. As a matter of fact, the tests show that roads constructed with the new coal binder and an aggregate will stand up four times longer than present asphalt surfaces under standard water soaking conditions. The coal-based road material has better self-healing properties when damaged by extreme changes in temperature. And it will support up to 30 percent greater loads without deformation.

It stands to reason that one of the best features of the new material is its skid resistance which will be a big factor in increasing highway safety.

As previously mentioned, the new material will be particularly valuable as an airport runway material because of its high resistance to the damaging effects of jet fuels and heat.

Curtiss-Wright research indicates that the new material will be commercially competitive with other blacktop binders. This will be the case especially when the process of low temperature carbonization of coal has been perfected. One of the principal by-products of low-temperature carbonization of coal is coal tar, a necessary ingredient of the new road material. The only source of coal tar at the present time is the steel industry, which produces tar as part of the process of coking coal.

If coal tar produced by low-temperature carbonization can be used to make a sturdy road binder, it would mean an additional production of 2,200 tons of new bituminous coal production for every mile of road surface laid. In view of the fact that the Federal highway building program alone calls for about 40,000 miles of superhighways, only a little arithmetic is needed to demonstrate the size of the potential new market for coal.

Because of the favorable results obtained by all the laboratory tests, Curtiss-Wright will continue development of its improved coal-based road binders. In addition to the road-paving material program, Curtiss-Wright also is conducting programs to develop other coal-based products, including pipe, conduit, building materials, and a variety of other products that will add to the large-scale utilization of coal and coal products.

Curtiss-Wright has announced that it will welcome inquiries from qualified firms to discuss the establishment of new programs for product development or improvement in selected areas. Inquiries regarding these programs should be directed to Minard W. Stout, vice president, research and development, or G. Frederick Bruckett, Curtiss-Wright Corp., 304 Valley Boulevard, Woodridge, N.J.

Representatives of the UMWA who witnessed the demonstration besides the Journal editors were: Michael F. Widman, Jr., assistant to President John L. Lewis and director of the research and marketing department, and his assistant, Joseph P. Brennan; District 5 Secretary-Treasurer John Seddon; International Representatives Leon Yablonski and Robert Gordon; and Peter Holvonik, district 5 board member for subdistrict 3.

Others in the party were James Kee, executive assistant to Representative ELIZABETH KEE (Democrat, West Virginia); Joseph McSweeney, assistant to the President, national coal policy conference; Ord Alexander, assistant director, engineering department, National Coal Association; Russ Flegal, development engineer, NCA; William Bailey, a real estate and construction man; Al Toffler, freelance magazine writer; Dr. Rose, Raymand W. Hiteshue, Chief, Coal Hydrogenation Section, U.S. Bureau of Mines; Howard W. Wainwright, Chief, Low Temperature Carbonization Laboratory, Appalachian Experiment Station, U.S. Bureau of Mines, Morgantown, W. Va.; and William Bradbury, editor, Coal Utilization.

Tribute to Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1959, at Fort Myer, Va., the retirement ceremony was held for one of the greatest, most esteemed officers in the annals of our military forces, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor. Contemplation of his invaluable contributions and dedicated career in the service of our Nation makes it most appropriate that the following remarks of the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, addressed to both General and Mrs. Taylor on that occasion, should be the subject of our attention:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE WILBER M. BRUCKER, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, RETIREMENT OF GEN. MAXWELL D. TAYLOR, FORT MYER, VA., JUNE 30, 1959

General Taylor, members of the First Battle Group of the 3d Infantry, Members of Congress, officials, and men of the U.S. Army, and good American friends who are gathered here, we are gathered here today for the purpose of observing the retirement of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor. In the brief moment that I shall occupy I shall not attempt to recount the record of General Taylor. It is too well written and too well known by the American people. However, I want to speak just a word in this retirement ceremony about General Taylor as a man and an officer.

Forty-one years ago on the plains of West Point, Cadet Taylor began his long and successful military career. It ends splendidly today at Fort Myer, Va., as Chief of Staff. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor steps down and takes his place in the civilian ranks of life as we Americans are wont to do. He is one of the most outstanding and eminently qualified men who ever wore the Army uniform.

General Taylor, if I were to pay you the respect today in the superlatives that you deserve, I would refer to the brilliance of your intellect, the greatness of your comprehension, the breadth of your character, and the magnanimous attitude that you always displayed toward problems of men as well as materiel. And I would point out to everyone the professional stature that you always maintained as you viewed these problems. This morning the President of the United States pinned upon your breast the Distinguished Service Medal with Second Oak Leaf Cluster—a magnificent recognition by our Commander in Chief—the highest source in our land. The turnout today in this heat and swelter is eloquent evidence of the confidence and friendship of people who regardless of the weather are here to testify to their high regard for everything that you stand for that is clean and wholesome and honest and upright. You have been a leader in every sense of the word. You have given direction and stature to every portion of the Army. It has been an inspiring spectacle to see you in the presence of your officers and men, wherever you have been.

Fifteen years ago this month of June you dropped—very early on that fateful morning of June 6 ,1944—helping to seal off Normandy Beach. Today, 15 years later, as you mark the completion of your military career, I know in your heart there is a sincere desire, if this country ever again needs Maxwell D. Taylor, you will come back into our ranks and do your part upon the drop of a hat as a patriotic American.

So, as a man—General Taylor—I here testify to the grandeur of your stature, plus the fact that your vision, undimmed by anything, and with pure professional purpose, zeal and courage, is an inspiration to everyone in this great Army.

May I say something about that loyal wife by your side, affectionately known to everyone in the Army, as "Mrs. Diddy Taylor." What a splendid thing it is to have a couple like the Taylors at the top of the Army—a picture presented to the world of wholesome Americans whom we admire and affectionately regard. To Mrs. Taylor goes a great deal of respect. Throughout these years, traveling to and from post, camp, and station, she has followed along and has been an ideal helpmate and an inspiration to us all.

Ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of all the men and women of the U.S. Army, I take my hat off to this great couple as they depart together.

Now, General Taylor, on behalf of the Army, as its Secretary, I officially present you this scroll and thank you humbly for your great service.

Mulchting the Little Fellow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 23, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to "Sowing the Windfalls," an article written by Raymond Moley in the July 6 issue of Newsweek magazine. Raymond Moley is a man of broad political experience and accute perception. He sees both the forest and the trees.

Here follows Raymond Moley's valuable commentary on "something-for-nothingism," which invariably sprouts a few fat pocketbooks and inevitably grows a very few crafty kings, products of the taxpayers' dollars:

SOWING THE WINDFALLS

The Republican Party, in pursuing its policy of ridding itself of the tag of "the party of the rich and big business," might reveal the extent to which liberal legislation provides rich windfalls, in the name of "the little fellow," for a new rich and big business class. Consider the unfolding picture of public housing, slum clearance, and urban renewal in which windfalls are created for promoters, political lawyers, and bankers, investors, contractors, and others. Or note that the chief beneficiaries of the soil bank are large corporations whose major profit is not in selling the product of their thousands of acres, but in Government benefits. Many other avenues to riches might be cited for a few individuals and organizations who certainly are not needy or little, all in the name of general welfare.

The Humphrey-Price bill, which failed to pass over the President's veto, would have taken the Rural Electrification Administration away from the watchful eye of a fine public servant, Secretary Benson. The Washington lobby for rural electrification, many Members of Congress, and zealots for a Government power monopoly want to push "rural" electrification beyond the remote farmers, who are now supplied, to the suburbs and the cities. This would be deadly competition with investor-owned companies because the Government is lending money to the rural electrical cooperatives at 2 percent—half or less what the Government must pay for it.

SPECTACULAR GROWTH

No one questions the validity of the original purpose of the REA, nor the wholesome character of most of the 900 cooperatives. Most of them are content with sticking to their field with modest returns. But since they are associated in a sort of trade association-pressure lobby called the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, they are being led collectively into a vast scheme which promises illimitable profits not in the production and sale of electricity but in banking and investment. That is, so long as the present 2 percent rate of borrowing from the Government and tax-free status can be retained.

The head of the NRECA, Clyde C. Ellis, is a man of vast imagination coupled with incredible political influence. At the last meeting of his organization he unfolded the plan.

It involves the brimming financial position of the cooperatives. The latest reports show a spectacular growth in their investments and savings account. In 1953 this was $43.7 million, in 1957 it was $192 million. The total earned surplus rose from $153 million in 1953 to $382 million in 1957.

Ellis proposed that the investment account be put into his NRECA in trusteeship—an unusual function for a trade association-pressure organization. Then he proposed that this pool be placed with a New York bank for investment opportunities. It is ironical that Ellis has always denounced the Wall Street financing of the private, investor-owned companies.

BLUE-CHIP POOL

"A pool," he said, "would be able to invest a reasonable portion of its funds quite soundly in the highest grate 'blue chip' industrial bonds and most of the balance in the highest-yield long-term Governments * * * The pool would have a constant inflow from maturing investments and from new investments and, therefore, would have to keep on hand only a relatively small amount of short-term low-yield Governments. This fact alone could appreciably increase the return over that of a single system's program with the same flexibility."

It would, indeed, if the cooperatives choose to relinquish their independence and give over to this sort of vast investment operation, made profitable by borrowing from the Government at half or less than half the price which Government must pay for its money. For this pool might become the biggest thing in Wall Street.

Space permits only a mention of another Ellis dream, recently proposed. It would have the Federal Government build a big Potomac River project on the TVA model. It would provide boating, swimming, picnicking for bureaucrats and employees of pressure groups, as well as Federal hydroelectric for the Capital community. This Potomac paradise would be a monument to that deathless fourth branch, the pressure group.

Federal Lamb Grading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, false information and misleading statements seem to be running rampant the last few days with regard to the proposed suspension of

Federal lamb grading. Since some of these have gotten into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I think it is proper to clear the air.

Those who want to see the present archaic Federal lamb grading system continued have very carefully avoided making statements on the real issues or problems involved. Much has been said about how the housewife will suffer if she cannot buy federally graded lamb. Proponents of Federal lamb grading even have women's clubs writing to their Congressmen stating that removal of Federal lamb grading will mean meat inspection will be removed or relaxed. Nothing could be further from the truth. The housewife is not being helped by the present Federal lamb grading procedure but lamb producers have been hurt and hurt badly by these grading standards. These are facts that the proponents of Federal lamb grading do not mention.

The problems caused by Federal lamb grading are clearly pointed out in the attached letter from Dee Broadbent and I would like to read the letter into the RECORD at this time to clear the air of some of the misleading propaganda that is being disseminated, in order to hold onto a grading service which produces a large overfat carcass of meat which the housewife does not want. Here is Mr. Broadbent's letter:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY,
Logan, Utah, June 22, 1959.

The Honorable H. ALDOUS DIXON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DIXON: Following up our telephone conversation, I want to again reemphasize the desirability of doing all that we can to suspend the grading of lambs by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

I am convinced in my mind, beyond any question, that the present grading practices are detrimental to the interests of the sheep industry of this Nation. I say this without reservation. This is based on experiences in the field of livestock marketing, with which you know I am familiar, and from my first-hand experience of results of the present program on the industry in which I am engaged as a producer of lambs.

The consumers of this country are not getting what they want. It is costing them more for their product. We are misdirecting the feed resources of the Nation in the production of fat that nobody wants—sometime feed resources will have to be husbanded. The lambs are too big for the household market. They are wasty. They are unacceptable to the consumer in appearance. There is so much excess fat on the typical top-grade lambs that they are a drug on the market.

We are compelled to produce a product that the consumers are not demanding because of the grading system rather than trying to meet the preferences of the consumers who would like a tasty, pleasing product for their table. I think that, without much question, the reason why consumption of lamb per capita has declined during the past two decades is the result of the unacceptable product which by U.S. grades is supposed to be top quality but actually is not in top demand. If top grade represented the most acceptable product to the consumer of lamb, it would be an altogether different matter.

Last January I prepared a discussion for the Utah Wool Growers in which I was shocked to see what had happened during the past 18 years in this industry. While the consumption of beef had increased 25 pounds per capita, or about 40 percent, the consumption of lamb and mutton had declined one-third. While the parity price of beef as of December 1958 was 95 percent and that of all agricultural products 80 percent, the parity price of lamb was 72 percent in spite of a much smaller supply and a greatly increased market with double the purchasing power. With this shift in supply and purchasing power, one would expect lamb prices to be relatively higher than beef.

It would seem to me that the principal arguments for suspending present grading are that the grading specifications are not realistic in reflecting consumer preference and demands; heavy, fat carcasses are not preferred in the market but the only way to obtain top grade is by excessive feeding which converts feed into fat; present lamb grading standards are not uniform; consumers have an idea that unless they are eating graded meat, and top-grade meat, it is inferior (we have become a victim of our own system); the grading system becomes a tool of the marketing agencies to divert purchasing power from the producer of the product; the grader is placed in a position of stamping a carcass on the profit or loss side without having it reflect a corresponding item of utility.

I wish that I had time to go into this problem more thoroughly with you, but let me emphasize that this has the unanimous support of the wool industry. They are badly in need of help.

Respectfully yours,

DEE A. BROADBENT,
Business Manager.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 29, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on June 22, 1959, at the annual convention of the Communications Workers of America, the following resolution was adopted urging the enactment of H.R. 22 providing for Federal assistance to education. The resolution follows:

Whereas many of our school buildings are unsafe for children to attend. Almost all classrooms are overcrowded and understaffed. More and more experienced educators are leaving the school systems each year because of the unbearable conditions and inadequate pay; and

Whereas most States and local governments have tried to keep pace with the growing population, but this is now a Federal problem which should be solved by Federal assistance. At the beginning of 1959 a survey by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare showed a shortage of 140,500 classrooms. These are shortages now, as of today. This means nearly 2 million students are attending unsafe, obsolete, and overcrowded classrooms; and

Whereas in 1956–57 the average beginning salary for teachers was $3,600 a year and the average salary was $4,520; and

Whereas nearly 25,000 of our high school teachers and 91,000 grammar school teachers, without proper qualifications, have been granted temporary certificates because of the shortage of fully qualified teachers. Each year there is increasing number of such certificates issued; and

Whereas in this session of Congress there have been introduced two bills which would provide financial assistance for the support of public schools by appropriating funds to be used for constructing school facilities and for supplementing teachers' salaries; and

Whereas these bills are S. 2 and H.R. 22 and are commonly referred to as the Murray-Metcalf bill: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this 21st annual convention of CWA goes on record as favoring the Murray-Metcalf bill; and be it further

Resolved, That the members, officers, and staff of CWA work actively in behalf of the passage of these bills to keep the United States in its place of leadership in the world; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator MURRAY, Congressman METCALF, and all Members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and the House Education and Labor Committee.

Setting the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, all too often there is a tendency to label any request for reclamation funds as "pork barrel" without investigating the merits of the individual case. The Minot Daily News in my State of North Dakota has performed a valuable public service in setting the record straight on the matter of investigational funds for North Dakota's Garrison Diversion Unit. These funds are now in danger of being slashed through congressional action. As is pointed out in the News' very excellent editorial, the question is not a matter of economy, or lack of it, but of the Government, through the Congress, keeping faith with the people of North Dakota.

The editorial follows:

[From the Minot Daily News, July 3, 1959]

A MATTER OF KEEPING FAITH

This is a big country. In most of its problems as they come to light in popular debate there is much more than meets the eye. How wrong sometimes are the faraway attempts to apply a general principle to the merits of a particular case.

We should not be too harsh with the Washington Post and Times Herald for failure to understand the historical justification of the Garrison diversion project. Editorially these newspapers have lumped this North Dakota project with a number of others, criticizing reclamation projects in general. The ground of the criticism is the thought that it is inconsistent for the Nation to be building new projects to increase productivity at a time when payments are being offered to keep other croplands idle.

The fact not appreciated is that the proposed Garrison diversion in North Dakota is part of a program which already has taken nearly 500,000 acres of North Dakota land out of production. In other words, North Dakota sacrificed that much good bottom land and prime grazing land to permit the Garrison Dam to be constructed on the Missouri. The diversion project takes the form of a recompense for lands already removed from the production of agricultural surpluses. It will be unjust if the Federal Government, having offered Garrison diversion in exchange

for other lands condemned or purchased, fails to carry out its part of the bargain.

This land was removed from North Dakota tax rolls, mind you, depriving the State and counties and school districts of a source of revenue. We feel quite certain no one has pointed out this fact to the Post and Times Herald. On the promise that there would be irrigation development to replace this loss of public and private resources, North Dakotans went to bat to help obtain for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation a congressional agreement for a Garrison Reservoir pool level of 1,850 feet elevation. That required the acquisition of a considerable amount of additional land above the 1,830-foot level which would not have been required otherwise. Certainly the Post and Times Herald do not suppose there would have been support for taking this additional land out of production, had it not been for assurance of stabilizing the economy of other acreages through irrigation.

When the Post and Times Herald suggest that there is nothing to stop North Dakota from undertaking its own irrigation project, it is clear there is no appreciation of the feeling here that, in reality, North Dakota has already made its investment. And the investment in lands taken out of production is the kind of investment for which the Post and Times Herald are asking.

And in addition to the half million acres of reservoir land, consideration must be given to the fact irrigation in North Dakota will remove thousands of wheat acres to other crops, some of which might be sugar beets now supplied from Cuba.

As we said, we are not disposed to feel bitter toward the Post and Times Herald for the view expressed in the editorial. It was, in the main, a temperate expression of a general viewpoint which has to be taken into account these days. It did not single out the North Dakota project as one which is especially vulnerable. But at the same time it missed an opportunity to show that the North Dakota project can be, and is, justified on the very grounds on which the general criticism was leveled. Sensing that the Post and Times Herald mean to be fair, we would like to see their editors take a second look at the facts of this project.

The First Dialogue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an item which I received from one of my constituents, Reeves Espy, San Clemente, Calif., entitled "The First Dialogue" which I think presents some very serious food for thought.

THE FIRST DIALOGUE

Uncle Sam left the consultation room and went to see the patient in 301. He entered without knocking.

"Well?" asked the Dollar, sitting up.

Uncle Sam nodded solemnly.

The Dollar lay back. "I've got it, eh?"

"Yes," said Uncle Sam, "the diagnosis was a formality. You've got it bad."

"Flat on my back with Inflation."

"The worst kind, I'm sorry to say. Cancer of the Currency."

"That means I'm a goner."

"Probably. It means I'm a goner, too."

"You said 'probably.' Is there any hope?"

"There's an outside chance," said Uncle Sam, "if the cure can be applied in time."

"There's a cure? What? What?," said the Dollar, jerking upright.

"Leadership," said Uncle Sam.

"Leadership? Are the scientists working on it?"

"No," explained Uncle Sam, "it's not a problem of exact science. It's a problem of the minds and the hearts and the toughness—or weakness—of men. It's a problem of character. Leadership is the only cure."

"Where does Leadership come from?" asked the Dollar.

"That's the question, Son; that's the question: Where does Leadership come from? Where do you find a Washington, a Jefferson, a Thomas Paine, a Lincoln, a Roosevelt."

"Theodore or F. D. R.?"

Uncle Sam was lost in thought. "Eh? Oh, both Roosevelts. Teddy in his time and F. D. R. in his. Of course the people kept F. D. R. on the mound too long."

"I've got it," said the Dollar, "this Leadership cure is up to the people; it's their responsibility."

"In a way, Son, in a way. They've got to want Leadership; they've got to recognize it when it comes along; they've got to seize it and establish it by their support. If it comes * * * if it comes at all * * * it will come from statesmen."

"You mean politicians?"

"I mean statesmen."

"That's doubletalk," said the Dollar, impatiently; "what's the difference between statesmen and politicians?"

Uncle Sam tugged at his whiskers before speaking. "To me it's the difference between men who want to be elected in any way they can and those willing to fight all out for principles whether they get elected or not."

Skepticism flitted across the Dollar's face. "You're looking for miracles."

"When the principle is sound and the need great I happen to believe in miracles. The miracle of Leadership is exactly what we're seeking."

Uncle Sam moved to the door. "The doctors said not to tire you. I must run."

"Thanks for coming," said the Dollar. "Try to locate some of that Leadership, will yuh?"

"Sure," smiled Uncle Sam. "I'm scouting for wisdom and courage. You wouldn't think it would take wisdom because the problem is so obvious but it will nevertheless in order to convince the people they face disaster. They must be persuaded of that fact. Leadership is the only cure for Cancer of the Currency."

"I'll see you later."

The Profits of Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it seems to be popular in some quarters these days to criticize the profits earned by corporate enterprises. It is difficult for many of us to appreciate the justification for such an approach, particularly when we remind ourselves that the level of Federal revenues is dependent very largely on these profits—the present corporate tax rate being 52 percent.

For some months, Mr. Speaker, there has been a running debate in the columns of the Washington Post and Times-Herald between Mr. Eugene Havas, a private economist, and Dr. Simon N. Whitney, chief economist of the Federal Trade Commission. A letter from Dr. Whitney, which appeared on May 6, 1959, places the profit question in its proper perspective, in my opinion. His comments deserve the attention of our colleagues and all other interested persons, especially at this time when we are approaching a critical point in the collective bargaining negotiations involving the steel industry.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include at this point the letter prepared by Dr. Whitney:

THE PROFITS OF STEEL

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, May 6, 1959]

I have read the April 20 letter of Eugene Havas and we are in agreement that steel labor costs should not be increased and that steel prices should come down. But Mr. Havas' sketchy statistics lead him to an incorrect estimate of the price reduction needed.

He says the industry has overcharged consumers by "about $1 billion per annum," and his next sentence infers that this was "in the postwar years." Profits before income taxes averaged $1.4 billion in 1946–48 and $2 billion in what he later calls "the highly prosperous 1955–58 period."

Profits after taxes averaged $0.7 billion and $1 billion respectively. Each reader must decide for himself whether or not the 50 to 70 percent reduction in Federal tax receipts and company profits which Mr. Havas is apparently calling for would have been desirable.

If Mr. Havas believes steel profits have been so much too high he should apply his remedy to many or most industries. Even in 1955–57, steel's rate of return on net assets ranked only 16th among the 40 manufacturing industries tabulated in the well-known First National City Bank of New York series. In 1958, it ranked 26th.

It may rank higher in 1959, but how can we tell, until the penalty is paid after July 1 for the early 1959 rush of orders to replenish inventories and anticipate a possible strike?

Mr. Havas says Wall Street estimates put expected steel profits in 1959 at 50 percent above 1958. (He does not say, and I do not know, whether these estimates assume a strike, a labor cost increase, or a price increase.) I heard 3 weeks ago from an officer of the Chase Manhattan Bank that the latest Wall Street estimates put average 1959 profits of all industries at 33 percent above 1958.

But steel profits had dropped 31 percent in 1958, and profits of all industries, 10 percent (First National City Bank data). Thus steel's profits in 1959 are predicted to be 3 or 4 percent, and profits of all industries 20 percent, above 1957. It is not my choice, but that of Mr. Havas, to play with these profit estimates or to place such emphasis on one industry.

He goes on to say that U.S. Steel's profits were $7.47 a ton in 1953 and are $20 now. (This company's labor costs were $63 per ton shipped in 1953, and $88 in 1958.) He concludes that a $12.50 price reduction is called for, and will leave U.S. Steel earning "about $6 per common stock." But the rest of the industry is much less profitable—perhaps because it is less integrated or less efficient on an over-all basis, but not because its prices are lower.

The 1958 decrease in profits for 48 smaller steel companies was 33 percent, so that a 50 percent increase will bring them back to the 1957 level. In 1957 the industry, omitting U.S. Steel, earned $13.10 per ton shipped. Mr. Havas would cut this to $7.10, resulting in a lower ratio of profits to sales than any since the war.

I suggest that a $5 average cut be tried (assuming, of course, no union-bargained labor cost increase), thus eliminating the 1958 price increase. This would leave the smaller steel companies with a profit-sales ratio at about the post-war low of 1951–54, except as they may control costs better or increase sales more than the 50 percent profit forecast assumes.

Lest some readers unwarily accept Mr. Havas' estimate that 200,000 steelworkers have lost their jobs due to labor-saving machinery, I want to state for the record that the Labor Department puts February 1959 employment in steel at approximately 593,000, as against an average of 599,000 for 1946–58, and a peak of 653,000 for 1953.

SIMON N. WHITNEY.

A Milestone of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared in the Kansas City Times—the morning Kansas City Star—on July 4, 1959, in which is set forth the need of Kansas and Missouri for flood protection and water conservation by means of the completion of reservoirs and flood-protection projects in the Kansas River basins.

Although the ceremony at Tuttle Creek on Saturday, July 4, was attended by over 10,000 residents of Kansas and Missouri and does mark a step in the right direction, it will be many, many years before the people of these two States can feel secure in their persons and in their businesses from the fear of devastation by floods and for the lack of sufficient water for industrial purposes. Let us shorten this period as much as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial in my remarks:

TUTTLE CREEK MAKES A PLACE IN KANSAS HISTORY

For the State of Kansas and the lower Missouri Valley the Tuttle Creek Dam site is the field of a decisive battle. A little Gettysburg.

The closing of the dam today dramatizes the end of one era and the beginning of another. Today the weight of Kansas public opinion supports a strong program to stop floods and conserve the floodwaters for the use of man.

In another 20 years Kansas should have a system of dams and local protection against floods. If delivered as planned, this system will bring confidence to the industrial and other developments of the cities. Even the lower agricultural levees will be adequate for protection against the frequent smaller floods.

Water is one of the most important of resources. Many cities are handicapped by an uncertain supply. The vast water storage of Kansas will be recognized as a major resource to attract new industries. Cities can grow with confidence in their water supplies. Farmers who tie into the water supplies will have the answer to drought. Even in eastern Kansas, supplementary irrigation can bring stability to farming operations.

The big dams are headliners in an overall program to conserve the water and land resources with soil conservation and watershed development. One approach cannot succeed without the other.

In the Manhattan area, people who formerly opposed the Tuttle Creek Dam are now looking forward to a new recreation industry. Recreation is a byproduct of river control that can be a tremendous asset to the immediate area. In the next 20 years many other communities should have their part of the booming recreation industry.

Control of water and land resources means control of the fundamental sources of wealth in an area. It is to these sources that an area may look for its future economy.

Kansas City, Mo., has a big stake in the strengthened Kansas economy that should come with general river development. The city is closely tied to Kansas business and agriculture. Kansas City has a vital stake in the flood protection that will be offered by Kaw Valley dams. And throngs of Kansas Citians will take part in the recreation of the Tuttle Creek and the other reservoirs to come.

The historic significance of the Tuttle Creek Dam goes back to 1934. TVA was being launched as an ideological dream for one valley. The Federal Government then had no plan of its own for allout river control.

At that early stage of thinking the Greater Kansas City Flood Planning Committee went into action with Willard Breidenthal as chairman. It employed Frederick H. Fowler, a San Francisco hydraulic engineer, to make the prophetic study of the Kaw Basin. Fowler recommended the Tuttle Creek Dam along with the Milford and Perry Dams that are on the drawing boards today.

Tuttle Creek was involved in the earliest debates of Congress. In time it became the field of battle over the issue of the rights of landowners and residents versus the general public interest. The reservoir area was a beautiful community of rich bottom farms and nearly 1,000 farms and town homes where some families had lived for generations. It had its churches and cemeteries. Even the strongest advocates of river control felt the strong human appeal of the people of the Blue Valley. Yet they had also to consider the future of scores of thousands of people including generations yet unborn.

Now the way is cleared for the other essential dams to come. Today, 25 years after that first Kaw Valley survey, the Blue River will be turned into the basin behind the still uncompleted dam. The ceremony will properly acknowledge a great step in Kansas history.

North Dakota Water Users Group Urges Funds Be Restored for Garrison Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, when the Garrison Dam in North Dakota was authorized, my State of North Dakota agreed to give up rich and fertile farm and river bottom lands in order to provide storage for the Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs. These lands were taken off the tax rolls and surrendered with the clear understanding that North Dakota would be compensated with a million acres or more of irrigation. Now the investigational funds to continue preliminary work on this Garrison diversion project are in danger of being drastically cut through action of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the executive committee of the North Dakota Water Users Association has forwarded me a resolution on this subject. Since the resolution illustrates our case so well, I ask permission to include it with my remarks in the RECORD.

RESOLUTION OF THE NORTH DAKOTA WATER USERS ASSOCIATION URGING RESTORATION OF INVESTIGATIONAL MONEYS FOR BUREAU OF RECLAMATION FOR THE GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT OF NORTH DAKOTA FOR FISCAL YEAR 1960

Whereas the Pick-Sloan compromise for the Missouri Basin development provided for the irrigation of 1 million acres of North Dakota land in exchange for approximately half a million acres taken from production and the tax roles; and

Whereas this agreement was accepted in good faith by the State of North Dakota as reflected by action of three sessions of the State Legislature, as well as by affirmative action of voters and taxpayers; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation, through their investigations, have discovered sufficient acreages and have engineering plans which provide for development of areas over a 70-year period; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation is presently engaged in firming-up more detailed land classification, topographical mapping, and engineering for canal lateral and drainage layouts, cost estimates and further economic studies in order to refine the Project Plan Report completed in 1957 which indicates the economic feasibility by all rigid standards; and

Whereas North Dakota, through its legislature, enacted legislation providing for the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District which has been activated and is presently cooperating with farm operators and six organized irrigation districts for the purpose of completing repayment contracts on a partnership basis in order to assure an expeditious program if and when construction moneys are made available; and

Whereas, the U.S. House of Representatives' reduction of the recommended Bureau of the Budget estimate of $550,000 to $300,000 for the Garrison Diversion unit, will impair and seriously hinder the efficiency of scheduled work because of disruption of the Bureau of Reclamation's technical staff, and thus will bring added costs to the National Government because of added delays: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota Water Users Association, a statewide organization founded for the purpose of assuring orderly and maximum development of all of North Dakota's water resources, That the U.S. Senate Committee on Appropriations restore the $250,000 reduced by the House of Representatives for the Garrison Diversion unit and urges that the Conference Committee on Public Works Appropriations for 1960 sustain the full amount because it is in the economic interest of not only North Dakota, but the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of said resolution adopted by the North Dakota Water Users Association be transmitted to the U. S. Senators WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON. R. YOUNG

of North Dakota and Senator CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the U.S. Senate Committee on Appropriations, and to the U.S. Representatives QUENTIN N. BURDICK and DON L. SHORT of North Dakota and to the Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, U.S. Representative and chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations.

The above resolution was adopted by the executive committee of the North Dakota Water Users Association at Bismarck, N. Dak., on June 19, 1959.

L. C. MUELLER, *President.*

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include my newsletter to my constituents of July 2, 1959.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By your Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

Yesterday began the new fiscal year for the U.S. Government. With the close of the last fiscal year on June 30, 1959, the deficit was just under $13 billion. This deficit produced repercussions on a world-wide scale comparable to what a sizable overdraft will do to your own bank account. Either you have to borrow money to cover it, or sell an asset, or face insolvency. Last week we raised the national debt limit to $295 billion, $10 billion of which is temporary. You may recall that when we raised the debt limit last year, as a temporary measure, I reported to you that the only thing temporary about it was that it would go up, and so it has. I voted against this increase, which might be considered irresponsible—that I did not want to pay our honest obligations; however, that is not the case.

After having fought against billions of dollars worth of needless appropriations, it would be highly inconsistent to vote for a debt increase, but more than that, I firmly believe that if the executive department could not get an increase in the debt limit, it would quickly improvise one of the solutions which I suggested in reference to covering your own overdraft, and that is to sell some of the assets, especially those which are frozen and are costing untold sums of money for storage.

We have $80 billion worth of surplus military equipment, some new, some obsolete, but nevertheless surplus to the needs of the military establishment. This surplus could be liquidated at about 10 cents on the dollar, or about $8 billion. We have $8 billion worth of strategic material stockpiles, half of which should be disposed of as surplus, according to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. That would bring in $4 billion. We have a billion dollars worth of real estate which is surplus, and should be sold and placed on the local tax roll. Between $10 and $20 million worth of this land is in Orange County. We have $8 billion worth of farm surpluses. At least $2 or $3 billion of this should be moved into the market. In rent and in space, storage is costing us in excess of $2 billion a year. The total amount is about $15 billion—more than enough to have covered the deficit and the increase in the debt limit.

This course of action is not taken because of two reasons. The first is that it is easier to ask Congress for an increase in the debt limit than it is to push a realistic surplus disposal operation. The second and biggest obstacle is the possible economic dislocation of such an operation. The manufacturers of new equipment do not want to have billions of dollars worth of surplus items come on the market in competition. The mining interests oppose having $4 billion worth of strategic materials available to processors who, they believe, should purchase from the producer, even though the greatest portion of this stockpile has come by way of imports, in exchange for American dollars and American farm surpluses. The lag in the disposal of real estate results from expanding military establishments which hope that someday they will find a military use for this land. But when you are in financial difficulties, some drastic action is called for.

If I read the public reaction correctly, there is an overwhelming demand that Congress preserve a sound dollar, stop creating a welfare state, stop competing with free enterprise, assume fiscal responsibility, and exercise self-restraint against every desire of the social planners. Failure on the part of any Congressman to carry this mandate into effect, should cause his removal from office at the next election. We have succeeded in not only bankrupting the Nation, but in damaging the faith and credit of every State in the Union, by taking money from the taxpayers and offering to give a portion of it back to their State, providing the State will take more money from them to match the cost of some project which is not absolutely needed.

Many of these programs were accelerated last year because of the recession. Acceleration of any program on a panic basis leads to inefficiency and higher prices. The highway program is a prime example. As a result of this acceleration, the program is costing about 20 percent more than estimated, and a special fund set up for this project is now exhausted, and Congress has been requested to increase gasoline taxes 1½ cents to maintain the fund. The Governor of California and the highway commission are urging Congress to increase the Federal gasoline tax, because they say that the Federal Government is paying 90 percent of this interstate highway program. But they do not seem to realize that before the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost, it first takes 100 percent of the cost away from the people of California. So my recommendation to the Governor's emissaries was that if the State of California wanted to continue this program at its present level of activity, it would be cheaper for them to increase the State tax on gasoline and keep 100 percent of that increase in California, instead of sending it back here to have only 90 percent of its returned. But they just don't understand that logic.

The chickens are now coming home to roost in the form of high interest rates and tight money, which is so badly needed for economic expansion. The need of private industry for homes and plant expansion, coupled with the monetary needs of the States, cities, and counties, has driven interest rates, the price for the use of money, to an all-time high, and the Federal Government, in competing for its monetary needs, is forced to meet these competitive rates. Current interest rates on savings bonds are not attractive to the saving public. Interest rates on short-time Government issues have jumped 400 percent in a year's time, driving the low-rate bonds to an unprecedented low in order to maintain a yield comparable to current issues.

Congress will be forced this week to remove the interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds in order to make them attractive. The $13 billion deficit means that we must borrow $13 billion worth of new money besides refunding the issues which mature this year. If, instead of having to siphon off $13 billion of American savings, we would pay off $5 or $10 billion on the national debt, competition for these funds would be less, and interest rates would be greatly reduced.

Government spending in itself does not create prosperity. Our greatest comparative period of prosperity and expansion occurred between 1920 and 1928 at a time when we were reducing our national debt by one-third and spending very little Government money.

Credit Union Bill Supported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, among the many letters and telegrams I receive daily, concerning the great need for credit union legislation, these I am inserting at this time are typical:

WACO TEX., *June 25, 1959.*

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the Waco Chapter of Credit Unions I send you best wishes and thanks on this the 25th anniversary of the Federal Credit Union Act. We sincerely appreciate your interest in the credit union movement which is evident by your introduction of H.R. 5777 and designation of June 26 as Credit Union Legislation Day.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. YOUNG, *President.*

DALLAS, TEX., *June 22, 1959.*

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge your committee to make favorable report on H.R. 5777. Our credit unions are very much in need of the proposed amendment to facilitate our growth and service to our members.

HARRY DAWSON.

BROOKLEY FEDERAL CREDIT UNION,
Brookley Air Force Base, Ala., June 24, 1959.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In order to appropriately commemorate this 25th anniversary of the Federal Credit Union Act, we are directing the gratitude of our members to you and through you to the Congress of the United States for the enactment of this humanitarian law. What has been done and what you are continuing to do on behalf of credit unions will help to perpetuate the economic well-being of millions of American families.

The established pattern is being followed throughout the free world in teaching untold multitudes the art of self-help. This way, above all others, can assure the economic stability of those who otherwise might fall by the wayside.

The credit union, which we represent, has grown since 1948 to nearly 12,000 members with savings in excess of $4,500,000. During the ensuing years, over $24 million has been made available to our members for provi-

dent and productive purposes in 60,000 separate loans. We hope that the many voluntary workers who will succeed us will continue to exemplify the principle of "not for profit, not for charity, but for service."

We reflect, as we know you must, on the magnitude of the decision which Congress faced a quarter of a century ago in giving a grateful people the Federal Credit Union Act. Today, we can truly say, in all humility, that we really are our brother's keeper.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH T. SHIGLEY,
C. L. GIVENS,
JOHN T. GREEN,
OSCAR B. MYRICK,
J. D. WILLIAMSON.

Hearings were held on the bill, H.R. 5777, to which specific reference is made in the telegrams, before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House on May 11, 12, and 13, 1959, and copies are available upon request. No report has yet been made on the bill.

The Republic of the Philippines Should Have the Friendly and Encouraging Understanding of Our Own Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include a letter received by one of my constituents from Mr. Gil Garcia, vice president and general manager of the Visayan Electric Co. in Cebu City, Republic of the Philippines. This letter is further evidence that the false impression that many Americans have received by reason of articles, appearing in national magazines which were uncomplimentary to the Philippine Republic and its President, the Honorable Carlos Garcia, are not shared by the people of that Republic.

It is my hope that the Republic of the Philippines, our strong ally in the Far East, should have the friendly and encouraging understanding of our own Republic.

VISAYAN ELECTRIC CO., S.A.,
Cebu City, Philippines, April 27, 1959.

Mrs. THERESA R. LANDON,
Laguna Beach, Calif.

MY DEAR MRS. LANDON: As one who has done your bit to the Philippines, you might be interested to know that the Visayan Electric is now deep in major projects to meet the ever-increasing demand of electricity as a consequence of the general clamor of industrialization.

We are now installing a brand new 5,000 kilowatt Worthington-Combustion Engineering steam turbine generating set and are erecting a new powerhouse building to house this set. God willing, we expect to have this new unit in operation before the end of this year.

After this project we shall undertake the construction of a 13.8 kilovolt high tension line. Next on the tab after the high tension line is the construction of a four-story air-conditioned building for the company. In spite of the constantly recurring war scare and unsettled economic conditions throughout the world, we in the Visayan Electric are going ahead with our plans, as we are aware of our part in the overall progress of our country.

We know that there have been a series of negative publicity about the Philippines in the United States, but I assure you that the bad pictures portrayed are not supported by actual conditions here. It is true that as a new growing nation we are encountering difficulties, but these difficulties are momentary and not insurmountable. Although there is a high degree of unemployment, thank God there is no breadline.

The present administration, headed by our President Carlos P. Garcia, is doing its best, reports to the contrary notwithstanding, to achieve our goals for a prosperous and progressive Philippines. I fully believe that it is on the right track, although there are kinds to be smoothed out along the way.

I believe that, as one of the stanchest friends of the Philippines who has done her part for the welfare of the Filipino nation, you could help us a lot to counteract whatever bad impressions have been imprinted on the minds of the American people by false propagandists. I would say without fear of contradiction that the Philippines and the Filipinos are the best friends of Americans in this part of the world, although our public officials may show some indignation toward American policy in the Philippines. At best, this segment of our population disagrees only with the implementation of American policies here, but believe these disagreements could be ironed out if the problems are placed in their proper perspective.

Yours very sincerely,

GIL GARCIA.

Rules for Anti-Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, while the excellent suggestions of his emminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, are particularly made to teenage students in combating communism, they are equally sound suggestions to all persons to follow who recognize the vicious intent and purpose of atheistic communism.

In my extension of remarks, I include the suggestions made by Cardinal Cushing:

RULES FOR ANTI-COMMUNISTS

(Following is a set of nine commandments suggested by Cardinal Cushing for persons, particularly teenage students, interested in fighting communism.)

If communism is the greatest threat today to our lives, our property and way of life, what can we do about it? What can you, a student in high school, do about communism?

In the first place, know something about what communism really is, for we cannot defeat communism unless we know what it is.

Secondly, study American history and especially study about the freedoms which are a part of our American way of life. Don't take liberties for granted. Recognize the fact that these precious freedoms are lacking in the countries controlled by communism.

Third, be very careful about calling anyone a Communist unless you are sure of your facts. Many people are careless about this and sometimes label everyone who disagrees with them as a Communist. This, of course, is wholly unfair, destroys reputations unjustly, and actually helps rather than hurts the Communist cause.

Fourth, encourage religious observance in your community. Attend the church of your choice. Religion is the weapon feared most by the Communists.

Fifth, be fair in your dealings with others and do all you can to see that justice is done at all times. Communist propaganda feeds upon the injustices occurring in non-Communist countries.

Sixth, be smart in your attitude toward communism and the Communists. Don't be fooled by their words. Remember that they will say anything, true or not, if it furthers Communist objectives. Never let your guard be put down, for as long as they adhere to Communist objectives, including world domination, the threat to us is ever present.

Seventh, if you should learn about any dangerous Communist activity, report it to the Federal Bureau of Investigation or to other law enforcement officers. Don't try to cope with it yourself.

Eighth, in choosing your life work, give serious consideration to the occupations that are important in giving you an opportunity to influence others, such as government, labor relations, education, and the creative end of newspapers, magazines, books, radio, motion pictures, and television—even though your income may not be as high as in some other fields. You will be amply rewarded by the realization that you are rendering vital service to your country. Communists try to place themselves in such key positions in order that they might exercise influence.

Finally, recognize and accept your deep responsibility as a citizen of the Nation that leads the free world. Be sure to take an active part in public affairs. When you are eligible to vote, always cast your ballot in every primary and election and vote for those you believe to be the best type of citizen. Work for such candidates. Run for office yourself. By making democracy strong, you will help to build the most effective bulwark against communism.

Communism presents the greatest challenge to the youth of today. I am confident that you, knowing the true meaning of communism, will meet the challenge.

But it is not enough just to be against communism—we must be for something. Let's be for America. All the way.

Have We a Labor Government Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, every American should read the following patriotic and timely appeal to the American people by Senator GOLDWATER:

HAVE WE A LABOR GOVERNMENT NOW?

(Broadcast by Hon. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, U.S. Senator from Arizona, over Manion Forum Network, June 28, 1959)

DEAN MANION. We are all familiar with the famous statement that "power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

Is the constitutional institution of American freedom now hopelessly corrupted by a concentration of power? With me at this microphone now is a great American who has earned the right to answer this important question by intelligent public service and successive elections to the U.S. Senate.

It is no longer necessary to introduce this man to an American audience. His candor, courage and statesmanship have made him the symbol of undeviating devotion to the conservation of our American heritage. To describe the menacing peril of unrestrained power, here is the Honorable BARRY GOLDWATER, U.S. Senator from Arizona.

Senator GOLDWATER. Thank you, Dean Manion. We hear a great deal these days of the dangers facing our country. Not a day passes without someone pointing to the perils that await at every turn in foreign affairs, in missile production or lack of it, in the race to space or to the poles, in every imaginable activity our Nation is engaged in.

And we could not have come this far as a prosperous republic if in the past we had not faced and met similar dangers. But to me the greatest danger we face as a Nation is not aggressive force from without, but irresponsible power from within.

Power that we as a Nation legally grant. Power that is unrestrained, irresponsible, unrelenting, and, most important, sanctioned by law.

This power is vested in three areas, government, business and labor, and is growing greater each day.

Let us examine the strongholds of this power. First there is government. Government has become so large today that nearly every move we make is met with Federal regulation.

Government after government in the history of this world has fallen because of the concentration of power in centralized government, and today, we are witnessing this growth in our own Nation's Capitol.

It can be successfully argued, in my own opinion, that big government spawns both big business and big labor, and that the three together constitute a real danger to our freedoms.

The second area of bigness is business. The usual explanation of the size of today's corporations is that through competitive struggle for survival, they have merged for technological reasons into massive combines.

But, can the immense size be explained alone in this way? Not at all. There are two factors causing it, but the underlying reason for both is governmental policy.

The wealth produced by capital is divided for supplemental wages, to pay the double tax of the State and Federal Government, and to provide a major portion of new capital formation. The Federal Government and most States levy such taxes on corporations doing business within their borders. Under these tax regualtions, corporations and businesses which should be allowed to put back money produced by their efforts are restrained from doing so by the effect of corporate taxes.

As the size of the business grows, so grows the size of the unions with which management must deal in the determination of wage rates and benefits to be received by employees. As the unions grow, the trend snowballs for industry-wide bargaining, and this is followed by a greater body of Federal regulations proscribing such bargaining between employers and union representatives.

Government regulations on employee relations impose compliance burdens on today's businessmen such that only the largest can afford the staffs of accountants, lawyers, and researchers required to keep abreast of procedures imposed on them by bureaucratic proclamation.

If the businessman attempts to follow the normal course of free enterprise, ignoring Government channels, criminal sanctions are soon imposed on him and his business is terminated. Thus, Government practice in the employee-relations field encourages large corporations to grow.

Now, for the third area—the one with which we are now intimately concerned. In contrast to business regulation, our Government has created in the trade union movement the power and privilege to compel union membership and to regiment employers by economic measures which are irresistible.

This power today has a far-reaching effect. Oddly enough, in this age of vast Government and proliferation of laws, we have, in the labor relations field, little Government and less law. We have, instead, a series of special privileges for abusive and destructive trade union conduct.

In the labor relations field, freedom has become a fugitive trapped, held by a superstate, while giant unions slug it out. They are slugging it out with big business in the most fearful struggle of our time.

The outcome of this struggle is in the hands of Congress and, more essentially, in the hands of every citizen. This conflict of raw power left unchecked in its present direction can only result in Government alone emerging as the sole survivor.

COMPLACENCY—THE ENEMY OF AMERICA

America is in danger. Not alone from the materiel or military threat of our enemies abroad, but from the complacency from within our boundaries.

This is a weakness which is reflected in the acceptance of the abuses of power and it is a weakness further demonstrated by our inability to face up to the real danger. The foreign threat is one which need not panic us so long as we avoid abandonment of our fundamental strength—the principle of freedom under law.

The danger lies in the excessive power of special privileges. All big unions, as they wield the club of economic pressures exploiting to the limit their privileges, have formed industrywide monopolies fraught with abuses and corruption so rampant that it portends certain destruction of the trade union movement, with the attendant handmaiden of disaster for our country. What has brought this about? The answer lies in the failure of our Government to control power and corruption.

During the course of debate on S. 1555, the Kennedy labor bill, I pointed out that, unless strengthened, the bill would make it perfectly permissible for a union to deny a member his right to freedom of speech by means of "reasonable rules and regulations."

Just 4 days after the bill passed the Senate this hypothetical example became a reality. Citing the section of their constitution which permits expulsion for "conduct unbecoming a member," the International Association of Machinists denied the appeal of three members who had exercised their constitutional right of free speech to support right-to-work laws.

Let me read from that decision the astounding reason the union gives in support of its position.

"While it is agreed that the right to freely express one's views is a privilege guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution, this does not mean that a member of our association is entitled to openly denounce the considered position of the labor movement and particularly his own organization, without the possibility of losing his rights to retain his standing as an IAM union member."

I draw your attention to this phenomenon because it is exactly here that I believe the bridge is being constructed between economic tyranny and political tyranny in this country. We are observing the transformation of economic compulsion into political compulsion.

We are probably strong enough to survive even the widespread corruption in union affairs which the McClellan committee hearings have disclosed. It is an evil thing and weaves threads through our social fabric of which none of us can be proud and which we ought to remove. But it is not, by itself, necessarily fatal to the country, damaging as it may be.

We can probably survive entrenched hoodlums, but can free political institutions survive the clever men whom we hear talk piously of their high ideals and lofty purposes at the same time that they go steadily and stealthily about the job of transforming compulsory unionism into compulsory political activity? I suggest these latter may be the truly evil, the truly dangerous men.

On this point there has been a strange and inexplicable silence on the part of the usually loquacious men who call themselves liberals. There has been a curious unwillingness on the part of some to concern themselves with civil rights of union members with the same relentless energy and determination they are accustomed to expend upon threats to the civil rights of other segments of the population.

Why is the union member the forgotten man? Why is this second-class citizenship for the union member held by liberals to be a negligible matter when applied to any other segment of the population it is held to be intolerable?

Where are the liberals who speak with such deep feeling and who are willing to undertake unlimited and immediate action to cure any diminution of that franchise in one part of the country but who are so strangely blind and deaf to this outrageous impairment of the franchise of union members which is especialy conspicuous in another part of the country? This I have called the civil rights problem of the North and I invite the earnest attention of the Nation to this problem.

The basic evil infesting the union movement is compulsory membership. Not one other segment of our society has the coercive power of compulsory unionism, transformed as it has been into a massive and irresponsible political power.

What we witnessed only recently in Congress during the development of the Kennedy labor bill ought to demonstrate to everyone how far-reaching this ruthless power does now reach.

SHAME ON CONGRESS

How humiliating it is for the Congress of the United States to have to conduct a sort of treaty-negotiation with a great internal political power almost as with a foreign power to find out what these union grandees would be willing to tolerate in the way of mild corrections. What level has this Congress reached when even a mild and inoffensive reform bill must be loaded with "sweeteners" to make it sufficiently attractive to the labor politicians so that they may be persuaded to permit its passage?

This overwhelming power, as I have said, is based on the transformation of compulsory unionism into compulsory political activity.

It is an appalling situation when Democrat union members can be required, as a condition of employment, to finance Republican candidates; when Republican union members can be required to finance Democrat candidates; or when any union member can be required to finance issues which he finds deeply repugnant.

When, for example, a profoundly religious Roman Catholic workman can be required by a Communist-dominated union leadership to finance the political designs of the Communist Party, on pain of losing his job.

I say this is the kind of issue that ought not to separate liberals and conservatives. On this issue we must all be Americans or there may soon be no America as we have known it. What we in Congress must awaken to is the fact that freedom is the target of concentrated power. There is no question but that trade unions have been scoring bulls' eyes for 30 years taking away freedom which belongs to you and me and our children.

How much more is there available for sacrificial offering? I submit that it may be too late. There is no question, however, that if we have any hope of retaining what little is left, we must deny the special privileges which allow the violence and monopolistic compulsion against union members.

We have reached a point again in our history where we once stood, when the question was asked of men, "Where do you stand, sir?"

Do we want a republic whose Constitution recognizes that freedom is ours because we are individuals and that freedom comes from God? Do we want a government unfettered by power? Do we want an economic system unfettered by abusive power? Do we want a labor movement with special privileges denied to the rest of our society, the use of which has produced the raw power disclosed before the McClellan committee?

The answer I say to my colleagues rests in the question: "Where do you stand, sir?" If we remain true to our oath of office, if we believe in the proclamations of freedom and liberty which we make from rostrums across the land, if we believe that power invested in any segment of our population is bad, then I suggest to those who hear my voice or who read my words that we can demonstrate this by recognizing the needed approach to labor reform, which is, attack the disease, not the symptoms.

If we fail at this crucial point in our history to measure up to our responsibilities, then history will judge us for what history will surely record us as—men who were timid when strength and courage were needed.

If, on the other hand, we want our freedom, we must work and sacrifice for it. There can be no compromise. Our Constitution is quite clear and we either stick by our basic principles or we don't have them.

There can be no compromise with those who would destroy us because time is on their side. There can be no compromise with courage, the courage to stand for principle with strength.

DEAN MANION. Thank you, Senator GOLDWATER. My friends, where do you stand on this question of special privileges for unrestrained power? Are you too timid, too tepid, or too tired to take a stand against the corruption of your liberties by absolute power?

Send this magnificent speech by Senator GOLDWATER to your own Congressman. Ask him: "Where do you stand, sir?" Insist upon an unequivocal answer, now.

Member Bank Reserve Requirements

SPEECH
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1120) to amend the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System against deposits and to eliminate the classification "central reserve city."

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, my freshman colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARR] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD], members of the Banking and Currency Committee, are to be commended for their fine work in support of S. 1120, the bill to amend the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act with respect to reserve requirements.

In voting for the final passage of this legislation, however, I was sorry that the committee had not seen fit to accept the amendment to strengthen the powers of the Federal Reserve System offered by another freshman member of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. That amendment would have increased the Fed's powers to resist inflation by raising potential reserve requirements to 26 percent.

Believing in a strong and active Federal Reserve System in our economy, I would like to express the hope that the committee will continue to study the methods by which the Fed might be strengthened in its powers to combat inflation as well as in its powers to stimulate economic activity when necessary.

Resolution of the Municipal Council of the City of Newark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to call to the attention of the membership the following resolution adopted by the municipal council of the city of Newark, at a regular meeting July 1, 1959, with respect to home rule for the District of Columbia. I am confident that most Americans agree with the council that the residents of the District of Columbia should no longer be denied the rights and benefits of local self-government. I urge my colleagues to give full support to the enactment of this legislation.

The resolution reads:

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF NEWARK, N.J., MEMORIALIZING CONGRESSMEN HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, PETER W. RODINO, AND GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER TO SUPPORT HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Whereas local self-government is the bedrock of free government;

Whereas the rights and benefits of local self-government should be available to all American citizens;

Whereas the residents of the District of Columbia are denied the rights and benefits of local self-government;

Whereas the Congress of the United States has the authority to assure local self-government by granting home rule to the District of Columbia;

Whereas the principle of home rule has been endorsed by a substantial majority of the residents of the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia have unanimously endorsed proposals for granting home rule to their city: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Municipal Council of the City of Newark, N.J.:

1. That the Congress be, and it is hereby urged to approve home rule legislation to assure local self-government to the residents of the District of Columbia; and

2. That the Members of the U.S. Congress from the 10th, 11th, and 12th Congressional Districts be and they are hereby memorialized to support home rule legislation for the residents of the District of Columbia and respectfully urge the Honorable HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, PETER W. RODINO, and GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER to communicate to their colleagues in the House of Representatives their individual endorsement of this resolution.

Adopted at a meeting of the Municipal Council of the City of Newark, N.J., July 1, 1959.

MICHAEL A. BONTEMPO,
President of the Council.

Certified to by me this 2d day of July 1959.

_____,
City Clerk.

Dalai Lama Reveals What Happened in Tibet—The Tragic Story of Other Attempt at Peaceful Coexistence With Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star on the statement made at a press conference on June 20, 1959, by the Dalai Lama, of Tibet, at his place of asylum in India. Never has a more unprovoked and inexcusable act of barbarism been committed against an utterly peaceful people than Red China's rape of Tibet. Never has there been a more devastating indictment by the head of a people who hoped for and tried peaceful coexistence with Communists. What shocks one almost as much is that there still are people on this planet, not Tibetans but Americans, including some officials of the Christian church, supposedly dedicated to a religion of justice, mercy, and love, who advocate accepting the Red Chinese tyranny into civilized society thereby enormously increasing its prestige and influence and power to do the same thing to others who dare oppose its will and strive to preserve their freedom.

The editorial follows:

TERROR IN TIBET

The Dalai Lama, the young Buddhist godking of Tibet, has given voice to a singularly eloquent and damning indictment of what Red China has been doing to his country, the fabled "roof of the world." Speaking from his refuge in Mussoorie, India, he has accused Peiping of a reign of terror that falls little short of the crime of genocide—a conscious, deliberate, systematic effort to wipe out not merely the culture, independence, and reli-

gion of his people, but also the people themselves.

Thus, according to the Dalai Lama who is their spiritual and temporal leader, the Tibetans have been subjected to agony and affliction in mounting tempo ever since the Chinese Communists first invaded their land in 1950. That particular aggression was followed by an agreement under which Peiping pledged itself to let them govern their own internal affairs, and practice their peace-loving faith, without let or hindrance. However, as the exiled god-king has just declared, the Mao Tze-tung regime began violating the compact in the most flagrant manner almost as soon as it was signed.

Since then, over a period of 9 years, Peiping has followed a policy which the Dalai Lama now has openly condemned—for the first time in detail—as a program calculated to bring about the annihilation of his country and the Buddhist religion. To that end, the Communist drive has been unremitting and merciless. In the God-king's words, "forced labor and compulsory exactions, systematic persecutions of the people, plunder, and confiscation of property belonging to individuals and monasteries, and the execution of certain leading men in Tibet—these are the glorious achievements of Chinese rule in Tibet." More than that, there have been mass departations from the country and a replacing influx of millions of Chinese in a resettlement move obviously designed to obliterate Tibet's historical, ancient identity as a region distinct from China proper.

Is this just spiteful anti-Peiping propaganda? Far from it. In making his charges, the Dalai Lama has been at special pains to declare that he has done so in full awareness of their gravity because I know them to be true. And he has gone on to challenge the Chinese Reds to prove otherwise. As a matter of fact, he has called upon them, if they care to dispute his accusations, to agree to the establishment of an impartial international investigating commission to look into what he has said and to pass judgment on the validity of his condemnatory views.

Needless to say, the Chinese Communists will never assent to any such inquiry. In that respect, the Dalai Lama has put them on a spot of sorts. Although they may rail against him, and although they may take the Nehru government to task for granting him asylum on Indian soil, they will be exceedingly hard put to persuade the world at large that they are not guilty of a crime of the first magnitude in Tibet. The consequent impact on Asian opinion as a whole can hardly fail to be wholesome.

Poison in Your Water—No. 138

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Toledo (Ohio) Blade of March 29, 1959, entitled "Sewage Disposal Poses Big Problem for Genoa":

SEWAGE DISPOSAL POSES BIG PROBLEM FOR GENOA—POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD ISSUED FINAL RENEWAL OF PERMIT TO USE CREEK IN 1957

In 1946, the Ohio Pollution Control Board let it be known that it was not happy with Genoa because the village was allowing overflow from septic tanks to pollute Packer Creek.

Start making plans now for a sewage disposal plant to end the pollution, the board suggested.

Today, more than 12 year later, there not only is no sewage plant, there are no definite intentions to build one.

One of the results of the inaction is that the present council and Mayor Robert Hille have been ordered to appear before the board in Columbus April 16 to explain why.

Another is that the question has become a hot political issue.

ENTHUSIASM MILD

In 1946, village fathers were mildly enthusiastic about building a sewage treatment plant. Faced with a light treasury, they managed to borrow several thousand dollars from a Federal agency to have the plans made.

Finkbeiner, Pettis & Strout, Toledo, consulting engineers, did the job.

The plans were duly filed. They're still on file, but enthusiasm has vanished. Estimates were that the job would cost about $400,000.

Heeding the village's plea that it lacked the wherewithal to finance a job of such magnitude, the pollution board, more and more reluctantly as the years went by, renewed the village's permit to go on dumping septic tank overflow into Packer Creek.

As the village grew, so did the amount of sewage directed into the creek each day.

FINAL RENEWAL

In December 1957, the pollution board decided to put its collective foot down. This is the last time the permit will be renewed, the board said.

Through the years, Genoans had come to regard the annual permit renewal as something that would go on forever. The problem of a sewage disposal plant, if not faced, would likely disappear in due time, many, in effect, had decided.

But the village council took the pollution board's warning to heart. Early in 1958 council passed an ordinance imposing a sewer charge equal to water bills.

The idea was to build up a fund so that financing for the treatment plant would be easier to secure. The extra charge was to retire, in 30 years, $140,000 in mortgage revenue bonds. The remainder of the cost would presumably have come from Federal aid and special assessments on the benefited properties.

DEFEATED AT POLLS

Council's plan went over like a lead balloon. For one thing, at almost the same time the sewer charge was imposed, the water rates were boosted by changing the minimum rates from $6 for 7,000 gallons a quarter-year, to $2 for 2,000 gallons a month.

The inevitable committee was formed, public support for their viewpoint was gained, and petitions for a referendum on the council action were successfully circulated.

The impending referendum halted collection of the sewer impost. The referendum itself, held at the general elections last November, brought a resounding defeat of the council plan.

Council gave up, and since then hasn't tried to do much except persuade a reluctant populace that the village must, somehow, get a sewage treatment plant built, and that the longer the job is postponed the more it will cost.

Enter politics. Mayor Robert Hille, somewhat piqued by the way the referendum went, says he won't be a candidate for reelection this fall.

Only man to file so far for mayor is Oliver Tester, a member of the committee which spearheaded the drive for the referendum. According to Mr. Tester's announcement of his candidacy, he is strongly opposed to the thoughtless expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars of the citizens' money on a useless treatment plant.

Mr. Tester goes on to state that the answer to the problem is to have 100 percent efficient septic tanks to end the Packer Creek pollution problem.

After receiving the order to appear before the pollution board, council's first reaction was to plan a mass meeting of Genoa citizens, particularly those most against the treatment plant, to explain why one must be built.

IDEA COOLS OFF

That idea has cooled off, however, and at its last meeting council said it would invite members of the committee that obtained the referendum to go along on the trip to Columbus. It is not known, however, how many would accept the invitation.

Just what will happen after the confrontation in Columbus is hard to say, at this point. The board, however, has let it be known that if Genoa continues to balk at cleaning up the pollution of Packer Creek, it will step in and force construction of a treatment plant.

The cost of the job would then be assessed on every property owner in the village, possibly without Federal aid or mortgage revenue bonds to lighten the load somewhat.

Public Health Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the Seventh Congressional District of California which I represent is the home of the University of California School of Public Health, 1 of the 11 such schools providing public health training for specialists to staff agencies throughout the 48 States and in many other countries as well.

Extension of the Federal public health traineeship program as provided in H.R. 6325 authored by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] is all-important if the University of California School of Public Health is to continue to provide its share of the training of specialists so badly needed by public health agencies in their work on heart disease, cancer, mental illness, radiation and air pollution, and other programs. Dr. Charles E. Smith, dean of our school, reports that most of the students planning to enroll for the 1959 and 1960 school years are depending on Federal stipends to make their attendance possible.

Since the Federal public health traineeship program was started with the passage of the Health Amendments Act of 1956, the number of graduate students at the University of California School of Public Health has gone from 84 to 1954 and 1955 to 165 in the term just ended—an increase of almost 100 percent. It is beyond debate that this Federal program has encouraged more

public health personnel to obtain graduate training.

The support of this traineeship program on the Federal level is only equitable, because the University of California School of Public Health, like its ten other counterparts elsewhere in the United States, is not training just for local State needs, but for the Nation and the world. Of last year's 165 graduate students, 53 were from 28 other States and 22 were from 16 different foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, in the larger view, H.R. 6325 takes care of only one phase of the problem of meeting the current needs and preparing for future public health programs. Traineeship grants are urgent, but, in truth, a much more comprehensive approach is necessary. Increased enrollment at our schools of public health means that facilities must be expanded, faculties enlarged, and research activities enriched.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] has introduced another bill, H.R. 6871, which would provide for the sustained, long-range investment in public health education which must soon be put into effect if we are to retrain the thousands of working public health specialists who do not have adequate knowledge of new methods and if we are to encourage new people into the field to fill the vacancies that now exist in almost every public health agency and will occur in even greater numbers in the next few years.

This bill, to which I have introduced a companion bill, H.R. 6872, was based on the recommendations of the 1959 national conference on public health training held here in Washington last July. It would not only extend the traineeship program, but also extend the grant-in-aid program created on a short-range basis by Public Law 85–544 to help meet the costs of expanding faculties and maintaining training programs. It would provide matching fund grants for construction of facilities, separate grants for training of public health nurses, our largest single professional component in health departments, and matching fund grants to States to help them meet public health training requirements.

Today our concern is with H.R. 6325, which I wholeheartedly support, not with the more comprehensive legislation I have mentioned. I do believe, however, that while we are looking at the field public health we should take time to recognize the scope of the problems we face and to realize that before too long we must initiate a long-range program equal in scale to those problems.

The West Never Learns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of June 11, 1959:

THE WEST NEVER LEARNS

Nothing is coming of the Geneva Conference except possibly an agreement to preserve West Berlin's arrangements. The West seems likely to make a few minor concessions to remain there.

THE WEARY QUESTION

So the weary question is asked, as it has been asked regularly for 13 years: Why do we confer with the Russians?

The stock answers are (a) that a conference is at least a sort of truce in the cold war and (b) that if the West talks often enough and long enough with the Russians a compromise with communism will be discovered.

The latter answer calls for the kind of patience postulated by the classic example of the operation of probability: If you give an ape a typewriter and plenty of paper and set him to pecking at the keys, he will eventually reproduce the works of Shakespeare.

As for the first stock answer, it has no truth in it. A conference can stimulate cold war by providing communism with an effective sounding board, as has been the case currently at Geneva, or it can provide a screen for Communist subversion, as was the case in the period of good feeling after the summit meeting of 1955 when the Red arms deal was made with Egypt and the Soviet Union emerged as a power in the Middle East.

Our fallacy is that in spite of all our experience, plus the explicit statements of the Communist prophets, we still believe we can negotiate stabilizing agreements with people who are our perpetual enemies. It is the very root of their doctrine that the world cannot be at peace until we are undone and the Communist revolution is complete.

REDS MAKE OWN RULES

The traditional diplomacy of the West sought a balance of power to keep the peace. The balance was never permanent, of course, because the factors of power change with time, but diplomacy was able to give the world peaceful periods. It could do this because it assumed that all the powers, regardless of the tensions among them, thought of war as a last resort and consequently were willing to adjust most of their differences through negotiations conducted in good faith. Statesmanship had rules.

But communism, a revolutionary movement, does not accept the rules of the system. No revolutionary movement ever did. Hitler's didn't; neither did the French revolutionary movement culminating in Napoleon. Because the revolutionaries, most particularly the Communists, reject the rules as a mere defensive device of the conventional enemy, they have an advantage over the conservative adherents to the traditional diplomatic system which is almost impossible to redress. The Communists refuse as a matter of principle to act in good faith, but the Americans, British, and French cannot retaliate by playing the part of confidence men.

Do the westerners really have to play at all? We are back to the original question but without the stock answers. Experience ought to tell us that we never should negotiate for an agreement with communism that we cannot enforce.

Premier Khrushchev's ultimatum on West Berlin united the western allies, which apparently surprised him. His bluff was called: The allies would fight to preserve their Berlin status. A conference restricted to the Berlin issue might have been summoned, the allies' status confirmed and the meeting adjourned. The alternative to agreement would have been war—perhaps. In other words, the agreement would have been enforceable by the allies.

WEST WILL PAY PRICE

As it turned out, the ministers at Geneva went instead through all the complicated steps of the diplomatic mating dance, knowing all the while that this was a barren wooing and giving the Communists a special opportunity to prop up the East German regime and reinforce the satellite system with skillful propaganda. And then the western ministers wavered on the main point—the only enforceable point. Our Secretary of State, Christian Herter, offered the concessions (to suppress anti-Communist propaganda and espionage originating in West Berlin) and so in the end the westerners shall probably be paying at least a token price to stay in Berlin, acknowledging, for Communist propoganda purposes, that they are there only because Moscow permits them to be.

Why, once more, do we do this? Because we steadfastly believe that the Communists are like ourselves, even though they have proclaimed that they are different and proved it by overreaching us for 13 years, from the seizure of the Eastern European countries to the Korean truce negotiations and from Korea to Geneva.

The Communists have declared perpetual war against the private enterprise system, any kind of war that suits the situation. To them a flag of truce means only the chance to shoot the man who carries it. And still our people rush to be flag-bearers. Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said on "Meet the Press" recently:

"I think it is worthwhile to go to a summit conference—unless they (the Russians) give evidence of lack of any good faith or any intention to discuss seriously our mutual differences, and I doubt if they have given that impression yet."

H.R. 11 and the Pricing of Canned Foods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Canning Trade advances some very practical arguments in favor of H.R. 11.

I am sure that all of the Members of the House are familiar with the revolutionary economic changes that have occurred in the food industry during the past several years and recognize that these changes have served to aggravate the difficulties facing the smaller food merchants struggling to remain in business. In the canning industry rampant price discrimination—the familiar tool of the monopolist—has been the principal affliction and the editorial, reprinted below, shows why H.R. 11 is needed to prevent further deterioration:

MEETING COMPETITION

If there is any one area of agreement within the canning industry, it would surely be found in a general recognition that the pricing of canned foods is the subject of a great deal of rumor. As everyone knows, a fancy isn't a fancy, nor is an extra standard an extra standard, nor a standard a standard. And even when the various factors of quality are officially in agreement, various buyers have their own ideas, creating either a real or convenient difference.

Also as everyone knows, the number of gimmicks connected with the sale of canned foods is limited only by the imagination of the buyer and the degree of anxiety (or necessity) for the sale. There are premiums, advertising allowances, label allowances, swell allowances, immediate shipment allowances, special display allowances, demonstration allowances, dented can allowances, torn label allowances, and so ad infinitum. Not too many weeks ago a U.S. district court ruled that it is legal to add the split-brokerage allowance to this mumbo jumbo.

For these reasons, canners have been fair game for unscrupulous quantity buyers and brokers, as long as there has been a canning industry, especially on a slow market.

In effect, then, the average canner (and many above average) seldom knows whether he is meeting competition, or as he strongly suspects, providing just one more handout to land an order.

The chief purpose of the Robinson-Patman Act was to make it illegal for a specific buyer to own, either through coercion or conspiracy with the seller, a block of goods at a price lower than that available to his competitor. Most reasonable men will agree that any buyer so favored continually might well establish a monopoly. It is self-evident that the Robinson-Patman law has failed to accomplish its purpose. The reasons are equally self-evident—apathetic enforcement, loopholes in the law, the natural bent of canners to court favor with large buyers despite below cost prices, resulting in wholesale violation of the law, especially the brokerage section, and last, but not least, the increasing public favor of the giant supermarket.

If, then, we accept the premise that monopoly is bad for business in general, or in a specific field, then it would mean that measures should be taken to put teeth into the Robinson-Patman law. S. 11 and its companion bill H.R. 11, were designed to do just that. It may be that there are some weaknesses in the amendment, or that S. 726, referred to in the National Canners Association statement appearing elsewhere in this issue, may be wholly or partially objectionable. If so, these should be corrected. But in taking a stand against this amendment and not suggesting substitute action in view of the obvious failure of Robinson-Patman as it is, the National Canners Association, the Wisconsin Marketing Committee, and the tristate legislative committee, put themselves squarely on the side of monopoly—and very definitely in the camp of one customer as opposed to another. In view of the record, the National Canners Association action is not surprising. The action of the local association committees, however, is most surprising indeed, and it seems hardly possible that any of these association committees speak for the membership as a whole.

Why It Is Important to the People of the Third District of Indiana That President Eisenhower Sign the Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Third Congressional District have a deep interest in seeing the Housing Act of 1959, which was passed by overwhelming margins in both the House and Senate, signed into law.

The bill is now on President Eisenhower's desk and it would be an act of utter irresponsibility and grave disservice to the citizens of Indiana and the Nation if he should veto it.

Here are some of the reasons the housing bill is so important to the people of the Third District:

IKE VETO COULD CAUSE SOUTH BEND FAMILIES TO LOSE HOMES

First. Nearly 350 South Bend families might lose their homes if President Eisenhower vetoes the bill.

These families, members of the Southmore mutual housing project, are threatened with foreclosure for falling behind in mortgage payments on their purchase of this project from the Federal Government. I therefore introduced an amendment to the housing bill to permit the modification of such contracts by the Government in order to give these families a chance to meet their payments, keep their homes, and discharge their debt to the Government.

I am proud to say that Congress included my amendment in the housing bill and so gave the people of Southmore real hope to keep their homes. It is therefore obvious that a presidential veto could mean terrible hardship for nearly 1,500 of our South Bend neighbors.

URBAN RENEWAL VITAL TO THIRD DISTRICT

Second. We are now witnessing in many third district cities and towns—South Bend, Mishawaka, Michigan City, La Porte, Kingsford Heights—the start of programs for the rebuilding and renewing of these communities.

The renewing of our American cities is without question one of the most important domestic challenges facing our Nation. It is in our cities that the great majority of our citizens live and work and where our children grow and play and learn. It is the cities that provide the vast bulk of the money required to keep our Nation strong. Anyone, therefore, who attempts to halt or cut back our vital program of urban renewal in our cities is doing real harm to our country.

I am proud to have been an active and militant supporter of the new Housing Act which contains urban renewal provisions of direct importance to the district I represent.

URBAN RENEWAL: SOUTH BEND

Over the past several years the need for a comprehensive rehabilitation of the city's central business district has become more and more pressing. Not only does the central business district provide a large percentage of the taxable value of the community but its offices, banks, and stores are at the heart of the city. To have a strong and growing community we must have a healthy central business area.

Twenty percent, or $180 million, of the urban renewal funds provided in the new Housing Act may be used for rebuilding areas that are not predominantly residential, areas such as South Bend's central business district. The city of South Bend and the South Bend Downtown Council can, if the bill becomes law, move ahead on this vital task. This same 20 percent provision will also be of great value in helping South Bend to acquire the land needed for a civic center for the community.

An Eisenhower veto of the housing bill would clearly be a serious blow to the citizens of South Bend.

URBAN RENEWAL: MISHAWAKA

Although Mishawaka has one urban renewal project well underway, the needs of that community have been fully studied and found to require additional urbal renewal activities if the city is to rid itself completely of substandard housing.

Three additional urban renewal projects are being held up due to lack of Federal urban renewal funds. With the approval of the Housing Act these projects can be undertaken and the substandard housing in Mishawaka eliminated. With the elimination of this substandard housing it will also be possible to make improvements in these housing areas to insure that they will be good areas in which to live and raise our children. These improvements will include badly needed parks and playgrounds as well as sewers and streets.

An Eisenhower veto would obviously be a serious blow to the citizens of Mishawaka.

URBAN RENEWAL: LA PORTE

La Porte is a community whose economic problems have kept the area on the critical unemployment list for over 50 straight months. The urban renewal program can, in addition to its direct objective of providing better living conditions, offer the local economy a much needed boost.

In the Maple Terrace area of La Porte some extremely poor housing has seriously jeopardized the value of the surrounding housing and resulted in very unsatisfactory housing conditions for a number of La Porte families.

In the first ward in La Porte a section of badly blighted housing is not only adversely affecting the remainder of the neighborhood but is preventing the expansion of adjacent industry that is so badly needed in La Porte.

Failure of the President to sign the Housing Act will mean that blighted housing conditions cannot be effectively eliminated and that significant industrial expansion will be blocked.

URBAN RENEWAL: KINGSFORD HEIGHTS

The closing last March by the Federal Government of the Kingsbury Ordnance Plant was a severe economic blow to the little community of Kingsford Heights. Another disastrous development was the fire which burned to the ground the community's only school. I have just introduced legislation which would give this community rent-free classroom space in a vacant KOP building until the school can be rebuilt.

In spite of its serious troubles, the people of Kingsford Heights have rallied and are undertaking a communitywide urban renewal program. This community has used every ounce of its limited resources in this program. Its suc-

cess depends upon approval by President Eisenhower of the Housing Act.

Failure to approve the act may deal such a harsh blow to Kingsford Heights that the town may never fully develop into the fine community it could with the aid of the provisions of this legislation.

URBAN RENEWAL: MICHIGAN CITY

With the vast industrial expansion expected in the Calumet area of northern Indiana, Michigan City leaders are working feverishly to rebuild and rehabilitate this community so that it can provide the many services and facilities which this industrial growth will require. The magnitude of this community rebuilding job is too much for Michigan City to handle alone. The Housing Act will provide the necessary aid that Michigan City needs to accomplish the task.

Park School area urban renewal project has already been given approval. But the "Patch" and other areas of the city must also be rebuilt if Michigan City is adequately to provide the economic and recreational opportunities essential for this part of our State to realize fully the vast potential of its industrial future.

A Presidential veto would clearly mean a severe setback for the people of Michigan City.

URBAN RENEWAL: PLYMOUTH, GOSHEN, NORTH LIBERTY, LAKEVILLE, AND NAPPANEE

These cities and towns are hard pressed by lack of adequate funds to provide some of the most important types of public facilities, such as sewers. The Indiana State Department of Health has nonetheless insisted that these communities construct sewage disposal systems. Such systems are essential because of the pollution of streams, rivers, and lakes in our district. All of these cities and towns are also forced with serious housing problems.

The new Housing Act will make it possible for these third district communities to count the sewer improvements which they must make as their contribution toward carrying out an urban renewal program. The act will permit such expenditures to be matched 2 for 1 by the Federal urban renewal program and so will enable the sewer and other badly needed public improvements to be realized.

The citizens of Plymouth, Goshen, North Libertry, Lakeville, and Nappanee have an important stake in seeing the housing bill become law.

FHA INSURANCE PROGRAM

Third. The new Housing Act reduces the minimum downpayment required when a family wants to buy a home. This new provision will not only make it easier for many citizens of the third district to have their own homes but will greatly aid the continued growth of the home-building industry which plays such a vital part in maintaining a high level of employment in our Nation.

Every American family that seeks to buy a home would suffer from a Presidential veto.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

Fourth. There is a rapidly growing need in America for decent housing for our constantly expanding aged and aging population. It is apparent that if our aged citizens are going to have decent housing a sound program, such as the one provided by the housing bill, is essential.

This is a program of Government loans to nonprofit groups to aid them in building decent homes within the economic means of many of our aged and aging citizens who are on meager pensions. It is a great step forward toward the solution of one of the truly serious domestic problems facing our Nation.

Here in our own district there are, particularly in St. Joseph and LaPorte Counties, citizens' groups devoting themselves to finding answers to this problem of housing the aging.

With this provision of the new Housing Act these nonprofit groups in our district can for the first time help provide our aged people with homes within their economic means.

If President Eisenhower vetoes the bill, our older citizens will have lost a great opportunity.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Fifth. The Federal National Mortgage Association, which makes it possible for our local banks, building and loan associations and other lending institutions to make additional home loans so that more Americans can own their own homes, has been greatly strengthened by the new Housing Act. This provision will also help in maintaining a high level of home construction in our country.

The majority of Americans who borrow to buy their homes as well as the entire home-building industry will be in real trouble if President Eisenhower fails to sign the bill.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I should like to insert an excellent editorial entitled "Why Veto Housing?" from the Washington Post of June 25, 1959. The editorial follows:

WHY VETO HOUSING?

In the office of Budget Director Maurice Stans hangs a framed, one-word question which, he has said, expresses his notion of what his job is all about. The question is: "Why?" Before Mr. Stans sends off his threatened recommendation to President Eisenhower that he veto the omnibus housing bill, we hope he will take time to ask that question of himself. For why, indeed, should Mr. Eisenhower reject so modest a measure? Congress has come a very long way to meet him on the housing programs, authorizing much less than the mayors of the country's slum-ridden urban areas believe to be necessary and much less than both the House and Senate have shown they are prepared to vote. The bill provides no more than is required to keep existing programs going at a slow pace.

Mr. Stans concedes that the impact of the omnibus bill on next year's budget would be very small—about $70 million more than the $77 billion budget calls for. His concern is with future years. About this there is much misunderstanding. For urban renewal, the major spending program covered by the omnibus bill, the President asked for $1.4 billion for 6 years. Congress has voted $900 million for 2 years. But in neither case would the money actually be spent evenly over the number of years specified. Urban renewal funds are committed as long as 5 years in advance of expenditure, and the actual outlays from any year's commitments may be spread over several years. Thus the added impact of the congressional proposal is likely to be very slight indeed on any year's budget. And the $900 million provided would make no more than a dent in the total urban decay problem.

The President asked for no new public housing authorization. Congress voted to authorize a scant 45,000 units which would probably be spread over a long period if recent experience is any guide. The District of Columbia alone could use a fourth to a third of that authorization in the next 3 or 4 years if its approved plans for slum eradication in the near-Northwest and other areas go forward on schedule. Measured against the Nation's need for subsidized low-rent housing, the authorization is little more than a gesture.

The omnibus bill carries other features about which there is no argument, including $10 billion in new insuring authority for the Federal Housing Administration which the President favors. A veto would mean that separate legislation for the FHA would be needed. It is conceivable that, having gone so far to meet the President on housing programs generally, Congress would balk at being asked to provide the FHA authorization separately. The result could be a disastrous slowdown in home building which has been a large factor in the economic recovery.

If Mr. Stans can somehow satisfy himself that a veto is called for, we hope he will at least send along with his recommendation his response to that framed question, "Why?" For surely Mr. Eisenhower will wish to weigh most carefully the wisdom of calling a halt to the Nation's attack on urban decay.

Cross Country With the On-to-Oregon Cavalcade—VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following story from the June 25, 1959, Drain (Oreg.) Enterprise. It contains the eighth part of the daily diary accounts of the On-to-Oregon Cavalcade being written by Rudy Roudebaugh, of Drain. This account covers the days of June 8 through June 19. The cross-country modern pioneers are well into their third month of travel.

The Oregonians have met many people en route. Senator GALE MCGEE, of Wyoming, visited the wagon train on June 12, along with Gov. J. J. Hickie of Wyoming.

The article follows:

WAGON TRAIN STARTS THIRD MONTH ON OREGON TRAILS; TWO PIONEERS LEAVE

(By Robert Rudy Roudebaugh)

June 8, 8:43: We are still together and rolling westward. Old Doc is feeling his oats this morning. He's spooked at everything he sees and hears. 10:01: Stopped to take the bedding and feed out of the big truck. 12:38: Stopped for lunch. The mules drank two buckets of water and half of their feed. We will be 19 days from any towns and no trees—it will be hot. 1:30: Starting out again after lunch. We are really out in the

sagebrush. 3:17: Stopped to camp on the Stanford ranch.

June 9, 6:10: Here we go. Two months ago we left Eugene for Independence, Mo. Jan got a new shoe on her left hind foot. The Indians came twice last night and raised cane. Our mules were tied to the wagon and they almost pulled our wagon over.

We are 21 miles from Casper way up in the sagebrush. About five carloads of Oregon people found us. It was like old homeweek. 6:37: Had to stop and pick a good sized rock out of Doc's shoe. 9:08: We're pulling the steepest grade yet. 11:20: Ready to make camp and we are still on Stanford's ranch. The wind is blowing.

June 10, 6:55: Ready to roll. Talk about cold, the wind goes right through you, but the sun is up bright so I hope it warms up. My wife, Ki, watched horses being shoed for the first time last night. 6:08: We are leaving camp. Janell slept out last night, but came into the wagon this morning. I guess she didn't get much sleep as it was so cold. All we can see is sagebrush. No cars, once in a while a cowboy. We can see the foothills of the Rockies.

We left the North Platte River at Casper for the last time. You drive for miles between ranches. This is our third day on this ranch. We are in the arrowhead and rattlesnake country. 7:19: Right on the the trail. 8:20: We're crossing an oil road. Janell slept for the first 2 hours and Ki the last 2 hours. We are coming to the Tom Sun ranch. It's half on the Sanford's ranch, Independence Rock, and that's where we're making camp. 11:04: I don't know if I mentioned this before, but we are getting up now at 4:30 and leaving at 6 because of the heat.

The wind blows every day and goes down at night. Feels like the wagons are going to blow away anytime.

June 11: We are going along the Sweetwater River on Tom Sun ranch. 6:59: Have to wait again for Roy. Ki is on cook shift again for 2 days. The sun is out bright today with no wind this morning. 7:04: We are on the oil going west about 4½ miles an hour. Going over Sweetwater River. 7:30: Rock Creek. 7:36: Pet Creek. 7:46: Pull off the oil onto a trail. I can see Split Rock dead ahead. 8:25: Cherry Creek. 10:24: Stop to feed and eat. Doc and Jan drank two pails of water and ate their grain. 1:00: We are stopping for the night on Bill Crane Ranch, which belongs to Bill Griep now. This ranch also is along Sweetwater River.

June 12, 6:01: Left camp at Bill Grieffen's ranch. A photographer from Lawrence, Kans., rode with me taking pictures out of the front and back of the wagon. 6:32: Passed by Split Rock. 7:51: Hit the oil road again. Ki is on cook shift today. 10:08: Stopped to feed mules and eat lunch. Both mules ate and drank real well: 10:56: On our way, can see Wind River Range all covered with snow. 11:23: Pulled out alongside of road to meet Senator GALE MCGEE, of Wyoming. He flew to meet us in a helicopter. Like Gov. J. J. Hickle, he was introduced and shook hands with everyone on the wagon train. I gave him some letters from the Drain mayor to give out. He wished us a happy trip to Oregon. 11:44: Westward ho again. 12:40: Arrived at camp on Beulah McIntosh Ranch. Ray Van Valeck, Jackson Hole, traveled this trail 60 years ago. When he traveled and met a wagon going the other way the first thing he'd ask them about was water and feed. Ivan Hoyer rode with me this afternoon and drove the mules. This was his first trip on a wagon. Elevation 6,100 feet.

June 13: All hooked up and waiting to go. Talk about mosquitos; they are big and thick, but thanks to Betty Anderson of Yoncalla, we have some repellant to take care of that. 1:04: We are on our way. It's a beautiful morning. We are traveling on the highway today. We were camped last night 1 mile from a place called Home on the Range. It's 2 years old and population 1,000. It grew overnight (uranium). They sure were nice to us. Free laundry and all our meals and opened the pool for the children. This Buelah McIntosh is really a person. She is 71 years old. She can ride and outshoot any man around here.

This place is lousy with jade. Gail Carnine found a piece of black jade weighing over a pound. Ki went and visited some people that were loaded with it. They told her they got $40 a pound for it. The ranches here are the size of counties in Kansas and Nebraska. 6.43: Crossing Grams Draw. 7:48: Passing H. D. Culver ranch. Janell and Ki are both asleep in back of the wagon. 8:07: The wind is coming up again today. At least it keeps the bugs away. 8:17: Ice Slough, only bridge I've seen with water running under it. 9:32: Ki has finally got up. 9:59: Stopped for lunch and feeding the livestock. Janell must have smelled lunch, she is crawling out of the wagon.

Windy River Range is still in front of us and it's snowcapped. It would make a beautiful picture. 10:32: Hooked up and ready to go. Guess somebody isn't ready. We only have 3 miles to go before we make camp. 10:49: We are on our way again. 11:40: This is Government property that we are on for the weekend, right on Sweetwater River. (It's a rodeo grounds.) Fine place to keep the mules.

June 15, 6:01: Hooked up and ready to go. The sun is out bright and no wind for a change. 6:09: We've taken off. We have about an hour's ride on the highway and then will be on the trail for the next 3 days. 6:14: We just crossed the Sweetwater River, which seems to have plenty of water. In this country water means a lot to them.

We sure had a nice weekend. The Hole in the Wall Club from Cody, Wyo., came and fed us a buffalo dinner and put on a square dance. Then had a bandit raid throughout camp screaming and shooting guns. Ki and Janell got under cover and the rest of us shot it out with them. 6:45: We are leaving the highway going southwest going around Windy River Range. 8:34: Ki had to get out to walk. 11:02: Stopped to water, feed, and eat. 12:11: On our way again. 1:10: We have come 20 miles now. We have been pulling some long hills. We have to stop and rest the horses about every 15 minutes. 1:48: We are on the top of the ridge. 2:08: Now in camp at Upper Diamond Springs. Made 22 miles today. Mrs. Lowell Blair of Sheridan had to leave the wagon train because of asthma.

June 16: We had rain last night, but the sun is out bright this morning. Only four cars in camp last night. 6:18: Leaving camp. Getting closer to Windy River Range. We are getting a pretty cold breeze from it. Elevation 7,200 feet. We should get on the South Pass by camping time today. 7:52: Forded across Strawberry Creek. 8:20: Stopped at a 1856 memorial of Mormons. In 1856, 13 Mormons froze to death one night, 2 next day. Before help came 77 had frozen to death out of 404. This place is Rock Creek. Still a little snow. 9:24: Just went through a ranch. In fact, right through the barnyard. The whole place was made of lodgepoles. In this part of the country they use lodgepoles for construction. 11:52: We have been going over nothing but rocky ground for the last hour and 45 minutes. We are on a rimrock ledge. We can see all over. It is a real sight. 12:16: We are stopped for the day above Sweetwater River. Elevation 7,700. South Pass City is 1 mile downhill. It is a ghost town now. Formerly a gold-mining town of about 15,000 population. They had an old museum, cafe, and bar and a few log cabins. They are having a dance for us tonight.

June 17, 5:51: All ready to go. 6:01: Heading southwest, smooth gravel road. The sun is shining bright and no wind. 6:42: This sure would have been a beautiful campsite here at Fish Creek. It beat the place we had to stay last night. The wind about blew us away. 7:06: We are now on top of the Continental Divide on South Pass—also beginning of Oregon Territory. 7:49: Sheryl Carnine and Janell just got up. Sheryl has been sleeping in our wagon since we have had good weather. 8:37: Crossed the Sweetwater River for the last time. 9:36: Crossed Pacific Creek. 9:56: Stopped for lunch, but decided to go into camp instead. Mike Speckt rode with us this morning. 11:24: We just passed the parting of the way. That's where the Oregon-bound wagons went their way and the rest went to California. It has a new monument put up in 1956. It was a sad day when they made that big break, knowing all the hardships they had and they probably would never see each other again. 11:39: The Fremont County Posse met us and escorted us into camp. They gave us lunch at 11:59. Made 25 miles today. There were two Indian tribes here today and they danced and danced. The men had to smoke the peace pipe with them. The historical society gave us each a piece of jade. The New York Life Insurance Co. gave us each a keychain with a piece of jade on it.

June 18: I have a pretty view of Windy River range from the front of my wagon. It is the highest point in Wyoming, 13,785 feet. 6:07: Turned southwest on Highway 28. 6:18: Leaving Sublette County, entering Sweetwater County. Out in the open today and very low sagebrush. 7:31: Janell and Sheryl got up. 9:25: Nine miles to Farson. Janell is driving and Ki is on cook shift. 10:55: Crossing Eden Canal. Farson is a new irrigation country which has developed in the last 10 years. Population, 400. 11:40: Stopped to make camp. We have a nice place to stay. We were sent a cake from Lebanon, Oreg., baked by Claude Durlam's Bakery and Mr. and Mrs. Luther Bennett drove out with it from Oregon.

June 19, 6:06: Leaving Farson. Heading west on 28. We have an east wind this morning. Kind of hazy out. Also chilly. 6:12: We are crossing the Big Sandy River. 6:22: Left the oiled road and on gravel. 11:52: Stopped for the day. We made 20 miles today. The Cavalry came in about 3 a.m. to stay the weekend with us. They came from Cheyenne. They are the Governor's First Guards. Janell, Ki, and I were making a movie. We are a couple that is dying of fever, and the wagon train comes along and helps us. It will be pretty good, I think. We have not been able to give many of the Drain letters away since we left Casper because we have been off the beaten path. Today we have been on the trail for 2 months.

June 20, 6:03: Starting out on our third month this morning, and all is well. The Cavalry stood at attention when we left camp. We really have made friends with them. This makes about three different visits they have been with us. In fact, they may show up with us in Oregon.

We can see our campsite for tonight—19 miles away (trees along the Green River). When you see a tree on this desert you feel like you are getting close to home. This is the Red Desert. It has very little vegetation. Almost as bad as the badlands. Janell is getting a big collection of rocks. She spends all her time hunting for them. Today she was riding on the tailgate of the Roseburg wagon with her friend Sheryl. 8:39: The moviemakers are here. Our wagon is one of the two they are using. This show is featuring the Carnine family of Camas Valley. 9:41: The wagon in front is having trouble. Lowell Blair has left the wagon train to join his wife in Sheridan.

Statement of Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Congress the following excellent statement by Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers:

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. BONNER FELLERS, U.S. ARMY, RETIRED, NATIONAL DIRECTOR, CITIZENS FOREIGN AID COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for the privilege of appearing before you, I am grateful. My name is Bonner Fellers. I am a brigadier general, U.S. Army, retired. I have been graduated from various Army schools beginning with West Point and including the War College. For 2 years, 1940–42, I was the U.S. observer of combat with the British forces in the desert campaigns in Libya. From 1943 to 1946, I was on the staff of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. My duties included chief of joint planning and military secretary to General MacArthur. Today I appear as the national director of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

On March 16 of this year, our committee published a 32-page pamphlet, "Foreign Aid and You—A First Report." Some quarter of a million copies have been distributed across the Nation. With less than a dozen exceptions, the reaction of the American public has been overwhelming favorable.

The executive branch of our Government, however, has disputed practically every line of our report. The tone of the opposition is malicious; it has been set forth in an unauthenticated April 27, 1959, committee print, printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled "Report on the Mutual Security Program" by the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee and comments supplied by the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Defense, and the International Cooperation Administration.

Today I propose to present a few of the many fallacies in the unauthenticated comments by the executive branch.

FALLACY NO. 1: THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH SUPPORT OF A PERMANENT AMERICAN GARRISON FOR EUROPE

Our committee report held that our Government should announce it is not our policy permanently to garrison Europe and that our garrison in West Germany should gradually be withdrawn and replaced by European NATO troops.

To this proposal the executive branch, at three different places in its comments implied that our oversea bases and troops were necessary, among other things, to man advanced early warning facilities beyond the continental limits of the United States. "European NATO forces contribute very heavily to this concept," the executive branch argued.

The facts are:

A principal threat to the United States is from Soviet bombers and missiles flown over the polar cap and aimed at our military potential. The bases for these weapons lies in the Soviet Arctic. In the enemy's flight over the polar cap en route to attack us, NATO troops and installations are not even on the enemy route of attack. They could provide no warning and have no such assignment.

Our distant early warning systems against Red bombers are located in the Western Hemisphere. They extend from Labrador to Alaska. They do not require the American oversea troop deployment which is now in effect. The new warning systems against missiles, one at Thule, Greenland, and one at Clear, Alaska, are also in this hemisphere. None is in Europe or Asia.

Whatever may be the reasons for the executive branch desiring American garrisons in Europe, the American people have the right to expect that the basis for the reasons given be entirely factual.

FALLACY NO. 2: THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH SUPPORT OF FOREIGN MILITARY ASSISTANCE

The recent changes which have taken place in war require that one must take care not to permit his image of the next war to become a reflection of past wars.

Decision in the next major war will not be reached by conventional surface forces. It will come from the sky. Five or fifty or no American divisions in West Germany would make little difference militarily. Our five divisions now in Germany, or lack of them, could not influence the decision being reached in the sky.

In this age of air-space-nuclear war, in which weapons systems can destroy any target on earth, only two powers, the United States of America and the U.S.S.R., possess what one might call an independent military capability. Lesser powers and even Britain, France, Germany, and Japan do not have a modern independent military capability.

This means that should the Soviets attack the United States with bombers and intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) flying over the polar cap, and from intermediate range ballistic missiles (IRBM) fired from submarines off our shores, our allies would be powerless to extend material assistance. They have not the military means to prevent Red air and space attacks against us. They have insufficient surface forces seriously to threaten the Red army. The NATO IRBM program has all but failed. Britain is emplacing four squadrons of IRBM. Italy has has agreed to accept a limited number of IRBM. Turkey is eager for the IRBM but has not the technically trained men to handle it. All other NATO powers have turned thumbs down.

Not only are our allies unable materially to assist in the defense of the United States, they are unable to protect themselves even with our contemplated military assistance program. It is therefore naive for the executive branch to claim that "the continuation of the military assistance program is vital."

The Congress is also being asked to extend military assistance to South American countries. But South American forces are neither equipped nor in a position to assist in the defense of the Western Hemisphere against air-space-nuclear attack. What the South American countries need is adequate internal police protection, which certainly they themselves can afford.

The same is true of the south Asian countries. Their greatest need is internal security. After more than 10 years of American foreign aid, surely these countries should be able to provide their own internal protection. They can never be strong enough to defend against a Communist air or ground attack. They have neither offensive desire nor capability. Our military assistance to these lesser powers should terminate now.

The European NATO powers, whose economy is flourishing, should be free to take such defensive measures as they deem necessary. However, there is one category of military assistance which we must not terminate. In areas which we are morally obligated to defend and which are directly threatened with Red aggression, we should—for the time being—continue military assistance. South Korea, Formosa, and West Berlin are examples.

The U.S. Strategic Air Command (SAC) is our principal defense. SAC extends protection also over the entire free world. It costs the United States many billions of dollars annually to maintain SAC. Surely, it is not asking too much of our allies to provide such local defense as they can afford.

FALLACY NO. 3: THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH CLAIMS THAT "THIS STATEMENT (THAT THE UNITED STATES CAN SURVIVE WITHOUT EUROPEAN AND ASIATIC ALLIES) IS CLEARLY BASED ON THE LONG DISCREDITED ISOLATIONIST CONCEPT OF FORTRESS AMERICA"

Our committee has indicated no inclination to repudiate treaties or to abandon our allies, or to permit the Soviets to take over the free world. We stand uncompromisingly for free-world defense with principal reliance on the air-space-nuclear striking power. SAC, today, is the only military force in the world which the Kremlin fears. With such totally destructive striking power at our disposal, the Soviet Union is unlikely to start a war. But if war came now, we could win quickly and decisively.

Today, the United States alone is providing the entire free world with the protection of the greatest known war deterrent—SAC, and so long as SAC is superior to Red strategic power, our deterrent is likely to continue effective.

With intercontinental bombers and intercontinental ballistic missiles in the hands of both the Soviets and the United States, the terrific striking power of these two colossi is only hours and minutes apart. Thus it is foolish to speak of isolation for the United States.

Modern technology has made isolation impossible. In the next war there will be no place to hide.

But if war should be thrust upon us, it is likely and it is militarily sound that the Reds will bypass Europe and strike directly against the United States and our overseas bases.

Unless attacked, our European allies might be inclined not to strike the Soviet Union but rather to be neutral. If not attacked European NATO powers could hold their weapons in reserve, just in case the Red attack against them might come later. Most certainly, to remain neutral and hold their fire would be a human reaction.

Should war come, it is to be hoped that our overseas bases would be available. However, the sound military planner knows these facts:

1. Overseas bases are more susceptible to ground sabotage than those in the Western Hemisphere.

2. The host country—when war is imminent—may, in the hope of survival, seek neutrality and thus deny us the use of its bases.

3. Bases most vulnerable to Soviet air and missile attack are those nearest the Soviet Union.

These two possibilities, neutrality and unavailability of bases, may leave us little choice other than to depend upon North American air and missile bases. Thus, the internationalists, whose passion is worldwide collective defense, may in the end, through force of necessity, be maneuvered into what they sarcastically call "the long discredited isolationist concept of Fortress America."

FALLACY NO. 4: THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH ARGUMENT THAT THE ARMING OF OTHER FREE NATIONS DOES NOT WEAKEN OUR OWN DEFENSE; IT GREATLY STRENGTHENS IT

The Red forces of the Soviet Union directly threaten the United States. There are three fearsome nuclear threats: from bomb-

ers flying over the Polar Cap, from ICBM fired over the Polar Cap, from IRBM fired from submarines.

Neither our allies nor our overseas troops have the capability of influencing these possible attacks. They can only be met by our forces, air power, missiles and the fleet. Only Americans can defend America.

Since World War II our military position in relation to that of the Soviet Union has changed so radically that a quick outline of events is indicated.

Our early postwar policy of containment of the Soviet Union was never a practical solution because of its almost interminable perimeter. However, until three or four years ago, with our strategic striking force, we possessed the ability to devastate the Soviet Union. The troops we sent overseas and the foreign aid we extended most certainly did not protect the countries concerned, yet our so-called investment in peace was not entirely thrown away because we had an effective war deterrent to protect it.

With this superior strategic striking force, we could safely participate in war and keep it local. Korea is the example.

Today, however, the Soviets have a strategic air force and a nuclear bomb stockpile which could inflict prompt and crippling damage anywhere on earth. In addition, the Soviets are building a missile force which in 2 or 3 years will be able to inflict instant and irreparable destruction against us and the free world before we could possibly retaliate with our long range bombers.

Therefore, it is wholly futile for us to extend surface aid to perimeter areas about the Soviet Union unless we have a superior strategic striking force in the United States. Unless we have such a force, it is obvious that the enemy could destroy the free world, even if our perimeter forces were to hold the line.

It is an awesome fact that within 2 or 3 years the Soviet strategic striking force will be equal and possibly superior to ours. Here are the facts, well known in Pentagon:

1. Three years ago the Soviets were producing intercontinental bombers—Bisons—at a faster rate than were we producing our B–52. At that time it appeared that by mid-1959 the Soviet's strategic bomber strength would have exceeded ours.

2. Today, however, Soviet Bison production has been slowed down so that our Strategic Air Force retains its supremacy over the Red Air Force.

3. Meanwhile, the Soviets have produced and tested the ICBM. Their facilities for production of this weapon, in comparison to our ICBM production program, are such that in 2 or 3 years the Soviets may enjoy an ICBM advantage over us in the ratio of 3 to 1.

Should this situation be allowed to eventuate, in 2 or 3 years the Soviets will have achieved ascendancy over us in strategic striking power. In this event, there is no successful strategy for us and our allies. A prerequisite to a successful strategy, both military and political, necessitates a superior American strategic striking force.

In less than 3 years, should we permit ourselves to be relegated to second place in strategic striking power, we and the free world will be at the mercy of the Kremlin dictators who are wholly without compassion. Unless we yielded to their demands, we and the free world would be open to attack and destruction.

It is obvious that the Soviets would attack us first rather than risk being struck by us while they were attacking other free world powers. During a strike against us our allies have no adequate means of coming to our rescue. They will be forced to seek neutrality or face destruction.

Each year the Soviet capability to destroy us grows because their strategic striking power is increasing faster than ours. Consequently, for our own defense and that of the free world, a vast major portion of our military resources must be put into building the best long range air and missile force in the world.

Without such a striking force, no matter how much military assistance we may extend to our allies, it will all be entirely futile.

Our strategic striking position in 2 or 3 years will be so precarious that we must start now materially to strengthen and augment our Strategic Air Command.

The question arises, Why have we not already started? The answer is—principally—we have not the funds.

Despite the fact that we have not the funds adequately to arm ourselves, the executive branch argues that "the arming of other nations does not weaken our own defense; on the contrary, it greatly strengthens it."

This statement is untrue. How can military assistance to free nations defend us against our only direct Red threat, an air-space-nuclear attack. This arming other free nations to strengthen our own defense has been preached so long and often that perhaps those who preach it have begun to believe.

Gen. Thomas S. Power, Commander of SAC, has protested the slim rations being allocated to his command. He has no operational ICBM. He warns that SAC is wearing out and we must start increased replacement now, but he has not the necessary funds. Yet you gentlemen of the Appropriations Committee are being urged not only to continue but to increase foreign military assistance.

At this point, I wish to inject another sinister situation into the defense picture. The report is authentic.

Recently our foremost intelligence experts have disclosed that in basic research having military application, the Soviets are making more rapid progress than is the United States. The more rapid Soviet progress results from their expenditures of unlimited money and effort on research within the Soviet Union. Our failure to make comparable or better progress is due to the fact that we are wasting our funds on various global projects rather than on basic military research within the United States which would eventually produce decisive weapons of the future.

If we and the free world are to survive, remedial action must be taken now to correct the following:

1. SAC, superior today, is wearing out. It needs more intercontinental bombers, more jet tankers, more dispersal areas, bomb proofs and a vastly stepped-up ICBM program. Funds are not available.

2. We are already in second place in basic research which has military application. Funds are not available to correct this lag.

This is no plea for more overall defense expenditures. Rather it is a plea for economy in defense. Remedial action can easily be effected by paring the budgets of our surface forces which are no longer decisive and by reducing foreign aid now by $2 billion. The savings thus made are more than sufficient to maintain American ascendancy in intercontinental bombers, missiles, and basic research.

Gentlemen of this committee, a good part of this most essential remedial action lies in your hands.

Thank you.

Resolution on TVA Bonding Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues in both the House and the Senate to a resolution recently adopted by the Michigan State Senate in opposition to H. R. 3460, the TVA bonding bill. This bill is due for early consideration on the floor of the Senate.

Following is the resolution:

SENATE RESOLUTION 71

A resolution relative to the Tennessee Valley Authority

Senators Steeh, Feenstra, Younger, Rozycki, Beadle, Christman, Fitzgerald, Lodge, Dehmel, Francis, Minnema, Prescott, Graebner, Stephens, and Hutchinson offered the following resolution:

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority, hereinafter referred to as TVA, was organized by act of Congress for the primary purpose of controling flood waters in the Tennessee Valley and the numerous streams tributaries thereof, and its incidental purpose was the generation of electric energy; and

Whereas TVA is now the largest thermal generating electric system in the world, with a generating capacity of approximately 10 million kilowatts and proposes to add substantial amounts to serve new territory, and with gross revenues during its fiscal period ending June 30, 1958, of $233,548,000; and

Whereas Congress has appropriated the aggregate sum of $1,200 million to TVA, of which approximately $100 million came from the State of Michigan through the payment of Federal taxes by citizens of this State; and

Whereas TVA, although engaged in a nongovernmental function, has not paid any interest upon the sums so appropriated by Congress, and its customers get the benefit of such subsidy; and

Whereas TVA has not made payments to the Federal Government to liquidate its indebtedness in accordance with the provisions of law; and

Whereas TVA in the generation of electric energy cannot be said to be engaged in governmental business, but rather in a nongovernmental business and in direct competition with private utilities, and as such should be compelled to pay the same taxes, be they Federal, State, or local, that any private business must pay; and

Whereas the said TVA is subsidized by the Federal Government, including the taxpayers of the State of Michigan, because it does not pay any Federal income taxes, and as an instrumentality of the U.S. Government it cannot be compelled to pay any State, local or any other Federal taxes, except those it may volunteer by negotiation or otherwise, to pay; and

Whereas these tax-supported subsidies enjoyed by TVA enables it to sell electric power at prices far below its actual cost and to sell such cheaply generated power at rates 30 to 50 percent below those which must be charged by private industry, and which when combined with the substantially lower labor rates prevalent in the same service area, gives to that area a tremendous competitive advantage which caused many industries to move to that subsidized area; and

Whereas TVA has caused to be introduced H.R. 3460 now before the U.S. Senate, the purpose of which would be to authorize TVA to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of further expanding its system in an amount not exceeding $750 million, the income from which will be exempt from any income tax and thereby affording the basis for further competition with private industry; and

Whereas the existence of the foregoing subsidies (freedom from income taxes, or interest, property taxes) was made apparent in a speech before the American Power Conference by TVA Chairman Herbert D. Vogel on March 21, 1956, at which time he said:

"A number of factors, aside from taxes, interest, and profit are favorable to lower power costs in the Tennessee Valley region, and it is upon those that I shall attempt to focus attention. Nevertheless, I cannot ignore the very real advantage accruing to any system which operates for minimum earning rather than normal profit and which is not required by law to pay interest on its obligations or income taxes to the Federal Government. In all fairness, it must be admitted that these result in consumer advantages not enjoyed by customers of private power companies. Any talk about establishing a measure for the cost of power without reference to these factors is, of course, absurd."; and

Whereas in recent years various civic and quasi-governmental bodies within the service area of TVA has visited cities in the State of Michigan and again this year with well-prepared advertising, solicited Michigan taxpayers to locate their business or industry within the service area of the TVA, advocating as an inducement the lower electric, but subsidized, power rates of the TVA, which places the citizens of this State at a distinct disadvantage; and

Whereas the press of this State has rendered a distinct public service and for which it should be complimented, when it published this grossly unfair and inequitable subsidization of TVA, upon the basis of which those resident in the TVA service area now solicit the employers of labor in Michigan to remove their business to that service area because of lower electric rates, lower labor rates and other lesser reasons, all of which would not otherwise have been called to the attention of the public or otherwise given the attention such preferential treatment deserves: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, That its members record their objections to H.R. 3460 and recommend to the U.S. Senators elected by the people of this State, that they cast a negative vote against H.R. 3460, unless H.R. 3460 is amended to provide for the following:

1. TVA shall be compelled to charge such rates as the Federal Power Commission may determine adequate to permit of the repayment to the U.S. Treasury over a period of not more than 40 years of the aggregate of all sums appropriated, together with interest thereon, computed annually at a rate which will reflect the average interest cost to the Federal Government upon such borrowings by it in excess of 10 years; and

2. Any securities issued by TVA when authorized by Congress shall be subject to Federal income taxes; and

3. The assets of TVA shall be subject to tax by State and local units of government within which such assets might be located; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to each member of the Michigan delegation to the Congress of the United States.

FRED I. CHASE,
Secretary of the Senate.

Adopted by the senate, July 2, 1959.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, foHowing is my newsletter of July 4, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)

Congress' legislative boxscore shows the House well along in the year's necessary work, while the Senate lags behind. True, many controversal issues remain, including depressed areas aid, Federal education aid, labor reform, minimum wage, unemployment compensation, and civil rights, these in addition to those bills not yet signed by the President though passed by House and Senate, such as the housing bill. Yet the basic work, the appropriation bills (except for foreign aid and military construction) have passed the House. The Senate has five appropriations to go (defense, foreign aid, military construction, public works, and supplemental). These, too, could be accelerated, if the Senate leadership chose to do so.

The real question is, how many of the controversal issues will be taken up this year or allowed to go over until the 2d session of the 2-year 86th Congress, remembering that 1960 is a presidential year and several Senators are trying to build records for campaigning. A most significant development of this Congress has been the effectiveness of the President's threat of a veto tied to the fiscal responsibility of a balanced budget in stopping the big spending liberals right in their tracks. The mood of the citizens is causing the spenders to think twice before insisting on deficit spending as a cure for every pain. Congress could well be in session through Labor Day, or later, while the leadership tries to create and develop some campaign issues.

The Korean war corporate and excise tax extension came back to the House for a vote after the House and Senate conferees met, and two Senate amendments were adopted. The Senate added amendments that would (1) cut the transportation tax in half, and (2) repeal the Federal tax on local telephone service, both tax cuts to take effect July 1960. Well, here were two very popular tax cuts which everyone would like to remove. But look at the facts. First, both these tax cuts were not related in any way to the Korean tax extension but were added by the Senate. The Constitution specifically states that all tax matters must originate in the House. What would you do on such a vote? Many constituents have urged these tax cuts, yet they come to us posing this problem of constitutionality. What's the right course, and is it the same as the political course? Further considerations included: (1) It hardly seems praiseworthy to propose tax cuts when (a) we are already $1 billion in the hole this year, and (b) programs passed this year carry $2.5 billion more spending next year when these tax cuts would take effect. It simply shows Congress is not yet disciplining itself to living within a balanced budget and Congress will not do so, I predict, unless we have a constitutional amendment forcing us to do so, or unless revenues soar faster than expected (so we couldn't have spent that, too).

The labor bill controversy continues unabated with daily semantics and committee performances replacing, but not burying, the earlier exposures of the McClellan Committee of racketeering, abuse of power, violence, corruption and graft—at the expense of the public and sometimes the union members themselves. Consider these related items: (1) A union worker's bill of rights—guaranteeing to the worker free speech and assembly, the right to sue, freedom from arbitrary dues and assessments, and safeguards against disciplinary action—was voted down by the Senate, but we all know the workers deserve these protections; (2) union power has come from Federal laws, (not collective bargaining); (3) a real struggle is taking place between union leaders and union members; (4) the racketeering exposures before the McClellan committee brought a flood of mail from rank and file union members asking for legislation correcting labor leader abuses of power; (5) racketeer picketing and secondary boycotts can destroy our economy, as can price control by union action; (6) employer and industry collusion with labor unions is frequent and detrimental, for example, to the public in price control, to the union member, whenever the national organization takes away his local bargaining rights through pattern or industry-wide bargaining.

So I introduced H.R. 8003 to offset the present immunity the labor unions enjoy from antitrust law. Providing injunctive relief, rather than criminal penalty, this bill, if adopted, would bring relief from the two distinct ways union monopoly manifests itself: (1) Restrictive trade practices such as price fixing, restrictions on use of new processes, exclusive of products from the market, etc. Example: A milk drivers' union can establish fixed price list for milk and force local dairies to conform, under penalty of drivers' strike, thus fixing prices; same price-fixing forbidden employers under antitrust laws; (2) enforcement of wage demands through industry-wide and pattern bargaining practices. Example: Local unions may enforce demands by traditional economic weapons of bargaining and striking. That's all right, but nationwide or areawide racketeer picketing, and secondary boycotts, regardless of the economic harm to the public, become an unlawful restraint of trade, which this bill would prohibit. In a nutshell this bill would simply subject unions to the same ground rules already applicable to business enterprises.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Independence Day Address by Hon. Ernest Gruening, of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on July 4 I had the honor of presenting to the city of Philadelphia, at Independence Hall, the flag bearing for the first time our 49th star. It has been 37 years since we have celebrated such a momentous occasion.

Philadelphia welcomed as its principal speaker of the day the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska, Mr. ERNEST GRUENING.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the full text of Senator GRUENING's Independence Day address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDEPENDENCE DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING, OF ALASKA, AT INDEPENDENCE HALL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., ON JULY 4, 1959

It is a rare privilege that you have accorded me in asking me to address you on this occasion, or, perhaps, to use the English language more precisely, a unique privilege.

For this is no ordinary Fourth of July.

This is an Independence Day ceremony which, in several important respects, is unprecedented—and therefore, unique.

We are celebrating the admission to the Union of the largest State in American history.

We are celebrating the admission of an area larger than it ever before admitted to the Union in any one year—an area one-fifth as large as the older 48 States.

We are celebrating the admission to the Union of a State that extends American dominion and full citizenship, and all concomitant blessings that American citizenship implies, to America's farthest west and America's farthest north.

Thus, we are celebrating the extension, for the first time in history, of the Union north into the Arctic and west into the Eastern Hemisphere. This is new terrain for the family of States.

We are celebrating the admission to the Union, for the first time, of a noncontiguous area—this is the first time that we have taken into the family of States territory which did not touch the rectangular block that hitherto has constituted the Union.

We are celebrating the admission of a new State after 46 years without such evidence of growth and expansion. Thirteen years was previously the longest interval between the admission of States.

These geographical and historical data imply a great deal more than their mere recital reveals. Behind these physical facts lie far more important symbolic and spiritual connotations. These are, first, that the United States is not static, not limited, not complete; but, on the contrary, is dynamic, growing, and on the march.

How significant is this?

It is true that throughout our history the voices of doubt and pessimism about the future of our Republic have been raised.

It would surprise many of you to know that the prophets of gloom and doom were heard almost as soon as our Nation was founded. History has repeatedly proven them completely mistaken.

It the last 2 years, alarm has been expressed—especially since the Russian achievements in outer space—that the United States had reached its peak of power and influence. In not a few places was the fear voiced that despite our great material achievements, our position of eminence in the world, our vast resources, our proved potentials and capabilities, our pioneering and leadership in many fields, all these had reached a climax and an apex from which recession would before long begin.

Comparisons have been made with ancient Rome, which, while apparently at the zenith of its imperial power and glory, was being insidiously corroded within by luxury and Sybaritic living, and was shortly to succumb to the onslaught of the cruder and tougher barbarians. Parallels have been latterly drawn to forecast that similarly, our luxurious, high standards of American living, and a consequent softness which this way of life presumably predicates, will cause us ere long to succumb to the ruthless aggressiveness of the hordes, mobilized by the governments in Moscow and Peiping—hordes unused to the refinements of Western civilization.

While it is well never to underrate one's opponents—and it is clear that at the present time the enemies of our freedom and of the whole free world lie in the rulerships of the totalitarian Communist police states—I boldly assert my conviction that the event that we are particularly celebrating today furnishes a substantial refutation of the apprehension that Uncle Sam is shortly to begin to dodder and to enter dotage.

Within the short space of 1 year, the United States has admitted the 49th and 50th States—Alaska and Hawaii. And while technically, Hawaii is not yet in the Union, and while officially, the new Old Glory we are unfurling here today signalizes the admission only of the 49th State—Alaska—we would be remiss in not hailing this double achievement.

For while Alaska's admission extends the frontiers of democracy to America's farthest North and farthest West, Hawaii's admission extends them to America's farthest South.

While Alaska's admission extends America into the Arctic, Hawaii's admission extends it into the tropics.

The Union's boundaries a year ago extended between approximately the 67th meridian and 125th meridian of longitude west and the parallels of approximately 25 degrees north latitude and 49 degrees north latitude. Now, they extend between approximately 67 degrees west longitude and 173 degrees east longitude and the parallels of approximately 19 degrees north to 73 degrees north latitude.

But the geographical extension is not the significant aspect of these achievements. The totalitarian police states have likewise enlarged their dominion. Within the lifetime of many living, we have seen the rulers of the Kremlin extend their brutal tyranny over a dozen formerly free and independent nations. Within a few weeks, we have seen the masters of Peiping invade and conquer the formerly free land of Tibet.

In contrast, the United States has to its new States extended that most basic of American principles—the principle of government by consent of the governed. What a contrast between Uncle Sam's treatment of his former dependencies—which is what Alaska and Hawaii, under Territorial status, have been—and the Russian treatment of Hungary and the Chinese treatment of Tibet.

There is a special significance in our two extensions. Alaska was formerly Russian-America; and but for the wisdom and vision of William H. Seward, Secretary of State in President Lincoln's and President Johnson's Cabinets, Alaska might still be groaning under the Kremlin's heel.

We can stand today on the shores of the Alaskan mainland and look across the Bering Strait and see the headlands of Siberia. Only 54 miles separate these two areas; but what a world of contrast in the lives of their peoples.

In the Bering Sea are two islands, only 2½ miles apart—the Diomedes. The international dateline passes between them. Little Diomede is American; Big Diomede is Russian. A couple of decades ago, these two islands were sparsely inhabited by Eskimos. They visited freely, paddling across the narrow Strait between them in the summertime in kayaks or oomiaks—the two varieties of native skinboats—or crossing over on the ice bridge which furnished a passageway between them for 8 months of the year. When the Iron Curtain descended upon Russia, the Soviet authorities evacuated their Eskimos, uprooted them from where they had lived, and removed them to the mainland of Siberia. The Eskimos of Little Diomede, on the other hand, were proud to enroll themselves as volunteers in the Alaska Territorial Guard during World War II, and eager thereafter to serve their Territory, and now State and Nation, as members of the Alaska National Guard. History and geography furnish here, on the northwestern edge of our continent, the great contrast between the two systems, theirs and ours.

In Hawaii, our 50th State, you will find a meeting of East and West. There, united in the common ideology that is America's proudest heritage—the heritage of individual liberty, of freedom of speech, press, assembly, and worship, that are guaranteed us by the Bill of Rights—is the finest example of ethnic democracy to be found not only under the American flag, but anywhere on earth. There, the races of East and West have mingled. To the Polynesian inhabitants whom the early explorers found there at the very end of the 18th century came the New England missionaries, and uniting with the aboriginal inhabitants, created a culture that is beautifully diverse in its outer aspects, but completely saturated with the principles of democracy.

To these islands came people from the Orient—from China, from Japan, from Korea, from the Philippines—who, as citizens of the 50th State, will constitute a bridge between East and West, contrary to Rudyard Kipling's pronouncement that East and West will never meet. They have met here, they

will continue to meet here, under the flag which we are raising today, and which, a year from today, will display its 50th star.

Now, the inclusion of the 49th and 50th stars today, and a year from today, demonstrate the most striking and unique fact about the American flag. It is the only flag which grows with the growth of the Nation. While its basic design remains unchanged, it does change just sufficiently in one recurring detail to record the amazing growth from a thin fringe of colonies along the Atlantic seaboard to the mighty Nation that the United States has become.

Indeed, each additional star represents a verse in the American epic, and it is appropriate, on this occasion, when a new star has been added, to emphasize that point and bring out the close relationship between the American flag and the Union whose emblem it is.

As we all know, our flag received its design 182 years ago from the Continental Congress. The Congress properly decided that the thirteen Colonies which had banded together to form our Nation should be represented both by the alternating red and white stripes and by the 13 stars in the Canton or Union of the Flag. For a time, it was assumed that each new State would be recorded by an additional star and additional stripe, and when our first two States were admitted—Vermont and Kentucky, in 1791 and 1792, respectively—our flag had 15 stars and 15 stripes.

But Congress soon realized that an additional star in the blue firmament provided adequate recognition for a new State; that likewise adding a new stripe for each State would not only entail needless duplication, but would, in time, diminish the beauty of design of the flag by overburdening it with stripes. Likewise, this duplication would destroy the great historic symbolism inherent in the memory of the Original Thirteen Colonies and the Original Thirteen States. Therefore, 141 years ago, the Congress returned to its original formula, which persists to this day—namely, 13 stripes forever, and an additional star for each new State.

Thirty-seven stars have been added to the original 13. But that does not mean that our flagmakers have had to make 37 different flags and 37 times scrap those on hand. A sufficient number of States came in at one time so that changes had to be made, or will have to be made, only about 27 times instead of 37. No historical museum could collect more than 27 different American flags because they do not exist.

In the nearly three-quarters of a century between the formation of the Union and the Civil War, not a few States came in in pairs. The dates of their admission did not coincide exactly, but their joint entry into statehood was prearranged, and by design.

Each star that has been added to our flag represents a stirring chapter in our history. each new star signalized a step in the progress of mankind. Each star incarnates a portion of the hopes, the struggles, the trials and errors, the quest for goals, and the achievements that together constitute the American saga.

It is, I believe, the greatest epic of all time. It is the greatest epic because it stories the untrammelled efforts of freemen—freer than any of their predecessors in the pageant of history—to work out their own destiny.

So we must not think of our flag only as an emblem. We must not think of it merely as a symbol, though of course it is very much a symbol—a symbol of everything that our American faith embodies. But we should think of it also as a symposium of great adventures—adventures of mind and heart and body—a recording of past performance, proudly raised on high for each coming generation to look up to, ever a summons to present obligation and a guide to future conduct.

We cannot identify any one of the 13 stripes with any one of the Original Thirteen States. We might have done so—or might do so—if someone wished arbitrarily to relate each stripe from the top of the flag down to each State in the chronological order of its adherence to the Union. That would assign to Delaware, our oldest State, the topmost stripe. It would award to Pennsylvania the second stripe from the top. Rhode Island's would be the stripe at the lower edge of the flag since it was the 13th State to sign up.

It was wholly appropriate that Delaware, the first State to enter the Union, should adopt as its motto, "Liberty and Independence." Perhaps this is the time and place to advert to the fact that Pennsylvania which decided to enter the Union 5 days after Delaware, amplified Delaware's ringing words "Liberty and Independence" by preceding them with the word "virtue," so that as you all know, the Keystone State's motto is: "Virtue, Liberty and Independence." Possibly the 5-day interval between Delaware's signing of the Constitution on December 7, 1787, and Pennsylvania's adherence on December 12, led Benjamin Franklin and his colleagues in the Pennsylvania delegation to reflect that they already had liberty and independence and needed to prescribe virtue additionally to safeguard and amplify the blessings of their new-found freedom. It might be worth mentioning that the motto of the third State to ratify, 6 days after Pennsylvania—New Jersey—was "Liberty and Prosperity." Thus was perhaps illustrated the rapidity of progress in our national infancy—all in the course of 11 days—from the newly achieved "Liberty and Independence" hailed by Delaware, to the addition of "virtue" by Pennsylvania, and the substitution by New Jersey for Pennsylvania's somewhat austere prescription of "virtue," the less arduous and perhaps more alluring goal of "prosperity."

Incidentally, those three first States—Delaware, your own State of Pennsylvania, and New Jersey—all contiguous to each other, were the only States to join the Union in 1787. Not until after the New Year, 1788, had begun, did the others follow. Here in the very heart of the new-born Republic, midway between New Hampshire to the north and Georgia, to the south, were the pioneer States, the first three to pledge their allegiance to the Constitution and flag of the United States.

I wonder that no one has thought to form an inner club, an exclusive order within some of the sons and daughters of yesteryear, entitling it: "The Joiners of 1787." Something analogous to its occurred a century later in Alaska. There, in what Alaskans fondly call the last frontier, "pioneering," a beloved word, dates from the days of '98 romantically eternalized in the verse of Robert W. Service and the short stories of Jack London. 'Ninety-eight was the year of the great gold rush that followed the discovery of gold in the Klondike. No candidate for public office in Alaska fails to claim—if he can truthfully do so—that he was a '98 pioneer. But several years ago, a charming lady, a candidate for Alaska's Territorial House of Representatives, proclaimed in her political advertisements that she was an '87 pioneer. She had been carried across the Chilkoot Pass in that year as a babe in arms, 11 years before the Klondike. She did not want to be mistaken for any of the Johnny-come-latelys of '98. She was elected.

It would perhaps be painting the lily to pursue further the theme of the rapid progressiveness of the sentiments in the subsequently enrolling States mottoes, but it may be worth noting that Georgia, the fourth State, which came in on Januarry 2, 1788, apparently considered "Liberty and Independence" now achieved, no longer timely, and instead looked to the future with the motto: "Wisdom, Justice, Moderation." May "The Empire State of the South" achieve them. They are desirable goals for any State.

If it is not customary to associate any one of the 13 stripes in our flag with any of the original 13 States, it is even more impossible to attach any one of the 49 stars to a given State. Yet we might well view the addition of each star to our flag as much more than a minor and automatic change on a piece of bunting. Rather, we should think of what lay behind that star, what preceded the admission of the new State that star represents, hail it as we would a great new star in the heavens, and reflect on the cosmic forces that brought it into being.

Who can relive the story of Vermont's gallant struggle for self-determination which culminated in its entering the Union as the 14th State—the first additional star in the flag—without sensing that the Green Mountain boys were renacting on the home ground our own epoch-making revolution? From the outbreak of the War of Independence, Vermont was master of its destiny and determined to remain so. In those 4 years, between 1787 and 1791, Vermont had not had Territorial status. It had steadfastly maintained its independence against the claims of adequate New Hampshire and of powerful New York, which Vermonters were prepared to resist, if need be, by arms. Likewise, Vermont rejected the tendered blandishment of union with Canada. It would join our Union, but only as an equal, as a sovereign State.

And now, early in our history, we come to the first of those interesting arrangements in which sectional balancing played a great part. For while Vermont was resisting the claims of two already established States, pioneers settled across the Appalachians in land belonging to Virginia, were trying similarly to free themselves from the grasp of Old Dominion, then by far the most populous—and by that token the most powerful—of all the 13 States. There had been not fewer than 10 conventions of representatives from Virginia and from the embryonic State of Kentucky in a vain effort to reach a solution. Finally, in 1791, under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson, a provision which satisfied conflicting claims and regional rivalry was achieved for the admission of both States, Vermont and Kentucky. This solution was reflected in a bit of doggerel which originated in a Pennsylvania newspaper and was widely reprinted in the press of that period:

"Kentucky to the Union given,
Vermont will make the balance even;
Still Pennsylvania holds the scales
And neither South nor North prevails."

Thus, those first two new stars in the flag—the 14th and 15th—marked not only the advent of two States, but, with the admission of Kentucky, the beginning of the westward march that has so profoundly shaped the American character and contributed such unique quality to our American life.

The next three States—Tennessee in 1796, Ohio in 1803, and Louisiana in 1812—were admitted separately, but widely varying and unprecedented conditions accompanied the admission of each. The frontiersmen occupying the region south of Kentucky, and belonging to North Carolina, as I have pointed out, impatient at the delay in granting them admission to the Union, first set up a State of their own and called it Franklin, honoring your greatest Pennsylvanian. But receiving no invitation to join the Union from the first three Congresses, they assumed the initiative, drafted a constitution for the future State of Tennessee, elected two Senators, and sent them here to knock at the door of Congress for admission. They were successful. In a few months, in 1796, Tennessee became the third new State.

With Ohio, represented by the 17th star, the frontier advanced across the Alleghenies north as well as south, ushering in the birth of that great American region known—perhaps not too exactly—as the Middle West. In Ohio, also, Virginia acquired a rival mother of presidents.

Before the next State, Louisiana, added the 18th star to our flag, President Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase had doubled the extent of American territory, and extended its western border to the Rockies.

Now there was a return to sectional balancing into which the issue of free versus slave States had crept, with the admission in 1816 of Indiana and in 1817 of Mississippi, represented by the 19th and 20th stars.

The same pattern was followed shortly thereafter by the admission of Illinois in 1818 and Alabama in 1819, our 21st and 22d stars.

By now, the slavery issue in relation to the admission of new States had become more acute and led to the Missouri Compromise—an important milestone in our history, dealing with problems happily no longer existing. By it, Maine was admitted as a free State in 1820, our 23d star, and Missouri, our 24th star, in 1821 as a slave State but with certain limitations, while thereafter all future States west of the Mississippi River and north of 36°30′ were pledged to freedom.

Thereafter the free versus slave State issue would, for a time, dominate every new State's admission. Arkansas, a slave State, came in in 1836, Michigan, its offset, a free State, in 1837—our 25th and 26th stars—and following the same pattern, Florida in 1845 and Iowa in 1846, our 27th and 29th stars. For in between, Texas, in 1845, under unprecedented and dramatic circumstances, following its victorious war of independence, had come into the Union, bringing its own Lone Star with it, and, surprisingly, not insisting that when added to our flag that star should be bigger than all the rest, but reserving the right to divide itself into five States. Alaskans have been waiting breathlessly to see whether Texas will do it.

By this time, the irrepressible conflict was looming larger and the balancing in the admission of northern and southern States ceased. Texas was the last slave State admitted. Wisconsin placed the 30th star in the flag in 1848.

California, having loosened its bonds from Mexico, set up its own republic, was briefly under U.S. military rule, and scorning even a temporary condition of territorialism, was admitted to the Union in 1850. Its star—the 31st—marked the extension of American dominion to the Pacific.

Minnesota came next in 1858, followed by Oregon in 1859 and Kansas in 1861, respectively the 32d, 33d, and 34th stars in the flag.

The next two States were war babies. They were the direct consequences of the Civil War. When Virginia seceded in 1861, the State's 40 western counties voted to remain loyal to the Union, rejected the action taken at Richmond, and set up an independent State with the capital at Wheeling. W. Va., as these secessionists from secession called it, which was admitted to the Union in 1863. Probably no State was born under more stirring circumstances than was this neighbors of your to the south and west. Its motto—Montani Semper Liberi (Mountaineers Always Free) both renews the aspiration for freedom voiced in the days of our War for Independence and reveals that West Virginia has the highest average altitude of any State east of the Rockies.

Nevada was brought into the Union in 1864 by President Lincoln to help him secure ratification of the 13th amendment to the Constitution which abolished slavery. Perhaps we might, with poetic license, call these two—the 35th and 36th stars—"Shooting Stars." They came into the Union amid the booming of cannon on the farflung battlefields, and as a direct consequence of that bloody family quarrel.

Nebraska followed in 1867, and Colorado in 1876. Dakota Territory was divided into two States in 1889, and in the same year Montana and Washington came into the Union. Idaho and Wyoming followed the next years, 1890. Six States in 2 years. Utah was added in 1896; Oklahoma in 1907, and the last two States, up to this time—New Mexico and Arizona—in 1912, brought the field of blue to yesterday's galaxy of 48 stars.

Now, a few concluding words about our 49th and 50th States and stars.

William H. Seward, who was really the author of Alaska's entry into the United States, had a great vision of extending the American idea all over this continent. It was not mere territorial acquisition that concerned him. Into the Treaty of Cession he wrote:

"The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States."

Decades later, we Alaskans held up this statement before the Congress as a solemn pledge and promise. We argued—and, I am convinced, logically—that only by statehood could the inhabitants of Alaska be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States. Actually, as a Territory, Alaska suffered an indifference, a neglect, and downright discrimination by the Federal Government which led to an increasing determination on the part of these frontiersmen of Alaska to achieve the full equality of statehood.

The first Alaska statehood bill was introduced in 1916 by James Wickersham, one of our early delegates, for, as a Territory, Alaska could be represented in the Congress by only a voteless Delegate in the House of Representatives. Of course, the bill did not even get out of committee. In the early 1940's, statehood bills were again introduced in the House by the then Delegate, Anthony J. Dimond, and in the Senate by Senator William Langer, of North Dakota, and Senator Pat McCarran, of Nevada. These bills likewise did not get out of committee. In 1945, I had the opportunity to present to the Alaska Territorial Legislature a recommendation for a bill providing for a referendum in the coming election to determine officially the wishes of the people of Alaska concerning statehood. The legislation was adopted, and at the 1946 election, the people of Alaska voted that they wanted statehood. That was the beginning of our present drive. President Truman enthusiastically endorsed statehood—the first President to do so—recommending, in his first state of the Union message in 1946, enabling legislation to the Congress, even before the vote of the people of Alaska had been recorded. Thereafter, our voteless Delegate in the House introduced a statehood bill in every session of Congress. It was passed by the House in one session, but failed on action in the Senate. Meanwhile, we were all working to mobilize public sentiment, which soon ran way ahead of congressional action.

In 1955, the Alaska Legislature, impatient at the delays, decided on bold action. It passed an act providing for a constitutional convention which would draft a constitution for the State of Alaska, and appropriated $300,000 for that purpose, scorning the advice of the timid and prudent that if Alaska waited until Congress acted, the Federal Government would pay the cost of this convention. A speedy election for delegates followed, and they were elected on a nonpartisan basis. Fifty-five delegates—the same historic number that met here in Philadelphia in 1787 to draft the Constitution of the United States—met at the University of Alaska near Fairbanks in 1955, and drafted a constitution which political scientists declare to be at least the equal of any existing State charter. The people ratified it at the next election. They went further. At this same election they approved an ordinance which authorized the people of Alaska to nominate and elect two U.S. Senators and a Representative and send them to Washington to work for statehood. In doing this, we were following an ancient, but generally forgotten, precedent. In 1796, the people living west of the Appalachians and south of Kentucky, which then belonged to the State of North Carolina, were becoming impatient because the first three Congresses did not admit their area to statehood. They drew up a constitution and elected two Senators, and sent them to the National Capital—which was then Philadelphia—to work for statehood. They were successful. We therefore called our procedure the Alaska-Tennessee plan, after its originators, the pioneer mountaineers of Tennessee. A similar procedure was followed by Michigan, by Iowa, by California, by Minnesota, by Oregon, and by Kansas. Similarly, three of us were elected by Alaskans. We went to Washington and were successful in persuading a majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress to pass a statehood bill in the 85th Congress.

And once the ice had been broken, figuratively speaking, it was not difficult to bring in the last of the incorporated Territories—our sister in the Pacific, Hawaii. In all fairness, it should be said that Hawaii was ready for statehood long before Alaska—it had met the basic tests earlier and should have been admitted before Alaska. But Alaskans were happy and proud to play an active part in bringing in the 50th State. We worked just as hard to bring in Hawaii as we had to bring in Alaska.

But I will leave the telling of Hawaii's gallant struggle to whoever succeeds me on this occasion a year hence.

However, you will see, from what I have said, that there is a great story behind the placement of each new star in our flag. Each star is a condensation of that story. Each, while different, is a saga of aspiration and effort, of sacrifice and struggle—all primarily for one basic purpose—the application of that principle proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. It was proclaimed as an unalienable right in this city in the Declaration of Independence. It guided our forefathers in the founding of the Republic. It has guided all of us to national greatness.

As I pointed out earlier, in one respect our flag is unique. While it is one of the oldest national emblems on earth—older than any other in the New World and out-aged by very few in the old—it is the only flag which, while unaltered in basic design, yet changes progressively. It is the only flag which is not static. It records the birth of our Nation; it codifies the Nation's growth from infancy to maturity.

So, I would say to any of those who, in moods of depression or doubt, fear that our great civilization is in danger of decline, atrophy or decay, they can find in the flag not merely the inspiration, but the visible and tangible proof that America, the land which we love, and the idea that we cherish, is secure. As the 49 stars are unfurled in the breeze, we can lift our eyes and our hearts in the confident knowledge that the best is yet to come.

Old Maestro Looks for Alaska Nickname

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Old Maestro Looks for Alaska Nickname," which appeared in the April 14 issue of the Anchorage Daily Times, Anchorage, Alaska.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Anchorage Daily Times, April 14, 1959]

OLD MAESTRO LOOKS FOR ALASKA NICKNAME

Barnee Breeskin, the popular maestro who presided for a decade in the blue room of the Shoreham Hotel, at Washington, D.C., has suggested a nickname for the new State of Alaska.

He says Australia is known throughout the world as "down under." He thinks Alaska should be the converse and become known as "up over."

Barnee, now a public relations man in the Nation's Capital, came up with that idea after returning from a trip to Latin America in behalf of Pan American World Airways. He made a survey of the airline's hotels and the services they render.

At first hearing, the nickname "Up Over" sounds strange. It is not the sort of name that clicks immediately.

But it does have certain attractions that should be considered. "Up" conjures up the prevailing conception of Alaska as up north, up high on the map, up near the top of the globe.

"Over" brings to mind the fact that Alaska is over the top of the globe instead of on the side the way one ordinarily looks at it. It also ties in with the new global air routes that go over the North Pole, over the Arctic ice pack, over the top of the world to the continent of Europe.

It lacks glamour, no doubt, but that did not prevent Australia's "down under" from catching on. Down under has become popular reference to that part of the world.

As far as Alaskans are concerned, the world seems to be in and out. Anything inside Alaska is in and anything outside is out. Any member of the Alaska fraternity understands the words when used in this connotation.

"Where are you going?"

"Out."

If you meet an Alaskan outside and ask when he is going in, he knows what you are talking about without explanation.

But in the language of the world, in and out has not clicked. Too many people who are outside don't realize they are out at all.

You can meet any worldy traveler and refer to "down under." He knows what you are talking about. Maybe the day could come when the destination "up over" has the same worldwide recognition as a specific reference to Alaska.

It will take some hard pushing by Alaskans to get the phrase accepted if it is going to be accepted.

While Barnee was visiting Latin America and thinking about this Alaska nickname, Alaskans have been more concerned with a name for the old 48 States than they have for their own.

Outside can no longer be stateside because inside is also stateside. The old 48 is common. The smaller 48 is heard frequently. The South or southern 48 is also used.

One intriguing reference to the other States is Little America. It was coined, as far as we know, by our own Muktuk Marston. He says it's Little America because it is composed of the smaller States of the Union.

Admission of Hawaii will bring new name problems. Hawaii is due south of Alaska. Should we call is South America? What becomes of the other South America? It must be either Souther America, Far South America, or even Southeast America because it is east as well as south.

We will leave all this to Barnee, along with the problem of what happens to the Pacific Northwest now that Alaska is the true Pacific Northwest. Are Washington and Oregon to be known as the Middle West, and California the Southwest?

Then what becomes of the old Middle West and Southwest? From the Alaska vantage point, the Middle West is now the Near East, and the Altantic coast is the Far East. And the old Southwest must be the Near Southeast.

Barnee was a booster for Alaska way back in the days when this great State was nothing but a Territory. He took verses written by Alaskans, set them to music and played them as a welcome for Alaskans when they visited the Blue Room for dinner and entertainment.

It is grand to know that Barnee, upon returning to the Far East from his trip into Southern America, is still thinking of "up over."

The Garrison Diversion Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, many great water projects have been completed or have been under construction in the Missouri Basin during the past 15 years. This is a part of the Pick-Sloan plan, which envisioned great development for this fabulous area including irrigation, navigation, flood protective works, water for municipalities, and low cost electrical power.

Until recently all the interests of the Missouri Basin were united in the belief that there was an ample water supply for all of these multiple purposes under the Pick-Sloan plan. Some opposition has been developing in recent weeks to indicate that some downstream groups are beginning to lose interest in the needs of the upstream States since the huge reservoirs inundating hundreds of thousands of acres of good farm land and providing flood protection for these downstream States, are nearing completion.

Mr. President, the Minot Daily News of Minot, N. Dak., under date of Friday, July 3, 1959, contains an editorial on this subject which I think makes a lot of sense. It is entitled "A Matter of Keeping Faith."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minot (N. Dak.) Daily News, July 3, 1959]

A MATTER OF KEEPING FAITH

This is a big country. In most of its problems as they come to light in popular debate there is much more than meets the eye. How wrong sometimes are the faraway attempts to apply a general principle to the merits of a particular case.

We should not be too harsh with the Washington Post and Times Herald for failure to understand the historical justification of the Garrison diversion project. Editorially these newspapers have lumped this North Dakota project with a number of others, criticizing reclamation projects in general. The ground of the criticism is the thought that it is inconsistent for the Nation to be building new projects to increase productivity at a time when payments are being offered to keep other croplands idle.

The fact not appreciated is that the proposed Garrison diversion in North Dakota is part of a program which already has taken nearly 500,000 acres of North Dakota land out of production. In other words, North Dakota sacrificed that much good bottom land and prime grazing land to permit the Garrison Dam to be constructed on the Missouri. The diversion project takes the form of a recompense for lands already removed from the production of agricultural surpluses. It will be unjust if the Federal Government, having offered Garrison diversion in exchange for other lands condemned or purchased, fails to carry out its part of the bargain.

This land was removed from North Dakota tax rolls, mind you, depriving the State and counties and school districts of a source of revenue. We feel quite certain no one has pointed out this fact to the Post and Times Herald. On the promise that there would be irrigation development to replace this loss of public and private resources, North Dakotans went to bat to help obtain for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation a congressional agreement for a Garrison reservoir pool level of 1,850-foot elevation. That required the acquisition of a considerable amount of additional land above the 1,830-foot level which would not have been required otherwise. Certainly the Post and Times Herald do not suppose there would have been support for taking this additional land out of production, had it not been for assurance of stabilizing the economy of other acreages through irrigation.

When the Post and Times Herald suggest that there is nothing to stop North Dakota from undertaking its own irrigation project, it is clear there is no appreciation of the feeling here that, in reality, North Dakota has already made its investment. And the investment in lands taken out of production is the kind of investment for which the Post and Times Herald are asking.

And in addition to the half million acres of reservoir land, consideration must be given to the fact irrigation in North Dakota will remove thousands of wheat acres to other crops, some of which might be sugar beets now supplied from Cuba.

As we said, we are not disposed to feel bitter toward the Post and Times Herald for the view expressed in the editorial. It was, in the main, a temperate expression of a general viewpoint which has to be taken into account these days. It did not single out the North Dakota project as one which is especially vulnerable. But at the same time it missed an opportunity to show that the North Dakota project can be, and is, justified on the very grounds on which the general

criticism was leveled. Sensing that the Post and Times Herald meant to be fair, we would like to see their editors take a second look at the facts of this project.

Larger Oregon State Park at Historic Fort Stevens Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, my home State of Oregon has one of the best and largest State-managed park systems in the United States. This is a reflection of the interest which all Oregonians have in preserving the great natural beauty of the area in which they live. Despite the development of many State parks, proposals continue for adding to the existing system. One such suggestion was unveiled recently in an able editorial published in the Albany Democrat-Herald.

The proposal urges State purchase of surplus Federal land at Fort Stevens. This idea certainly merits consideration, because such a move would greatly improve an already established State park area, Fort Stevens State Park, at the mouth of the Columbia River. An informative article in the July 1959 issue of Ford Times, by an Oregon newspaperman, Mr. Ben Maxwell, of Salem, describes the beauty and special attractions of Fort Stevens State Park. The scenic features described by Mr. Maxwell are illustrated in the magazine by some outstanding paintings by Mr. Ernest Richardson, a gifted Oregon artist. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD with my remarks, the editorial from the Albany Democrat-Herald, entitled "Take Another Look," and the Ford Times article by Mr. Ben Maxwell, entitled "The Park at Fort Stevens."

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Albany (Oreg.) Democrat-Herald]

TAKE ANOTHER LOOK

Notice has been given that the General Services Administration is offering for sale another portion of the Fort Stevens Reservation at the mouth of the Columbia River.

It is to be hoped that the Oregon State Parks Division of the Oregon State Highway Department may see fit to add this newly advertised area to the property it has so excellently developed on the southern portion of the reservation, which it acquired from the Government some years ago.

The present State-owned area lies along a gradually sloping beach on which the big sailing vessel, the *Peter Iredale*, was wrecked during the early 1900's. Remnants of the corroding steel hull and masts are still prominent on the beach and have lured thousands of curious visitors. This beach, also, is popular with razor clam diggers. The park surrounds sightly, sand bottomed Coffenberry Lake, which beckons swimmers, boatsmen, and fishermen, and which is dotted with tiny tree-bearing islands.

This park offers commodious picnicking facilities, parking lots, and overnight accommodations and has become one of the two most popular State parks in Oregon.

We have seen no description of the additional Fort Stevens property now to be put up for sale but it presumably includes what is known as Swash Lake, to the north of Coffenberry Lake, also abutting on the 20-mile long Clatsop Beach.

If this is true the area should by all means be reserved for public use. In fact, the entire Fort Stevens Reservation should have been left intact and in public hands when the fort was abandoned by the Army. If its obsolete guns, which were scrapped had been left in place, centennial visitors would have the more reason to linger in Oregon and visit the coast. Fortifications such as these are rare now in the United States, and if the ancient fort had been preserved and publicized it could have been rendered a great public asset. The area formerly occupied is deteriorating rapidly and has become an eyesore. Its once proud batteries are disintegating and accommodating weeds, its buildings dingy and falling apart. All because no adequate public agency intervened when this most attractive portion of the reservation was put on the block. The city of Hammond tried. It did acquire the property but the little hamlet found it could not maintain the area properly so let it pass into private hands, save one building which is being used as a school.

Retention of Fort Stevens by the government would have been justified by its historic significance alone. It is near the end of the Lewis and Clark trail, near Fort Clatsop, now being restored, and it includes ruins of a fort built during the Civil War to guard the Columbia River against invasion by the confederates. True, it never had to fire a shot but it was ready to do so, just the same.

Also it includes the only spot on the Pacific coast ever bombarded by an enemy.

Soon after the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor a Japanese submarine surfaced off Battery Russell, safely out of range of its antiquated 6-inch disappearing rifles, and peppered the beach with shells. The attack caused no damage but provoked no reply for the commanding officer decided that to return the fire would have been futile and would only have exposed the battery's position, which the submarine gunners apparently could not precisely locate.

We think that if Congress should decide to establish a national park on the Oregon coast it should investigate the Fort Stevens area before spending tax money on property around Florence. The Government and State already own much of the Fort Stevens Reservation and probably could recover that which was unwisely sold for but a few thousand dollars.

Furthermore, it is not likely a Fort Stevens National Park movement would meet local resistance. In contrast, a sizable portion of the Florence area population is violently objecting to inclusion of privately owned property in the proposed Florence National Park. On the other hand, we know that many residents of the lower Columbia district, including Hammond itself, feel about Fort Stevens as we do. We suggest they write to their Congressmen their approval as the people of Florence are writing their protests.

[From the Ford Times, July 1959]

THE PARK AT FORT STEVENS

(By Ben Maxwell)

If you would like to visit an abandoned fort, or see the rusty hulk of an old limejuicer, or dig razor clams, or swim in Coffinberry Lake, then let Fort Stevens State Park at the mouth of Oregon's Columbia River be your goal. The park and associated areas are reached by about 125 miles of pleasant westward driving from Portland over lower Columbia River Highway U.S. 30 through historic Astoria. And along the way you will see numerous picturesque fishing villages and lumber towns like Rainier, Mayger, Wauna, and Clifton.

Fort Stevens was named for Isaac Ingalls Stevens, early territorial governor of Washington and a Civil War general who was killed in action. The fort was established on the Oregon side of the Columbia River late in the Civil War for the purpose of keeping out Confederate privateers, though no attempt to enter the river or to destroy commerce at its mouth was ever made. About 1900 the fort was modernized as a big gun bastion. Then for years it served as a pleasant summer encampment area for National Guard and Reserve units. After World War II, part of Fort Stevens was declared surplus and sold to the city of Hammond, but other areas remain as classified Government property.

The section of Fort Stevens that was sold contains rows of old, spacious structures, now privately owned and mostly vacant, wearing a drab complexion of camouflage applied in war time and now peeling. Occasional guardsmen, returning for a nostalgic look, usually leave somewhat disenchanted by the marks of deterioration at Oregon's only surviving fort.

Fort Stevens is said to have been the only part of continental United States attacked during World War II, when a Japanese submarine standing offshore lobbed a few shells harmlessly into the area. Battery Russell, a now dismantled section of the Fort Stevens area, overlooks the Pacific and was, until a few years ago, a placement for a 12-inch disappearing gun. This massive battery with underground rooms and corridors is now the property of the Oregon Game Commission. As such it is open to public inspection. From Battery Russell there is a splendid view of the Nacific northward to the Columbia River and its lengthy jetty.

In 1955 the Oregon Highway Parks Department acquired 788 nearby acres and named their acquisition Fort Stevens Park. Within this park are three sylvan lakes for swimming and boating: Coffinberry Lake, Crab Apple Lake, and the smallest, Creep and Crawl Lake. Located here are overnight camping sites (there is a modest charge) with fireplace cooking facilities, dry wood, and showers with hot and cold water.

Fort Stevens Park is also popular among picnickers. On one July Fourth, no less than 9,500 registrations were recorded. Those who swim in the lakes are protected against boat intrusion; those who prefer surf bathing can find it at the nearby beach.

Digging tasty razor clams is another local attraction. There is a restriction on the number of clams you may dig in a single day, but when tides are right, Clatsop Beach from Gearhart to the Columbia jetty is dense with clam diggers working against time and tide to get their quota.

The wreck of the *Peter Iredale*, one of many British windjammers that came to the Columbia River for grain and lumber in the early 1900's, occurred during a raging gale in 1906. A rusted, forward section of the old limejuicer, with steel masts lying where they fell, remains a popular and seemingly eternal landmark in the Fort Stevens area.

Tribute to Harry and Gretchen Billings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the third annual convention of the Montana State AFL–CIO, upon motion of Presi-

dent James S. Umber, earlier this month unanimously approved a resolution commending Harry and Gretchen Billings, coeditors of the Peoples Voice, published in Helena, for receiving the Sidney Hillman award this year.

The resolution points out that Mr. and Mrs. Billings have for years stood in the vanguard of labor's battles in Montana.

Labor is not the only cause for which they have fought valiantly. They are leaders in the fight for conservation and full development of our natural resources, for better education, for the family farmer, and against injustice wherever they have found it, whether or not the side they espoused was the popular side.

Mr. President, I share with the Montana State AFL-CIO and many other Montanans a deep pride in the accomplishments of Harry and Gretchen Billings. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Members of the convention: We, of the Montana labor movement have much to be proud of, not the least of which is an honor which this convention would be remiss in allowing to go unnoticed and unheraled.

This year, in honor of a great and noble leader of labor, an award was gained by two wonderful members of the Montana labor movement.

Because this honor is one of great significance nationally, and because it comes to us here in Montana, I ask this convention's unanimous consent to approve the following resolution of commendation:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas Gretchen Billings and Harry Billings have for years stood firmly in the vanguard of labor's battles in Montana; and have, without hesitation spoken out in the People's Voice in favor of the fundamental principles of the democratic trade union movement; and

"Whereas the excellence of their work has achieved national recognition in the award to them this year of the Sidney Hillman award, an award given in honor of one of American labor's greatest statesmen; and

"Whereas Gretchen and Harry Billings were two of six people in the United States to be so honored this year, bringing to them and to Montana great national honor; and

"Whereas we of the Montana labor movement are proud that two of our members should be so honored: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this convention go on record as adding our commendation and sending our congratulations to Gretchen Billings and Harry Billings and the People's Voice for winning the Sidney Hillman award; and are proud with you."

St. Lawrence Seaway: Gateway to the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway has sparked one of the greatest efforts by the people in the Midwest to benefit from such a project in the history of the country.

Along Wisconsin's shorelines, for example, our 14 ports and harbors are carrying on constructive programs of development and progress. These ports will not only serve surrounding communities, but will accommodate expanding volumes of traffic to and from the Heartland of North America.

To Wisconsin and the Midwest, the completed seaway marks a new economic era.

The task ahead of us includes the encouragement of more and more traffic to utilize the St. Lawrence Seaway. The less expensive trade routes to the ports of the world through our Midwestern lakeshore cities will, I believe, serve more and more as a magnet to trade and commerce "tagged" for other lands around the globe.

As things look now, our Wisconsin ports, for example, may well serve as convenient transfer points for trade and commerce emanating perhaps a thousand miles west of Wisconsin and including more than 15 States, as well as Provinces in Canada.

For the products of farms and factories, our Wisconsin gateways to overseas have connections with 12 railroads, operating a total of almost 39,000 miles of right-of-way that fan out to the west.

A well-engineered and maintained State arterial highway system, too, connects Wisconsin's port cities with a network of truck routes that will efficiently serve the upper Midwest.

The 2,100-mile arterial system of most-used highways includes 482 miles on the National Interstate and Defense Highway System. Wisconsin's County trunk highway system, also, is one of the best in the Nation, nearly all hard surfaced for dependable, year-round service to farms and factories.

Wisconsin also has 71 public airports throughout the State. The number is expected to reach 100 by 1965. These airlines provide excellent travel and connections for businessmen, putting them in easy reach of customers, suppliers, and financial institutions. In addition, air cargo service assures fast shipment of valuable and perishable items and repair parts for industrial machinery.

Recently I was privileged to review a splendid editorial by Editor Matt Werner, of the Sheboygan Press, Sheboygan, Wis., entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway: Gateway to the Future."

The editorial contains a splendid appraisal of the significance of the seaway, both in terms of national and local community interest.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY: GATEWAY TO THE FUTURE

The heart of this continent is being opened to seagoing ships as the St. Lawrence Seaway, gateway to the world, becomes fully operative. The formal dedication came today when Queen Elizabeth and President Eisenhower participated in the joint United States-Canadian exercises at St. Lambert. But by now the ships have been using the full length of the waterway for more than 2 months.

The St. Lawrence Seaway is the answer to an ancient dream dating back to the revolutionary days. Its construction has been studied and planned since the turn of the century.

Seaway capacity has been estimated at about 50 million tons a year by the U.S. Government. This will include some 12 million tons of grain outbound and 10½ million tons of iron ore inbound. Canadian estimates are considerably higher.

Hard to exaggerate would be the impact of the seaway on the national economy. Midwest imports and exports are bound to be stimulated. Distributors of foreign steel already have opened a score of offices in Chicago. Cheaper transportation will cut the cost of a foreign automobile in the Midwest some $70.

Foreign beers, wines, and liquors will be available at lower prices. Other imports expected to be favored include Italian marble, woodpulp, pottery, rubber, coffee, and many others now higher priced in the Midwest than on the coasts.

Farm products, in turn, will be better able to compete in foreign markets. So will U.S. made trucks, heavy machinery, steel pipe, chemicals.

At the same time, rail freight rates to the Midwest will go down. Whether east coast ports will suffer is debatable. The seaway will be frozen for 4 months—at least until a way is found to keep it navigable through the winter.

Up until now, discussion about harbor improvements on Lake Michigan and Lake Superior have been centered on the major ports of Milwaukee, Chicago, and Duluth-Superior.

Other port cities such as Sheboygan and Manitowoc have been advised to go slow in heavy investments in harbor facilities. Some argue that this means the seaway will be just another name in the history books as far as these cities are concerned.

If such an attitude had prevailed a hundred years ago, the West would never have been developed. It's much too early to scratch Sheboygan and other small lake ports off the map as far as the seaway is concerned. As the Midwest grows, the need for more facilities will develop.

In discussions concerning the seaway, Sheboygan is continually compared to Milwaukee and Chicago. The comparison is unrealistic since Sheboygan has never entertained the thought of becoming another Milwaukee.

The hard fact is that the seaway cannot help but benefit Sheboygan.

We are living in an age where transportation—whether it be on land, sea or air—is the lifeblood of our existence.

New firms which import and export will naturally be drawn toward the Great Lakes. There have already been some reports of firms now located in crowded coastal cities moving inland and relocating along the Great Lakes.

There has been no rush of industries to Wisconsin but the seaway wasn't conceived and built in a day either.

Sheboygan has many assets worth evaluating when a plant site is to be chosen, including an abundant supply of fresh water. Water, indirectly is still that all-important natural aid in getting wheels to turn, motors to hum, factories to produce and commercial enterprises to breathe with vibrant success.

Other assets are a huge electric power plant, and availability of abundant supplies of natural gas, oil and coal. It has an extensive suburban area suitable for any conceivable development. Sheboygan has a

good supply of skilled labor and is located in a State rated highest in employer-employee realtionship. There are scores of beautiful churches, the finest equipped public and parochial schools, lovely parks and large bathing beaches.

Sheboygan ranks about third in the State, too, in the number of industrial plants. Another point favoring the community is the Sheboygan County Municipal Airport now under development.

The city can hardly miss being benefited in the future by the enormous amount of shipping that will pass through the seaway.

Investing in Medical Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in an editorial in yesterday's edition, the New York Times points to the progress of the National Fund for Medical Education.

The fund has been set up to organize private support, primarily from American business, for the Nation's medical schools. There are few educational problems more vital or perplexing than the training of more physicians in this country. America has a very serious shortage of doctors and a tragic number of vacancies on the faculties of medical schools.

The fund is still small for the size of the job it has to do. But it is growing and the donors have increased impressively in number.

I ask unanimous consent that the Times' editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTING IN MEDICAL SCHOOLS

The 1958 report of the National Fund for Medical Education shows a widening area of cooperation by contributors. The fund was organized 10 years ago—under the sponsorship of President Eisenhower of Columbia and other university presidents, the American Medical Association, and the American Association of Medical Colleges—to mobilize private financial support for the Nation's 82 accredited medical schools. It has made impressive headway, especially in the enlistment of leading corporations in its cause.

Each year its roster of companies has grown. The total amount it received last year exceeded $3 million, of which about $2 million came mostly from business concerns, and $1 million from a matching grant of the Ford Foundation. Out of this pool a uniform unrestricted grant was made to each of the medical schools, supplemented by $60 for each undergraduate student, making a total of $2.9 million.

Last year the fund began to give special purpose grants to selected schools to help finance promising new programs of teaching and a new plan was worked out for financial support of basic medical research.

The shortage of physicians now amounts to "a very real and present emergency," as Surgeon General Burney has described it. We need 4,000 more new doctors a year than are now being turned out by the medical schools, where there are more than 600 vacancies in fulltime faculty posts.

The number and standing of the companies which contribute to the fund show an encouraging recognition of the stake which business has in turning out good doctors and of the fund's usefulness as a mechanism to help in doing it. But the medical school emergency calls for still wider support.

Cash Dissipated by Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a recent column by Sidney Andorn which was published in the Cleveland News on June 29, 1959, is worthy of careful study.

While paying tribute to the thousands of patriotic Americans who have volunteered their time and services for civil defense, it offers a clear commentary of the waste of the taxpayers' money in Ohio and the Nation on the utterly useless and vague program of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland News, June 29, 1959]

CD STAND FOR CASH DISSIPATED?

(By Sidney Andorn)

Since civil defense is notable for the fine work turned in by thousands of volunteer individuals and organizations who don't get paid for it, why should civil defense be costing us taxpayers millions of dollars a year?

Civil Defense Recognition Day here was celebrated last Monday.

City Hall ceremonies gave certificates of commendation to doctors and nurses associations, to the utilities, the Red Cross, newspapers, broadcasters, police and fire departments, and industries.

Certainly the certificates didn't cost the city $106,000.

NONE OF THEM IS PAID

Cleveland's contribution to civil defense here this year is $106,000.

Cuyahoga County's contribution to civil defense here this year is $77,000.

Civil defense in passing out certificates of honor paid tribute to its 3,000 auxiliary police and its 300 rescue-service workers.

These are countywide volunteers. They work for no pay.

Their certificates didn't cost $77,000.

So you have a right to ask where does the money go?

BIG DOUGH FOR WHAT?

You have a right to ask where does the State and Federal civil defense money go?

State of Ohio's civil defense appropriation this year is $342,520.

Congress for this year's civil defense appriated $45,285,000.

Not a penny of this goes to the volunteer rescue-service workers who did such a yeoman job during the recent disastrous flash flood here, nor to the auxiliary police for their fine services directing traffic.

WARTIME IS DIFFERENT

Flood rescues, directing traffic are feasible peacetime efforts of civil defense.

They become almost impossible under an avalanche of fallout from a nuclear-bomb barrage in wartime, with roads glutted by panic-piloted cars fleeing atomic extermination.

It's for such wartime protection we pay our money to civil defense.

Maybe this is why there is such stalling and double talk when a reporter tries to find out from the headmen of county and State civil defense how much money they've been given for 1959.

Use of Lodgepole Pine Species for Production of Insulating Board in State of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the significant developments in the State of Oregon during recent years has been the establishment in Klamath Falls of a $12.5 million plant to use so-called scrub species of timber for the production of insulating board.

Some of us were active in persuading the U.S. Forest Service to put up, for competitive bidding, the lodgepole pine trees in the Fremont National Forest which are the source of supply for the Johns-Manville plant near Klamath Falls.

On July 1, the plant was formally dedicated by A. R. Fisher, president of the Johns-Manville Corp., and by Gov. Mark Hatfield, of Oregon. Because similar undertakings providing payrolls and wealth for the Pacific Northwest may hopefully be in prospect for the future, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Oregonian of July 1, 1959, written by Mr. John L. Denny, business editor of the Oregonian, describing the formal opening of this huge undertaking which will process lodgepole pine into insulating material, and an editorial on the same theme from the Oregonian of July 2.

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., July 1, 1959]

JOHNS-MANVILE PLANT DEDICATED AT KLAMATH FALLS—INSULATING BOARD MADE FROM PINE AT INSTALLATION

(By John L. Denny)

KLAMATH FALLS.—Johns-Manville Corp. Tuesday dedicated its new $12½ million insulating board plant 19 miles north of here, signalling a $2 million increase in the State's industrial payroll.

Of more significance to the economy, however, is the creation of a brandnew

source of wealth for the State. This is the first manufacturing plant to utilize lodgepole pine on a major commercial scale, converting to useful and marketable products a scrub tree formerly considered to be of no economic importance.

OREGON PINE SUPERIOR

The insulating board products made from the lodgepole pine are superior to those made out of southern pine at the firm's Mississippi plant, according to A. R. Fisher, board chairman and president of Johns-Manville.

iFsher, who participated in official opening ceremonies along with Gov. Mark Hatfield and other notables from the city, State, and Federal agencies, also had kind words for Oregon's business climate, rating it next to availability of raw materials as his company's reason for locating the plant here. While sidestepping a direct answer to a question on the State's tax structure, Fisher said:

"No place have we felt more welcome than we are here. We have not found a better overall business climate anywhere."

The plant gets its raw material from the Forest Service under a long-term cutting agreement. Fisher said that under certain conditions the company might be interested in acquiring land and tree farming lodgepole pine, something no one has ever done anywhere. But this may be a long time in the future. The Fremont National Forest is said to have lodgepole pine for a perpetual supply for six plants the size of this one.

PLANT'S USE DELAYED

The plant actually was completed early last year, but operated on slow bell during its shakedown period due to the effects of the recession and the slump in building. Now it is operating three shifts daily on a 5-day week. Fisher said it probably will go on a full 7-day week within a year. This will add about 50 more men to the present employment of around 300.

W. H. Graham, manager of the new plant, said the contract loggers supplying it with lodgepole pine are producing about three cords of wood per man-day, compared with one cord per man-day in the firm's pine operations in the Southern States.

Located on the Williamson River, the plant consists of six groups of buildings with 285,000 square feet of floor space. Products are sent throughout the West, going as far east as the Dakotas and St. Paul, and the plant was designed for future expansion as the market grows.

LODGEPOLE LOGS CRUSHED

Insulating board is produced by grinding the debarked lodgepole pine logs, then forming the tough wood fibers into sheets by wet processing, pressure, and heat. The large amount of water required is supplied by two 750-gallon-per-minute deep wells. Effluent is screened, dumped into a settling basin, and thence into the Williamson River.

The Klamath Falls plant is the eighth to be completed by Johns-Manville in the past 2 years. It makes a total of 33 plants in which the company produces more than 500 different product lines, including building materials, pipe, insulations, and allied industrial products.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., July 2, 1959]

WEST'S INTERDEPENDENCE

In Klamath Falls they talk a lot about the State of Jefferson, which includes a large part of the southern Oregon and northern California and which is described as more of a state of mind than a physical entity.

The State of Jefferson, has roots in history In the early 1850's, residents of southern Oregon and northern California seriously agitated for formation of a separate territory. Partly this was based on the desire of some residents of the area, who had migrated from Southern States, to form a slave State and secede from the Union.

The present tongue-in-cheek State is a resurrection of rebellions of 1935 and 1941, when lack of good highways and a feeling of being neglected by the distant metropolitan areas of the legal States brought about mock-serious but pointed agitation for formation of a separate State. The Jefferson revived this year in Klamath Falls, its self-proclaimed capital, is designed more to advertise the advantages of the area for industrial and business development than to voice grievances against the authorities in Salem and Sacramento.

A folder telling of these many advantages was distributed to visitors from as far away as New York who attended the dedication this week of the $12½-million lodgepole pine insulating board plant near Klamath Falls of the Johns-Manville Corp. Undoubtedly, the State of Jefferson is sound promotion, calling attention to a large area which is bound together by geography and similarity of resources, where growth has been rapid but where there is room for much more development.

One can quarrel with only one statement in the well-written promotion piece. "In many ways it (the Jefferson area) is a world unto itself—self-sufficient, with enough water, fish and wildlife, farm and orchard land, mineral resources, and gumption, to exist on its own," says the folder.

The fact that one of America's largest corporations has built a huge plant to convert the former weed tree, lodgepole pine, into modern building materials is in itself a refutation of any such claim to self-sufficiency. Success of the plant, which employs some 250 workers and gives the Klamath economy a substantial boost, depends on the whole West, not just the "State of Jefferson."

Products will be sold as far east as the Dakotas and New Mexico, with the thickly populated cities of California forming the most lucrative single market. Thus, Jefferson is dependent on a dozen real States in this instance and in innumerable others involving sale of its timber, agriculture, and other products.

Actually, all of us are dependent for our livelihoods on virtually everyone else. Portland's prosperity hinges on the well-being of a large part of the Pacific Northwest, including the "State of Jefferson," and prosperity in the metropolitan area is reflected in other communities of a wide region. The Johns-Manville plant will not only help Klamath Falls and southern Oregon. It will benefit the whole State and adjacent sections of California and Washington, just as do all new payrolls, wherever the paymaster's office may be situated. This concept is accepted generally nowadays, and one is sure that Jeffersonians really feel that way, too.

The Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, Mrs. Joseph N. Ulman, Jr., of Woodbridge, Conn., has written to me asking that I have inserted in the RECORD a letter to the New York Times by Ruth S. Phillips, president of the League of Women Voters.

Mrs. Phillips' letter is worthy of wide attention, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLANNING ECONOMIC AID—AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IN DEVELOPING MULTINATIONAL PROGRAM ENVISAGED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The mutual security program this year has become one of the most controversial issues in our foreign policy. If we do not consolidate our forces, the program will suffer from the current differences in support between those who stress foreign military aid and those who stress economic aid.

It was significant that "Meet the Press" recently interviewed Vannevar Bush on the mutual security program, thus helping to focus public attention on the issue during the present period of reassessment of the program.

Your editorial of May 26 "Time and Foreign Aid," quite rightly, we believe, adds one pertinent reason for the program which Dr. Bush failed to mention in his convincing and able answers to the questions asked. We agree with you that "what we need to do is to make persons and societies strong in their own right" and this "* * * lays the ground for progress in human betterment."

NOT EMERGENCY MEASURE

We maintain that mutual security economic aid and technical cooperation programs should not be used merely as incidental tools in the so-called "ruble war" or as props to our military security. We believe economic aid must be conceived in long-range terms, not as an emergency, year-to-year, stop-gap operation geared to the fortunes of the Cold War.

The economic and social problems which the developing countries must solve to achieve stability and prosperity are problems that can be met only by long-range, comprehensive planning and by disciplined effort.

During the past 2 years the League of Women Voters has supported the Development Loan Fund as a sound means of providing economic aid through long-term loans. We now believe the resources of the fund should be strengthened rather than limited and, therefore, in the biennial meeting of our national council this month, we endorsed the principles set forth in the proposed Fulbright amendments to the mutual security program for 1960.

LONG-RANGE GOALS

The amendments will emphasize the constructive, positive goals of economic development without ignoring the necessary purpose of military security; will expand economic aid and allow for greater flexibility in the program; will improve the effectiveness of aid by making possible long-range planning over a period of up to 5 years.

We know full well that the Development Loan Fund is not the whole answer to the needs of the developing countries of the world community. We see the task of helping to build viable economies and enduring democratic institutions in these countries as one which calls for the combined efforts of all nations.

Why not then, at the proposed summit conference, initiate a coordinated, worldwide program of economic development? The leadership of the United States in working to develop a multinational economic aid plan would certainly find backing from Great Britain and the other Colombo Plan members and from Italy, France and West Germany—all of whom have expressed similar views.

RUTH S. PHILLIPS
Mrs. Robert J. Phillips,
President, League of Women Voters.
WASHINGTON, *May 26, 1959.*

Equal Justice in South Carolina for White and Negro Rapists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Equal Justice in South Carolina for White, Negro Rapists," published in the Anderson (S.C.) Daily Independent of July 4, 1959.

I have noted that very little has been written about these cases in the large Northern newspapers. The Northern daily press, as usual, headlines any minor racial unrest in the South, but plays down racial problems in the North.

In most instances the large Northern papers infer that justice is unequal in the South. As this editorial points out, justice is equal in South Carolina for whites and Negroes.

I join with the Anderson Daily Independent in its editorial comment on the subject and in its appeal to place the national spotlight on the Beaufort cases cited in the editorial, which points up that justice is equal for all in my State.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Anderson Daily Independent, July 4, 1959]

EQUAL JUSTICE IN SOUTH CAROLINA FOR WHITE, NEGRO RAPISTS

On Thursday in General Sessions Court in Beaufort County venerable Judge J. Henry Johnson sentenced two men to die in the South Carolina electric chair.

First to face the judge was a white marine, age 24, convicted by an all-white jury of raping a 47-year-old Negro woman. The jury which heard the facts did not recommend mercy. The death sentence was mandatory.

Two hours later a 19-year-old Negro who broke into a home and attempted to rape a young white housewife also was sentenced to die in the State's electric chair. He was convicted by a jury of six white persons and six Negroes. Mercy was not recommended.

The two were sentenced on the same day in the same court in the same county, to pay the death penalty for rape. And they are scheduled to die the same day—August 14.

If Fred G. Davis, the white marine, dies in the electric chair, he will be the first white man in U.S. court history to be executed for the rape of a Negro.

J. E. McTeer, sheriff of Beaufort County 33 years, testified Davis told him he sometimes had "an overpowering sex urge and got pleasure out of using force with women." The testimony of other witnesses for the State must have been fully convincing to the all-white jury.

Judge Johnson, commenting on the verdicts, said the two cases "should establish beyond all doubt that any person, regardless of race, color, or creed, can get justice in South Carolina."

The judge is right. The Beaufort cases should establish the fact. But will they?

The question now is how many fairminded Americans will have opportunity to learn what happened in the Beaufort courtroom.

How will the anti-South press and radio and TV commentators react to this clearcut example of justice in South Carolina?

However precedent shattering, the verdicts are not likely to receive more than nominal and grudging attention from press, pulpit, and periodicals brainwashed by alien philosophies and NAACP propaganda. But how they would have howled if the white man had been acquitted regardless of the circumstances.

We join other South Carolinians in challenging the integrationist bleeding-hearts to put the spotlight on the Beaufort cases with the same intensity employed to magnify the South's relatively few interracial incidents into unjustified proportions.

Put the national spotlight on the Beaufort cases.

July 4, 1826: The Day Two Titans Died

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the finest commemorative articles I ever have read about our American Independence Day was published on the editorial page of the Oregonian, of Portland, for July 4, 1959. The author of the article is Dr. Kenneth L. Holmes, assistant professor of history at Linfield College, which is located at McMinnville, Oreg. Dr. Holmes cites the intertwining of the illustrious careers of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, both of whom died within a few hours of each other on July 4, 1826.

I doubt if any young American can read this moving article by Kenneth L. Holmes without feeling a renewed sense of thrill and pride in his country.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article, entitled "July 4, 1826: The Day Two Titans Died," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., July 4, 1959]

JULY 4, 1826: THE DAY TWO TITANS DIED

(By Kenneth L. Holmes)

All Americans have heard about July 4, 1776, possibly the most important day in our history. Many, however, have not heard that 50 years later, on July 4, 1826, there occurred the second most exciting Independence Day of all.

The drama developed in two localities: Virginia and Massachusetts.

In Virginia, at his home at Monticello, lived a man who had been one of the signers—nay, one of the very framers—of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson. He was 83 years old.

In Massachusetts, at the family home in Quincy, lived another of the signers of the Declaration, political archenemy of Jefferson for many years, John Adams, who had reached the age of 91.

During the last 14 years of their lives they had carried on a correspondence as they forgot the bitterness that had antagonized them during the heyday of their political careers. And how bitter it had been! Why, when Jefferson succeeded him as President on March 4, 1801, Adams slipped away in a coach so that he would not have to attend the inauguration. A mutual friend, Dr. Benjamin Rush, another veteran of 1776, persuaded them to start a correspondence in January 1812. As Clifford Smyth wrote of the remarkable series of letters, "No shadow of political bitterness darkened their correspondence. Each writer vied with the other in frank, good-humored expressions of opinion, and in simple tributes of enduring affection."

Just before the Fourth in 1826 each of them was invited to journey to Washington to take part in the festivities. Both of them declined for reasons of health.

Adams wrote suggesting a toast for the occasion: "I give you independence forever."

Jefferson wrote a remarkable letter expressing his appreciation for the invitation, and in the letter rang out the high ideals of 1776 once more:

"I should, indeed, with peculiar delight, have met and exchanged there congratulations personally with the small band, the remnant of that host of worthies, who joined with us on that day, in the bold and doubtful election we were to make for our country, between submission or the sword; and to have enjoyed with them the consolatory fact, that our fellow citizens, after half a century of experience and prosperity, continue to approve the choice we made. May it be to the world what I believe it will be (to some parts sooner, to others later, but finally to all), the signal of arousing men to burst the chains under which * * * ignorance and superstition have persuaded them to bind themselves, and to assume the blessings and security of self-government.

"That form which we have substituted, restores the free right to the unbounded exercise of reason and freedom of opinion. All eyes are opened, or opening to the rights of man. All of the light of science has already laid open to every view the palpable truth, that the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately, by the grace of God. These are grounds of hope for others. For ourselves, let the annual return of this day forever refresh our recollections of these rights, and an undiminished devotion to them."

So these two "giants of the earth" did not go to Washington for the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence; they stayed at home.

Ah, but here is the drama of it:

Jefferson knew he was seriously ill when he wrote the letter on June 24. He became progressively weaker in the days that followed and began to have periods of unconsciousness on July 2. On the third he was in a stupor most of the day. Just before midnight on the third he awoke for a short period and whispered, "This is the Fourth?" His doctor answered, "It soon will be." Jefferson whispered further, "Ah, just as I wished." Just after noon on the Fourth of July he died.

Over in the family home in Quincy, John Adams was sitting weakly in his chair on the morning of the same day. He was fading rapidly. He seemed to hear the sounds of the celebration of the Fourth distantly through the windows. Of a sudden he whispered clearly, "Thomas Jefferson still lives." An hour after Jefferson's death Adams had gone to his reward.

James Truslow Adams tells us that when the Nation learned of the extraordinary coincidence, it was received with hushed awe, as though a mystreious portent. Death had struck simultaneously at the two most shining marks in the land, and as the past sym-

bolically went down to the grave, an era was dramatically closed.

If on this Independence Day, 1959, we sense a kind of mystery about that July 4th in 1826 when two titans of '76 died, it is only natural. And somehow the words come crowding into our minds from the Declaration itself, "We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Kenoshans Strike Pure Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Sunday's New York Times featured a superlative story in its business section on the boom in Kenosha, Wis., sparked by the smashing success of Rambler automobiles.

Too often the consequences of business success are only spelled out in the cold statistics of a profit and loss statement or of the affluence it has brought to foresighted stockholders who had the courage to back their vision with cash.

The thrill of the Kenosha story is the happiness and satisfaction it has brought a whole community. Not only is management justifiably proud of their proven ability. Working men too are walking on clouds—proud of the central part of their skill plays in producing the best car in the business. Merchants and storeclerks too recognize the advantage of working and living in a community that has struck pure industrial gold.

Appreciation in Kenosha is deeper and broader because this community has suffered serious depression repeatedly in the past. There is a firm, strong undertone of determination that the community will do all it can to cooperate to help maintain the growing gains of the golden Rambler.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Austin Wehrwein, who was formerly a Pulitzer prize-winning reporter on the Milwaukee Journal, and now writes for the New York Times, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 5, 1959]

RAMBLER SPARKS BOOM IN KENOSHA

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

KENOSHA, WIS., July 4.—This middle-size Wisconsin lake port city is riding the crest of a small—or, as they insist here, the compact—car craze.

The only unhappy voices are those of some merchants who complain tongue-in-cheek, hand-on-the-cash register:

"The auto workers don't get enough time off to spend their money."

To help the workers solve this problem the stores stay open now on Mondays as well as on Friday night. But time is indeed scarcer than money.

THREE SHIFTS COMMON

The American Motors Corp., the city's largest employer and the cause of it all, is running assembly lines 6 days a week, double shift. Other departments go round the clock to keep production lines supplied, so that 65 percent of the work force is in three-shift, 6-day-a-week departments.

But it's not all work. The Tyson brothers, Robert and Eugene, are doing a thriving business at their sporting goods store in all lines, from bar bells to boats.

"It's surprising," Eugene Tyson said, "how many men walk in here in working clothes and buy golf clubs."

A union official said: "Everybody seems happy."

American Motors is making 1,635 Rambler cars a day, a record high. Its present schedule calls for a model-year output of 376,087 or 210,704 more than in the first schedule setup a year ago.

This compared with a low of 250 a day in June 1954, and 73,393 in all of 1954.

Employment in the last 12 months has risen by 5,000 jobs to more than 12,000, also a new high—higher than in World War II. The company recently invested $5 million to increase capacity.

Only a year ago, Kenosha was still classed as a place with "critical" unemployment, with 7½ percent of its working force out of work.

Today the unemployment compensation office is deserted, and other businesses find it almost impossible to get extra help. Even maids are scarce.

The 1950 Federal census found 54,800 people in Kenosha. The population is now estimated at 62,000, not counting heavy growth in environs.

The influx of new people has created a housing shortage, too. But the city's new "Rambler prosperity" has created fresh optimism.

"We're thinking bigger," Mayor Eugene R. Hammond said. "We're planning for the future on the basis that we're going to grow. We're moving away from conservative type of thinking."

George Epstein, owner of Bell Clothing, a leading store, summed it up this way:

"A few years ago there was fear that American Motors was dying. But they have gone from the bottom of the bottom to the top of the top. It's wonderful to be on a winning team."

BUSINESS UP 20 TO 30 PERCENT

Mr. Epstein said that business was up 20 to 30 percent from year-ago levels, and added: "People are buying in a light-hearted vein."

In line with this, the Tyson brothers noted a marked increase in quality bicycle sales. Parents, it seemed, were doing something for their children, too. Two other signs of "Rambler prosperity": more foreign sports cars and a booming market for power lawn mowers.

Spot interviews with men and women on the line and with the officers of United Auto Workers Local 72 indicated there were a fierce pride in the product.

"We are definitely trying to get as much production as possible," Leo Downing, local 72 president said, "We're going to make the big three (Ford Motor Co., General Motors Corp., Chrysler Corp.) compete. We're going to make them hustle."

The union, at its own expense, has set up a committee to urge the UAW, State, and local governmental units to buy American Motors' cars.

And it tells its members: "You earn your bread and butter here—buy the product."

"Any car produced off the end of the production line could be our own—the cars we make could be our own," George Nordstrom, local 72 vice president, declared. Heads nodded in agreement around the conference table at union headquarters.

With all the fervor of a sales manager, the union men said that the American Motors' cars were the best on the market.

In a separate interview, a former local president, Jack Beni, declared that the morale in the plant was at its highest point.

To beef up its payroll the company didn't go far afield to recruit help. And its careful screening of applicants has, according to the mayor, enabled the city to absorb the thousands of workers arriving here without any increase in crime or other social problems.

Most of the new people come from Wisconsin, some commuting long distances.

There is a romantic sidelight resulting from the employment of smalltown lads from northern Wisconsin. They get lonesome for their girls, and on the old principle that absence makes the heart grow fonder, have sharply increased the engagement and wedding ring business at local jewelry stores.

MOST FROM WISCONSIN

While the bulk of the new people come from Wisconsin, some 400 have migrated from the Michigan auto centers. Jack R. Bell, 29, a native of West Virginia, used to work in the Flint Buick plant. After being out of work for 6 months in 1957, for 9 months last year, and 4 months this year, he came here and found work in the body plant. His take-home pay is $109 a week.

Michael Morris, 22, worked in a Detroit filling station after he got out of the Marines. Then when it went out of business, he was out of a job a year. Now he makes nearly $100 a week take-home pay.

A woman production line worker, Mrs. Florence Koessl, the mother of five children and whose husband is a fireman, said the family's extra cash above savings was going into a new garage. Lyle Krahn, a 29-year-old inspector, who was laid off in 1953 and 1954, but who now has take-home pay of $112 a week, said he had confidence in the company's future and was building a home.

A 10-PERCENT RISE

William Thurn, president of the First National Bank, also reported savings deposits up—about 10 percent above last year's.

R. F. Kingsley, editor and publisher of the Kenosha Evening News and president of the Kenosha Savings & Loan Association, reported a better than threefold increase in applications for home loans.

Milton Wittenberg, secretary of the chamber of commerce, noted that in May 1958, Kenosha had 24,000 wage and salaried workers. This May there were 31,000.

Factory production payrolls in May 1958 covered 14,300 jobs, a figure that rose in a year to 20,200.

He reported smaller but similar gains in wholesale and retail and transportation jobs.

A Bill To Amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 So as To Authorize the Secretary of Defense To Provide for a Security Program With Respect to Defense Contractors and Their Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the

Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide for a security program with respect to defense contractors and their employees.

On June 29, 1959, in the case of William L. Greene versus Neil M. McElroy, in another divided opinion, the Supreme Court held invalid virtually the entire industrial security program of the Defense Department on the ground that it is not clear that the President or the Congress "within their constitutional powers specifically have decided that the imposed procedures are necessary and warranted and have authorized their use."

The effect of my bill, Mr. Speaker, is specifically to overcome this decision so that the Department of Defense may have congressional authority to safeguard our industrial establishments, without disclosing information injurious to our national security.

Speech of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in Kenosha, Wis., on June 14 at a Testimonial Dinner for the Honorable Walter Molinaro, Speaker of the Wisconsin Assembly

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD T. FLYNN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to return to my home district on the 14th of June to attend in the city of Kenosha, Wis., a testimonial dinner in honor of Speaker of the Assembly of the Wisconsin Legislature, George Molinaro. George Molinaro is an old and dear friend of mine and was my good friend and counselor in the days when I served in the State senate at Madison, Wis. The ability and leadership of George Molinaro has been recognized by his Democratic colleagues for when the Democrats took over the Wisconsin Assembly for the first time in 24 years, they immediately elected him as speaker of that body. The home community of George Molinaro turned out en masse. There was business and labor, farmer and friend; they all joined hands, over 900 strong, to wish him well and to congratulate him on his fine record of achievement. It was my privilege to say a few words to express my deep feelings and in recognition of the fine and outstanding record which George has carved for himself in the history of Wisconsin politics, and as a leader of Wisconsin citizens and as a man who has stood on all issues for that which is right and proper for the people whom he represents.

At this dinner, the enthusiastic crowd was addressed by one of the outstanding Democrats of our day. I speak of the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY who is serving in the U.S. Senate as the senior Senator from the neighboring State of Minnesota. I believe, as do so many in the Midwest, that Senator HUMPHREY is a man of principle, a man who will stand up for a platform and for a program, and who will fight even though the odds are against him. He is a man of deep sympathy and understanding who knows the problems of the little people. He has deep feeling for their complex problems and for the complex society in which we live. He believes that government should be administered so as to lighten their load and burden both taxwise and otherwise. Also while fighting their battles he recognizes the needs of business and industry and knows the necessity of having a set of laws that will permit industry to operate at a profit. He is truly conscious of all segments of our society as well as all of the problems that we face, and his record is one of constant battles to improve our present day living conditions for all classes of people in the Nation. I was deeply impressed by the speech which he gave, and although I have not endorsed or personally come out in favor of any candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, I do feel that Senator HUMPHREY would, if chosen, be an extremely good candidate and one of whom the party could be proud. I, of course, recognize that the Democratic Party has several other candidates, each of whom would do a creditable job and would make both the party and the Nation proud of the program and the platform which they would run upon. I would like, however, to extend in the RECORD the speech which was delivered by Senator HUMPHREY in Kenosha, Wis., on the evening of June 14 at the testimonial dinner for George Molinaro, speaker of the Assembly of the State of Wisconsin. The speech follows:

OUR NATIONAL GOALS

(Remarks of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY at testimonial dinner for Speaker Molinaro, Kenosha, Wis., June 14)

It is natural for me to feel at home here in Wisconsin, for this is home territory for me.

Minnesotans and Wisconsinites are used to talking to each other as neighbors talk over a back fence—and the fence between our two States really might as well not exist, judging from the friendly reception the people of Wisconsin have given me during these past 2 days. I have really been treated like one of the home folks.

One thing that has given me a feeling of being at home in Wisconsin is what's been happening in the Democratic Party in this State. In this respect, I am happy to say, the Wisconsin story and the Minnesota story are very much alike.

Fifteen years ago, both of our States were dominated by Republicans. They held both Senate seats, and virtually all of the congressional seats. They controlled the governorship and both houses of the State legislature.

Well, things have changed for the Democratic Party in Minnesota and in Wisconsin.

In Minnesota, we now control both Senate seats. Instead of having one or two Democratic Congressmen, we now have four. We hold the governorship, and one house of the State legislature.

Yes, things have changed in Minnesota—but no more than they have in Wisconsin.

You have written a record here that Democrats the Nation over can envy and be proud of.

You have a Democratic Senator for the first time in 21 years—a courageous and able Senator you can be mighty proud of—BILL PROXMIRE.

From being totally blacked out of representation in Congress in 1946, you have won 5 of the 10 congressional seats—including this First Congressional District now happily and effectively represented by an outstanding new Congressman, GERRY FLYNN.

You control the governorship for the first time in 25 years, and I'm proud to share the platform with the man who broke that Republican jinx, your great Governor and my good friend, Gaylord Nelson.

But the symbol—and perhaps, too, the secret—of your success may be found in the story of the man you and I honor tonight, the speaker of the Wisconsin Assembly, George Molinaro.

For when George Molinaro first became an assemblyman in 1946, the State legislature was a mighty lonely place for Democrats. In fact, there were only 11 other Democrats to keep him company in the house.

I wonder if George Molinaro—or any of the other 11 Democrats who sat with him in those bleak days of 1947 ever dreamed that a little more than a decade later, the Democrats would actually control the house, and that your neighbor, George Molinaro, would hold the powerful and respected post of Speaker of the Wisconsin Assembly. How many of you here tonight thought that could happen in such a short time?

When a man can, by hard work and sheer merit, work his way up from a Kenosha constable to one of the highest posts in the State, the party that gave that man the chance to rise is not only a vigorous party, it is a great party.

And so when I salute you, Mr. Speaker Molinaro, I salute every Democrat in Wisconsin, from the precinct worker, committeeman, party officer right on up to Senator PROXMIRE and Governor Nelson and his associates in State government.

You in Wisconsin, like your Minnesota neighbors, know the ingredients of political success: Hard work—not just around election time, but 12 months a year; dedication to liberal, progressive principles and programs, and not just at election time, but all the time; and a willingness to welcome new faces and to give every person that precious chance to rise to the top and fulfill the responsibilities of political leadership.

Fortunately, the Wisconsin story and the Minnesota story are being written in State after State across the Nation. Since 1953, we've won State house after State house. We've won senate seats and house seats that had been occupied for years by Republican mossbacks.

But, our victory—the people's victory—will not be complete until we win the White House.

And if other States can develop the kind of Democratic leadership that Wisconsin has, I have little doubt that there will be a Democrat in the White House in January, 1961.

But let's not get complacent and overconfident and think we can just coast in on the tide.

The Democrats swept the country in the 1958 election with promises of action—yes, liberal and progressive action—for 1959.

The people who elected the Democrats are getting restive and they are looking to us for action. We in Congress have an obligation to carry out the mandate of the 1958 election.

The Republicans would like to see this Congress fall on its face and they have the money and the press to publicize its shortcomings. But we Democrats have a two-to-

one majority and there can be no alibis if we fail. And we're going to stay on our job in Washington just as long as necessary to live up to our 1958 promises; we must and we will carry out our progressive and constructive Democratic program.

For the Democrats to win in 1960 there must be a powerful and liberal image of the Democratic Party in the mind and heart of every American voter.

I suggest, as a model for that image, the image the Democratic Party enjoyed when it was led by that great humanitarian 20th century American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

There is a lesson for our party, in this year 1959, in the last words ever written by Franklin Roosevelt. They were addressed to the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations, which he did not live to attend.

In those last words, he admonished the world, "We must move forward with strong and active faith."

These last written words of Roosevelt were not words of complacency or contentment with the past. They were a call to action. They summoned us—and the world—to move forward.

To Franklin Roosevelt, moving forward did not mean reliance on the momentum of forces already in being. He said that we must be strong and active. He knew that there was no strength in waiting for events to take their course. He demonstrated that events must be shaped. He knew that neither domestic nor international problems could be solved by sporadic and desparate reactions to crisis. He demonstrated that leadership means positive action, that leadership means setting goals and always striving to meet them.

Let us, too, set our goals and always strive toward them.

In the years ahead, three great goals confront America: the winning of an honorable and lasting peace; the fulfillment of our economic potential; and the attainment of full dignity and liberty for every American.

The winning of the peace means this:

It means unfailing pursuit of the goal of universal disarmament, so that men can devote their energies and resources to constructive purposes, to bettering a lot of their fellow men.

But until we attain that goal, the pursuit of peace means an invincible shield of defense—not only to deter those who would make war, but to negotiate disarmament from strength, and not from weakness.

And finally, the pursuit of truly lasting peace means a long, hard struggle to improve the lot of the oppressed, the poor, the hungry, the sick, and the illiterate.

For the Communists and enemies of freedom will never cease their appeals to these people; and unless we wish to yield the world to their domination, we cannot relax our efforts to help those who are less fortunate than we.

These totalitarian states, first Russia and now in increasing measure China, recognize no ideal but power. Yet they know where they are headed, and they have the blueprints for attaining their goals. Year by year, the masters of the enslaved people are driving them relentlessly forward, in the most gigantic program of military and economic development the world has ever seen.

Our shortcomings, unlike those of the totalitarians, are not in ultimate purposes. But we have not yet equalled them in the steadfastness of our purposes; nor in our willingness to dedicate our full resources to the attainment of our goals.

Too many of our actions are improvised and disconnected, instead of being purposeful and long ranged. Too often we blunt the effect of fine words with meager deeds. And too often we blur the effect of fine deeds with foolish words.

The challenge of the Soviets is total. Their dedication is total.

We cannot answer this challenge of the totalitarians merely by declaring that they are evil doers and do not have the power to accomplish their asserted goals. We can answer it only by superior deeds.

Now, the second great goal before America is the fulfillment of our real economic potential here at home.

In pursuing this goal, we must look upon our economic system as something bigger than the dollar sign, and something warmer than the brick walls of our factories.

We sek not only to build machines, but also to improve men; not only to provide work opportunity, but also to provide leisure for self-development; not only to achieve security, but also to stimulate initiative and daring; not only to be efficient, but also to do justice.

But in order to move forward with strong and active faith toward this goal, we must remove one primary obstacle—a Republican administration which is satisfied with stagnation.

The Republicans take great pride in telling us that the economy is bigger than ever—as if this solved everything.

But when the Republican press agents tell us that we are now higher than ever before, we want to know who is higher, and how much higher. The better than 3 million unemployed are not better off than ever before. The farmer is hardly enjoying prosperity. The homeowner is hardly being helped by higher and higher interest rates. The small businessman has not reached his millenium.

The truth is that since this Republican administration took office, the American economy has fallen far short of its potential.

From 1953 through the end of 1958, we have lost more than 10 million man-years of job opportunity through unemployment.

The income of the average American family has been penalized to the tune of almost $3,000 in real buying power.

Net farm income has been about $31 billion less than it should have been, and wages and salary income almost $100 billion too low.

Private business investment opportunity has been almost $40 billion too low.

The excessive idleness of plant and manpower from 1953 through 1958 caused us to lose more than $150 billion in total national production.

As a result, even high tax rates have yielded to all levels of government about $25 to $30 billion less revenues than full prosperity would have yielded. These deficits in public revenues have meant deficits in national security and international economic cooperation. They have meant immense deficits in education and health services, housing and resource development, social security improvement and income protection to the unemployed.

None of these things has happened by accident. Every basic economic policy of the Republican administration—the tight money policy, the high-interest rates, the regressive tax policy, the pennywise and pound foolish economy programs, the giveaway of our resources—all of these have resulted in substituting economic slow-down for full economic growth.

These Republican policies have not meant boom and bust in the old fashioned sense. The protective Democratic legislation of the New Deal and the Fair Deal has saved us from this. But they have meant recession half the time and stunted growth all the time.

Where do we go from here; and first of all, where can we go?

If we fully marshal our economic potential, we can in the next 5 years lift our $460 billion economy to much better than a $600 billion economy.

We can increase the average annual income of American families, measured in real buying power, by about $2,000.

We can liquidate most of the private poverty, which still bears down upon millions of our people.

We can have prosperous farmers as well as prosperous industry; small business can thrive alongside the corporate giants. In short, we can lift those at the bottom without penalizing those at the top.

We can combine the American system of different rewards for different abilities and efforts with the American system of equal opportunity for all and social justice.

And on the productive foundation of this private economic progress we can check the impoverishment of our vital public services, and put an end to the neglect of our greatest national and worldwide priorities of need.

We can, in a word, fulfill our economic potential and realize our dream of abundance.

The third great goal before America is the attainment of full dignity and liberty for every man, woman, and child within our borders.

We have made a start toward equality of opportunity for employment.

We have made a start toward integrating our public schools.

We have made a start toward integrating our public facilities of all kinds.

We have made a start toward preventing discrimination in housing.

We have made a start toward assuring the right of every citizen to vote.

Yes, we have made a start in each of these areas. But there is more—much more—to be done.

And we are determined that from these small beginnings we shall one day build a land of tolerance that knows no bigotry.

The road toward understanding and tolerance, toward equality and justice may be a rough one. But we must travel that road and travel it surely if we are to survive in a world two-thirds colored. And we must travel that road and travel it courageously—not only because it is necessary for our survival—but because it is right.

My friends, if we move forward to cross and conquer these three new frontiers, many of us may live to see the greatest era of accomplishment in the history of man.

During a large part of the 19th century, the Old World enjoyed a wide measure of peace and prosperity, scientific development, and practical reform. The outstanding characteristic of this period was faith in the future of man, expressed by a poet laureate of England who spoke of the gleam of the untraveled world ahead.

At this midpoint in the 20th century, mankind is again moving into an untraveled world. New problems, new danger, new uncertainties, confront us. But the New World into which we are moving is also gleaming with high promise. The free peoples of the world are infinitely stronger than they were in the 19th century. We have gained in knowledge of the physical world, in science and technology and communication. Above all, we have come to appreciate the links which bind all free peoples together. We have found the instruments of cooperation which may forge these loose links into an unbreakable chain of strength.

So let us lead from strength. Instead of thinking that every great task is beyond our means, let us measure the greatness of our capacity.

Instead of filling the air with fear, let us fill men's hearts with hope.

Instead of being overwhelmed by the dangers of the world, let us be inspired by the challenge to surmount these dangers.

Instead of worrying about the future, let us labor to create it.

Again in the words of the poet, as the great world spins forever through the ringing grooves of change, we can bring an increasing purpose into the lives of freemen, if only we do not close our minds to new problems, if only the thoughts of men are widened with the processes of suns.

I know that after reading this fine speech you will agree with me that the vision and breadth of the Senator well qualifies him to lead this Nation in the event the Democratic Party should select him as their presidential nominee.

A Suggested Temporary and Partial Solution to the Problems Raised by the Supreme Court's Recent Decision Approving State Taxation of Income Derived Exclusively From Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the businessman who sells his product in States other than the one in which his establishment is located must anticipate greatly increased exposure to State taxes as a result of a recent opinion of the Supreme Court—*Northwestern States Portland Cement Co.* v. *Minnesota* and *Williams* v. *Stockham Valves & Fittings, Inc.*, 358 U.S. 450—in two related cases, one involving Minnesota and one involving Georgia taxes.

BACKGROUND OF PROBLEM

Prior to February 24 of this year, it had been generally assumed that if a business had no factory, warehouse, or inventory in a State but solicited business in that State, the sales made were in interstate commerce and therefore protected from State taxation by the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution.

THE NEW DECISIONS

On February 24, 1959, the Supreme Court rendered a decision in two cases involving State taxation of income derived exclusively from interstate commerce—dissenting Justices Whittaker, Frankfurter, and Stewart. In both cases, the taxpaying corporations had restricted their activities to those previously considered nontaxable. Their manufacturing operations and inventory were entirely outside the taxing States and all orders from purchasers in such States were required to be transmitted to the home office for acceptance. Basically, the only activities within the taxing State were the maintenance of a sales office and the solicitation of orders. The specific holding of the Court was that a State has jurisdiction to levy an income tax on a corporation organized under the laws of another State when the taxpayer's only activities were soliciting orders in the taxing State and shipping goods to customers therein. The Court did, however, impose two qualifications. The income taxed must be fairly apportioned to the activities in the taxing State and the corporation must have some minimum connection, or as the Court put it, "nexus" with the State.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISIONS

If all States were prepared to restrict their taxes to those corporations having an established sales office within their borders, the problem of the burden on firms doing an interstate business could be held to manageable proportions. However, the full implications of the taxing powers granted to the States by the new Supreme Court decisions have yet to be explored. In two other recent cases—*Brown-Forman Distillers Corporation* v. *Collector*, 359 U.S. 28; *International Shoe Company* v. *Fontenot*, 359 U.S. 984—the Supreme Court refused to review decisions of a State court upholding a State tax on a corporation which merely solicited orders and shipped goods into the taxing State. In neither case did the corporation have an office of any kind there. No one knows why the Supreme Court refused to review the decisions or what action it would have taken if it had considered these cases on their merits. However, until further light is shed on this area by subsequent decisions, the only safe assumption is that by merely sending salesmen into a State, a corporation subjects itself to such State's taxes. In fact, since February 24, three States—Utah, Idaho, and Tennessee—have amended their taxing statutes to take full advantage of the most liberal interpretation of the Supreme Court's decisions. Any continuation of this trend will have the result that many small- and medium-sized businesses, which now pay taxes only in those States where they have plants, warehouses or offices staffed by employees authorized to accept orders, will be required to file returns and pay taxes in every State in which they solicit orders and ship goods.

THE SUGGESTED SOLUTION

To alleviate this problem in a way which will represent a fair compromise between the revenue requirements of the States and the need to obviate the imposition of an unfair burden on medium and small interstate businesses, it has been proposed that Congress enact legislation restricting State tax jurisdiction to situations where the corporation has a permanent establishment in the form of a plant, warehouse, stock of goods or office in the taxing State. Such a minimum activities type of bill has definite precedent in prior congressional legislation since it follows the exact pattern of the restrictions imposed by Congress on the taxing power of the District of Columbia.

A further advantage of this solution is that it would not involve the necessity of urging Congress to reverse the recent Supreme Court decisions in Northwestern States and Stockham Valves, inasmuch as under the facts of those decisions, the taxpayer had an office in the taxing State. All such legislation would do would be to prevent State tax jurisdiction from extending beyond the specific situations already ruled on by the Supreme Court.

This type of legislation would restrict State jurisdiction to tax only in those situations where potential revenue is the least and foreseeable difficulties in collection are the greatest. Thus, it is to be anticipated that State opposition will be reduced to a minimum. In fact, there is reason to believe that, when State administrators appreciate the difficulties of enforcing taxes against foreign corporations which have no permanent establishment within their States, they may well be willing to accept such legislation, even though they would not have felt themselves free to suggest it in the first place. At the same time, the medium- and small-sized businesses operating across State lines will be relieved of the heaviest portion of the burdens imposed by the new decisions.

The proposed legislation would in effect hold the taxing power of the several States to the exact situation passed on by the Court only until Congress has a chance to examine into the whole question and enact permanent corrective legislation.

Letter of President Carlos Garcia, of the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter written by President Carlos Garcia of the Philippines, as addressed to Mr. Max Abelman, known as Brooklyn's ambassador of good will, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALACANANG PALACE,
February 12, 1959.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. ABELMAN: I have just received your letter of February 4. It was a pleasure to read its contents and the various interesting enclosures you forwarded. From the things said about you and considering your friendly gestures towards this country, you are certainly living up to your reputation as Brooklyn's ambassador of good will.

May I also say that I appreciate your sympathetic views on the present state of relations between the Philippines and the United States. You will remember that your good friend, our Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo, recently brought up omnibus claims for the consideration of the U.S. Congress. I am glad that you are trying to help in Washington by communicating with friends there who are in a position to give favorable support to the Philippine stand.

Let us hope that everything will turn out for the best. Meanwhile I extend sincerest thanks and cordial regards.

Truly yours,

CARLOS P. GARCIA.

Are Wage Increases Inflationary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article entitled "Are Wage Increases Inflationary" by Stanley H. Ruttenberg, research director for the AFL–CIO:

ARE WAGE INCREASES INFLATIONARY?

(By Stanley H. Ruttenberg)

For too long, the Eisenhower administration has been using fear of inflation to block normal economic growth. Recent price levels mark almost a year of stability. Even the price changes of the preceding 10 years have been lower, on an annual average, than those of the distant past, when inflation received much less popular attention.

In March 1959, the much publicized yardstick of inflation, the Consumer Price Index, stood at 123.7. This is precisely where it was in June 1958, and only 0.4 percent above March 1958. The Wholesale Price Index has 'so shown stability. In March 1959, it stood at 119.6, which was 0.1 percent below the same month's index in 1958. Further investigation shows that price changes in the previous 10 years compare very favorably with previous decades. The "compound rate" of increase per year was 1.25 percent for wholesale prices and 1.75 percent for consumer prices. During the last 60 years, the average has been 2.3 percent in these two indexes combined. As Prof. Alvin Hansen stated in a recent letter to the New York Times: "Indeed, the record during the years 1948-58 (which, however, included a war of considerable dimensions) discloses a per annum price increase not much more than half as large as that of the entire 60-year period. This is by no means an irresponsible record."

Immediately before the past year's price stability, between March 1956 to March 1958, price levels moved up 7.4 percent. But for the first time since the end of World War II, with production below capacity, unemployment at a rate averaging 4 percent, and a shortage of demand that helped cause a recession, economists could not depend on the classic explanation of inflation—too much demand chasing too short a supply. Earlier sharp rises in the price level, both in the 1948–58 period and immediately before it, had been caused by demand-inspired inflation. The two periods after World War II which had the greatest price increases were 1946–48 and 1950–51. In both cases, war-related demand sent prices skyrocketing. Immediately after World War II, prices shot up in response to the unleashing of pent-up demand at a time when civilian production could not absorb it. During the Korean period, the same forward push came from anticipated shortages, speculation, "scare-buying." These war-related pressures accounted for 74 percent of the total increase in the Consumer Price Index after World War II.

But the most recent wave of price increases between 1956 and 1958 seemed to stem from a shortage of demand. Even during the worst period of the 1957–58 slump, prices continued to rise. This confusing economic phenomenon was responsible for the term "wage inflation"—a pat but insufficient explanation. Indeed, failure to recognize the difference between current price pressures and sharp war-related rises has resulted in the administration's devoting all its energies to combating what can only be called a "non-existent inflation."

What were the price pressures at this point in the decade between 1948 and 1958? Wages rose throughout the decade and except for 3 years prices were relatively stable. In fact, the pressures responsible for the greatest changes in the price index between 1956 and 1958 were those least related to wages. The Consumer Price Index, of course, is a reflection of various sectors of the price structure, each of which responds to specific economic influences peculiar to its makeup. Examination reveals that almost two-thirds of the total index rise of 7.4 percent in the period 1956–58 came from the components known as food and services.

Food price increases accounted for 45 percent of the rise, with perishable foods alone accounting for one-third of it. Economists agree that drought in the Southwest in 1956–57, accelerated the beef-cattle cycle (usually of a 2-year duration), leading to a shortage of beef and higher prices. A freeze in the South in 1957–58 also led to shortages of perishable foods and higher prices. As for the other food price increases, wages in agriculture—among the most depressed in the Nation—can hardly be held accountable. Nor can the costs of packaging, processing, and distribution account for the price increases. For they were largely caused by varying supply and demand and improvements in quality.

Services, the next sector of major influence, accounted for 20 precent of the overall 7.4 percent rise in the index. This catch-all category includes such varied items as finance, insurance, professional fees, shoe repair, education, auto maintenance, and insurance charges. The sharpest increase was in finance and insurance charges, which jumped 17 percent—multiplying costs for all items in the economy. Wages in these areas are notoriously low. Price pressures came from increased demand due to population growth and improved living conditions, and from the effects of tight money on the population.

What happened in the unionized industrial sector which has been blamed for all inflation in national ads? What about the collective bargaining increases that have been dubbed by the President and others as inflationary? Obviously, these accounted for far less than a third of the 7.4 percent 1956–58 rise in the index.

Yet there has been a growing tendency to equate a 10-percent wage rise with a 10-percent increase in costs. Such an equation is unreasonable: Despite constantly increasing wages between 1953 and 1958, unit payroll costs in manufacturing were lower in early 1958 than in 1953—the index was down to 109.7 from 111.3. But wholesale industrial prices were much higher—up from 114 to 125.6. The lack of relationship can be seen even more clearly from the fact that wages increased between 1957 and 1958, unit payroll costs went down and wholesale prices did not change at all—they did not go down in response to a drop in the payroll index from 112.2 to 109.7.

If wages were not the cost pressure, what was responsible for price increases from 1953–58? Precise figures are not available, but the evidence is clear: Research and development outlays by private industry rose over 300 percent in this period; depreciation charges of nonfinancial corporations jumped 52 percent; interest payments by nonfinancial corporations went up 45 percent; the number of professional employees increased by 27 percent; advertising outlays rose enormously. In all cases, the bulk of the increases occurred after 1955.

On top of these massive expenditures, industries have naturally sought to maintain or enlarge high profit margins. In key industries where there is little or no price competition—such as steel, auto, aluminum, oil refining—giant corporations have been able to set prices for strategic manufactured goods with little relationship to costs. Administered prices have had an enormous effect on the hard-goods sector and have also influenced other sectors of the price structure.

It is a mistake to consider wage increases a major price pressure in these industries. Congressional studies have shown, for example, that United States Steel can still make profits when operating at only 40 percent of capacity. Its break-even point is so low that in 1958 when it operated at 59.2 percent of capacity (the lowest since 1938), net profits were the fourth highest in its history. Net profits as a percentage of employment costs have exceeded 20 percent in 1955, 1956, 1957, and even in the recission year 1958. Though steel wages are the highest in history, payroll costs in 1958 were the lowest since 1954. Excessively high profits, based on low break-even points, are being made by United States Steel and other corporations in administered price industries at the expense of the American consumer.

The most important challenge facing the American economy is economic growth. Price stability and economic growth must be considered together. Prices tend to rise more in periods of slackened economic growth than during times of high-growth rates. To put it another way, a greater degree of price stability may be produced by a higher rather than a lower rate of growth.

From 1948 to 1953 (omitting the 1950–51 Korean inflation), for example, the average annual rise in the consumer price index amounted to only 0.8 percent, and the wholesale price index changes showed a decline averaging minue 1.3 percent. Economic growth, as measured by the average changes in gross national product, was relatively high—rising by an average of 4.1 percent. Contrast this period of low price rises and higher growth rates with the period between 1953 and 1958, when the average annual consumer and wholesale price changes were considerably greater—1.5 percent and 1.6 percent respectively. The average growth rate, at 1.3 percent per year, on the other hand, was one-third that of 1948–53.

It should be clear then, that price movements are complex processes. No one factor in the price structure can alone be deemed responsible for inflation—neither wages, food, administered prices nor services.

What can be done to control inflation? The post-World War II and Korean demand pressure suggest the necessity for comprehensive standby legislative authority for economic stabilization controls in emergency, inflationary situations. Such authority—lacking at the beginning of the Korean inflation and too short lived for the World War II period—might well have curbed a good part of postwar price pressures.

The impact of food prices in 1956–58 suggests the need for a new approach to agricultural programs—perhaps an income-support instead of a price-support system for farmers. Similarly, knowledge of the facts about service costs might help relieve the inflationary pressures they create. Study of medical care might lead to reduction of this price pressure through acceptance of current proposals along the lines of cooperative plans or group practices. Greater understanding of the effects of tight money on interest rates would shed additional light on ways to reduce financing costs. High automobile repair costs and their effects on insurance rates need further examination. Other specific areas should also be studied. For example, housing costs have increased in recent years, but plans for improving efficiency of construction and reducing rental costs have not been carefully and fully considered.

The complexities of industrial price pressures suggest the need for closer examination of the makeup of unit costs and distribution costs in an effort to reduce prices. Public attention ought also to be focused on the cost-price-profit-investment policies of major corporations in the administered price industries.

The American consumers, the people most concerned, should be provided with information about the complex causes of price changes. Some method, possibly a government consumers' agency, should be devised to provide information and to develop understanding of such problems as quality of goods and interest costs. Perhaps a Federal program of research and education for consumers could accomplish much of this necessary task.

Abolish Farm Subsidies: The People Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in order to convince my colleagues that people really do want the farm surplus mess brought to an end, and really do want farm subsidies stopped, I have from time to time placed in this RECORD extracts from letters from various parts of the country commenting on my four-point program to accomplish that objective. These letters come from both rural and urban areas.

Briefly, the program calls for immediate cessation of all farm subsidies, estimated this year alone to cost $6 billion, and the fire-sale disposition of Government-held surpluses amounting to around $9 billion and costing $1 billion a year to store. The proceeds of the sale would be used to relocate small, marginal farmers, to reduce the national debt, and to reduce taxes.

Here are additional extracts from letters approving this program:

We want to join the taxpayers' revolt against farm subsidies. We were farmers for years and are interested in your four-point program.

Your position on the agricultural situation is courageous and, I believe, so sound that it must ultimately win a majority support.

I have talked to hundreds of people about the farm subsidy program and almost to a man their thinking coincides with yours. It is my opinion the American voters have about reached the end of the rope as far as the present scandalous mess is concerned.

Please stick to your guns on the taxpayers' revolt on the farm subsidies.

This letter is to give support to your four-point program to end the farm mess.

I have just read in the local press of your proposed four-point program to end the farm mess and it seems to me that what you are proposing makes sense. It may be radical surgery but the patient is beyond palliative measures.

Am absolutely opposed to farm subsidies and go along with you 100 percent on the fire-sale idea for unloading the surpluses—let's do it and not have any more.

Agree wholeheartedly with your stand on the farm mess.

Allow me to congratulate you on the stand you are taking on this farm mess. Farming is a business and it's high time the farmer was allowed to run it without any Government help or other interference. The average farmer will not have any trouble making a success if he diversifies and runs his farm in a businesslike manner.

The farmers never had it so good. The fire sale is an excellent idea. Let the law of supply and demand control production of farm products.

I am anxious to hear more about your farm bill and am absolutely with you 100 percent when you propose to stop all farm subsidies. I think the farmers have had it soft for too long.

My congratulations upon your proposed solution of the farm mess. I have felt for a long time that something of this kind should be done, but have despaired that the politicians in Congress ever would consent to it.

Your farm program sounds sensible to me.

Your farm program as outlined sounds as if it will be a great step forward in eliminating government controls—which I believe is good.

Want to express approval of your farm plan.

Congratulations for effecting a plan to remedy the unfortunate farm mess. If this plan is effective and feasible in its details you have more support than ever.

Good luck to you for your plan for the fire sale getting rid of the farm mess.

I agree the farm mess should be stopped. My brother in Iowa (a farmer) does not approve of it—never did.

Toward a Statement of National Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently at the 41st annual meeting of the National Lutheran Council, the council adopted a statement of national policy which I feel should have a broader audience. It is a wise and statesmanlike declaration.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement "Toward a Statement of National Policy" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD A STATEMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY

The following statement is offered for our fellow Americans to consider and test in the light of the lessons of history and of their own insights and convictions, with the prayer that ultimately the power of such ideals will seize us and all men, leading us to experience the things that make for peace.

"Recognizing the inequities which exist among peoples of the world in such respects as education, social and political freedom, economic levels, and access to natural resources;

"Realizing the natural tendency of men and nations to set themselves and their self-interests above the common good of men everywhere;

"Knowing the complexity of the problem of developing an adequate national policy in the face of the power struggle in today's world, where the absence of major armed conflict is largely dependent upon precarious balances of power;

"Convinced, nevertheless, that humanly speaking the only ultimately effective power toward world peace is to be found in obedience to divine law expressing itself in love and justice; and

"Believing that our Nation under God is an integral part of a world community of nations;

"Therefore we submit to our fellow Americans the following propositions for thoughtful study in the belief that they are in harmony with God's law expressed in love and justice and embody policies essential to the national interest:

"That our Nation's interests, responsibilities, and welfare are not only interrelated but also inextricably intertwined and interdependent with those of her sister nations throughout the world.

"That our Nation's policies, domestic as well as foreign, should be designed to further purposes consistent with the well-being of the whole family of peoples and nations. In the long view her true national interest is best served by advancing the international interest, the common well-being of the whole community of nations.

"That our Nation's course of action should be determined not arbitrarily, not in isolation, nor in reliance primarily on economic or military power, but in recognition of her obligations toward others and in harmony with universal standards of law and justice.

"That our Nation's conduct and policy should strive to develop in partnership with other nations increasingly adequate structures of international organization and law to achieve justice, order, peace, and disarmament.

"That our Nation's posture in military and economic affairs should be designed to support an international equilibrium which is dynamic rather than static involving not only powerful nations but also national groupings or agencies within or outside of the framework of the United Nations designed to develop political, economic or military coordination until such time as agencies or international law and justice are sufficiently established to preserve world peace and order.

"That our Nation's efforts to maintain her standard of living, involving such matters as immigration, trade, tax, and fiscal policies, as well as her treatment of racial, cultural, and economic minorities within her own borders, should manifest a sense of moral responsibility consistent with her recognition of man's individual dignity and worth and also of his membership in the one human family.

"That our Nation's 'life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness' depend in important measure upon her willingness to share mutually and responsibly with other nations in developing the latent resources and potentialities with which these nations are endowed. Both governmental and voluntary channels need to be used to insure for the peoples of the world opportunities for lives that are personally satisfying, socially enriching, economically productive, and responsibly independent."

Morton Explores Reasons for Growth of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Sterling Morton, which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times of June 22, under the heading "Morton Explores Reasons for Growth of Inflation":

MORTON EXPLORES REASONS FOR GROWTH OF INFLATION

(Out of a vast store of business experience, spanning more than 50 years, Sterling Morton, chairman of the board, Morton Salt Co., writes of the contemporary economic scene. This is the 10th in a series.)

(By Sterling Morton)

To talk about inflation is sheer waste of time. For inflation is a result and when once in progress, as now in our country, the fundamental causes must be removed or disaster follows.

If you suddenly "inflate" personally, (develop some abnormal swelling) your doctor doesn't treat the swelling, he looks for its cause. That, he treats.

What are the causes of the disease now rotting the purchasing value of our savings, our insurance, our old-age pensions? Why are endowments of our churches, non-tax-supported educational facilities, voluntary hospitals, and a host of other worthy institutions shrinking each year in purchasing power?

"Because the dollar buys less," you say. Why? What has cheapened that dollar whose soundness was once proverbial? We must seek the basic causes of the disease so we can insist that those we elect to manage our public affairs, from the school districts to Washington, apply the needed remedies—or else.

In my opinion, our present growing inflation results mainly from:

1. The 16th (income tax) amendment, which opened Golcondas of revenue to the politicians.

2. Departure from sound money, freely convertible into gold.

3. Bribing groups of voters: farmers, miners, low-income families through subsidized housing; veterans, old people, etc., etc., with Federal tax money. The major political parties vie in such bribery.

4. The sprawling, arrogant Federal bureaucracy—now over 2½ million of them.

5. Absence of real control over military expenditures, letting interservice competition run wild.

6. Federal bribery of State and local governments by "matching funds" for projects the voters otherwise probably would not authorize.

7. Extravagance of State and local governments, school boards, etc.

8. Wage increases not justified by increased productivity but forced by monopolistic, tax-free unions.

9. Enormous increase in the share of national income eaten up by taxes.

10. And, most important, no widespread public realization that such fiscal irresponsibility endangers the very life of our Nation.

The mere statement of these causes suggests the remedies needed.

But, let's go a bit further:

Always remember that the Congress and the executive are independent branches of our Federal Government. Basically, the executive cannot force the Congress to appropriate money and, conversely, the Congress cannot force the executive to spend appropriations, except for the national debt charges.

The citizen can censure extravagant spending by Washington, its agencies or by any local governmental body. He can throw the spendthrifts out. Every 2 years he, collectively, could retire a Congressman who wastes tax money.

At longer intervals, he could veto a President or a Senator. He has the power to pass judgment on his legislative and executive representatives in the State house, the county building, the city hall. Governmental extravagance can be curbed only by the citizen.

I am old enough and cynical enough to know that, with few exceptions, elected officials, whether executive or legislative, will promise economy but not practice it—unless and until reckless spenders meet defeat. The survivors would then change their tune.

We know the follies of foreign aid. I've seen it in action. Some of its personnel are sincere, some projects are sound, yet, I am convinced that our well-intentioned gifts and "loans" (and the administrators we send over) make us more enemies than friends and have alienated former friends. Even more serious, we have lost the respect we formerly held everywhere.

Foreign aid is a small part of the spending, while "defense" is a very large part. Here, the layman must rely on the experts—within limits. Clemenceau said, "War is too important to be left to the generals." Only recently some Defense Department heads said they were oversupplied with armaments. Fancy that.

In recent years, the cost of the Federal Government's civilian activities has grown stupendously. Here, the President could effect enormous economies overnight. He might forbid his executive departments to replace any employees leaving, he could stop the enormous buildings now going up in Washington and elsewhere to house these hordes of taxeaters, he could pull home the many missions now poking into everybody's business overseas.

He could declare it public policy that murder is murder, assault is assault, and mayhem is mayhem, whether committed by an ordinary thug or a union one. Should he simultaneously announce his determination to make dollars again freely convertible into gold, the effect would be electric.

Such an example would affect government at other levels. Washington, while the leader, is not solely to blame for high taxes. Illinois, like other States, has been doing its part. Its collections doubled in 10 years—from $303 million in 1948 to $778 million in 1958. The rise in levies by other taxing bodies is comparable.

Who pays all these taxes? You, and nobody else. Your landlord collects real estate taxes from you, a corporation collects its so-called income taxes from its customers, and the contractor who builds your house adds on union dues and benefits. Taxes enter into the cost of everything you buy.

Taxes are paid by persons—and only by persons.

You pay for new highways, both at the toll booth and at the gas pump. You pay for harbor improvements, airports, public housing, the gorgeous new offices in Washington and elsewhere, the palaces of the labor chiefs. It all comes out of the customer, the consumer, and that is you.

There ain't no free lunch.

It may be that you like what's going on, want all these things done and are willing to pay for them. But, the price will be heavy. The first fruits of inflation are always sweet. The union member thinks he can keep ahead of the procession, the farmer perhaps likes subsidies better than free markets, the reliefer prefers the dole to work, the spendthrift politician finds it easy to buy election.

But, all history teaches that the primrose path of inflation leads to dictatorship, if not conquest and enslavement.

Heed, then, the words of wise Tom Jefferson: "We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude," and stop this headlong rush toward national suicide.

Immigration Bill To Facilitate Reuniting of Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain my reasons for supporting H.R. 5896.

This bill contains a number of amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act which I support wholeheartedly. Under the bill, for example, the unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens are moved up from the fourth to the second preference category. The spouses and minor children of fourth preference immigrants are included within that preference group and the number of fourth preference visas are increased from 25 to 50 percent of those unused under the first three preference categories.

These, and other amendments contained in the bill, will improve the system of visa distribution by assuring increased reunification of the close family relatives of citzens and permanent resident aliens.

One feature of the bill, however, I find somewhat disappointing. I refer to section 4, which grants nonquota status to certain second, third, and fourth preference aliens. I introduced a bill earlier this year, H.R. 5536, which I believe would really solve the problem that is dealt with only in part by section 4.

My bill would amend section 12 of Public Law 85–316 under which some 29,000 immigrants on the first three preference waiting lists of oversubscribed quota areas were allowed to immigrate to the United States by May of this year.

The effect of my bill would be to allow all aliens within the four preference categories, whose immigration petitions were approved before July 1 of this year, to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants, provided they meet general entrance requirements. This is the simplest and most direct—and therefore in the long run the easiest and most sensible—method of handling the problem of oversubscribed quotas.

The bill under consideration is good as far as it goes. But in my opinion it does not go far enough. It would grant nonquota status only to those aliens in the second, third and fourth preference categories—that is the close relative groups—who had applied for an immi-

grant visa prior to December 24, 1952, the effective date of the McCarran-Walter Act.

The difference between this provision and my bill is that this section does nothing for those aliens who have applied for entry into the United States as permanent residents during the last 6½ years.

The distinction made between aliens registering before and after December 24, 1952, is purely arbitrary. It lacks a good substantial reason. Certainly, by excluding those who registered since that date, we are merely postponing part of a problem which should be handled in its entirety.

The difficulties and hardships resulting from oversubscribed quotas would, of course, be best remedied by doing something about the ultimate source of most of our immigration problems—the national origins quota system. The British quota of 65,361 is never more than half used, while Italy with its quota of 5,666 has a waiting list of 165,000 people who have petitioned to enter the United States. Greece, which has close to 100,000 of its natives petitioning to immigrate into this country, is granted the pitifully small number of 308 immigrant visas a year under the national origins formula.

We are not really going to solve our immigrant visa distribution problem permanently until we have the courage and show the strength necessary to replace the national origins system with one more in line with the needs of this country and of the potential future citizens who wish to take up permanent residence here. In the meantime, I support H.R. 5896—with some reluctance—on the theory that half a loaf is better than none.

Sudeten Germans Extend Best Wishes to United States on Our Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Dr. Walter Becher, secretary general, Sudeten German Council, member of the Bavarian Landtag, on the occasion of this Nation's Independence Day:

SUDETEN GERMAN COUNCIL,
SUDETENDEUTSCHER RAT E. V.,
München, den June 30, 1959.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: On the occasion of July 4, the American National Independence Day, please accept the best wishes of the Sudeten German people.

I myself and my political friends over here in Germany are very grateful for and admire the firm stand which the United States have taken in the conferences in Geneva. The firm stand of the United States of America is the hope also of all other nations, both free and enslaved.

Against the offensive ideology of world communism and slavery, only the United States at the helm of the free world can—and, we pray, will soon—put an offensive ideology of world freedom, including diplomatic, journalistic, political, and economic measures, a warless liberation policy. This is what not only the threatened Berliners, the enslaved Soviet Germans, not only the enslaved peoples of Europe and Asia, but all freedom-loving peoples think of and hope for on July 4, the American Independence Day.

Your Nation having a great past has a still greater future ahead. I most sincerely send to you, on your national day, our heartfelt congratulations and best wishes for your great people as well as for you personally.

With best personal regards.

Yours very sincerely,
Dr. WALTER BECHER,
Member of the Bavarian Landtag,
Secretary General.

City of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Col. S. H. Bingham as it appeared in This Week magazine of June 21, 1959.

Colonel Bingham, former head of New York's Board of Transportation, is consultant to the cities of Caracas, São Paulo, New Orleans, Montreal, and Stockholm.

The article suggests some fine ideas that could improve all of our metropolitan communities and particularly the District of Columbia and its environs:

HERE'S YOUR CITY OF TOMORROW—BIG, EXCITING FEATURES, BUT WE CAN'T WAIT TOO LONG

(By Col. S. H. Bingham as told to Myrick Land)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA.—I have spent the last 40 years adapting horse-and-buggy cities to the automobile age. And wherever I've gone, I've entertained a dream.

My dream is of a futuristic city built specifically for high-speed cars, jets, and rockets.

On these pages, an artist has pictured this trafficfree, noisefree, weatherproofed city of tomorrow. Some of the features may strike you as strange, but actually they are not. Most of them already are in use some place, and designs for the others are on the drawing boards. If a major new city were built today, every one of them could be included.

Here are a few of the features which would free this metropolis of many of the irritations which make life difficult in our old-fashioned cities:

Magic parking: The heart of this city will be completely free of private automobiles. A man who lives in the suburbs will get out of his radar-controlled automobile at the edge of the city core. The car will be pushed into a boxlike container and stored automatically in its allotted spot in a huge garage. Some garages will be built underground, like the one under Union Square in San Francisco.

Speedy commutation: The commuter will walk directly into a waiting monorail train which will be air conditioned, noiseless, and brightly lighted. He'll settle down, glance at the headlines in his morning paper, and be whizzed to work in a matter of minutes.

The monorail can travel above ground, but will probably dive underground for most of the ride through the core of the city. As riders on monorail lines in Dallas, in Cologne, Germany, and other places have learned, the monorail is free of the vibration, grime, and discomfort which make present-day commuting an unpleasant chore for many suburbanites. Beginning this month, hundreds of thousands of Americans will have a chance to try this dramatic new type of travel at Disneyland, Calif. And visitors to Seattle's "Century 21 Exposition" next year will travel to the exposition grounds by monorail.

Weatherproofed cities: The city which the monorail commuter reaches could be entirely weatherproofed against rain, snow, sleet, ice, biting winds, and the midday sun. An ideal temperature could also be maintained the year round.

I doubt if we want to go quite that far. Weather control rather than weatherproofing will probably be enough for the residential areas of the city. Homes will no longer need expensive individual heating systems or air conditioners, since cooled or warmed air will be piped in from a huge central air-conditioning unit, just as gas and steam are now. And there will be a number of other improvements, such as radiant-heated sidewalks which will melt snow as soon as it falls.

Complete weatherproofing will probably be reserved for the center area of a city. This is the section where bad weather is always a costly nuisance—and often dangerous. The artist has shown the kind of dome designed by Buckminster Fuller to close out snow, sleet, rain—even cold wind. Although this type of dome has never been used to enclose a section of a city, it has served to protect railroad marshaling yards and other similar areas from bad weather.

Freedom from traffic: Except for the monorail, the core of the city will be free of almost all traffic. Cities will belong to people again—not to automobiles, trucks, buses, streetcars, and trains. Ambulances, fire trucks, and sanitation vehicles will travel through a special network of underground passages.

Sao Paulo, Brazil, has proved that it is possible to bar traffic from a shopping area in the heart of a city during daylight hours without causing intolerable inconvenience. But in planning a new city—or reclaiming the heart of an old one—we should not settle for a small island of quiet and safety. We should have a large traffic-free, fume-free, noise-free shopping and leisure center.

Speedwalks and carveyors: Once the monorail brings you into the city of tomorrow, you will have a choice of a carveyor for rides in the core area, and the speedwalk for your window-shopping tours. Both are shown in the drawing. The glass-topped carveyor moves slowly but endlessly along major routes. The speedwalk—which has already been installed on a very small scale in Jersey City and Houston—is a moving sidewalk which will be as common tomorrow as escalators today.

Speedtubes: Small parcels, mail and food will be rushed through ducts and pneumatic

tubes from one part of the city to another, substantially reducing the number of truck deliveries. This kind of speedtube service—long used in Paris—could prevent traffic tie-ups which present-day cities face.

Automatic sky control: A monorail line will run from the airport to the heart of the city. This will put an end to the long delay air travelers now face in fighting heavy traffic from the airport into the city. Such details are checking papers (for passengers arriving from other countries) and delivering baggage could be handled en route, or at a central air-passenger terminal in the heart of the city.

The new airport wold also have an automatic control system. This foolproof device would take over direction of incoming planes while they were still some distance away and bring them in without any chance of accidents caused by pilot failure. It would also end the stacking up of planes above an airport, which is sometimes dangerous.

How soon will we begin to introduce some of these imaginative features in our present-day cities? We can't wait too long. The need for them is emphasized in the recent book "Cities in the Motor Age," by Wilfred Owen. Mr. Owen gives this grim reminder of what can happen unless we plan ahead:

"By 1975 we can expect another 50 million people to be living in metropolitan areas. Twenty million more workers may be added to the morning rush. More people, more jobs, higher incomes, and more leisure time will furnish the ingredients for still greater urban chaos. More than a hundred million vehicles will be jockeying for position."

But we don't have to surrender to urban chaos. By introducing some of the practical new ideas I have described, we can make tomorrow's bigger cities safer, quieter, and far more pleasant than any city in the world today.

SHAPES OF THE FUTURE?

Domes that can cover whole cities, or trains that run on one rail, may seem revolutionary to you, but they've actually been in existence a long time. Everything mentioned in Colonel Bingham's article, in fact, is either in existence now or could easily be constructed.

The monorail was first put into operation in Germany and Ireland before the turn of the century. Models now planned will travel 60 miles per hour and faster.

The Geodesic Dome first designed by Buckminster Fuller in the 1930's, drew incredulous gasps. But the Marines have adopted it for portable shelters, and it's come into wide commercial use. Biggest so far: a 384-foot cover for the railroad roundhouse in Baton Rouge.

Carveyors, although not in operation now, would be built on the same principle as kiddie trains in zoos. Speedwalks, however, have been put into successful operation in Houston and Jersey City.

In Our Image

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the real problems of our times and one which demands our most careful thought and attention is that of juvenile delinquency.

One of the finest articles dealing with this subject which I have read appeared in the June 19, 1959, issue of the Commonweal magazine, entitled "In Our Image." It is written by Dr. Gordon C. Zahn, who is a member of the sociology department at Loyola University in Chicago, Ill.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

IN OUR IMAGE

(By Gordon C. Zahn)

Juvenile delinquency is not a new phenomenon. In the "old days" (c. 1910 and World War I), "Teutonia Indians" and "Bloody Sixty-six" stirred much the same chill of terror now evoked by "Cobras," "Silver Arrows," and the other colorful names chosen by the marauding gangs of today. Then, as now, national-origin loyalties and prejudices combined with common area of residence to unite individual toughs into a predatory force—though the "territory" was then more an area of identification than a realm subject to the absolute sovereignty of a street gang.

But the similarities soon fade away before the differences between the gangs of then and now. The misdeeds of the older delinquents, as they are remembered, at least, seemed to consist of such offenses as crashing private parties for the purpose of carrying off whatever edibles might be found. Acts of physical violence generally involved clashes with those who tried to interfere with or resist these forays. This is not to say, of course, that they never engaged in more serious offenses, but at least they were not known for them. The escapades our elders recall would be regarded today as innocent pranks when compared to the terror that rules the streets of a modern metropolis.

The gang delinquents of our day boast of arsenals that include broken bottles, tire irons, knives, guns, dynamite, and acid. They are better organized and far more numerous. Their delinquencies are marked by greater daring and a studied disregard of all limits of malevolence and viciousness. Instead of being occasional and unexpected, their activities have come to be regarded as commonplace, even routine, occurrences. All generations have their share of sadists and compulsive killers, but organized beatings and killings "just for kicks," as described, for instance, by Harrison Salisbury in "The Shook-up Generation" (Harper, $3.95) seem to indicate a new trend. This is especially compelling when considered in the light of the most horrifying fact of all—the steady decline in the age levels at which these offenses are committed.

Journalists, novelists, psychologists, and sociologists have all concerned themselves with the shook-up generation, its problems, and its frightening behavior, in the hope of discovering the reason and a cure for juvenile delinquency. For the most part, the journalists and the novelists have had the greater impact. Salisbury, Benjamin Fine, and their many colleagues can draw upon the full sensationalism of the problem in all its lurid dimensions to shock the public into awareness. Their more literary brothers probe into the inner depths of Nick Romano, Tomboy, and the Amboy Dukes to play upon the sensitivities and sympathies of the understanding reader. Both approaches, however, rest upon the oversimplification of a complex problem; and it is no surprise to find the explanation (and the solution) expressed in equally oversimplified form—whether it stresses family responsibility and laxity, the hereditary determinism of a "bad seed," or the environmental determinism that assures the reader that the delinquent lurks behind any door in any slum neighborhood.

One would like to be able to say that the social scientist has done much better, but, generally speaking, he has not. True, we have a wealth of carefully detailed and large-scale research programs furnishing clear evidence of the multidimensional character of the delinquency problem, but as these seldom reach the general public, most people hear and accept the more superficial explanations. And even if the scientific studies were known, it is unlikely that they would be effective; for the more careful the method and the broader the scope of such investigation, the less likely it is to produce conclusions that lend themselves to general explanations and applications. The net result is that while social scientists have been able to free themselves from the easy attraction of deterministic explanations, the layman becomes ever more impatient with the growing complexity of their findings and ever more willing to turn to the daily newspaper or the latest paperback for the real, down-to-earth facts and answers.

This is not to say that the social scientist has contributed nothing. He has helped to establish some degree of validity, however limited, to most of the "commonsense" explanations. There are now studies which give clear statistical support to the harmful influence of a bad physical environment, to the destructive impact of a broken home; and detailed case history analysis has confirmed the role played by the individual's own physiological and psychological malformations or maladjustments. To the extent that all the "total" explanations are given scientific support, however, all of them necessarily suffer some deflation and modification.

These findings represent important gains, of course, but they offer small consolation when we compare them with the rate of increase in the incidence and malevolence of the phenomenon itself. The evil is fast outdistancing our poor efforts to isolate its causes, much less cure or even control it.

Perhaps this is because we are looking for the wrong kind of cause—or looking in the wrong places. The study of the delinquent, juvenile or adult, is usually set in the framework of a deviation from the accepted social norms; he is seen as a rebel, with or without a cause, who, alone or in the company of other like-minded rebels, scorns and seeks to overthrow the dominant values of society. Occasionally one encounters an exception—Albert K. Cohen's 1955 study, Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang, being one outstanding example—which approaches the delinquency problem as one not of deviation in itself but, rather, of conformity to a deviant value system held by some group more immediately crucial to the delinquent than the more abstract and distant society. This is an important shift of focus; neither the individual nor even the gang but, instead, the subculture of the neighborhood or community becomes the culprit.

This should not be confused with the old-style environmental determinism which viewed delinquency as the direct product of material deprivation, slum housing, recreational deficiencies, etc. These things are important, of course, but they are now important in that they contribute to a cultural setting in which distinctive patterns of social interaction emerge, producing an equally distinctive system of values. Such a system of values can linger on long after the tenement gives way to the public housing towers and their carefully planned playground program and facilities. It is in the molding force of such subcultures that one may find the true leads to an understanding of the problem of the delinquent and his behavior.

Though this approach does emphasize the conformity aspect of delinquency, it still holds to the basic deviation formula, merely shifting the onus of the delinquency from the deviant individual to the deviant neighborhood subculture. As such it would apply to the Teutonia Indians of the 1910's as truly as it does to the Egyptian Kings of the 1950's. We are still left with the problem of the critical differences between them. To understand these an even more drastic approach may be in order, one which departs from the basic deviation concept as it is customarily employed.

No one would suggest that the behavior patterns we call delinquency are not in a very real sense a departure from the general norms (at least, as the general norms are overtly expressed; Kinsey's disturbing discoveries of the widespread incidence of sexual delinquencies on the part of the general population are relevant here). However, even though the fact of deviation is accepted, one may still challenge the direction usually ascribed to that deviation. In short, I am suggesting that much of our present delinquency problem—and certainly its most significant characteristics—represents not a rejection of flaunting of our contemporary social values, but rather an overacceptance of these values leading to a distortion in the form of carrying them to their logical extreme of application.

The key to the whole problem lies in the quality and not the quantity of delinquent behavior. The prevailing characteristics of such behavior seem to incorporate, first, an utter disregard of the intrinsic worth of human life and rights; second, an almost completely hedonistic orientation at the price of abandoning or denying all moral self-restraint; and, third, a slavish acceptance of peer group evaluations as the final test of one's own importance and meaning to himself.

It should not be too difficult to see that these characteristics are really exaggerations of behavior guides that rule much of our normal and respectable ways of life. The joy-riding young demons on a hundred-mile-an-hour spree are not too far removed from the reputable exurbanite heedlessly pushing his chariot of death to its maximum speed—or, for that matter, from the even more reputable manufacturer who was well aware that his product's greater size and increased speed potential would be measured by new record highs in highway murder. The alcohol-drug-and-sex orgy of the teenage gang finds striking parallels at a more restrained level in the mores and tastes of enlightened sophisticated society and are certainly a direct response—perhaps more honest, however crude—to the battery of sex-and-fun stimuli to which everyone is subjected by the advertiser, the sensation press, and the prominent figures of all the entertainment worlds. Finally, the importance of proving oneself to his fellows, even though proof that one is not chicken may involve some act of delinquency, mirrors grotesquely the unending striving for status and acceptance, regardless of the price, that sets and maintains the pace in the rat race of the organization man.

If this is the shook-up generation, that terms applies to all of us, not only to the teenage thug with the zip gun and the leather jacket. Whence our right to criticize his disregard for human life, we who have seen the bodies burned to ashes at Buchenwald and Hiroshima, we who are willing to accept the fact that we are preparing to use ("only as a last resort," of course) new and inhumanly murderous weapons that are on target if they fall within 50 miles of their military objective? How can we who have renounced our own sense of ultimate personal moral responsibility challenge the conformity of the youth who rides the social current into the jungle of the street gang? It is no accident that the most vicious gangs model their organization, their alliances, and their rumbles after the patterns set for them by their elders, even their supposedly responsible elders who engage in the game of international power politics.

Of course, not all of us carry our social values to such logical extremes of violence, and it is here that specific personal or social handicaps and influences become relevant in that they operate as selective factors. Most of us, juveniles and adults, do develop a measure of self-restraint and maturity that makes it possible for us to draw lines and call a halt this side of delinquency and crime. Not so the delinquent. Limited intellectual endowment or retarded intellectual development, poor home and neighborhood environments, economic and recreational deprivations—all these serve to make him more susceptible to the pervasive amorality or outright immorality of the general culture, just as inferior physical endowment and development or a state of physical weakness makes some individuals more readily susceptible than others to infection when all are equally exposed to a raging epidemic.

Salisbury comes close to this conclusion by declaring in his book that "surely it is in our value system that the germ of the trouble lies hidden." Even more to this point are the words of Dr. Albert Schweitzer: "Increasingly, there is lost the consciousness that every man is an object of concern for us just because he is a man; civilization and morals are shaken and the advance to fully developed inhumanity is only a question of time."

Is this the factor that has been lacking to confound all our efforts to explain and solve the problem of the delinquent—the patterned inhumanity of society itself, arising from the loss of the sense of individual human dignity and moral responsibility? If yes, it is futile for us to turn to such proposals as a "return to the woodshed" penology or the more elaborate but equally sterile blueprints of the social engineer. The real solution becomes terribly simple, just as it is terribly hard. Man must again become an object of concern for us "just because he is a man" and not because he is a potential customer or competitor, fellow national or enemy, or even the anonymous "other" who has it in his power to help or hinder us in our efforts to find a comfortable niche in an admittedly uncomfortable world.

The terror that stalks our streets has been fashioned in our image; not an image buried in the night depths of subconscious fears and evil urges, but an image blazoned forth in headlines, on billboards, everywhere we turn. Until we correct our value system (the one we live by, not the one we proclaim), until we destroy the deadly germ from which the poison growth of delinquency has sprung, it is a hopeless challenge that we face.

Red China From the Inside—A Dismal Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following factual report in U.S. News & World Report on conditions inside Red China, by Louis Wiznitzer, correspondent for a leading newspaper of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. While no one man's observations during a relatively short trip to a police-state land whose language he does not speak can be comprehensive or final, the actual things seen cannot be denied. More and more of the terrible truth about the alleged miraculous developments in Communist China gradually leaks out. Mr. Wiznitzers' main impressions are that about 95 percent of China is still primitive, a land of bowing peasants, donkey-powered water wheels, soldiers without guns, factories without assembly lines—a depressing, overrated country, at least 30 years away from real power. The interview follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, June 15, 1959]

"I SAW RED CHINA FROM THE INSIDE"—WHAT'S REALLY GOING ON: FULL REPORT BY WESTERN NEWSMAN

Question. Mr. Wiznitzer, how long were you in China?

Answer. Seven weeks; it was 50 days exactly, in March and April of this year.

Question. How were you able to get an entry permit?

Answer. Actually, you see, I applied to the Communist Chinese consulate when I was in Berne, Switzerland, last September. After several delays I was accepted. This is largely due, I think, to the fact that the Communists are making such a big play for Latin America at this time in their political propaganda.

Queston. Did you get to see a good deal of China in the time you were there?

Answer. I believe so. I traveled to Shanghai, Peiping, Lanchow—which is very far off, near Sinkiang—Sian, Loyang, Chengchow, Wuhan, and to Canton.

Question. Had you ever been there before?

Answer. No.

Question. What surprised you most?

Answer. I was surprised by a great number of things—to begin with, the fantastic hate campaign that is going on. Hate against the West, hate against the United States in particular. The country is covered with thousands, millions of posters where the United States is being hanged or kicked or shown as a snake, an octopus, a rat. This goes on over the radio, the press. It is a 24-hour nationwide hate campaign of a size that I don't believe ever has existed—not even in Nazi Germany.

Question. Is the campaign effective? Is it catching hold among the people?

Answer. Absolutely, completely.

Question. What is your overall impression of China under the Reds?

Answer. I reached two conclusions about China. One is that too much emphasis is laid on the industrial power of China, which is practically nonexistent and won't exist for another 30 years. China is no world power, and China has very little industry.

But, on the other hand, the Chinese people are under the Government's control. To a great extent, they are satisfied with conditions in China today. Communist propaganda is very efficient, and the hate campaign is penetrating very deep. The people have nobody to tell them different. Of course, a few thousand people have traveled, but they are just nothing—they don't count.

Question. Would China be a dangerous enemy in case of war?

Answer. No. China without Russia is no adversary. When we speak of China as a world power, we don't know what we're saying. China is no world power, except for limited wars—wars like Korea, where China can send in a few million men and sacrifice a few million men easily. But, in a world

war, China's power is nonexistent now and for maybe another three or four decades.

Question. Why?

Answer. Well, on one hand, they have Manchuria. The industry in Manchuria, we know, has been built by the Japanese and the Russians, and its functions—there is no doubt about that. But the new factories and mills of China, the ones that the Russians have built for them in Paotow, in Lanchow, in Loyang and in Wuhan, which they are very proud of—these very huge plants are not producing at all.

I visited them all. I was at the oil refinery in Lanchow—Soviet built—at the oil well equipment plant in Lanchow, at the tractor No. 1 factory in Loyang, at the mining-machinery plant in Loyang, at the heavy machine tool plant in Wuhan and at the steel and iron plant in Wuhan.

Question. Are those all new industries?

Answer. Those are all new industries. These are the industries that the regime is concentrating upon because it wants to decentralize, because they want to have their industries, they say, not near the sea where the imperialists had built, but inside China and as far west as possible.

Question. What are these installations like?

Answer. The visit to a plant or factory was always divided in two parts. First, there was the interview, not with a technician, not with an engineer, but with the party man.

Question. A political man?

Answer. A political man, and I would ask him questions about the plant. He would give me the official answers. Then came the visit, which showed me things completely different from his answers.

Question. Did they realize that?

Answer. No, they are very naive. I believe that, altogether, industry is a new thing for the Chinese, and they think that a man who is not an expert, who is just a newspaperman, doesn't understand industry at all. They don't realize that any westerner has industry in his blood and that he knows what an assembly line is like, and he knows when there is no assembly line. I don't know many details about industry, but when I see a huge crane move back and forth carrying nothing and only making a big noise and its cables hanging for 15 minutes, I know that nothing is going on.

I will give you another example, the oil refinery in Lanchow. It's a very big, very huge refinery that the Russians have built there, and it's not finished yet, but part of it is finished. It has about six cracking towers. One of the five or six was functioning. One was busy, the others were deserted.

Question. They were not working?

Answer. Only one was working, apparently. So we went in there and we went to the automatic-control board. This has these gages, about 12 of them, where you see what the production is. The hands were all showing zero, except one. On one of the gages the needle was off zero, so I asked the guide, "How come all the others are showing zero?" And he said, "Oh, that doesn't mean anything. They are to be repaired."

At the time I really didn't know what that meant. I thought that was possible, but, as soon as I was back in Peiping, foreigners explained to me that when these gages show zero it just means that there is no production.

Question. Was this plant typical of what you saw?

Answer. There is this oil-well-equipment plant in Lanchow which I mentioned. It will produce not only equipment for oil wells but for the chemical industry. I was told that they have 12 engineers out of which 4 are Russian. The Chinese have all been trained in Russia. This plant is not finished yet—one-third is under construction. They have 4,000 workers. They claim they have one, two or three shifts engaged in production, but I saw no production—no production whatsoever going on.

Question. Were they shut down completely?

Answer. No, no. They are busy. They are busy in that very strange manner—people going about and hammering or nailing or doing things on the floor or running one machine to learn how it operates, or doing something with it. But there is no production at all.

Question. Did you see a Russian engineer?

Answer. No. I never saw any engineers in those plants. I saw small teams of four or five people working on one small machine or hammering together or melting iron. They have this big building, and they are going about learning what it's all about, trying to get used to it. No A-to-Z production, no assembly line.

Question. Did you find the same thing in other factories?

Answer. Yes. In Shanghai, I visited an ammonium bicarbonate plant, which was supposed to be making chemical fertilizer——

Question. A new plant?

Answer. It's a new plant. It was completed May 1, last year. Now, before going there, they were reluctant to show it to me. But I insisted; I said that this is the kind of thing we don't have in Brazil and I wanted to see it. So they took me along—two chemical engineers and a guide—and warned me that the plant had been stopped for 24 hours for repairs. And, indeed, I found not one worker. There was not one single person there. It was like a ghost town.

One Chinese chemical engineer showed on paper what kind of ammonium bicarbonate the Americans made and what kind the Chinese made. There was a difference somewhere in the formula, and, according to him, the Chinese ammonium bicarbonate was much more efficient. He gave me the figure of how much more rice it would produce on a plot of land, compared to the American. The only thing is—they weren't producing any ammonium bicarbonate at all.

Question. How many people would that plant employ normally?

Answer. I would say about 30 or 40 people. Not only was there not one man working when I was there, but there was no coke—that much I know. You see, if the plant had been working yesterday or a week ago, there would be some traces of coke, because that's what they need. But the whole plant actually hadn't been working for months. I later checked with some Western businessmen and technicians who live in Shanghai. They told me that what happened at this plant was typical of a great part of the Chinese industry—it was working sporadically.

In other words, even the textile industry, even fountain pen factories would work 2 or 3 weeks and then they would stop for a month or two, and then they would start again, all according to the amount of raw material coming in, the amount of fuel, or maybe problems of transportation. This is happening in even the small factories. They suddenly rush work for 2, 3, 4 weeks and then stop again.

Question. What's the big problem in factories?

Answer. Well, if we speak of these large factories, there are four main problems, really.

The biggest problem of them all, I believe, is: no skilled labor. In all these factories, these eight superplants of which I spoke, I found that the only busy areas were the small workshops that are equipped with Chinese machines—small or medium-sized machines. They had hundreds, yes, thousands of very young people—15-, 16-year-old boys and girls—who were learning the trade. The rest of these factories were practically empty or not busy. You see, these factories are used as schools. In other words, they don't have enough skilled labor—far from enough skilled labor. The skilled labor they have is up in Manchuria, and they are now beginning to train a new generation of workers to operate these plants.

Second, no transportation. China has no transportation at all as we know it. As you travel through China—north, west, south, east, to as far as Sinkiang—you never see a truck on the road. You never see a tractor on the landscape. They do produce a few thousand small trucks, but they don't know where to use them first. This is a continent, this is a place larger than Europe, and a few thousand of these small-size trucks that they bring out—they don't know where to send them first.

For instance, at the steel and iron plant at Wuhan, all the transportation is on men's backs. This is one of the maddest contrasts I have ever seen in my life—an iron and steel plant, and thousands of men carrying things on their backs. You don't see a truck in there.

Then, of course, there is a shortage of raw material and a shortage of power. These are the four factors that explain the low production of this modern industry.

Question. You saw no tractors in the fields—what about the tractor plant you mentioned?

Answer. Yes, the tractor No. 1 plant in Loyang.

Question. Where is that?

Answer. Loyang is along the railroad from Shanghai to Sinkiang. Now, they told me that construction of this tractor plant was started in 1955 and finished in 1959. It was supposed to employ 22,000 workers, on two shifts. The construction cost 200 million yuan, or $50 million at the unofficial rate of exchange. They said it produces a 54-horsepower tractor, called the Red East. They claimed they have already produced 200 of them. And they also claim to produce a 40-horsepower tractor. They say they have 20 Soviet engineers there and 30 Chinese engineers.

Now, as to what I actually saw.

I saw one-third of the factory was empty, completely empty. One-third was half equipped, and one-third was fully equipped. But nothing was going on there, except handworking, and there was no production, in the Western sense of the word. Thirty percent, I would say, of the machines were Soviet, 70 percent were Chinese.

All the very huge machines, the huge cranes, all the very big machines are Soviet, and some of the medium machines were, too. All the small and some of the medium were Chinese. In many rooms there was heavy Soviet equipment not unpacked or not working. And there was no assembly line.

Question. No assembly line?

Answer. Well, this is typical of the Chinese—a naive projection of all knowledge of industry. On one hand, they told me that they had already produced 200 tractors in September. On the other hand, they said, "Well, we don't have an assembly line yet. Some of the equipment for the assembly line is still missing." This, of course, is a contradiction in terms.

The only activity that I could really see was training in the small workshops. People were sort of busy with hammers. They were trying to bend iron. In the middle of all these machines, they had places to bend iron. Thinks like that you don't see in a modern factory.

Question. Did you find the same thing in other factories?

Answer. In the same town—Loyang—there is a mining-machinery factory. They started to build it in 1956. It's completely finished

now. It employs 7,000 workers, and they work two shifts. I was told production started in December 1958. The cost of construction would have been 6 million yuan, or $1.5 million. It has eight brick buildings and looks like a factory in any other country. They employ 40 engineers—15 Soviet engineers and 25 Chinese engineers. Now this factory, I was told, produces machinery for coal and copper mines and so forth. Eighty percent of the equipment was Chinese. Twenty percent, roughly, was Soviet equipment. Again, the very big equipment was Russian.

This factory is divided in two lines: a heating, processing workshop that leads to a foundry, and a cooling, processing workshop that leads to an assembly line. But there, again, I didn't see an assembly line.

I found the same thing everywhere, roughly speaking. One-third of the buildings either were not constructed yet or completely unequipped, one-third vaguely equipped, and one-third fully equipped. And this one-third had no assembly-line production—it relied on handworking.

So eventually from a factory they would get one mining machine or one motor or there would be one heavy tool or two lathes that were handmade. They work on machines for a couple of weeks, to train themselves how to use them, and then they either keep them as models or to show visitors, or they send them to a factory where they can be used.

Question. And then the workers go back to their hand methods?

Answer. That's right. So far, in all these plants, it's handwork, and I imagine it takes them 2, 3, or 4 weeks to make one mining machine or to make one small tractor or one lathe. That is the kind of production they are getting now.

Question. So they might get one tractor every month?

Answer. Yes; that's right. At the tractor factory I asked to see one tractor, and they were not able to show me one. At the very end of the visit, after 3 hours, they said that there was one tractor, but it was circulating around the factory and they didn't know where it was. I finally saw it. We happened to bump into it—at this huge tractor No. 1 plant in China I saw one small tractor.

Question. Then are the Chinese just as dependent as ever upon the Russians for mining machinery, tractors, and other basic equipment?

Answer. Absolutely, completely.

Let's go, for instnace, to the heavy-machine-tool plant in Wuhan. It was started in 1956 and it was finished in August 1958. The cost of construction was 100 million yuan, or maybe $25 million.

Well, the production that they planned here is 1,000 lathes per year, and they employ 6,000 workers. They were mostly trained there. They have 2,000 technicians—but by "technicians" they just mean skilled labor.

Question. Somebody who can use a hammer?

Answer. Who can use a hammer or has a little more knowledge than an ordinary, illiterate worker. They also claim 150 engineers, out of which 7 were Russian engineers. Production, they claim, started last year. The guide was very violent about the West and kept talking about America and how he hated America and he didn't want American machines and China didn't need British or American machines.

I saw three or four lathes of different sizes lying about there—there was no assembly line. One wasn't put together yet. It was obviously handmade for the purpose of training. The lathes that they are planning to make are a planer, 40 yards long and weighing 500 tons, and also a 9-yard vertical lathe, to be produced this year. They also plan to produce a 12-yard-high gear-cutting machine.

There was much assistance from the Soviets in designing and constructing the factory. There were a few machines from Germany and Czechoslovakia as well, and some of the small machines were made in the factory. The kind of activity that was going on there was hammering and tinkering, that kind of thing, and huge cranes moving without carrying anything which was obviously to impress me.

This is a point that I would like to stress, because it's very important and it's hard for westerners to understand it. We get the Chinese figures on production. We take off 25, 30 percent, sometimes 50 percent. But we can't believe that sometimes one must take off 99 percent. There are certain things that one has to know about the Chinese people that are completely inconceivable for westerners, but are completely normal for the Chinese.

Question. Such as?

Answer. Well, the Chinese do everything—they have always done everything—to save face, to show off. The Chinese will operate a section of a factory at whatever expense for 2 hours to show it to a visitor. This is the kind of thing that is too much out of proportion for anybody from a Western country, because it's not worth it to waste that effort—that raw material and eventually the money—to impress visitors. Well, the Chinese will not retreat from that. They will do anything from moving big cranes for nothing, or telling you things that they believe you don't understand, to actually operating a whole section of a whole workshop for a couple of hours, or set up what they did at the "Car No. 1" factory in Peiping.

Question. Is China making cars?

Answer. The Chinese do not as yet make any passenger cars. They have a "Car No. 1" factory in Peiping, where they produce those small trucks. In one of the rooms there they display a few hand-manufactured cars, small passenger cars, of which they say, "These are the cars that are being produced in the Car No. 1 plant." A Western man—even the most distrusting Western man—will not take the whole thing down completely to zero. Actually production like this has to be taken down to zero of the official claim.

Question. Is Wuhan supposed to be their big, new steel plant?

Answer. Yes Construction started in 1957 and will be finished eventually in 1961. It's still very much under construction. It will employ 100,000 workers. It's very big. It's really very big even now. Very little of it has been constructed yet, but the whole area is something like a very huge iron and steel industry anywhere else—in outward looks, anyway.

Question. Does it compare with any in the West?

Answer. Well, it's like the German plant in Essen in appearance. But there are 10 small furnaces which are completely irrelevant. There are three large furnaces—one is an iron furnace and two coke furnaces. They plan to construct 26 big ones. They have 300 engineers, of whom 11 are Soviet engineers. They claim iron production now is 1,2 million tons a year, and coke 1.5 million tons a year.

Question. Were you able to check their actual production?

Answer. Yes. I was able to check because I met in Pieping, and then again after leaving China, two steel experts from a Swedish factory that is delivering material to China. They were able to figure out very expertly what the real story was—these people can't be fooled, because they can figure out to a few hundred tons whether it's this or that.

The plant will be automated. The steel plant is only under construction. There is no steel furnace yet in Wuhan. It will come from Russia. Its capacity will be 500 tons of steel per day. The blast furnace now working produces 2,400 tons of iron per day, or not quite 900,000 tons a year. It has automatic charging—this is true, I saw that—regulation of temperature and pressure. There are trains coming in and out to take coke and iron.

Question. Does it operate the same as the plant in Essen?

Answer. No. It looked more primitive. The way the men worked at the place where the iron comes out actually—where the oven opens and this iron runs out—looked much more primitive than what I saw in Germany. The plant is filled with mud and little men carrying stones and earth and going all up and down hills, and building roads, and beginning to put up new buildings.

And it's at a very early stage. When we speak of the "iron and steel plant of Wuhan," we're speaking of something in the distant future.

Question. Could you check production figures in other plants?

Answer. The Swedish experts visited the Shanghai steel plant No. 2, where the Chinese claim a production of a million tons per year.

The Swedes came to the conclusion that they were producing 200,000 tons per year.

Question. Just one fifth—

Answer. And that, if the factory was really working to its full capacity, it could produce 350,000 tons, which is a third of what the Chinese claim was.

Question. Is this an older plant?

Answer. This is an older plant. At the Canton steel plant, where the Chinese claim a production of 500,000 tons a year, the Swedish experts said that this plant was only starting now and that there were no figures for this production. It was very, very low. It was about maybe 50,000. In other words, a tenth of the Chinese claim.

The Peiping steel plant is not producing at all. The Swedes were told that at this time it was to be repaired. These are three older plants that the Chinese claim are functioning.

In the Anshan district, in Manchuria, the industry does have 10 furnaces, of which 7 are automatic. That's the one we know works. The 10th furnace was actually constructed in China. Anshan produces 1,500 tons of steel a day—this according to the same Swedish experts.

Question. Did you come across any instances where percentage gains were used to confuse actual production?

Answer. Yes, very often. In the Hsinhau (New China) News Agency Bulletin—the bulletin they publish every day—they will always say that factory such and such or plant so and so has increased production by 20 percent, or 40 percent. And later on, as I checked with Western experts who had been there or knew something about it, the production there was so small that an increase of 20 percent meant 20 percent over nothing at all.

What the Chinese really aim at now, the more important thing in China, is this mobilization, general mobilization. And it's not so much the material result as the mental mobilization. They try to organize the whole country—not with weapons, because they don't have all those weapons, but in a military fashion. Workers are industrial soldiers, and the peasants are the militia. There are the health soldiers, and the university soldiers. Everybody is a soldier, and everything is organized. They insist on more effort, more work—which is more important, in a way, than the results, than the tons of output.

They speak of a water-conservancy army moving across the country. They speak of a railroad-track army and of an industrial army. The peasants form a militia and, in the streets of the major cities, you see the workers go to work beating rhythms on their broomsticks or on their instruments.

They don't have weapons, but they are all marching in military fashion and they are told they're soldiers. They are reminded that the West threatens them and that there is an American aggression in Formosa. This goes on 24 hours a day. There are loudspeakers in every train compartment and there are posters on every wall. China lives in a fever, in a tense, warlike atmosphere today.

Question. So, could Mao Tse-tung order 600 million Chinese to war and get them to obey?

Answer. He would get the support of the Chinese. Why? What matters mostly are the young people. Since childhood, they have been told every minute of the day and everywhere they go to hate the West. That is true in the villages, too.

Everywhere you see posters and inscriptions repeating the same slogans against the West. They hear the slogans over the radio, they hear them when they do gymnastics—you know, in China, they do gymnastics every morning in the streets. Anyway, even the gymnastics are interrupted every 15 minutes by slogans: "More effort into production." "Remember the American bacteriological war," and so on. And these people have no reason to doubt it.

Question. Is there forced labor?

Answer. I wanted to speak to law students in the University of Peiping, and I was told that they were away on productive labor. And this I checked later all over China. The students are away in the country for farm work between 2 and 4 months a year.

Question. What do the students do?

Answer. Farm work. When they are in the university, they have to do 1 day a week of productive work, which means either cleaning up the place or building a new house or all kinds of practical handwork that you can do—anything from cleaning, from kitchen work, to building a new building. The teachers do it, too, unless they are old. Old teachers are spared, but all the young and middle-aged teachers have to go to the country, have to do the same things.

These students are volunteers, but in a way very odd to us. The authorities don't go and tell them, "You shall go, you have to go." They line them up by hundreds of thousands, and they take them one by one and give them a choice. But the choice is so simplified that it is no longer a choice.

They tell them, "Do you want to help build up your country, or do you not want to help build up your country?" So the first one will say, "Yes, I want to." "All right, you go." And then the second one, and so on. And I know it's very hard for number 44 in the middle of all these others, to say, "I don't want to help build up my country," or begin to argue. He would not be sent to jail, but to a center of reeducation.

Questions. Are the Chinese wiping out illiteracy?

Answer. Yes. I would say that China has made much progress in certain areas. It has made progress against illiteracy. There is still illiteracy in China, but much less. They have a huge campaign of: Everyone must know how to write and read, and the children must teach their parents.

They have made progress in health. They have wiped out some of the traditional Chinese plagues like cholera, bubonic plague, yellow fever, smallpox. They have made colossal progress and they lay great emphasis on cleanliness.

The Chinese have become almost too clean. Again there are contradictions here because they spit as in no other country in the world; they spit all the time, but they are very eager for cleanliness. They have made progress in clothing and in food.

Question. Did you find any class differences in China?

Answer. I was always shocked in China by the arrogance of the elite and of the young people toward the old people. The [Communist] party people are tremendously arrogant toward the other people.

And the country of equality—China considers itself a country of equality—is a country where classes are sharply divided into different elites. For instance, all over China—all over the factories, on all the walls—you see a new division of the Chinese workers into sputnik worker, jet workers, car workers, horse workers, ox workers, and snail workers, according to how much they produce.

In other words, the one who is a sputnik worker will be called a hero and a national this and a national that. The one who is a snail worker will be an object of contempt. Even a factory will be called an ox factory, and it will have these posters saying, "The equivalent factory in Shanghai is a sputnik factory—why aren't you?"

Question. Is this causing and dissatisfaction?

Answer. We think too much of the Chinese people's dissatisfaction, their readiness to rebel, and so on. My impression is that the great majority of the Chinese people are content, and not ready to rebel. They have come up from misery to a very low standard of living.

Question. Were you able to find out much about the communes?

Answer. You hear a lot about their communes, where they were going to bring a lot of farms and people together, so they work, eat, and share modern equipment together. So we keep talking about these communes, and we don't know what we're talking about.

The fact is that there are few modern communes in China. There are about 100 or 150 communes, but, if the implements haven't changed, if the methods of working haven't changed, if the lodging hasn't changed, a change in name doesn't mean much.

If a village is very poor, whether this poverty is private or communal doesn't make much difference. In any case, if you put all these communes together, you would get something about the size of Maryland.

Question. Have they changed things very much?

Answer. The great west of China, as I saw it from my train window traveling from Canton to Peiping, from Peiping to Lanchow—trips of 48 hours—is nothing but hundreds, thousands of small, primitive villages. It's the old China that hasn't changed: Bamboo huts. Clay houses. Peasants bowing to the ground, working with their hands. Donkeys turning the wheels to get water out of the well, as in Egypt, as in India, as in Latin America. Ninety-five percent of China is the same as it was 10 years ago, or 50 years ago.

Question. Overall, what struck you as Red China's big weakness?

Answer. This, which I say now, is the very fundamental thing: The Chinese are illogical. Intelligent, yes, but not logical.

The Chinese think experimentally. Now Red China's leaders are applying Marxist dialectics, one of the most sophisticated results of Western logic. They are planning like mad. You get 5-year plans, 10-year plans, 50-year plans. Everything has a plan. Very well. But then you have to get 50,000 or 500,000 people to carry out this plan, and along the way they will leave out a few things and the whole plan goes to pieces. Like the backyard blast furnaces.

Question. What about those backyard steel furnaces?

Answer. The answer is very simple—I think your magazine has given it. They are all junk.

I read the story in your magazine (issue of Jan. 30, 1959) before going to China and, frankly, I didn't believe. But the story was right. Those backyard furnaces are junk. I saw thousands of them as I was traveling. But I never saw smoke coming out of one of them. Never did I see any production going on.

Question. Did you hear any talk about this backyard-steel campaign while you were in China?

Answer. Oh, yes; this is very amazing. They still say in their propaganda, even to us, that "this new commune will have its own iron production" and so on and so on. But these inconsistencies are very normal in China.

Question. Did you get any reasons for the breakdown of the backyard-furnace campaign?

Answer. Yes. The reason is very simple. They have found that it is not enough to have furnaces. You need raw materials, and they have found that you need transportation. They have no transportation, they have no raw materials. In other words, they can't operate.

Question. Was any iron actually being delivered from backyard furnaces to the steel mills?

Answer. Last year, I understand, I spoke in Peiping to many westerners; there was a fantastic iron drive that went on for 2 months. Everybody was in the streets, in the gardens, in the public squares, gathering scrap or making iron. But 90 percent of this iron had to be either completely abandoned or sent to Anshan to be refined. And, meanwhile, the crops had suffered. I wouldn't make too much of that, because there is no great shortage of food in China. Still, food production did suffer from this madness.

Question. What about Communist claims of developing an oil industry?

Answer. They claim that they have oil in Yümen and in Karamai, in Szechwan and in Tsaidam, and that all or most of this oil will go or is going into the oil refinery in Lanchow.

The oil that they have found in these four places that I have named—it is just in the stage of research. They may have had evidence of oil existing in these places.

Question. Have they actually drilled?

Answer. They haven't drilled. There is no oil coming out of these places yet.

Question. Does China depend on Russia for its oil?

Answer. On Russia, and Rumania, I'm told. The most significant evidence I had of that was at the station of Lanchow, where I saw a Soviet train of 50 flatcars unloading oil.

Now this was at the time of the Tibetan crisis, although I didn't know this until 2 weeks later; the Government was not permitting anything to be said about Tibet then. But Lanchow is about 100 miles from Sining, the place where the road to Lhasa begins, and most probably this explains the presence of the Soviet train unloading oil to replace stocks at that time.

Question. Has China found any new sources of iron, of coal, of other raw materials?

Answer. They have great claims. They say that they have 1.5 billion tons of coal in the ground, that their iron reserves come to 100,000 million tons, and their phosphorus reserves to 30,000 million tons.

But then, of course, they say that they have 600,000 geologists all over China today, which is a joke. They just mean that anybody who goes around the country looking for anything is a geologist. But they are training geologists at the universities very much. They are concentrating very much on geology and on finding their resources.

Question. Can they produce engineers, technicians, and scientists to compare with those of the West?

Answer. I think not. They are in too great a hurry now. They are more anxious to produce engineers and technicians who can be set to work immediately, who have a minimum knowledge, than engineers with knowledge equivalent to ours in the West or even to Russia.

Question. What about advanced study?

Answer. They discourage advanced study. They send youngsters off to work as soon as they know something—a minimum. I don't think they want to do this particularly. I mean, they know that this is not the best way, but they are faced with a problem. They have a fantastic shortage of technicians and engineers, and the first thing, as far as they are concerned, is production and getting them busy now.

Question. But you say it's hurting them in production—

Answer. Yes. Misquoting Shakespeare, I would say there is madness in their method. I think this is very important. The Chinese method of constructing the country is completely inconsistent.

For instance, there are these new superplants on a scale you find in the Soviet Union and the United States. At the same time, the rest of the Chinese industry is still laying its foundations. It is very primitive.

This is typical of the Chinese method. They don't construct their industry, they don't build their industry organically, logically, layer by layer, from the smallest to the larger until they come to have an oil refinery or a gasoline-equipment plant, which are part of the more sophisticated complex of industry. They begin by building the roof. They cannot operate this roof, there is nothing to support it. They cannot operate these factories, but they have them.

Question. What about transport? Do the railroads run on time?

Answer. The railroads run on time between Canton and Peiping—Peiping, Shanghai, Canton. They run very slow, but they run on time. To the far west—to Lanchow—they run about 3 hours late, but that might have been seasonal or some kind of accident.

I would have to check, but I don't think I would be very wrong if I would say they run about 30 miles an hour.

Another thing is their civil air transport. It is very interesting, because they have quite a network, they go almost everywhere. But every time you want to take a palne—or very often, anyway—the flight is postponed for 1 day or 2, sometimes 3 days. They tell you that the weather is bad. Actually it rained somewhere or there was a cloud. They are fantastically cautious. They fly very low, very slow, and only if the weather is perfectly beautiful.

This is not only my experience. Almost any foreigner I met in Peiping goes by train because at least he's certain to get where he wants. If he takes a plane and the weather is not too good somewhere, the plane will land immediately and he will spend 2 days in some small town in China waiting for the weather to get better. What they call "bad" weather has nothing to do with what we call it.

Question. What about their roads? Are they paved?

Answer. Only around the big cities. They are building a modern paved road outside Lanchow. They are concentrating great efforts on Lanchow. This is supposed to be someday the center of the new China. There is no running water in Lanchow, hardly any food. But they have an oil refinery, they have an oil-well-equipment plant, and they have all these people working on roads and bridges and so on.

Question. All of this is done by hand?

Answer. Yes. All over China, as you travel, that's actually the thing you see most. If I had to remember one image of China, I would remember the image of 50 Chinese people in a row carrying things on their backs, going uphill or downhill, along rivers, inside factories—always the same picture of Chinese people——

Question. What do they carry?

Answer. Rocks, land, clay—what they carry you don't even know. What they're doing it for is too much to figure out.

Question. Men and women?

Answer. Men and women and children. Sometimes you see carts—you know, oxdrawn carts—and so on. But most of the time it's huge, endless lines of Chinese people carrying things on their backs. You see them doing it along rivers and you wonder why. Along bare mountains, on the roads, they're carrying land from one place to another place.

Question. Do you ever see an automobile or bus on the roads?

Answer. No. In the towns and cities you do, but on the roads you can go day after day without seeing a truck, an automobile, or anything. There aren't any. You see camels and bicycles and people dragging carts. I would say that 90 percent of the transportation is on man's back.

Question. Have they made a great push out to the west, as they claimed they were going to do?

Answer. They are pushing the Lanchow railroad. They are quite ahead with that. They have already passed the border of Sinkiang and they want to connect with Alma-Ata in Russia.

I saw a few trains—flatcars—loaded with young people, packed together like animals. They were being sent out to Sinkiang. It was a pretty ugly sight.

Question. Are any of the new industries you saw located by rail sidings?

Answer. The only place where I saw railroad sidings was at the Wuhan steel plant.

Question. The others would have to depend on highway transport?

Answer. Yes, and it just was nonexistent.

Question. Did you get any idea of their exports?

Answer. In Shanghai they have an institute—Export Exhibition Hall—where they have samples of everything that China can export today—from rice to oranges to machines, even radio tubes. They have catalogs and prices. But a western businessman in Shanghai said that most of this cannot be exported because they're not producing it.

I also spoke to some British businessmen who told me that 2 years ago they wanted to make a deal with China to import 5,000 cans of tinned food from China into England. The Chinese insisted that they would be interested only if it were 50,000 cans. The Englishmen didn't want to take 50,000, they wanted only 5,000. The Chinese insisted, and finally the British accepted and they signed a 50,000-can contract. Two years have gone by, and they have got 2,000 cans so far.

Question. What is your impression of the military strength of the Chinese?

Answer. You see soldiers everywhere—millions of them—but not with weapons. They work in the country or in factories—they work like everyone else in the street. They are workers, only they have military uniforms. But there is no evidence of military strength. I never saw trains with equipment or tanks or cannon, and I really traveled very much and very far out. Of course, it's hard to guess the strategic and the military secrets, but you don't get the impression of a strong military establishment at all. You get the impression of a vast country that has no industry, no transportation—a country that is just beginning to crawl. But it's pouring out so much propaganda—we are discounting it 50 percent and we still credit them with much more than they have.

Question. How does Red China's strength compare with India's?

Answer. China, because of its totalitarian methods and its propaganda, may impress the world with greater results than India has shown, or lead us to believe that China is stronger. I don't think this is so.

Question. Over all, how do you feel about China after being there?

Answer. I went into China with great drive and interest. After 2 or 3 weeks I fell into a state of great depression and eventually anxiety.

Question. Why is that?

Answer. The working circumstances are terrible. One never knows what interview one will or will not have, what trip will be authorized or not, whether one's stay permit will be prolonged or not. You have the feeling you're being watched all the time—it's a weird atmosphere. When one hears, on top of that, of the Westerners who are actually in jail without a sentence having been passed on them, one begins to wonder and fear. You ask why they haven't been sentenced, and you're told, "They haven't confessed enough."

I was told by Western people in Peiping that practically all the foreign correspondents from France, Canada, Australia, England, and so on have gone through the same psychological evolution that I did. Pretty soon your drive is lost, you feel the atmosphere of distrust and hate all around you, and all you want to do is leave China and forget about it.

Fading Americanism Makes True Citizen Feel Like Exile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a most thought-provoking sermon delivered by Dr. Walter R. Courtenay, minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Nashville, Tenn. This sermon appeared in the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner under date of July 6, 1959.

It was delivered by this most eminent minister on Sunday following the Fourth of July.

Dr. Courtenay calls on all true Americans, who are firm in their faith in God and dedicated to liberty and justice, to rededicate their lives to the principles of our Founding Fathers.

He likewise reviews with unerring accuracy some of the overtones of history so obvious to all who take the time to review them.

I believe this erudite discourse by one of the Nation's scholarly ministers of the gospel will be most interesting to the Members of Congress. I, therefore, under the unanimous-consent rule insert it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

FADING AMERICANISM MAKES TRUE CITIZEN FEEL LIKE EXILE—CALLS FOR REDEDICATION TO FOUNDING PRINCIPLES

(By Dr. Walter R. Courtenay)

Yesterday America observed her 183d birthday. Looked at in terms of man's life expectancy, it is a great age. Looked at in

terms of nations it is brief. Looked at in terms of human history it is nothing.

I awoke yesterday at 5:50 a.m. and thought immediately of the day into which I was entering—July 4, 1959. My mind went back to those disturbed and disturbing days of 1776, when English colonies, pushed by a foolish king, a stupid Parliament, and an aristocracy that sought to make Britishers-away-from-home pay for a war in which they had neither interest nor participation, rebelled and demanded separation and free government.

The recommendation for the convening of a General Congress was made by Franklin in July, 1773. The Congress met in September 1774, sought only to find ways and means of recovering the just rights and liberties of the colonists, and the restoration of union and harmony with Great Britain. The Second Continental Congress met in May 1775, a month after the battles of Lexington and Concord. The Revolutionary War was being waged with a growing sense of imperativeness. When the Congress met again in the summer of 1776 it did so in an atmosphere of final purpose and steeled resoluteness. On June 7, Richard Henry Lee of Virginia moved that "these united colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent States." On June 11, a committee was appointed to prepare a Declaration of Independence. The members of that committee were Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Adams, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sherman, and Mr. Livingston.

JEFFERSON CHOSEN

The man chosen by the committee to write the Declaration was Thomas Jefferson, a young man of 33 from Virginia. He was a tall, attractive, red-headed man, gifted in law, farming, philosophy, and science. He was chosen because he had a happy talent for composition, as well as being a man of sound judgment and tested patriotism.

Jefferson's draft was reported to Congress on June 28. It was laid on the table until July 1. On that day it was debated. On July 2, Congress voted independence, but did not act on Mr. Jefferson's Declaration. On July 3, his Declaration was again considered, and was finally passed on July 4, 1776. The signatures were not affixed to the document until many weeks later. In this great document Jefferson did not strive to create something original, something self-made, but rather tried to gather into marching sentences what Members of the Congress had been saying for 2 years. Jefferson gathered into memorable form the best of the hopes of his generation.

The average age of the signers was 44. Samuel Adams was 53, John Hancock, 39; Richard Henry Lee, 44; Benjamin Harrison, 36; John Adams, 40; Jefferson, 33; Livingston, 29; Roger Sherman, 55; Benjamin Franklin, 70.

Those who espoused revolution and independence were educated men with significant estates. They stood to gain liberty, but they also stood to lose everything they had, including their lives. The Members of Congress in 1776 and those who signed the Declaration threw everything they had into the cause of liberty and justice for all, although there was a strong difference of opinion among them as to the meaning of the words: "we the people."

As my mind touched the events of 1776, I thought of how Americans would observe July 4. Here is the record: The churches were not filled yesterday with grateful citizens expressing appreciation to God for the Founding Fathers and those others who have labored and died to keep us free and prosperous. Few paused to acknowledge God from whom all blessings flow. No sermons were delivered with challenging remembrances and pointed prophecies. Few in Nashville hung out the Stars and Stripes or spoke with one another about past blessings or increased dedication. Throughout the land it was a getaway time, a holiday time, a have-fun time, a do-as-you-please time.

July 4, the birthday of this great Nation, has come to mean nothing but another holiday. Who pauses to weigh its meaning? Who takes down a history book to hear the stirring words of John Adams in 1765 as he called upon clergymen, lawyers, educators, business leaders and citizens to "dare to read, think, speak and write. Let every order and degree among the people rouse their attention and animate their resolution. Let them all become attentive to the grounds and principles of government, ecclesiastical and civil." Adams ended his address with these words, "The prospect now before us in America, ought in the same manner to engage the attention of every man of learning, to matters of power and of right, that we may be neither led nor driven blindfolded to irretrievable destruction."

Who in these self-centered, get-all-you-can days takes time to refresh his mind with what men said and did 183 years ago? How many Americans care what happens next as long as their present pleasures and income are not disturbed? How many Christians, appointed of God to determine for the Nation the principles of justice and right, study the problems of our day and look at them with eyes free from prejudicial squints and jaundiced discoloration?

We have reached a time in America when the flag is a piece of colored cloth, but is no longer a sight that brings tears to the eyes of the patriot. And we of the South have too long associated the Stars and Stripes with Union armies rather than the Union. Southerners who fought and won the battles that clinched independence at Cowpens, Kings Mountain and New Orleans, ought to display the American flag with more pride and gratitude than any other people in our land.

We live in a day when we have made open patriotism socially offensive. We have now attained the age when each Congressman, each Senator, each presidential candidate, and each political party spends more time playing to private audiences than he does the general welfare of this Nation. Only when personal or sectional welfare coincides with national welfare do men step forward to espouse the larger causes of our land. Where personal or sectional or party benefits conflict with the overall well-being of our Nation, how many Representatives are willing to jeopardize local and party standing by taking strong stands against the selfishness that calls itself public welfare, good business, smart politics, freedom of labor, sectional progress, or the general good? A white label pasted on a dirty bottle filled with poison does nothing to cleanse the bottle nor make innocent its contents. There ought to be fewer differences among those who represent our people in Washington. There ought to be more similarities in the realm of wisdom and greatness. Our major issues there ought not to be the name calling, the knot tying, the feet dragging, and the weird party jockeying that now characterizes every piece of legislation that comes before the Congress. We are afflicted with what Madison called "the mischief of factions." What is good for America is not always good for the Republican Party or the Democratic Party, and what is good for either party is not always best for our Nation as a whole.

Here I pause to observe that what is good for the world is not always good for America, and what is good for America is not always good for the world. What is good for business is not always good for labor. What is good for labor is not always good for business. There is a golden mean which men of integrity find and follow.

What we need today is an increase in Americans who love America, who appreciate the things that have made her great, who work constantly to keep her not only strong, but sincere, God-entangled, justice-dedicated, rich in righteousness and pointed in sacred, generous purpose.

I feel about America as I do the Christian church: She has grown and succeeded in spite of us. We have done enough, beginning with Hamilton and Jefferson, to have destroyed her a hundred times.

Our cost of Government and its various programs is today too great. Our concern for economic commonsense, financial sanity, and overall productivity is not great enough. Too few Americans understand what inflation does to the strength of a nation or what the flow of gold out of America does to our world prestige and leadership. Not enough Americans are exercised about the increased dangers rising from our slow drift toward socialism or the threat of labor-leader control over one of our major political parties. Right now we are like a man caught in quicksand whose struggles drive him deeper into the very situation from which he seeks release. Many times our leaders seem more like little boys playing at cops and robbers rather than mature men endeavoring to measure up to the awful responsibilities and demands of governments in a world that is striving to adjust rapidly from a classical to a scientific view of life, from the earth age to the space age, from a nationalistic to a whole-world concept, from war with men and planes to war with missiles, from peace with peace, to peace with cold-war fears. Fiddling while Rome burned was costly in Nero's day. Today it is national, yea, international suicide. If the United States of America is weakened by her own unseeing leaders or by her all-seeing enemies; if America, the shepherd, is wounded or killed, the flock of free peoples will not only be shepherdless, but lost. The fate of the free peoples of the earth, in fact, the fate of all the peoples of the earth, is in our hands.

Does not that fact startle and sober you? Dare you live out this day and the day after as if all were well? Dare your interest be no larger than self-interest, and your patriotism no stronger than your loyalty to a party?

I speak of these things on this day after July 4, 1959, because the land of the free and the home of the brave is producing more and more Americans who feel that they have lost or are losing the land they love. Increasingly they feel like exiles in these United States. No longer do they feel on every side the old fervor for the American way of life with its Constitution and its free enterprise economy. Seldom are they stirred to sacrificial giving and living by leaders who, seeing the signs of the times, move men to dedicate their all to such invisible but real objectives as justice, liberty, fair play, morality, faith in God, faith in duty, and the peace of the earth. More and more we become absorbed in the rough and tumble game of winner take all, and because our eyes are on our hoped-for winnings instead of on God and duty, our understanding of America decreases, our loyalties grow weaker, our national and world objectives less distinct, and our fervor for God and country loses the heat that once made it a flaming torch of hope for the entire world.

Samuel Goldwyn, premier Hollywood producer, has said that when he came to America from England, an immigrant boy at the age of 12, he literally kissed the welcoming earth of the land to which he had come. He goes on to say that he has never ceased to give thanks that there exists on this troubled globe one country where freedom and opportunity are denied to no man.

Do we feel that way about America?

Oh, I know that patriotism has its dangers. Men under its banner have lied and cheated.

In the name of patriotism they have given power to their pride and their prejudices. Patriotism has produced the demagog as well as the statesman, the traitor as well as the hero. Under its banner men in high places have become self-centered and selfish, greedy and vengeful. But patriotism has also produced in men their purest love, their greatest sacrifice, their loveliest dreams, and their holiest dedication to God. I cannot go so far as to say that the Nation is everything and the citizen nothing. Nor would I care to say that the citizen is everything and the Nation nothing. But this I know: Unless the citizens of this land concentrate on the well-being of the Nation as a whole, and unless this Nation concentrates on the well-being of our people, there cannot long remain harmony within our borders or peace beyond them. I cannot help but feel that the welfare of this Nation as a whole is more important than my welfare, as dearly as I love my place.

I wish sometimes that we could all suffer from amnesia, the loss of memory. There is something to be said for a situation where one must face his future without consciousness of the past. Then we would be compelled to think new thoughts, to plan in new ways, to face up to the needs of the times with less hesitation. And who can measure the good to be achieved if Germans, Frenchmen, Englishmen, Italians, Russians, and Americans should suddenly become amnesic, the past blotted out, so that we would all have to begin where we are, getting acquainted without the penalties of hurt memories, and working together without the hangovers of old hatreds and suspicions.

Only one thing might be more beneficial: That all nations would so understand God and His will for mankind, that they would love where they have hated, trust where they have doubted, work together for peace where they have armed each other for war.

Ah, but you say we live in a world where cold war is hot, and sin is a way of life and no mere dogma of the church. I agree. But what is the cure for both? More deadly missiles? Bigger wars? Higher and higher budgets for defense, until we spend more on feeding warheads than we do ourselves?

At stake in this year of 1959 is humanity itself, nothing less. Until men fear their strength, seeing in new war the death, not of individuals but whole cities, states and nations, we must remain strong, but with our physical strength there must come, and that right soon, increased respect for the moral laws of God and the duties He has assigned to those who call Him Lord. In a world like that which surrounds us all, military power is only a small part of the final answer. As Washington himself has observed, "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports."

A Christian is not merely one who loves his country and is willing to serve her faithfully and fully. Many storm troopers and Mussolinites did that. Many in Russia so live today.

A Christian is first of all one who loves God as he knows God in Jesus Christ, and who also loves his fellowmen. A Christian, because he honors, loves and serves Almighty God, seeks to live with goodwill toward all neighbors and all nations.

Love of country is a virtue in a Christian, but only when his country is mindful of the will of God, and seeks to be stronger spiritually than she is militarily.

In this age of missiles we must not forget that we still do business with the God of stars and of all space.

Ere this birthday season of our Nation ends and we return to the mundane tasks of Monday, may I plead with you to ponder seriously the forces, principles and events that has blessed America and the world, and to look with clear eyes upon the demands of our times, dedicating yourselves to God first, to making America Christian second, and to building peace in the world third. Or as a great American has expressed it:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphans, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Too many Americans are beginning to feel like exiles in America. Too many do not seem to care what is really happening within and beyond our frontiers. Too few are taking their places in the frontlines where men who love liberty strive to hold at bay the Communistic push.

May more of us so love God, our Nation, and the peace of the world, that we move forward into frontline positions.

May God bless America, and may she be worthy of God's blessings.

H. R. 5896

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself for a few moments to the provisions of H.R. 5896. There is much in this bill which is commendable. It reasserts the principle that the reuniting of families should be one of the cornerstones of our immigration policy. To a limited extent, this bill, among other things, does exactly that. The married sons or daughters over 21 years of citizens of the United States are moved from the fourth to the second preference. Married sons or daughters over 21 years of age of lawfully residing aliens are placed in the third preference category. As a result of these changes and others, immigration visas available for the use of fourth preference immigrants are raised from 25 percent to 50 percent. Equally far-reaching is the provision of this bill which will give nonquota status to those prospective immigrants whose names appear on the consular waiting list before the date of December 24, 1952.

This bill, while a progressive step, by the very limitation of the date imposed tends to defeat one of the most significant purposes of this bill, viz, the reuniting of families. We took similar action in the 85th Congress under Public Law 85–316, but there the Congress concerned itself only with the first three preferences and made eligible only those who had been reached prior to 1957. The fourth preference clause was given no consideration therein at all. Hence, we find that in two successive Congresses we have taken a piecemeal approach to solving the heart-breaking problem of families separated by the operation of our immigration laws. To me, it appears wholly logical that if we attack this problem that we attack it whole; that we bring a solution to it that is total, and not step by step. That if the law is to be revised, that it be revised cleanly and precisely without the ragged edges which remain as irritants and prods to our conscience. The cut-off date of 1952, to my mind, fails to meet the problem. Had we used the year 1955, following the expiration of the Refugee Relief Act, or more logically still, the year 1959, we could have disposed of this problem in its entirety.

Separated families bring divided hearts and divided homes. Does not logic, therefore, dictate that if we seek the solution, as unquestionably this bill does, that we bring a solution that is totally compatible with our problems? Though this bill represents a job only partially completed it does help to relieve a distressing situation.

I look forward with hope to the day when we will tackle this problem of reunification of families in a more direct and total fashion.

Grading of Meat, H.R. 1043

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced H.R. 1043, to provide for the grading of meat and for informing the consumer of such grade.

On June 19, 1959, it was my privilege to appear before the Livestock and Feed Grain Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee in support of my bill.

The following is a transcript of that testimony:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to appear before your distinguished committee. I do hope that you will look with favor on my bill, H.R. 1043.

The introduction of the bill is prompted by the fact that we have much advertising and sale of meat, in the retail stores particularly, with the purchasers being misled as to what kind of meat or the grade or quality of meat they are buying, and I would not be at all surprised if to a certain extent, some of the advertising was deliberately misleading.

I picked these advertisements out of Thursday's Washington papers, but the advertising throughout the country is practically the same, particularly chain store advertising.

Yesterday's Post carries an ad of the Giant Food Store chain. This is what I call good and proper advertising. They set forth their own trade name, "Giant Topnotch." Then they take the trouble to explain in the advertisement what it is and what it means, and then set forth what Government grading means. They set forth USDA, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Prime, Choice, and explaining the differences. Then when you read this advertisement you know just what they are offering you. When you go into their store the food is plainly marked and you get what you expect to get.

I shall leave these advertisements with you.

On the other hand, in the Evening Star of last night is the advertisement of a nationwide chain, A. & P., and this advertisement is typical of their advertising from one end of the country to the other, and it has been going on for many years. I have almost the identical advertisement in my file which bears the date January 1959. They advertise "super right quality, top grade. Super right quality, none priced higher." That is typical of their advertisements.

What in the world is "super right quality"? What is "top grade quality"? You and I look at this desk and say this is top grade. A furniture man would look at it and say it is second or third grade. You and I would go into a store and look at a piece of meat and say, "That looks awfully good. It must be top grade." But the man behind the counter knows it is probably "good" or maybe only "commercial." He can pass it off as "choice" or "prime."

Another advertisement, also from Thursday's Washington Post. The chainstore advertises their chickens, "table right, grade A fryer." I wonder what they are selling. It may be the lowest grade of chicken, but it is being passed off as grade A because he says it is grade A. You may differ with him, but the average housewife does not know the difference until after she has cooked it and tried eating it. Looking at it they cannot tell.

Another typical advertisement is from the Washington Post of yesterday. This chain advertises their meat as "Lancaster brand." You might be put on notice that it is a private brand and find out what it is. Again, looking at it, there is no way of telling what you are buying. From the price, 89 cents per pound compared to the price of the "choice" advertised in another company's ad, you might think you were getting choice, but I would bet if we walked into the two stores and bought a pound of each, one would be choice grade and the other would be an inferior grade.

My bill seeks to remedy that. While I know we cannot legislate ethics and cannot legislate honesty, at least we can regulate it to the extent that everybody will know that an item which is Government inspected will carry a grade label under a standard set by the Department, and then that the product will be labeled accordingly and everybody will know just what they are getting when they make a purchase.

I do not contend that the bill is perfect by any means. When you get into the details you probably will find you can improve it. It was prepared for me by legislative bill drafters. I think it is at least an approach to the problem and I hope the committee will look upon it with favor.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. MULTER, this bill provides compulsory Federal grading on all meat and meat products, is that right?

Mr. MULTER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. POAGE. Of course it requires that the evidence of that grade go with the meat or meat product until it is sold at retail.

Mr. MULTER. That is right, sir.

Mr. POAGE. Does it prohibit the use of private brands along with that?

Mr. MULTER. Oh, no.

Mr. POAGE. You can call it "Lancaster Special" as long as it has the Government grading?

Mr. MULTER. As long as it has the Government grade, whatever it may be.

Mr. POAGE. In the last few months there has been a flare-up of criticism in a number of the livestock producing organizations protesting against the whole Federal grading process. I have not personally felt that they were entirely well advised, but the objection comes from what they feel to be unreasonable and arbitrary grading. I think it goes primarily to lamb. The sheep people are especially incensed at what the Federal Government has done in the way of grading. They feel that the Federal grades do not reflect consumer wishes at all, and of necessity they have to feed their lambs out till they are nothing but tallow.

Last night I had a couple of lamb chops and I did not get any more lamb out of them than the end of this gavel. Yet they were great long lamb chops. They were nothing but fat and bone, and I thought they were as sorry as any I had ever eaten. Yet they were supposed to be choice lamb, and were by Federal grading, because the Federal grading looks too much to the amount of fat, I think.

Our beef people have felt, probably not so strongly on the matter as the sheep people have, but they have felt that there has been too much emphasis on fat, too much emphasis on marbeling of meat. The public wanted that a generation ago, but the Federal grading system keeps about a generation behind public needs.

For that reason the committee is being faced with demands to repeal all Federal meat grading. I do not think it stems primarily from any desire to let these various stores establish their own system, because I think the producer has a stake in having a sound system which appraises the relative value of his product with the relative value of somebody else's. I think it good for both producer and consumer to have some standards whereby we can know what we are selling and what we are buying.

I do call your attention to the fact that right at this time there is a considerable wave of resentment against the Federal grading system, and it is primarily because producers feel it is not realistic, that it does not represent the actual quality of the meat.

You do not touch upon the Federal grading system itself?

Mr. MULTER. No. I leave it to the Department to set the standards.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, they have that power right now.

Mr. MULTER. They have the right to set the standards. This goes a little further and permits the licensing of inspectors. I think it is rather carefully drawn so at a place where there is no inspector you do not create a hardship on the man who is raising the stock and trying to process it for the market. I do think that once it is ready for the consumer market it ought to be marked, and somebody ought to set the standards and they should come within those standards.

Naturally there will be a high and a low. You are not dealing with a product to which you can put a micrometer and say this is it. There will have to be a minimum and maximum within each grade. I think that should be adhered to and the labeling should be enforced. I think you would not need anybody but the housewife to do the enforcing for you, because if the law required it to be graded and the housewife knew it, if the purchaser at retail knew it had to be graded, they would look for the grade and if it was not there they just would not buy it. The retail outlet would very soon know they had to grade the meat properly or the customer would not buy it.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, we thought when we established the present grading system that that would police it and the public would demand those grades. The public has not demanded them, as far as I can see. The housewife has that opportunity today and she does not exercise it, as far as I can see, because the housewife in Brooklyn right now has the same opportunity she would have under this bill to ask what the Federal grade is on a piece of meat. She does not ask in so many cases. Of course, there are cases where she does, but in too many cases she does not demand it, and the result is that Federal grading is not anything like complete at the present time.

Then that raises the question of what it would cost if we do require grading on all of this meat. Much meat, especially in your State is not now subject to Federal grading. Obviously, you must have the Federal Government pay for all the grading when you require it. How much would it run?

Mr. MULTER. I could not say.

Mr. POAGE. It runs about $19 million now, does it not, Mr. Short?

Mr. SHORT. We have been talking about wheat so much lately, Mr. Chairman, I have gotten off the subject of meat, which is probably something I should know more about. I believe it is something like that, Mr. Chairman.

Excuse me, sir, for being late, and may I inquire, sir, what your interest is in this? This whole matter of meat grading, of course, falls into a maze of different arguments.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. MULTER's proposal is to require that all meat sold through retail outlets carry a Federal grade marked on the retail portions of the meat, that the grading be done, of course, by the Federal Government, through Federal inspectors who are federally paid, and that nobody should be allowed to sell meat which did not carry a Federal grade. They can use their own trade names, but they still would have to carry the Federal grade.

Mr. SHORT. How much attention the housewife pays to it is a very debatable question in my mind. I am interested as a cattleman when I come back here a long way from the producing areas and hear housewives continually say you can get much better beef at one store than you can at another of the big chains, when we all know that the big chains carry essentially, for practical purposes, the same identical grades of beef. They have all practically standardized on U.S. Choice. Within that grade they have the right to select their beef, which maybe can fall into the category of high Choice or low Choice, or something like that, but when the housewife goes to the market thinking that she is guided in her choice by the Government grade, it certainly eliminates to a considerable degree any responsibility that the processor or the retail market has in being able to have some characteristic about their particular trade grade of beef that they have as an argument to induce the housewife to buy their brand rather than someone else's.

There is probably an overall benefit in a Federal grading system, but there are certainly many other aspects of this business of grades. The first thing you have to recognize in this matter of grading is that I do not think any two animals raised yet were identical so far as grade is concerned. There have been some very interesting things developed in recent years as far as the difference in palatability, tenderness, marbeling, and all sorts of things, of livestock which from the outward appearance or even the carcass appearance happens to fall into the same grade.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, just for clarification on this, addressing myself to anyone, what is the present status of grading by USDA at the overall Federal level where there are some meats at the retail level which are stamped and others are not?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, correct me if I am wrong. It is my impression that there is no requirement that the meat be labeled as to grade when it reaches the retail level.

Mrs. MAY. It is up to the retailer to advertise Government inspected meat himself, is that right?

Mr. SHORT. The carcasses are stamped.

Mr. MULTER. The carcasses, yes; but very few retail places receive the whole carcass

and then carve it up in the store for retail sale. Places like A. & P. will receive the carcasses into their main warehouse, where it is cut up into small sizes and even wrapped, and then delivered to the various stores for sale to the customer. I think very few, if any, of the chains do any of the cutting of the meat for the customers in the store. Most of it is all done in the warehouse.

The small butcher shop receives a half carcass or quarter of a carcass and carves it up for the trade as they buy it.

Mrs. MAY. So the Government actually stamps only the carcass, and then it disappears between there and the retail, unless there are State laws. Am I not correct on this?

Mr. POAGE. That would be a State stamp and not Federal.

Mr. MULTER. I know of no State which requires inspection and stamping for the retail trade. I believe our boards of health, State, and city, in New York, rely on the Federal grading.

Mr. SHORT. The grade stamp is visually evident on the carcass. It is put on with a roller from top to bottom. In the cutting of the various cuts of meat, particularly roasts lots of times, unless they resort to excessive trimming, that grade stamp is still visible on the retail cut of meat. If the housewife understands this business of grading, she will start looking for that, but I doubt very many of them do.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not right, Mr. SHORT, that there is no requirement that it be there? The meat may very well be cut so there is no Federal stamp on the particular cut you buy. I would assume that three-fourths of the cuts which are sold have no Federal stamp on them.

Mr. MULTER. That is quite right.

Mr. SHORT. Particularly now, when they resort to so much trimming and packaging and that sort of thing.

Mr. MULTER. These advertisements are from yesterday's newspapers in Washington, but they are typical of what is going on across the country in every community where there are chain stores. You will find these full-page ads week in and week out. As I indicated before, here is what I call good advertising, fair and proper. It sets forth as a substantial part of the ad the definition of the U.S. grades and indicates that their particular brand "Topnotch," is the choice grade as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Turning to these other ads of competitive chains, one uses its own brand, "Lancaster Brand," with no definition of what it may be. Another says "Grade A Fryer," and a third one says "Super Right Quality." "Super Right Quality" is just one of those colossal phrases developed by the motion picture industry. It has no grading value, but it fools the housewife.

Mr. SHORT. It does not fool her very long. If she is fooled once she isn't apt to be fooled again.

Mr. MULTER. I suppose you may be right, that if she is fooled one time, she probably will not go back to the store again.

Mr. SHORT. My contention is that most people continue to buy meat on the basis of their satisfaction with what they bought the first time. I do not think the fact that a store advertises that the grade they are offering under their brand name falls into the category of a certain Government grade is necessarily an assurance to the housewife that that is true. If she is not satisfied with the quality of the product she buys, she will not go back there very often, it seems to me, if she gets better quality product at some other store.

Mr. MULTER. Unfortunately, too many of these big chain operators operate on the old Barnum theory that there are always enough of the public around to be fooled to keep you going.

Mrs. MAY. Is there a penalty at the retail level if the retail store, A. & P. or something, would advertise U.S. stamped, federally inspected, Grade A Choice, which really is Good?

Mr. POAGE. It is certainly fraudulent advertising.

Mr. SHORT. I would say they would be subject to somebody hauling them into court for misrepresentation if someone could prove that was true.

Mr. MULTER. I think there probably would be a civil cause of action, but there is no penal statute on the subject, there is no penalty, and nobody will waste the time and money to hire a lawyer and sue over a few pounds of meat.

Mr. POAGE. Yes; there are, Mr. MULTER. A. & P. certainly will spend a good deal of money to see that Safeway tells the truth.

Mr. MULTER. You mean between the competitive stores. Then Safeway ought to get busy and sue A. & P.

Mr. POAGE. A. & P. has not misrepresented anything.

Mrs. MAY. Under the law.

Mr. MULTER. Under existing law, I think you are right. They have a right under existing law to say this is our definition of "Super Right." This is what we call "Super Right." It may be the lowest grade of meat, but they call it "Super Right."

Mr. POAGE. But if they said it was "Prime" when it was "Good," then it would be misrepresentation.

Mr. MULTER. Some of the advertisements I have seen have the word "Pride" in small letters. Looking at it quickly you would think this is "Prime." They have told the truth, it is their "Pride." You probably would not eat it, but it is their "Pride."

I will leave these advertisements with you for your committee file, Mr. Chairman, if you want them.

Mr. POAGE. Yes; we would like to have them.

Do you feel you would like to call other witnesses on this? Frankly, this meeting this morning is not necessarily to dispose of legislation, but we wanted to be able to sound our docket and see where we stand on it.

Mr. MULTER. I have no desire to call any other witnesses, Mr. Chairman. I might say I have no interest in any abattoir, and chainstores, or any of the other retail stores. I was prompted to introduce the bill merely as public service to protect the retail purchasers and consumers and mainly, of course, the housewife.

Mr. BREEDING. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

What does your bill provide?

Mr. MULTER. The bill would require that all meat offered for sale at retail, after having been graded in accordance with standards set by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, must be labeled to show the grade.

Mr. BREEDING. All meats—chicken, roasts, and everything must carry the grade?

Mr. MULTER. Yes. Frankly, I do not know the poultry industry well enough to know whether it is practical to apply it to the poultry industry. The bill drafters who prepared this for me applied it to both poultry and meat. If it is impractical to apply it to poultry, that can be changed.

Mr. POAGE. You recall we are just beginning Federal inspection of poultry. It started just in the last few months.

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. We do not have the well-organized Federal inspection of poultry that we have of other meats.

Mr. MULTER. That is the reason I suggest it may not be practical at this time as to poultry.

Mr. BREEDING. This bill would prohibit this kind of advertising?

Mr. MULTER. That is right. If it is a Prime cut or Choice cut, they would say so. If they want just to advertise meat, let them advertise meat, but don't let them advertise "super grade" or "grade A" or "super quality" when it does not meet Grade A standards.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. MULTER, you would allow them to advertise any private brand they want to call it, would you not?

Mr. MULTER. Of course.

Mr. POAGE. But they would have to give the Federal grade as well.

Mr. MULTER. They would have to do the same as this chain Giant does. They could have "giant topnotch" but explain that "giant topnotch" is USDA choice grade. In addition to that, they can carry that trade name if they like. My bill would not prohibit it. But they would have to say it is choice, prime, commercial, or whatever it may be.

Mr. POAGE. I think it important to let them carry their private trade name.

Mr. MULTER. By all means.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. MULTER, you say in here that this is compulsory Federal grading of all meat and meat products. How would we define "meat products"? Would that include tins and potted meats, Spam, meat spreads, and that sort of thing? Would that be all-inclusive, so the labels on these jars and cans would have to carry the Federal grade?

Mr. MULTER. I hope this does not go to that.

Mrs. MAY. It says "any article of food intended for human use which is derived or prepared in whole or in part from any edible portion of the carcass of cattle, sheep, swine, poultry, or goats"—I suppose it could even go into dog food—"if such edible portion so used is a considerable and definite portion of the furnished food products." There may be cereal mixed in with some of the meats. Again, it might be an administrative question on labeling.

Mr. MULTER. It was not intended to apply to the processed foods. It may be that you can cover the processed foods, the canned foods, the bolognas, and things of that kind.

Mr. POAGE. I doubt that you ought to go beyond fresh meat.

Mr. MULTER. This is intended to cover fresh meats or fresh frozen meats, where the meat itself was being sold, not having been processed into the bolognas or into canned goods or even into cooked goods.

Mrs. MAY. It might have to be spelled out.

Mr. MULTER. I am sure it would have to be.

Mr. SHORT. All those products are, for the protection of the consuming public, subject to Federal inspection for health.

Mr. MULTER. When it gets to processing, you do have, I think, in almost every State and municipality today, health laws which cover the situation.

Mr. POAGE. Federal meat inspection is compulsory and universal. The grading is not.

Mr. MULTER. I think it would be completely impractical to try to require the putting of Choice or Prime or something on a canned product or a precooked product.

Mrs. MAY. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. One other question. I notice in a couple of sections you refer to meat shipped or delivered for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce. Is it the intent of this bill that this shall apply only to meat which goes into interstate commerce?

Mr. POAGE. It could not apply to anything else, Mr. SHORT. You cannot apply Federal law to simply intrastate movement.

Mr. SHORT. As a lot of people do not realize a terrific amount of the beef in New York

City is slaughtered right there. This law would not apply to that.

Mr. MULTER. The cattle are brought in from outside.

Mr. SHORT. They are not subject to inspection until after slaughter.

Mr. MULTER. This would require that kind of meat to be graded. I think the act would apply to that. If the animal has been brought in from outside the State, I think the slaughtered animal is required to be inspected. Am I not right in that, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. POAGE. I should say, ask the Judiciary Committee or ask the Attorney General. I do not think anybody knows how broad this question of interstate commerce goes.

Mr. MULTER. Interstate commerce laws will apply in certain instances to a man who is hired and working locally in a building in the city of New York but, because other employers is the building are engaged in interstate commerce, he comes under that law.

Mr. POAGE. I never believed it, but the courts have so held.

Mr. MULTER. The next day we get a decision which indicates when he made his purchase that day in a store in the same building, he was not in interstate commerce.

Mr. POAGE. We are very much obligated to you, Mr. MULTER. The committee will of course consider the bill later on. We wanted this morning to have a chance to find out what was before us. We do appreciate your appearance.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you for the opportunity of being here.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you so much.

Publisher Esther Klein of Philadelphia Jewish Times Writes Trenchant Column Endorsing Congresswoman Granahan's Drive To Rid Mails of Obscene Material

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish Times, published in Philadelphia by Mrs. Esther Klein, features in each issue a hard-hitting column written by the publisher which takes up vital issues of the day and discusses them in a clear and forthright manner. It is always interesting to read and it is frequently provocative enough to stimulate community action. That, to me, is the test of a commentator's effectiveness, and it is a test which Mrs. Klein certainly meets and surmounts.

In a recent issue of the Jewish Times, Mrs. Klein, in her column "The Publisher Speaks," discussed the campaign of our colleague in the House of Representatives, the Honorable KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, of Philadelphia, to devise tighter laws for coping with the flood of filth, pornography and obscenities now being delivered by mail, particularly to children victimized by a brutal big business which is without morals or scruples.

Congresswoman GRANAHAN has undertaken this important task as chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. She has been doing an outstanding job in this assignment, and has won the praise of civic, educational, parent, community, and religious groups throughout the country for her efforts and for the investigation which her subcommittee has been conducting. I am pleased that the subcommittee is to visit Philadelphia and hold hearings there on this problem later this week.

I believe it is appropriate, therefore, to share with the Members of Congress interested in this important problem the excellent column which appeared on this subject in the Jewish Times, under the heading "The Publisher Speaks," by Esther Klein, as follows:

THE PUBLISHER SPEAKS
(By Esther Klein)

"The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 60 minutes."

Thus the Speaker of the House in Washington granted Philadelphia's Congresswoman the opportunity to speak for an hour before that august body on one of this country's growing problems. She made an impassioned plea for direct and immediate legislative action to combat the vast half billion dollar industry thriving on pornography and obscenity through the use of the U.S. mail.

As chairman of the Postal Operations Committee, Mrs. KATHRYN GRANAHAN, has been untiring in exposing this vicious industry that has expanded all over the country. Her stirring recital of the dire effect of the distribution of this smut material on the youth of the country moved the hardened Congressmen at a recent session.

It was at the initial hearing in April of this year that the Postmaster General testified that a half billion dollars is realized annually in mail order obscenity and pornography. J. Edgar Hoover, of the FBI, emphasized that these vicious dealers are aiming their material at teenagers, not only in the slum and rundown areas, but in every suburb.

This lewd material is directed at the youngsters who attend churches and synagogues, as well as those lacking parental and religious havens. Increasing widespread use of the mails to send obscene matter is proving alarming to teachers, religious leaders and social workers. One of these nationally known educators indicated that there is a direct relationship between the increase of smut available to our youth and the increase in juvenile delinquency.

"Women of this country are irate and offer their support to all concerned in fighting the dealers in filth and smut," according to one of the national club presidents quoted by Mrs. GRANAHAN in her statement to the Congressmen. "They will use all their power to help prevent the demoralization of youngsters which results when they are subjected to obscene trash at the impressionable age."

Mothers and fathers can be equally helpful in combatting this scourge. Just because they live in a good neighborhood, have a fine home, and send their children to the synagogue for services and classes, the parents can't assume immunity from this filthy material that comes in the mail. Children as young as 8 and 10 years old have been the recipients of samples of filthy literature. The names of these children as well as the older brothers and sisters are obtained when they write for stamps, airplane models, and other desirable items. This mailing list becomes highly desirable for the dealers in smut, who are vicious in their attempts to awaken the teenagers' cusiosity.

Parents can cooperate to stamp out these cruel dealers. If such an advertisement comes in the mail or is sold by a dealer near the school, contact should be made immediately with the local postmaster. Save the material and the envelope for the postal authorities. Immediate action may result in prompt arrest and curbing of this objectionable mailing.

Boys and girls picked up for minor crimes and even very serious crimes have admitted the adverse influence of the obscene literature, a contributing cause of these crimes. But if there was any further doubt in the minds of Philadelphians, it was emphasized distressingly by the youth who strangled the 3-year-old Becky Holt. He admitted reading smut advertisments sent to him through the mail. A fine home in a fine neighborhood and a parochial school of high standards couldn't combat lewd, indecent, and vile pictures that came through the Federal mail.

"Community support must be mobilized behind our efforts to safeguard the youth of our land from the dealers of smut and filth," declared the Philadelphia Congresswoman in her concluding remarks. "At the present time our subcommittee is in the process of preparing a report which will include a suggested program of action to be followed at the National, State, and local levels."

Let us as parents and earnest citizens forward our approval for the legislation being considered to protect our youth. The seriousness of this problem demands our immediate attention.

Retired Jerome Postmaster Hartshorn Recalls Varied Life in United States and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, at this season, when interest in the new 49-star flag makes us acutely conscious of the history, resources, and vast potential of the great new State of Alaska, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a feature story from the June 20 issue of the Twin Falls (Idaho) Times-News. It deals with the life and good times of my good friend, A. H. (Bert) Hartshorn. Bert, who is a retired postmaster, but still keeps close track of his farming operations in Idaho's Magic Valley, will celebrate his 90th birthday on December 3. A good part of Idaho and Alaska will celebrate it with him, for he is a living symbol of the pioneer tradition which has shaped the development of Idaho, Alaska, and the Pacific Northwest. I ask unanimous consent that the feature story to which I have referred may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAGIC VALLEY PORTRAIT—RETIRED JEROME POSTMASTER HARTSHORN RECALLS VARIED LIFE IN UNITED STATES AND ALASKA

JEROME, June 20.—Railroadman, blacksmith, boatman, powerplant supervisor, laundryman, farmer, and postmaster—all

these are occupations that A. H. Hartshorn, Jerome, has had during his long and eventful life in both the United States and the Yukon Territory during the gold rush.

Hartshorn first came to Jerome in 1919, fresh from the Yukon Territory, where he had spent the previous 20 years. He farmed near Jerome for several years and in 1935 he became postmaster of Jerome.

RETIRED IN 1950

Hartshorn was postmaster from 1935 until his retirement in 1950. Ever since he moved to Jerome and Idaho, he has been active in the Democratic Party.

Hartshorn was born in Dundee, Mich., on December 3, 1869. He completed nine grades of public school there and then went to work for his father, who operated a sawmill in southern Michigan.

In 1889, Hartshorn and his new bride came West. They moved to Olympia, Wash. He worked in various towns in Washington doing construction work for several years. Eventually he started working for the Northern Pacific Railroad, but was laid off after the 1894 strike.

BECAME BLACKSMITH

Hartshorn searched about for something to do and eventually purchased a blacksmith shop and worked days, nights, and Sundays shoeing packhorses in an effort to make a living.

In 1898 the gold rush to the Klondike began and the lure of the northland caught Hartshorn's fancy. He rented his blacksmith shop and struck out for Skagway, Alaska. After packing equipment overland to the headwaters of the Yukon River, he discovered the ice would not allow him to travel on the river for another 2 or 3 months.

Hartshorn was annoyed by the delay, but he made the best of the time on his hands. He managed to pick up a forge and anvil, manufacture some charcoal and he set up business as a blacksmith. He shoed horses for the many pack outfits that passed through the country.

STARTED RESTAURANT

He bought a small, one-room log restaurant building and operated both the restaurant and blacksmith businesses. He cooked meals for the packers and while they ate he would go outside and shoe their horses.

After a short time Hartshorn heard about a new gold discovery in the Atlin district of British Columbia. He took off for the discovery, leaving a horse half-shod in his blacksmith shop. After walking many miles and rowing over 30 miles on Tooshi Lake he arrived at the discovery. He finally sold the claim he had there and returned to his restaurant and blacksmith business on the trail to Dawson.

SAVED $600

He says the business was good. He fed the trail drivers on "run-bacon and beans and coffee." And in a few months he had saved $600.

Hartshorn recalls one amusing anecdote that happened on his trail-side restaurant and shop.

One night he heard a lot of laughter coming from the bunk-house. He investigated and found that the men were telling stories about good things to eat. "Too long on bacon and beans and they were hungry for something different," he says.

One man told how in his hometown he and his brother-in-law used to bait fishhooks and snag chickens from the railroadman that lived next door.

CHICKEN MYSTERY SOLVED

Hartshorn listened for awhile and then asked if the fellow's brother-in-law was named Spiker. The man replied that it was and asked how he knew this. Hartshorn laughed and told the men that he was the railroadman who had lost the chickens.

Hortshorn notes that instead of following the stampede he mined his own kind of gold mine in that very area. It seemed the trail was literally lined with dead pack horses that had died on the trail.

He explains the packers wouldn't feed the horses expensive grain they needed to keep them alive, so they died on the trail of undernourishment and overwork.

Hartshorn discovered he could operate a thriving blacksmith business by traveling along the trail and pulling the shoes off the dead horses, reshaping them and reselling them to the pack outfits. He estimates there were about 5,000 dead horses along the trail.

After wintering in Washington State, Hartshorn returned to Alaska. He discovered that the packhorse companies had built their own blacksmith shops and that his days of blacksmithing, as a profitable enterprise, were over.

Hartshorn then drifted down to Bennett Lake and found the lake covered with all kinds and shapes of steamboats. With his experience as a railroadman and with steam engines he had no trouble getting a job with one of the boat companies. He worked for the company until 1902, when he lost his job because he didn't have a Canadian license. The following winter he operated the White Pass lighting plant at Whitehorse.

The next spring he bought the Skagway steam lighting plant. He moved the plant to the Atlin mining camp and opened a laundry and sold electric power. He was enjoying a thriving business when the building housing the plant and laundry burned to the ground.

FIRE BROKE HIM

Hartshorn had no insurance and found himself broke. The next morning after the fire he applied for a job as the night operator of the local powerplant. He got the job and started a long career with northwoods powerplants.

He operated a powerplant near Dawson until 1911. Then he was transferred to a new plant that was being installed on the north fork of the Klondike River. He helped install the plant.

Hartshorn worked at the plant until 1919 and eventually became superintendent. Tiring of that kind of life, he resigned and came to Jerome and bought a farm.

TELLS ABOUT FARMING

"During my first year in Jerome I bought a fine team of horses, a good wagon, and farm machinery, and hopped to it like a kid. I raised some good crops. The second year I put in 12 acres of beets and got 20 tons to the acre.

"But the more we raised, the more we lost, so I started raising hogs. I built a smokehouse and processed about 16 hogs a year."

He had a thriving business selling cured pork and he notes he should have stayed with the meatpacking business.

In 1925 he bought a second-hand store and began repairing stoves and furniture.

Hartshorn became interested in politics and in 1926 he was elected chairman of the Jerome County Democratic Central Committee. Hartshorne is proud of the role Jerome County played in electing C. Ben Ross to the post of Governor in 1930.

In 1935 a group of Hartshorn's friends persuaded him to apply for the position of Jerome postmaster. He took the civil service test, made the highest score and took over the post in April of 1935. Since he retired in 1950 all he does is fight weeds on his farm near Jerome.

During his years as an active member of the Democratic Party, Hartshorn has been a champion of Federal power projects. He believes large Federal power projects, and the vast amount of power they would offer to industry, is the stimulus needed to make the Northwest the greatest industrial area in the world.

PENS MANY IDEAS

A prolific letterwriter, Hartshorn has penned his ideas on this, and other subjects affecting the economy of the Northwest and the farmers, to many politicians and newspapers in the Nation. He is a frequent contributor to the Public Forum in the Sunday Times-News.

Sure of his party's principles and the future of the Democratic Party, Hartshorn says the Democrats will win the presidential election in 1960 with ease.

Asked who he believed the candidate would be, he says it is now between Adlai Stevenson and John Kennedy.

"Personally, I'd like to see Kennedy," he says. "We need young men."

Besides looking forward to the 1960 election, Hartshorn is eagerly awaiting his 90th birthday anniversary on December 3. He has already started planning his party and has even started sending out invitations to old friends in such far-away places as Dawson.

"I'm going to have a really big party," he declares.

Report by Dr. Robert Jay Morrison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a newspaper article from the Harrisburg, Pa., newspaper, the Patriot. It is an account of Dr. Robert Jay Morrison's observations while in Russia which many will agree with me are very interesting since it is, as you might say, a first-hand account.

Dr. Morrison is one of the pioneers in the development and use of contact lenses and has lectured in various parts of the world by invitation because of his work in that field. He just returned to his home community of Harrisburg, Pa., where he is an optometrist, and I just thought his interesting report on his most recent trip abroad is very enlightening, not only as it relates to his field of specialization, but his other comments as well.

Mr. Speaker, the newspaper article follows:

[From the Patriot, Harrisburg, Pa., July 1959]

CITY OPTOMETRIST SAYS SOVIET LAGS BEHIND U.S. CULTURE

(By Jerry Fitzpatrick)

Russia is a land where the people go wild about black market American jazz and flock to museums and ballet. But the country is backward compared to the American standards of living.

These are the opinions of Dr. Robert Jay Morrison, city optometrist, who recently returned from a lecture tour of 11 countries in Eastern and Western Europe. He visited an additional five.

"Russians seemed so pleased with their advancement," Dr. Morrison said. "They still are not anywhere near us. They must have been really backward a short time ago. We're used to having things much better."

BANS JAZZ PLAYING

The Russian Government forbids jazz and is attempting to raise the country's cultural

level by exposing the masses only to the best in literature, ballet, and other arts.

The reaction, Dr. Morrison said, has been both ways—the people want both their culture and jazz.

Also missing from the Russian scene are gum and ball point pens. Youngsters swapped small pin emblems of Russia with Dr. Morrison to get these items.

"Religion is government, and creation is chemistry, in Russia," Dr. Morrison observed. "The young people do not understand religion, and my guides were puzzled about it."

FEW CHURCHES

He said that out of the original couple of thousand churches serving Moscow's 8 million people, there are now only 13 Orthodox churches and one Jewish synagogue. Only old people visit these.

Dr. Morrison, one of the pioneers in the development and use of contact lenses, originally had been invited to Russia to lecture. An announcement, appearing in professional journals, quickly led to engagements in 10 other countries.

"The Russians were extremely interested," Dr. Morrison related. "They plan to supply contact lenses for the masses by setting up laboratories in each of the six republics. Lenses now are made only in Moscow."

He believes American methods for eye examination and manufacture of lenses are superior.

Dr. Morrison achieved international recognition for his theory that contact lenses will prevent myopia (nearsightedness) from growing worse in small children. He has fitted national statesmen, movie stars, and one woman who traveled from Australia especially for the lenses.

Dr. Morrison spent 6 weeks in Europe traveling alone. He remained 8 days in Russia. He already has given a number of talks here on his experiences.

Warning From an Expert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding scientists of the world and a great American is Hon. Thomas E. Murray, former member of the Atomic Energy Commission, and now consultant to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. There is no one who has a more profound knowledge of the sinister and evil intentions and purposes of international communism than Mr. Murray.

On Sunday last he appeared on a TV program "Meet the Press."

I enclose in my extension of remarks a splendid editorial appearing in the New York Daily News of July 7, 1959, entitled "Warning From an Expert," and a continuing part of the editorial relating to remarks made by Dr. James B. Conant on the "College News Conference" TV program:

WARNING FROM AN EXPERT

As consultant to Congress joint atomic energy committee, Thomas E. Murray appeared on the TV program "Meet the Press" Sunday evening with an important warning to Americans.

Mr. Murray believes the Kremlin will kick up further limited wars, such as Korea, while fearing to start the all-out nuclear war which the United States is well prepared to fight.

Therefore, says Murray we should stockpile tens of thousands of small nuclear weapons for these probable limited wars. That makes sense to us.

It also reminds us that the Geneva talks about banning nuclear weapons tests are still going on. There is considerable danger that the United States may buy British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan's plan for a specified yearly number of inspections (say three or four) to "enforce" a permanent ban on all of such tests.

That would be no enforcement; and dropping all tests would hand Moscow a tremendous cold war victory. How about our people at Geneva simply standing pat on President Eisenhower's plan, to abandon fallout-producing nuclear tests in the earth's atmosphere, but go on with tests underground and in outer space? And for our own safety, how about resuming underground and outer-space tests in a hurry regardless of Red objections? The Russians are on the ball for war or peace; witness their alleged recovery of two dogs and a rabbit alive from their latest rocket.

Speaking of Kremlin-spurred limited wars, James B. Conant more or less backed up the Murray prediction Sunday, when he remarked on the "College News Conference" TV program that he expects Khrushchev to go to the jagged edge of war over West Berlin, and then pull back.

ANOTHER CRISIS IN FORMOSA AREA?

Certainly the Commies are making limited-war gestures in the Formosa area. Chiang Kai-shek's Chinese Nationalist Government reports an attack Sunday near the Matsu Islands by 12 new Soviet-made Chinese Red Mig-19 jet fighters on 4 U.S.-made Nationalist *Sabrejets*, with 5 Red and no Nationalist planes shot down.

So it may be that Moscow and Peiping are steaming up another Formosa rangdoo, to jibe with the resumption next week of the foreign ministers' conference at Geneva. This looks emphatically like a time for the Strategic Air Command and the 7th (Far Pacific) Fleet to be on extra alert.

John Paul Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, the motion picture industry is recognized throughout the world as a powerful medium for propaganda. But it is much more than that. When properly used, the motion picture screen can be an instrument for understanding, for the dissemination of truth and for a more effective presentation of history that can be achieved through the printed words of the most brilliant historians.

Recently, I had occasion to be forcefully reminded of this fact when I attended a special showing of the motion picture, "John Paul Jones." For that reason, I sincerely believe that significant attention should be paid to it.

Here, through the medium of motion picture entertainment—and the picture is good entertainment—millions of people all over the world will be made conscious of the part played by the man who is generally regarded as the father of the U.S. Navy in America's struggle for the freedom we now enjoy. It will serve to remind them that this great country of ours, now blessed with wealth and power and the respect of free nations, did not gain this position without a struggle. It will relive for them and, especially for all Americans, the anxious moments of this country's founding days. As such, it should bring about a better understanding between nations.

In "John Paul Jones," actor Robert Stack portrays him as history described him—a dour, determined Scot who, having adopted the United States as his country, sacrificed his health and, eventually his life, in fighting for it.

He opposed not only the outside enemies of this country, but the politicians within who failed to foresee its future as he did. It is a character which will not soon be forgotten by the peoples of the free world when they see the film and it may arouse the admiration and excite the interest of intelligent young filmgoers who have become tired of sin, sex, and horror.

There is much to inspire in the film. This is particularly evident in the words of George Washington in the film when, during the scenes at Valley Forge, with America's military fortunes at their lowest ebb, he discourages Jones from resigning his commission in the Continental Navy of the United States. The words were penned by John Farrow, who wrote the scenario from which he directed the picture, but they are as worthy of consideration today as they were two centuries ago. Says Washington:

There will be no United States unless all of us remain united and bound by that vision of liberty and freedom from tyranny which we have dedicated ourselves to make fact. The cowards, the malcontents, the traitors to our cause, will inevitably be thinned from our ranks but the bright beacon of justice will keep the survivors united. The goal will be attained and a permanent design will be set for the new generation of freemen that I am sure will live by the high ideals we have set in this blessed land. The United States will exist as long as we have faith.

And, in speaking of faith, I would like to pay tribute to Samuel Bronston, the man whose faith brought the story of John Paul Jones to the screen.

European born, he conceived the idea of making the picture 12 years ago when he was studying American history in order to receive his citizenship papers. He discovered that various motion picture studios had considered making such a picture but in each instance had abandoned the project because they considered it too costly. But he was determined to make the picture because he felt it was a subject that should be made.

Discouragement after discouragement followed. He exhausted his personal fortune but he would not give up. Eventually, his sincerity attracted the support of a circle of bankers and patriotic American businessmen. Most of them

had never invested in motion pictures before and between them they made it possible for the picture to be filmed on its proper scale.

I think the fact that Mr. Bronston's 12-year-long dream has at last assumed reality is visual proof to all the world that America is still the land of opportunity for those who, like John Paul Jones, have courage and determination and faith.

Therefore, I consider it a privilege to render this acknowledgment to the picture "John Paul Jones," and to the man who made it possible.

The Recent Graduation From Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa., of Mrs. David C. Kinkead, Clearfield, Pa., Unfolds a Human Interest Story Made Possible by Sheer Hard Work and Firm Determination To Reach a Goal in Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the United States is reeling under the charge of having an abnormal divorce rate and of being a nation with a high percentage of broken homes, it is refreshing to read of the outstanding achievement of Mrs. David C. Kinkead, Clearfield, Pa., a devoted wife and mother of four children, in obtaining a degree in nursing and public health from Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa. The courageous and resourceful Clearfield mother accomplished her cherished ambition as a member of this year's graduating class of 600 students while she was also occupied with the duties of a wife and mother of four children ranging in age from 3 to 19 years.

In expressing my sincere congratulations to Mrs. Kinkead on reaching her coveted goal, I wish to include in my remarks at this point the following article from the June 13, 1959, issue of the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress written by Jane Dietzel, staff writer, which recounts in an interesting manner the feat accomplished by Mrs. Kinkead through confidence and perseverance and with a big assist from her husband and four children whose love and devotion played an important part in her successful effort to attain her objective.

[From the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress, June 13, 1959]

COLLEGE DEGREE COMES AT LAST FOR BUSY CLEARFIELD HOMEMAKER

(By Jane Dietzel)

There are several ways to achieve a college degree, the most usual one being that of entering college directly from high school and attending the prescribed number of classes for 4 years.

Or one can do as Mrs. David C. Kinkead of Clearfield did—take a degree while rearing a family of four children, helping one's husband build a new home and following a career in nursing at the Clearfield Hospital all at the same time.

Mrs. Kinkead was one of 600 students graduated from Duquesne University June 7, receiving a bachelor of science degree with a major in nursing and a minor in public health.

She was probable the only one of the 600 to have a husband and four children—ranging in age from almost 3 to 19—in her cheering section.

It was undoubtedly a proud day for Mrs. Kinkead and her family, although the lasting impression that remains from an interview with her is of calm modesty and capable matter-of-factness. "I don't recommend what I did, for every woman. Yes, if they live in a university town or close to one, but not unless they are willing to work very hard and always remember one is doing it for the family, not for oneself."

The family she speaks of are her husband, Dave, a brakeman for the New York Central Railroad; 19-year-old Jack, a freshman student at St. Francis College; a second son, Charles, also called Dave by practically everyone, who will be a senior next year at Clearfield High School; Joan, an upcoming fourth grader at St. Francis Elementary School and Allan, who will be three in October.

College for Mrs. Kinkead was made possible, not only through her own efforts and determination, but with the wholehearted assistance and cooperation from the family. "For many years, I worked during the day and my husband worked at night so there was always one of us at home with the children. Only recently—while I was attending Duquesne full time—we had to get a babysitter to care for Allan 3 days during the week."

The older children helped care for the younger ones, and as is always the case in a busy household, have become adept at many house and yard chores. Praise for the Kinkead family life is a two-way matter in their Elm Avenue neighborhood. "We have such wonderful neighbors," Mrs. Kinkead says, "they think nothing of taking over and helping if, for instance, the babysitter is late or can't come at the last minute, or if anything goes wrong."

"You should just see how they manage," says a neighbor, "Dave can do about anything and the boys and Joan take care of the baby as if it were the most natural thing in the world. And Jane (Mrs. Kinkead) is always so serene and capable in a nonfussy way."

Born Ellen Jane McKissick, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John C. McKissick of Penfield, Mrs. Kinkead came to Clearfield following graduation from the Huston Township High School to enter the Clearfield Hospital School of Nursing. She was graduated from the school in 1936 and did general duty there for a while following graduation. Her first step toward further training came in 1939 when she took a course in ward management at Philadelphia.

Marriage, the first two children, and a sojourn of living in Jersey Shore, in California, then back to her native Penfield for a short time interrupted her career, but she didn't give it up entirely, working from time to time on both private and general duty when needed.

In 1950 the Kinkeads began to build their home on Elm Avenue, doing much of the work themselves. Mrs. Kinkead's career resumed in earnest and she began her college work at about this time. She took undergraduate courses at Pennsylvania State University and University of Pittsburgh (one at the latter shortly before Allan was born) during the summer and in night classes. Finally, it was time to go on campus and she chose Duquesne for the final three semesters because of its bachelor's degree in nursing and nursing education. Not all universities offer the course.

She came home every weekend while at Duquesne, and admits the schedule wasn't easy. Life on campus was different for her than for most students—"Everyone was very friendly, but they categorized me instantly—I was just a little different, a little older, not quite one of the girls." She was able to concentrate on her work, perhaps more than the average undergraduate, because she had little social life and outside diversions. There was no time for that if the pace of school all week and home for the weekend was to be kept up.

Different she might have been, in her mind at least, but Mrs. Kinkead was selected for the recognition in "Who's Who Among Students in American Universities and Colleges" an annual directory of distinguished students chosen on the basis of their scholarship, leadership, general citizenship, and promise of future usefulness. Very few students make the scholastic "Who's Who."

"Do you plan to continue your education?" I asked Mrs. Kinkead near the end of an interview in her office at the Clearfield Hospital where she serves as instructress of the fundamentals of nursing. Yes, she replied, she expected someday to take her master's if she can select a university where she may attend summer school and have the family with her.

There is no doubt in my mind that she will do it.

NATO: The Near Miracle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in Army-Navy-Air Force Register and Defense Times of July 4.

This is the final article in a series of 14 devoted to NATO, by John Wiant.

By the fact that the article is a summation of the present situation of the United States and her allies in Europe at the present time, it is of interest to all of us.

It is not only interesting, it is encouraging. We often hear NATO criticized and disparaged, but it is well to remember "that a 10-year period has been marked with amazing success. Not one handful of NATO territory nor one of its people has fallen under the thumb of Communist domination."

NATO: THE NEAR MIRACLE

This review of the preceding 13 articles on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is also a review of the first 10 years of the NATO alliance.

That 10-year period has been marked with amazing success. Not one handful of NATO territory nor one of its people has fallen under the thumb of Communist domination.

First time: For the first time in recorded history, a defensive alliance has been formed by a large number of nations—representing nearly half a billion freedom-loving people of varied political affiliations, religious creeds, and basic ways of life—and resisted the infiltration and aggressive tendencies of a powerful nation bent upon world domination.

The concept of such a broad alliance in peacetime is idealistic—its fulfillment is almost a miracle.

The material accomplishments of NATO are a tremendous demonstration of the backing of words with a realistic financial investment. The 15 nations have contributed nearly $3 billion for the development of military facilities required in various geographic localities, regardless of the nationality of the soil—the only requirement being necessity.

Small complex: From a small complex of only 15 airfields in 1949, NATO common infrastructure funds have developed a network of 150 modern bases supplied through more than 5,000 miles of pipelines.

The common funds have developed a communications system that includes about 15,000 miles of telephone land lines, 9,000 miles of radio relay circuits and 2,000 miles of submarine cables.

Development of a modern communications system based on the "Forward Scatter" theory is proceeding rapidly. This theory utilizes a signal bounce technique and will enable military commanders to establish communications networks within seconds. A modern early warning radar system is on the way to completion out of common funds and will soon form a continuous protection network along the entire Iron Curtain.

Common weapons: In another area, international cooperation has developed common weapons for NATO forces. The lightweight strike reconnaissance fighter now being produced by Fiat in Italy is an example. The plane will be used by several NATO nations and an experimental international squadron slated to include pilots and crewmen from France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Turkey is being formed and will soon start tactical tests.

A similar program has been started to develop a new maritime patrol aircraft and a design has already been selected.

Broadens base: This sharing of development and production helps broaden the European production base and reduces the degree of allied dependence on any one nation. It also insures a greater degree of standardization and is a big economic boost to the various nations.

Another field of international cooperation is represented by the establishment of the NATO Science Committee which is aimed at strengthening research into pure science on a cooperative basis plus development of defense research programs.

The near miracle 10 years of the NATO Alliance has not been without rough sailing, however. The British-French action at Suez was strongly opposed by the United States. Great Britain and Iceland still are disputing the legal limits of national waters for fishing rights. Greece, Turkey, and Britain have had a long and difficult dispute over the Cyprus question.

Close ties: Yet, each time such a controversy is solved, it reveals strong purpose and close ties among the allies. Above this, however, it clearly demonstrates that even though there may be family disagreements, the will to resist communism is still the most prevalent factor in the minds of free people.

The very existence of NATO is a step toward reducing the misunderstanding which might arise. The North Atlantic Council meets regularly for consultations on international matters and the governments consult on a top level basis regularly.

In the military field, international cooperation is developing wide areas of understanding never before believed possible. At SHAPE near Paris, the officers and men of 14 nations work together day in and day out developing the plans that keep alive NATO's deterrent power.

Live together: Not only do the various nationalities work together but they are developing an intimate understanding of their allies through social relationships and close association. In the suburbs of Paris a housing area has been built to house the families of the international staff and more than 400 families from the various nations live together.

Members of the international staff study languages at SHAPE. Both French and English are recognized as official tongues and all members of the staff are proficient in one and usually in both. Those members of the international family desiring to learn any of the NATO national languages can attend the SHAPE school.

An international staff school—the NATO Defense College—was founded in Paris in 1951 and has graduated 700 officers to staff and command posts in NATO forces as well as to staff positions in national forces and government ministries throughout the NATO area.

Students at the NATO Defense College come from the military establishments of all of the countries—a few civilians also have attended. In addition to basic military subjects, the NATO Defense College instruction includes a 5-month course devoted to the study of the broad concepts of the NATO alliance.

Positive action: In the actual military establishment of the NATO scheme, positive action is being taken to develop international cooperation. The Air Forces of all member nations participate in a continuous exercise aimed at developing operational capability of bases to handle aircraft of types not normally handled at the field. All six Air Forces of the Allied Air Forces Central Europe Command dispatch planes on missions to fields in other countries during which the crews perform normal combat operations and arrive at the foreign fields unannounced. The training benefits of the program have been lauded by members of all of the participating nations.

In a more realistic training mission, NATO forces have taken steps to counter the impressive Soviet submarine threat—the greatest underseas fleet ever assembled by a nation. The two Supreme Allied Commanders, Atlantic and Europe, made a detailed study of the problem and afterward established, in Italy, an antisubmarine warfare center. This center concentrates international efforts on a technical study of the Communist submarine potential and tactics, techniques, and technical means for combating the menace.

There is increasing attention in the NATO family of nations for a nuclear concept insofar as the military force is concerned. The members are generally agreed that the size of the land army buffeting the Iron Curtain can be trimmed but these cuts cannot be made until the day when the forces of all nations are armed with the most modern of weapons. At present, there is every evidence that the manpower standing guard duty in Europe today can be reduced by at least 50 percent.

Near miracle: Regardless of the composition of the shield defending freedom, however, there is no doubt that it will continue to exist. The first 10 years at NATO represent a near miracle—the nations allied under the banner of NATO are determined that this near miracle will become a real miracle, one that guarantees freedom for every man, woman, and child that wants it.

Finally, before it is completely possible to reach a conclusion on the effectiveness of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, some thought must be given to the composition of the Communist military machine threatening the freedom of mankind.

Soviet Army: The Soviet Army has 2.5 million men in its 175 active duty divisions. In as short a time as a month, it may well be possible that this division total could be swelled to 400.

European satellites of the Russians are capable of fielding another 60 divisions.

The Soviet Air Force has an estimated 20,000 planes with the vast majority being jet powered fighters and light bombers. The heavy bombers are still primarily propeller driven but advances are being noted in the field of long range jet craft similar to the B–52 and the medium range B–47's. The satellites add another 3,000 planes—at least half of which are jets—to the Communist total.

The Soviet fleet has a recorded total of 30 modern fast cruisers plus more than 100 destroyers in the 1,800 to 3,500 ton class. They have at least 500 large submarines plus a countless number of smaller patrol subs.

Missiles: Missile capability is not completely known but there is every reason to believe that the Soviets can equal present Western efforts.

This is the machine threatening the freedom of NATO—it is the might that freedom must meet if it is to survive. And the nations allied under the banner of NATO are determined that they will, regardless of cost, retain the freedoms that represent human dignity.

Happy Anniversary, Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to present a resolution of the board of directors of the Crestmont Savings & Loan Association of my home community, Maplewood, N.J., which expresses its congratulations on the outstanding record of the Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corp., which is celebrating its 25th anniversary of good service:

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, CRESTMONT SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION, MAPLEWOOD, N.J.

JUNE 23, 1959.

Whereas the Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corp. is presently celebrating its 25th anniversary; and

Whereas no person in an institution insured by the Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corp. has suffered any loss during the 25 years of its existence; and

Whereas its regulations have been such that institutions have conducted their affairs in a conservative and a safe manner; that during the past 3 years no losses have been suffered that would require help from the insurance corporation: Now be it

Resolved, That we, the board of directors and officers of Crestmont Savings & Loan Association of Maplewood, N.J., do congratulate the Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corp., its management and its staff on their splendid record and accomplishment; and be it futher

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in Washington and a copy to those interested in the activities of the Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corp.

LOREN F. GARDINER,
President.

ARTHUR R. TAYLOR,
Secretary.

Uniform Postal Requirements Relating to Disclosure of Average Number of Copies of Certain Publications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 6, 1959, H.R. 6830 passed the House. H.R. 6830 restates and clarifies the requirements of existing law with respect to the content of sworn statements which must be submitted to the Post Office Department by publishers having a second-class permit. The only substantive change in existing law is the extension to magazine publishers of the requirements now applicable to most newspapers, that the sworn statement include the average number of copies of each issue sold or distributed to paid subscribers. This paragraph continues in effect the present authority of the Postmaster General, upon appropriate notice, to deny second-class entry to any publisher who does not comply with these important requirements. It also continues in effect the exemption from the reporting requirements which since 1933 has been extended to religious, fraternal, scientific, and similar publications.

The bill continues in effect existing law which requires that all advertising matter in publications entered as second-class mail be plainly marked "advertisement" and prescribes a penalty up to $500 for failure to observe this requirement.

In summary, therefore, the bill makes only one substantive change in postal policies and practices which have been in effect since 1933 under existing law. This is the extension to magazines of the requirement heretofore applied only to newspapers, to disclose the average number of copies of each issue of such publication sold or distributed to paid subscribers during the preceding 12 months. It should be pointed out that the provisions of this bill, except for this one change, are identical to the provisions relating to publishers' sworn statements and to the marking of advertising matter and the penalty for failure to observe this requirement as contained in the postal codification bill, H.R. 2339, recently passed by the House.

Post Office Department officials, who supported the bill, testified that the requirement for the disclosure of circulation information will aid the Department substantially in the performance of its functions and will impose no undue hardship or burden on the publishers. They also indicated that there would be no increase in cost as a result of this legislation, but that it could have the effect in a minor way of producing additional revenue.

Tribute to Hon. James A. Purcell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of Trade Practice Annual, special tribute is paid to the Honorable James A. Purcell who will soon retire from his past as hearing examiner with the Federal Trade Commission. Judge Purcell, as the article points out, has presided in hundreds of FTC cases during his tenure of office, and achieved the outstanding record of never having been reversed by the Commission or the courts.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article, entitled "Purcell Leaving FTC and Much Good Work—Pioneered in Costing":

PURCELL LEAVING FTC AND MUCH GOOD WORK—PIONEERED IN COSTING—HEARING EXAMINER RULED IN MANY IMPORTANT CASES—NO REVERSES IN 20 YEARS—SET PATTERN FOR SOUND COSTING ENTIRELY "ON HIS OWN"

Soon to leave the FTC for the more lucrative practice of law, in which he is unusually well versed, is Hon. James A. Purcell, hearing examiner and member of the Commission's staff since 1941, with general practice experience of 20-odd years prior to that time.

NO REVERSALS IN 20 YEARS

Judge Purcell has presided in hundreds of FTC cases during his tenure of office and has never been reversed by the Commission or the courts. His cases include Progress Clothing (153 Fed. (2) 103); Anchor Serum (1955–3–1, 6); Morton Salt (334 U.S. 37, 61); International Cellucotton (1951–11–6); Manhattan Brush (1957–8–3); Scientific Living (1953–11–6); and many others. In the Carter's Little Liver Pills case his unusually thorough analysis and report on scientific evidence was reproduced by the Commission and 1,000 copies sent to medical schools, libraries, and hospitals throughout the United States.

PIONEERED SOUND COSTING

Probably the most important and far-seeing ruling of Judge Purcell was made in the Morton Salt case, D4319, in the matter of cost justification under the section 2(a) proviso of the Clayton R–P Act (which requires price differences as between sales of like goods to competitive buyers to be no more than cost differences of manufacture, sale, or delivery).

With no precedents for guidance, he rejected cost estimates based on cost of invoicing as a major factor measure when he found from the exhibits that the same charges on 34 invoices of $90.20 involved sales in one case of $31,282.26 and only $17,170.74 in another. He also rejected estimates which did not include certain necessary selling factors, and were based on the selection of respondents' Port Huron plant as typical of the distribution costs of other plants.

NO PLACE FOR GUESSWORK

"In conclusion," Judge Purcell said, "the attempted showing of justification should be based upon a factual foundation, rather than upon estimates, hypotheses, or mere guesses as to the apportionment or allocation of costs of distribution, to say nothing of the many arbitrarily included items of distribution, the correctness of applicability and the verity of which, as shown on the various exhibits, are seriously contested by counsel for the Commission."

Some years later and after many protests of the Bulletin and Mr. Warmack, the Purcell objections were acknowledged by all to be valid. (See 1954 Annual 11 and citations.)

PUTS JUSTICE ABOVE TECHNICALITIES

Judge Purcell's fair approach is reflected in a recent ruling permitting the delayed filing of proposed findings. He said in part:

"It would be manifestly unfair, because of a technical failure to meet a deadline to deprive any party of the opportunity to cite and urge upon a hearing officer the law governing the case as he conceives it to be, and it is no less a serious deprivation to the hearing officer that he is denied the opportunity to be appraised of and to consider the respective contentions of competent and learned counsel."

As Captain Purcell, he served in France, and has since taken an active part in veteran and social organizations.

Jesse Taylor: Unusual American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Blytheville (Ark.) Courier News on July 1, 1959, paid a justly deserved tribute on the passing of Hon. Jesse Taylor, who had served his Nation and community with outstanding distinction.

A résumé of Jesse Taylor's lifetime of service include:

Enlistment at age 18 in World War I—was given a battlefield commission in France.

A founder of Dud Cason Post of the American Legion.

A partner in law firm of Harrison, Smith & Taylor, associating himself with two distinguished attorneys, Judge Zal B. Harrison and Judge Leon Smith. Later, he was associated with the late Judge V. G. Holland, and, more recently, a member of the firm of Taylor & Sudbury, having joined with Judge Graham Sudbury in 1953.

President Blytheville Bar Association.

Chairman of Mississippi County Democratic Central Committee continuously for 25 years.

Chairman of the county board of election commissioners.

Member of Mississippi County Fair Association.

Member of city hospital board.

Commissioner of Walker Municipal Park.

Charter member and a president of Blytheville Lions Club.

Adviser to city in locating of industrial plants.

A founder of the Little League Baseball League.

Special justice, Arkansas Supreme Court.

The editorial follows:

JESSE TAYLOR: UNUSUAL AMERICAN

This city, county, State, and, indeed, Nation, lost one of its fine citizens Tuesday night when death came to Jesse Taylor, Blytheville attorney.

Though active in politics and civic and church affairs for more than a quarter century, Jesse Taylor not only didn't seek publicity, he avoided it. At the same time no newspaperman could have had a more cooperative official with whom to work.

But Jesse Taylor's efforts, as chairman of the county election commission, for example, were purely labors of love—works inspired by his devotion to a system of government which he had quickly volunteered to defend some 40 years ago in a war which everyone hoped would be the final one.

Jesse Taylor's guiding hand touched so many parts of his community—as do other lawyers, he provided free legal service to the Chamber of Commerce when it was necessary to deal with industrial leases and contracts; he pondered problems of education; he worked to see that Blytheville had a full, vigorous athletic program, he dedicated himself to carry out fundamental truth of a democracy; that voting must be unfettered and the ballot secret; he felt that God's goodness to man demanded in return service to his Master; he believed that above all honesty was not only the best, but the only policy.

This is the sort of man we lost. This is the kind of person we must replace, for in the Jesse Taylors—the people of principle—resides the strength of the democracy.

Congressman John W. McCormack: Nation's No. 1 Democrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement of Jim Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union, concerning Congressman McCORMACK's popularity and great prestige as one of the greatest Democratic leaders of all times.

The statement follows:

WASHINGTON.—There is no question about the fact that Massachusetts is the No. 1 State in the Nation when it comes to men of distinction and accomplishments in politics.

With prestige on the State and national level, value to the Democratic Party, and achievements attained for the good of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the Nation used a gage to rate political personalities, Congressman JOHN W. McCORMACK, House majority leader, can be correctly termed "the Nation's No. 1 Democrat."

An example of Congressman McCORMACK's popularity and great prestige was in evidence here today following a conference at the Democratic National Committee relative to agriculture legislation.

Jim Patton, Denver, Colo., president of the National Farmers' Union (membership 750,000), expressed the farmers' opinion of Congressman McCORMACK.

He said "for the past several years Congressman McCORMACK has been extremely helpful to the farmers of the Nation. They consider him as 'one of the greatest Democratic leaders of all times.'

"The people of Massachusetts and the Nation have every right to be justifiably proud of his record of achievements which have considerably aided to make the Democratic Party the party of the majority of people in the Nation."

Patton, who has just returned from a trip through 45 of our 49 States, reported that the Democratic trend is getting deeper and deeper. He is firm of the opinion that the Democratic nominee for President will win by a landslide vote and carry 40 of the 49 States.

The Day We Celebrate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent Memorial Day address, entitled "The Day We Celebrate" by Capt. Francis A. Adams, U.S. Army, retired.

The address was delivered at services held at the Civic Center, Stuart, Fla., under the auspices of the Harold Johns Post, the American Legion, on May 31 of this year.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL DAY, 1959: THE DAY WE CELEBRATE

(Address by Capt. Francis A. Adams, U.S. Army, M.I. retired)

There are only a few red-letter days, in our calendar, Memorial Day is one of them. To gain this high distinction has taken years of devotion, by patriotic men and women, who have never faltered in paying respect to the honored dead who have fought our wars and won the love, respect, and devotion of our Nation.

It was 91 years ago that the first Memorial Day was observed. This was in 1868 when the national commander of the, then young, Grand Army of the Republic issued a general order. This proclamation by Gen. John A. Logan set the pattern that has been kept faithfully ever since. In the passage of 91 years much has happened in the world to change the order of things, for countries and peoples. Nor has the United States of America escaped the sharp impact of an era of change.

When hostilities came to an end in April 1865, a Nation that had been divided through Civil War reaffirmed peace and indissolvable union. That pledge has been kept. The day we celebrate has a strong hold upon the hearts of all America. It is the day when the living give, to our honored dead. We give homage to all who served in the Armed Forces under the Stars and Stripes. Formal services are held throughout the United States of America and its Territories and outposts. Veterans of all wars are participants and their families and friends join in the memorial service. Today we have veterans of the Spanish-American War, 1898–1902, who have faithfully kept the pledge of remembrance on every Memorial Day since 1899. We have veterans of World War I, 1917–18, who have participated unfalteringly in Memorial Day services.

Coming closer to the present, we have veterans of World War II, 1941–45, who have taken pride in associating themselves with those who cherish Memorial Day. What a power there is in the united expression of all servicemen. It gives notice to the world that Americans are one when it comes to protecting our flag and what it symbolizes. One of the most important functions of our national emblem is its use as a symbol in formal occasions.

At half staff it signifies bereavement. Draped upon a coffin it bestows the respect of a nation upon the departed. A small flag on the grave speaks in solemn silence the active thought of the living for some comrade departed. All of this is associated with Memorial Day. Is it any wonder that time does not stale nor custom dim our fulfillment of services on this occasion.

There is something deep, intimate, and affectionate about turning our thoughts to those who have answered the last rollcall. This day is shared by all. Children are told by their parents that members of their family are among those being honored. Adults realize a sense of pride in taking part in a ceremony that is spontaneous and sincere. There is nothing perfunctory in the services held today. We are here of our own free will. What we say and do is the expression of free men and women. That is why Memorial Day continues to be the time when Americans express heartfelt devotions to its defenders. Our Republic is invincible so long as its people keep faith with those who have given their lives to preserve it. Long live the United States of America.

As part of our Memorial Day service it has become our custom to march to the water's edge and cast a floral tribute to those who have perished at sea in defense of our country. During the past half century, men of the Navy, Marines, Air Force, Coast Guards, and Army have found watery graves in the Atlantic and Pacific and Indian Oceans. Their last resting place cannot be located, but a grateful nation can express its devotion to their memory by the poetic gesture of casting a floral wreath upon the tide.

Besides these ceremonies it seems fitting that in this year, 1959, we, in America, should send words of greeting to those unfortunate servicemen who are being held captive in North Korea, Communist China, and in the land behind the Iron Curtain of Communist Russia. Let us send them a message of encouragement. Let us petition Congress on their behalf. Let us appeal to the United Nations to act in their behalf.

Let us, above all else, pray to God for their deliverance.

What's Behind the Farm Problem?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Alvin F. Bull, managing editor of Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead, one of the leading farm magazines in America, has written a series of articles relating to the farm problem. These articles are factual and objective and afford much food for serious thought. The first of the articles appeared in the June 6, 1959,

issue of Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead and is entitled "What's Behind the Farm Problem?" The article is as follows:

WHAT'S BEHIND THE FARM PROBLEM?

(By Al Bull)

(This is the first of a series of articles. We hope they'll help you better understand the facts behind our farm problem.—EDITOR.)

Agriculture is facing a tough problem. On this, nearly all farmers and farm organizations agree.

The Agricultural Adjustment Center at Iowa State College is examining the farm problem in detail. You'll be hearing more about this work.

The farm problem was neatly packaged into few words by Karl Fox, agricultural economist at Iowa State College:

"In recent years, farm income has not increased nearly as fast as nonfarm income. In fact, farm income has lost about 10 years of growth."

Most folks are still together at this point. but not everyone agrees on how we got into this fix or on what should be done about it.

In simple terms, here's what has been happening:

EXCESS PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY

Farmers are turning out more goods than we can sell at satisfactory prices on the open market.

Though excess capacity has been building up for some time, it took a real jump during World War II. Farmers geared for extra production. Once resources, particularly land and capital, were committed to farming, individual farmers couldn't afford to leave them idle.

Research, from both experiment stations and commercial companies, poured out new technology at an explosive rate. Nitrogen fertilizer, hybrid crop varieties, and stilbestrol are examples. The result was more production from resources already in agriculture.

Generally, the first farmer adopting a new practice made some extra profit. Then others had to follow or lose out. As soon as enough made use of the new technique to bring a noticeable increase in production, prices dropped. All the benefit then passed to the consumer in the form of lower prices, or fewer price increases during general inflation.

This new technology has been increasing farm output at least as fast as the Nation's population grows. It promises to continue this pace for years to come.

So our ability to produce will stay in excess of need. A number of economists have estimated the excess at 5 to 10 percent.

LOW PRICES

An increase in agricultural production drops prices to a point where total income is less than it was from the smaller original output.

This is what economists call inelastic demand. But don't let the fancy term scare you. The idea is simple enough. This is partly what got the big hog crop of 1955 into price trouble.

Inelastic demand can work the other way, too. A cut in production raises prices enough to increase total income in spite of the smaller output.

Coupling this inelastic demand with excess productive capacity accounts for low prices. Consumers get most of the benefit, in lower prices, higher quality diet, or more built-in services with their food.

ADJUSTING TO CHANGE

Going back to inelastic demand, the solution to agriculture's problem looks obvious—just reduce supply.

But to do this, some resources (land, labor, capital) must be left idle—or transferred to other uses. This is what industry does.

Steel companies are operating at less than three-fourths capacity. Auto makers could produce at least a million more cars in 1959. Yet both are having a profitable year.

These industries, controlled by few individuals, can prevent excess capacity from being a serious liability. Management can fit supply and demand together at a price more or less satisfactory to the industry.

Feed grains and livestock are another story. Production and marketing decisions are controlled by millions of small operators, each thinking mostly of his own immediate interest.

Often the wisest move for an individual is opposite to the interest of the industry as a whole. For example, you may be better off expanding your hog production at the same time that total hog output should be cut back.

None of this alters the fact that resources must be pulled out of agriculture to shrink the supply and raise prices.

Let's look briefly at each of the major resources (labor, capital, and land).

Labor: At one time, about 90 percent of the Nation's population was needed on the farm to feed the other 10 percent. Now one man on the farm feeds 23 others.

Thus, a huge amount of one resource, labor, has left agriculture. Two main factors encouraged the move—good job opportunities in town and a price squeeze on the farm. Both factors have been active during the last 15 to 20 years, and people have left agriculture at an astounding rate.

Decreased manpower won't solve the problem alone, however. Even if it would, such a solution is neither socially nor politically acceptable to most of us.

Capital: Total output can be reduced by drawing capital out of agriculture. But this is difficult to do. Few of us are willing to stop using fertilizer or modern equipment.

Switching to bigger and faster equipment costs money—adds to the capital in your business.

It's pretty hard to convince a man not to expand his operation when it has a good chance to pay off. Especially so when most of us have little information about investing our profits outside the farm operation.

Land: Land is probably the easiest resource to remove from agriculture to balance supply and demand at a satisfactory price level.

The soil bank was a step in this direction. But so far, the bite is too small to get the job done alone.

Overproduction, with a surplus that's difficult to eat, give away, or turn to nonfood uses, is not likely to yield to reasonable reductions in a single resource. But a combination approach might provide the answer.

Urban Orphans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, while there are conflicting viewpoints as to the need for programs to assist areas of various economies in these United States, there should not be any disagreement with the opinion that the cancerous conditions existing in some of our larger cities should be corrected. If they are not, a serious blight on our Nations will remain uncorrected and will lead to serious consequences. The citizens who have had to live under these conditions could well spread the philosophy of complaint and dissatisfaction that is usually associated with the underprivileged.

The editorial in the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News of July 5, 1959, very clearly expresses the concern of many of us.

[Newark (N.J.) Sunday News, July 5, 1959]

URBAN ORPHANS

Cities dominate national life almost everywhere except in the United States. Here there is a theory, centuries old, that everything rural is admirable and everything urban is to be suspected.

Billions in taxpayers' money have been poured into supporting thousands of farmers who can never make their farms pay. They are being kept on the land by Federal handouts because in the national folklore theirs is supposed to be the ideal way of life—and besides they have the votes.

But although most of the Nation's millions are concentrated in urban areas, until recent decades not a Federal dime was available to help solve urban problems. Even now funds for slum clearance are appropriated grudgingly.

Mayors of large cities insist that rail, highway, and other transportation problems, air and water pollution and urban decentralization and blight can no longer be dealt with at the local or even the regional level.

Under pressure from the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association, Congress is considering bills which would establish a Federal commission to study urban problems. Ultimately they hope there will be a permanent Federal agency.

At recent Washington hearings, at which the views of Mr. Wagner of New York and other mayors were presented, all the emphasis was on the coordination of municipal research under Federal auspices. But implicit in the testimony was the hope that ultimately there will be more substantial direct Federal aid for urban renewal, improvement of local transit systems and other things cities would like to have.

As to where the money is coming from, the mayors and their councilmen, looking hard at the billions that go to the farmers, are thinking how nice it would be if they could divert a few of them to city folks.

Will Keep America Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the June 25, 1959, issue of the National Tribune expresses the gratification and pleasure of the Department of Defense in signing of a labor-management pact by the Pan American World Airways. The article titled "Will Keep America Free" follows:

WILL KEEP AMERICA FREE

A highly placed spokesman of the Department of Defense expressed the gratification and pleasure early this week at the announcement of the signing of a pact between Pan American World Airways and four unions that provide services to the airlines.

The agreement, which the Defense spokesman described as a very definite and forward

step in labor management relations in defense interests, provides assurances that cargo and personnel essential to national defense will be transported even though union members may have withdrawn from commercial airline service due to labor disputes.

The latest unions to sign the agreements are: The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America covering service supply clerks and lead supply clerks, the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks AFL–CIO, covering clerical and related employees; the United Plant Guard Workers of America; the Transport Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, Air Transport Division, covering mechanics, flight service personnel and port stewards.

Previously similar agreements had been made by Pan American with:

The Air Line Pilots Association, the Flight Engineers International Association, the Air Line Dispatchers Association.

The agreements provide for the following:

1. Even though the unions should withdraw from commercial airline service because of labor disputes, they will continue at their respective jobs to insure the airlift of cargo and personnel essential to national defense.

2. A company official will certify in writing that the flight concerned will be exclusively for these purposes.

3. The agreements will not be altered or terminated without at least 2 years' written notice by either the company or the unions.

4. The agreements with the seven unions have been incorporated into their regular collective bargaining agreements.

The significance of the agreements lies in the fact that the Government can be assured that traffic essential to the Department of Defense will continue to move despite labor disputes involving any of the unions directly concerned with Pan American's flight operations.

(This newspaper feels that both Pan American and the labor unions concerned in this agreement deserve commendation for putting their country's defense above their own personal desires and as long as this type of teamwork exists America will always be free.)

Poll Indicates Thinking on Current Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks I have solicited the opinions of my Seventh District constituents on a few of the significant issues of today. The summary of this poll is, I believe, of interest to my colleagues.

SUMMARY OF POLL RESULTS

The No. 1 domestic interest of Americans today is the problem of inflation. This vitally affects not only the persons living on retirement pensions or insurance proceeds, but it affects every family. It penalizes the thrifty and robs the poor. There may be some families who are profiting from inflation, but I have not had anyone express such an opinion to me.

I know that many of my colleagues have found inflation to be the predominant interest of their people. The national Sunday supplement, This Week, asked its readers to write about the goals this Nation should seek. The overwhelming concern was inflation.

Yet, people are not certain what steps should be taken to control inflation. Forty-three percent of the replies I received indicated that price, wage, and credit controls could do an effective job of regulation, although many said they did not want to see them restored. Seventeen percent believe Federal Reserve monetary policies can combat the price spiral, and 12 percent expressed confidence in continued high Federal taxes.

Almost 7 out of 10 agreed that the Federal Government could fight inflation by living within its own budget. Sixty-nine percent said that the budget of the Federal Government should be balanced and deficit financing avoided.

My voters show an overwhelming determination to stay put in Berlin. Ninety-five out of a hundred said the decision to stand firm in Berlin was wise. The marginal comments on this question may be summarized thus: If we give in to the Communists in Berlin, it will be the beginning of a continual retreat. We must show them we will not be intimidated.

The great majority also recognized the high cost of a defense establishment to back up our determination in Berlin and elsewhere in the world. Sixty-four percent expressed approval of the $40.9 billion defense appropriation request, trusting the best judgment of the President and our military and civilian leaders. Twenty-three percent believe these funds could be reduced, mostly by the elimination of waste and duplication. Nine percent would support an increased request, with the suggestion that the extra money be spent primarily for rocket and missile development.

There is a widespread belief that our foreign aid expenditures should be cut. Seventy-two percent of the questionnaires asked for a reduction, with many commenting that it should be eliminated. Twenty-two percent approved of the budget request, and 3 percent believe it should be increased.

SCHOOL AID STILL CONTROVERSIAL

I attempted to draw out in more detail the thinking of the people on the subject of Federal school aid. The program which has been discussed this year has proposed Federal funds for school building construction and for teachers' salaries. Fifty-four percent of the replies I received would refrain from giving any further forms of school support beyond the National Defense Education Act and other established programs such as vocational education and the school lunch program. Some suggested that the programs already in effect be reduced or eliminated.

Thirty-five percent of the respondents would allow direct aid for construction expenses, and 19 percent favored teachers' salaries assistance. The additional comments which I received indicate there is still a sharp division of opinion on this subject.

With the ever-increasing attention to the goal of retirement, I asked my constituents what the ideal age for retirement is. Forty-six percent believe retirement programs should be aimed at age 65; 12 percent suggested age 62; and 39 percent said age 60. There was much agreement that retirement is an individual matter, and the programs should be optional and flexible. Some voters wrote that they are still working and enjoying it, although several years beyond age 65. On the other hand, some commented that mandatory retirement would provide more jobs for younger workers to fill.

POLL PERFORMS VALUABLE FUNCTION

I realize that these questions do not exhaust the many problems which we face as individuals and as a Nation. They are indicative of public sentiment on several important matters, and perhaps will be useful guidelines. I am sure that this sampling has done much to encourage Seventh District voters to seriously think and discuss these matters, and, as many admitted to me, come to the realization that for many of our governmental problems there are no quick, easy solutions.

The many favorable comments I have received on this poll convince me that it has been eminently worthwhile. It is another means to know the will of the people that I represent, in addition to the thousands of letters, telegrams, and telephone calls I receive and the many personal contacts I have, including my customary tour of each of the post offices in the 11 counties of the Seventh District.

Here are the questions and the replies:

1. A rising cost of living, caused by inflation, is a great menace to our continued national progress. Which methods, of those indicated below, do you believe are most effective in stabilizing the purchasing power of the dollar (check one or more):

(a) Price, wage, and credit controls, 43 percent.

(b) Federal Reserve monetary policies, 17 percent.

(c) Balanced budget of the Federal Government, 69 percent.

(d) Continued high Federal taxes, 12 percent.

No opinion, 1 percent.

2. Do you believe the decision of the United States to stand firm in Berlin despite efforts of the Communists to force us out of the city is wise:

(a) Yes, 95 percent.

(b) No, 3 percent.

No opinion, 2 percent.

3. National security is still the largest expenditure in our Federal budget. For the next fiscal year the President has requested $40.9 billion for defense expenditures plus $3.9 billion for foreign aid. In your opinion, defense expenditures should be (a) reduced, 23 percent; (b) as requested, 64 percent; (c) increased, 9 percent; no opinion, 4 percent. Foreign-aid expenditures should be (a) reduced, 72 percent; (b) as requested, 22 percent; (c) increased, 3 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

4. The National Defense Education Act, approved in 1958, established Federal help for teacher training, science and language educational programs, and student loans and fellowships. Other Federal programs which assist schools include the school lunch program and the Federal impact area program.

Do you believe the Federal Goverment should:

(a) Give direct aid for construction expenses, 35 percent.

(b) Give direct aid for teachers' salaries, 19 percent.

(c) Refrain from giving other forms of school support, 54 percent.

No opinion, 4 percent.

5. The trend of recent years has been to allow persons more leisure time in advanced age and through Government and private plans to assure them adequate income on which to live in retirement. Leaving aside those with special physical disabilities, do you believe retirement programs should be planned for voluntary retirement at age:

(a) Sixty-five, 46 percent.

(b) Sixty-two, 12 percent.

(c) Sixty, 39 percent.

No opinion, 4 percent.

New England Export Club Urges End to Oil Import Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter recently sent to President Eisenhower by the New England Export Club, Inc., urging the President to terminate the oil import quota system at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have watched the unhealthy effects of the oil import quotas on our national economy and our international standing will certainly endorse the sentiments expressed in this letter:

NEW ENGLAND EXPORT CLUB, INC.,
Boston, Mass., June 29, 1959.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The New England Export Club, by unanimous vote of its board of directors, again emphasizes its strong traditional oppositon to voluntary or mandatory oil import quotas. The New England Export Club is composed of 300 businessmen, the leaders in importing and exporting of this area, together with their associates in banking, insurance, and shipping.

The need for economic leadership from our country is highlighted by the dramatic moves now taking place in Western Europe, and being discussed in the Western Hemisphere. This is the time for the United States to go forward with liberalization, not backward into protectionism. The United States must retain its leadership and prestige in the international trading community.

The argument of national security seems strange on two counts. The restricted oil imports come from friendly neighbors, who are part of our defense alliances. Furthermore, why rush to exhaust our limited known oil reserves?

We in New England, in view of our geographical location, are particularly dependent on imports of residual fuel oils; and are sensitive to any arbitrary interference with the imports which would restrict the supply of low cost imported residual fuel oils, which are essential for the economical operation of our industries.

We hope, Mr. President, that you will find it possible in the early future to terminate the oil import quota system.

Respectfully yours,

GOVERNMENT LIAISON COMMITTEE,
JOSEPH SABA,
LAWRENCE A. ROBINSON,
IRVING JAY FAIN, *Chairman.*

Annual Freedom Celebration, Mount Vernon, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, St. Paul's Church in Eastchester, Mount Vernon, N.Y., nationally known as the Shrine of Basic Freedom, because of its profound effect on the tenets held dear to the people of the Original Thirteen Colonies, was the scene on July 4 last of a gathering of citizens who cherish deeply our freedom and our liberties.

Three Presidents of the United States previously spoke from the rostrum at St. Paul's. The bell in the tower of the church there is the sister bell to the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia. It has tolled 13 times for many years on each Independence Day in honor of the Thirteen Original States.

The original St. Paul's Church goes back to the latter half of the 17th century and antedates the Revolution by over 100 years. In its graveyard lie the remains of soldiers from all our wars and also a group of 100 Hessians who gave their lives fighting for England against the Colonies in the War for Independence.

It was my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to address the Fourth of July gathering there, and to bring to the people assembled a message of greeting from President Eisenhower. Chairman Dr. James W. Thornton, and town historian, Dr. Alfred M. Franko, as well as all present, were grateful for the President's recognition of the historic significance of the occasion.

Following are the President's remarks and my own address:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 25, 1959.

The Honorable EDWIN B. DOOLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: Please give my greetings to the citizens of Mount Vernon gathered at their annual freedom celebration on July 4th.

It is fitting that this event take place at the site of St. Paul's Church, which I understand is called "the Shrine of Basic Freedom." The freedom of religious belief is a fundamental part of our national heritage; in our Bill of Rights it is guaranteed before all others.

In this spirit, I am sure that Independence Day in Mount Vernon will be nobly celebrated.

With warm regard.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE EDWIN B. DOOLEY AT THE ANNUAL FREEDOM CELEBRATION, MOUNT VERNON, N.Y., JULY 4, 1959

As your elected representative in the Congress of the United States. I am deeply conscious of the privilege of addressing you here today, on a subject which is richly intertwined with the history of your great city—namely, freedom.

Freedom means many things to many people. But to those of us who have been fortunate enough to enjoy the liberties of this blessed land. I think freedom means to us about what it meant to ill-fated Ann Hutchinson of historic memory, and to Peter Zenger of heroic courage.

Both were willing to face death rather than endure religious or political injustice. Boldly, they stood before the tides of ill-conceived measures which would have swept away their God-given rights.

Ever since the dawn of history, men in positions of authority have often sought to coerce the weak. Only respect for law such as we find crystallized in the Constitution of the United States, and in the Magna Carta, stands between political freedom and despotism.

Ignore those sacred documents and we set back history 1,000 years. Ignore those sacred documents, and we open the doors to a flood of political evils such as no honest man ever envisioned.

When we reflect on the almost incredibly astute foresight of our forefathers, we cannot help but be grateful. They incorporated in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution the very basic tenets on which our freedom rests.

Listen to them:

"ARTICLE I. Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

"ART. II. A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

"ART. III. No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner. * * *

"ART. IV. The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated. * * *.

"ART. V. No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury. * * *

"ART. VI. In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed. * * *

"ART. VII. In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed $20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved. * * *

"ART. VIII. Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

"ART. IX. The enumeration in the Constitution, or certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

"ART. X. The power not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

There, my friends, is a bible of freedom. Let us forever preserve it if we are to maintain freedom.

In the Congress some 120 years ago, a great statesman, John Quincy Adams, who knew the real meaning of freedom, enunciated his views on the significance of public trust.

Freedom can be retained only when there is honor in high places.

John Quincy Adams was a versatile man. Few men before or since have held so many positions of high station as he did. Senator; Ambassador to Russia, Prussia, Portugal, and France; motivator of the Treaty of Ghent; President of the United States; and lastly, a U.S. Representative. John Quincy Adams had a profoundly devoted sense of duty to his country.

One day, seated in the House of Representatives where he served faithfully for 18 years, he took time out to pen a prayer, which sums up in my mind the highest precepts of any man in a position of public responsibility. So long as men serve their country as he did, freedom will flourish.

He said:

"Almighty Father, look with mercy down
And grant me virtue to perform my part,
The patriot's fervor and the statesman's art,
In thought, word, deed, preserve me from thy frown.
Direct my path to ways of bright renown,
Guide my frail bark by truth's unerring chart,
Inspire my soul and purify my heart,
And with success my steadfast purpose crown.
My country's weal, be that my polar star.
Justice, the rock of ages, is thy law
And when thy summons comes to cross the bar
Be this my plea, thy gracious smile to draw
That all my ways to justice were inclined
My only aims, the blessings of mankind."

Call the roll of statesmen who fulfilled their destiny, who cherished freedom, who served their country, nobly, and unselfishly, and regardless of party ties you will find they lived up to John Quincy Adams' concept of public responsibility.

A proper evaluation of the moral and political obligations of a public official is a prerequisite to the maintenance of those freedoms we and our forebears cherish.

On this day—commemorated across the vast expanses of our country, teeming as it is with opulence and prosperity—we pause reverently to thank our forebears for the freedoms they assured us in their God-given wisdom, and at the same time we pause to reflect on the course which our country has taken, since those men of stature and patriotism whom we know, passed from this mortal scene.

It has been said, and said sagely, that the pragmatic axioms of the past are not a reliable index to guide future actions. Never was a fact so evident as that is today.

Without in any sense diminishing the stature of the father of our country, whose memory is enshrined in every good citizen's heart, it must be said nevertheless that the admonition he gave us against foreign alliances was made at a time, before days were telescoped into hours—before space was annihilated by supersonic speeds, and before nations were so interdependent on one another.

The course of our country, its material wealth, its idealistic concepts, and its immutable ties to the free way of life, delineate in bold lines its historic destiny. By all the tenets given us by God, through our Judeo-Christian heritage, and by all man-made patterns of life, as evidenced by our common and statutory law, we are irrevocably committed to accept the Biblical phrase, "I am my brother's keeper."

Therein lies all the justification needed for our global generosity—for our constant effort to feed the world's hungry; to give inspiration and moral and physical aid to the distressed multitudes of the Asia-African bloc who are rising in belated revolt against the unmoral imprisonment and abuse they have endured through the centuries. If we believe in freedom as we proclaim so steadfastly, then we believe that the people of Nyasaland, of Ghana, and of other areas of the world have the same God-given right to preserve their destiny, unhampered by the imperialistic whims of other nations and other men.

We believe that Vietnam has a right to repel the invasions of the Communists, that each nation and each people in fact has an innate right, a tacit right if you will, to fashion its own freedom and its own destiny.

But today with the world teetering recklessly on the brink of self-annihilation, with mankind's ingenuity focused on the problem of how to devise the most destructive instrument of mass slaughter attainable, it is necessary, yes, even urgent, that we reexamine our attitude toward our allies and our attitudes toward freedom, with the aim of trying to rescue reason from chaos, and of preserving what we can of our free way of life and the precious heritage which was handed down to us from our forebears.

First, I think that in appraising our position we must express thanks to our Almighty Father for the infinite variety of blessings he has showered upon this land and on our generation.

He gave our forefathers a source of natural wealth virtually unprecedented in human history. Sturdy and courageous people that they were, they could not have survived had it not been for the boundless forests, the rivers teaming with fish, the rich soil, and the proper climate.

Europe and other lands from which our ancestors came had long since exhausted their resources. And from the bounty inherent in the new land our forebears built the great cities, the industries, the educational institutions, the norms and the culture which are ours today.

Now we face the supreme test of whether those things which are ours, this freedom which is ours, can be preserved for ourselves and our children's children.

When we reflect on the fact that a fleet of enemy submarines halted momentarily off our coast has the power to virtually obliterate all of us, and our culture, we realize that we have reached a critical stage from the standpoint of our chronological history—a turning point in our destiny.

We have reached a time when more than ever before we must be willing to make sacrifices for our country that Americans were never called upon to make before.

I am not referring to the imminence of sudden extinction which the present strategy of warfare makes possible, but rather to the need for sacrifice of material things in order that our Government can have the resources to carry on.

The burden of our defense program is oppressive, but so long as the Communists continue to threaten, so long as Khrushchev makes a mockery of international diplomacy, and a toy of protocol, we must of necessity keep our sinews of preparedness sturdy and resilient. All of this costs money and our taxes are our chief source of revenue. We must be willing to pay our fair share if we are to survive.

We must too sacrifice certain illusions, the illusion for example that we can stand alone in this tumultuous and somewhat fearsome world.

We must of necessity forge stronger the links which bind us to friendly peoples of distant lands, not out of humanitarian impulses alone but out of enlightened selfishness so that we may weather any storm that may eventually buffet us.

We must sacrifice funds if need be for the development of our young people's minds, and for the just remuneration of those who teach them, in order that they will be fittingly equipped to meet the problems which they will be called upon to face. Fluency in language, adaptability to science, flexibility of mind and loyalty to country are the virtues our young people must acquire if they are to adjust to the swiftly changing patterns of the world.

As one prominent aspirant for high office put it, he who sells freedom cheaply is a deceiver, or is himself deceived. He who sells it cheap or offers it as the byproduct of this or that economic system is a knave or a fool. For freedom necessitates infinitely more care and devotion than any other political system. It puts consent and personal initiative in place of command and obedience. It supplants the harsh and oppressive disciplines of dictatorial tyrannies with individual devotion and personal initiative.

All of these qualities are compatible with adherence to our principles, and to the heritage which our honored forefathers gave us.

What a superbly indescribable heritage the men who endowed this country with freedom bequeathed to us.

What a realm for happy living they gave us. Here abide in peace the peoples of all lands. Here no man demands of another patriotism or loyalty. They are willingly offered by Christian, Jew, and Moslem, all of whom are grateful for the benefactions of our wonderful country.

And you can find a reflection of this land of freedom in the eyes of a midwestern farmer, surveying his broad acres of wheat stretching across a limitless plain. You can hear freedom in the voice of a Jewish boy singing the sacred words of the Torah, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord is one. Thou shalt love thy God with all thy heart and mind." In the prayer of a Catholic girl saying "Hail, Mary, full of grace." In the voice of a Protestant boy singing, "A mighty fortress is our God, a bulwark never failing."

Yes; freedom, accepted so lightly but loved so deeply, is an integral part of the pattern of our life.

We say little about it, but most of us, like Peter Zenger and Ann Hutchinson, would as soon forsake life as be without it.

Ours is a great land, but we must respect other men and women who love their native lands. Ours is a great and opulent country, but if we are to enhance it, we must be willing to do our fair share in its behalf.

One thing is certain, in this confusing world, we have much to be grateful for, and we must never lose heart. Ours is a land rich in blessings. Ours a tradition bright as a star. All of us must ever be grateful, for out of gratitude for freedom flows patriotism, and loyalty undying.

The American Library Association: Its Purposes, Its Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, 1959, I was pleased to join other Members of Congress as guests at a luncheon in Washington sponsored by the American Library Association. The ALA, founded in 1876, is an organization of libraries, librarians, library trustees and others interested in the responsibilities of libraries in the educational, social, and cultural needs of society.

The purpose of the ALA is "to aid in making books and ideas vital forces in American life; to make libraries eas-

ily accessible to all people; to improve professional standards of librarianship; and to develop and publish professional books, periodicals, and pamphlets useful in rendering library service."

Dr. Emerson Greenaway, president of the American Library Association and director of the Free Library of Philadelphia, delivered an excellent address at the congressional luncheon which my distinguished colleague from Indiana, the Honorable J. RAY MADDEN, has inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 26, 1959, on page A5524.

Mr. Speaker, as Dr. Greenaway's remarks make clear, librarians are very much interested in the role of the Federal Government in improving library services for the citizens of our country.

I believe, therefore, that Members of Congress will find useful as they consider legislation in this field the following summary of Federal legislative policy of the American Library Association which was adopted this year by the council of the ALA. The summary follows:

FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE POLICY OF THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, ADOPTED JANUARY 29, 1959, BY THE ALA COUNCIL

FOREWORD

The American Library Association—founded in 1876 and incorporated in 1879 under the laws of Massachusetts—is an organization of libraries, librarians, library trustees, and others interested in libraries and in their contributions to the educational, social, and cultural needs of society.

Its development has paralleled that of the popular library movement and of the growth of librarianship as a profession in America. With members in every State, in every Canadian Province, and in many other countries, it is the chief spokesman for the modern library movement in North America. It is affiliated with more than 50 other library associations in this country and abroad and works closely with many other organizations concerned with education, research, recreation, and public service.

Government at all levels is becoming increasingly aware of the educational and social services that libraries provide. To facilitate library cooperation and to assist in interpreting library needs as they relate to the Federal Government and its agencies, the association maintains an office in Washington. Similar work with State and local bodies is carried on by State and local library associations; but at the national level, the American Library Association is the only nongovernmental organization representing all libraries.

OBJECTIVES

The association aims to promote library services throughout the United States by increasing the accessibility of books and libraries to all, by improving the professional standards of librarianship and thereby assisting in making books and ideas vital forces in American life. It endeavors to improve the services of our public, school, college, and university libraries and those of the special libraries serving government, the armed services, commerce and industry, hospitals, and other institutions. It promotes the coordination of all library resources for research, the establishment of library services for special groups, the improvement of the role of libraries in the education of adults, and the raising of professional standards through better professional education, working conditions, salaries, and the enactment of State certification laws. It encourages the creation, production, and distribution of books and other library materials to meet the needs of the people.

These objectives are rooted in the belief that an informed citizenry is essential to our democratic society, that only through a continuing educational process can we attain our maximum competence and satisfaction as individuals and as citizens of our community, State, and Nation, and that the free, ready access to the accumulated knowledge of man is basic to our way of life.

Libraries, as integral institutions in the total educational structure in our democracy and as the primary depositories of man's knowledge and idea, have direct responsibilities in making good books and other materials of communication available in quantity to all Americans of all ages, races, creeds, and circumstance. In performing this essential work, libraries require and deserve adequate public support.

Peace among nations is dependent upon mutual understanding, and understanding, upon information. Important contributions to world peace, therefore, can be made by promoting the development of libraries in other nations, by encouraging the interchange of ideas, informational materials, and persons with all nations, and by advancing research and scholarship which know no national boundaries.

FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

As one of the means through which it can achieve its objectives, the American Library Association is concerned with Federal legislation which relates directly to these objectives or which establishes a climate favorable to their promotion, principally in the following areas:

I. Direct services to libraries

A. The Library of Congress: The Library of Congress, one of the principal libraries of the world, performs services which are essential to the activities of other libraries and to research in the United States, particularly the catalog card distribution service and other publication programs which may be subscribed to and paid for by individual libraries. The association supports the improvement and extension of these important services.

B. Library Services Branch, U.S. Office of Education: Adequate educational services and facilities, and the equalization of educational opportunities are essential to our national welfare. As a primary agency in promoting the cause of education, the U.S. Office of Education, including its Library Services Branch, should receive annual appropriations adequate to carry out an effective program. The library services branch gives advisory and technical assistance on extending and improving the resources, services, and facilities of school, college, university, research, State, special, and public libraries; prepares valuable statistical compilations and other essential library publications; and administers the Library Services Act program. This important national library service, begun in 1938 at the request of the ALA, has never had adequate funds and staff to reach its full potential. The association is vitally interested in and gives support to a fully developed program by the library services branch.

C. Library Services Act: More than 25 million Americans do not have access to local public library service and some 50 million more receive only inadequate service. The passage of the Library Services Act, in June 1956, was a significant step toward improving this situation. The annual appropriation of $7,500,000 authorized under the act is urgently needed to permit the States to demonstrate effectively the value and importance of good library service to their rural inhabitants.

D. Depository libraries for Federal publications: The depository library system makes certain Federal documents available free to those libraries of the country designated as depository libraries. These depositories, in turn, maintain a network of information centers through which citizens may request and use Federal documents. This is a sound program. Its improvement and extension is essential to an informed citizenry.

E. Library services to the blind: Substantial progress has been made in the development of specialized library service to the blind. The association will support legislative proposals to strengthen and expand these services not only to the blind but to other handicapped groups as well.

F. Public works: As a means by which library facilities may be extended and improved, the association favors the inclusion of libraries in legislation providing for programs of public works.

G. Surplus property: The association urges that libraries, like other educational institutions, be made eligible to receive Federal surplus property, such as books, shelving, desks, chairs, vehicles, and other items of equipment.

II. Indirect services to libraries

A. Postal rates: The association favors the widest possible dissemination of information to achieve the well-informed electorate essential to our Nation's welfare. For this reason, the association believes in low postal rates on all informational, cultural, and educational materials. It recognizes the assistance given by Congress in establishing the educational and cultural materials rate and the special library materials rate and in designating these rates as public service functions of the Post Office Department.

B. Customs regulations: The easy importation of foreign books and other library materials for scholarly and research purposes and the continuance of customs policies which permits library materials to enter duty free under simplified customs regulations should be continued.[1]

C. Internal revenue taxation: The present narrow definition of an educational institution by the Internal Revenue Service as "an educational institution having a faculty and a student body" affects some libraries adversely. It discriminates against the public libraries in terms of charitable contributions because a prospective donor is more likely to make his contributions to a school or college when such a contribution will permit a larger personal deduction. Since this ruling tends to serve as a precedent for other Federal agencies, it deprives the public library of benefits and services to which it is properly entitled; e.g., public works, surplus property.

D. Copyright: The U.S. copyright law should be adapted to changing techniques of communication in the interest of interposing the fewest possible obstacles to the communication of ideas consistent with preserving the fundamental constitutional purpose of encouraging creative endeavor.

E. Federal aid to education: Federal aid to public education is needed to assist the States and their local subdivisions in establishing and maintaining adequate educational services and facilities and in equalizing educational opportunity. This assistance should also include school and library construction.

1. School libraries: The association believes that library service is an essential and integral part of every school program, whether at the elementary, junior, or senior high school level and that the Federal and State governments have a responsibility to

[1] See also reference to "Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials," under sec. IV.B. UNESCO.

stimulate greater effort and support at the State and local levels so that all school children may have adequate school library service.

2. College and university libraries: Libraries are a vital part of higher education. Federal scholarships and loans, special grants, research contracts, aid to college building programs, and tax exemptions for educational institutions benefit the whole country by raising the general level of support for college education. Increased support of college and university libraries must be a part of, or a corollary to, increased support of higher education.

3. Public libraries: The public library is a vital part of our total educational structure and supplements the program of formal education at all levels. The success of the Library Services Act clearly demonstrates the value of Federal stimulation grants to improve library service. The association recommends that Federal assistance be provided to the States to stimulate public library development, not only in areas having less than 10,000 population, but also in all areas where library service and facilities are below standard or do not now exist.

F. Social security: The association supports a strong Federal social security program as an important contribution to, and as a basis for, actuarially sound retirement programs for libraries.

III. Policies and activities of the Federal Government affecting its libraries and library employees

A. Personnel policies:

1. General: In order to fulfill the library's function of serving as an unbiased nonpartisan bureau of information, the association supports a library personnel program based on the following: (1) a sound position classification plan; (2) selection and promotion based solely on merit, with persons chosen for their educational, professional, and personal qualifications; (3) well-organized plans for inservice training and merit rating; (4) conditions of employment, including vacations with pay, paid sick leave, and provisions for group insurance, to promote job satisfaction and high morale; (5) an equitable and adequate pay plan to attract and hold men and women of marked ability; (6) an actuarially sound retirement plan supplemented by, or including, Federal social security; (7) security of intellectual freedom; and (8) tenure with protection against discharge and demotion without adequate cause and a fair hearing.

2. Civil service: The effects of a strong, flexible Federal civil service system extend beyond the Federal system. It establishes a standard for library positions everywhere. Continuing efforts should be exerted toward professionalization of the Federal library service.

3. Recruiting of librarians: Along with a strong, flexible civil service system there should be an aggressive recruiting program for librarians on the part of the Federal Government. The Government should not be content to fill library positions with unqualified employees through default.

B. Federal libraries: Certain libraries in the Federal Government, namely, the Library of Congress, the Library of the Department of Agriculture, and the National Library of Medicine, are recognized as having a national responsibility for collecting, organizing, and servicing research materials in their fields. Adequate funds should be provided to permit these and other Federal libraries to carry out their national responsibilities.

IV. International programs

A. United Nations: The association supports participation by the United States in those programs of the United Nations and of its specialized agencies which, in fulfillment of the objectives of the Charter, relate significantly and constructively to books, reading, and libraries. The association will support legislation implementing U.S. participation in the United Nations and its specialized agencies toward these ends.

B. Unesco: The association supports the principles of Unesco as stated in the Unesco constitution and endorsed by the Government of the United tSates. Through its representation in the U.S. National Commission for Unesco and through the work of its various committees and individual libraries and librarians, it seeks to assist in the implementation of the Unesco program in this country and abroad, particularly those aspects of it involving the development of library services and bibliographic activities throughout the world. It favors adequate support for the Unesco Relations Staff in the Department of State to facilitate this work.

The American Library Association favors the early ratification by the United States of the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials.

C. Exchange of persons: The international exchange of persons program which has done much to better international understanding should be continued, and foreign visitors under the program should be given the opportunity to observe our libraries and to understand their contribution to American life. The exchange of librarians between this and other countries should be encouraged.

D. Exchange of publications: The interchange of publications between the United States and other countries is important for the friendly interchange of ideas and for international understanding and should be fostered in every way possible.

E. International copyright: The establishment of reciprocal copyright relationships with other countries through appropriate international arrangements such as the Universal Copyright Convention should be encouraged.

F. International postal policy: The optional provision in the Universal Postal Convention permitting reduced rates on educational and cultural materials should be adopted. The several proposals made by UNESCO for the modification of the Universal Postal Convention to encourage wider and easier international distribution of educational and cultural materials should be supported.

G. U.S. information libraries: The American Library Association believes that American libraries abroad are one of the most effective means of providing information about the United States to other peoples and that they should be administered by professionally trained, experienced American librarians. The association, therefore, urges that the U.S. Information Services program receive sufficient support to carry on an effective program.

H. Technical assistance programs: The program of technical assistance to underdeveloped countries should be continued and should include professional library assistance.

V. Intellectual freedom

The association believes that the freedom to read, guaranteed by the Bill of Rights of the United States, is essential to our democracy and must be preserved. The association's position is clearly set forth in its library bill of rights adopted by the ALA Council in 1948:

Library Bill of Rights

The council of the American Library Association reaffirms its belief in the following basic policies which should govern the services of all libraries:

1. As a responsibility of library service, books and other reading matter selected should be chosen for values of interest, information, and enlightenment of all the people of the community. In no case should any book be excluded because of the race or nationality, or the political or religious views of the writer.

2. There should be the fullest practicable provision of material presenting all points of view concerning the problems and issues of our times, international, national, and local; and books or other reading matter of sound factual authority should not be proscribed or removal from library shelves because of partisan or doctrinal disapproval.

3. Censorship of books, urged or practiced by volunteer arbiters of morals or political opinion or by organizations that would establish a coercive concept of Americanism, must be challenged by libraries in maintenance of their responsibility to provide public information and enlightenment through the printed word.

4. Libraries should enlist the cooperation of allied groups in the fields of science, of education, and of book publishing in resisting all abridgment of the free access to ideas and full freedom of expression that are the tradition and heritage of Americans.

5. As an institution of education for democratic living, the library should welcome the use of its meeting rooms for socially useful and cultural activities and discussions of current public questions. Such meeting places should be available on equal terms to all groups in the community regardless of the beliefs and affiliations of their members.

By official action of the council on February 3, 1951, the library bill of rights shall be interpreted to apply to all materials and media of communication used or collected by libraries.

Button, Button

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 18, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the June 29, 1959, edition of the Medford Mail Tribune:

GOODBY, TARIFF LEAGUE, HELLO

After nearly three-quarters of a century, one of the best-established of political leopards is undertaking to change its spots. On Wednesday, July 1, the redoubtable American Tariff League becomes the Trade Relations Council of the United States.

The change, no doubt, is partly perfumery. Over the years, the word "tariff" has taken on an archaic, faintly disagreeable air, redolent of celluloid collars. It conjures up the titanic clashes between free trade and protectionism which used to rock Congress to its heels every few years.

But the renaming also reflects shifting realities. The great issues have gone lower case. Advocates of free trade and tariff protection still go at it hammer and tongs, but the battlefield has shifted.

Today, as League President Ralph A. Butland conceded recently, "tariffs as such are a joke" (though, of course, a notably unfunny one both to advocates and contemners). President Eisenhower's Commission on Foreign Economic Policy estimated in 1954 that eliminating all U.S. tariffs in one fell swoop would displace no more than 400,000 American workers and probably fewer than 200,000.

The real fence against foreign competition now is the import quota system—this and the political horsetrading in which the White House must engage to win periodic renewals

of the reciprocal trade program. For example, insiders say President Eisenhower was forced to barter quotas on lead and zinc in exchange for votes to put over the 1958 extension.

These quotas may have serious effects on the economies of friendly countries. And they may be illogical from a strictly economic view. (Harvard Economist Sumner Slichter thinks eliminating all restrictions on imports would be an effective brake on inflation.) But they are nonetheless attractive to companies bucking cheap foreign imports and to workmen whose jobs might otherwise disappear.

So Tariff League or Trade Relations Council, the battle still is joined.

Address by Miss Frances Knight at Opening of Passport Agency in Miami

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we all know of the outstanding efforts of Miss Frances Knight, Director of the Passport Office of the Department of State. During the time this agency has been under her direction great savings have been made in money and time; and all Americans who have traveled abroad have come to appreciate the efficiency and courtesy exemplifying the U.S. Passport Office and its field agencies.

Miami, Fla., has recently been established as a field agency in view of the ever-increasing amount of travel through that port. I want to present the following speech made by Miss Knight on the occasion of the opening of the Miami office:

This is, indeed, a happy occasion for the Passport Office, as well as for the city of Miami. Needless to say, we are delighted with this generous and sincere reception. We like the idea of being identified with what is certain to become one of the world's largest and busiest and probably the most popular, year-round international tourist and travel center.

Some of you may remember that we had a Passport Agency in Miami during the war years, from February 1942 through April 1946. It was located in the U.S. Post Office Building and was established primarily to to assist American citizens traveling between the United States and the South and Central American countries. After the war there was a quiet spell in the travel business. People were staying close to home, and our records show that less than 200 persons a month were applying for passports from this locality. Obviously, the cost of maintaining the Agency could not be justified, so it was closed.

It has been noted that the more people that come to visit Miami, the more return to live here permanently. And this is true of the Passport Office. Our war years with you could be described as a visit, and now we have come to live here with you, on what I hope will be a permanent basis.

We have been watching the growth of Miami with a great deal of interest and anticipation. In 1955, there were over 3,000 applications for passports from metropolitan Miami and 7,100 from the U.S. district courts in southern Florida. By 1958, these figures rose to 6,700 from metropolitan Miami and 10,000 from southern Florida. We estimate that by 1960 there will be a total of 26,000 passport applications handled by this new Agency which we are opening today.

There is no need for me to spell out the phenomenal growth of Miami. You are all well aware of the facts. I have no crystal ball but it seems quite obvious to me that, with the construction of Miami's exceptionally fine International Airport, the eventual establishment of a new deepwater port, together with your greatest blessing—the possession of the finest climate in the United States—you just can't miss on becoming one of the busiest and most popular crossroads of the world. And I don't mean the cloverleaf variety, a bypass or a transfer station. I mean a crossroads where travelers take a breather and linger awhile.

A tremendous amount of thought, study, and planning goes into the opening of a passport agency. We are loaded with statistics, as we should be, because this is a costly undertaking. Our responsibility is to see to it that we give the traveling citizen prompt and efficient service, and at the same time return to the U.S. Treasury as much revenue as is consistent with rendering that service. In the past several years we have concentrated on learning where travel originates; who is traveling; what age groups are traveling; where are they going and why; how do they travel; how long is the average trip; is another trip being contemplated in the future; how many persons are traveling on a passport and many other related data. All such information is vitally important in planning for the future.

In considering the establishment of an agency in Miami, I have given weight to one very interesting statistic—important and significant to Florida as well as to the travel industry—that is the year by year increase in the oversea travel of retired persons. In 1958, there was a 31 percent increase in this category over 1957. These men and women range from 50 to 76 years of age, and with the trend toward retirement to Florida, or at least prolonged vacation in Florida, it is likely that a Miami Passport Agency would service a large percentage of the applications from this group.

Now, what does the establishment of a passport agency mean to the Miami area?

Up to now passport applications have been received and executed by the very cooperative office of the clerk of the district court. The applications have been forwarded to Washington where they are checked over, cleared across our master index, and then processed. Due to major improvements in the processing of passports, we have maintained over the past 2 years a record of issuing passports within 4½ days of the receipt of the application, provided, of course, that the application was properly made out and in good order. Add to this mailing and delivery time and it generally took 10 days to get the passport to the applicant.

With the inception of the Miami agency, clerks of court throughout the State of Florida will be advised to forward passport applications directly to Miami. As the capacity of the agency increases, it will be possible to send similar instructions to clerks of court in adjoining States. The Miami agency is already linked with the national office in Washington by teletype. As applications are received at the agency, pertinent information will be teletyped to Washington, and at our end we are geared to make immediate verification of this information and to teletype clearance within 48 hours. The agency is thus authorized to issue the passport. As a matter of fact, it will be possible for applicants from the Miami area, to file their applications, take a leisurely stroll around the block, and return to pick up their passports.

The Miami agency is thus designed to provide prompt and efficient passport service to the citizens of Miami as well as to citizens of the State of Florida and citizen visitors from other States. The agency will have a staff of five persons, supervised by an agent-in-charge, Mr. William Nerren, who has had 20 years of service with the Passport Office. Mr. Nerren is knowledgeable in citizenship law, and I can't think of a question regarding passports which he could not answer.

The agency is located at 320 South East First Street, in the new First National Bank Building. We have tried to furnish it in a manner which will compliment the friendly, casual atmosphere of so many of the modern offices in this area. Our color scheme has been selected with care. We hope that you will find it informal and inviting.

In the past week, as we completed the arrangements for the opening of this Agency, a strange thought passed through my mind, engendered, no doubt, by the news accounts of the current conditioning of a group of men for space travel. Perhaps the Miami Passport Agency will process the first application for a passport into outer space.

I want to express sincere thanks and gratitude to our many friends in Miami; the civic, municipal, county, and commercial representatives who by their encouragement and advice and enthusiasm have made this celebration possible.

Your two Senators and all your Members of Congress have kept in close touch with this project. We couldn't have had better cooperation. Everybody pitched in to make this successful. I wish they were all here to take a bow and participate in this happy occasion.

I started out by saying that we liked the idea of being identified with the growth and aspirations of such a forward looking community. Miami will continue to grow in all directions and we are mighty proud of the opportunity to grow with you.

The Flint Idea Is Catching On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, recently I took occasion to describe to my colleagues in the House the community schools program of Flint, Mich., a bold concept which makes the public school facilities available to the entire community with the double-barreled benefit of enriching the adult population while stimulating their interest in their public school system.

It is my pleasure to report the Flint idea is catching on. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Flint Journal of July 1, 1959, commenting upon the adaptation of this educational concept at the University of Chicago. The editorial follows:

A GREAT IDEA NOW CAN GROW

Flint's famed concept of developing better citizens and better urban living through community education is due for more widespread imitation in years ahead.

The source of that expansion of the Flint idea is on the campus of the University of Chicago. It is the new industrial relations center, dedicated last week before leaders of education, industry and business.

It was fitting that Charles Stewart Mott should be on hand to witness the dedication ceremonies and to turn over the structure, which was dedicated to him, to the chancellor of the University of Chicago.

It was Mr. Mott who made possible the fulfillment of the community-education dream in Flint and it was "Mr. Flint" who gave the money for the $1,300,000 Industrial Relations Center.

Over the years the community-education program of the Mott Foundation and the Flint Board of Education has grown until few in this community can confess that they have not participated in some degree.

Because the value of the program was recognized by community leaders all over the Nation, it became apparent some years ago that the idea should be shared with other communities. The IRC at the University of Chicago is the result.

Leadership is needed if other communities are to benefit from the kind of human progress so evident in Flint. The function of the IRC is to train and assist leaders who will go out into other colleges and develop the personnel needed to implement the Mott system in cities all over America.

Who can predict the benefits which can come from this project for human and community achievement? We know Flint has gained immeasurably in many ways from community education. There is no reason other communities, given the tools through the facilities of the IRC, cannot also become mighty forces for personal development and education of their citizens.

Flint is proud to be the cradle from which has grown a great program for community good.

Poison in Your Water—No. 139

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald of April 13, 1959, entitled "Cities Must Pay":

CITIES MUST PAY

As the city of Bellingham adds up the sums that must be spent on trunk sewer installations and sewer disposal plants, citizens should be interested in the plight of Chicago.

Our fair city must face some rather costly projects in order to meet requirements of the State pollution commission and appease the health department. But these two departments have not been complaining without just cause. The installation of septic tanks in many of the residential areas has created a serious problem. And the discharge of raw sewage into Bellingham Bay is an archaic practice.

In Chicago a plea has been made to permit it to take more water from Lake Michigan to flush the sewage into the Chicago River and then down the Mississippi.

This metropolis already has spent some $425 million for treatment plants, but in spite of that great amount, raw or partially treated sewage goes into the river. One can imagine that cities below Chicago are not happy about conditions.

Several years ago the Windy City reversed the flow of the Chicago River as a means of discharging the vast accumulation of sewage. Now the problem involves the entire Nation, as well as Canada. As explained a short time ago by the Portland Oregonian, the Pacific Northwest also is anxiously watching the decision on whether Chicago should get more water from Lake Michigan. "This region and its representatives in Congress are worried because the waters of Lake Michigan are involved. Canada officially has protested, but also has said that diversion is Chicago's business. But this may mean only that Canada would then feel free to divert water from the Columbia River into the Fraser River, to the great detriment of hydroelectric power potential at dams in Oregon and Washington on the Columbia." Thus sewage disposal problems can even involve a continent.

Now we know it is spring. The dandelions are begininng to pop out.

Military Housing Is Big Factor in Service Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services I have been particularly interested in the various factors which incline capable young men to remain in the service and give us the career-minded specialists we vitally need. We have found that one of the most important areas in which the Government can provide incentive to these men is that of dependents' housing.

The Capehart housing program, started in 1954, has proved eminently successful in meeting this need. The program is described in an article by Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART in the July issue of the VFW magazine:

HOUSING FOR OUR ARMED FORCES

(By Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART, U.S. Senator, Indiana)

In the World War I era only 20 percent of the men in the service were married. Wives and sweethearts occasionally visited them in camp but were able to be with them only when they were on pass. Now it is estimated that more than half of the men in all four branches of the service are married. In the Air Force alone, about 80 percent of the men are married. It is generally agreed that countless thousands of these men can be persuaded to remain in the service if we can give them the chance to live in typical American homes with their families.

An increasing number of men in the Armed Forces today, particularly those in the highly specialized grades, are finding military life as attractive as anything industry has to offer and are making a career of it—mainly because of the growing availability of adequate housing. It is estimated that this factor has saved Uncle Sam at least a billion dollars a year in the turnover of trained personnel. It takes money to train today's soldier, a good $200,000 for a B–52 pilot. To have him remain in the service after he has received his costly training is that much net saving to Uncle Sam.

Increased pay, of course, has had its inducements, but the availability of adequate housing on or adjacent to the reservation has tended to make military life more attractive. The wives are happier. Where no housing is available near the station, servicemen often have to find living quarters as far as 10 miles away.

Aside from helping the morale of the men, this on-the-site housing will serve well in time of an emergency. It obviates the necessity of their having to fight traffic in an effort to get to their stations, whereas the probability would be thousands of people moving in the opposite direction. Like firemen they can now slide down the greased pole, so to speak, and report for duty immediately.

Congress originally set a ceiling of $13,500 on each house but has since raised it to $16,500. The average cost per unit has been approximately $14,850. It is estimated that comparative homes in lots of 5–50 units sold on today's market for private sale would cost on an average of $23,000.

It was in the summer of 1953 that I came face to face with a problem that, in my opinion, required immediate attention if America was to keep pace with what everyone agreed was to be a long and tedious struggle to maintain our superior strength in the cold war. I was well aware that our forces, to achieve success in our effort for survival, must be the leader in the development of new and fantastic weapons. It was easy to understand that to maintain our superiority in effective manpower, our servicemen must have pay scales somewhat comparable to equally responsible positions in private industry. But, only after a number of visits with my daughter, Pat, and her husband, Lt. Jim Pearson, and talking with their friends, did I realize the tremendous importance of improved housing for our key military personnel if we were to prevent a turnover that some day might make less prolific any hot war efforts that might become necessary.

So, some 15 months later, along with Congressman ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama, I became the sponsor of legislation to ease this problem.

The Capehart housing legislation was designed for the purpose of building family housing units on our principal military bases. They were to house the families of enlisted men as well as officers. Key assignments were to receive priority in the occupancy of these homes. The housing was to be sufficiently attractive to stimulate the morale of our soldiers and, equally important, the happiness of their families.

Capehart housing is built by private industry after competitive bidding and financed by private capital. Mortgages on the properties are insured by the Federal Housing Administration and guaranteed by the Department of Defense. The mortgages carry an interest rate of 4½ percent, a return which has attracted investments by various pension and retirement organizations. Plans are now being worked out to permit participation in these issues by investors who now are excluded because of the size of the mortgages. The Defense Department is reimbursed from the quarters allowances of the occupants.

The Department of Defense, the various military services, and the Federal Housing Administration each share a part of the responsibility in guaranteeing the delivery of good homes to our key military people without any undue delay.

In the spring of 1956 the first families began to move into Capehart homes at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. Since that time some 41,000 units have been occupied, and an

additional 39,000 units are in various stages of processing and construction. This total of 80,000 units is still a long way from the number of homes actually needed, but we are at least making an approach toward the goal that should be reached.

More than 70 general contractors and approximately 1,000 subcontractors have participated in these developments. No military bases where construction has actually begun have been either disestablished or reduced in activity. Labor relations have been outstanding, and even in the Deep South the races have been integrated in these projects without difficulty.

There is little question that this program has achieved the desired and expected results. In a statement recently released for publication, Assistant Secretary of the Army Dewey Short stated: "Despite all the wonderful advances that have been made in weapon development and in better organization and cooperation throughout our Armed Forces, in my opinion there has been no progress of more long-range value to the overall strength of this country than the long overdue provision of attractive housing for our enlisted men and officers."

It has been estimated that the drop in turnover among the military services as a direct result of better housing has saved the American taxpayers something over $1 billion.

In pinpointing a specific instance where good housing is essential for the morale of the serviceman and his family, Secretary Short called attention to Loring Air Force Base in northern Maine, one of our most vital outposts, located 120 miles from the nearest town of any size. He said, "I am sure that this base and many others of this remote character could not possibly be staffed in the manner necessary for our strategic defense if attractive housing were not available on the base." It is Secretary Short's opinion that Capehart housing is one of the most unsung yet vitally important contributions to our national security.

The value of this program has been further enunciated by the good reception of those officers and men now occupying these homes throughout the country. Gen. Donald Yates, commander of the all-important Cape Canaveral operation in Florida, said that in his opinion the addition of Capehart housing at Patrick Air Force Base was one of the principal reasons why he was able to keep intact the type of personnel he so sorely needed to carry out his responsibilities.

A group of Federal housing officials recently visited various defense areas in an effort to determine (1) what impact title VIII housing was having on the local real estate markets; (2) on the economy of the various nearby communities; and (3) if the results of this better housing was consistent with the purpose for which the houses were designed.

Here are some of the answers they were able to obtain:

Henry Tallmadge, president of the Brevard County, Fla., Builders Association, said "We were quite skeptical when we first heard that 1,000 new homes were to be built at Patrick Air Force Base, thinking it might decrease the value of the land for miles around; however, now that we have seen these homes we have found that—because of their design and layout—nearby land has actually increased in value. We have no doubt that should be base ever be disestablished, these homes would be sold promptly and at a good strong price."

Richard Muldrew, president of the Melbourne, Fla., Chamber of Commerce, commenting on the same project, stated that the very attractive Capehart project at Patrick is "a very wholesome addition to the development of Brevard County and one of which the citizens of this community are extremely proud."

Many homes were visited without notice by the housing officials, including those of Lt. Col. J. H. Mosley at Fort Story, Capt. Harold Smith, Capt. Robert Schwartz, and Sgt. C. H. Preston at Ft. Eustis. The families of these people, without qualifications, felt that these desirable homes had enhanced their standard of living and given them a complete new outlook toward an Army career.

Lt. John McCaens, housing officer at Langley Air Force Base in southern Virginia, commented that since construction began on their Capehart project a few weeks ago, his office has been literally swamped with requests to occupy these homes. The wives especially have implored consideration with the hope that they might occupy these quarters.

During the past few months Commissioner Julian Zimmerman of the Federal Housing Administration has been traveling throughout the country, helping local people celebrate the 25th anniversary of this fine self-sustaining agency. In each of these visits he has emphasized to his audiences the importance of this military housing program. He recently said, "FHA is proud of the part it has played, and is playing, in this vital field of housing on behalf of national defense and honestly believes that this program has been so carefully administered as to have had no appreciable effect on the private market where units have been built."

The Commissioner told me a few days ago that he feels title VIII housing is one of FHA's most important programs. He added that once the people understand its purpose and objective and the dedicated interest with which it has been administered, they will readily appreciate its necessity in accomplishing a very important job for the welfare of the Nation.

I like to feel that any opposition to the continuation of this program is either of a political nature or stems from a deep misunderstanding. To be very frank, I am delighted with the results and will continue to fight for good housing for our military personnel as long as I am in the U.S. Senate. There will always be sniping at minor mistakes in the program, but I am sure that when the overall results are in, the purpose will have been well served and our boys will be getting more and better houses and getting them on time.

Inflation and Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include editorials from the Flint (Mich.) Journal and the State Journal, Lansing, Mich., of Sunday, July 5, 1959.

That the two daily newspapers, which are in no way related, in my district, should happen to editorialize in such similar vein on the same day only emphasizes the deep concern with which the American public—as both taxpayers and consumers—are viewing the cycle of increased Government spending, budget deficits, and inflation.

I commend these thoughtful editorials to anyone who feels that limited inflation is a healthy sign or that "we only owe this money to ourselves."

The editorials follow:

[From the Flint Journal, July 5, 1959]

DEFICIT HARMFUL TO ALL AMERICANS

The Federal Government wrote an unhappy financial chapter last week when it closed the fiscal year with a deficit of between $12 and $13 billion, largest in peacetime history.

Running a deficit of that size is certain to have serious consequences on the financial stability of the people as well as the Government. A deficit acts as a stimulant to inflation.

The red ink has forced the Treasury into extremes of borrowing to provide the Government with money to pay its bills. It has forced Congress to approve a higher ceiling on the Federal debt.

It will affect the budgets of future years. The loans will have to be paid some day, and borrowing charges will appear quickly, adding to the interest load which already amounts to $8½ billion a year.

The huge 1958–59 deficit was the result of the recession and the efforts of the administration and Congress to end it by speeding programs that required more spending than had been expected.

The recession reduced Federal revenue because lower incomes of individuals and the profits of business cut down the Government's collections from personal and corporate income taxes.

Fortunately for Federal financing, the prospects for the fiscal year which began last Wednesday are much brighter. President Eisenhower submitted to Congress a precariously balanced budget. The threat of veto of rash spending measures is keeping the budget reasonably close to the limits of prospective revenue.

Unless the budget is kept within the bounds of income this year, the red ink will have to come out again, and Congress would have the choice in 1960 of again raising the debt limit, an inflationary step, or raising taxes.

More taxation is a development which Americans do not want. They are being beset from all sides for more and more revenue. State and municipal governments all over the Nation are authorizing a bigger grab on the pocketbooks of the taxpayers, and they don't like it.

Furthermore, officials involved in tax-supported programs are insisting that more spending is needed. That means more taxes. As an example, the Educational Policies Commission, a joint undertaking of the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators, claims another $8 billion should be spent annually for public schools to provide a good educational program.

Education is not the only seeker of more funds. Even if the Federal Government practices strict economy during the next decade, budget officials report, its budget will climb to $87 billion for the 1969–70 fiscal year.

The budget for the current fiscal year would be at least as high as the 1969 prediction if the Nation had not experienced a surprising shift in public sentiment after last November's election.

The voters then elected a heavily Democratic Congress. The liberals were in ecstasy. They predicted quick congressional approval of spending programs which would add importantly to the services Government provides for its citizens.

It hasn't worked out that way because President Eisenhower insisted the Nation could not jeopardize its economic future by adding to the budget.

He threatened to veto excessive "gimme" measures and warned that he would carry his fight to the people. To the surprise of the liberal spenders, the public shied away from the liberal promise of its November vote and supported the President's demand for a balanced budget in 1959–60.

Aware that there wasn't enough spending sentiment in Congress to override vetoes, the conservative leaders of the Democratic Party in Congress have kept the spenders leashed. The final budget will be almost what Mr. Eisenhower recommended.

But the seeds of continued red ink and approval of every kind of spending program are there. They will sprout if the public doesn't continue to resist a system that would erode further the present low value of the dollar.

People concerned about a budget which ends deficit financing, permits a gradual reduction of the current tremendous debt, and holds out eventual hope of lower Federal taxation must make their sentiments known to their representatives in Congress. Their votes will determine America's future financial direction.

[From the State Journal, Lansing, Mich., July 5, 1959]

INFLATION: EVERYBODY'S ENEMY

President Eisenhower's statement last week that inflation will be one of the main issues in the 1960 presidential campaign is regrettably true.

It is regrettable because inflation is something that everyone should be against. Unfortunately, not everyone is, although almost everyone recognizes the terrible consequences to a nation when uncontrolled inflation develops.

Proponents of government spending argue that "a little inflation is a good thing," and, unfortunately, the supporters of this viewpoint have been in control of governmental pursestrings more often than not in the past 25 years. The result is that the American dollar today is worth less than half of its 1939 value.

The national debt is at an astronomical alltime high of $286 billion. Much of this, of course, was accumulated as an inevitable consequence of World War II, but it also is true that Federal spending exceeded revenues in all but a very few years from 1933 to the present year.

Federal deficits were accumulated even in the years of greatest national prosperity and despite the highest peacetime tax rates in American history. Federal debt is not the only force that creates inflation, it is true, but it is an important factor and it is a sign of the times.

A Trendex News Poll, published in this issue of the State Journal, reveals that 40 percent of the public blames labor unions most for U.S. inflation, with 25 percent putting the blame on Government and 11 percent on private industry. Labor unions are blamed because of the pressure they exert for higher wages which, of course, forces higher prices.

Actually, the never-ending wage-versus-price issue is much like the argument concerning which came first, the chicken or the egg. All segments of our economic society must share in the blame for inflation and this includes the public that constantly demands more in the way of governmental services at extravagant costs.

Inflation is an erosion of a nation's economic strength. To combat it effectively requires the cooperation of everyone and a complete rejection of the theory that a little inflation is a good thing.

Everyone is hurt by inflation. It lowers the value of insurance, bonds, and all things tied to the dollar. The effect of inflation upon those persons living on fixed incomes, such as pensions, is tragic.

The Cabinet Committee on Price Stability, headed by Vice President NIXON, in a report just released by President Eisenhower pointed out, "resistance to inflation is bound to cause temporary inconvenience to some and to limit the gains of others, but price stability will powerfully promote the welfare of all."

The alternative to voluntary public action to check inflation is Government control of prices and wages, and this is a case where the cure may be worse than the disease. Wage and price controls serve to stymie production which in turn creates scarcities, the ally of inflation.

Inflation constitutes not only an economic danger to the Nation but a serious threat to national defense as well. A nation weakened by economic erosion would be a susceptible target for Russian aggression.

Government, labor, private industry, and the general public have a mutual obligation to work together to halt the threat of inflation in the national interest.

Reforms, in Communist Doubletalk, Means Repression—Another Painful Lesson in Tibet—Where Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 6, 1959:

PATTERN OF CONQUEST

There is something all too familiar about the Chinese Communist announcement of a program of "reforms" for Tibet. Stripped of the usual doubletalk it all comes down to the same pattern of conquest. Kill, rob, terrorize, rule with iron, and then call it reform.

The first stage, necessarily, must be suppression of rebellion. Then comes the confiscation of land holdings and redistribution of the land. This is to be coupled with a campaign "in the temples and monasteries to oppose rebellion, privileges and exploitation." Naturally, say the Communists, they will follow a "policy of firm adherence to freedom of religious belief." But not of course, if it involves loyalty to the religious head of the Tibetans, the Dalai Lama, now driven into exile. Such loyalty would be rebellion, and would be intolerable, especially since the Buddha himself has already been branded as a "reactionary element."

Peiping's current overlord in Tibet was joined by the Panchen Lama, the captive puppet, in mouthing this pious buncombe. The fiction of legality is thus preserved in the usual Communist manner.

An interesting sidelight is the fact that the Dalai Lama, in his first official statement to the free press of the world two weeks ago, told of his program of real reform for Tibet and how it had been frustrated by the Chinese Communists at every turn. He outlined in detail how he had proposed to put an end to serfdom and to get the land into the hands of the tiller. But he did not propose to murder the landlords and monks, and so the Communists would not allow it.

But the Communists propose to establish, now, peasants' asosciations that will represent mass rule. Presumably this means that the horrors of the Chinese communes will be extended to Tibet.

There has never been one shred of evidence that the leaders of the Communist hierachy—in Russia or in Red China—have had the slightest interest in human welfare and human happiness for its own sake. Their contempt for human life has been characteristic. But the pattern of Red conquest must be followed and that pattern calls for compounding felony with persistent hypocrisy. One would think that by this time the more intelligent of the Communists might realize that free men cannot watch their deeds and listen to their false words without nausea.

The Realization of the Golden Age of Senior Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending the third annual national convention of senior citizens at Lakeland, Fla., on June 13, and addressed them at their principal banquet, attended by some 1,200 persons from all over the Nation, and had the privilege of reflecting on what is becoming an increasing national problem, the problem of providing security, health, and happiness for the estimated 15 million citizens over age 65 in this Nation.

The remarks received such a fine reception that I felt they might be of interest to other Members of Congress, and for that reason I am submitting them for the RECORD:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM C. CRAMER BEFORE THE THIRD ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION OF SENIOR CITIZENS ON JUNE 13, 1959, LAKELAND, FLA.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am indeed honored to have the pleasure of addressing this senior citizens national convention, and wish to thank your leadership for inviting me and for affording me this privilege.

I have a very devoted interest in the problems of senior citizens, particularly in view of the fact that my district, the First District of Florida, has more senior citizens percentagewise than any other congressional district in the United States. I have thus had an opportunity to gain firsthand, through correspondence and personal contact, a working and living knowledge of what some of the problems of senior citizens are and have devoted many hours of my tenure in office in an effort to meet the challenge offered by some of these problems.

I subscribe to the more recent view with regard to growing old, which is that it is a pleasant social achievement not to be feared, but rather to be anticipated. As Bernard Baruch says, "It is the greatest achievement arising out of our scientific culture." Or to express it in a different way, Robert Browning once wrote, "Grow old along with me, the best is yet to be, the last of life, is for which the first was made." Of course, since those words were written in 1860, life expectancy was only about 40 years and in the United States there were fewer than 3 percent of the population over 65. Today, of course, life expectancy is approaching 70 and, thanks to the advances in medical science and the other emoluments of modern-day living, more than 1 of over 12 in

our 176 million population are over 65, and the ranks of the senior citizens are still growing. Further, since the turn of the century, our total population has a little more than doubled, but in the same period senior citizens increased 3½-fold with there being in excess of 15 million people in this country over the age of 65. In addition, the shortening of the hours of work of today's workingman and the increased life expectancy of Americans combined have given us each 45,000 hours or 22 years of newly found free time as compared to the citizen of less than a century ago. Medical science has made such great strides that many of the killers of 10 and 20 years ago no longer ravage the population and even such dreaded diseases as heart and cancer are experiencing breakthroughs that offer hope for recovery in the not too distant future to many additional millions of Americans.

On the side of financial security today, social security, Government and private pensions and annuities are coming into full force for the first time in the history of the country and millions of retirees find themselves on a fixed income, but a guaranteed one which was a condition unheard of some 20 years ago.

Thus, we see some of the blessings of today's senior citizens. But a statement of the aforementioned facts also leads us into a discussion of some of the problems that senior citizens face today. Some of the major problems are that of having an adequate income which involves the problem of the increased cost of living or the curbing of runaway inflation, the present status of existing Government and private pensions as well as social security, the income plight of those who have no such pension programs, the need for continued extensive medical research in the conquest of the remaining diseases, adequate housing for those who cannot acquire it today under present circumstances, the need for making full use of their skills and technological know-how in the field of employment, the happy and full use of spare time, and the continued participation by senior citizens in social and community affairs.

It is my belief that the senior years should be golden years, years which we anticipate in our youth. To make it so it is necessary that many of these problems be effectively faced and that long-range programs to accomplish such a golden age be developed.

To me the expression golden years means a maximum of happiness and security which results from the assurance that senior citizens will have equal opportunities with others to engage in gainful employment. It means senior citizens must have sufficient income to pay for the essentials of food, clothing and shelter, and for the maintenance of a standard of living with dignity. It means an opportunity for participation in community life as self-respecting and self-sustaining citizens. It means providing of adequate housing suited to the needs of senior citizens and available at prices that they can afford to pay. It means that senior citizens should have the opportunity to make preparation, develop skills, interests, and social contacts that will make the gift of added years of life a creative reward and satisfaction. It means the avoidance of unnecessary social costs of premature deterioration and disability. It means relieving senior citizens of some of the burden of sickness and mental breakdown.

I am one who also believes that this golden age is within our reach and there is a greater awareness today than there has been at any time in the last century of the problems of senior citizens. More is being done presently to serve their welfare and attain this goal of the golden years than at any time in our history.

It will be my objective to review some of the things that are being done presently as well as to outline some of the objectives and goals which I believe we must concentrate on achieving if the golden years are to be realized.

It is interesting to note that one of the most significant efforts ever taken got underway just this week with the meeting of the Advisory Committee of the White House Conference on the Aging. This Conference was authorized by legislation which passed the Congress last session and which I actively supported. It is presently being implemented with the appointment of some 130 outstanding citizens from all over the country, from every walk of life to serve on the National Advisory Committee. I was proud when Mr. Edward A. Turville of St. Petersburg was appointed from Florida to serve on this very important committee, which met this week in Washington.

To bring you an up-to-date report on that meeting, it is interesting to note that the theme that has been adopted for the Conference is "Aging with a future every citizen's concern." The Advisory Committee further set 2,800 as the number of delegates to attend the Conference some time in January 1961. These delegates are to be appointed by the States. Each State has been requested and encouraged to turn in reports as soon as possible on the problems of senior citizens within the State and action taken by the States in solving these problems.

I have already discussed with Robert Kean, Director of the Conference and former Congressman from New Jersey for some 20 years, some of the subject matter which I think should be considered by the Conference, some of which I have outlined above.

It is further worthy to note that the administration appointed an Executive Committee on Aging. It has been elevated to Cabinet level and has representatives from all branches of the executive Government serving on the board in order to coordinate and plan programs immediately for senior citizens. As I see it, this Conference on the Aging is to deal with long-range problems. Thus, the administration is tackling the problem on a present as well as long-range basis. I find this most encouraging.

For some time I have felt the problems of senior citizens sufficiently significant that I have introduced, during the last 4 years, legislation establishing a Bureau of Senior Citizens within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which would give the Director sub-Cabinet status and would establish a permanent agency that can do the actual planning and directing as well as administration of the program for senior citizens. I still think that this approach will eventually be accepted, and these other two approaches give substantial support to my contention that the bureau is needed.

This administration has taken action in many fields to indicate a very sincere interest in the senior citizen and has enacted legislation to provide FHA loans on the same favorable terms as for younger persons to senior citizens that can acquire a third signature. Of course, this is not the true solution of the overall problem, but it is a step in the right direction. Further in the field of housing, the FHA has a very active program of multifamily housing for the elderly and has a $20 million special assistance fund to purchase mortgages on houses for the aging from the Federal National Mortgage Association to be insured by FHA. The FHA is now armed with an impressive arsenal of new weapons with which to accept the challenge of providing our senior citizens with the kind of free-enterprise housing for their needs and wants. Just as the Nation rose to the need of housing for the veterans returning from World War II in 1946, so now the Nation must rise to the needs of our senior citizens today. Significant steps in this direction are being taken, but much remains to be done.

I am not going to be satisfied until legislation is passed that will result in senior citizens getting FHA loans on the same basis as the younger people, that is without the penalty imposed on senior citizens of substantial down payment. I was a stanch supporter of the senior citizen program written into the 1956 Housing Act, but it is acknowledged that it must be expanded to be effective and, of course, I have strongly supported the nursing home proposal, as contained in the housing bill before Congress this session and as recommended by the administration. It would permit private enterprise to construct nursing homes with FHA guaranteed loans, whereas previously such authority existed only for charitable or governmental bodies. This amendment to the housing act would require approval of mortgage insurance applications by the State or local body which regulates nursing homes and would require a certification by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that there are in effect in the locality involved minimum standards of systems for licensing and regulating nursing homes. Of course, Florida in the last few years has taken giant strides in the enactment of nursing home legislation and setting much higher standards directed toward protecting senior citizens against some unscrupulous operators and against the safety hazards inherent in unsupervised facilities, that too often was the experience in Florida.

Having started to bridge the subject of housing and medical attention with a discussion of nursing homes, I will discuss for a minute some of the problems with regards to sickness and medical care.

This session of Congress, on the House side at least, has appropriated $346 million for medical research in the field of chronic diseases which I think indicates substantial interest on the part of Congress in this field. I would like to give you some idea of how this $346 million is to be spent: $36,404,000 has been designated for general research, $83,308,000 has been designated for cancer research, $60,400,000 has been designated for mental health research, $54,744,000 has been designated for heart research, $3,725,000 has been designated for dental research, $37,790,000 has been designated for arthritis research, $30,286,000 has been designated for infectious disease research, $33,613,000 has been designated for blindness research.

Of course, I acknowledge that a great many senior citizens do not have sufficient income to bear the burden of the ever-increasing cost of medical care and drugs. I was most encouraged to read the President's speech before the American Medical Association in Atlantic City, N.J. He asked that the medical profession join in the fight against inflation by setting fees that would be within the range of what the patients could reasonably pay. I believe that he could have gone a step farther and suggested that if we are to avoid socialized medicine, which I believe each and every one of you, as well as myself, are dedicated to avoid, then of course the medical profession should acknowledge its responsibility of coming up with a free enterprise solution to the problem. In the legal profession there are legal aid societies that make available legal assistance to those who are unable to pay. It seems to me that some similar approach on the part of the medical profession would do much toward avoiding Federal action in the field, which of course customarily is justified on the basis of inaction by local government or private enterprise itself. The medical profession, in this, I believe is offered a great challenge and an opportunity of service to the Nation. It is

my hope that the medical profession will come up with an answer.

The Federal Government has to some extent acknowledged the problem of providing adequate medical and doctors' care for senior citizens by permitting tax deductions for all such costs for persons over 65, but no deductions are permitted for the cost of drugs up to 1 percent of the person's income. I have introduced a bill this year which would permit a tax deduction for total amounts of medicine and drug costs to a person age 65 and over, it being difficult for me to understand why such provision has not already been enacted into law. This is just a small step in the right direction.

It is interesting to note that in the State of California, an experiment is underway by one large drug chain whereby drugs are sold to retirees of the State pension programs at a substantial discount, that is at only 15 percent profit to cover overhead for the druggist. This means that a considerable reduction in the cost of drugs results. It is a most interesting experiment which I am sure you, as well as myself, will watch very closely, hoping that it will prove successful as a free enterprise approach to the problem and that it might even spread to Florida.

The administration has this matter of medical care under consideration presently and I am sure it is one of the matters that the conference on aging will give great study to. The administration recommended some 3 years ago a Federal program to encourage the extension and development of voluntary health prepayment plans or policies which would assist private enterprise companies in developing programs for such insurance at a reasonable cost to groups of greater risk people. This was not enacted into law but indicates again the considerable interest being shown and the study being given to this problem.

No more serious threat could be offered to the security and well-being of the person on fixed income, which is the vast majority of persons that are retired, than that of inflation. This pocketbook bandit has robbed all people, but particularly with more aggravated results, those on fixed incomes of some 50 cents of the value of the dollar over the last 20 years.

Again the President made particular note of inflation in his address before the Medical Association and particularly with regard to senior citizens when he said:

"Inflation is not merely a threat, it is a robber and a thief. It takes the bread out of their mouths, the clothes off of their backs, and it limits their access to the medicine, care, and facilities they need."

The President went on to say: "We must work together (meaning the medical profession, industry, Government, and the broad body of our citizenry) to make possible for our senior citizens meaningful activity so that they can become, as they all hope to, independent, useful, and creative members of our society."

He went on to call for judgment, and restraint in the operation of the Government and its economy and stated that if the Government spends foolishly, it can only result in higher taxes and inflation. He suggested that we must live within our means, if we as a people are to prosper.

I believe this brings into focus one of the chief contributors to inflation, and that is unbridled Federal spending. I am sorely disturbed about the many tens of billions of dollars in proposed legislation that has either been passed by the House or the Senate or in the alternative is awaiting a rule for congressional action which, if enacted as proposed by some of the liberal Members of Congress, would have the effect of unbalancing the budget to a completely irresponsible extent.

I believe this to be one of the major issues facing Congress, that is, the question of whether the budget busters are going to prevail or whether fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget is going to prevail. I, of course, have voted against the $5 billion housing bill, the airport construction bill which exceeds the President's recommendations by $100 million, and led the floor fight in the effort to avoid spending an additional one-half billion dollars for additional Federal grants to sewage treatment plants as examples of my contribution toward a balanced budget.

There could be added to the list of budget-busting proposals, the Federal aid to school construction and teachers' salary bill, costing $4 billion, the aid to depressed areas bill that passed the Senate, costing $3 billion, the $6 billion highway reimbursement for toll roads and freeways bill which was voted out of my Public Works Committee last week. If these prevail, it is easy to see how many more billions of dollars will be added to deficit spending. Our national debt already stands at the staggering amount of $286 billion and is costing a billion dollars a year in interest alone.

Of course, this administration has invoked its full executive authority in an attempt to control interest rates and national bank discounts as well as making an open appeal to labor and management to try to prevent a wage increase spiral and in order to avoid inflationary effects.

In addition, inflation is also eroding away the pension and social security programs and other fixed incomes of senior citizens insofar as Federal pensions and annuities are concerned. It means that to keep up with this increased cost of living, increase in all of these has been inevitable and particularly in the last 6 years.

The other side of the coin an the restrictions that have been placed on outside earnings of those on social security and veterans' pensions toegther with certain other Federal programs. I have introduced legislation to permit increases in outside earnings to help meet the increased cost of living. In addition, I have introduced a bill which would exempt Civil Service retirement from income tax as well as a bill to reduce the age at which beneficiaries of social security are no longer subject to restrictions on outside earnings, the present age is 72, and I have proposed reducing this to 70. Again this is merely stopgap legislation to meet the immediate situation in certain given areas acknowledging that the over-all problem of considering pension adjustments and adequate outside earnings is one that must be given lengthy and careful consideration, and I am sure it will be by the President's Executive Committee as well as by the Conference on Aged.

A discussion of some of the aforementioned programs and proposals on the part of the Federal Government, as well as free enterprise, offers some food for thought and certainly indicates that things are really stirring insofar as the development of the program to assure senior citizens happy and secure lives during the golden years is concerned. It is obviously necessary that long, as well as short-range programs be devised and carried out. It is my hope that the Conference on Aging will give consideration to some of the problems and suggestions which have been made, and further, that it will thoroughly consider some of the following as well:

A complete analysis of all Federal taxes and their effect on this group with the objective of making recommendations as to where tax adjustments would be justified in easing the strain of the tax burden on those who are on fixed incomes or who have insufficient income;

A study of the advisability of removing all limitations on outside earnings from all Federal laws such as social security, and veterans' pensions, in order that the elderly might be gainfully employed and make useful to society his unusual skills, as well as providing adequate security for himself;

A serious question as to the proper approach to providing adequate medical and hospital treatment and care, as well as stepped-up research in the field of chronic diseases as well as in the field of geriatrics and gerontology;

A planned program for employment of senior citizens and to overcome the employer resistance to hiring a person over age 50, as well as the possible rehabilitation for senior citizens where needed;

A thorough study of how leisure time can be filled with the joy of living with adequate recreation and the opportunity to develop friendships;

The means of combatting inflation on the one hand, or providing for some type of adjustment to offset the increased costs of living, if and when that develops, in order to relieve the senior citizen of the financial pinch for which he has little or no remedy being on fixed income, which results from the devaluation of the dollar or, in other words, the goal of economic security;

And, the availability of adequate housing which is the basis for the feeling of security so essential to basic happiness.

These are some of the suggestions which I have recommended to the White House to be included on the agenda of the Conference. Although they are certainly not exhaustive, they point the way to a long-range program that I think gets at the heart of some of the problems, as well as giving hope for the realization of the golden age.

Thus, in closing, I can say that real progress is being made and great interest is being generated in this field, more so today than at any time in recent history. Not only is long-range planning getting underway through the White House Conference on Aging, but immediate steps are being taken and the problem is receiving immediate consideration through the President's Committee on Aging within the executive branch of the Government. In conjunction with the national conference, State participation and interest is essential if it is to succeed. Thirty-five States have some form of official senior citizens organization as appointed by the Governor, through which the Conference's activities will be channeled and suggestions will be received. The Governor of the State of Florida has established the interdepartmental commission on aging and also the Florida Development Commission as a retirement section headed by Mr. J. M. Buck. These agencies, I am sure, will work hand in hand with the White House Conference on Aging, to help select delegates, make studies of the problems peculiar to Florida, and to make available information to the Conference, as well as to Florida governmental and civic bodies in the State. I also believe that the local governments, likewise, should have advisory committees to deal with this problem on the local level, thus giving us a three-pronged attack, Federal, State and local, and a broad basis for attacking the problem at all levels.

Thus, when it comes to a program with the goal of securing for senior citizens the golden opportunities of senior years, I propose as a minimum starting point the following:

1. The establishment of a bureau of senior citizens in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with sub-Cabinet status, to concentrate on senior citizens matters.

2. Decreasing, if not eliminating, the limitations on outside earnings for social security, veterans' pensions, and other Federal

annuity and pension programs where such limitations exist.

3. Legislation to permit all medical expenses to be deducted for income tax purposes for senior citizens and the immediate planning on the part of private enterprise to meet the challenge of making available medical services and drugs to senior citizens who are unable to pay for them;

4. An all-out fight against continued inflation which means this session of Congress a determined effort to balance the budget and to turn back the budget busters.

5. An immediate thorough study of all taxing fields including national, State and local, and the effect of such taxes on persons with fixed incomes to determine what adjustments, if any, can be made to relieve this burden wherever it is reasonably possible to do so.

6. The passage, this session, of an improved senior citizens' housing program as well as the nursing home provision to permit private enterprise to acquire FHA guaranteed loans and to require minimum standards for such nursing homes.

7. Immediate studies to determine how the skilled and semiskilled employment capabilities of senior citizens can be made use of and how such citizens can continue their participation in the life of the community.

As I said before, this is a very minimum where immediate activity programming and planning is essential and, of course, the long-range goals rightfully should be established by the White House Conference on Aging and I have high hopes that such will be the case. So, as this organization meets, I think it is fitting to say that it does so in a year of great hope, great expectations, and a year in which the way is being charted for the realization of the truly golden age of senior citizenship.

Philippine-American Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, these are days when our friends should know that we appreciate their friendship. We should not make them feel that we are in any way taking them for granted. That is why I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the messages exchanged on July 4 between the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines. As you will recall, Philippine independence was proclaimed on July 4, 1946, and this date was chosen by the Filipino people in grateful acknowledgment of American friendship and good will.

The two brief but meaningful messages exchanged by radiogram reveal the mutuality of ideals and interests of our two peoples. It is an inspiring note that it is gratifying to be able to emphasize in a world torn by frictions and irritants.

President Eisenhower's message to President Garcia follows:

The people of the United States join me in extending to Your Excellency and to the people of the Philippines felicitations and best wishes on the national anniversary of the Republic of the Philippines.

President Garcia's message to President Eisenhower is the following:

In behalf of the Filipino people and of my own, I wish to convey to Your Excellency and to the great American people my most sincere greetings and felicitations on the anniversary of your Independence Day.

It is quite meaningful that our two countries have a common independence day because we share the same ideals of freedom and democracy for which our gallant soldiers have fought and died. It is my fervent hope that the special relationship between our two countries be further strengthened as we rededicate ourselves today to the continuing defense of the dignity and the liberty of man.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to call attention to a recent press interview that President Garcia gave to the United Press International datelined from Manila on June 27, 1959.

Because of an approaching election in the Philippines this coming November at which eight Senators, all the Governors and mayors will be elected, an electoral campaign is now going full blast. As we in the United States are well aware, during a campaign charges and counter charges are made against the party in power. We in the United States have nothing to do with the Philippine election. That is their own domestic affairs as a sovereign nation and we Americans are the first ones to respect Philippine sovereignty.

However, since a certain sector of the American press has published statements to the effect that President Garcia has been showing signs of anti-Americanism in his official acts, he has vigorously denied the charges in the following interview:

(By William Miller)

MANILA, June 27.—Philippine President Carlos P. Garcia strongly asserted today his friendship for the United States and accused his political enemies of attempting to alienate the Americans from the administration.

"When these critics of mine were collaborating with the Japanese during World War II, I was a guerilla leader in the hills of Bohol with a Japanese price on my head," President Garcia said in an interview with the United Press International.

Visibly irritated by reports that he had become discouraged with the United States, the Philippines President lashed out at his political critics as "idle talkers who are fence-sitting." He suggested that Gen. Douglas MacArthur, World War II Philippines and Pacific commander, set the record straight on who stood by the Americans during the Japanese occupation of the Philippines. He urged that letters between Garcia, then a guerilla leader in the southern Philippines, and MacArthur in Australia be released.

"I was and am a friend of the American people because I believe in the principles of which they stand. I staked my life for the cause once and I believe that I would do it again if necessary," Garcia said emphatically. * * * The President said that members of the opposition had deliberately misguided Americans in a campaign to drive a wedge between the Garcia administration and the United States.

"I will stake my record of friendship for the United States against anyone in the opposition anytime. When others in Manila were doing business with the Japanese I was in the hills of Bohol fighting with the American," he said.

There were actually only two irritants at present in Philippine-American relations, he said, and they were the military bases issue and the old Philippine claims against the U.S. Government.

"I still hope that we can have a meeting of the minds on the bases issue," he said. Progress had been made in talks with U.S. Ambassador Charles E. Bohlen, he said, and the only snag was the jurisdictional issue. The recent U.S. congressional appropriation for an old Filipino gold devaluation claim dating back to the 1930's was gratifying, he said, and there were expectations that an additional $130 millions in war damage claims would be approved.

"The United States could also help us with the updating of our defenses, particularly air defenses and additional strength for our navy," President Garcia said.

He felt that U.S. Pacific Chief Adm. Harry Felt's reported criticism of Filipino air defense thinking, which stirred up a minor Manila storm, had been clarified.

"We have in fact been pressing for the updating of these very things. We appreciate the importance of airpower. I, myself, had personal experience, in World War II, in the resulting demoralization when the Japanese gained air supremacy over the Philippines," he said.

Turning again to "these professional critics of mine," the President said that they had painted a picture of gloom that "was exaggerated by about five times."

"The opposition paints a picture of gloom, while in truth, by and large, this country is progressing much faster than its contemporary nations—much faster than most," he said.

The President admitted that there was graft and corruption in the Philippines today, but he added that his administration was carrying out an active drive against it which had resulted in the suspension of 77 officials during the year 1958. "That 1 year's record, 1958, cannot be equaled by 8 entire years of the opposition," he said.

"Graft and corruption is an old problem in the Philippines. Even Jesus Christ had His problems with corruption amounting to 30 pieces of silver. The United States also has the problem, but, fortunately, unlike here in the Philippines, the President of the United States is not blamed for every municipal or State corruption," he added.

President Garcia said that the Filipino First movement had been misunderstood. "The Filipino First is an effort to increase the participation of Filipinos in the economy of the country," he said. "At present much of the nation's economy is in the hands of aliens. Now that we are independent, we wish to frame economic policies advantageous for our own people—the same as any other country would do," he said.

President Garcia denied that Filipino First was antialien particularly in its application to Americans. He pointed out that Americans would enjoy preference up until 1974 under the parity agreement, "and even after that time Americans will have preference, although, of course, it would require a new agreement at that time," he said. Garcia emphasized that there was a considerable degree of political stability in the Philippines today and that his Nacionalista Party enjoyed the biggest majority in Philippine history—83 out of 102 representatives and 20 out of 24 senators.

Mr. Speaker, we should approach questions affecting our country abroad with balance. Certainly it cannot be considered anti-American for another nation to defend its enlightened self-interest just as it is our duty as Americans to defend and uphold our own interests.

In a recent speech in New York, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassa-

dor to the United States, whose friendship for our country no one can question, said:

Why should it be called anti-American for our people to insist that our rights as a sovereign nation be respected? The British do not consider it anti-British for the Canadians to demand that they be treated as sovereign equals. My people are growing into maturity, they are seeking new values, in quest of new goals, reassessing our standards and engaged in searching national introspection. We cannot escape the evolution of mankind. America no doubt is our best friend and we are grateful, but it is not because we love our old friend less when we have to prepare for an inevitable future because knowing America as we do we are sure she would not begrudge us our loving our people more.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot quarrel with that statement. That is how we feel toward our own country. If we are to maintain our position in the world it must be based on the respect that other nations have for our moral leadership to the extent that our actions command such respect. Moral leadership includes a sympathetic understanding of other peoples' feelings, attitudes, ideals, and traditions. Again, quoting from our good and true friend General Romulo:

I do not fear for America nor for her continued preeminence as a great power. My concern, our common concern, is rather that her greatness will rest not merely upon her demonstrated superiority in economic power and naked might but upon her steadfast adherence to freedom and justice and upon the faith which the world's peoples have in the essential goodness of her heart and in the soundness of her principles.

Winning Essay in the Civitan Club's International Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the winning essay in the Civitan Club's international essay contest.

The sponsorship of such a contest by this outstanding civic club is entitled to the highest commendation.

It is an annual affair, and high schools throughout the United States and Canada participate in it. The subject of the essay is "Citizenship," and any high school senior is eligible. The winner is awarded a $1,200 scholarship.

This great international Civic Club is making a substantial contribution to the youth of the land, and I very heartily congratulate this fine civic organization.

I am especially proud of the 1958–59 winner, and honored, too, in being privileged to call to the attention of the Nation this outstanding achievement of a young man from Nashville, Tenn., David Ray Hunter. He is the winner of this award.

David Ray Hunter is a graduate of a fine high school in my home city, the East Nashville High School. I am sure that all Nashville is proud of this young man. His essay is entitled "Citizenship—A Process of Gradual Achievement." I congratulate young Hunter on his success and wish for him future successes in his chosen field.

Our city board of education, the principal and teaching staff of East High, the Civitan Club of Nashville, and all our people are proud of this young man, and I recommend the reading of his essay to the Members of the Congress.

It follows:

CITIZENSHIP—A PROCESS OF GRADUAL ACHIEVEMENT

(By David Ray Hunter, East Nashville High School, 110 Gallatin Road, Nashville, Tenn.)

"'Tis education forms the common mind:
Just as the twig is bent the tree's inclined."
—*Pope.*

One of the greatest lessons I have ever learned was taught me by a wise, but uneducated, old countryman who by diligent, devoted labor had transformed a rundown, barren tract into a beautiful productive farm. This transformation had evoked recurrent comments in neighboring homes and as crossroads stores. One day as I watched him lovingly prepare his soil for spring planting, I said with a childish burst of confidence, "Mr. Newell, grandpa says yours is a fine farm." His tanned and furrowed face broke into a happy smile as he said quite simply, "It ought to be fine; I live here. But, son, I have had to keep everlastingly at it—everlasting at it."

Good citizenship, like all other worthwhile things like wisdom, human charity, and Christianity, results only if we "keep everlastingly at it." It is a process of gradual achievement. Citizenship is like a plant: first there is the planting season, followed by the growing season, which in turn, is succeeded by the period of maturity and reproduction, and climaxed by the harvest.

The planting season is the most important period. Seeds of citizenship become rooted when children's minds are in their embryonic stage before they start attending school. During this period they develop many important character traits necessary for good citizenship, such as honesty, truthfulness, and industry. Children have echoic minds and tend to imitate the lessons and the actions of their parents. They should early be taught both self-reliance and family cooperation. Parents should teach them not to be selfish, to love other people, never deliberately to hurt anyone in mind or body, and many other small but essential lessons which form the roots of the plant, serving as the foundation for citizenship. Later they attend nursery school or kindergarten where they learn to work and play with others. This lesson is very important, because citizenship is based upon teamwork, and a team can function properly only if the members of a team work together toward one common cause, as the cells in a plant work independently yet as a unit to provide nourishment for the plant. Next children enter the first grade and begin intellectual development. At this crucial period, they come under the influence of persons not related to them. The important lessons learned in our educational institutions and churches must be applied with the greatest care as a young plant must be handled gently and intelligently.

The growing season begins with early adolescence and extends into young manhood. Ideals of citizenship previously planted in their minds now sprout beyond the protective soil of home environment and flourish or die as the elemental forces of outside influences beat upon them. Life-long habits are formed. These habits result largely from outside influences just as the growth of a plant is affected by the elements. Many organizations such as the Boy Scouts, Junior Civitans, Hi-Y's, Key Clubs, YMCA, and youth groups in various churches, teach responsibility, concerted effort, desirable character traits, high moral standards, and good citizenship by instilling in them a desire to be better individuals and a desire to improve their country. High schools of America are perhaps the greatest institutions for developing the growth of citizenship. Most high schools have student governments which make possible the exercise of citizenship on a small scale. Here students have a chance to be junior citizens and to practice good citizenship. Elections of student officers provide the chance to vote for the person best qualified for office regardless of personal feelings. Actual courses in high school develop responsibility and the willingness to take part in class discussions and carry their loads by making good grades. Teachers offer inspiration and guidance. Students learn that the security of the Nation depends upon their mental ability and their citizenship. Their future determines the future of their country. Their citizenship, good or bad, determines their country's citizenship.

Our plant has now reached maturity; it has been subjected to the good and bad influences of nature and now it begins to bear its fruits. At this period of development, opinions are stabilized; manners and customs are established. If the environment and development have been good, people will participate in various civic activities without being prompted. They will enjoy knowing that they are taking an active part in their government. Those who have not taken advantage of the lessons taught through good citizenship training become parasitic weeds of society. Those who have taken advantage of conscientious training and who have practiced good citizenship consider citizenship a privilege, for they realize that Americans have more individual rights than the people of any other country. To protect these great gifts, all of us must be good citizens by practicing good citizenship, lest the "apple become rotten at the heart." We must protect ourselves and the future of America against corrupt governments, our own and that of others.

The plant has matured at last. It has been planted, cultivated, fertilized, and kept free from weeds. The time has now come to harvest the fruits of the labor. The rewards of the plant are many: we have faithful voters, people who will take an active interest in civic affairs, better individuals, people who will help others as they help themselves and as a result of their influences and labors we will have a better government. Unlike their barren bulimic brothers who take much but give nothing in return, such citizens bring forth bountiful harvests—some 5, some 10, and some 20 fold.

If America can continue to produce such vigorous, alerted, dedicated citizens in sufficient numbers, this Nation, like Mr. Newell's farm, "ought to be fine" because they live here. In the wise, but prosaic, words of this old countryman, however, America in nurturing successive generations of citizens must also 'keep everlastingly at it," for citizenship, no less than effective farming, is a never-ending process of gradual achievement.

I have used no reference material of any kind in writing this paper except my subtitle which is a short quotation from Alexander Pope's "An Essay on Man." This quotation is properly enclosed in quotation marks.

Facts and Figures on the Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately a lot of folks have the mistaken impression that the $5.4 billion appropriated last year for the agricultural budget went to the farmer. Actually, two-thirds of the money was used for programs which benefited all of the citizens of this country—as well as people abroad. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt included Minnesota Congressman FRED MARSHALL's breakdown of the Department of Agriculture budget in her column, "My Day." Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have this column printed in the RECORD:

FARMER GETS SMALL SHARE OF PROPS FUND

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

HYDE PARK.—There has always been a great discrepancy between the price received by the farmer for his product and the price paid by the consumer. As far back as I can remember this has been the case, but, instead of improving, the situation seems to grow worse.

I have a letter from the wife of a dairy farmer in Minnesota enclosing some rather interesting facts which Congressman FRED MARSHALL of Minnesota lately brought to the public's attention. Here, in part, is what Representative MARSHALL said:

"Five and four-tenths billion dollars were appropriated for stabilization of farm prices and income. Most people assume that farmers get that money * * * about two-thirds of it does not go to the farmer.

"Twenty-one million dollars goes for meat inspection, a general public health measure. One billion dollars is for commodities sent to other countries, a State Department and Army program. Another Army program of supplemental defense stockpiling uses $129 million. The State Department foreign relations program gets $65 million for the international wheat agreement. Thirty-six million dollars goes into financing military housing in Europe.

"Even in the $3 billion charged to price supports, less than one-third ($989 million) is properly charged to farmers. More than a third of the total is of primary benefit to business, such as $633 million for storage, handling, and transportation, $203 million for export charges, $102 million in interest charges, including $48.4 million for Federal Reserve bank charges.

"Many people would be surprised that farmers get so small a part of the money going into the farm stabilization program. And so far as dairy farmers are concerned, less than 1 percent of the Government's investment in agricultural price supports last year was chargeable to dairy products."

MIDDLEMAN PROFITS

Now to go back to my farm wife's letter. She says: "We receive 6 cents a quart for grade A milk; we pay to have it hauled to the creamery, also pay for the city milk inspector to come out and inspect our barns and milkhouses.

"A certain percent is taken out for advertising. It takes a big investment to get started in farming. Machinery is so high and with so little profit a lot of farmers on family-sized farms have to look for work elsewhere.

"The milk is handled many times before the consumer buys it in the store, and each one has to have wages or a profit. So, by the time the consumer buys it, it is hard to know who is worse off—the farmer who gets little or nothing for his product or the consumer who has to pay such high prices."

This is an old, old story. It could be repeated about many food products, but it is particularly hard perhaps on the dairy farmer just now. So, in the hope that those who can do something about this will someday make a real study of how to eliminate some of the middleman's handling, I urge everyone to give some thought to this situation.

Mr. Butler's Blowoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in the Washington Evening Star today expresses well the thinking of the American people concerning our Democratic leadership in the Congress. The overwhelming majority of the people and the Congress have confidence in our congressional leaders. They resent the untimely comments and schemes of Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER'S BLOWOFF

It is surprising that Democratic Chairman Paul Butler should openly criticize the Democratic leadership in Congress. For this is a poor way to go about satisfying Mr. Butler's consuming ambition—to garner votes, votes, and still more votes.

What this blowoff really exposes is a basic conflict in political philosophy between Mr. Butler and the Lyndon Johnson-Sam Rayburn congressional leadership.

It is Mr. Butler's job to win elections, and he is not too squeamish about how he does it. Thus, criticizing his party's leaders in Congress for toning down legislation to avoid a veto, Mr. Butler urged passage of bills opposed by the President even though the measures might be vetoed. In such event, he declared, "we will take the issue to the American people." In other words, as a matter of political strategy, he would prefer to have issues, or what he thinks would be issues, than to place his political bets on the best legislative program which can be pushed through Congress with the President's approval.

Messrs. JOHNSON and RAYBURN do not agree. They also are interested in winning elections. But they think it is smarter politics to skip the manufactured issues and, instead, to present the voters with the best possible record of legislative accomplishment.

We think they are right, and that the Democratic sweep in last year's congressional elections proves them right. Mr. Butler, of course, thinks differently. He says the Democrats won in 1958 not so much because of the Democratic record in Congress, but rather as the beneficiaries of a negative vote against an administration which lacked positive and aggressive leadership.

He is entitled to his opinion and there is little likelihood that anyone will change Mr. Butler's mind. He is inclined to be set in his ways. The same thing goes, however, for LYNDON JOHNSON and SAM RAYBURN. It will be the surprise of the century if they are converted to the Butler brand of thinking—especially with the latest Trendex poll showing 71.3 percent of the voters favoring a freeze on the debt ceiling with spending reduced, if necessary, to stay within the ceiling.

Meanwhile, the Republicans must be sitting back and enjoying themselves. For a real knockdown Democratic family fight is just what the doctor would order for an ailing GOP.

A Report on the First Inter-American Parliamentary Conference in Lima, Peru

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I had the privilege of participating with two other Members of the House of Representatives in the First Inter-American Parliamentary Conference, which was held from May 10–17 in Lima, Peru.

The Honorable W. R. POAGE, of Texas, and the Honorable JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, of New Mexico, and I served as delegates from Congress at a meeting of some 85 members of national legislatures from 16 nations throughout the Western Hemisphere.

The Inter-American Parliamentary Conference in Lima was the first to be held by Western Hemisphere member-nations of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, an association of legislators from 55 nations throughout the world.

The parent Inter-Parliamentary Union was organized in 1889 by legislative groups from nine nations. Its objectives are to foster personal contacts between members of national legislatures and to encourage common action toward strengthening democratic government all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to report on some of the highlights of the conference in South America as I saw them.

LATIN AMERICANS WANT ECONOMIC COOPERATION

The Conference unanimously passed a resolution offered by the Argentine delegation aimed at the No. 1 goal of the Latin Americans: a resolution to encourage the economic integration of South and Central America and to establish a Latin American common market.

The high priority given by the Latin American delegates to economic problems is illustrated by what a Chilean senator told me: "we in Latin America should be our own best customers. But we need a common market without trade barriers just as you in the United States have among the States. We also need a common economic plan for all of Latin America, not for just one country."

U.S. FARM PROBLEM DISCUSSED

A discussion in one of the several study committees to which the delegates were

appointed dramatized the obstacles to cooperation between the United States and Latin America. The debate also illustrated the opportunities provided by the Inter-American Conference for useful exchange of views between elected officials.

An Argentine senator, urging abolition of trade barriers in the Western Hemisphere, attacked U.S. farm subsidies which, he said, forced our surpluses on the world market in unfair competition with other food-producing nations.

In response to this statement, Representative POAGE, the distinguished chairman of our delegation and vice chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, declared that the U.S. delegation strongly supported the removal of barriers to trade and the development of economic unity in the Western Hemisphere but added that these goals could not be achieved in one step.

I do not think you in Latin America completely appreciate—

Said Mr. POAGE—

that if all controls on U.S. farm production were removed the result would be a tremendous expansion of output in the United States and a resulting drop in our farm prices which would be disastrous for you.

He added:

The farm problem is a very hard one for us to solve, and, before you condemn us, we would be grateful if you would tell us how to solve it.

REPRESENTATIVE MONTOYA TALKS OF U.S. INVESTMENT IN SOUTH AMERICA

Plenary sessions of the conference were held in the Peruvian House of Representatives. On the first day Representative MONTOYA, speaking in Spanish, touched on one of the most sensitive issues between the United States and Latin America.

The Latins feel that American economic aid has gone to Europe and Asia while they have been neglected.

Mr. MONTOYA, in a very frank speech, carefully listed the substantial amounts of U.S. economic assistance, in both aid and trade, to Latin America in recent years. Total U.S. Government aid and direct U.S. private investment in Latin America has now reached the level of nearly $2 billion annually. U.S. private investments amount to over $10 billion, more than in any other region in the world.

The fact that Mr. MONTOYA is of Spanish descent and that he speaks the Spanish language fluently meant that his remarks were given very close attention by the Latin American legislators at the conference.

Mr. Speaker, I should like at this point in the RECORD to include an English translation of the text of Representative MONTOYA'S speech on the opening day of the conference:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH M. MONTOYA AT FIRST INTER-AMERICAN PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, LIMA, PERU

My colleagues and I are particularly pleased to be in Lima, the beautiful and historic City of the Kings, attending the First Inter-American Parliamentary Conference.

The United States has been interested in conferences of this sort since the first days of our independence. It is therefore extremely gratifying to see the increasing interest on the part of other countries in this hemisphere in such a joint meeting of the representatives of the legislative branches of our neighboring countries.

I should like to assure you of the deep desire of the United States to cooperate with our Latin American neighbors in the political and economic fields.

We have, for example, contributed greatly to the development of Latin America and we shall continue to do so. The public and private North American dollars invested in the development of Latin America have reached the incredible amount of $2 billion annually. The immensity of this sum can be appreciated if one realizes that the total requests for economic assistance presented to the United States from throughout the world for the year 1960 amount to $1.6 billion. Nor do I include in this figure the hundreds of millions that we have contributed to the World Bank and the newly established Inter-American Bank, the latter of which will grant all its loans to Latin America.

These figures also do not include private capital from the United States invested in Latin America to stimulate its economic growth and development, a sum which exceeds $10 billion. If we add to this figure the $7.5 billion in annual trade between the United States, I think you will understand why we are proud of the great contribution we are making to the economic development of Latin America.

I can assure you, nonetheless, that the United States will be seeking new methods of assistance to aid in hastening the economic development of Latin America. Our resources for cooperation in this direction are not, however, unlimited. There are vast areas in the United States which also need Government funds for their own development. The representatives of these people, moreover, cannot forget that whatever aid we give comes from the taxes paid by these same people.

I do not think I need to remind you of the great opposition to taxes and the desire of people to see this weight lifted from their shoulders. The average taxpayer of the United States pays over 20 percent of his income to the Federal Government. So while we are on the one hand eager to cooperate, we are on the other limited by the tax burden on the American citizen.

I should be less than frank with you if I did not say that the prospects for obtaing additional financial assistance from the American taxpayers, who are clamoring to be relieved of the heavy taxes they have to pay, are very limited. In addition, the private investment which amounted to a figure over $1 billion in the past year for economic development in Latin America had to compete in the money market and I must impress upon you that the underdeveloped areas within the United States which want economic development are strong competitors in this struggle for economic assistance. In the United States there are several communities that offer to private investors stable political and labor conditions, freedom from Communist agitation, reasonable governmental regulations justly applied, tax advantages and a satisfactory return on the investment. If a Latin American country is interested in obtaining the substantial sums available from this source for economic development, it must compete with the communities in the United States and with other countries that are also anxious to obtain such capital and are willing to offer all kinds of advantages to the American investors.

Conferences such as the one in which we are participating are providing us, as members of the legislative branches of our governments, the opportunity to discuss such problems in an open and frank way, and so contribute to a mutual understanding of these problems as well as to the fulfillment of our common goals and needs.

Let us hope that this first Inter-American Parliamentary Conference will help in the encouragement of personal relationships among the members of our respective legislative branches and will contribute as well to the development and progress of our parliamentary institutions and keep us united in a common action in our objective of strengthening and developing our democratic institutions in the interest of peace and international cooperation.

PRAISES REPORT OF HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker, I should like also to take this opportunity to congratulate the members of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs which, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Representative ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR., prepared an excellent report on United States relations with Latin America which appeared on May 11, 1959, during the conference in Lima.

Because I believe this subcommittee report to be such an excellent summary of some of the major problems confronting our country in its relations with Latin America, I have sent a copy to each of the Latin American delegates attending the Inter-American Parliamentary Conference.

SUMMARY: A VALUABLE CONFERENCE

Mr. Speaker, I should like to conclude this brief report by saying that I believe that the Inter-American Parliamentary Conference was an extremely valuable opportunity for Members of our Congress to emphasize to Latin American legislators the great importance we in the United States attach to our ties with their countries.

Politically, economically, and strategically, good relations between the United States and the other American republics are indispensable to the overall strength of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the delegates to this first such conference, my own conclusion is that the discussions among the elected representatives of Latin America and the United States were of genuine help in contributing to Western Hemisphere strength and understanding.

One Hundred and Eighty-first Anniversary of the Battle of Wyoming, Pa., Observed on July 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Wednesday, July 1, 1959:

MONUMENT EXERCISES

The 181st anniversary of the Battle of Wyoming, which falls on Friday, July 3, will

be observed at the Wyoming Monument grounds on Saturday morning, July 4, in connection with the observance of Independence Day.

These exercises, under auspices of the Wyoming Commemorative Association, constitute the only formal program locally for the occasion. The opening of Swetland Homestead to the public by the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society will provide an interesting sidelight for visitors.

The flavor of Independence Day has disappeared in so many places that Greater Wilkes-Barre is indeed fortunate to have a rare opportunity to participate in this national holiday in the spirit of our forefathers. The fact that the program is scheduled for 10 a.m. will allow ample time for visits to parks or lakes during the day and, for that matter, over the weekend.

The mounting interest in this observance indicates that the public is not lacking in appreciation of the efforts of the Wyoming Commemorative Association to restore the significance of the Nation's birthday. Locally, it has added meaning because of the drama that was enacted on July 3, 1778.

There is no reason why this year's audience should not be numbered in thousands instead of hundreds, with Justice Benjamin R. Jones as the speaker, a concert by the Stegmaier Band and participation of the 109th Battalion and patriotic organizations in the tribute to the hero dead of colonial days.

Rev. John Leo Sullivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 1959, the Reverend John Leo Sullivan, pastor of St. Francis Xavier Church in Waterbury, Conn., celebrated the completion of 50 years of service as a Roman Catholic priest.

Ordained at Lugano, Switzerland, in 1909, Father Sullivan has devoted his entire priestly life to the spiritual care of his coreligionists in various parishes in the State of Connecticut.

I am proud to claim Father Sullivan as a fellow native of Waterbury. He was born in that city on November 10, 1881, of a prominent local family.

In trying to sum up the man that is Father Sullivan, one is confronted with the difficulty of cataloging his amazingly diverse capabilities and accomplishments.

He is a finished scholar with a background of studies at Holy Cross, St. Brieuc in Brittany, France, Piacenza in Italy, and Lugano in Switzerland.

He is a skillful linguist who speaks French and Italian fluently as well as his native tongue.

In his younger years, he was an outstanding handball and baseball player and even today his walking gait and swimming pace outdistance many younger men.

He is a skillful writer with a record of many incisive newspaper articles, and he is a graceful speaker.

His secular civic contributions particularly in World War I are too numerous to detail.

Above all, however, Father Sullivan has been a devoted shepherd for the people whose spiritual care has been entrusted to him. Beyond all his other achievements, that which has surpassed all others has been his devotion to his priestly duties and his loyal service to his parishioners and to his church.

I am happy to join Father Sullivan's thousands of friends and admirers in thanking him for his half century of devoted ministry and in wishing for him many more years of health and service.

Father Sullivan's contributions and the affection and esteem in which he is held in his home community are well described in an editorial from the Waterbury American of June 30, 1959, which I include herewith:

FATHER JOHN L. SULLIVAN

Father John Leo Sullivan of St. Francis Xavier Church was honored by a great turnout of parishioners and friends Sunday. It was indeed a testimonial which the pastor may well cherish as an expression of affection on the 50th anniversary of his ordination as a priest. But as philosophers have said there is no such thing as massed sorrow, joy, or other deep-seated emotions. They belong only to each individual. And in this case Father Sullivan saw a manifestation of the high esteem in which he is held by so many separate souls each of whom has enjoyed, at some time or other, a different facet of his benign nature.

Father Sullivan may point to many accomplishments during his half century of service as a priest. He may well be proud of these for they are in true keeping with the vows he took as fledgling servant of his church. But many a man has done great and noble things and was not cherished as an individual for them. We believe that Father Sullivan is a man who has that added intangible something which makes him appreciated for his intrinsic worth in doing big things in a handsome way and small things in an unobtrusive humble way. Members of Father Sullivan's faith believe that divine grace is a gift that is ennobling to the soul. In his case we believe that inner virtue is reflected to the surface in a worldly grace of person that is enjoyed by all too few.

Fourth of July

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an impressive, direct, and simple statement on the true meaning of the Fourth of July which was prepared by Mr. Morris V. Rosenbloom, president of American Surveys:

This year the Fourth of July has a special significance. It commemorates not only the adoption in 1776 of the most famous document in American history, the Declaration of Independence, but it is also the day on which our Nation's new 49-star flag will be raised officially for the first time at Fort McHenry National Monument in Baltimore, birthplace of "The Star Spangled Banner."

Just as the Declaration of Independence proclaimed the birth of the United States, and set forth with matchless eloquence the basic philosophy of our democracy and liberty, the flying of our new flag this Fourth of July symbolizes the perpetuation of a spirit of independence singularly American—a spirit reflecting our traditions of vision and enterprise, with equal opportunity for responsible performance.

May our hallowed heritage help to lead America on to new horizons—both in our national and international relations—in the difficult and decisive period we now face.

Kansas City's Last Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in the heart of Kansas City, Kans., is an ancient Indian burial ground. This cemetery is situated between the beautiful Carnegie Library grounds and the Huron and other business buildings. It has been estimated that as many as 720 bodies of the Huron-Wyandotte tribe and 7 chiefs are buried there. It is the only spot of great historical significance within the boundaries of Kansas City.

A law was enacted by the 84th Congress which would authorize the sale of this Indian cemetery. Thereafter bills were introduced to preserve the burial ground and to repeal the provision authorizing its sale. The Secretary of the Interior promised the people of the Greater Kansas City area that an administrative hearing would be held in Kansas City, Kans., before any action was taken in connection with the disposal of this ancient landmark.

No administrative hearing was held by the Department of the Interior, and no action was taken by either the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs nor the House of Representatives on the measures during the 85th Congress.

Upon the convening of the 86th Congress, measures were introduced looking toward the establishment of the Huron Indian Cemetery as a national shrine and which would stop the sale of the cemetery.

The people of the Greater Kansas City area, many of whom have fathers, mothers, sisters, brothers, and children buried in the cemetery, were lulled into complacency relying upon the promise of the Secretary of the Interior to hold hearings prior to any final action by his agency. The Interior Department filed unfavorable reports, which gave no valid reason for the Department's conclusions, before the citizens of the Midwest realized that they would not be accorded the hearing which they had been expecting. The complacency of the people suddenly ended and petitions and letters poured

in to the Representative of the Second Congressional District of Kansas.

Because of an aroused public and because the people had not been granted an opportunity for a hearing, the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs held a hearing in Washington on May 18 and concluded it in Kansas City, Kans., on Saturday, June 27. Many leading citizens testified and urged that the Indian burial ground be preserved.

President Harry S. Truman submitted a strong statement pointing out the great historical value of the site and urged its retention. Letters were filed with the committee from the other five Kansas Members of the House of Representatives and from the four neighboring Missouri Members whose districts border the State of Kansas. Each of these distinguished and outstanding Members cited the historical value of the ancient burial ground and urged its preservation for the benefit of posterity.

Miss May J. McGuire, one of the many distinguished citizens who testified before the committee, is a past president of numerous county and State civic organizations and is a feature writer for the Kansas City Kansan, one of the great newspapers of the Midwest. In her column for Friday, July 3, Miss McGuire wrote of the committee hearings and of the members of the subcommittee.

The handsome man with graying hair is, of course, the chairman of that subcommittee, the Honorable JAMES A. HALEY, of Florida. The other nice looking men who smoked cigars were the Honorable B. F. SISK, of California; THOMAS G. MORRIS, of New Mexico; and E. Y. BERRY, of South Dakota. Miss McGuire expressed the unanimous opinion of the people of the Greater Kansas City area when she paid tribute to the excellent manner in which the hearings were held and the sympathetic consideration displayed by its members.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the article written by Miss McGuire in the extension of my remarks, as follows:

LOOKIN' AROUND

(By May J. McGuire)

Members of the congressional committee who came here from Washington, D.C., Saturday to hear testimony concerning Huron Cemetery learned that it is a live issue.

These men learned that many of the citizens, who are not descendants of the Wyandots, want the cemetery preserved according to the ancient treaty for "as long as grasses grow and rivers flow."

The hearing was first scheduled for the city hall auditorium but Mayor Paul Mitchum wisely decided the junior ballroom of the Town House Hotel would be a better place, because it is air-conditioned.

The hearing was set for 10 a.m. to noon and from 2 to 4 p.m. Well before 10 a.m. the ballroom was comfortably filled. The distinguished men from Washington came in and took their places at a long table on a platform at the front of the room. On a lower level, at the center front, was a smaller table for the witnesses. There were "mikes" for all speakers.

The word "witness" made me think of a court scene and I was greatly impressed that this was the first time for a congressional hearing to be held in Kansas City, Kans.

Those men were very nice looking—the kind to get votes. Every one of them, except our own NEWELL GEORGE, smoked cigars. Not that they smoked all of the time—just an occasional puff.

The moderator or chairman was a handsome gray-haired man from Florida, who had a very mild way of speaking—sort of informal—leaving off final "g's" and never seeming to be hurried.

But if things seemed to be getting the least bit out of hand he rapped sharply with his gavel. Applause wasn't the order of the day. I wondered if the gavel came from Washington in his brief case.

There was a name plate in front of each member of the committee—just like on TV. There were introductions and then the first witness was called.

He was one of six persons who came for the hearing. He was really the spokesman for that group. He went over the history in some detail and filed a copy of his testimony with the clerk as did all witnesses.

One woman from Oklahoma spoke critically but briefly of the care the cemetery had been given. She based her own remarks on a visit made some years ago.

Later in the hearing, a local woman commented that she felt, since the Oklahoma descendants of the tribe felt it was their property, they might consider paying us or at least being grateful for care that had been given the cemetery.

It was mighty interesting to hear so many of the descendants talk and tell of the history of this cemetery and what it means to them. There were men and women who have children buried there who spoke with deep emotion of the cemetery. It is more than a historic spot to them.

It was 12:30 before the morning session was ended, so that there could be time out for lunch. Most of the people came back for the afternoon session and testimony was resumed. Witnesses were questioned by members of the committee. In the morning it seemed to me the women were being treated like Indian squaws because the men did all the talking—but things changed in the afternoon and women gave their testimony.

No one knows what will be the outcome, but those men from Washington learned that the people of Kansas City, Kans., want Huron Cemetery to remain as a cemetery—the only such cemetery in the United States.

"It Isn't Just My Car, but Everything We Buy"—Protest Against Manufactured Items Which Don't Hold Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a letter from a resident of St. Louis who put down on paper a complaint one hears day after day from friends protesting the shortcomings of today's manufactured goods. Are we cutting so many corners on production costs that "shoddy" is to become the national norm?

This protest was not unique, but the extent of the buyer's troubles seems to be a bit unusual. She bought a new car last fall, with a 90-day service guarantee. As she says, most cars hold together for that period of time, "but mine did not."

"At least three things they had to fix—on the other things they kept telling me nothing was wrong. But after 90 days, then they wanted to fix the things they should have fixed before."

She listed such items as:

1. Gear shift broke off.
2. Horn would not work.
3. Windshield wiper would not work.
4. Accelerator stuck.
5. A new distributor with all the trimmings.
6. Oil leaking from motor—new gasket.
7. Heater would not work—I had to buy a new thermostat.
8. Thermostat was no good, water started boiling out, had to have it taken out.
9. A new sealed beam headlight.
10. Steering wheel had to be worked on.

This woman said she wrote to Michigan, and an adjuster then came around to see her "but they would not do a thing. Anything I had to have fixed they have charged me outrageous prices. When I holler, they tell me it is flat rates."

After some further comments about her less-than-perfect new car, the writer added, "Now, it is not just my car but everything we buy."

It is this woman's feeling we should have a law to require manufacturers to make their goods come up to a standard. I have asked the St. Louis Better Business Bureau to look into the particular incident of this woman's car, but in the meantime, as a consumer, I can feel more than a little sympathy for her plight and that of millions of others who find their new gadgets of all kinds falling apart in use.

A Memorial to James Madison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD, an editorial from the Fourth of July issue of the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times which endorses the proposal to erect a memorial for our fourth President, James Madison, who is best known as the man who authored our Constitution. In lending its editorial support to the campaign, which was initiated by the Washington Post and Times Herald, the Capital Times said:

We feel certain * * * we reflect the wishes of all the people in this city which so proudly bears the name of Madison.

The editorial follows:

CAPITAL TIMES SUPPORTS PLAN FOR MEMORIAL TO JAMES MADISON

Elsewhere on this page is reprinted a letter from Irving Brant, a distinguished journalist and historian, who is now at work on a life of James Madison. Mr. Brant suggests that the country should memoralize in an appropriate way the fourth President of the United States.

In one sense of course President Madison is already memoralized in a way that no building of even the purest marble could hope to rival. That is his enshrinement in our history through his monumental achievement—the Constitution of the United States and the first 10 amendments, the Bill of Rights.

We would also like to believe that the spirit of the Father of the Constitution has been immortalized in the name of Wisconsin's capital city.

We agree with Mr. Brant, however, that there should be a visible marks of respect to his memory in the Nation's capital.

The Washington Post and Times Herald has initiated a campaign to put Mr. Brant's suggestion into effect in a most practical and fitting way.

This is the proposal to use the discarded 24 columns from the Capitol's East Front to compose a Madison memorial situated harmoniously with the existing memorials to Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

It seems to us that James Madison's claim to such high honor from his countrymen is beyond debate. In a phrase that has become famous in history, Gladstone once described the Constitution as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

On this Fourth of July, which celebrates our independence, it is appropriate to rememebr that this independence was given lasting form in the Constitution, that wonderful work. No man was more singularly responsible for the final form of the Constitution than James Madison. He served with unmatched brilliance as the mediator who was able to put it over at the famous Philadelphia convention, and he defended it with irresistible logic as the most famous of the authors of the Federalist papers.

He then crowned this achievement by drawing up the Bill of Rights, the most powerful guarantee of freedom ever conceived by man.

The Capital Times is happy to endorse the proposal for a Madison memorial in Washington. We feel certain that in doing so we reflect the wishes of all the people in this city which so proudly bears the name of Madison.

Rural Development in Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, to those people who are interested in problems connected with area redevelopment and the rural development program, there are now abailable some preliminary statistics put out by the Florida Agricultural Experiment Stations and the U.S. Department of Agriculture in cooperation. The report is entitled "Sources and Levels of Income—Rural Households of North and West Florida, 1956."

Florida contains a part of the low-income area that has persisted in the southeast for several decades. It is with the rural segment of this low-income area that this report is concerned. The successful development and implementation of both local and national programs requires more detailed knowledge than is provided by usual sources. The interest of many people in rural development programs prompted the publication of these statistics as soon as they became available.

In many of the counties in north and west Florida, sources of income continue to be limited largely to an agriculture that includes many subsistence farms, the harvesting and primary processing of timber and forest products, and Government expenditures in the form of payrolls and welfare payments. In 20 counties scientific random sample interviews were conducted. Income records were complete on 730 schedules. The report states that:

Cash income averaged $2,430 for the 730 families. Farm families averaged $2,520 compared to $2,338 for nonfarm families.

Nonfarm employment was by far the major source of income for farm as well as nonfarm families.

Cash income from farming operations accounted for approximately one-fourth of the total cash income reported by farm households. Net cash farm income averaged $657 for the 368 farms. Residential and part-time farms reported negative net cash farm incomes, on the average, while commercial farms averaged almost $1,200.

Nonfarm employment income accounted for 60 percent of the total cash income reported by the survey households. Approximately 59 percent of the families reported income from this source. Nonfarm families averaged some $500 more than farm families. Residential and part-time farm families earned considerably more income from this source, on the average, than commercial farm families.

During 1956, approximately 75 percent of the 730 households had cash family incomes of less than $3,000, with 56 percent reporting less than $2,000. Only 11 percent of the households received cash family incomes in excess of $5,000.

Viewed from the standpoint of the relative importance of the various sources, as family income rose, income from farm operation varied from approximately 10 percent to 13 percent of total income through the $5,000 to $7,499 income class, then increased to 19 percent and 36 percent, respectively, for the two highest income classes. By comparison, as family income increased, income from nonfarm employment became increasingly important from a relative standpoint. It accounted for 17 percent of total income for those households within the $0 to $999 income class and increased to 78 percent of total income for those families receiving from $7,500 to $9,999 income. So far as income from farm wage work and nonemployment sources are concerned, they became less important relative to total income as family income rose.

This is but a sample of the sort of information which can be derived from the report. I commend the report to your attention.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Address by Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, Before the National Democratic Women's Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] before the National Democratic Women's Club on May 18, 1959. The subject of his speech was the interest of the consumer in the legislative measures passed on by the Congress and the policies of the Government. He proposed the establishment in the Federal Government of a Consumers Department.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR KEFAUVER BEFORE THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC WOMEN'S CLUB LUNCHEON, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 18, 1959

I appreciate very much this opportunity to address you today on a subject of special interest to you as women, though it is of importance to every one of our 175 million people. It has to do with the question of how best to provide political space for the representation of the consumer interest—how best to insure that the consumer voice will be heard—in the making of Government decisions and policies on economic matters. This I believe is one of the necessary, and belated, steps we must take if we are to protect and strengthen the dynamic character of our economy and keep it expanding in a direction that will bring a higher standard of living for all our families, and a firmer material support for our international policies. This is why I and 23 cosponsors introduced Senate bill 1571, which provides for the establishment of a Federal Department of Consumers.

I ask your support for the general provisions of this bill. I shall be glad to consider any particular amendments which you, from your experience as consumers and as practitioners in public affairs, may think desirable.

Before I outline the bill itself, let me bring two or three aspects of our economic situation to your attention which will help you understand the bill's intent. To the classical economic theorists, society was best served by an economy in which individual sellers were kept on their toes in producing goods of satisfactory quality at reasonable prices, by the hidden hand of competition among themselves; and by the exercise of informed choice by consumers on the other side of the counter. Under these circumstances, Government had only to play the minimum role of enforcing contracts and maintaining order.

But the realities we face today are very different from those envisioned by the classical theorists. Despite our antitrust laws and other policies designed to maintain a free competitive economy we are experiencing a market trend toward concentrated power in many of our basic industries—steel, oil, automobiles, etc. This power is demonstrated in part by their ability to establish and maintain what we have come to be known as administered prices, as distinct from free market prices.

Let me give you an illustration.

For the past 2 years, the Senate Subcommittee on Anitrust and Monopoly, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has been investigating the pricing policies of some of these basic industries, particularly steel and automobiles. This period covered the recent economic recession, characterized by a considerable degree of unused plant capacity, as well as unemployed workers.

What did we find?

In the steel industry, the bellwether of our whole economy, during the period August 1956 to August 1958, when the operating rate ranged from 62 percent down to as low as 48 percent of capacity, price increases to their customers amounted to some $2 billion, and of course these increases were pyramided as the product went through various manufacturing processes. This was a significant inflationary factor in a period when, according to the theorists, prices should have been declining.

And even more disturbing was the fact that each of the steel producers raised his prices by the same amount and to the same level, even though, by their own admission, they had different costs. Representatives of the industry explained to us that when a leading producer raised prices, the others had to follow, to meet competition.

Now I ask you, if that is competition, what is monopoly? It is like saying that competition between Macy's and Gimbel's would be greater if every price increase by Gimbel's was immediately matched by Macy's with a new banner over Herald Square waving the slogan "Our prices are always exactly as high as Gimbel's."

This will illustrate for you the stifling effect of power not only on economic processes but also on men's minds. It explains a statement by the president of General Motors to the effect that a 20-percent return on investment, per annum, after taxes, is just a normal profit.

This type of inflationary factor that we have been witnessing is beyond the reach of the traditional monetary controls by Government. It encourages a speculative psychology, threatens our stable economic growth, and depresses the particular living standards of large numbers of our families with relatively fixed incomes. The cost-of-living index has held fairly steady lately, not because of any significant change in the situation with respect to the concentration of industrial power in large sectors of our economy, with characteristic administered prices, but because of lower returns to farmers for their products. This type of inflation reflects private power rather than economic growth. It is one of our most urgent domestic problems, whether from the standpoint of the individual consumer or of the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Another matter which I want to bring to your attention, by way of introduction to a discussion of the consumer bill, is the changing role of Government in our economy over the past half century and particularly within recent years. The ramification of Government influence on economic life, direct and indirect, is now far reaching; Government action affects in some way, to some extent, the price, kind, quality, and/or conditions of sale of most of the goods and services made available to us as consumers. The increasing growth and complexity of the economy, its instability, its power pressures, as well as the necessities of national defense in a technological age, have involved Government in an expanding program of economic decision and action.

The hard-pressed Congress has had to extend its authority through the establishment of various regulatory agencies—the FTC, the FPC, the CAB, the FCC, and others; but in too many instances these agencies have become bogged down in controversies between conflicting business interests and have lost sight of the public interest which they were set up to protect and promote. Further, great departments of the executive branch, concerned with various aspects of the economy, have increased their power within the vast complex of Government, particularly in the field of administrative law. And during the same period, private economic groups have organized to exert their influence on this governmental process, to try to insure that public policy promotes their particular ends. Representatives of business, of labor, of agriculture are organized in powerful lobbies and also have found a channel of expression and support through the Departments of Commerce, of Labor, of Agriculture, and other agencies of the Government.

But what of the interest of the vast consumer public that was theoretically served by the beneficent operation of the free competitive market?

We have been told that the emergence of private power blocs "on opposite sides of the market" will provide checks and balances to offset the diminishing role of market competition. But we have no reason to believe that the tug-of-war between organized producer and distributor groups will maximize the public interest, either through the market process or Government action, unless the public interest itself can become a more effective factor in decisionmaking.

Heavily burdened public officials responsible for policymaking tend to be influenced only by the facts and opinions brought directly to their attention. What we propose to do now is to bring the voice of the forgotten consumer into this policymaking complex, through the establishment of a Consumers Department.

Consumers have a great responsibility in spending the family income to maximum advantage. If it is not spent to maximum advantage, much of the labor that went into earning it is wasted and our national resources are not used for greatest satisfaction. It is difficult for the individual consumer—and for the most part that means the housewife—to make an informed choice among the vast array of goods and services which our economy has made available. It is particularly difficult because our educational system

has been oriented toward the problems of production rather than of consumer choices, and because business promotion tends to confuse rather than to inform.

It is a good thing that consumers are beginning to get some help in carrying out their job more effectively through some of their own organizations, notably Consumers Union, Inc.

But however effective individual consumers may become in their market choices, they still cannot reach back of the market to the points where important economic decisions are now being made by industry—decisions for instance with respect to "administered" prices—nor can they directly influence the decisions made at all levels and in all areas of government with respect to economic matters. For this, organization is needed and there is no well-supported, well-financed organization among consumers comparable to that found among other economic interest groups.

There are no doubt many reasons why it has proved difficult for consumers to organize for the effective representation of their point of view, with respect to economic and political action. Most consumer purchases are made by housewives who have a multitude of varied, nonspecialized jobs to do. And the fact that we all spend some money, as consumers, makes the concept of the consumer role, as distinct from a producer role, a rather difficult one to grasp. There is an even greater difficulty when it comes to the matter of finding leadership and soliciting funds necessary to make the consumer voice heard on a sustained basis.

It is, therefore, all the more urgent for the Congress to take the initiative and make provision for consumer representation so that we can have all necessary facts and opinions before us when we make the economic decisions that we have to make.

We must help free the dynamic forces of our economy from its present unwarranted constraints, so we will not have the paradox of prices rising while production and employment fall, with waste of plant and manpower capacity. We must formulate more intelligent and imaginative public policies to encourage creative business vigor in a climate of democratic capitalism, thus checking the present trend toward greater concentration of power and control both in business and Government.

More effective consumer representation will help us toward this goal, and, therefore, as a first practical step that can be taken now, I and my cosponsors have introduced Senate bill 1571.

This bill provides for the establishment of a Federal Department of Consumers with specific powers and functions. Department status is provided to insure that the consumer voice will not be controlled by an agency oriented to other interests, and also that consumer representatives will have appropriate status when making their views known.

The Department will have the responsibility of presenting the consumer viewpoint when economic policies are being developed at the highest levels of government. As I pointed out earlier, people in their capacity as consumers are affected by such decisions, and it is right and proper that the total effect of proposed policies should be brought forcefully to the attention of those who formulate them.

Representatives of the specialized interest groups are heard directly through their lobbies and they also have friends at court in the heads of the producer-oriented departments who hold Cabinet rank. There is no question that when people look at the economic questions from the point of view of those who spend the family income—mainly the housewives—they think differently and in a more generalized way, than those whose business it is to promote the particular interests of producer groups in the economy; and, of course, this is especially true if they are well informed.

A second function of the Department would be to represent the interests of consumers in proceedings before the regulatory agencies and in some instances before appellate courts when economic matters are under consideration (as, for instance, in antitrust suits). The regulatory agencies were set up by the Congress under its power to regulate commerce in the public interest. But though many of their decisions (as for instance those of ICC affecting railroad rates, the Federal Power Commission in setting gas rates, the Federal Trade Commission in its decisions with respect to unfair business practices) are of direct concern to consumers, they are not regarded as a party at interest in these cases; exen if they were allowed to appear, under existing circumstances they would not be in a position, generally speaking, to prepare and present significant data.

Under bill S. 1571, the Department of Consumers would have the right by law to intervene in cases which, in its opinion, affect the consumer interest, and to present such evidence and arguments as it thinks necessary, subject to the rules of practice and procedure of the agency. Of course, as a practical matter, the Department would have to establish priorities, and concern itself only with the more significant cases since it is not likely to have the money or experienced personnel for a general coverage of the field.

The department would also have certain operating responsibilities resulting from the transfer to it of certain units and functions now set up or carried on by other departments or agencies. The bill lists particular units and functions to be transferred, but in this matter I should like particularly to have your suggestions.

The point to keep in mind is that transfer should be made in those instances where consolidation into a consumer-oriented department would lead to more efficient operation, higher morale, and a general strengthening of the overall program through the new focus and unity of purpose.

The transfers proposed in the bill include the Food and Drug Administration, the Division of Prices and Cost of Living of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Institute of Home Economics and Human Nutrition, and certain elements of the National Bureau of Standards engaged in research with respect to or testing of consumer goods. In other cases the Department is authorized to establish cooperative relationships with existing consumer services for more effective coordination of programs and policies.

A department set up to represent the consumer point of view must, of course, have channels opened for two-way communication with consumers, consumer groups and consumer agencies—including agencies that have been or may be set up in the States. Provision is made under the bill for the setting up of advisory committees, and particularly the department is directed to hold an annual consumers conference "for the purpose of obtaining information, recommendations, and suggestions necessary or desirable for the effective performance of other functions of the department."

The department will also provide an information service for consumers on the lines that the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce have been serving farmers and businessmen for decades. To this end the Department is authorized to "receive, assemble, evaluate, act upon and disseminate information helpful to consumers of the United States in performing their economic function more efficiently, including information concerning commercial and trade practices adversely affecting their economic interests."

Provision is also made whereby the department will serve as a central clearinghouse for complaints from consumers who presently are baffled by not knowing where to turn for help. If the matter involved comes within the jurisdiction of another department or agency, then the complaint will be forwarded for its attention and appropriate action; if the matter appears to involve a violation of law, or of a judicial decision, it is to be transmitted promptly to the appropriate officer or agency together with "such evidence and information as the department may have concerning such probable violation" and the department is further charged with the duty of ascertaining "the nature and extent of action taken with regard to probable violations so reported."

You are well aware, I am sure, that one of the major problems in consumer protection against unfair and improper business practices, is insuring effective enforcement of existing law, partly because consumers do not know what protection is provided under the law, or how to go about availing themselves of it. And as a matter of fact, not of criticism, agencies responsible for carrying out public policy for consumer protection, are at times heavily involved with other responsibilities to which top priorities are given.

The Department is given broad powers to carry on research, surveys, and investigations necessary for the effective performance of its duties, including the dissemination of useful information to the consumer public.

It is charged specifically with the responsibility and given the necessary authority to conduct economic surveys and investigations in certain broad areas, set out in the bill, of particular significance to consumers.

One of the great contributions which government has made to the growth of our economy has been in and through the research carried out by the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the different land-grant colleges and experimental stations in the various aspects of agricultural production and marketing; indeed, the increase in efficiency has, in many instances, been phenomenal, even to the point of embarrassing us with the problems of abundance.

Consumers, like farmers, are in no position to carry out on their own account, research relevant to their function. But increased knowledge and efficiency in spending the family income and in bringing informed consumer opinion to bear on the making of economic growth, a firm material foundation to the democratic way of life. For this reason I attach great importance to the Department's role in research and the dissemination of information.

I can assure you that the Congress itself would be among the beneficiaries of the proposed Consumers Department. It is usually difficult for legislators to obtain the type of information necessary to evaluate the probable effect of economic proposals on the interest of the consumer public, which is, in fact, an aspect of the public interest. To have an agency charged with the responsibility of presenting such information and of voicing consumer opinion, will I am sure, prove to be of tremendous assistance to the Congress.

For these various reasons I urge that you give active support to S. 1571, providing for the establishment of a Consumers Department in the Federal Government.

There are particular difficulties to be overcome in promoting meaningful legislation in the interest of the unorganized consumer public. The sponsors of such legislation cannot rely on the kind of support that alert, politically-experienced, and well-

financed groups give to proposals oriented toward special interests—the kind of support that helps carry legislation forward over the obstacles presented by the complex processes of our political system.

Consumers are not presently in a position to give this kind of support. But I and my cosponsors know, and I am sure you know, that our average families are becoming increasingly concerned and worried about the position in which they find themselves as consumers, largely as a result of the rising-price trend.

They are looking for a way to give effective expression to their point of view. They will want this legislation, once they learn about it and understand its significance not only for themselves but for the economy as a whole.

So I confidently ask your help in bringing this message to them, as a public service.

Address of Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge at Graduation Exercises, West Point, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, while he spoke several weeks ago, I have just had brought to my attention the very stirring remarks made by my former colleague—our most able and distinguished Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, on the occasion of this year's graduation exercises at West Point.

As Ambassador Lodge indicates, West Point's motto—"Duty, Honor, Country"—not only inspires its graduates but is a noble watchword for all Americans. These thoughts expressed at West Point directed to young Americans about to begin their career in the service of their country can well be of value to us who also serve our country. It is fitting that they be placed in the RECORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by Mr. Lodge be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HENRY CABOT LODGE, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, AT THE GRADUATION EXERCISES OF THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY, WEST POINT, N.Y., ON JUNE 3, 1959

For 157 years America has looked to the graduates of West Point to lead her through the valley of danger. Whoever is stirred by the recognition that duty is a summoning word; and whoever is moved by the thought of the millions of officers and men who march through the pages of American history under the leadership of Grant and Sherman; of Pershing; and of Eisenhower and MacArthur, must thrill at being in this place where such leadership was forged.

The French essayist Montaigne 400 years ago said:

"I would rather know the truth of the talk the general had in his tent on the eve of battle than the speech he made the next day to his army after the victory."

This statement has vivid meaning for me because I have heard some speeches by generals after the victory and they were good. But I have also been in the general's tent on the eve of battle—which is one place where you appreciate the essence of the West Point tradition.

West Point's motto—"Duty, Honor, Country"—inspires its graduates to be sure. But it is a noble watchword for all Americans because implicit in it is the idea of selflessness, of striving in behalf of something bigger than yourself.

Justice Holmes points out that "The reward of the general is not a bigger tent, but command." Yet there is a state of mind which is interested in getting the credit for what has been achieved, or in getting the perquisites of rank.

But the finer state of mind is that which wants above all to get the job done; which does not ignore danger but refuses to take counsel of its fears. It is expressed in the words of Tennyson which are inscribed over the Antarctic grave of the British explorer, Scott, who died on his way to the South Pole: "To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

This spirit of selflessness and striving commands the respect of Americans. Because of it West Pointers can repeatedly make great demands on young Americans thought by too many to be soft and self-indulgent.

This spirit of selflessness and striving is also a vital part of what makes America unique and admired by the nations of the world.

For I ask you to take it from a man who has spent much of his life in foreign relations, that what the world admires about America is not the angle player or the corner cutter or the smart aleck, but the man with a code, generous and high principled, a code by which he lives. You know that at moments it is as difficult to give an order as to obey one. Yet you are equipped to do both because, as West Pointers, you have such a code.

You are on the threshold of great careers—richer in the true sense of the word than any purely money-making occupation could possibly be. They will be richer in terms of the reward that you get during your life; richer in honor and in satisfaction for responsible work well done; and richer in the meaning which they will give to human life when you measure that life's importance in the scale of eternal values.

The daily grist of talk about missiles, necessary though they are, must never let us forget that missiles can never replace men.

Four hundred years before the birth of Christ, Pericles said this about the soldiers who had died in war:

"They faced the foe as they drew near him in the strength of their own manhood; and when the shock of battle came; they choose rather to suffer the uttermost than to win life by weakness. So their memory has escaped the reproaches of men's lips, but they bore instead on their bodies the marks of men's hands, and in a moment of time, at the climax of their lives, were rapt away from a world filled, for their dying eyes, not with terror but with glory.

"Such were the men who lie here and such the city that inspired them. We survivors may pray to be spared their bitter hour, but must disdain to meet the foe with a spirit less triumphant. * * *

"They gave their bodies to the commonwealth and received, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the grandest of all sepulchers, not that in which their mortal bones are laid, but a home in the minds of men, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by. For the whole earth is the sepulcher of famous men."

West Point has long had a home in the minds of men. Instead, it still has. For, in spite of all our unremitting efforts, the world is dangerous and catastrophes, large and small, can happen.

We all strive so that no war, large or small, shall occur anywhere. Your military readiness—your ability not to shrink from any possibility, however bitter—is vital to that striving and to all our hopes for freedom. If, despite our striving, war starts to smolder, we look to West Pointers for the leadership which will meet and defeat the shock of violence where it occurs.

And if, in spite of all our efforts, the worst violence should happen, we look to West Pointers to stand up amid the wreckage—even before the fumes of war have cleared away or the wounded have been tended or the dead have been buried—to take command and save our Nation. We count on you for the hard, steely resolve which will never yield.

Yours, therefore, can be the triumph—and the glory—of which Pericles speaks. And because of that our Nation holds you in honor every day of its life.

As you begin your careers of leading America through the valley of danger, I salute you and wish you well.

Oregon Centennial Year Featured by Publication of Epic Volume on Dr. John McLoughlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the outstanding publication events during Oregon's centennial year is the recent issuance of the new book "The McLoughlin Empire and Its Rulers," by Dr. Burt Brown Barker, distinguished historian and vice president of the University of Oregon. Dr. Barker is a great scholar, who has devoted many years of his life to the accurate and perceptive analysis and portrayal of Dr. John McLoughlin, frontier factor of the Hudson's Bay Co. and a major force in the settlement of the Pacific Northwest.

Dr. John McLoughlin is one of the two Oregon entrants in Statuary Hall, in this Capitol Building, the other being the Reverend Jason Lee. Although a British subject, Dr. McLoughlin made vast and important contributions to the development of the entire Oregon country, which we know now as the States of Oregon, Washington, and parts of Idaho and Montana.

Dr. Burt Brown Barker has conducted tireless and assiduous research into all the many branches of the McLoughlin family, in order to create a book which will stand as an enduring monument to a period of great historic significance in the expansion of the Pacific Northwest. It is fitting that such a volume be published during the period which marks Oregon's 100th year of membership in the Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful review of Dr. Burt Brown Barker's book "The McLoughlin Empire and Its Rulers," which appeared in the Oregonian of Portland, Oreg., on July 5, 1959. Author of the

review is Malcolm Bauer, associate editor of the Oregonian and president of the Oregon Historical Society.

There being no objection, the article was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Malcolm Bauer)

The biographies of Dr. John McLoughlin, who ruled the Oregon country in the second quarter of the 19th century, give little attention to things antecedental. There is a reason: Until recently, there was little but speculation to guide biographers in their study of the family life of Dr. McLoughlin and the roots of the rocklike character on which was built a Northwest empire.

Now, thanks to Portland's Dr. Burt Brown Barker, Dr. McLoughlin's early and family life can be documented with a high degree of accuracy. Dr. Barker, who has devoted many years to the study of the McLoughlin life and works and who has already published the letters and financial papers of the Hudson's Bay Co. factor in the wilderness, has capped his research achievements with the publication of "The McLoughlin Empire and Its Rulers."

Here is a rich store of newly discovered, authentic information about the McLoughlin family, of whom Dr. John was just one among members of distinction. Sharing the title role as "rulers" of the McLoughlin empire with the chief factor are his older sister, Marie Louise and younger brother, Dr. David McLoughlin. Marie Louise, as Sister St. Henry, became Mother Superior of Quebec's great Ursuline Monastery. David, who perhaps reached a level of distinction higher than that of any other in the family, became personal physician to King Louis Philippe of France—after having received vital financial assistance in his medical studies from brother John.

Proof of David McLoughlin's high position in Paris is among the many valuable revelations in the McLoughlin family letters, which Dr. Barker was instrumental in bringing to light and preserving. Most of these letters are here published for the first time, giving historians access to historical materials which until a few years ago were not known to exist. Certain key papers—such as Dr. McLoughlin's petition to practice medicine and his permit to practice—are reproduced in facsimile.

"The McLoughlin Empire and Its Rulers" is a solid addition to the Oregon history shelf. Copies may be obtained from the Oregon Historical Society.

Brown Compiles Notable Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the New York Times in an article by Lawrence E. Davies on Sunday, July 5, gives an excellent report of the outstanding record Gov. Edmund G. Brown has made in the first 6 months of his term as Governor of California. The article correctly reports, I believe, that Governor Brown has had notable success.

I was glad to note that the article gives recognition to Frederick G. Dutton, who is the Governor's executive secretary, as well as his campaign director. Mr. Dutton was also the southern California campaign director in the presidential campaign of Adlai Stevenson in 1956. I was the State chairman in that campaign and came to hold a very high regard for Mr. Dutton's capabilities.

I note also that the article makes it very clear that Governor Brown is primarily concerned with consolidating his position and the position of the Democratic Party in California. I am sure that in that effort he will have the support of all the Democratic Party leaders in our State.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 5, 1959]

BROWN COMPILES NOTABLE RECORD—ONCE INDECISIVE, CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR STICKS TO POLICY AND AVOIDS ANY TRAPS

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

SAN FRANCISCO, July 4.—The new Edmund G. Brown moved this week into the second semester of his freshman year as Governor.

He was self-confident, with his first successful legislative session behind him. His score sheet showed 35 victories against 5 defeats on major issues.

He seemed more determined than ever, as an open-ended favorite son for the Democratic presidential nomination, to keep control of the State party against any bids from outsiders.

Governor Brown's performance has surprised Californians. Politicians elsewhere have been asking, "How come?"

The State's second Democratic Governor since the start of the century came into office last January with a reputation as an amiable, indecisive politician, who had often become trapped between conflicting viewpoints.

ENJOYS MAKING DECISIONS

In 6 months, close associates insist, he has arrived at the point where he enjoys making a decision and sticking to it.

"It's partly the office, partly a realization of what his own image was in the public mind," one said. "Now, he is not only more decisive but he is willing to move into situations. Why, he's almost ready to throw down the gauntlet on an issue."

The 54-year-old Governor does not reach decisions without study and accepting advice. He has picked advisers in whom he has confidence, and, according to one, he has "little pride of authorship."

His closest administrative adviser is a 36-year-old attorney who has been in politics only 3 years.

Frederick G. Dutton was a corporation lawyer in Los Angeles in 1956, after service in the Korean war and a period of private practice. He left his post as assistant general counsel of the Southern Counties Gas Co. to become southern California chairman for the 1956 presidential campaign of Adlai E. Stevenson.

MAKES IMPRESSION

Mr. Dutton's initial efforts impressed Mr. Brown, then State attorney general. The following year Mr. Dutton became his chief assistant. Before the year was over he had begun charting the 1958 campaign of "Brown for Governor."

Throughout the bitter fight between Mr. Brown and the former Senator William F. Knowland, the Republican nominee, observers sought vainly for a major mistake in the Dutton-directed Brown campaign. The Governor named him his executive assistant. He has described him as "one of the finest governmental political analysts I have ever known."

Mr. Dutton, a graduate of the University of California and Stanford Law School, discounts any appraisal that he is chiefly responsible for keeping the Governor "on the track." He avows that he is not in politics as a career, regardless of Mr. Brown's political future.

"I'm having a good time now," he said this week, "but I'm not staying in politics. I have not set a cutoff date specifically. It is not, however, a matter of weeks or months."

AIMS AT PARTY UNITY

Governor Brown is represented as having two immediate objectives. One is to maintain unity in the California Democratic Party while it gains stability after the long reign of Republicanism. The other is to plant himself as California's top Democrat, so that he may have an influential voice in demanding a liberal national party.

"He is aggressively pinning down his California base," an associate said. "We figure he has 99 percent of the Democratic leadership with him now."

Looking back over the 1959 legislative session, the Governor points to two issues on which he believes he recorded his biggest victories. One was a compromise settlement of the controversial water program, which still has to hurdle the opposition of many voters.

The other was the enactment of legislation to set up a fair employment practices commission, after more than a decade of fruitless attempts.

In some tax measures, and on the water program, he was criticized by organized labor, which had supported him in his gubernatorial campaign.

THREAT BY LABOR

Labor threatens to try to defeat his $1,750 million water bond issue in November 1960, unless the legislature next year changes the law to prevent big landowners from gaining enrichment from the water development program.

Some observers picture Governor Brown as having imposed his will on the legislature to a greater degree than any California Governor of the era. Others say that if this is true, it is because of a change in the political climate, with party government increasingly stressed. For years legislatures were wont to divide on progressive and conservative lines.

California Governors traditionally have had representation on the floor of the assembly and senate. Mr. Brown has had floor leadership, especially in the assembly. He has Democratic majorities in both houses to give him partisan advantage.

The Strauss Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GALE W. McGEE
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials—one from the Laramie Daily Boomerang of June 17, 1959, and one from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 21, 1959. Both of them deal with the importance of the separation of powers between the legislative branch and the executive branch and the importance of the power of the Congress to

preserve its right to check and to work in accordance with the people's right to know the facts.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Laramie (Wyo.) Daily Boomerang, June 17, 1959]

THE CASE OF STRAUSS AND LAWS

Despite charges and countercharges and seemingly petty hassles, the case of Adm. Lewis Strauss has been an enlightening affair.

In some respects, the actual confirmation or refusal of confirmation, of Admiral Strauss as Secretary of Commerce has been relegated to the back seat.

Wyomingites should be proud that their Senators have helped take the lead in examining closely the relations between the legislative and executive departments of the Federal Government.

When Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY speaks on the Constitution and what it means, other Senators and responsible officials listen carefully.

They did that when Senator O'MAHONEY helped them take a new look at the Constitution last week. "The only right given to the President of the United States with respect to the selection of Cabinet officials is the right to nominate," O'MAHONEY emphasized on the Senate floor.

The citizens of Wyoming should be pleased to know that Senator O'MAHONEY and Senator GALE MCGEE are taking the lead in safeguarding the rights of the Senate, and consequently the people of the State and Nation.

It's time to assess our Government carefully when people become alarmed that the Senate doesn't rubber stamp the President's wishes. Under no circumstances, should the President rise above the Constitution of the people of the United States.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 21, 1959]

THE STRAUSS DEFEAT

Now that the sound of administration tooth gnashing has died away, it is possible to perceive that the defeat of Admiral Strauss in the Senate was on the whole a healthy thing.

Not only did the Senate, by a close vote of 49 to 46, keep out of the Cabinet a man whose record called for precisely such a repudiation. More important, in the long run, is the fact that the Senate has broken the old taboo against closely examining the qualifications of Cabinet appointees.

The notion that a President is entitled to pick his own official family had been stretched to the unreasonable point of almost nullifying the Senate's constitutional power of confirmation. Now as before the Strauss controversy, it is true that a President's appointments start with a presumption in their favor. But the Senate should not abdicate its responsibility to examine them closely.

In the Strauss case, a perfunctory hearing would not have disclosed those qualities of character, the official arrogance and the cavalier attitude toward truth which were brought out by the Commerce Committee's extensive consideration of his appointment. Just because the committee did delve so deeply, it elicited from Strauss conduct which in large measure confirmed the charges of his opponents. Undoubtedly his own testimony proved his undoing; it changed a few crucial minds and tipped the balance of the Senate vote against him.

That there was also plenty of politics in the affair is obvious—and not surprising, since this was a political issue. It is most difficult to believe that Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON finally decided to swing against Strauss strictly on the merits of the case. Senator JOHNSON was all too plainly in need of bolstering his leadership with the liberal wing of his party, which from the beginning had carried the burden of the fight. The Strauss vote gave him an opportunity to mend fences on that side, and should be worth a good deal to him in persuading Democrats to back his compromises on the budget and other issues. It also enabled him to keep his franchise, so far as the liberals are concerned, as a Presidential candidate.

Once the majority leader had made his decision, all the other Democratic Presidential candidates in the Senate were able to leap on the bandwagon. By voting against Strauss in a body, they removed the issue with all its implications from the contest for the nomination. This convenient arrangement must have been particularly gratifying to Senator SYMINGTON.

On his record, Senator SYMINGTON should have been a strong supporter of Strauss. He and Strauss have long seen alike on most issues of atomic bombs, nuclear testing, and national defense; and we imagine that Strauss' feat of driving J. Robert Oppenheimer out of Government service had the Senator's full sympathy at the time. Yet it might have been gravely injurious to the SYMINGTON Presidential campaign had he been compelled to vote his sympathies.

Though politics of this sort played its part, it was not the decisive element. The decisive element was the courage, persistence and independence of a little group of Senators who were deeply convinced that Admiral Strauss' record at the Atomic Energy Commission disqualified him for Cabinet service. To such men as Senators ANDERSON, of New Mexico; MCGEE, of Wyoming; MONRONEY, of Oklahoma; ENGLE, of California; MAGNUSON, of Washington; MORSE, of Oregon; YARBOROUGH, of Texas; and O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, goes the credit for insisting that the Senate face the Strauss issue headon. Finally it was by the margin of the two Republican Senators who broke ranks and voted against Strauss that he was rejected—the first Cabinet rejection in 34 years. To MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, and WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, the country owes a debt of gratitude for placing independence of judgment above party regularity.

Observance of National Catholic Youth Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN O. PASTORE
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, National Catholic Youth Week will be observed October 25 to November 1, 1959. I have noted the theme of this ninth annual observance. It is "Spiritualize Youth—Vitalize Nations."

The observance is sponsored by the National Council of Catholic Youth, an organization of over 7 million youth, under the guidance of Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph E. Schieder, the director of the youth department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

I ask unanimous consent to have a statement regarding this observance printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The theme of this year's Youth Week—"Spiritualize Youth—Vitalize Nations"—aptly summarizes what it is that the family of nations most needs. In order that each member of the family be assured of his individual dignity, and be accurately informed of the source from which will derive his positive contribution to the common interests about which turns the opportunity for meaningful existence—the youth of that country must prize the power of spiritual motivation.

I would hope that this message—that spirituality is a source of vitality—will be brought to the attention of civics classes and courses in government.

Herein lies the answer to the quest for the source of greatness in each individual and in the nation he must assist in guiding.

Corrupting influences can so easily destroy the power and life of a nation. On the contrary, each nation must be infused with high moral and civic virtues in order to conquer the forces of evil which are so apparent and to meet the several challenges which lead to greatness.

Our young people, then, must be enlightened on this truth. Their ideas and ideals must be set on solid foundations so that they may find the answers being sought and, in return, establish a basis for those who will follow them.

In this manner, vitalized nations, such as our own must indeed be, will be receiving that stabilizing and energizing force from an inexhaustible source—spirituality. Indeed, through such a process, our young people will see the reality of the dreams they so properly dream.

World Refugee Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, July 1, marked the beginning of World Refugee Year.

Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, who also is chairman of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee, has issued a statement describing the meaning of this designation. I ask unanimous consent that Governor Williams' statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON WORLD REFUGEE YEAR BY GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, CHAIRMAN, NATIONALITIES DIVISION, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

World Refugee Year, starting July 1, is for Democrats a worldwide extension of what we have long been working for, through the Democratic Party, and particularly through the nationalities division.

It was the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, and the firm leadership of President Harry S. Truman, which enabled Americans to truthfully say that we, in our generation, had carried forward the great traditions of the founders of our Nation, who came here themselves as refugees from tyranny abroad,

and vowed that America should always hold out a helping hand to victims of injustice from whatever place they might come.

Our party has been traditionally the party of the immigrant. That is as it should be, and as it always will be. Our national platform commits us to keeping America a nation that shall ever be the land of hospitality and asylum for those seeking freedom, opportunity, and escape from oppression; and the coming months, set aside for observance as World Refugee Year, should be a time of challenge for us, as we work to enact new immigration laws that will not erect unfair and discriminatory barriers against the people of any race or nation, to provide opportunity for admission of our fair share of the thousands of new refugees from Soviet and other tyrannies, and to appropriate funds to contribute to the relief of those for whom we cannot find homes.

It is only through such action that we can live up to the high standards of Thomas Jefferson or a Franklin Roosevelt, and make of our land a place where, as the Psalmist wrote centuries ago, brethren may dwell together in unity.

Address of Hon. Grant Sawyer, Governor of Nevada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. CANNON
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Disabled American Veterans of the State of Nevada have one of the best records in the country of conscientiously working for the interests of so many of our unfortunate former servicemen. Their work is well known throughout my State, and their services are recognized beyond the borders of Nevada.

Recently I was fortunate to attend the 11th Annual Convention of the Disabled American Veterans in Reno, Nev. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech made to this gathering by the Honorable Grant Sawyer, Governor of the State of Nevada.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF GRANT SAWYER, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, TO THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, DEPARTMENT OF NEVADA, 11TH ANNUAL CONVENTION BANQUET, HELD ON JUNE 13, 1959, IN RENO, NEV.

It is a distinct honor to be here this evening as the guest speaker before this State convention of one of America's outstanding veteran organizations.

As I shall explain in a few minutes, I also feel indebted to you for extending to me this courtesy. I should like to talk, in general terms, about the philosophies and principles, and the problems and accomplishments of the Disabled American Veterans. First, however, I should like to make a few observations on the subject of ideals and responsibilities.

Patriotism, in the minds of millions of Americans, is a rather vague ideal. Few can define it in concrete terms, but most, nevertheless, believe that they have it within them, and I am sure that most do. But like many ideals, patriotism exists in various forms and to varying degrees, and because we recognize this, we naturally tend to classify patriotism into the different levels to which it is evident. As an example, throughout our country we recently held commemorative services. The day was, of course, Memorial Day. I pose this question: Why do we hold such services? Many might answer, "To honor our war dead," or "Because it is part of the customs and traditions of our Nation, a part of the heritage of a freedom-loving people." These would be correct and acceptable answers. However, those answers really tell us what we are doing, not why. I suggest to you that the real motivation stems from our recognition of the fact that the Americans whom we are so honoring exhibited the highest and greatest degree of patriotism possible: to die for, and in defense of, one's country.

We and our Government recognize that our responsibility to those great Americans can never be adequately and completely discharged, and that perhaps the most we can do is pay homage to them and provide for their loved ones, for they themselves are now in the care of the greatest benefactor known to man.

In view of the fact that we can never meet fully our obligation in this respect, we must then, in the interests of moral conscience and good government, determine related aspects or obligations which can be fully met and which are equally vital to the development and preservation of the American ideals and principles upon which our Nation is founded, and then proceed to meet such obligations.

This evening we need not dwell upon the determination of such obligations, however. Over the years, much of this groundwork has been laid for us, and for this evening I have selected one area of responsibility which meets the criteria I have just outlined. It is the area of mutual responsibility which exists between the American citizen and his Government. More specifically, I shall describe it as the Government's responsibility to protect the citizen and promote his welfare, and the citizen's responsibility to support his Government and to protect it against any and all aggressors.

Some of the greatest living examples of citizens who have met their part of this responsibility are before me this evening—Disabled American Veterans; an organization of distinguished Americans who, having recognized that they had fulfilled their obligation to the best of their ability, founded the Disabled American Veterans on the principle that this Nation's first obligation is to its war disabled veterans, and their dependents. This organization plays a vital role not only in services to veterans, but of perhaps even greater significance, in the preservation of good government through its continuous vigilance in seeing that the Government accepts and discharges its part of the mutual responsibility.

Perhaps we should examine that vital role for a moment in order to clarify the problems involved and to understand the interrelationship between a better America and the solutions to such problems.

One of the principal methods the Government uses in discharging its part of the mutual responsibility is the passing of legislation which will provide for the common defense or which will promote the general welfare, as expressed by our Founding Fathers in the preamble to the Constitution. We must remind ourselves that although we speak of the Government as an entity, we really mean elected Government officials, who, of course, are people. They must have, in order to make judicious decisions with respect to legislation, as much valid information as possible. For example, in the case of proposed or pending legislation the purported object of which is to promote the general welfare, a legislator needs to know the answers to several questions, such as, "Will it promote the general welfare? How will it? What is the ultimate objective? Is there a better way to accomplish the same objective?" The record readily shows that the DAV long ago recognized that through its organization it could provide the Government with valuable advice on legislation concerned with that segment of the general welfare which I shall call veterans' welfare, historically, the DAV has advocated, and correctly so, that the primary purpose of providing governmental benefits to service-connected disabled veterans is to enable them and their dependents to live in the American way. These very words were most recently spoken by your national commander, Judge David B. Williams, in a statement before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The basic point here is that the DAV has been instrumental in convincing the Government, and also private industry, that the disabled veteran does not seek, nor does he want, Government benefits which can be classified as charity. He seeks and wants only those benefits which will enable him to supplement his disability compensation through useful and suitable employment. In the last 10 years great strides have been made in educating private industry to recognize the principle that it is ability, not disability, that counts. Impetus in this respect has been given by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, by similar Governors' committees in the several States, by procedures and programs in public employment offices, and of course by the veterans' organizations.

The efforts have not all been successful and the results are far from 100 percent satisfactory, but we must remember that education of the general public is usually a battle—a different kind of battle, yes—but the toughest kind, because even when you have all the weapons, all the supplies, all the transportation, all the communications, and all the strategy you need, you still can't expect immediate victory. You need patience, greater patiencee than you've ever known, because your objective is more difficult than the destruction or capture of a seemingly impenetrable enemy position. You have to change human thinking—thinking that is being done by minds affected, or perhaps I should say infected, with unwarranted fear.

But the battle is progressing, and the fear is being overcome. A few daring, pioneer employers, some of them themselves physically handicapped, began experimenting in a practically unexplored field—hiring physically handicapped employees in an effort to restore them to their former, and rightful, place in society as useful citizens who could once again accept their full share of responsibility and once again contribute their full share of production to the economy. From that point to today is history, and to you undoubtedly old history, but, as you know, better than I, the battle must continue. Even with an estimated 7 to 8 million handicapped gainfully employed in American industry today, there remain approximately 2 million more, who are capable of being employed.

I grant you that the battle is properly the battle of all Americans; but as in many battles, you must continue to fight, as you have always done, with or without adequate support. Replacements are beginning to arrive, but the front line must still be held in the interim.

In reference to my introductory remarks on patriotism, I should like to point out an interesting observation. You may recall that I said few people can define patriotism in concrete terms. I am not one of the few. I merely pointed out that we classify it in different levels, and I then proceeded to dis-

cuss the higher levels—the levels in which great personal sacrifice is involved. My observation is this: You have attained the higher levels of patriotism, as evidenced by your presence at this convention. Yet you did not stop there and say, "I have made my personal sacrific. My obligation is fulfilled." You continued unfalteringly to show, and you are still showing, your love of country. By advising the Government and by dispelling the general public's fear, you are actually helping the Nation to fulfill its part of the mutual obligation I mentioned earlier, and what else can this be called but another form, or level, of patriotism?

There is still another great accomplishment of your organization which I have not yet mentioned. I hesitate to classify it as patriotism because it is broader in scope and more profound in depth. It is the very core of moral, mortal life on earth. I am referring, of course, to your unlimited devotion to your less fortunate brothers. The 90 percent of you who are fighting your own battle for the right and the opportunity to become and remain gainfully employed, are at the same time fighting unselfishly to obtain the benefits necessary to provide the comforts of the American way of life to the 10 percent who gave their capabilities in order to preserve that very ideal.

Up to this point I have been speaking in general terms about this organization, its philosophies and principles, and its problems and accomplishments. I should like to make a few specific comments within the same framework.

I stated earlier that I felt not only honored to have been invited here this evening, but indebted to you as well. Had it not been for this invitation, I might not have had the pleasure and the opportunity to become informed with respect to much of the valuable, specific information about the disabled American veterans.

I hope I have not been presumptuous in talking about patriotism to this organization—the one organization composed exclusively of Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war. I knew that the DAV was not the largest veteran organization, and that it never would be because less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities, but I did not know that your national headquarters in Cincinnati maintains the largest staff of any veteran organization of full-time trained national service officers. The fact that they have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney should be of vital interest to the disabled veterans in Nevada, as well as to those thoughout the United States. On this very point, it is interesting to note that most of the 37,200 veterans whose disability compensation payments have been discontinued, and most of the 27,300 other veterans whose payments have been reduced since the institution of the claims review program of the Veterans' Administration, were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. During the next 3 years, the probable time required for completion of the review program, it is logical to assume that many more such unfavorable adjudications will occur. I therefore urge every disabled veteran in Nevada to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, as a protective measure.

The efficiency of your national service officer system is certainly worthy of note. For each dollar spent by the DAV on this system the return has been approximately $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants. Of equal significance is the fact that although DAV costs over a 10-year period amounted to over $12 million, the organization defrayed these costs with no subsidy from the Government.

Another point, with respect to your national service officer system, which typifies your sincere interest in all disabled veterans is the fact that in the many thousands of requests received by your national service officers, expert advice was given in all cases, although only 10 percent came from DAV members.

I mentioned earlier that the DAV had long ago become aware of the sage advice it could give in the field of veteran legislation. This year for example, through various congressional delegations in the several States your organization has submitted recommendations on such important issues as hospitals, widows' pensions, protection of service connection after 10 years, the VA review program, disabled veterans preference in Federal employment, and reinstatement of national service life insurance, this latter issue being one which I feel particularly warrants consideration.

There are several brief conclusions which I should like to draw this evening. Every American, in Government and out, should become aware of the tremendous accomplishments of veterans and veteran organizations in fostering Americanism and good government, and every American can assist in the preservation of our heritage by supporting actively at least one organization which reflects his thinking and interests, whether such organization is a trade association, labor union, fraternal, religious, or civic association.

Veterans, in the interest of their own welfare and in the interest of the preservation of our democratic ideals, should belong to one or more of the service-giving, patriotic veteran organizations. All of America's disabled defenders who are receiving disability compensation have derived great benefit themselves, and have made innumerable valuable contributions toward better Government and a better America, through their official voice—the DAV.

Three Hundredth Anniversary of the Hopkins Grammar School of New Haven, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, in October 1960, the Hopkins Grammar School of New Haven, Conn., will complete its 300th year of successful operation. This school is an institution renowned in New England, and throughout the United States, for its 300-year tradition of educational achievement. Indeed, the Hopkins School is almost unique in having maintained a near-continuous existence since 1660.

This continuity derives from a self-perpetuating board of trustees appointed in regular succession from the original trustees. For three centuries, the trustees, as named by Edward Hopkins or his successors, have endeavored to carry out the wishes of the founder by holding property in the name of the school and by providing high quality education for many hundreds of boys. Except for an occasional lapse of a year or two during the first century of the school's existence, New Haven has always had a school of some type founded on the Hopkins bequest.

Since 1660, Hopkins has grown from a simple colonial grammar school into the complex institution it is today—a school embodying the most advanced educational experience. In the beginning, the principal and almost only aim of the school was to prepare the boys of the New Haven Colony for college and, more specifically, for the ministry. The curriculum and equipment were equally limited. The colleges of the period required only a rudimentary knowledge of Latin and Greek, and these were the only classes offered at Hopkins. Furthermore, its facilities and equipment comprised only one bare room, a series of benches for the scholars, one teacher, and a motley collection of books.

In the years from 1660 to the present, the course and character of the Hopkins School have been adjusted to meet the greater requirements for college entrance, and to fulfill the broadening concepts of modern education. Although the founders and early schoolmasters might find it difficult to recognize their creation today, it is noteworthy that the Hopkins School has grown to maturity without losing either the identity or the characteristics of Edward Hopkins' original purpose.

The Hopkins Grammar School traces its origin to a bequest of Edward Hopkins, seven times Governor of the Colony of Connecticut and twice president of the New England Confederation. In his will, dated March 7, 1657, Edward Hopkins established an educational foundation, part of the funds from which were to be used for the establishment and support of a grammar school in New Haven.

Long a friend of John Davenport, the pastor and spiritual leader of the New Haven community, Hopkins shared his interest in education, and was sympathetic with the early attempts to develop a complete educational system.

Following the death of Hopkins in 1657, the terms of his bequests became involved in prolonged legal entanglements. In 1660, however, John Davenport, acting as executor of the estate, issued an order employing one Jeremiah Peck to teach the young boys of the Colony in a Hopkins Grammar School.

On the basis of New Haven Colony records, the school's historians have determined June 14, 1660, as the founding date. The first classes actually began in October 1660.

From the beginning of the Connecticut settlement until 1798, grammar schools were required by law. The New Haven leaders believed that opportunities for education should be made available to everyone, but theirs was not the modern idea of universal education. The early educators held that society was divided into something like classes and that within those classes, individuals could move from a lower level to a higher level. They maintained that elementary instruction must be given the average person and that he must be brought up to some lawful calling or employ-

ment. Hopeful youth, that is, those with ability and social status, were entitled to receive a higher education to fit them for leadership and public service.

The Hopkins School was not the only institution of its type founded in colonial New England, nor was it the only school founded upon a share of the Hopkins estate. It is unique, however, in that, unlike other schools founded under the will, it did not become a part of the city public school system.

During the century and a half which embraces the first period in the educational history of Connecticut, there was no great fundamental change in educational policy or action. After 1798, grammar schools were no longer required by law in the State, and Hopkins entered the second period of its history—a period of about 50 years. There was at that time a general movement to provide educational facilities which offered something more than the traditional Greek and Latin courses of the grammar schools. Numerous academies and schools were opened, but Hopkins, with only minor changes, continued as a private Latin or classical school and continued the use of its original name, "Grammar School." Continuance of the established system at the time when responsibility for higher education was being abandoned by the State was important in two ways: Such institutions as Hopkins may be said to have kept alive the interest in classical subjects, and to have preserved an important educational form. The public schools, which developed more from the old common schools than from the grammar schools, gave primary emphasis to the current popular conception of practical subjects. In the midst of this changing environment, Hopkins continued for some time as a one-man classical school. Perhaps one reason for the continuance of the classical curriculum was the presence of Yale University in New Haven, furnishing an immediate demand for boys educated in the classics.

During the last half of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th, the curriculum offered at Hopkins underwent a gradual but important transformation. More and more of the so-called modern courses were added, although much of the classical program was retained intact. It is interesting to note that the catalog of about 1860 states:

> The classical and modern studies are so arranged that at the end of 4 years the student may find himself prepared to enter college and "no more."

The emphasis on "no more" is in the catalog. The 1915 catalog, however, includes a statement almost revolutionary as compared with the earlier attitude:

> Yet any real fitting school must also be a finishing school. The courses at Hopkins therefore aim to fit boys for life as well as for college. To this end it provides for a threefold training: physical, mental, and moral. This training is based on the fundamental principle that the ultimate goal of all education is to train the individual for a life of service to the community which he may be privileged to serve.

Several attempts to integrate the Hopkins School with the New Haven High School were made during the latter part of the 19th century. The various committees were unable to reach agreement, however, and Hopkins retained its independent position outside the New Haven public school system. This is the curious and unique result of the history of a colonial grammar school started as a town enterprise. Perhaps it is due to the union of two conditions: an endowment, and its close association with Yale in New Haven.

In 1925, there was what one might call a refounding of the Hopkins School: first, the adoption of a country day school idea, made possible by the new location acquired in that year; and second, the adoption of the contract assignment plan for individual work. In making these changes in educational approach, Hopkins joined a group of private schools whose endowment and position enabled them to lead the way in testing and applying the best educational thought of the time.

The contract system of study was designed to provide a method by which each boy might progress at his own rate. Necessity for such a development was recognized in 1857 when the rector, Mr. James Whiton, provided for a flexible course of 3 or 5 years depending upon a boy's ability and previous training.

Throughout all the changes brought by the 300 years of its existence, Hopkins has kept the original and primary character that it inherited from its founders—that of a school to prepare boys for college. Terms in which its aims are expressed and methods by which they are accomplished have been modified many times. As long as the school retains its vitality and vision they will probably be modified again and again to meet the changing conditions of social and economic life.

In the early days educational training emphasized means to ensure salvation, obedience to the law, and preparation for public service. Today, Hopkins Grammar School emphasizes social leadership, character training, development of the reasoning powers to the individual's fullest capacity, all based on a foundation of cultural training. The Hopkins School today is a place to learn the great end and real business of living. In preparing young men for the serious business of life, it is faithfully carrying out the injunction which Edward Hopkins gave in his bequest:

> Breed up hopeful youths for public service of the country in future times.

Our New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial about the wonderful area of New England which appeared in the Chelsea (Mass.) Record on July 2, 1959:

OUR NEW ENGLAND

New England is a wonderful area which, all too frequently, is taken for granted by New Englanders. Many companies and industries in the six States hide their shining light under the proverbial bushel basket instead of sounding a Yankee bugle call to signal the unmatched, abundant resources and achievements of all New England.

Like all progress, New England advancement cannot come by itself. It must be promoted and it will continue only with concerted efforts by all facets of our society.

To that end, the Record is joining with scores of New England daily newspapers in an unusual cooperative effort to boost our region. Each month during the second half of 1959 the newspapers will publish an advertisement with the theme "The new New England" to inform our readers about the national importance of the region's leading industries.

The public service advertising campaign was prepared by the New England Council regional economic organization, in cooperation with the New England Daily Newspaper Association and the New England Weekly Press Association.

Connecticut Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff, chairman of the New England Governor's Conference, has issued the following statement:

"Your organizations are to be commended strongly for cooperating with the New England Council in promoting the new New England advertising program.

"A program reminding the citizens of New England of the many positive aspects of the economy of the six-State area can have far-reaching benefits. This series should give New Englanders a better understanding of the importance of our industries, and I hope that other advertisements dealing with other aspects of the New England economy will be prepared.

"The Governors of the New England States salute the New England Council for initiating and preparing the advertisements, and we are grateful for the public service attitude shown by the New England Daily Newspaper Association and the New England Weekly Press Association."

The Record is proud to participate in promoting New England. But in the final analysis, each citizen must be a salesman for his community and State and the great region in which he lives.

Let's "talk up" New England. And while you are at it, sell yourself on your region, if you need to.

Young Democrats Support Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, President Nelson Lancione of the Young Democratic Clubs of America has called to my attention a resolution passed unanimously at the most recent meeting of the National Committee of the Young Democratic Clubs of America placing that fine organization on record in support of home rule for the District of Columbia.

Mr. Lancione points out that Young Democrats throughout the Nation have supported the principle of home rule in the District of Columbia just as they were in the vanguard of those who, for many years, campaigned for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that every Democrat will be interested in this Young Democratic Clubs of America resolution on home rule for the District of Columbia, and I should like to make this resolution a part of the RECORD at this point.

RESOLUTION ON HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNANIMOUSLY PASSED BY THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF AMERICA, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., APRIL 1959

Whereas the residents of the District of Columbia are denied both a voice in their own local governmental affairs; and in the choice of a national Government; and

Whereas this works an unfair denial of the basic rights of citizenship to these residents and, furthermore, place an unfair burden on the whole United States by requiring an already overburdened Congress to devote time to purely local legislation; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Committee of the Young Democratic Clubs of America favors the granting of self-government and of voting in national elections to the residents of the District of Columbia; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Committee of the Young Democratic Clubs of America specifically urges the Congress of the United States to enact in substance, the Bible bill (S. 659), during the present session of Congress as the fulfillment of the first step in the full grant of the voting franchise to District of Columbia residents.

The Louisiana Library Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, during my years of service with State government in Louisiana, and especially while occupying the position of State budget director, I was able to observe the splendid work and great accomplishments of the Louisiana Library Commission under the directorship of Miss Essae Martha Culver. It has always been a source of great satisfaction to me to have been closely associated with this great work for Louisianans, and I was happy to see Miss Culver's accomplishment rewarded by the recognition granted her by naming her as recipient of the 1959 Lippincott award. I commend the citation to the attention of my colleagues:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINE LIPPINCOTT AWARD CITATION (APPROVED BY AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION AWARDS COMMITTEE)

During a lifetime of service, Essae Martha Culver has provided the world of librarianship with a remarkable and inspired example of library leadership. Her profound influence on library development in the State of Louisiana clearly exhibits the work of a consummate librarian—one who has brought to the task administrative genius, political acumen, and a measureless capacity for sustained effort.

Miss Culver's interest and leadership in all phases of library endeavor are attested by the breadth of her accomplishments. In the public library field she organized a statewide library service, originating for the task a demonstration method which has greatly influenced library development both in this country and abroad. She was instrumental in developing a strong school library program throughout the State and in establishing a library school at Louisiana State University. She built a poor and inadequate State commission library into the highly efficient, effective, and magnificently housed Louisiana State Library of today.

As president of the Louisiana Library Association, of the Southwestern Library Association, of the League of Library Commissions, and, finally, of the American Library Association, Miss Culver has demonstrated a level of library statesmanship which is an inspiration and challenge to all members of the profession.

Today, as the library function becomes ever more essential to the common good, it is significant to note that the life and work of Essae Martha Culver testify to her belief in a philosophy of librarianship dedicated to the living and to her deep understanding of the human heart. It is fitting that her unique and distinguished contribution to librarianship be gratefully recognized in the form of the Joseph W. Lippincott award.

Resolution of William E. Sheridan Police Post No. 1059, American Legion, Brooklyn, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 10, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the William E. Sheridan Police Post No. 1059, American Legion, Brooklyn, N.Y., at a regular monthly meeting held on May 26, 1959:

Whereas the worldwide Olympic games are conducted to promote understanding and good will among the nations of the world; and

Whereas the International Olympic Committee, at its recent meeting, has voted to disqualify Nationalist China from the Olympic games to be held in 1960, and in its place has accepted application from the so-called Republic of China; and

Whereas Nationalist China is, and has been for many years, an ally of the United States and other freedom-loving peoples of the world; and

Whereas the so-called Republic of China has been known to be, and is in fact, under the direction of a tyrannical regime, keeping millions of people enslaved by brutal force; and

Whereas the same Republic of China has repeatedly refused to reveal the whereabouts of American prisoners-of-war known to be held in Red China; Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention, through the State and National conventions, petition the International Olympic Committee to reinstate Nationalist China as a participant in the forthcoming Olympic games; and be it further

Resolved, That this convention go on record as opposing the entrance of Red China in the Olympic games of 1960; and be it further

Resolved, That if said petitions are ignored, said county, State, and national bodies of the American Legion campaign to have the U.S. Olympic team withdrawn from the Olympic games of 1960 and to request those persons who normally support the U.S. Olympic team to withhold their support until Nationalist China is reinstated to its former position with the International Olympic Committee and is again permitted to participate in the Olympic games of 1960.

A Statement in Support of a Bill To Extend Benefits to Certain Civilians Who Participated in the Construction of the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, in all the history of man there have been few engineering wonders more imposing than the construction of the Panama Canal in terms of obstacles overcome and scope of achievement. The building of the pyramids represented, possibly, an even more miraculous conquest of seemingly insuperable problems; but certainly the erection of monuments to royal conceit was of less enduring popular benefit than the fashioning of a world utility which serves the physical and cultural needs of men of all nations.

In some respects, the difficulties confronting our canal diggers were more awesome than the trials imposed upon the artisans of the Pharaohs. "Yellow Jack" and malaria had made Panama a pesthole for centuries; and when the French Canal Co., under Ferdinand de Lesseps, attempted to cut through the isthmus, the brave attempt was doomed by these twin scourges. But the Americans, armed with new medical and sanitary techniques, damned the mosquitos and ultimately transformed a death trap into a relatively pleasant work area. It was then that American ingenuity and know-how was able to confound the skeptics—who were numbered among the best scientific minds throughout the world—by performing herculean feats of excavation and construction. Some of our own skeptics had conceded that a canal might be built in 20 or 30 or 50 years; to the delighted amazement of most Americans, the project was completed in less than 10.

Just as Casey Stengel could not have won all those pennants without, as he so quaintly put it, "all them ballplayers," the canal would never have materialized without the truly heroic services of thousands of American workers, skilled and otherwise. To date they

have received comparatively little recompense for their magnificent contributions. In 1915 Congress handsomely rewarded officers of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service—38 Stat. 1190. It was not until 1944—58 Stat. 257—that any appreciable benefits were extended to civilian officials and employees, and these were limited to those civilians who were citizens of the United States and were engaged with, or employed by the Isthmian Canal Commission or the Panama Railroad Company on the Isthmus of Panama for 3 years or more during the construction period from May 4, 1904, to March 31, 1914. For the man who served for as much as 3 years and not more than 4 years, an annuity of 40 percent of his average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation was to be extended.

Such an annuity, it is true, was to be paid for the remainder of the recipient's life; but inasmuch as salaries for foremen, for example, ran as low as $75 per month, Uncle Sam was not going broke in rewarding these men who risked their lives in situations that sometimes were almost as perilous as combat.

In the present bill, we ask only that the time limit be reduced to 2 years. Any 2 years of service, and especially those years before yellow fever and malaria were wiped out, are deserving of perpetual recognition, expressed in tangible form.

Water Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the North Dakota Wildlife Federation annual convention on June 7, 1959:

RESOLUTION 2

Whereas the Small Watershed Flood Prevention Act, commonly referred to as Public Law 566 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out water development projects designed to minimize flooding of agricultural lands; and

Whereas such development may include land use practices designed to increase water absorption of soil, channel deepening, and straightening, establishment of retention dams, and others; and

Whereas there does exist, in our area, many natural water reservoirs whose potential for flood water storage should be utilized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota Wildlife Federation meeting in annual convention in Williston this 7th day of June 1959, That the Soil Conservation Service, designated as the Secretary's agent in this matter, be urged to place more emphasis upon land use practices designed to increase soil permeability and the storage potential of natural reservoirs and less emphasis on development of floodways and costly retention dams; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Soil Bank Service (Mr. Don Williams), Gov. John Davis, and to the members of the State's congressional delegation.

The Delaware Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the part Delaware played in the signing of the Declaration of Independence was interestingly related by Dr. John A. Munroe of the University of Delaware in the Wilmington Morning News, Wilmington, Del., on July 4, 1959.

I include the article here for the information of my colleagues:

THE DELAWARE STORY OF JULY 4 AND DELAWARE'S PART IN THE DECLARATION

(By John A. Munroe)

The Fourth of July has become the center of a number of myths—that is, of a number brought down from the past and not known to be true. In fact, a lot of the Fourth of July myths are known to be false.

The main myth about the Fourth of July is that on this day in 1776, the Americans declared their independence of Great Britain. Actually this event occurred on July 2, when Congress passed a resolution moved by Richard Henry Lee.

The words of it are in the Journals of the Continental Congress under the July 2, 1776, dateline: "*Resolved,* That the United Colonies are, and, of right, ought to be, Free and Independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British crown, and that all political connexion between them, and the state of Great Britain, is, and ought to be, totally dissolved."

The great debate on independence had occurred in Congress a day earlier—on July 1. The chief debaters were John Adams, for independence, and John Dickinson, against. Dickinson was no Tory. He was then the only Member of Congress with a commission in the Army. His argument was that this was not the time for a declaration. It might cause more bloodshed than was necessary, he thought; it might get in the way of peaceful negotiations.

After the debate on July 1, the Congressmen voted, one vote to a State. Several States opposed the independence resolution or did not cast a vote. Delaware was one. Since its two Delegates present, Thomas McKean and George Read, did not agree, Delaware could not vote. McKean, son of a Scotch-Irish immigrant, was decidedly anti-English and for immediate independence. Read, also an immigrant's son, was a close friend of Dickinson and of a more peaceful disposition than McKean.

There was a third Delaware Congressman who was absent on July 1. This was Caesar Rodney, Kent County landowner, Speaker of the General Assembly, commander of the Delaware Militia, public servant extraordinary.

McKean knew Rodney would also vote for independence. So, he sent a message to him, urging him to hurry to Philadelphia. And thereupon Caesar Rodney took a ride.

Caesar Rodney's ride is the subject of a whole set of myths. They find their expression in the statue in Rodney Square.

For one thing, it is sheer chance if the figure on the statue looks anything like Rodney looked because no contemporary portrait of him exists. As a bachelor, he had no wife and children to demand an oil painting to hang in the ancestral halls.

Besides, he was not very handsome and probably did not relish the thought of looking at himself. "He was the oddest looking man in the world," John Adams said, with "a head no bigger than an apple; yet there was wit, fire, and humour in his countenance."

His appearance was also marred by a cancer of the face. As he grew older he hid the ravages of the cancer behind a patch.

As to the horse—well, Rodney may have ridden a horse to Philadelphia. There is some evidence that he did, and also some evidence that he set out by carriage. Maybe he used a carriage part of the way and rode a horse the remaining distance. Dover to Philadelphia is a long ride by night in a thunderstorm—and we know there was a storm on the night of July 1.

The inscription on the statue has Rodney rising in Congress to vote on July 4. Probably the incident it described occurred on July 2, and Rodney's ride occurred on the night of July 1.

A romantic tale is current which has Rodney setting out from Lewes and involves a flirtation with Delaware's reigning belle, Mary Vining, and the loyalty of an old servant. I read it as a boy in "Once Upon a Time in Delaware," a book I love. So far as I know there is not the least truth in this tale. Someone—probably someone before Katharine Pyle—made up the story to garnish the truth.

Other Rodneys lived at Lewes, but not Caesar. He was a Kent County Rodney. He had been in Sussex—and probably in Lewes recently—at the head of some militia who had put down a Tory outbreak, and this was a reason he was not in Philadelphia at Congress. But he seems to have returned to his Kent farm before going to Philadelphia.

Nor did Rodney's ride decide the question of independence. The independence resolution had enough votes to pass anyway. But mere passage wasn't enough. Congress wanted a show of American unanimity in defying Britain. Other States had also voted against independence on July 1. But in one way or another they were all brought into line by July 2, so that the independence resolution was passed by the unanimous vote of those States present and voting. (One State delegation kept quiet and didn't vote on July 2.)

It was to bring Delaware into line with the other States that Rodney rode to Philadelphia "through thunder and rain" on the night of July 1. Besides the cancer, he also suffered from asthma, and however he rode we can sympathize with the patriotism that led an asthmatic, cancerous Delawarean to take a 75-mile ride on a wild July night.

The Liberty Bell did not ring out—or ring in or ring anywhere—on July 4. Not even on July 2.

Probably it did ring on July 8 when the Declaration of Independence was read aloud to a great crowd of people in the statehouse yard (the park behind Independence Hall). Nobody mentions this bell in particular, but but people did leave record that all the bells in the city rang out, even the chimes in old Christ Church—the only specific reference.

The Liberty Bell had been placed in Independence Hall in 1751. The building was then the capitol or statehouse of Pennsylvania, and the bell did proclaim liberty—the liberty of free-born Englishmen. It was not widely known as the Liberty Bell nor as a symbol of independence until the days of the abolition movement.

The signing of the Declaration of Independence by the Members of Congress probably did not occur on July 4, but later, in

August, after a fine parchment copy was prepared. Some Congressmen signed the Declaration who had not voted for independence; some who had so voted did not sign.

What did happen on July 4, 1776? On that day Congress adopted an explanation of its action 2 days earlier—its resolution that the former Colonies were now free and independent States. The explanation is called by us the Declaration of Independence.

This document, the Declaration of Independence, was written by Thomas Jefferson and adopted by Congress with a few minor changes. Claim that people other than Jefferson (Thomas Paine, for instance) wrote the Declaration seem to be absolute nonsense. Within a year or two the phrases of Jefferson's Declaration had so won the hearts of Americans that the day of its adoption became to them the Independence Day. And so be it.

The strangest fact in the history of July 4 is that the two Congressmen who were most important in the July 1776 decision for independence both died on the same day—and exactly a half century after the original Fourth of July. John Adams, who made the main speech, and Thomas Jefferson, who wrote the main document, both died on July 4, 1826.

Effort by State Department To Renovate Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article written by Mr. George W. Oakes, entitled "State Department's Efforts To Renovate Foreign Service Finds 55 of 81 Heads of Missions Career Officers," published in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star of June 28, 1959. I commend it to all my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT'S EFFORTS TO RENOVATE FOREIGN SERVICE FINDS 55 OF 81 HEADS OF MISSIONS CAREER OFFICERS

(By George W. Oakes)

Although reforms are constantly advocated for the State Department's Foreign Service, improvements that have taken place since World War II are substantial.

Today a capable career officer has probably a better chance than ever before to become an Ambassador.

Fifty-five of eighty-one heads of diplomatic missions abroad are now careerists.

The latest effort to improve the caliber of our Ambassadors is a campaign being led by Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who feels strongly that outsiders should be appointed only if they possess distinct and obvious qualifications for the particular post.

Senator FULBRIGHT says that unless the United States puts such a policy into effect at once the Russians "will be convinced that we are not really serious about our foreign policy, and they will regard us as amateurs in this most important business of foreign affairs." He points out that two world wars have occurred in this century because Germany did not correctly estimate U.S. intentions.

Therefore it is essential that our ambassadors abroad not give a misleading impression through their own inability to comprehend and carry out our foreign policy. In Senator FULBRIGHT'S view, ambassadors who lack adequate knowledge of the problems with which they are dealing and so cannot gain respect abroad not only encourage Soviet miscalculation but also do tremendous damage to U.S. prestige in the country to which they are accredited.

The Foreign Service Officer Corps of the State Department, from whom career ambassadors are selected, now numbers about 3,500, of whom more than 300 are women.

In the opinion of State Department officials, approximately 80 percent of our ambassadors should be drawn from career officers. Neither the State Department nor Senator FULBRIGHT would wish to exclude qualified outsiders from such posts, because both recognize the danger of the Service becoming too ingrown if all ambassadors were career officers. In addition, such extremely successful noncareer Ambassadors as David Bruce in Germany and Ellsworth Bunker in India have a valuable stimulating effect on the Service.

Senator COOPER, recently an Ambassador in India, believes that his effectiveness was enhanced because his political background enabled him to speak more frankly to the political heads of the government to which he was accredited. Some observers would like the State Department to draw more heavily on the universities for outside ambassadorial talent.

PRIVATE INCOME PROBLEM

Although the financial expense of representing the United States abroad is often cited as a reason for appointing noncareerists, there are at most only half a dozen posts today that require a private income to supplement the Ambassador's salary and allowances. These are London, Paris, Rome, Madrid, Bonn, and Rio. Some career Ambassadors believe that even Rome, or more likely Bonn, could be adequately handled without private means.

However, much depends on the financial housekeeping ability and requirements of the particular individual or family as well as the kind of a job he sets out to do.

In New Delhi, for example, Former Ambassador CHESTER BOWLES returned some of his official expense allowance of $5,000 to the Federal Treasury. On the other hand, one of his noncareer successors had to draw on his own financial resources.

Mr. BOWLES, who is now a Representative from Connecticut, has pointed out that "if the American Ambassador to France were to live within his official budget ($27,500 annual salary plus $20,000 tax-free expense allowance) he would have to close up the 50-room Embassy residence, move into a smaller house and cut his entertainment in half (in 1956 he entertained 7,000 guests at 40 receptions and 3,000 more at 200 luncheons and dinners, plus 8,800 American visitors on July 4). In addition, he would have to refuse invitations from many important diplomats or accept their invitations and not reciprocate and invite visiting Congressmen to go with him 'Dutch treat' to restaurants on the Left Bank."

The problem of making ends meet bothers most foreign service officers, especially the younger ones in the lower grades who have little, if any, expense allowances. In contrast to conditions before World War II, most younger men in the service today are married and have families so they are forced to entertain (often on $100 a year expense allowance) whereas the prewar batchelor wasn't expected to do so.

State Department officials consider that the entertainment allowance of all officers below the No. 2 position in our Embassies is too low. For example, the chief political officer in a major Embassy is likely to have only $500 a year for this purpose. Such an officer must entertain extensively to maintain valuable contacts—an essential part of his job.

SOME LEAVE SERVICE

Although few resign for lack of adequate expense allowances, some of the most competent foreign service officers get out when they are faced with the financial burden of educating their children, especially during the costly college years. In order to meet this problem, the Foreign Service has in recent years established various benefits. For example, if an officer is stationed at a remote post like Khartoum in the Sudan, where his children cannot receive a suitable education through high school, the Government will pay the entire tuition plus transportation charge of sending the child to the nearest adequate school.

It is estimated that about 1 percent of the service, including some of the best men, resign voluntarily—to some extent for financial reasons, but also because many, especially those in their first few years, discover that they or their wives do not like the nomadic and somewhat disciplined life. Some specialists in fields like labor, agriculture, etc., who had been serving in Washington and were forced to enter the service under the Wriston program, integrating all departmental officers into the Foreign Service, find that they are not suited to the more varied duties required overseas and often join academic or research institutions or foundations. Some of the ablest career officers quit because of frustration, a common complaint among Government officials.

In order to weed out the least capable members of the service, the Department is about to put into effect a new policy. Until now, the Foreign Service has not been up to full strength because of its expanding responsibilities since the war and hence had to retain many who have not achieved the desired standards. By practicing up or out, the Department will soon be able to promote more rapidly its more competent officers and thus improve the morale of the service. In general, veteran careerists believe the quality of our ambassadors today is higher than it was a generation ago, when promotion often depended more on social connections and private wealth than ability.

STILL NEED GOOD MAN

There is some question in the minds of top State Department officials who have spent all their working years in the Foreign Service whether the quality of those entering the Service from the universities is higher than it was a generation ago and whether it's harder to get into now. Our Foreign Service is still not attracting as many of the top-flight college graduates as are wanted—the type who before World War II entered the British Foreign Office. But more of such valuable talent is applying to the State Department today than a few years ago.

In the last fiscal year the department appointed 104 new officers. Out of 5,194 who took the written examination in December, 1956, only 191 passed both it and the oral examination. In contrast with 30 years ago when much specific knowledge on varied subjects was required, today's examinations are more general. The best college preparation for the Foreign Service is a liberal arts education.

The State Department has been making a vigorous effort in recent years, by sending experienced foreign service officers to college campuses throughout the country, to recruit applicants on a broad basis so that the incoming officers will be as representative as possible of all segments of the Nation. Officials have found that the increasing number

of college courses in foreign affairs as well as compulsory military service have tended, as have books like "The Ugly American," to encourage young men with a sense of public service to consider a career in the State Department.

Roads, Money, and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting article on the Federal highway program which appeared in the Boston Daily Globe on July 1, 1959:

ROADS, MONEY, AND POLITICS

The opening of the new fiscal year in Washington finds the President and Congress still profoundly at odds over the huge 17-year Federal highway program, which was launched just 3 years ago. The problem is money, which is running short, and where to find it.

If the construction rate on this continent-wide system of interstate roads to meet the Nation's growing traffic problems and strengthen defense communications is to be maintained, there must be either new taxes or possible recourse to Treasury borrowing. For the Highway Trust Fund, set up under the original law to finance the Federal Government's 90 percent contribution to these road costs, is sorely depleted. It no longer keeps pace with the program.

The issue dividing the administration and the Congress assumes sharp immediacy for a very simple reason. In July and August, contracts have to be signed for the parts of the 41,000-mile interstate system scheduled for construction during 1960–61. This becomes impossible without prior assurance of the availability of Federal allotments to the various States for that period. Until the President and Congress reach agreement on the method of raising the money, no such allotments are possible. There are not sufficient funds.

This impasse has not arisen suddenly. Thrice within the past 2 months the President has urged Congress to accept his own solution, which is to raise the Federal gas tax from 3 cents to 4½ cents. The White House has even gone to the length of publishing statistics from the States, showing what the monetary loss would be for each of them were the Federal highway program to bog down for lack of money.

The President has also reminded Congress that the pay-as-you-go plan, written into the original law for these roads, was accepted by both Houses. The Highway Trust Fund is financed by receipts from Federal gas, oil, and tire taxes. That method of financing was suspended during the recession, a year ago, and the scope of construction was expanded to meet unemployment problems. The President insists upon a return to the original plan for the new fiscal year.

Though Mr. Eisenhower is finding strong support for his position among highway officials in the States, the Congress, attentive to the political implications of adding another 1½ cents to the Federal gas tax at a time when an election year looms and public sensitiveness to new taxation is only too obvious, refuses to agree with the administration plans for replenishing the trust fund.

"There will be no increase in the Federal gas tax," declares Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of the House, where revenue bills must originate. Given the power exercised by Speaker RAYBURN, and the strong Democratic majority behind him, it is fairly obvious that the hurdles blocking the President's plan are close to insurmountable.

What the majority party in Congress proposes, briefly, is that the temporary suspension of the pay-as-you-go policy last year, to counter recession, be extended over the new fiscal year also; and that shortages presently afflicting the Highway Trust Fund shall be met out of the general fund during the period. In the event that there is no budgetary surplus, this would mean deficit financing.

Whatever the political realities involved in this dispute, and they are admittedly genuine, the counsel of sound policy is clear enough. The citizenry wants and needs these roads. National defense requires them. The Congress found a pay-as-you-go policy completely acceptable for 1956 and 1957. If it was sound then, why isn't it now?

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Why I Am Casting My First Vote for the GOP in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the South Dakota young Republicans recently conducted their 1959 essay contest on the subject "Why I Am Casting My First Vote for the GOP in 1960." David Olsen, of Rapid City, S. Dak., was judged the winner and received an all-expense paid trip to the National Young Republican Convention in Denver on June 17. Because he so ably outlines the goals of the Republican Party, I ask unanimous consent that his essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I AM CASTING MY FIRST VOTE FOR THE GOP IN 1960

Decision 1960 will be good for our people if we cast our vote Republican. In the Republican Party I see the best possibility for conserving the formula of greatness for our Nation. What then is the formula of greatness and its test for the success of any political system?

The true conservative believes in the conservation of the system under which the individual may grow and prosper, and where government may answer the legitimate needs of the people through progressive action. The essence of progress is improvement, not mere change. Change without improvement inevitably weakens the system under which greatness of our people has evolved. Unfortunately, many political charlatans prescribe our salvation irresponsibly in the name of political expediency without regard to the formula of greatness.

The standard to be applied to any program was established by the philosopher of Springfield on the threshold of greatness in 1854: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves."

The formula and its standard must be consistently employed by our party to insure real progress and to conserve our system. It must be applied with confidence in the people and respect for their ability to make proper decision at the polls. When the Republican Party has met this challenge, it has won. When it has failed and has used the standard of Lincoln as an excuse to prevent change, it has lost.

As practitioners of government Republicans understand the formula of greatness. They are in stride with the people. I'm voting Republican in 1960.

America's Role To Maintain World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 18, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address which I made at the 72d annual convention of Brith Abraham, national fraternal order, on June 30, 1959, at the Concord Hotel, Kiamesha Lake, N.Y. The address follows:

AMERICA'S ROLE TO MAINTAIN WORLD PEACE

Gratefully, I accept the American Public Service Award of Brith Abraham. I say gratefully because we understand each other. The words I use will have the same meaning to you as they have to me. I need have no fear that here my words will be twisted and tortured to serve a purpose alien to my own mind and soul. Thus, it is an honor and a happy moment for me. We have had good fun, good companionship, good food, and consequently, it would be a very simple matter to turn away from the issues—the terrible issues—of war and peace that lie before us. But face them we must, with the knowledge that no peace can be built on a foundation of golf balls. We, all of us, wish we had the answers that we could place neatly on a platter and hand around like souvenirs. But I do know where the answers do not lie. They do not lie in ambition, political intrigue, greed, deprivation, of civil liberties and civil rights. The answers do not lie in a world split into fragments of "haves" and "have nots." The answers do not lie with the timid, the self-hunters, and the smug. Perhaps the answer does lie in the sum-up of freedom. I mean to include in such a word greater freedom in international trade; greater freedom of immigration and emigration of people; greater freedom in travel; greater economic freedom in the world of finance; greater freedoms in individual liberties. These are positive and possible goals. All of these, and more, are contained in Franklin Roosevelt's "freedom from fear." This I believe to be the most important, the most significant role the United States can play in maintaining peace. There have been times within the last few years when the United States has seemed to be caught up in a paralysis of fear. The administration bespeaks its fear of and distrust in our expanding economy within our land, and the symbol of its fear has been the budget. We have been afraid to face the race issue squarely; we have been afraid to face our own needs in housing and in education; we have been afraid to face our needs for an ade-

quate defense; we have yielded again and again to expediency in international relations. And all these fears add up to a public image here and abroad of a country, though the richest in the world, both in a material and a spiritual sense, whose muscles have grown flabby and whose tissues have shrunk.

I have been laboring incessantly to liberalize our immigration laws with its abominable taint of national origins, that races from northern and Western Europe should be favored over races from southern and Eastern Europe. In my book, one race is as good as another, one man is inherently as good as another. Why should Italians, Poles, Hungarians, Roumanians, Greeks be punished with low immigration quotas, whereas the British, Irish, and German are favored with high quotas. And the irony of it all is that Britain and Ireland get most of all permissible quota numbers and do not use them. Those numbers go to waste.

But why do we fear the Latins and Slavs and welcome the Nordics? They all make good citizenry. In debates on immigration one often hears the hollow boastings of one's forebears from England or Ireland. I say, "He who serves his country needs no forebears."

In the conventions of the Daughters of the American Revolution, the ladies prate of their nobler blood. I say, "Take your nobler blood to the marketplace and see what it will buy." Indeed those who seek to make their place in the sun had better not bask too much in the shade of the family tree. I am not so much interested whether you were born in America. I only ask, "Was America born in you, America with its deals of the freedom and dignity of man?"

And see how we cringe and fear when some of our citizens refuse to conform. Let one speak out and utter the unorthodox and he is immediately castigated and labeled a pariah. Instead of welcoming differences, we demand conformity. We fail to heed that only on the anvil of debate and discussion can the truth be forged. Nature has no more made flowers in the garden alike than she has molded the minds of men alike. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes said, "The theory of our Constittuion * * * is an experiment, as all life is an experiment. * * * While that experiment is part of our system, I think we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe and believe to be fraught with death."

There are many colors in the spectrum. Thus men can be no more forced to think and speak alike than you can compel all colors to become black or white or beige.

And, unfortunately, there is developing in this country a mob psychology of fear against anyone who avails himself of what the Constitution guarantees to him, freedom from enforced self-incrimination by pleading the fifth amendment.

It is these types of fear which barricade the road of progress; that build up walls that keep out the light.

Then there is the timidity in the White House in facing up to responsibilities anent civil rights. I can assure you that kind words and benign sentiments will never cause the Southland to accord the Negro his due.

Before my committee appeared many witnesses actually testifying to the evil my civil rights bill would create. Not a single attorney general and Governor of a Southern State, not a single officeholder of any Southern State, not a single southern Congressman or Senator who appeared was willing to admit that the Brown desegregation decision of the Supreme Court was the interpreted law of the land. Each one claimed the 14th amendment guaranteeing equal rights was a nullity and need not be obeyed. Coupled with such intransigence, we have had the so-called southern manifesto signed (with a few exceptions) by every Member of both Houses of Congress from the Southland, in effect declaring resistance to integration and tearing into tatters the Constitution's 14th amendment. State after State in the Bible Belt passed laws requiring closing all public schools rather than integrate them. Clinton and Little Rock still stick in the Nation's eye like cinders. The South remains unregenerate. Southern gentlemen hold their traditional way of life sacred and will not change. They thumb their noses at the Constitution.

Assuredly the Constitution cannot mean one thing in the North and something else in the South. Citizens at all points of the compass must respect that document, otherwise we have chaos.

The White House must, in no uncertain terms, tell our southern friends that civil rights are color blind.

Despite this brooding darkness of fear at the White House, I, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, have already had approved by my subcommittee a strong civil rights bill with teeth in it. I expect the full Judiciary Committee to approve the Celler civil rights bill of 1959 on July 9 and have it up for debate in the House soon thereafter.

If we seek stability and the status quo, then we have surrendered to delusion though we have, since 1949, spent $22 billion, in joint military effort. Going back still further, since July 1940, including the new Mutual Security Act which has passed the House, we have spent $49 billion through World War II, and $75 billion since then in one form of foreign aid or another, and yet we cannot rest secure. While this foreign aid is one channel toward peace, I fear most strongly that it is by no means the only one. We have ignored to our own danger and to that of the countries allied with us the example we could have set before the world of a thriving, self-confident democracy which would have stilled a lot of rattling sabers. We have supported foreign governments on the fallacious theory of assuring their stability rather than recognizing the natural desire for change in reform that burns alive in every thinking man.

In the new Mutual Security Act which passed the House on June 18, a new opening sentence has been added, a sentence which I believe to be of the greatest significance:

"(a) It is the sense of Congress that peace in the world increasingly depends on wider recognition, both in principle and practice, of the dignity and interdependence of man, and that the survival of free institutions in the United States can best be assured in a worldwide atmosphere of expanded freedom."

It is not enough, I have said throughout the years, merely to be against. We are against communism, yes, with the very best of reasons, but what are we for? And, so, we in the United States in a major bill designed to maintain the peace have said what we are for. Now let's prove it through our own actions at home as well as abroad to insure the greater freedoms of people as individuals. Let no one suppose that our policies on immigration, on civil rights, on civil liberties, on free trade, on adequate housing, on employment opportunities, on education, are not potent weapons in a war, cold or hot; or in a peace, just and honorable. We have seen U.S. policy geared to military aid in a manner that has provoked animosities. I believe that the committeee report which I have cited above of the Foreign Affairs Committee has, with great sensitivity, put its fingers on some of the wrong turnings we have taken:

"On occasion, our military assistance has been granted for political reasons with unfortunate results. These results have occurred when we have tied our prestige and influence to the dubious tenure of a dictatorship subsequently overthrown, helped to burden an unstable new government with an excessive military load, adding to internal economic strains, and helped to inflate the political power of a local military group, handicapping the country's initial efforts toward democracy. It has sometimes diverted internal efforts away from tasks which the committee believes to be essential, such as growing rice, eradication of malaria, building schools, clinics, and roads."

As a result, we have seen mischief grow not only in the Latin American countries; not only between countries like India and Pakistan, but in an area of tremendous strategic value, viz., the Middle East. Relations between the Arab nations and Israel have been exacerbated by the emphasis on military aid to the Arab nations. The results we have seen for ourselves of the internal dissension between the Arab countries We have neither made friends, nor gained respect of the countries we sought to appease. I do not mean by that that the United States has not been a friend of the little democracy of Israel. It has. It has given generously to Israel. It has stood for awhile firm on freedom of passage through the Suez Canal, though we cannot say with certainty that that firmness will continue.

In March of 1957 the President reassured President David Ben-Gurion that: "Israel will have no cause for regret having thus conformed to the strong sentiment of the world community." These words were said after Israel withdrew from Sinai. How will it be now when the United Arab Republic has resumed seizure of Israeli cargo? The prestige and the authority of the United Nations, as well as the United States, are now at stake. And as one commentator has put it, "Where does a nation go if the United Nations is powerless to defend it from attack?"

The Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjold, is now at Cairo trying to persuade that megalomaniac Nasser to allow that Danish vessel to proceed through the Suez with its Israeli cargo. I hope he will succeed. I doubt that he will. Israel is prepared to send through an Israeli ship under the Israeli flag.

I'm convinced that Israel will be compelled to bring the matter before the Security Council. Our State Department does not wish the matter to boil over into the Council. It still thinks it can diplomatically resolve the difficulties. I doubt that—you can no more make Nasser see reason than you can make hair grow on my bald pate. You can no more make Nasser abide by the previous ruling of the Council that the Suez must remain free to the traffic of all nations and free of political controversy than you can make a tiger eat grass or a bull eat meat.

Nasser is brash enough to claim that Israel is still at war with Egypt and he can seize Israeli property as a prize of war. Of course, two can play that game. Israel can and will seize Egyptian ships if Nasser persists in his brigandage and piracy, and in so doing, world public opinion would applaud Israel.

Again, I thank you for the privilege of being with you and for this opportunity to speak my mind and heart.

Gen. Walter Washington Williams, Lone Survivor of the War Between the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following telegram sent pursuant to a resolution adopted by the Georgia State Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars meeting in Atlanta recently to the lone survivor of the War Between the States, Gen. Walter Washington Williams, of Houston, Tex.

JUNE 29, 1959.

Gen. WALTER WASHINGTON WILLIAMS,
United Confederate Veterans,
Houston, Tex.:

In compliance with unanimous action by resolution of the Georgia Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in 17th annual convention assembled in Atlanta, Ga., June 28, 1959, it is an honor and a privilege to send you expressions of our fraternal admiration and comradeship. Many of our members are grandsons and great-grandsons of those who wore the gray and some who wore the blue.

CHARLES A. MORAN,
Americanism and Loyalty Chairman.

American Legion To Withdraw Support of 1960 Olympic Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 10, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by Preston J. Moore, national commander of the American Legion, on their position regarding the recent action of the International Olympic Committee:

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 17, 1959.—"The apparently Communist dominated Membership Committee of the 1960 International Olympic Games, now meeting in Geneva, has made suckers out of the U.S. group on that committee, headed by Avery Brundage," said National Commander Preston J. Moore here today.

"The Reds for the third time within a week have accomplished just what they wanted in dealing with the National China Olympic group. This time Brundage has indicated that not only has National China been rejected, because they quite properly insist on using the word 'China' for group identification, but that the admission committee is now entertaining the North Korean team, as possible participants in the 1960 games," the commander continued. Here is conclusive proof.

"The Korean Ambassador to the United States charged today that the International Olympic Committee plans a secret meeting with representatives of the North Koreans in Hong Kong to arrange their participation in the winter Olympics here next year.

Ambassador You Chan Yang said his government heard rumors of the proposed Hong Kong meeting from refugees and recently sent Yong Shik Kim, its Minister to France, to Switzerland to check with IOC President Avery Brundage of Chicago. He said Brundage told Minister Kim he "intended to meet with North Koreans in Hong Kong and our protests were useless."

Yang said he had written Brundage this would be "a slap in the face to the 16 nations" which fought for the U.N. in Korea and would constitute "de facto recognition" of the Pyongyand regime.

Commander Moore made the stand on this issue of the American Legion quite clear.

"Unless the Chinese Nationalist Olympic team is admitted to participation it will be necessary for me to request the 17,200 American Legion posts to cease cooperation and financial support for this series of games. The American Legion was proud to cooperate with Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur and solicit its 2,756,000 members to help in every way, with money, and individual aid, to send our Olympic team into action. This we cannot do, if by doing so we expose U.S. amateur athletes to Russian and Red satellite subsidized performance, with no hope of equal competition," said Commander Moore, adding, "This is no new move by the commies. Why and how Brundage and his group continue to ignore the storm signs is beyond me. In January 1959, in Lima, Peru, during the amateur international basketball tournament the Reds had a taste of blood, they apparently haven't forgotten, and we have. They beat a pick-up U.S. Air Force team, that had been sent down to Lima, as the collegiate period prevented a regular college group from participating. And here is what completely baffles me about the stand Brundage is making now. After winning over the U.S. Air Force team the Russians refused to play the National China basketball team and thus lost the series by default. No, a man in Avery Brundage's position, should be alert enough to the wiles of the commies, to meet such a threat in the Olympic games, head-on, without aiding and abetting such obviously a Russian ruse.

"Brundage, and perhaps his team, should be pulled out of the game. This is standard procedure in any sport. During the past week they have dropped the ball three times:

"First, by permitting National China's Olympic team to be rejected because they used the word "China" to identify their group.

"Second, by permitting a second rejection after the National Chinese resubmitted 'The Republic of China Olympic Committee,' as their games name symbol. This is itself a terrific concession as 'Nationalist China' is accepted by the United Nations.

"Third, by standing aside while the membership committee makes solicitious overtures to the Red Chinese government, for obviously subsidized athletes from North Korea to participate in the 1960 Olympic games.

"It is because of these reasons I regret that it will be necessary for the American Legion to withdraw all support and active participation in raising funds for the 1960 International Olympic Games."

Here's Your Report, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that in our legislative processes, it is important that we keep "tuned in" to the thinking of the public on issues confronting the country.

We all appreciate that it is not possible, with the heavy congressional schedule, to keep as close to the grassroots as would be desirable under conditions more ideal.

Nevertheless, it is most helpful, from time to time, to review polls of public opinion that reflect a consensus of what the American citizen is thinking about the issues confronting the Nation and about his future.

Recently the magazine This Week conducted a poll of its 45,000 readers from all over the United States. The poll was designed to encourage individuals to select national goals for the next 10 years. The results of such a broad cross section of American thinking, I believe, merits the attention of Congress.

The July 5 edition of This Week contained an article entitled "Here's Your Report, Mr. President."

According to the article, the idea behind the poll was to obtain an idea of what the American public is thinking about long-range goals—as suggested in the President's state of the Union message.

At this time I would like to quote briefly the 10 major goals selected by Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public.

They are as follows:

1. Control inflation.
2. Raise human standards.
3. Reduce crime and labor racketeering.
4. Improve international relations.
5. Reduce taxes.
6. Provide stronger national defense.
7. Improve interfaith and interracial relations.
8. Provide college education for all gifted students.
9. Stabilize population.
10. Conserve our natural resources.

In addition, the article contained reflections of grassroots thinking on a variety of these and other aspects of our way of life.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERE'S YOUR REPORT, MR. PRESIDENT

Reduce crime and labor racketeering: "Gangsterism, corruption—our citizens know these evils exist but pretend all is well and do nothing." (S. M., Atherton, Calif.)

Improve international relations: "We need a real effort to understand other nations which do not agree with us. We need greater faith in God—and in humanity." (Rev. F. D. B., Green Lake, Wis.)

Reduce taxes: "I am bothered by * * * the attitude of spend, spend, spend, without thinking of who has to pay for the spending." (A. R., Sharp Park, Calif.)

What troubles America: Here are some typical comments on "the thing that bothers me most about America today" in the opinion of This Week readers.

"A lowering of moral and ethical standards in business, labor, and social life." (Mr. and Mrs. H. P. W., San Jose, Calif.)

"* * * The preference for the inferior: ignorance over knowledge, superstition over fact, bigotry over fairness." (V. M. W., Houston, Tex.)

"* * * Lack of national discipline and moral responsibility." (L. S. LaF., Hollywood, Calif.)

"* * * Lack of national purpose." (R. S., Rapid City, S. Dak.)

"• • • How much we have progressed in science and how little we have progressed in dealing with each other." (Miss W. S. B. Warrensburg, Mo.)

Of all the general comments, the one that cropped up most often expressed irritation at the philosophy of "something for nothing" Many readers used this phrase.) H. B., of Chicago, puts it this way. "Too many people want the good life without exerting the effort to earn it."

One of the shortest comments is also one of our favorites: Under "the change which would do most for a better America," this reader wrote, "Less luxury, more work." It was signed simply, "Old lady."

Scenic Wonders of the State of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a most impressive communication about the scenic marvels of the State of Oregon was published in the Oregon Daily Statesman, of Salem, on July 3, 1959. The author of this letter is Mr. Howard D. McGeorge, of New Jersey, who has been visiting his son's family in Oregon. Mr. McGeorge compares Oregon in grandeur and majesty to Switzerland with its celebrated Alps. Yet, Mr. McGeorge actually claims that, to compare Oregon with Switzerland, is a greater compliment to Switzerland than to Oregon.

In this centennial year of Oregon statehood, I ask unanimous consent to have the communication on the editorial page of the Oregon Daily Statesman by Mr. Howard D. McGeorge printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EASTERNER TERMS OREGON "SWITZERLAND OF AMERICA"

To the EDITOR:

For the past month I have been visiting my son's family here and have been given an opportunity to see something of Oregon. Perhaps you would be interested in hearing some of my impressions of your State.

Two facts concerning it have particularly impressed me: (1) That nature has been extraordinarily—to me unsuspectedly—lavish in its gifts to Oregon. (2) That the people of Oregon have done so little to exploit these gifts.

My own home is in the east—the "far east" I might say, for I live in New Jersey. New Jersey has no apologies to make in the way of beauty; but for grandeur our people have to go elsewhere. Switzerland has been their first choice. Switzerland's grandeur—its Mount Blanc, over 15,000 feet high; the Jungfrau and Matterhorn only slightly less; Switzerland's lovely lakes and its lovely valleys cannot be belittled. We think it the ultimate in praise to say of any place that it is "the Switzerland" of its region. This summer hundreds of thousands of Americans will flock to Europe and few, whatever their limitations of time or money, will omit Switzerland from their itinerary.

I hope I will not be thought to exaggerate when I say I think that to call Oregon the Switzerland of America would be a greater compliment to Switzerland than to Oregon. There is little that Switzerland has that cannot be found in Oregon, and Oregon has much, certainly, that cannot be found in Switzerland.

Oregon, to be sure, could contain six Switzerlands and still have space to spare, though this in itself, from the standpoint of attractiveness, is, of course, no special advantage. But there are other respects in which Oregon greatly surpasses Switzerland.

Its mountains, almost as high as Switzerland's tallest, are infinitely more beautiful. Of all the world's mountain's only Fujiyama can be classed with Mount Hood or Mount Jefferson for sheer beauty, and there are many others in or near this State no less impressive. None of Switzerlad's rise into the blue sky with such breathtaking loveliness of form and color.

And Oregon's forests. Where in Europe can such trees be found—and in such numbers? Where else in the civilized world is there such a procession of mountain ranges—of range after range, forest clad, rising almost perpendicularly from lovely valleys? Where else, plunging down between walls of these giant trees, is there another Koosah Falls? Where is the fertility of soil to nourish such trees, to produce flowers of such unparalleled size and variety? Where will you see fields of lava, recalling so vividly the pyrotechnics nature once lit up the heavens with?

I ask myself, how comes it that Oregon has failed to acquaint the rest of their countrymen and the world with the marvels of their State—with all these wonders and such others as the river that bursts from the side of a mountain as the goddess Minerva is said to have done, full grown, from the head of Jupiter?

Disregarding the pleasure and inspiration of which their countrymen would be the beneficiaries, do your people not realize the wealth that would pour into Oregon if its treasures were better known—the multitude of tourists who would come here to enjoy their loveliness, many to stay? Where, Mr. Editor, is Oregon's Chamber of Commerce, to let these extraordinary attractions go unsung?

HOWARD D. MCGEORGE.

Pacific Coast Tuna Industry in Serious Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, one of the country's most colorful maritime enterprises, the Pacific coast tuna fleet, is being put out of business because of the mounting importation of frozen tuna from Japan. In fact, Japan is in a position to completely flood our market. This is a result that no one wants to see occur. The canners who buy their tuna from the Japanese fishing fleet are sensible enough to realize that if our own tuna fleet goes out of existence they will be at the mercy of the Japanese fishing fleet. I know that they do not want to see that happen. Efforts are going forward now to find ways and means to keep this important and useful industry in California alive. The situation is described in some detail in an article in the Wall Street Journal of July 7, 1959, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 7, 1959]

MOUNTING IMPORTS FROM JAPAN, MINIMUM PAY GUARANTEES KEEP U.S. TUNA FLEET IN PORT

(By Ronald J. Ostrow)

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.—One of the country's more colorful maritime enterprises—the tuna clipper fleet—is being buffeted by financial storms.

Because of mounting imports of frozen tuna from Japan, prices canners offer for the domestic catch fall well below the wage guarantees demanded by unions that man the U.S. ships.

As a result, San Diego's tuna clippers are dwindling. The vessels currently number 125, down from 170 in 1955 and 214 ships in 1952, according to the American Tunaboat Association, which has headquarters at No. 1 Tuna Lane of the waterfront here. The vessels are also known as bait boats because they use the hook-and-line method of fishing.

As far as the rest of the country is concerned, the plight of the clippers has only limited importance. In fact, the price of a can of tuna is nearly 22 percent lower than the price 10 years ago, thanks largely to the flow of fish from foreign ports. But passing of the clipper in this harbor city is a small waterfront tragedy involving what was once a romantic and thriving industry.

Boats are transferring registry to Peruvian and Puerto Rican ports, where they are able to hire cheaper labor to serve as crews. Other boats are selling out to foreign ownership. Still others are equipping themselves for a different type of fishing and few clippers are being built to replace those tuna boats that go down at sea.

Berths available aboard the tuna craft—the industry term for the fleet's total employment at a given date—have fallen steadily from a record of 2,730 in 1952 to 1,880 last year and an estimated 1,550 today, according to the Tunaboat Association. The tunaboats expect to receive between $18 million to $19 million for their catch this year, compared with a record $39.2 million in 1954.

North of here, at Terminal Island, which is close to Los Angeles, the purse seiner fleet also is feeling the pinch.

Purse seiners generally are smaller than the clippers. They use nets to snare schools of tuna, rather than lure the fish with live bait and catching them with unbarbed hook and line, the method of the clipper.

The seiners in the last year have had record catches. But the absence of profit in tuna fishing has kept the purse seiners tied to their Terminal Island berths for more than 7 weeks now.

RED INK OPERATION

Tuna clippers still trying to make a go of it here are falling ever more deeper into the red. "You can safely say that 20 percent of the fleet is operating entirely at the sufferance of their creditors," says Harold F. Cary, general manager of the American Tunaboat Association. There hasn't been a departure in the 125-craft fleet since mid-May.

The tuna industry itself is split as to the basic cause of the clipper demise. Boat owners and the union representing crews that sail the ships and do the fishing con-

tend Japanese imports that force the price down are the chief ill. Cure them through a dose of formal or informal controls, and the industry will thrive again, according to their argument. Tuna canners who buy the boats' product, however, disagree; they assert the tunaboats' troubles are due largely to the fixed wage guarantee demanded by the unions that man the craft.

Figures kept by Uncle Sam show that imports of fresh and frozen tuna, nearly 90 percent of them from Japanese boats, soared to a record 234.7 million pounds last year. This was more than 20 times 1949 imports of 9.9 million pounds. In contrast, the tuna catch by domestic-flag vessels fell to 339.2 million pounds from the record 1950 catch of 391 million pounds. So far this year, imports of the fish are running about double those for 1958, says the American Tunaboat Association.

Five years ago, a ton of yellowfin—the higher priced of the two most common varieties of tuna—brought up to $350 when the clippers unloaded their catch by San Diego. But then the price-depressing inroads of Japanese competition began to be felt. By this time last year, the domestic price had sunk to around $270 a ton.

"In September 1958, the Japanese price f.o.b. Tokyo was $276 a ton; ours was $275," recalls Mr. Cary. This month, the Japanese price has hovered around $220 a ton, while the domestic price has approximated $240 a ton.

A freight and handling charge of about $70 a ton must be added to the Japanese figures for U.S. delivery. Because American-caught tuna carry with them no such freight costs, the Japanese fish are actually selling for more per ton. But both canners and the American Tunaboat Association explain that the Japanese tuna usually is gilled and gutted before delivery, yielding cannery customers 12 to 15 percent more tuna per ton than the American fish. In addition, the Japanese tuna arrives graded according to size, a treatment the domestic catch doesn't receive.

Gilbert Van Camp, Jr., president of Van Camp Sea Food Co., a major canner based in Long Beach, maintains elimination of guarantees demanded by unions that sail the tuna craft would afford the tunaboats a new financial lease on life. "Admittedly, it's pretty tough for the domestic tuna fleet to compete with imports, but they'd have a better chance of survival if they could get their crews to go along without the guarantees," he says.

The two AFL–CIO unions that man the vessels here, the Cannery Workers and Fishermen's Union and the International Association of Machinists' Tuna Clipper Engineers, in September 1957, demanded and received from reluctant boat owners minimum wage-base guarantees.

PAY BASED ON VOYAGE'S OUTCOME

The fishermen's pay is based on the financial outcome of a voyage; they get a specified share of the boat's revenue after deduction of certain trip expenses.

The guarantees—$270 per ton of yellowfin sold and $230 per ton of skipjack, a smaller tuna which sells for about $40 a ton under yellowfin prices—create a minimum price for the seller at fish auctions sales, critics say. If the price the boat receives for its load falls below the guarantee levels, the boat owner is expected to make up the difference out of his own pocket to determine the crews' share of the revenue. If the price tops the minimum level, then the terms of the contract apply, which currently call for the crew to receive 48.13 percent of the revenue, less trip expenses allowed by the contract.

"By simple mathematics, we figure that the guarantees are necessary to give us a decent yearly wage, around $6,000," says Lester Balinger, secretary-treasurer of the Cannery Workers and Fishermen's Union. He emphasizes that the calculation "is based on at least 290 days of fishing a year, which we won't come anywhere near this year."

With the current pre-ton price of $240 for yellowfin falling well below the $270 a ton guarantee, and faced with mounting repair and maintenance bills, the tuna clippers are tying up at the docks here, rather than go to sea for what they believe would be a sure loss.

Address by Dr. Wernher von Braun Before the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Wernher von Braun, Army Ballistic Missile Agency, U.S. Army Ordnance Missile Command, Redstone Arsenal, Ala., on May 27, 1959, gave a very important and significant address to the members of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass. In his address, Dr. von Braun said, among other things:

We are confronted by an aggressive competitor whose ultimate objective requires that he exploit his advances to counter and defeat our progress, not only in science, but in every phase of our social order. Those of us who are engaged in missile and space programs feel this challenge keenly.

Dr. von Braun also said:

It would be utterly fallacious to assume that catching the Russians in the race for space will rid us of Ivan's shadow. The Soviet challenge is political, ideological, cultural, economic and educational—it is as broad as human society and social organization. For Communism aims at world domination and nothing short of that.

Dr. von Braun further said:

I believe we must awake America to the danger and then, as a united country, get to work.

He then referred to his own experiences under a dictatorship, when Dr. von Braun said:

Having lived under a dictatorship equally as cruel, equally as ambitious as is the Communist state, I know the price of lost freedom. I don't want my children or yours to pay it because we failed to recognize the real threat in all its proportions.

In my extension of remarks I include the excellent and dynamic address, to which Americans should pay heed, made by Dr. von Braun on May 27, 1959.

ADDRESS BY DR. WERNHER VON BRAUN, ARMY BALLISTIC MISSILE AGENCY, U.S. ARMY ORDNANCE MISSILE COMMAND, REDSTONE ARSENAL, ALA., GREATER BOSTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, BOSTON, MASS., MAY 27, 1959

Boston has been called the "Hub of the Universe." It would therefore be logical, it would seem to me, that the citizens of this capital of the solar system should have more than a passing interest in the activity that has been taking place in those regions during the past 2 years. The officials and citizens of this Solar Capital must know what is going on in the wards and precincts if they justify their title as the "Hub," and in this case the wards and precincts are in outer space.

We have another center of space activity in the South that would like to share with you this honor. It is the headquarters of the Army Ordnance Missile Command at Huntsville, Ala., or better known in those parts as "Rocket City, U.S.A." There the missile systems were designed and fabricated which launched the Explorer Earth satellite January 31, 1958, the first launching of its kind in the free world. There the Juno II rocket was built which launched the Pioneer IV space probe March 3, 1959—the probe which passed the Moon and went on to become the first made-in-the-U.S.A. satellite of the Sun.

When I was invited to speak in Boston, my first thought was of the great universities in and around it and of their great teachers and splendid scholars. So naturally, confronted and surrounded as I am here in Boston by such highly educated fellow citizens, and inadequately prepared, I am uncomfortably reminded of the abiding truth of those words that never occurred to Horace but which were uttered by Adlai Stevenson in his Godkin Lecture at Harvard: "Via ovicipitum dura est," or, for the benefit of my fellow engineers: "The way of the egghead is hard."

When we attempt to forecast the dynamic progress of technology the problem is equivalent to measuring a turbulent river whose volume increases geometrically by incessant rainfall. Scientific research is a self-generating and self-multiplying phenomenon. A new discovery contributes to vertical building of the scientific structure. It also brings with it opportunities for still more advances. Each new discovery in fundamental or basic science opens up challenges for the applied scientist and the engineer to interpret the results, to devise means of utilizing them in new products, which enrich our standard of living. Science and technology create the momentum which carries them forward at ever-accelerating rate. Consequently it is extremely difficult to predict in an absolute sense the direction in which developments may occur, the kind of end products which may stem from them, or the magnitude of the industrial effort they may spawn.

Practically everything we utilize is the result of research and development in the past century. Every modern convenience derived from some type of research, usually performed without regard to its application by men who simply wanted to know more about the universe. This was true of the automobile, the airplane, the clothes we wear, the food we eat, the electrical miracles which brighten our homes.

One major area of technological advance which has caught the imagination of mankind is, of course, the development of rocket propulsion and guidance systems which will enable man to explore the limitless reaches of outer space. The field is moving at such pace that the danger is in underestimating the possibilities.

A second major area, dating back approximately 20 years, is that of nuclear energy. Since the first atomic bomb was detonated a little over 13 years ago, many developments have taken place. Within the year the first American commercial generating station powered by nuclear energy has been put into operation. This should be regarded as the forerunner to the use of power systems which tap the vast resources available in the radioactive process. We have seen nuclear energy applied to the propulsion of submarines and we can expect increasing use both of the direct application of nuclear energy and the

indirect utilization of many of its by-products.

Still a third area is automation, the application of machines to control other machines and so to achieve automatic functioning. In its simplest form automation has been applied in the mass production techniques of the automotive industry. More recently it was introduced in the electronics industry where numerous assemblies utilized in radio, television, and other devices are automatically assembled, tested, packaged, and shipped.

These are but three of the numerous areas of technological advance but they will suffice to emphasize its far-reaching influence and to point up the unpredictability of the scientific future.

Now I will attempt to relate the technological and the human equations because of my sincere belief that we are so mesmerized by our successes we may overlook, and therefore fail to prepare, for the satisfactory resolution of human problems generated by our progress. If we forget man in our enthusiasm for science and technology inspired by their awesome achievements, we shall not long survive to enjoy them.

One of the major differences between the demands of space, nuclear, and automation industries from our industrial environment of the past lies in the quality of labor force that is needed. The textile industry I cited earlier required labor capable of learning certain routine operations. Very little understanding of principles was involved. With the introduction of automation, more and more routine processes will be performed by machines. These machines need to be controlled and maintained. Their operators must be prepared by a higher level of training—the requirement is more technically and scientifically educated men at the lower levels of industrial strata.

Another difference will be found in the kind of scientists and engineers required. There is evil in over-specialization; there is basic need for broad, general scientific training. The man trained in a narrow scientific or engineering field may find himself by the technological developments of tomorrow. Flexibility has become the must in professional preparation. We shall require increasing numbers of men thoroughly trained in the fundamentals of science so that they can adequately pursue the developments of the future and adapt themselvevs to new and unforseen requirements as they arise.

As automation replaces unskilled labor the productive capacity of the individual will expand. Inevitably this will lead to a shorter workweek and more leisure time. We must assure that leisure time does not become wasted time, a trend that is all too apparent at present. Almost every individual who is to feel at home in the world, who is to function as an intelligent member of society, will in the coming years require a broad basic understanding of the physical sciences as surely as the adult today must know how to drive an automobile and twist the dials on a TV set. This knowledge will be fundamental to the art of technological living. We must reach out to the largest possible segment of our population and create an understanding of the literature, philosophy, history, and sciences which form the foundations of our culture.

I believe there is a great challenge in this situation confronting the people of Boston. If, against these readily foreseeable requirements, we pause to take stock and determine what we are doing now and its relation to what will be required of us, I suspect that we will discover some problems which should be attacked with a sense of genuine urgency. By defining the problem, we can set about developing a solution before it becomes overpowering. There is an equally valid, perhaps even more pressing reason for action now. We do not enjoy a monopoly on technology. We are confronted by an aggressive competitor whose ultimate objective requires that he exploit his advances to counter and defeat our progress, not only in science, but in every phase of our social order.

Those of us who are engaged in missile and space programs feel this challenge keenly. The implications have not been thoroughly grasped by all of our people if we are to judge by the apparent disinterest they manifest. Evidently they are happily convinced that we are supreme in all fields and will assuredly overtake the Russians in their bid to exploit outer space for the purposes of communism. We enjoy superiority in many areas, to be sure, but we must ask how long that situation will continue and look into those areas where the assumed superiority does not exist.

It would be utterly fallacious to assume that catching the Russians in the race for space will rid us of Ivan's shadow. The Soviet challenge is political, ideological, cultural, economic and educational—it is as broad as human society and social organization. For communism aims at world domination and nothing short of that.

The threat has become all the more dangerous because of the impressive technological capability built up by the Soviet state through a massive educational program designed to provide an immense reservoir of scientific and engineering skills. While the long-range purpose of the Russian space drive may be shrewdly masked under the guise of scientific effort, I believe they intend to expand their sphere of influence in every direction. If we do not aggressively pursue an equally determineed United States space flight program, with an even greater sense of urgency, we may in the not distant future find ourselves surrounded by several planets flying the hammer and sickle flag.

How much time remains is indeed a moot question. It is not the scientist whose research paves the way, or the engineer who translates his discovery into useful hardware, who decides when, how and for what purpose space will be exploited. Those decisions and their realization depend primarily upon the level of effort committed to the tasks. I can translate that into how many dollars and cents are made available to carry on the work. In the Soviet Union those decisions are made by a few men concerned only with their dreams of expanding Communist influence. In this country we can muster the resources only if the people themselves want such a program, will support it over whatever period of time is required, and will sacrifice if necessary to achieve the desired ends.

I believe we must awake America to the danger and then, as a united country, get to work. Having lived under a dictatorship equally as cruel, equally as ambitious as is the Communist state, I know the price of lost freedom. I don't want my children or yours to pay it because we failed to recognize the real threat in all its proportions.

In sharp contrast with the Soviet scheme is the clear statement of the objectives of the United States voiced by President Eisenhower. He said that "we and other nations have a great responsibility to promote the peaceful use of space and to utilize the new knowledge obtainable from space science and technology for the benefit of all mankind."

A great deal has been done in little more than a year. Two agencies have been established to direct our space programs—the Advanced Research Projects Agency, which is concerned with space programs of military significance, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which promotes the scientific exploration of space. All three of the armed services contributed to the International Geophysical Year by rocket experiments, satellite and space probe launchings.

Each of the vehicles hurled into space by U.S. rocket systems were small scientific laboratories equipped with highly efficient sensing and measuring devices and transmitters which reported back to earth receiving stations physical data about the spatial environment. An outstanding discovery is the Van Allen Radiation Belt, the doughnut-shaped bands of intense radiation activity, made possible by the explorer satellites and the pioneer probes launched by the Army team. We believe it will be possible either to steer a safe course around these bands or to provide the shielding necessary to protect a human passenger in a space vehicle from harmful radiation.

We have demonstrated highly efficient tracking and communications systems. Pioneer IV's signals carried over a range of more than 400,000 miles—the greatest span attained to date by any manmade communications equipment. We have demonstrated relatively simple techniques for the control of temperatures in orbital bodies. We have satisfied ourselves that micrometeorite showers do not pose a serious risk to space flight. More of these exploratory launchings will be undertaken in the coming months by NASA and ARPA.

I might mention one of the interesting aspects of our space investigations. The first Explorer satellite, which will continue to orbit for some years, has traveled approximately 150 million miles since it was injected into orbit from Cape Canaveral. If you weigh the cost of the project against the distance the satellite has traveled and the millions of additional miles it will cover, I think you will admit we have a means of transportation more economical than the family auto. My guess is that Explorer will do better than 500 miles to the gallon—the cost per mile will be reduced to about one-tenth of a cent.

Two major programs occupy the lion's share of attention currently. One is Project Mercury, the NASA man-in-space program, and the other is Project Saturn, the ARPA program to develop a booster supplying thrust energies in the order of 1,200,000 pounds or more—larger, I might add, than anything our competition has yet demonstrated.

The Army's contribution to Mercury will include firing several Redstone and Jupiter missiles to test the man-shielding capsule and we shall, before we complete our phase of the project, give one or more of the carefully selected and highly trained astronauts the benefit of a ballistic missile ride.

We are responsible to provide the Saturn booster, now in the early hardware stage. A multistage rocket system based upon this huge unit could launch a communications satellite providing instantaneous, worldwide relay of messages for the Air Force, the Navy and the Army. Far down the road can be dimly seen even larger vehicles, the stepping stones of a long-range program of human activities in space. There are many intriguing possibilities—a small fleet of satellites equipped with modern electronic recording devices could easily handle the entire mail volume of earth. Worldwide television and radio relay could become possible by the use of satellite relay stations. Weather observation and forecasting can become an exact science, providing savings in lives and property damages that would far exceed the cost of the service. No human mind restricted to earthbound concepts can possibly visualize all the wonders which may reward the intrepid explorers.

These brief glimpses into our present work and the future prospects of space technology

will not serve their purpose, however, if they are accepted as further assurance that all the problems have been eliminated. In my closing remarks, I want to point out some areas which deserve the attention of thinking people:

1. We must look to a solution of the human displacements caused by advancing technology. We must take back into the ranks of the useful and productive those whose preparation is inadequate and who now can find no market for their skills.

2. We must immediately recast our educational philosophy to anticipate the needs of the future, and thus avoid the same kind of dislocation on a much larger scale.

3. We must awaken our people to the total scope of the threat confronting them and the speed with which it is advancing in space.

4. We must refill the well of basic knowledge by increasing our research effort. We are not developing new information at the rate with which we are burning up and reworking our nearly exhausted store.

We are on the verge of a truly golden age of discovery and opportunity if we can proceed in peace without the menace of aggression in outer space. The only sure guarantee against that threat is to advance our programs with redoubled vigor for the purpose of establishing the supremacy of freemen in this new and limitless environment. The time will surely come when the geography of our sister planets will be as familiar as the swan-boat ride in Boston Common or the counter of Filene's basement.

It is disquieting to be asked "But what will all this profit us?" Such questions betray a lack of confidence and, even more serious, the kind of unenlightened approach which has hamstrung our progress in the past. No man can say with assurance what benefits will accrue from our discoveries. With Explorer we made a modest beginning. We have stepped onto a new, high road from which there can be no turning back. As we probe further into the area beyond our sensible atmosphere, man will learn more about his enviromnent; he will understand better the order and beauty of creation. He may then come to realize that war, as we know it, will avail him nothing but catastrophe. He may grasp the truth that there is something much bigger than his own little world. Before the majesty of what he will find out there, he must stand in reverential awe. May God give our Nation the humility and the strength to pass the acid test as man moves into the unknown.

Texas State Bar Opposes World Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the Texas State Bar, at its annual convention on July 4, 1959, adopted the following resolution which was submitted by members of the Houston Bar Association:

Whereas a proposal to subject the United States to the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court of International Justice (commonly and hereafter call the the World Court) has recently been submitted to the Senate of the United States (S. Res. 94, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 4510-4513), whereby if adopted this Nation would relinquish completely its power to determine unilaterally that any case brought against the United States in the World Court is exclusively within its domestic jurisdiction, and therefore wholly beyond the jurisdiction of the World Court; that power having been preserved to the United States by the Connally resolution of 1946 (S. Res. 196, 79th Cong., 2d sess.); and

Whereas the World Court is composed of 15 members or judges, of which 1 is a citizen of the United States and the others are nationals or citizens of Egypt, Nationalist China, Australia, Greece, Poland, France, Mexico, El Salvador, Britain, Argentine, Uruguay, Norway, Pakistan, and Soviet Russia; that is, 2 are from Moselm nations, 1 is a Chinese, 2 are Communists, 3 are from common law countries, 4 are Latin Americans, and 1 each is from Greece, France, and Norway, the President of the Court being a Norwegian and the Vice President from Pakistan; and

Whereas the World Court is a tribunal in no way bound to or guided by any definite rules or system of law such as the common law or the American system of constitutional law, and it is therefore entirely free, by the statute of its creation to follow to whatsoever judgment they may lead in any particular case, the whims and caprices engendered from time to time by national pride or interest, envy, greed, or actual hostility; in other words, the World Court is clearly subject to the criticism voiced by Thomas Jefferson when he wrote, "Let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution"; and

Whereas the jurisdiction of the World Court includes "all matters specifically provided for in the Charter of the United Nations or in treaties and conventions in force" (Statute, art. 36), and the Charter of the United Nations expressly excludes from its jurisdiction "matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state" (charter, ch. 1, art. 2, par. 7), nevertheless, one of the first actions of the General Assembly of the United Nations was, by vote, to override the contention of France that matters in controversy between its government and the people of Algeria were matters "within the exclusive domestic jurisdiction" of France, on the ground that Algeria was not a colony but was an integral portion of the Republic of France; and there is no reason to expect that the World Court or any other portion of the machinery of the United Nations may not likewise overrule any contention of the United States that any other matter is "essentially within its domestic jurisdiction" if this country should surrender its power, now expressly reserved, to determine that question unilaterally; and

Whereas it has been claimed that the Court's paucity of business (10 or 11 cases decided in more than 10 years) is due to the fact that few if any nations have submitted themselves unreservedly to the jurisdiction of the Court (those not so submitting unreservedly including the United States and all the Communist nations), although it may as readily be inferred that few if any countries are sufficiently imprudent, under the circumstances herein recited, to submit to the unpredictable judgments of such a tribunal questions that they may regard as being "essentially within their domestic jurisdiction"; and

Whereas relinquishment by the United States of the power to determine unilaterally that any case brought against it in the World Court is exclusively within its domestic jurisdiction would—

(a) seriously impair the sovereignty of the United States and of the several States composing it;

(b) effectively vest the power to amend the Constitution of the United States in a tribunal essentially foreign, not necessarily competent, probably political rather than juridical in its attitudes and decisions, possibly dominated by our enemies and therefore likely disposed to be hostile to the major interests of the United States; and

(c) unnecessarily and dangerously weaken and impair the ability of the United States to defend itself against enemy aggressors; and

Whereas, the proposal so made, and now pending before the U.S. Senate, is being vigorously supported (without, we think, an adequate understanding or appreciation of its reach on dangers) by many influential public officers, individuals and national organizations, who may succeed, in the absence of determined opposition, in having the said proposal adopted by the Senate; and

Whereas, the members of the State Bar of Texas are not only devoted to our State and National Constitutions and forms of Government, but are bound by oath to support and defend those Constitutions:

Now, therefore, the State Bar of Texas, in annual session assembled at Dallas, does hereby resolve:

1. That it does hereby condemn, as unwise, un-American, and extremely dangerous to posterity as well as to American citizens now living, the proposal contained in the Senate resolution mentioned above.

2. That a certified copy of this resolution be promptly sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, to each of the U.S. Senators from Texas, and to the president of the American Bar Association.

3. That each member of the State Bar of Texas is hereby urged to write, as soon as may be, to our Texas Senators urging them, as they love their country, to vote against the proposal, and to use their influence with other Senators to do likewise.

Nuclear Medical Training Program of U.S. Naval Medical School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, while many people wring their hands over the grim threat of nuclear warfare, other people are actually attempting to do something useful and constructive if this most frightful of catastrophes ever should come to pass.

I have reference to the nuclear nursing and education program undertaken by the Department of Nuclear Medicine at the U.S. Naval Medical School in Bethesda.

We all realize that, if ever there should be wreaked upon the United States a cataclysm similar to that which struck the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, every city would need skilled people highly trained in how to treat casualties of nuclear bombing—in other words, men and women and children who had suffered radiation burns of varying degrees.

I have been very impressed with the training program in nuclear medicine undertaken by the Naval Medical School at the National Naval Medical Center. Perhaps some of this interest stems from the fact that I, myself, have been treated therapeutically and prophylactically with radiation for cancer. Yet I am aware

that training in nuclear medicine involves not only care of patients who are taking radiation therapy for some disease, but also the possible protection of countless millions of Americans who might be caught in some atomic holocaust of international proportions.

There recently was presented at Chicago a symposium on training in nuclear medicine, nuclear nursing, and allied fields. Those of the Navy who conceived this challenging program were Capt. E. R. King, of the Naval Medical Corps; Lt. Comdr. L. Simon, of the Nurse Corps of the Navy; Lt. A. R. Nice, of the Naval Medical Service Corps; and Lt. T. G. Mitchell, of the Naval Medical Service Corps.

Mr. President, civilian defense will be without substance or meaning unless there are doctors, nurses, and medical technicians to treat the victims of nuclear attack. This means training in a highly complex and technical field. That is why I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD the details of the symposium recently presented on nuclear medicine by Capt. E. R. King and his associates of the Naval Medical Corps.

I feel certain that many of my colleagues will share my favorable impression that such training and education is taking place far ahead of any emergency which might require these skills being put into actual practice.

There being no objection, the symposium was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SYMPOSIUM ON TRAINING IN NUCLEAR MEDICINE AND ALLIED FIELDS

(By E. R. King, captain, Medical Corps, USN; L. Simon, lieutenant commander, Nurse Corps, USN; A. R. Nice, lieutenant, Medical Supply Corps, USN; T. G. Mitchell, lieutenant, Medical Supply Corps, USN; Department of Nuclear Medicine, U.S. Naval Medical School, National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md.)

TRAINING IN NUCLEAR MEDICINE

During the past 4 years over 60 physicians have been trained in nuclear medicine at the U.S. Naval Medical School, Bethesda, Md. The training period has varied considerably. The candidates have been representatives of the three branches of the Armed Forces, the Veterans' Administration, the Public Health Service, residents in radiology from the medical schools in the Washington-Baltimore area, and physicians from eight foreign countries.

The course was originally planned for residents in radiology, but has been extended to residents in internal medicine and pathology. Physicians training in any other specialty would be favorably considered for admission. Practicing civilian physicians are not accepted as it is believed they may be trained in special civilian training programs in this field.

This discussion is based upon the above experience and presents our views concerning several problems connected with nuclear medicine training programs.

TRAINING IN NUCLEAR MEDICINE—TYPES OF PROGRAMS

1. One week course: For the (little) birds.
2. Two week course: For the (big) birds.
3. One month basic course: OK for introduction to problem.
4. On-the-job training: Inadequate—they get in the way.
5. Part-time course: OK if adequate—suggest 3–4 hours per week for 9 months, including formal training.
6. Full time 4 month course: This appears best to our group.
7. Full-time 1 year course: Too long, unless they take supplementary college courses.
8. Three year residency: Too long, impractical, if not impossible.
9. Two-three year college program, leading to Ph. D.: This is probably OK.

Summary—(1) 100 hours of training with about 25–30 hours in lecture is absolute minimum.

(2) Four months full time is maximum, unless candidate is working for Ph.D.

TRAINING IN NUCLEAR MEDICINE—16-WEEK PROGRAM

Basic science portion (6 weeks)

	Theoretical	Practical	Percentage of total
	Hours	*Hours*	
Radiological safety	0	14	6
Mathematics	30	0	14
Radiologic physics	44	61	48
Radiochemistry	8	10	8
Statistics	7	4	5
Radiobiology	14	0	5
Field trips and review (Saturday mornings)	22	0	10
Total	125	89	
Total hours	214		(1)

[1] Reduction of each 16 percent increment reduces course by 1 week.

Clinical portion (10 weeks)

	Lecture	Laboratory	Percent of total
	Hours	*Hours*	
Thyroid studies (and endocrinology)	16	75	22
Hematological studies	24	75	21
Tumor localization (plus scanning)	10	25	9
Function studies (other than thyroid)	8	25	8
Spaces and metabolism (H^3, Na^{24}, K^{42}, etc.)	7	25	8
Radioisotope therapy (other than I^{131})	8	[1] 40	12
Clinical radioisotope dosimetry	5	0	1
Radiation syndrome symposia	18	0	4
Clinical radiation patient management (reactor and weapon effects)	11	0	3
Instrumentation (includes commercial demonstrations)	0	25	6
Field trips (includes fishing)	0	12	3
Total	107	302	
Total hours	409		(2)

[1] Case presentations.
[2] Reduction of each 10 percent increment reduces course 1 week.

RADIOLOGIC PHYSICS TRAINING

The increase in clinical use of radionuclides in naval hospitals, expanding programs in training of physicians, nurses, and technicians has created a need for more medical nuclear physicists in the Naval Medical Department.

A program has recently been initiated to provide for training of qualified Medical Service Corps officers both on the job and at an approved university.

Prospective applicants from civilian life should write to the address below for further information:

Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Code 74, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

MEDICAL NUCLEAR PHYSICS

Naval hospitals licensed to utilize radionuclides in clinical applications:

1948	1
1959	8

Medical nuclear physicists assigned to naval hospitals:

1948	0
1959	1

Medical nuclear physics

Training	Duration	Period of obligated service
		Years
Department of Nuclear Medicine, U.S. Naval Hospital, Bethesda.	1 year on the job.	1
Postgraduate training at an approved university.	1 year	2
Department of Radiology, U.S. Naval Hospital, Bethesda.	6 months	1
Radiation Technology Division, Naval Medical Research Institute.	do	
Total	3 years	4

PAY SCALE

	Pay and allowances	With dependents
Ensign	$338.58	$355.68
Lieutenant (junior grade) (18 months' service)	384.34	401.44
Lieutenant (4 years' service)	548.38	565.48

THE NUCLEAR NURSING PROGRAM

The uses of radioactive and fissionable materials are rapidly expanding. This presents new problems for the nursing profession.

Long-range considerations indicate the need for a formal training program.

1. In medicine.
2. In military nuclear power programs.
3. In national defense planning.

The problem: What is the best way to prepare nurses for current needs?

Specialized courses presented in a formal program will best achieve nursing readiness.

Nuclear nursing functions

1. Provide optimum nursing care for patients receiving radioisotope therapy.
2. Assist with diagnostic and therapeutic procedures in the radioisotope laboratory.
3. Teach principals of radioisotope procedures to nursing service personnel.
4. Participate in research programs.
5. Work with passive defense teams and teach disaster management procedures in nursing in-service programs.

The nuclear nursing curriculum

Aim: To gain knowledge and understanding of the scientific principles underlying radioisotope and disaster management procedures as they relate to medical diagnosis, treatment, and nursing care of patients.

Curriculum hours—Basic science portion, 8 weeks

	Lecture	Laboratory
Mathematics	48	
Statistics	5	
Physics	10	
Radiation safety	26	34
Nuclear physics	24	39
Biochemistry	44	40
Radiobiology	10	
Total hours	167	113

THE NUCLEAR NURSING CURRICULUM

Curriculum hours—Clinical laboratory period, 8 weeks

	Lecture	Laboratory [1]
Clinical radioisotope theory	112	89
Nursing seminars	8	
Critiques	2	
Disaster management procedures	44	10
Total hours	266	99

[1] Field trips pertinent to the applicable course subject are credited to laboratory hours.

Grant total:	
Lecture hours	333
Laboratory hours	212

The nuclear nursing course

Admission requirements: (1) Registered professional nurse, (2) baccalaureate degree, (3) optimum background—basic sciences.

Duration of course: Four months.

Presentation of course: Annually.

Mission within the hospital framework: To prepare registered professional nurses to function on all hospital levels.

1. Nursing service administrator.
2. Division supervisor.
3. Staff nurse.
4. Nurse educator.
5. Clinical radioisotope laboratory nurse.

SUMMARY

1. Twentieth century medical and nuclear technology demands specialized nursing preparation if competent nursing care is to be administered.

2. On the job training, seminars, and other short courses are helpful but inadequate.

3. A specialized educational program can prepare the nurse to become a more capable health team member when responsibilities are fulfilled with knowledge and understanding.

4. A course in nuclear nursing similar to the curriculum outlined should be the prerogative of higher education. This presentation should be incorporated into the basic college curriculum.

RADIOISOTOPE TECHNICIAN COURSE

With respect to the training of radioisotope technicians at the U.S. Naval Medical School, the past 4 years have marked the development and formalization of a course of instruction, designed to educate enlisted personnel in the application of radioactive isotopes to the problems of medical diagnosis, therapy, and research.

This development has been predicated on the belief that a firm working knowledge of basic mathematics, the fundamentals of the basic sciences, and the opportunity to perform the latest procedures with the various equipments, will produce individuals who can form the nucleus of a well trained, medically oriented, group of people, able to contribute intelligently to the critical scientific developments of the nuclear age.

Minimal prerequisites for radioisotope technician students

GCT plus ARI score of 110. High school graduate. Volunteer. Have 24 months' obligated service at the beginning of course or agree to extend for required length of time. Hold rate of HN, HM3, HM2, or HM1.

Instruction time for each phase of course

	Hours of instruction	
	Lecture	Laboratory
Mathematics	90	
General chemistry	50	100
Health physics	20	20
Radiation physics	60	70
Clinical laboratory procedures	40	350
Review and examination	40	
Subtotal	300	540
Total hours actual instruction	840	

Curriculum

Mathematics: Slide rule, including logarithms; review of elementary algebra; use of appropriate tables and graphical analysis; calculating machines.

General Chemistry: Constituents and classification of matter, basic particles, atoms, molecules, etc.; basic chemical laws, processes, and energy relationships; preparation and standardization of solutions; chemical calculations; laboratory apparatus—selection, use, care.

Health Physics: Use and care of various survey instruments, general laboratory procedures, elements of personnel protection and dosimetry, storage and disposal of radioactive waste materials.

Radiation Physics: Naturally occurring and artificial radioisotopes and series; radioactive processes and units of radioactivity; measurements of radioactivity: instrumentation and related laboratory procedures, calculations and statistical considerations; principles of X-ray and reactor technology.

Clinical Radioisotope Procedures: Foundations of isotope diagnosis and therapy, biology, introduction to physiology and biochemistry, biological effects of nuclear radiations, and the like; preparation, standardization, and administration of isotopes; collection, handling, storage, and analysis of specimens.

Clinical Radioisotope Procedures: Specific determinations and related calculations—blood volumes, thyroid function studies, scanning techniques, erythrokinetic studies, special studies, including total body water, fat studies, cardiac output, and the like; preparation of therapeutic doses of various isotopes; preparation of clinical data and charts, related clerical procedures.

South Dakota Farmers Favor Farm Price Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the farm people of South Dakota have indicated overwhelmingly in a recent poll that they favor a workable system of price supports and production controls. Most of the farmers realize that they are confronted with economic disaster if we continue the trend toward lower farm prices while costs of operation are rising.

An excellent analysis of the South Dakota poll has been made by the Daniel F. Rice Co. of Chicago. I am including, under unanimous consent at this point in the RECORD, the July 7 commodity letter of this company.

COMMODITY LETTER OF JULY 7, 1959

In our letter of March 26, 1959, we called attention to a poll of farmer opinion about agricultural price supports that was completely loaded to get agreement with the editorial opinion of the publication conducting the poll. This was the poll that purported to show that 78 percent of farmers favored the immediate or gradual elimination of all farm price and income support.

We branded the poll as nonsense. Now we have proof to back up our position. A poll was conducted by three newspapers in South Dakota without any accompanying editorializing. The vote for different kinds of plans was as follows:

	Percent
The present program of flexible supports	5.7
A system of direct payments to compensate farmers for the difference between the market price and a fair price. (This plan would be accompanied by production controls)	22.6
Price supports fixed at 90 percent of parity with strict bushel and pound quotas instead of the present acreage approach	24.5
90 percent of parity with no specific crop restrictions but a reduction of 15 percent of each farmer's historical acreage base	18.9
No Federal crop controls of any kind and no price supports of any kind	28.3

From this tabulation it is perfectly clear that 71.7 percent of farmers want a workable system of supports and controls. Sixty-six percent favored higher price supports and stricter controls than the present programs provide.

The difference in results between the recent poll and the previously cited poll is not a matter of geography. The earlier poll showed only 36 percent favoring high supports and production payments in South Dakota. The results are very different when the bias is taken out.

In our letter of March 26, we said that if farmers were given an opportunity to do so they would overwhelmingly say, "I think the Government has a responsibility to see that farmers get a fair share of the national income; that the best way to get a fair income is to adjust production to the market size just as industry does." The South Dakota poll proves that we were exactly right.

In the South Dakota poll, farmers were specifically asked whether they favored stricter controls and higher supports or less control and lower supports. A majority favored stricter controls and high supports. Farmers know that the price of higher supports is production control and are willing to pay the price.

Farmers voted overwhelmingly to get the Government out of the grain business.

Twenty-one percent favored a deeper involvement of Government in the storage, merchandising and handling of grain and 79 percent favored withdrawal from this type of operation. Farmers are clearly aware of the damage that the badly run programs of the USDA are doing to their prices and want this merchandising competition stopped.

Farmers were asked, "Do you believe that farmland retirement, either under the soil bank or some similar program, should be employed as a means of controlling production of farm commodities?" Thirty-six percent voted "yes" and 64 percent voted "no." The soil bank was recognized as a failure and farmers do not approve of failure. Farmers clearly recognize that programs have to have some teeth in them.

Farmers were asked to rate Ezra Benson as Secretary of Agriculture. The results were as follows:

	Percent
Excellent	11
Good	8
Fair	32
Poor	49

This result was obtained in traditionally Republican South Dakota.

Three main conclusions must be reached from this poll:

1. Current price support programs are unsatisfactory.

2. The present Secretary of Agriculture is disapproved of by the people that he is supposed to represent.

3. Farmers believe that they are entitled to fair prices and incomes and are willing to accept the governmental restriction necessary to get them.

This mandate to the Congress should be perfectly clear. Present programs are not satisfactory when judged by farm prices and income and by the surplus problem. Farmers understand and want a sound, workable program. The Congress is doing nothing about getting one for them. We are watching the spectacle of another session of Congress roll by without any agricultural accomplishment.

In exasperation and frustration we again ask, "Why? Why? Why?"

DANIEL F. RICE & CO.

Wrapping Our Flag Around Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Albert E. Reitzel, former General Counsel of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which appears in the January 1959 issue of the Daughters of the American Revolution magazine.

In this article Mr. Reitzel masterfully depicts the need for congressional action establishing statutory standards for the denial of passport facilities to American citizens associated with the international Communist conspiracy. In June 1958 the Supreme Court declared in two 5–4 decisions that the Secretary of State had neither the constitutional nor the congressional mandate to deny passports to American citizens based on Communist Party activity. In the absence of congressional action, the effect of these two fateful decisions is to provide the Communists with a pipeline for the person-to-person exchange of ideas and information between Communists in the United States and party functionaries located throughout the rest of the world.

I am personally appalled at the failure of Congress to act so as to cure this defect in our security system. I commend this excellent article to the attention of my colleagues in the hope that it will bring home the urgent need for legislative action in the passport field. I urge the committee to give prompt consideration to S. 2095 which I have introduced to correct this situation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WRAPPING OUR FLAG AROUND COMMUNISTS

(By Albert E. Reitzel)

It is difficult to accept the fact that the 85th Congress, 2d session, adjourned without passing any law, which would prohibit the issuing of passports to American citizens who refuse to make affidavits as to present or past membership in the Communist Party. On June 16, 1958, two decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court held that the Secretary of State has no authority to refuse to issue passports in such cases. All this has happened in the face of a law of Congress of 1954 which declares that the Communist Party of the United States, which claims to be a political party, is in fact an active part "of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States." More than a month before Congress adjourned in August 1958, the Secretary of State urged the passage of a law to give him authority to refuse to issue passports in such cases; but Congress failed to do so. The result of these decisions is that the Secretary of State is required to issue passports to American citizens even though there may be evidence of communistic affiliations.

At the present time the Passport Division is operating under the continued existence of the national emergency declared by Presidential proclamation during the Korean war (1950). The regulation prohibits any citizen without a passport, with some exceptions not in point here, to go or attempt to go from the United States during a national emergency, or in time of war, to any country outside of this hemisphere. The special law prescribes a severe penalty on any citizen who violates the regulation. The passport does more than say that the person named in it is a citizen of the United States. In the passport the Secretary of State requests "all to whom it may concern to permit safely and freely to pass, and in case of need, to give all lawful aid and protection to" the citizen. This request from the Secretary of State clearly shows under international practice an intention of our Government to extend reasonable protection to the citizen. At any time passports are considered so much convenient proof of the name and citizenship of the owner that transportation lines generally require American citizens to have U.S. passports for trips between the United States and countries overseas.

The decisions of the Supreme Court on June 16, 1958, in the suit of Weldon Dayton against Secretary Dulles and the suit of Rockwell Kent and Walter Briehl against Secretary Dulles compelled the Secretary of State to issue passports to them. In each case the opinion of the majority of the Court was by Justice Douglas, Chief Justice Warren, and Justices Frankfurter, Black, and Brennan concurring. The dissenting opinion insists that Secretary Dulles had authority to deny the passports. It was by Justice Clark, joined by Justices Burton, Harlan, and Whitaker, and applied to both cases. In short, five of the Judges decided the two cases in favor of Dayton, Kent, and Briehl, and four Judges were in favor of Secretary Dulles. Every patriotic citizen should strive to understand these two 5-to-4 decisions and their menace to our safety just as they are being studied and used by citizens to obtain passports for trips abroad to aid the Communist movement.

In the Dayton case the opinion of the majority of the Court states that Congress had not authorized the Secretary of State to deny a passport to Dayton on the ground that its issuance "would be contrary to the national interest." The opinion includes a copy of the decision by Secretary Dulles in which he had refused to issue the passport. Mr. Dulles said: "I have reason to believe, on the balance of all the evidence, that the applicant is going abroad to engage in activities which will advance the Communist movement for the purpose, knowingly and willfully, of advancing that movement." That view is amply supported by facts stated by the Secretary in that copy.

In the case of Kent and Briehl, the opinion of the majority of the Court was in their favor for three reasons: A passport is necessary to travel abroad; the right to travel is a part of the "liberty" of which a citizen cannot be deprived except by a law of Congress; and Congress has not authorized the Secretary of State to withhold a passport from a citizen who refused to submit an affidavit as to his past or present membership in the Communist Party.

Kent had been informed by the Director of the Passport Office that the issuance of a passport was precluded on two grounds: (1) That he was a Communist and (2) that he had had a consistent and prolonged adherence to the Communist Party line; and that before a passport could be issued, it would be necessary for him to furnish an affidavit as to present or past membership in the Communist Party. Briehl, after his application for a passport had been temporarily denied because of allegations as to his Communist activities, had been informed by the Passport Office of the State Department that it would be necessary for him to file such an affidavit. Both refused to furnish such an affidavit. The refusal was described in the opinion of the majority of the Court as a "refusal to be subjected to inquiry into their beliefs and associations." It must have been forgotten by the majority of the Court that a law of Congress of 1950 and one of 1954 make clear that membership in the Communist Party means more than having beliefs and associations. The 1950 law states that "the nature and control of the Communist movement itself, present a clear and present danger to the existence of free American institutions"; and the 1954 law says that the Communist Party of the United States, which claims to be a political party, is in fact an active part of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States. These two statements had been cited in the brief in the Supreme Court on behalf of Secretary Dulles.

The regulations of the Secretary of State, which had required the passports to be denied, are consistent with a law of Congress of 1926 and were issued by Presidential proclamations which are within the terms of a law of Congress of 1952. The law of 1926 declares that the Secretary of State may grant and issue passports "under such rules as the President shall designate and prescribe for and on behalf of the United States." The law of 1952 declares that "While the United States is at war or during the existence of any national emergency proclaimed by the President it shall be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to depart from or enter, or attempt to depart from or enter, the United States unless he bears a valid passport." The law prescribes a serious penalty

for a violation. That law merely repeated a law of Congress of 1918 as to requirement of passports in time of war and a law of Congress of 1941 as that requirement during a national emergency. The view of the majority of the Court was that at the time this 1952 law was passed by Congress it intended only to authorize denial of passports in two classes of cases; they are cases involving questions of citizenship or criminal or unlawful conduct. None of these matters, the opinion said, were involved in these cases.

The dissenting opinion of Justice Clark, joined by three other Justices of the Supreme Court, insists that the law of Congress of 1952 had authorized denial of passports in these cases. That opinion is based on these points: At the time that law was passed by Congress there was in effect a Presidential proclamation declaring a national emergency caused by the Korean conflict, and that proclamation is still in effect. The travel restrictions of that law were put into effect by a proclamation of the President in 1953. The proclamation pointed out that it did not revoke any regulations "heretofore issued relating to the departure of persons from, or their entry into the United States."

Among the regulations were those under which passports were denied to Dayton, Kent, and Briehl; and those regulations had been issued to be effective August 22, 1952, which was before the date on which the 1952 law came into effect though after the passage of that law. Thus, the dissenting opinion asserts, Congress by the 1952 law has approved "whatever use of his discretion the Secretary had made prior to" that law. Hence, the opinion describes as "nonsense" the statement in the opinion of the majority of the Court that the Secretary's wartime exercise of his discretion, while admittedly more restrictive, is not relevant to the practice which Congress can be said to have approved. The statement in the opinion of the majority of the Court that the Secretary's denial of passports in peacetime extended only to two kinds of cases, those involving allegiance and those involving criminal activity, is described in the dissenting opinion as "contrary to fact." In support of that view, the dissenting opinion states that the peacetime practice of the State Department indisputably included denial of passports for reasons of national security. That statement is proved by excerpts in the Report of the Commission on Government Security from documents of the State Department. The excerpts are quoted in the dissenting opinion and show these facts: Shortly after the 1917 Russian revolution, the State Department "became aware of the scope and danger of the worldwide revolutionary movement and the attendant purpose to overthrow all existing governments, including our own." From that time until 1950 the practice of the State Department as to denying passports to Communist sympathizers was not consistent. However, beginning with September 1950 the Department consistently denied passports to American citizens with Communist affiliations, after it was pointed out "that the Internal Security Act of 1950 clearly showed the desire of Congress that no Communists should be issued passports of this Government." The State Department's legal adviser "agreed that it was the duty of the State Department to refuse passports to all Communists, including journalists."

In January 1958, several months before the above decisions of the Supreme Court, Congressman WALTER, of Pennsylvania, introduced a bill, H.R. 9937, in Congress to authorize the Secretary of State to deny passports. Some of the provisions of the bill were broad enough to authorize denial in such cases as those of Dayton, Kent, and Briehl. Many of the provisions are based on recommendations made in the Report of the Commission on Government Security which was sent to Congress and the President on June 21, 1957. The Chairman of the Commission was Mr. Lloyd Wright, formerly president of the American Bar Association. On the day after the two decisions were handed down by the Supreme Court, Congressman WALTER introduced H.R. 12989, a bill to permit the Secretary of State to deny passports to Communist sympathizers.

The President sent a message to Congress on July 7, 1958, referring to the two decisions of the Supreme Court and urgently requesting legislation to authorize denial of passports where their possesion would seriously impair the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States or would be inimical to the security of the United States. He said the lack of that power is exposing us every day and week to great danger. The following day, Senator GREEN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, introduced S. 4110 at the request of the Secretary of State. S. 4410 (same as H.R. 13318 introduced by Congressman KEATING, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee) was written by the State and Justice Departments; these bills had practically the same provisions as those introduced previously by Congressman WALTER.

At this time Secretary Dulles sent a letter to the Vice President of the United States as the Presiding Officer of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The letter said: "The international Communist movement seeks everywhere to thwart U.S. foreign policy. The issuance of U.S. passports to supporters of that movement facilitates their travel to and in foreign countries. It clothes them when abroad with all the dignity and protection that our Government affords. Surely our Government should be in a position to deny passports to such persons."

Mr. Robert D. Murphy, Deputy Under Secretary of State, included the following points in his argument before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on July 16, 1958: The legislation proposed in S. 4110 is based on the existence of a national emergency. The international Communist movement eagerly seeks the use of the citizens of the free countries wherever possible. Contacts with such citizens are necessary and travel by them is essential. Party conferences in many countries and meetings of a host of front organizations throughout the world are an essential part of the movement. Those who attend meetings of the front organizations may be ardent Communists; others may be innocent persons who lend themselves, their prestige and facilities to the development of contacts and operations so necessary to the international Communist movement. Laws to prevent Communist couriers and agents from going abroad would deal the Communist movement a very serious blow, just as the McCarran-Walter law of Congress has in prohibiting the travel of Communist aliens into this country. Even the Magna Carta recognized the obligations of a government to exercise some control over the issuance of passports in time of war and national emergency. The need for action by Congress is urgent. Since the two decisions of the Supreme Court passports have had to be issued by the State Department to 60-odd applicants with proved records of Communist activities; thus, they are in a position to travel abroad and aid the international Communist movement. Seventy more applications of people of this sort are pending in the State Department. Many more such applications must be expected. Mr. Murphy assured Congress that under this bill the State Department will not be in a position to deny passports to persons whose sole activities abroad would be to voice their own opinions and even to criticize our foreign policy, if they be so inclined. He said that the executive branch of our Government is convinced that our national security is threatened by the free issuance of passports to American supporters of the international Communist movement who wish to travel abroad. Without congressional authority, he said, such passports cannot be denied, and Congress is being requested to give that authority on an urgent basis. He stressed that our national security requires no less.

Doubtless, it was in view of the present open gate to citizens with Communist affiliations to go on visits to foreign lands that Attorney General Rogers, in July 1958, urged Congress to amend our laws against spying to include violations against the United States by our citizens while in foreign countries. Such an amendment was passed by the House of Representatives but failed to be voted on in the Senate.

On August 8, 1958, after hearing a number of witnesses, the matter of new legislation to give authority to deny passports to Communists and Communist sympathizers was shelved by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. On August 13 a bill, H.R. 13760, introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman SELDEN, of Alabama, states that Congress finds that the activities of the international Communist movement constitutes a clear, present, and continuing danger to the security of the United States. The bill would give authority to the Secretary of State to deny passports to persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement. The bill would require that no person be denied a passport on that ground except after opportunity for a hearing and that a denial of a passport on that ground shall be subject to be canceled in the district courts of the United States, whenever the denial is contrary to law. The bill was approved on August 23, 1958, by the House of Representatives by a voice vote. The bill is without effect because no action in favor of that or any other bill relating to denial of passports was taken by the Senate committee.

We are in these critical times with an international Communist conspiracy against us that causes our Government to draft every year thousands of men from their homes and chosen pursuits to serve in our Armed Forces anywhere in the world. The Secretary of State has been left in a straitjacket of law that requires him to issue passports to citizens with Communist associations to make visits anywhere abroad, thus free to aid the conspiracy. Verily, the Stars and Stripes are being wrapped around them. This danger to our country is all due to the two 5 to 4 unconvincing decisions of the Supreme Court and to the incredible, and terrifying failure of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to give the Senate a chance to vote on and approve any of the bills.

Employment Patterns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I would like to take this opportunity to disabuse the minds of our colleagues that my native State of West Virginia is a rural slum of 25,000 square miles.

While it has been true that we have suffered trade reverses in our basic soft-

coal-mining industry, it is true that our economy is progressing along the broad and splendid path of an eventual prosperity.

West Virginia needs all of the help it can receive, but, as our State's motto reads, "Montani Semper Liberi"—Mountaineers Are Always Free—we can always help ourselves, individually and collectively. This we intend to do.

We, as a State of the Union, have been subjected to publicity tending to relegate us to the status of a poor relation. I should like, therefore, to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of the latest publication of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. which authoritatively shows that our economic recovery is slow but sure.

PATTERNS OF FACTORY EMPLOYMENT IN WEST VIRGINIA

More factories is often suggested as the remedy for unemployment as well as a source of tax revenues, particularly in West Virginia where mine employment has been halved since 1948. Mechanization of the mines has caused layoffs involving one-eighth of the State's workers.

The creation of jobs by West Virginia's new factories, especially in the Ohio Valley where electric power, aluminum, chemicals and steel manufactures predominate, has not overcome the elimination of jobs in other manufacturing sectors. Factory employment declined 10,000 between 1948 and 1957. Another 8,000 factory workers were laid off in 1958, and by May 1959 only 5,000 had been rehired.

What has happened? The loss of jobs because of factory mechanization and the decreased demand for some products has more than offset the creation of jobs. While chemical plants added 3,100 jobs, pottery, glass and textile plants lost 8,400. Steel, even with greatly increased capacity and output, has managed to maintain its 1948 employment level.

Employment in another group of industries—lumber, furniture, metal fabricators and machinery—declined by 5,400. Partly offsetting this decline was the gain of 1,100 jobs in clothing mills, printing establishments, newspaper publishing, petroleum and coal products.

What is a factory job? A shift in the distribution of jobs has occurred within the factory. The proportion of employees on the "assembly line" has decreased while the proportion of "white collar" jobs has increased. The assembly line, with more efficient methods and equipment, produced 50 percent more goods with 2.5 percent less workers between 1947 and 1956.

Meanwhile, West Virginia office, laboratory and outside workers in manufacturing increased by one-half. More scientists, engineers and technicians are required for research and development activities and automation. More salesmen, clerks and managers are also needed to handle a greater variety of products.

White collar workers in factories were hired at about the same rate in the country as a whole as in West Virginia—i.e., increased by one-half since 1947. Also, the proportion of "assembly line" workers to total factory employees decreased. However, the number of factory workers in the country as a whole has increased slightly while the number in West Virginia declined. This is illustrated in the table which shows percentage changes between 1947 and 1958.

[In percent]

	Factory	Mining	Other	Total
United States	+1.2	−23.5	+26.1	+16.3
West Virginia	−13.8	−53.9	+16.6	−8.3

The distribution of nonfarm employment in the State is getting closer to the national pattern every day. Due to the greater impact of mining losses on West Virginia employment, the relative importance of manufacturing stayed the same, i.e., 25 percent of the State's workers. In all United States of America, manufacturing employment relative to total employment declined from 35 to 31 percent.

Retired Military Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Hon. PAUL J. KILDAY:

Mr. Chairman, you are dealing with an important and very complex question. It is not as simple of solution as was proposed by the amendment offered in the Committee of the Whole during the consideration of the Defense Department appropriation bill. The fact that the amendment was then defeated by 1 vote on the division and by 22 votes by tellers indicates that many Members of the House recognize the existence of the problem, but are uninformed as to its complexity.

CATEGORIES OF RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

There are a number of categories of retired military personnel:

1. Those who retire for length of service.
2. Those who retire for physical disability.
3. Those who retire for physical disability incurred in combat or as the result of an instrumentality of war.
4. Reserve officers who are retired under the provisions of Public Law 810.
5. Those Army of the United States officers who retired because of disability incurred during their wartime service.
6. There are others, including National Guard, temporary officers, etc.

Most of the discussions which have been had refer to "retired officers." There has been little, if any, discussion of the various types of retired officers. The list placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the other body lists several officers as "reserve, retired." The individuals named could have served under a number of circumstances.

They could have been wartime citizen soldiers who were wounded or otherwise disabled and entitled to retirement.

During the war effort a great many technicians were recruited from industry, commissioned, and assigned to highly technical work. Therefore persons now designated as "Reserve, retired" could be persons who left an industry, served during the war, were disabled, retired and returned to the industry from which recruited.

EARLY RETIREMENTS

There has been discussion of the relatively early age at which military officers are being retired. However, it should be borne in mind that by a mandatory provision of law many of these officers are retired at an early age.

The Officer Personnel Act of 1947 contains a provision requiring the retirement of an officer after 30 years of service and 5 years in grade. This provision is designed to create vacancies at the top so as to permit orderly promotion through the grades.

The provision was included in the law in contemplation of a normal tour of duty in each grade. The Officer Personnel Act of 1947 contemplates a tour of 3 years as second lieutenant; 3 years as first lieutenant; 8 years as captain; 4 years as major; 4 years as lieutenant colonel; 4 years as colonel. It was therefore contemplated that an officer would reach the gratie of colonel after 22 years of service. Of course, those selected for general or flag rank would be eligible for further promotions. In contemplation of a normal career most officers would be approaching the normal age for retirement at the time he had both 30 years of service and 5 years in grade.

Before the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 had an opportunity to function normally, the Korean war began. Promotions were accelerated. We therefore have the period of 30 years of service and 5 years in grade coinciding when men are younger than men in industry normally would retire.

This is a temporary situation. It is about to be eliminated because all of the military services have reached, or are reaching, normal periods of service in grade.

These men face retirement and reduction in income when their families are at the period of the greatest expense to them. It is unreasonable to suppose that these relatively young men will remain idle. They possess experience urgently needed by both the Government and industry.

A number of these officers hold graduate degrees in engineering, management, and other fields. Not only should they be permitted to continue in their fields, but their services are urgently needed in those fields.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

Because the officers secured their experience and generally, education from the Government, they should first be utlized by the Government after retirement. This is rarely possible.

The Dual Officer Act of 1894 is an effective bar to the utilization of most retired regular officers by the Government.

The Dual Compensation Act of 1932 is an effective bar to most other retired officers.

However, in this connection the inequality of application of both of those laws is of major importance. There are many exceptions by clear provisions of statutes. The Court of Claims decisions provide other exceptions. There are exceptions provided by private bills passed by the Congress permitting the employment of named individuals in named positions.

It should be academic that if any restriction is now to be placed upon the employment of retired officers by industry, the laws restricting their employment by the Government must be reviewed and repealed, amended, or made uniform.

In addition, existing laws placing restrictions upon the employment of retired officers in industry are not uniform in their application to the various services. There is no bar in certain services and an absolute bar in others. Any legislation on this subject should make those laws uniform.

RELATIVELY FEW RETIRED OFFICERS ARE EMPLOYED

Because officers well known in Washington enter the employment of industries holding Government contracts, the impression exists that the practice is general.

Actually, relatively few retired officers are employed by industries holding Government contracts or employed at all. Rarely is a field commander so employed. Care must be taken that retired officers as a class be not subjected to criticism because of the action of a few.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST IS WRONG

No officer should retire and soon thereafter enter the employment of a contractor in a position which would give him an opportunity to have that contractor favored, or give the appearance of so doing.

For instance, there should be no objection of an electrical engineer retired from the military working on an electronic development for a Government contractor.

There is every objection to the employment of a procurement officer in a procurement position by a Government contractor. At least there should be the lapse of a reasonable period of time.

Mr. Chairman, this committee has a very difficult task in permitting the one and prohibiting the other.

In this connection I suggest you consider carefully the existing statutes which apply to Government lawyers in the practice of their profession after leaving Government service. Here you may find a reasonable solution of your problem. The effectiveness of that solution will depend finally upon the ethics and attitudes of the retired personnel which I will discuss separately.

THE RETIRED PERSONNEL MUST POLICE THEMSELVES

Military officers are professional men. They belong to the noble profession of Arms. That profession is based, to a very high degree, upon honor and ethical conduct.

All professions have codes or canons of ethics. While all professions have their codes and canons of ethics, we hear most of such in connection with lawyers and doctors.

There are provisions for disciplinary action for the violation of medical or legal ethics. However, disciplinary action in either profession is rare.

Actually, the lawyer or doctor observes the ethics of his profession because it is the right and proper thing to do. In addition he does not fear disciplinary action nearly as much as he prizes the respect of the other members of his profession.

No matter what law might be passed it will be ineffective if its violation remains socially acceptable. The observation of the spirit of any such law will depend largely upon the attitude of other retired officers towards the officer who finds a way to circumvent the intent of the law.

The reward to the retired personnel will come from the standing and prestige of the retired people in the community. In addition, they have a very practical interest. As an example, many bills are pending here to permit military personnel retired before June 1, 1958 to recompute their retired pay under the Military Pay Act of 1958. There has been much editorial and other support of that recomptuation. It would restore a highly desirable tradition that retired personnel be paid under the larger new rate. I would like to see that done. In view of the margin by which the amendment to the Defense Department appropriation bill was defeated, it is evident such a law could not be passed at this time.

Washington Pilgrimage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to call to the attention of the House an address by the Honorable Don Paarlberg, Special Assistant to the President, before the Washington Pilgrimage at a luncheon meeting on the campus of the George Washington University, Saturday, June 20.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DON PAARLBERG, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, BEFORE THE WASHINGTON PILGRIMAGE AT A LUNCHEON MEETING ON THE CAMPUS OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D.C., SATURDAY, JUNE 20, 1959

It is a pleasure to address the members of the ninth Washington pilgrimage. It is an honor to bring greetings to you from the White House. I am sure all the citizens of the Nation's Capital have welcomed you and saluted the high purpose of your visit.

As a public official I have a personal reason for enjoying your delegation. You came here to give us freely of your faith and spirit. Thank you. Thank you for reminding us that the religious heritage of America is a precious gift.

What is the religious heritage of this country? Have we been good stewards of this legacy? What needs, what hopes and possibly what forebodings inspire your pilgrimage?

The religious heritage of this Nation consists of the worship of God and a faithful obedience to His Commandments. Out of such worship and obedience comes the structure of morality and individual responsibility which is the strength of American society.

George Washington, in his farewell address, expressed this thought with deep conviction: "And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure; reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

This works both ways. We cannot sustain the religious life of America without a vigorous moral response. Last Sunday, a well-known preacher in New York said: "Religion and morality belong together, and whenever one of them suffers a decline, the other will not prosper long."

This says what religious faith has long taught: "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also."

The New York minister spoke of the present popularity of the church in America. He said church membership was at a record high. So are church budgets, church construction, and church attendance. Religious books and movies have a rich market. But despite all these signs of religious progress there is a disturbing back-sliding in public and private morality. There is an appalling increase in crime and violence. The American divorce rate continues to be a national scandal. Racial antagonism and the lack of personal discipline makes us reexamine the depth of our religious teachings.

So there is a feeling of disquiet as to the state of our religious heritage. There is a feeling that we may not be the best of stewards. Some are trying to improve our social and economic and moral performance without strengthening the religious faith; some are trying to improve our religious activity without strengthening our moral practice. In either case, the result can only be failure. We must have both faith and works. They are mutually supporting and enriching.

It seems to me that our religious heritage is threatened by a strange and unlike coalition: the subversive, the selfish and the slothful.

First, the subversive. This is atheistic communism, frankly intent upon overcoming both our Nation and the religious belief upon which it is based.

Second, the selfish. This is a kind of agnostic materialism, which pays lipservice to the deeper values while it strives to use the institutions of government for personal gain.

Third, the slothful. This is the lazy attitude which shifts moral problems to the Government. It tries to reach the millenium by the legislative route. It would substitute public law for private morality.

Let me now describe how this strange coalition through a mixture of motives, threatens our religious heritage.

Communism was born of religion gone sour. Karl Marx was a frustrated son of the church. His program is an international movement, zealous, dedicated, vigorous, and resourcesful. In a little more than 40 years of active growth, communism has brought into its camp one-third of the human race. One could hardly conceive of a philosophy or a form of economic and political organization more antagonistic to our religious heritage.

But it is not enough to speak strong words about communism. It is not enough to attack the Communist teaching directly, to expose its flaws, to lay bare its errors, or even to overthrow it by force. Our religious heritage grew not by attacking those who opposed it, but by positively demonstrating its own merits. In our daily living, in social context, we show forth our inner faith. The American system, rooted in our religious-moral heritage, provides the richest of spiritual and material rewards. To prove its worth, these rewards must be demonstrated by individual citizens and by the Nation as a whole.

As I said, the first member of the coalition which threatens our heritage is the subversive. He has a false religion of his own, on the offensive throughout the world. Let no one underestimate this deadly enemy.

And we are not underestimating his strength—nor our own strength. We too are on the march around the world but not with bayonets and guns. Rather with plows and spades—and in a thousand peaceful ways we are trying to build a peaceful and productive world.

Let me tell you something good out of my own particular field of experience. Last year, it was my privilege to travel around the world and see how American agricultural experts and products were being used to combat the forces of communism and to raise the levels of living of our neighbors in the underdeveloped countries.

And this, I believe, is practical religious service of the highest order. In fact, our missionaries were the first to practice it. They knew that part of the believer's re-

sponsibility is always to "feed the hungry and give drink to the thirsty."

America is doing great work in this area of need. Last year, we gave away $265 million worth of our surplus farm products to feed the hungry and give the thirsty a drink. It makes the story of the five loaves and two fish seem modest indeed. This food went, not to 5,000 people, but to 60 million in 78 countries.

This is what Americans are doing on a magnificent scale on every continent. We can be proud of them—and of our Nation which supports them. I saw their work with my own eyes and I was most encouraged.

I saw an experimental laboratory where Indian biochemists, trained in the United States, were developing new forms of human food from oil seed cake and meal.

In Bangkok I saw agricultural scientists from the United States teaching plant breeding, soil science, and farm economics to a group of alert Thai students.

In Greece there is an agricultural education system based largely on the American pattern, including extension agents and 4–H Clubs.

In India I talked with an American agricultural expert who had helped make a significant engineering advance. He had helped the village people to shift from the broad-bladed hoe, their traditional digging tool, to the American spade. For centuries these people have dug irrigation ditches by flailing the earth with this heavy hoe and then jerking up and throwing aside the bit of dirt they dislodge. "A spade would be better," thought this American expert, so he procured one. But the edge of the spade hurt the digger's bare foot and the spade was flung aside. The extension man welded on a flange, but then the dirt stuck to the spade. Finally, he devised a wooden sole, with leather thongs, which the digger could tie onto his foot, and then the transition from a hoe to a spade economy was achieved. This probably was a change comparable with the shift from binder to combine for a midwestern farmer.

In India, men from the Ford Foundation have developed a bullock-driven electric generator for village use. This opens the way for a new source of electricity for lifting irrigation water, driving tools for small industry, and providing electric lights for village homes.

Throughout all this area the American missionary, accompanied by the agricultural specialist, laid the foundation for the advance of agricultural science.

In the Middle East agricultural scientists from many countries have teamed up with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to check the locust plague, a scourge in this area ever since Biblical times. American scientists are a part of the team.

This is part of our great American mission called mutual security. This is the only Government program I know of which has the unanimous support of the leadership of all the major religious groups in our land: Catholic, Jew, Protestant and Greek.

Don't believe all you hear and read about "the ugly American." In many, many places throughout the world, the face of America is the face of sympathy, helpfulness and understanding.

The best way to deal with the subversive is to fill the world so full of positive good as to dispel the hate, want, and lust on which the subversive feeds.

The second member of the coalition which threatens our religious heritage is the selfish man who pays lip service to religion but has no real feeling for our religious heritage or for the freedom which flows from it. He sees in government a means of protecting himself from a competitor, or gaining advantage over an opponent. Our religious heritage gave us freedom and responsibility; the selfish man accepts the freedom and disregards the responsibility. His standard of morality is what the law allows. To him the law is as power politics can write it. Though government was set up to protect the general interest from the special interest, the selfish man strives to make it serve the exact opposite purpose.

This member of the coalition has no intention of eroding our religious heritage; indeed he speaks highly of it. But his actions can bring our religious teaching into disregard and our government into disrepute.

How much of this can the country stand? At some point the citizenry would lose faith in the equity and justice of government action. At some point our people would doubt that religious teaching has any practical meaning. These are real threats to our religious heritage.

There is no better way to deal with this fellow than to revitalize our religious teaching, lift the standards of morality and adhere to sound principles of government. We must, as a people, set a standard worthy of our heritage and hold our public officials to that same high standard.

The third member of the group which threatens our religious heritage is the slothful fellow who would substitute public programs for individual responsibility. He avows the highest motives and is anxious to redress any human wrong by passing a law. He notes the shortcomings of the American system, but is somehow blind to its advantages. He does not understand the social sciences but he would remake our economic and social system. He does not understand the responsibilities laid upon the individual by the tenets of religious faith, but he is ready to undertake, by government programs, wholesale invasions of this area.

Robert Frost, the poet, once described this slothful fellow in a short poem. Let me read it to you. It is about the man who wants to remake the world by waving the wand of government over everything.

"Harrison loves my country, too.
But wants it all made over new.
He's Freudian Viennese by night.
By day he's Marxian Muscovite.
It isn't because he's Russian Jew.
He's Puritan Yankee through and through.
He dotes on Saturday pork and beans.
But his mind is hardly out of his teens:
With him the love of country means
Blowing it all to smithereens
And having it all made over new."

We all know this fellow. He's not as harmless as we sometimes think. When the load of moral responsibility is lifted off the back of the individual and transferred to the state, our religious heritage suffers.

Our religious heritage teaches that God counts us not as members of worthwhile civic associations, or as taxpayers who support worthy causes, or as persons who vote in favor of benevolent government programs, but as individual human souls.

Government owes each citizen an equal place at the starting line; it cannot assure that all will breast the tape at the same instant.

There are many helpful things which government can do, some of which are not now being done. But government is not omnipotent. If government undertakes some well-intended but ill-advised intervention in economic life, public decisions are substituted for private responsibility. And so, without wishing to do so and without knowing how or why it happened, freedom and individual responsibility may be lost. Individual responsibility is closely associated with the religious heritage of this land; to weaken one is to threaten the other. Good intentions would make this no less a tragedy.

So we have here the three who together threaten the structure which represents our religious heritage.

One, the subversive, is a deliberate housewrecker.

One, the self-seeker, thoughtlessly pulls down the house as he hunts for anything that could be useful to him.

One, the slothful with the best of intentions, dreams about additions and remodelings which the inhabitants of the house cannot afford and are unable to use.

But while some threaten our religious heritage, others, as I have said, build it up.

There are those who understand our religious heritage, who are committed to it, and who work for it in their daily lives.

There are those who understand the purpose of life, who recognize the shortcomings of our system, who would strengthen the system where it can be strengthened and accept it where it cannot.

There are those who recognize that communism, like toadstool, grows best in the dark—as far from the light of religion as it can get. These people want to set their light on a hill and work steadily, with faith and courage, for the betterment of their fellowmen.

There are those who love freedom and who accept responsibility, who ask of government no special favors for themselves.

These are the true stewards of our religious-moral heritage. They are the children of light. I believe they will overcome the children of darkness. But we cannot relax. We must work hard and faithfully with them.

When the historian of the future writes the history of our present times, he must write that the supporters of faith and freedom won out over the subversives, the selfish and the slothful. Our religious heritage must be preserved, strong and virile for our own people and indeed for the people beyond the seas. I know your Washington pilgrimage has this intent. I wish you well.

I add one further thought. A little while ago, I thanked you for coming to Washington because you want to give something. Of course you want to give. But you also want to receive something. You are pilgrims and pilgrims always have a goal and purpose. They want to get something so that they can return home stronger than when they started out. I hope that is what you are now able to do.

I hope you have seen your servants in Government at work and I hope you have been encouraged by what you have seen. I am not a career civil servant. I have been in Washington only a few years. But I am deeply impressed and gratified by the devotion—religious devotion—which inspires the work which is being done here on your behalf—and on behalf of our neighbors around the world.

I hope you will go home and tell your friends that the religious heritage of America is honored here—and I hope it motivates all that we do.

Thank you and goodby.

Funny, Unless—

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, our very able colleague from the Sixth District of Michigan, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, has performed a service in pointing out some

of the many loopholes in our present revenue code. A few of the paradoxical provisions of present tax law are humorous—unless, as the Cleveland Plain Dealer pointed out editorially on July 6, you happen to be the one who has to pay. Under unanimous consent, I insert the editorial:

FUNNY, UNLESS—

One of the funnier examples of how silly some of our tax laws are was cited recently by Representative CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, Republican of Michigan.

He explained that in 1951 when a 5-percent tax was levied against the unsuspecting and unorganized power mower lawn growers of the Nation, it was decided that industrial power mowers—for golf courses, farms, etc.—should not have to pay the tax. So any power mower 24 inches and wider in its cutting swath wasn't taxed, according to CHAMBERLAIN.

At that time most home mowers were 17 inches wide. But lately these have been widening, and the 17-inch home mower gave way to the 19-inch mower, the 19-inch mower gave way to the 21- and 22-inch mower, and then, naturally, came the tax-exempt 24-inch mower.

The result is wholesale confusion.

Very funny, as we said in the beginning. Unless, of course, you have had to pay the 5-percent tax on a mower. As Representative CHAMBERLAIN also commented, "It is one more example of the willy-nilly tax discrimination imposed upon the American consumer who has to pay a 10-percent tax on his automobile which is a necessity, while his neighbor pays no such tax on a yacht."

Four Banking Groups Favor H.R. 7950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. MASON. Four important banking groups have issued a statement in favor of H.R. 7950, which I introduced to the House recently. Inasmuch as the proposed equal taxation of commercial banks, mutual savings banks, and savings and loan associations has become a matter of rather violent controversy in the newspapers within the past few days, I believe that this joint statement should be published as it was agreed to by the signatory groups, without addition, subtraction or editorial comment. It is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 1.—The American Bankers Association, the Bankers Committee for Tax Equality, the Independent Bankers Association, and the Roth Committee will give their full united support to H.R. 7950, the groups said in a joint statement today.

The bill, introduced in the Congress last week by Representative NOAH M. MASON, of Illinois, provides for changes in the laws governing Federal taxation of commercial banks, mutual savings banks, and savings and loan associations. It would, if enacted, result in the payment of substantial Federal income taxes by mutual institutions.

The joint statement follows:

"The American Bankers Association, the Bankers Committee for Tax Equality, the Independent Bankers Association, and the Roth Committee are dedicated to a belief in the principle of fair competition through fair tax treatment of commercial banks, mutual savings banks, and savings and loan associations.

"These four organizations are keenly aware of the importance of savings as an anti-inflationary curb. They are also aware of the need for Federal revenue.

"The present tax advantage of mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations over commercial banks places commercial banks in a disadvantageous position in competition for savings and in their ability to serve the public. This should be corrected.

"To this end, the American Bankers Association, the Bankers Committee for Tax Equality, the Independent Bankers Association, and the Roth Committee stand united to achieve equitable tax treatment.

"Therefore, H.R. 7950, embodying a joint proposal of these groups was introduced in the Congress on June 24, 1959, by Representative NOAH MASON, of Illinois. It was referred to the House Ways and Means Committee, where all tax legislation originates.

"The bill provides for—

"1. A uniform bad debt reserve formula for all three types of institutions. It would permit these institutions to set up annually one-half of 1 percent of loans, not Government insured or guaranteed, as a bad debt reserve before taxes, until the reserve amounts to 5 percent of such loans;

"2. Repeal of the present provisions of law which permits savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks to make transfer to a reserve for bad debts, without the payment of taxes, so long as the total of their surplus, undivided profits, and reserves does not exceed 12 percent of withdrawable accounts or total deposits;

"3. Amendment of the present provision under which mutual institutions may deduct all dividends and interest paid out. The bill would limit such tax deductions to an amount equal to the average percentage of net income actually paid out by all savings and loans associations or by all mutual savings banks during the preceding 10 years.

"That part of H.R. 7950 described in point 3 above merits particular attention. Its effect would be to permit a mutual institution to make dividend or interest payments, on a tax-deductible basis, up to a fixed amount of its net income—the amount to be determined by the percentage of income paid in dividends or interest by the entire industry during the previous 10 years. If it paid out less than the limit, it would be able to deduct only the amount it paid out. If, for example, records through 1958 were to show that all savings and loan associations had paid out in dividends an average of 70 percent of their net income during the past decade, then under this bill each savings and loan association would be permitted tax deduction on dividends up to 70 percent of its net income. A similar test is provided for mutual savings banks.

"H.R. 7950 differs in some detail from the general proposal adopted at the April meeting of the American Bankers Association administrative committee and executive council, which was described in the letter of President Lee Miller of the American Bankers Association under date of April 24. The change resulted from discussions and conferences in Washington with representatives of the American Bankers Association, the Bankers Committee for Tax Equality, the Independent Bankers Association, and the Roth Committee, leading to the introduction of the bill.

"Other bills on the subject of taxation of mutual institutions are now pending befor the Congress. The Curtis bill and the Harrison bills purpose a straight reduction in the tax-free loss reserves of mutual institutions from the present 12 percent to 5 percent. The Harrison bill additionally limits tax deductible dividends and interest to 3½ percent. We recognize that the Curtis and Harrison bills also have as their objective equitable tax treatment. We believe that the alternative methods they offer will aid the Congress in arriving at a sound decision.

"The opposition which we may encounter claims to be deeply entrenched and influential.

"With this in mind, the importance of unified and well coordinated action by our respective groups cannot be overemphasized. It merits the wholehearted support of all banks.

"We therefore pledge our strongest efforts toward the achievement of equitable tax treatment."

Tribute to Congressman Daniel J. Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein an article from the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Record, concerning the tribute paid to our colleague DAN FLOOD recently when he was honored by the various civic groups of his hometown:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Record, July 3, 1959]

DELAYED TRIBUTE

EDITOR OF THE RECORD:

As one who had been looking forward enthusiastically to participating in the richly earned tribute on June 6, 1959, to Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, I was bitterly disappointed that the plane in which I was traveling to Wilkes-Barre was forced by storms to return to Philadelphia, and that I was thus deprived of the privilege and pleasure of joining our mutual friends in honoring the Congressman.

It had been my purpose, as president of the Association of the U.S. Army, to present him with a certificate of appreciation from the association, and in so doing to deliver some appropriate remarks. Since the aforementioned circumstances prevented my doing so, I beg to forward, as of possible interest to you, the accompanying copy of what I had intended to say on that occasion.

With my sincere good wishes,

A. J. DREXEL BIDDLE,
Major General, President.

"I have an abiding admiration, affection, and esteem for DAN FLOOD, and I consider it a singular honor to participate in this richly earned tribute, and to be granted the privilege of touching particularly on two facets of his distinguished, useful life.

"You see, prior to and during World War II I lived very close to the people of the now captive countries behind the Iron Curtain in Eastern Europe. From the outset of their deplorable plight, DAN became acutely concerned with their unhappy fate. Inspired, of course, by his love and deep devotion to the people of this area who are friends and relatives of those in captive Europe, DAN has always been ready to lend a helping hand. Believe me, there's many a family in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and of the Baltic and other States who would welcome the chance to embrace DAN and thank him for what he has done and to express their ap-

preciation of his steadfast drive to further the principle of freedom and dignity of the individual.

"Then, too, it is with a sense of pride and appreciation that I point to his untiring efforts toward advancing the interests of our armed services. With his clear comprehension of the problems confronting the free world, our Nation in particular, together with his penetrating grasp of the military requirements necessary to meet them, he is always out in front, striving for what it takes to keep our military posture second to none.

"As president of the Association of the U.S. Army, I take the greatest pleasure in announcing in the association's award of a certificate of appreciation to DAN for his active and continued support of a strong national defense and his unswerving recognition of the Army as an indispensable factor in the Nation's defensive strength.

"Congressman FLOOD, it is now my privilege and pleasure to present to you this expression of appreciation from the Association of the U.S. Army.

"I should be remiss were I to conclude without paying my warmest respects to the other member of this outstanding team—one who has been constantly at DAN'S side, working with him in furthering the interests of this area, of this Commonwealth, of the Nation—none other than his charming, intelligent, and ever-understanding and helpful lady, Mrs. Dan Flood."

Reuben Darbinian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of an editorial taken from the Armenian weekly, Hairenik, in its issue of July 2. The article pays tribute to the editor in chief of Hairenik, Mr. Reuben Darbinian, who recently celebrated his 50th anniversary of service to the Armenian people, as well as his practice of journalism.

It was my pleasure last week to be in Detroit on the occasion of the annual convention of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, the Armenian Relief Society, and the Armenian Youth Federation. On Thursday evening, July 2, a testimonial dinner was given to Mr. Darbinian at the Sheraton-Cadillac Hotel, before which I had the privilege of speaking at that time. It was a great privilege for me to be present and to join Mr. Darbinian's many friends and admirers in paying a well-deserved tribute to him, and I include this editorial so that Members may have a chance to be familiar with his outstanding record and his many accomplishments in the field of journalism and on behalf of the cause of Armenian independence:

REUBEN DARBINIAN

The jubilee celebration of 50 years of service to his people which tonight is being accorded to Reuben Darbinian, editor in chief of Hairenik publications, at the behest of the central committee of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, and in a festive setting of three conventions being held in Detroit, not only is a well-deserved tribute to a great man, but it has the proportions of a landmark in contemporary Armenian history.

During the past half century no other Armenian, perhaps, made his influence felt so sharply and so decisively upon the fortunes of the Armenian communities of the dispersion as the modest recipient of tonight's homage. Reuben Darbinian has behind him an illustrious record of more than half a century activity as a brilliant intellect, a distinguished journalist, and an incomparable party and national leader.

A man of deeds more than words, a champion of great causes and great accomplishments, he early came into prominence as a leading figure in literary, cultural, and policymaking schemes of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation.

His journalistic career, a field in which he distinguished himself as almost unrivaled, began early in his youth when he became editor of the Armenian language publication Arev (Sun) of Baku, followed by Harach of Erivan, the Korz (Work) monthly of Baku, the Azadamart (Fight for Freedom) weekly of Istanbul, and finally, during the past 37 years, as editor in chief of Hairenik publications. It may truly be said he was the sole inspiring genius behind the creation of the Hairenik Monthly, the Hairenik Weekly, and the Armenian Review, three distinguished publications which the paternal patronage of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation has maintained to this day.

With the dispersion of the Armenian intellectuals after the Soviet takeover of Armenia, Reuben Darbinian salvaged much of the wreckage by rallying these expatriated and expropriated unfortunates around the Hairenik Monthly, providing them at least a modicum of subsistence from the meager pay which they received for their contributions. He nurtured entire generations and discovered a host of talented young writers as a result of the Hairenik Monthly. Today, the Hairenik Monthly has become an imposing compendium of documentary literature about the recent and contemporary history of the Armenian people.

He did the same thing with the creation of the Hairenik Weekly and the Armenian Review. The latter, in particular, now in its 11th year, is slowly proving itself as a veritable counterpart of the Armenian language monthly.

A realist by temperament, he never was carried away by the romanticisms of his contemperaries which fell victims to various types of isms. A keen observer, a profound student of history, a man of unusual insight and unquestionably an extraordinary analyst, he always kept his foot on solid ground, and in so doing he kept countless others from wandering in devious paths. That is the reason why he won for himself the reputation of the greatest foe of communism, and conversely, the greatest champion of national freedom.

He analyzed and exposed the Soviet evil as early as the twenties and it may confidently be contended that, his conclusions of 40 years ago are just as fresh and valid today as they were then and no one has been able to improve upon them.

A great educator, leader, patriot, and statesman, Darbinian has endeared himself to countless admirers, being respected by friend and foe. He has given us a life of service and great achievement. He has served his people well.

Metropolitan Pollution Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, again the Rocky Mountain News has put the spotlight on the difficulties of a metropolitan area—in this instance Denver—in trying to manage the sewage wastes of a rapidly increasing and sprawling area.

Bill Miller's sixth article on June 26 reports how Denver has failed in its several efforts to get secondary treatment of its sewage, as required by the Colorado law.

In inserting this article in the RECORD Appendix, may I especially call attention to the commendable statement of Denver's new Mayor, Richard Y. Batterton, showing his intention of working this problem out in concert with his neighboring metropolitan communities.

It is these suburban areas I have the duty and privilege of representing here in the Congress. It has been in their interests that I have spoken before this House and its committees in favor of economical and effective action by the Federal Government, such as that provided in H R. 3610. I met with the public official of the metropolitan area on Monday of this week in support of a cooperative approach to this problem.

The article follows:

TWO PROJECTS HELD SOLUTION TO SEWAGE PROBLEM

(By Bill Miller)

Back in the depression-ridden 1930's Denver undertook two projects which, if successful, would have solved the city's sewage disposal problems.

Unfortunately, neither was successful. But the effort was made by Denver in bygone years when sewage problems, stream pollution and similiar phrases were seldom heard.

These two projects were the Whitecap Canal and magnatite filters.

First the story of the Whitecap Canal project, a fascinating one that showed imagination, vision, courage, and determination.

Unfortunately, it was a giant boondoggle.

PACT SIGNED

On August 30, 1935, Denver entered into an agreement with the Farmers Reservoir and Irrigation Co. concerning the Whitecap Canal, which had not been in use for many years.

The canal ran from Clear Creek to the Platte River and, according to the agreement, "needs extensive cleaning out and other renovating before it can be used."

At the time, Denver was engaged in bringing Fraser River and Williams Fork water from the western slope.

"Use of the Whitecap Canal would be advantageous to the city both in connection with its water to be brought through the Moffat water tunnel and its Williams Fork water," the agreement read. In return the reservoir firm was given certain rights to buy excess water.

To carry out the project, the manager of improvements agreed to build a dam to divert water into the Burlington Ditch.

CANAL CLEANED

The canal was cleaned up. The dam, inlet and outlet structures, a drainage system, and warehouses were built.

The canal work was accomplished through the aid of the Works Progress Administration (WPA) and the Public Works Administration (PWA). It ran along a shale outcropping that was covered in some areas by sand and gravel.

In addition, the canal was too level. There was not much gravity flow and some believed at times of high water in the Platte, water could be diverted into Clear Creek.

Its purpose, of course, was to carry Clear Creek water to the Platte.

After years of work and expenditure of dollars, water was released into the canal.

And all hell broke loose.

ALL FOR NAUGHT

The canal was porous as a sponge. Furthermore, the water didn't run either way. It just stayed in one spot and seeped through the canal bottom and banks.

Lowland farms, houses and even a schoolhouse were flooded.

The experiment lasted 3 days. The water was drained out and the experience forgotten, except for damage suits that stretched out through the years.

The old canal is covered now, its many structures just a memory. Out along Clear Creek, north of Denver, there still are visible a few outcroppings of cement pilings but that's about all.

What has this to do with the sewage problems in Metropolitan Denver?

The interesting thing about this entire project is this: It was built, primarily, as a sewage not a water project.

GOOD INTENTION

The theory behind it? Western Slope water would be diverted, brought into Clear Creek and eventually to the Platte River near the Burlington Ditch.

Purpose of this diversion water was to dilute the sewage being dumped into the Platte by Denver.

In addition, the city planned to construct a series of shallow lakes or lagoons and use some of this water for the natural treatment of sewage. The lagoon system still is effective—it is used extensively by smaller communities.

When sewage is dumped into these shallow lakes, nature, through bacteriological processes, disposes of the waste.

This canal project was not a small one. The depth at water line was 5½ feet and was 48 feet wide at the top and 26 feet wide at the bottom.

Its length was 20,200 feet or nearly 4 miles.

TROUBLE AHEAD

How much the project cost is a moot question.

A report of the Denver Water Board in 1936 indicated that nearly $500,000, mostly WPA and PWA, had been spent in 1935 and 1936.

However, the entire project was not a loss.

Water from the Williams Fork is still diverted to the Western Slope through the Jones Pass tunnel.

Now, about the magnatite filters.

Before 1936, Denver deposited all of its wastes into the Platte. When plans and specifications were drawn for the Denver sewage disposal plant, the city envisioned complete treatment facilities.

The plant was designed for a population of 317,000. It was to handle a flow of 54 million gallons per day.

The plant was put into operation December 11, 1937, and almost from the outset difficulties were encountered with the magnatite filters.

FILTERS FLOP

The filters, coupled with chlorine disinfection, were supposed to give Denver complete treatment.

But the filters didn't work. It was a new process and the filter screens would erode and the fine sand would wash away.

A city engineer later reported:

"For 4 years, the contractor and magnatite filter representatives attempted to correct the operational difficulties. More than $100,000 was spent to place the filters in satisfactory operation."

But the efforts failed.

The Magnatite Filter Co. was unable to put the filters in acceptable working order. The city sued for $288,000.

But the firm entered bankruptcy and the city settled for $30,000.

CHLORINE KEY

Magnatite filters and chemical flocculation were abandoned in 1942 when the plant was converted to primary treatment with some aeration and return of the sludge to increase solids removal.

Chlorine disinfection of the final effluent before it was dumped into the river was continued then and continues now.

Since this time, Denever experimented with many methods of treating sewage. Many have met with failure, others with moderate success.

But Denver has never stopped trying. Denver admits its shortcomings and does not claim to have perfect treatment.

But a report issued in 1950 spells out its position:

"It is apparent that the Denver sewage plant was designed with the intent of providing complete treatment. The failure of the secondary treatment by means of the magnatite filters necessitated the conversion of the existing plant to only preliminary treatment with chlorine sterilization of the effluent."

MUST BE SOLVED

The city recognizes that, eventually, the problem will have to be solved.

Mayor-elect Richard Y. (Dick) Batterton pledges:

"We recognize the problem and we wish to solve the entire metropolitan area sewage situation in cooperation with our neighbors. It's a problem that must be solved."

Complete treatment includes the primary and secondary, which usually involves some biological process in which a high BOD (biochemical oxygen demand) removal is obtained.

This is most often provided by either activated sludge or tricking filters, followed by secondary clarifiers.

Following this treatment and a good dose of chlorine for added safety, the effluent can be dumped with little fear of polluting the stream.

But without secondary treatment—and especially when mechanical difficulties or insufficient capacity forces bypassing the plant—downstream users are mighty unhappy.

There are odors, there is stream pollution. When this happens people living in the Brighton area get incensed at Denver.

There's also another interesting sidelight about the effect, if any, on truck farming.

Admissibility of Evidence—Statements of Confessions

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4957) to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, my chief difficulty with this bill, to which I am opposed, is that it is an indirect attack against rule 5(a). Rule 5(a) is very simple, and it says much. It states that any accused shall be arraigned without unnecessary delay. As was so succinctly and ably pointed out by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY], in the Mallory case there was an 8-hour delay, and it was shown that there was every opportunity to arraign prior to the time that arraignment occurred. It has long been Federal practice, and it has been the rule ever since the McNabb case that rule 5(a) will be safeguarded by excluding from evidence the fruits of its violation. Therefore, what this proposed bill does is to indirectly nullify rule 5(a), and I suggest to the Committee that if there is disagreement with the rule stated in 5(a), that any accused shall be arraigned without unnecessary delay, we should attack it on this ground and not by a back-door approach.

The Mallory case represents no basic change to the evidentiary rule established by the McNabb case in 1943. Since 1943, certainly, the Congress has not seen fit to take action to overcome what was done in the McNabb case. I point out also that the Mallory decision was a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court, and the author of the decision was Mr. Justice Frankfurter who was also the author of the majority opinion in the McNabb case. What rule 5(a) does, which is at the basis of this, is to simply state the fundamental rule that a man is to be detained in a criminal proceeding solely for the purpose of bringing him before the court, to assure his presence at the trial and to set in motion the various rules of protection upon which so much of this country's history is founded. Rule 5(a) reflects the right to counsel; the right against self-incrimination; the right to habeas corpus and the right to be detained only for probable cause. The argument has been suggested that in the majority report, which the Committee has before it, the difficulty with the Mallory opinion and the Mallory decision is that the public is being punished and that if we allow the rule of the Mallory case to stand, the entire public will be punished, society will not be safeguarded and the police will be unduly hampered in their efforts to safeguard the public. Let me

answer this by referring to a very excellent report, in the form of a letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, from the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, one of the leading bar associations of this country, which is opposed to the Mallory bill. The letter says this:

This argument, in short, proves too much, because almost any exclusionary rule of evidence or procedure adopted to protect the rights of accused persons might be criticized on similar grounds.

For example, it may frequently happen that hearsay evidence is available which, if received in evidence, would go far to establish that an accused person is in fact guilty. Under some circumstances, hearsay evidence may be very reliable and highly pertinent on the issue of guilt or innocence. Nevertheless, for reasons which are generally understood by the public as well as the legal profession, such evidence should not be, and is not, received. The interests of justice are thought to be better served by excluding all hearsay evidence than by admitting such evidence, either on a general or a selective basis. Is the public punished because, on some occasions, a guilty man goes free who might have been convicted on the basis of hearsay evidence? Surely not, if one accepts the general conclusion that the interests of justice are best served by the exclusion of hearsay evidence. So, too, if the interests of justice are best served by requiring prompt arraignment of arrested persons, the public is not punished merely because confessions might sometimes be obtained during an unlawfully protracted confinement.

So I would suggest to the members of the committee that the difficulty with this bill is that it might well deprive the accused of the cloak of innocence; it might deprive him of counsel when counsel is most needed; it would permit detention incommunicado and by that means deny him the right of habeas corpus.

In connection with the argument that the rights of the accused are safeguarded by the writ of habeas corpus and always will be despite this bill, it should be pointed out that as a practical matter the great writ of habeas corpus cannot come into play until someone is notified that the accused has been detained. His family or friends must know where he is. It is therefore fundamental that the most important thing that a man can have under the conditions of an accused like the Mallory case is the independent advice of counsel which must be supplied, of course, by persons on the outside who have knowledge of his detention. Therefore, in summary, I should like to say that this bill in the interest of justice should be defeated.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield.

Mr. POFF. May I inquire of the gentleman if he feels that unnecessary delay in and of itself should void a confession even though admittedly the confession was voluntary?

Mr. LINDSAY. I think the answer to that is that as was pointed out by the chairman of the committee, that as a practical matter it is impossible to know whether or not unnecessary delay—that is to say, a long period of unnecessary detention without arraignment, whether such a delay in and of itself could render a confession involuntary; and for that reason, and going back through history, therefore, it has been a rule established in this country that unnecessary delay in and of itself is unlawful, and all evidentiary matter which is obtained as a result of that delay must be excluded. The question cannot be put in terms of whether the confession was voluntary "even though there was unnnecessary delay." Delay in and of itself can be coercive.

Mr. POFF. Then the gentleman's answer to my question is yes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield.

Mr. YATES We have seen many instances recently passed and through the years, where the fifth amendment has been used by people whom the police have tried to convict. Is that a sufficient reason for doing away with the fifth amendment, would the gentleman say?

Mr. LINDSAY. Of course not.

Mr. YATES. Does not that same reason hold true for sustaining the Supreme Court decision and for voting against this bill?

Mr. LINDSAY. I would say so.

No Place for Bigotry and Intolerance in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD an address I delivered Sunday, June 28, in Cleveland, at a banquet of Knights of Columbus, Cleveland Council No. 733, in honor of His Excellency, the Most Reverend Edward F. Hoban, Archbishop-Bishop of Cleveland. The subject of my address was "No Place for Bigotry and Intolerance in America":

It is a very great honor and privilege for me to have this opportunity to speak at this banquet through which we express our esteem and affection for His Excellency the Most Reverend Edward F. Hoban, Archbishop-Bishop of Cleveland. It is altogether fitting that Cleveland Council No. 733 should name this third degree class in honor of Archbishop Hoban, coming as it does one day after the celebration of His Excellency's 81st birthday.

This occasion affords us a splendid opportunity to look back on the founding days of the Knights of Columbus, to examine the reasons which brought our Order into existence and to reflect upon its importance in these days in which we live.

The founding of the Knights of Columbus was based upon the avowed intention of its members to protect the holy office and person of all Catholic priests. Through the years, that has remained as the purpose, as the inner life, of all members of our order.

It would do us all well to look back upon that era when such protective action was a matter of practical necessity. In 1882 when the Knights of Columbus was founded our country was in the throes of a period of bigotry and black prejudice. As always, the bigotry and prejudice of that era was based upon ignorance and the exploitation of this ignorance by those who sought personel gain by advancing disunity, misunderstanding, and distrust among the American people. At that time all sorts of evil gossip was being spread about the mission of the Catholic Church in the world, about our clergy, and indeed, about our outstanding Catholic laity. These bigots described the mission of the Catholic Church in America as a conspiracy, an effort to rob our people of their liberties and freedoms. Rumors were spread that our churches and rectories were storehouses for arms and ammunition which was to be used at some future date by us Catholics to seize control of the civil machinery in our country. Cartons appeared in the hate journals of that day depicting our priests and religious as wearing horns. Charges were frequently heard that the clergy and laity in America were working together toward the day when the Holy Father would be installed as temporal and spiritual ruler of the United States.

Those were the days when the bigots played upon the minds of the illiterate and the gullible, and quite a racket they made of it—that is, a racket for their own personal and material gain. It was in these circumstances that the holy office and the person of our Catholic priests fell under violent attack and insistances arose in which the very lives of our clergy were in danger. It was in these same circumstances that a handful of Catholic laity, alarmed by the trend of that day, banded together to form the Knights of Columbus. Their good works, and particularly their advocacy of the truth about the mission of the Catholic Church in America, stimulated the development of the order throughout the United States.

With the coming of World War I, when the cause of human freedom hung in the balance, the bigots were forced to run for cover by the patriotism and courageous deeds of the Catholic clergy and laity. Legions were the Catholic chaplains and fighting laity who won the acclaim of their fellow Americans by their bravery and sacrifices in defense of our country. It would have been very unpopular indeed to impugn the loyalty of our clergy and laity in this atmosphere. There followed then a period of warm understanding and tolerance in our country. It was no accident that, in the years immediately following World War I, our country enjoyed a period of great progress and development. In no small measure, the unity of all our American people contributed to this development.

But once again the evil voice of bigotry was heard in our public life, this time in the form of a secret and terroristic organization. I speak of the Ku Klux Klan—the KKK. The public memory is short. The deeds of patriotism and sacrifice during World War I which had put the lie to the false claims of the anti-Catholic bigots had been dimmed by the passage of time. The professional bigots, whom it seems we are likely to have with us in all ages, then organized to destroy the unity and amity among all our American people, which grew out of facing and defeating a common danger. The Ku Klux Klan attempted to set apart all Catholics, Jews, and Negroes from their fellow Americans and to make them the targets of suspicion, distrust and hatred. What a racket this turned out to be. You will recall that the leaders of this un-American movement were exposed as scoundrels of the first order, stealing vast sums of money, contributed by its members. The hoods and robes, the symbols of terror and the acts of violence which characterized the KKK, in due time brought about its

destruction. The American people will not long tolerate the advocates of hate once they are exposed to public light.

With the coming of World War II American Catholics, clergy and laity alike, were in the forefront of the struggle for human freedom and the dignity of man. Our Catholic people saw the dangers of Hitler and his movement presented to our democratic way of life long before any of their fellow Americans. They also recognized the equal danger of Russian communism and the threat it posed to our American way of life. What a bitter pill our people had to swallow as they heard Russian communism referred to as a democratic way of life and the Russians called fighters for the basic human freedoms. When the Russian Communists were officially declared as our allies in World War II this served as a real test of the devotion and loyalty of our Catholic people. In these circumstances our Catholic clergy and laity again arose to superb heights as they demonstrated their unswerving loyalty to our country on the battlefields of the world. The daily list of fatalities and the wounded, by their names alone, stand as an indelible testament to this unquestioned loyalty.

So again at war's end, that is World War II, there was no room for bigotry and intolerance in our public life. The common sacrifices of all the American people again brought us closer together as a diversified, but always united, people. There was then no room in our country for those who would question the origin, the religious faith or the color of a fellow citizen as a requisite to loyalty. This was especially true in our public life as fresh from the trials of a devastating war, we, as a people, looked forward to an era of peace with justice for all nations and people. The world had undergone a very great change and with it came changes which had affected the daily lives of every one of our citizens.

In these past 10 years we, as a Nation, the citadel of human freedom, have been forced to look to our ramparts by the threat which atheistic communism, on the march, poses not only for us but for all civilized mankind. These are days when the call for unity, mutual respect, and understanding among all our people, overrides any other consideration. These are days which test all the values and, indeed, the very foundation of civilization.

Is it not strange, then, that in these days the head of the evil serpent of bigotry has been raised to strike a hard blow at the cause of unity, mutual respect, and understanding among people. There are operating today, on the American scene, a number of hate organizations, some of which have attracted national attention by the violence of the falsehoods which they seek to permeate into our public life. I do not propose to name these organizations, but I would group them all under this appropriate title "Bigots and Other Un-Americans United for the Spread of Falsehoods and Disunity Among the American People."

It is almost unbelievable that in these enlightened times we see the qualifications of a candidate for public office put into question because of his religious faith. To put it more bluntly, a small band of professional bigots are questioning the loyalty of all Catholics in the United States and in particular they have raised the question as to whether a Catholic, because of his religious beliefs, is fitted to be President of the United States.

It is both fair and proper to ask what occasions such an un-American inquiry as this. As I have said, it seems as though we are destined to have the advocates of bigotry and intolerance among us in all generations and they appear when the moment seems most opportune. But this is hardly an opportune moment for the professional bigots to undetrake a widespread propaganda campaign calculated to spread disunity and to weaken the fabric of our democratic way of life. Nothing could serve better the despotic purposes of atheistic communism and the plan of the Russians for world conquest than to cause division on the American scene on the basis of religion. So I believe it is urgent in the extreme that thinking Americans ban together for the purpose of taking a hard and honest look at the question of what motivates those who seek to divide our country by bringing into question the loyalty of anyone because of his religious beliefs.

The Knights of Columbus was founded for the avowed purpose of defending and protecting the holy office and the person of all Catholic priests. In this, the members of the order have done well. But the task is not finished. A great public service would be accomplished if the members of the order would take the initiative necessary to expose the motives and objectives of all hate organizations now operating on the American scene. I commend this to you as a task worthy of the purposes for which you stand. I ask this of you as Americans who have proved your loyalty and devotion to the highest American ideals so that we may remain a united people, fearless of the future, and certain of the destiny which divine providence holds for our beloved country.

Freedom's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the East Side News on July 4, 1959:

FREEDOM'S BIRTHDAY
(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Tomorrow is freedom's birthday. July 4th is a glorious day. It is an immortal day—our national holiday.

It is the day when our birth certificate as a nation was signed. It is the 183d anniversary of our Declaration of Independence. For the blessings of liberty have sprung from God and are enshrined in the hearts of His children.

Our sacred document recognized the principle that all men are created equal. It declared that man is endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights. It was a fearless arraignment of tyranny. It was the bold assertion of the rights of man. It was indeed the soul of the Liberty Bell.

The Liberty Bell pealed like a trumpet blast throughout the world. It roused men and women to thought and to action. It was the fulfillment of the prayers of every living soul.

Here was a land where liberty is the property of every man. Here was a land where freemen dare to think, to speak, and to write their convictions. Here was a land where every man dares to go from any schoolhouse to any church house. Here was a land where every man is a peer and where no man dares to wear a crown.

The pillars of all races and creeds came to our shores. They drank deep from the fountain of liberty. They helped to forge and build a new civilization. They fought and died that liberty might live—that our flag might be unstained. They fought so that all men underneath its fold shall bear no chains, and that no man shall sigh for freedom while a single star shines in the heavens. It was truly God's country.

America has become the worldwide synonym for truth, charity, justice, liberty and equality. American sons and daughters have fallen on every battlefield where the inherent rights of free people have been challenged since the birth of our Nation.

At the dedication of the 5th Marine Cemetery on Iwo Jima, in March 1945, Rabbi Roland B. Gittlesohn caught the spirit of the meaning of freedom when he said in part:

"Here lie men who loved America because their ancestors generations ago helped in her founding, and other men who loved her with equal passion because they themselves or their own fathers escaped from oppression to her blessed shores. Here lie officers and men, Negroes and whites, rich men and poor—together. Here are Protestants, Catholics and Jews—together. Here no man prefers another because of his faith or despises him because of his color. Here there are no quotas of how many from each group are admitted or allowed. Among these men there is no discrimination. No prejudices. No hatred. Theirs is the highest and purest democracy.

"Any man among us, the living, who fails to understand that will thereby betray those who lie here dead. Whoever of us lifts his hand in hate against a brother or thinks himself superior to those who happen to be in the minority makes of this ceremony and of the bloody sacrifice it commemorates an empty, hollow mockery. Thus, then, do we, the living, so dedicate ourselves to the right of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, of white men and Negroes alike to enjoy the democracy for which all * * * have here paid the price."

Let us make July 4 a day of rededication throughout our land. Let us take a new look at freedom, think how it works for you in your community and help it along today as it has helped you in the past.

Admissibility of Evidence—Statements and Confessions

SPEECH
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4957) to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the principal question before the House today is not so much a matter of a technicality or a question of semantics. The question is whether one of the real treasures that we have in this country vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, our liberty, our liberty from the police state, will be further reduced. Any encroachment by the Congress of the United States seems to me rather astonishing and rather a shame. Apparently, this bill will pass as it passed overwhelmingly last year. I certainly will not be one to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ashley Resolution Offers Congress an Opportunity To Help Solve Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the editors of the New York Times which appeared on Sunday, July 5, 1959, describing the concurrent resolution, introduced by Congressman THOMAS L. ASHLEY, for a statement of U.S. solidarity on the Berlin problem. The Ashley resolution also explains that the U.S. position is based on a commitment to liberty shared by peoples everywhere. Representative ASHLEY has made a positive contribution to the solution of the Berlin problem. The text of the resolution appears at page 10471 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 22. The letter to the Times follows:

BACKING OUR BERLIN STAND—CIRCULATION AMONG SOVIET PEOPLE OF ASHLEY RESOLUTION TEXT URGED

(The writer of the following letter has served as Information Officer at the American Embassy, Bangkok, and is former European director of Free Europe Press in Germany.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Geneva deadlock is based squarely upon a fundamental conflict of principles. Because those principles reflect interests which are neither territorial nor military, but are psychological, disengagement of forces seems to hold little promise as an avenue toward solution.

The Berlin problem is consistent with the general pattern of East-West tensions since World War II. Initiative exercised by the Soviets elicits a defensive Western response and a polemical battle ensues, revolving about the issue cited or created by the U.S.S.R. In this case the minimum Soviet demand, to date, is liquidation of the cancer of liberty in West Berlin. The Western position is defensive: to avoid war and to seek an accommodation, but not at the price of West Berlin's liberty.

Perhaps a posture of firm, defensive response is as far as we can go. It was this sort of limit which was implicit in the containment policy. But nowadays even realpolitik must incorporate dynamic psychological action, and Berlin is no muddled issue like a Dienbienphu or a Quemoy. Moreover, American public opinion is reported to be consciously and stanchly behind our Geneva stand.

DYNAMIC POLICY LACKING

It is disturbing, therefore, that our political imagination and shrewdness have failed to put us in a position more dynamic. It is almost as if our arsenals contained no more than hardware and not a stimulating proportion of that.

Having taken a bold position for very positive reasons, can we not build that position up to more than mere intransigence? Can we not exploit those reasons in order to set the stage of this continual international tension against the backdrop not of our passive fondness for the status quo, but of sly Soviet machination and brinkmanship?

A new congressional proposal recently pointed to psychological opportunities existing for us in the present deadlock. In the House Congressman THOMAS L. ASHLEY, of Ohio, introduced a resolution (text reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 22) which would provide a much-needed statement of U.S. solidarity on the Berlin issue and at the same time comprise an act of psychological initiative by addressing a significant message to the Soviet peoples.

This resolution, by putting both Houses of Congress on record as endorsing the U.S. diplomatic position, would underscore American unity and forestall a totalitarian miscalculation of our degree of determination.

But the resolution goes beyond our firmness (and willingness to negotiate) to explain why our stand is derived from a commitment to liberty and how that commitment is identifiable with the aspirations of peoples everywhere. It is in these passages that the resolution (which would be communicated to the Soviets with the request that it be made public information in the U.S.S.R.) contains ideas of significance to the Soviet peoples and the regime alike.

SOURCES OF TENSION

Pointing to the lack of conditions of liberty as a source of tension, e.g., the Hungarian revolution, the resolution deplores dogma which creates fear and tension by alleging the inevitability of antagonisms between nations or so-called classes. It calls for elimination of restrictions upon communications, both international, and internal, as a practical, immediately available means of reducing misunderstanding and friction.

In a dignified expression of friendship for the Soviet peoples and of respect for the achievements of Soviet individuals, the Ashley resolution states plainly that the accomplishments of Soviet citizens can be regarded as no threat or danger when they are devoted to the service of the Soviet peoples as they freely decide.

By emphasizing the universality of men's ordinary aspirations, this message shows that we are against something because we are for a future of individual dignity and peaceful prosperity.

For us to try to communicate these ideas, particularly through the device of a special pronouncement of our elected representatives, can be far more than propaganda. Reflecting without belligerence the nature of our commitment, the resolution goes to the heart of the big lie, that ideological notion of hostility which is employed by a minority to mobilize a nation in support of its totalitarian regime.

By acting upon an understanding of the Soviet regime's reliance on such notions we may rise above desperate inflexibility and wishful thinking in countering that regime's initiatives.

H. S. WEAVER.
CAPE ELIZABETH, MAINE, *June 30, 1959.*

Recreational Buildings With a Threefold Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 29, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, what seems to me as an excellent and at the same time a very practical proposal has just come to my attention. The City Fusion Party of New York suggests the construction of recreational buildings which would serve a threefold purpose: as armories, which could also serve as recreational centers for youngsters; as air raid shelters in the event of emergencies; and as garages which would serve to keep many cars off the streets and thereby supply the funds to cover the cost and maintenance of such buildings.

This proposal has come to my attention through Mr. Jack Padawer, chairman of the City Fusion Party and a good friend of mine. I am pleased to insert into the RECORD the text of a brief release to the press issued by Mr. Padawer explaining the proposal. I think it deserves serious consideration and I commend the proposal to the attention of my colleagues:

The City Fusion Party proposed that the city construct combination armory-shelter-garage recreational buildings in place of existing obsolete armories.

Jack Padawer, party chairman, said this is a good method of providing a large number of youth recreational centers on a self-supporting basis.

By combining the garage portion with the other uses, the buildings will be self-liquidating in cost and self-supporting in operation, Padawer claimed.

"The city and State governments should jointly establish a new authority to finance the cost by the sale of bonds. This authority would function in a way similar to the Port of New York Authority and Tri-Boro Bridge Authority," Padawar explained.

"The subbasements which will be garages can easily be converted into air raid shelters whether the autos are in them or not, in case of emergency. The armory portions can double as juvenile recreational centers for after-school hours and on Saturdays, and Sundays, and holidays.

"The roof can be used as a helicopter landing area in times of stress, and a play area at other times.

"The revenue from the parking of cars will support it all."

Kennebago Guide, Cooking Champ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, time after time I have been pleased to read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD elaborate and interesting accounts of what is going on in the congressional districts of my colleagues.

With an effort to reciprocate, I am inserting into the RECORD an article from the Bangor Daily News that shows what has been cooking in my congressional district in Maine:

KENNEBAGO GUIDE, COOKING CHAMP

(By Bud Leavitt)

It wasn't the world series, nor the spit and polish of an Army-Navy football game, but for a touch of Maine's vacationland, plus some ingenius skill over a hot fire, Saturday's international outdoor contest at Bass

Park offered stay-at-homes something new and colorful in the way of entertainment.

A longtime Maine guide and bush pilot, Bud Russell, of Kennebago, was adjudged the grand champion and for the seven-course production carried away prizes and cash totaling $1,680.

Russell didn't win going away, not by any one slice from his seven rib, tastefully served roast beef. It took the jury 1 hour and 6 minutes—and some pencil work before Russell won it all. But he did, and no one protested the final decision.

Russell's $1,680 haul, broken down, went this way: $300 for winning the appetizer round, a creamy lobster bisque; $1,000, grand champion; $50, judged the most colorfully garbed entrant; a Scott outboard motor and a McCullough chain saw, valued respectively, $140 and $190, gifts to the king of the kettles by Southard's and Son of Bangor. It added up to a solid day's pay for the smiling Rangeley sporting camp owner and guide. He didn't take all the money, but the lion's share.

Valuewise, Blue Hill Artist Frank Hamabe ran second in the race. He copped $300 in the bread category and from the Pillsbury and General Electric Co., trucked home an electric range marketing at $420.

Then came the $300 winners, judged best in the seven course dinner derby.

REFUSES TO ACCEPT BOND

Charlie Miller of Bangor, skillfully preparing chicken, provided by the Hillcrest, Co., of Belfast, won the big round—1 to 25 points—for the preparation of meat, fish or fowl.

He took this heat, won $300 and passed up another $100, a savings bond, offered by the Henri Sauce Co., when he declared publicly that he had not used the product. This posed one for Executive Secretary J. Dan Baldwin of Bangor's 125th anniversary committee to untangle.

Charlie announced, "Give the full amount to my favorite charity, the Pine Tree Cripple Children's Camp."

But this couldn't be, according to the rules, said Baldwin. The savings bond then went to second contestant in the contest for meat honors, Mrs. Luke Smith, of Norfolk, Va.

Right down the line came Sports Editor Bob Kennedy, of the Portsmouth, N.H., Herald, a $300 victor in the salad class; Stanley Howland, of Milo, $300 for doing the outstanding job on a potato; Mrs. Sarah Saarikko of Lincoln, tastiest beverage, a Scandinavian drink and for the dessert class, a young man assigned to the U.S.S. *Jacana*, James Mastronardi.

VICTORY NO FLUKE

The whole lot, $3,500 in cash and another $900 in merchandise, added up to the richest outdoor dinner in America.

Russell's victory was no fluke. He came to make a run for the winner's circle.

His seven-round knockout opened with a lobster bisque, then broiled native Maine trout, a handsome cut off a 20-pound roast of beef, potatoes with sour cream, venison shish kebab, hot biscuit, pancakes and maple sirup and if the judges were willing boiling coffee with a whale-sized strawberry shortcake.

ARRIVED AT 7 A.M.

He served on a beautifully prepared woods table, flanked by green trees and scented with wild flowers—all native to the Maine eye.

Russell was at Bass Park preparing affairs at 7 a.m., 5 hours before the judging. He'd checked and double-checked to make certain every item was in its proper place. By midafternoon, after the judges had been out more than an hour, Russell's detailed planning paid off handsomely.

The whole scene thrilled the gathering who milled around the fires, some wood, some charcoaled. The crowd saw the oldest of outdoor cooking technique employed, Stan Howland's and Charlie Miller's woodsy settings; the modern contrivances featuring mechanically-timed broiling units.

VISITORS DELIGHTED

It was evident early in the morning that here was a show certain to delight visitors. And the visitors stayed around late, warmed and comforted by a perfectly beautiful splash of sun and humid-free temperature.

The judges worked each course like they were weighing diamonds.

They realized the importance of their task and each shouldered the responsibility with earnestness and great sincerity.

Judging the championship were: Congressman Clifford G. McIntire, of Perham; Dr. Kathryn Briwa, University of Maine; Francis B. Messmore, Esther Foley, New York; and Lydia Infield, India.

Did the Government Flood $40 to $50 Million Worth of North Dakota Land Forever Just To Protect a Few Kansas City Warehouses?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the Government made a bargain with North Dakota, and North Dakota has carried out her part of the bargain: namely, the sacrifice of nearly 400,000 acres of her lush river bottom and crop land to enable the construction of the Garrison Dam. To compensate for this loss, the Government promised when the Flood Control Act of 1944 became law, to construct the Garrison diversion project for irrigation and other beneficial uses in North Dakota. The situation, as it stands today, is summed up very well in an excellent editorial dated July 1, in the Bismarck, N. Dak., Tribune. The editorial follows:

THE BARGAIN SHOULD BE KEPT

Hope that Garrison diversion legislation might reach Congress in time for at least a start on hearings during the current session has evaporated.

The Bureau of the Budget, which is the policymaking arm of the White House, has adopted a negative attitude toward the project. It is now so late in the 1959 session that any congressional consideration before 1960 is all but impossible.

That is bad enough. But it's not the worst part of the story.

The worst is the growing fear that the Eisenhower administration is going to go back on the Federal Government's commitment to build Garrison diversion as a part of the Missouri Basin program adopted into law in 1944.

When the Flood Control Act of 1944 was adopted by Congress, diversion from the Missouri River for irrigation and other beneficial uses in North Dakota was an important part of the program it authorized.

The benefits to be achieved through diversion and irrigation were used to help justify the total program.

By the nature of things, it happened that construction of this phase of the program had to follow construction of other phases, such as big dams like Garrison. The dams were designed to serve not only irrigation but also flood control, navigation, flow stabilization for municipal and industrial water, power production, and so on.

Now the structures which will fulfill those purposes have been built, and the Federal Government is being asked to finish what was started by making a start on Garrison diversion.

North Dakota might have been excused for assuming that this would follow almost as a matter of course. Hadn't we been promised, in the 1944 act, that we'd get diversion, and with it irrigation, in return for sacrificing several hundred thousand of acres of rich Missouri bottom lands for Oahe and Garrison Reservoirs?

That was the commitment. When North Dakota worked for the basin program, including Garrison Dam, and even fought to have Garrison Dam Reservoir level fixed at the maximum efficiency height, it did so with the understanding that it would get diversion and irrigation.

If it had known, or even suspected, that it would get the dams and lose the land and not get diversion and irrigation, it would have fought the dams with all it had.

It couldn't make sense to flood maybe $40 to $50 million worth of North Dakota bottomland forever to protect a few million dollars' worth of Kansas City warehouses from infrequent floods, and get nothing in return.

Unfortunately, North Dakota may be in the position of having irrevocably carried out its part of the bargain and now begging the other party to the bargain, and the one who holds the strings, to carry out his part.

There is not space here to go into the benefit-cost ratio studies which have convinced the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior that the Diversion project is more than justified from an economic standpoint. If the facts that have been given the Bureau of the Budget haven't convinced it, it is because someone high in the administration doesn't want to be convinced. The suspicion exists that the negative attitude toward Garrison diversion stems from a general antipathy toward reclamation as opposed to other public works like river and harbor development—which, incidentally, don't pay their own way like irrigation does.

North Dakota and the reclamation program deserve better at the hands of the administration, which will have to take full responsibility for the betrayal which an adverse Budget Bureau report on the project would be.

Maine Greets New Old Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, Fourth of July this year afforded us an opportunity not only to celebrate our independence but to extend a warm welcome to the new State of Alaska as well.

All over America flags flew from their staff tops, greeting the new Fourth of July day with a new member included in its family of stars.

In some sectors of Maine this new version of Old Glory greeted Independence Day at its dawning, and because of the inspirational quality of these sunrise ceremonies, I am inserting into the RECORD a Bangor Daily News account of this exciting event at two locations in Maine.

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News, July 6, 1959]

MAINE GREETS NEW OLD GLORY AT MOUNT KATAHDIN

MILLINOCKET, July 5.—There were stars over Katahdin July 4.

Stars of the heavens that glowed brightly at midnight but faded in the graying light of the chilly windswept dawn.

Forty-nine stars of the flag of the United States raised on Monument Peak at 4:42 o'clock in the morning as the sun's golden disk broke over the northeastern horizon.

And eight golden stars of the flag of the State of Alaska set in a field of blue in the outline of the Big Dipper.

There were human stars in the sunrise drama atop Katahdin, too. Members of the Millinocket Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and troop No. 58, Boy Scouts of America, who carried the new flag 5⅛ miles up the rugged slopes to hold the first civilian flag raising in the Nation in honor of the 49th State. Flag etiquette permits display of the colors at sunrise except in unusual circumstances.

Seven members of the VFW post and five Boy Scouts reached the windy plateau atop Katahdin after dark Friday and poised for the predawn dash to Monument Peak, which rears its granite ramparts 5,267 feet above the level of the sea.

There was little in the nature of a formal ceremony to accompany the unfurling of the 49-starred banner planted above the rough boulders which mark the northern terminus of the Appalachian Trail from Georgia.

An eight-starred flag, donated by an Alaska friend for the occasion, whipped below the American flag in the windy dawn.

It was only a fleeting ceremony, and in minutes after the sun had cleared the horizon the party began its long trek down the mountain for a hot breakfast and a rest for weary legs.

Heading up the event and making the trip up the mountain were VFW members Frank Perry, Dana Burleigh, Wilson Greene, Everett Barnes, Henry Ackerson, and Alfred Jenkins.

Boy Scouts from Troop No. 58 who made the trip under direction of Scoutmaster Herbert Tucker were Robert Larkin, John Barker, George Murray, Robert Ellis, and Wayne Kidney.

Supporting the expedition at the base of the mountain with a hot meal were Francis Larkin, Edward Weiskitchen, Ralph Jewers, and Carlton Kidney.

AT MOUNT CADILLAC

BAR HARBOR, July 5.—It was a far cry from that day 183 years ago when this country's infant politicians signed the Declaration of Independence to the summit of Mount Cadillac at Bar Harbor Saturday morning at 4.46 o'clock when a group of dignitaries made their own declaration welcoming Alaska as the 49th State.

For 183 years ago the Declaration was signed amidst bitterness and argument, with this country seeking escape from its motherland and citizens regarding each other with suspicion as to where their loyalties stood.

But on Mount Cadillac the dawn showed that most of that feeling has vanished. In fact, a representative of the Canadian Government took part in the ceremonies which saw one of the first U.S. flags to greet the sun of a July 4 day hoisted on its staff here.

The ceremony was held to officially welcome Alaska as the 49th State.

The 49-star flag which was sent aloft will be shipped to the Governor of Alaska. Approximately 500 persons attended the ceremonies.

George Hadley, first mate aboard the ferry *Bluenose*, which plys the Bay of Fundy between Yarmouth, N.S., and Bar Harbor, represented the Canadian Government at the affair.

Three members of the committee arranging the ceremonies on Mount Cadillac listed the official time that the sun's rays first struck the new flag at 4:45.5 o'clock. They were H. Otis Keene, Bar Harbor harbormaster; C. Edward Shea, Bar Harbor Times editor and publisher; and Col. Pardon Watson, honorary president of the Mount Cadillac Sunrise Club.

Speaking at the dawn rites was U.S. Congressman CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, of Perham, who told those gathered at the summit that "as we extend our greetings and a hearty welcome to the new State of Alaska, we are reminded that others before us have experienced a similar excitement, watching, as they have, our family of stars grow from 13 to its present number. And next year, with the admission of Hawaii to the Union, this family will have grown to 50."

He urged Americans to regard the Fourth of July not only as a day of celebration, but one of dedication.

A telegram from the Governor of Alaska, William E. Egan, to the committee was read. Egan wrote: "that this ceremony is being conducted while it is yet July 3 throughout much of the vast expanse of the 49th State provides dramatic evidence of the greatness of a Nation in which we are all one under the flag."

Taking part in the ceremonies were a U.S. Marine detachment from Brunswick; members of the George E. Kirk American Legion Post at Bar Harbor, Lt. Comdr. J. Feeley of the U.S.S. *Miller*, a Navy destroyer which anchored at Bar Harbor for the July 4 observance; and members from Portland, Maine, headed by the Loring Post AMVETS, Department Commander Wallace Bragdon of New Gloucester.

The Farm Mess: Rural and Urban Voters Say Clean It Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, my 4-point program to end the farm mess is as follows: First, end all farm subsidies forthwith—they will cost almost $6 billion this year alone; second, hold a "fire-sale" of Government stocks of accumulated farm surpluses aggregating about $9 billion—and costing about $1 billion a year to store; third, use part of proceeds to relocate smaller, marginal farmers; and, fourth, use remaining proceeds for debt and tax reduction.

Since this plan has been proposed, letters of approval have reached me from all parts of the Nation written by both rural and urban voters. I have received not a single disapproving letter, even from a farmer receiving subsidy. This pretty well bears out a recent poll of the Nation's farmers in which 55 percent of them voted to get rid of all subsidies and get the Government out of farm programs altogether.

Previously on several occasions I have placed in this RECORD extracts from some of the letters I have received. In the hope of convincing my colleagues to go along with the 4-point program and to support H.R. 7848, which I have introduced to implement it, I call to their attention the following additional extracts from voters' letters:

Am delighted to read that you are taking action to help end the farm mess. It is certainly a deplorable situation and one that must be corrected.

I heartedly approve your program.

Just a note to tell you that I heartily agree the farm mess must be ended. Your program sounds good—at least subsidies must be stopped—and they can only be stopped by courageous action.

I further wish to commend you on your stand on farm subsidies which I have just read. It is my firm belief that it should have been dropped long ago.

Kill all farm supports and let free enterprise work.

I am 100 percent in favor of your ideas on ending farm subsidy. This terrible waste of food and money has to stop.

I am all for your farm program and would go even further by limiting Federal money being spent to bring more land under cultivation, as it doesn't make sense to me to pay farmers not to use their land and at the same time spend millions to make more land available for farming.

Congratulations on your courageous action on the farm mess. We are all for the fire sale and stopping farm subsidies now. May Congress see the light and without delay.

We have long thought the farm subsidies were just plain nonsense. Your program is sound and makes sense and we hope it will be adopted.

I feel very strongly that you should continue your efforts in behalf of the public in reducing the subsidy allocations.

Please do what you can to get some type of farm legislation passed so that we can get rid of some of that surplus that eats up so much money just paying for the storage thereof.

I was very happy with your stand on the farm subsidy mess. Hope I can see more of the same in the papers soon.

Your sensible approach to Government problems is greatly appreciated.

Please—let's end the farm mess. All of them. We have 30 adult voters in my family and I can promise you their support.

I took a trip back East and talked with a number of farmers in my old neighborhood in Ohio. Most of them resent the restriction and price control. They would rather be governed by supply and demand with no price supports.

Am more than pleased to know that you are working toward the stopping of this farm subsidy nightmare—the quicker the better.

I agree with your idea to stop all farm subsidies and sell the surplus.

I am in agreement with you on your four-point plan on the farm program. Should have been done long ago.

Bridges—Tough To Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the vigilance of one of the distinguished Members of the other body, the Communists have been deprived of an elaborate propaganda event which would have resulted in untold damage to the standing of the United States among our allies in the free world.

Soviet Deputy Premier Kozlov is on a barnstorming trip across our country—solely for the purpose of attempting to neutralize our feelings over the shooting down of American planes over international territory and other unfriendly acts.

During his visit to Capitol Hill the Reds thought the stage was set for a big show—Kozlov's appearance on the floor of the other body—and they had their press agents in the gallery poised for action.

How the plan was thwarted by an alert colleague is described in an article by Constantine Brown appearing in the Washington Star July 7 under the title "Bridges—Tough to Cross." It follows:

BRIDGES—TOUGH TO CROSS—YANKEE REPUBLICAN SEEN AS BLOCK TO KOZLOV'S APPEARANCE IN SENATE

(By Constantine Brown)

The smiling, hand-pumping Soviet Deputy Primier Kozlov has been snubbed twice by high-ranking officials. The first by the mayor of Detroit was widely publicized. But Senator STYLES BRIDGES' stand in preventing the Russian leader from appearing on the floor of the Senate has received little publicity.

Last Wednesday the Deputy Premier was scheduled to lunch with members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This was a courtesy extended to the other No. 2 man of the Kremlin, Anastas Mikoyan. But the hosts thought they might help the cause of "relaxation" by doing more honor to the charming Kozlov than they did to the frowning Mikoyan. They decided it would be good policy, and possibly good politics for some of them, to bring the burly Russian to the Senate floor and introduce him to the assemblage. Expecting a spectacular and historic scene when for the first time in history a high-ranking Russian would receive the Senate's accolade, two Russian reporters were given temporary visitors cards to the Senate press gallery.

But Kozlov never appeared. Senator BRIDGES, the senior Republican and chairman of the policy committee, had stopped him.

Before Kozlov's arrival, some of the leading Senators who were to attend the luncheon realized that there might be some unpleasantness if their honored guest were brought to the Senate floor before talking the matter over with the senior Republican Senator. So Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, and Chairman WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of the Foreign Relations Committee informed Senator BRIDGES of their intentions. They pointed out the good effect such a presentation might have on Soviet-American relations. And they asked BRIDGES what his position was.

BRIDGES' answer came without any hesitation. He informed his colleagues that before they would have a chance to introduce Kozlov he would take the floor on a point of personal privilege and denounce the presence of the representative of one of the most ruthless dictatorships in history. It would be an insult to the American people, he added, as well as to those nations fighting hard to preserve their freedom against the Red onslaught.

It was bad enough, Senator BRIDGES said, that this representative of Communist oppression was invited to a private luncheon under the dome of the American Capitol. He could not interfere with that in any way except by refusing an invitation to attend that shocking affair. But he would not hesitate to denounce not necessarily Kozlov but the whole system of which Kozlov was the devoted servant. The Senators took the hint. The Senate and the galleries were spared the sight of one of the leaders of the international Communist conspiracy receiving the compulsory plaudits of the representatives of American democracy.

In later conversations, Senator BRIDGES pointed out to his colleagues that he considered the luncheons tendered by the Foreign Relations Committee to the visiting Soviet dignitaries as humiliating and completely out of place.

BRIDGES had made his views clear in a speech from the Senate floor after Mikoyan had been entertained by Senate leaders. He recalled the lame explanations given by his colleagues such as "it was a good place to find out what that man was thinking" or "we frequently invite dignitaries and some of our own ambassadors to such luncheons and there we have a better chance to talk things over leisurely." Majority Leader JOHNSON explained at that time his own position with that shibboleth "it is better to exchange words than bombs."

So far Kozlov's reaction to BRIDGES' adamant stand is not known. But the fact that an advance guard of Soviet reporters had been sent to the Senate gallery to chronicle the historic event indicates that the Soviet propaganda machine had laid much store in Mr. Kozlov's waving his hands in response to the anticipated standing ovation from the Senators and the public galleries.

Who Is Hurt by Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, although many letters come across my desk urging the Federal Government to live within its income in order to stop the inflationary trend, one I received this morning from Mrs. Vivian D. Saul of Belle Fourche, S. Dak., impressed me particularly. I ask unanimous consent to insert part of it in the RECORD, as follows:

I have just been reading an article in the July Reader's Digest, written by Maurice H. Stans, Director, Bureau of the Budget, and I feel concerned about it enough to write you.

He passes on a solemn warning, and I quote, "Unless we as a Government insist right now upon living within our income, we face certain hard inevitabilities. Either there will be more tax increases, piled on top of our already heavy tax load; or there will be a mounting national debt and growing inflation with disastrous rises in the cost of living and a dangerous weakening of our national strength."

I am one of many thousands of women who have been widowed, have invested the life savings of the combined efforts of husband and wife as carefully as we knew how in order to insure us a decent income on which to live when our earnings years are over. Everyone suffers when disastrous things happen to the national security, but those on a fixed income are hit harder than others, I believe.

The only thing that I can think of at the present is to appeal to those in Washington to do the best they can to avoid the pitfalls.

Please do not forget the little people, one of whom I am.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. VIVIAN D. SAUL.

The Man Who May Be President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as a followup to the series of articles from Look magazine concerning Earl Mazo's book "RICHARD NIXON: A Political and Personal Portrait," which I previously submitted under extensions of my remarks, I feel it imperative to make special mention of Mr. Mazo's background as well as to insert two articles which point out implicitly the objectivity of the book.

Earl Mazo has been a journalist ever since he joined the Charleston News and Courier in 1935. Born in Warsaw, in 1919, he was brought to Charleston as an infant by his parents. He attended Clemson College, and worked on South Carolina papers until the war, when he served in the USAF in England and became a combat reporter for the European Stars and Stripes. Afterward, he worked on the Camden, N.J., Courier Post, and also was executive director of a Democratic group to oust Boss Hague. Since 1955 he has been national political correspondent for the Washington bureau of the New York Herald Tribune. He has covered hundreds of political campaigns, has traveled with NIXON in Africa, Europe, and South America. His researches for RICHARD NIXON alone have taken him on revisits to many parts of the country. With his wife, Rita, and two children, Mr. Mazo lives now in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include two articles, one by William H. Lawrence, corre-

spondent for the New York Times, which appears in the June 27 issue of the Saturday Review and the other by Raymond Moley, appearing in the Peoria Journal Star of July 6:

[From the Saturday Review, June 27, 1959]

THE MAN WHO MAY BE PRESIDENT

(By William H. Lawrence)

Earl Mazo's account of the life and times of Vice President NIXON is, by all odds, the best biography of the controversial man who may be our next President that has yet appeared.

Happily, it is neither idolatrous nor is it a hatchet job. What Mr. Mazo has put together is basically a reporter's report: a collection of facts—the good with the bad—about Mr. NIXON, his personal and political history, his temperament, his thoughts and beliefs.

Although it was prepared with the most complete cooperation of Mr. NIXON and his staff, including access to hitherto unpublished personal papers, the biography certainly is not the campaign book candidates usually arrange to have published.

There is, in this volume, a lot of praise for Mr. NIXON and his accomplishments; but there is also harsh criticism of the malignant innuendo of his campaign hyperbole and other actions. Both sides will find it useful source material next year—in the struggle for the Republican Presidential nomination—as well as, if he wins in the convention, in the battle for votes in November.

To Mr. Mazo, the Nixon personality is "singularly complex, a paradoxical combination of qualities that bring to mind Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and Joe McCarthy," which is probably the first time those four names have been linked in a single sentence to say nothing of a single individual. And he concludes that "no one, whether in dismay or in admiration, can expect that RICHARD NIXON would be a weak executive."

What makes the book particularly fascinating reading is that it contains a lot of previously unpublished political history. There is the fullest account yet of the crisis over the 1952 disclosure of "the California fund" for Mr. NIXON, and the pressures Mr. NIXON was under to get off the ticket promptly to avoid another Republican defeat. It tells how an undecided General Eisenhower, hoping characteristically that he wouldn't have to make the decision, telephoned to his still undecided, but, by now, quite depressed, running mate, only to have Mr. NIXON snap back, "There comes a time in a man's life when he has to fish or cut bait." Mr. Mazo parenthetically admits this quotation is false, because the Nixon words were stronger; and one hears that the words had an earthy flavor that must have shocked a five-star general whose word had always been law with subordinates.

One of the Democratic complaints about Mr. NIXON is that any campaign in which he is involved gets mighty rough, that the NIXON technique is to "go for the jugular." This book reports that the Eisenhower forces got the same treatment from the Nixon camp within a week after the Vice President barely escaped being dropped from the ticket. The issue was some nationwide television time, originally set aside for Mr. NIXON to talk about the Alger Hiss case, which had been preempted for General Eisenhower, himself. Murray Chotiner, the valuable close personal campaign aid who later was to be dropped by NIXON as a possible liability, got the time Mr. NIXON wanted by threatening Republican headquarters he would ask the public to put Mr. NIXON on the air on another network opposite General Eisenhower "with the dual speeches being billed as a contest for the biggest audience." Mr. Mazo reports Mr. Chotiner made this bold threat to party headquarters without Mr. NIXON's knowledge.

These and other incidents serve to explain why there has not been a close personal friendship between the President and his Vice President, and between the Vice President and some of the key powerful White House aides.

He fought until the end the White House decision in 1954 that the time had come, at long last, to come to grips with Joe McCarthy. Mr. Mazo discloses that Mr. NIXON was so lonely in the administration, and so generally dissatisfied with things political, that in February 1954, he agreed with his wife, Pat, to retire from politics when his first term ended in 1956—and at her request he noted the decision and date on a small slip of paper he tucked into his wallet. By 1956, however, he was shocked and hurt when President Eisenhower, in a man-to-man conversation in the privacy of the White House, did not ask him to run for reelection but instead suggested the NIXON political future might be served better by his taking a Cabinet job instead, specifically as Secretary of Defense. Again he decided to quit, and to announce it publicly, but was dissuaded by Republican professionals in whom he confided. All this was months before Harold E. Stassen began his spectacular, if abortive, "dump Nixon" campaign, but it helps to explain in part the uneasiness of the Nixon camp until the renomination was safely sewed up.

In terms of 1960 and the battle for the nomination—in which the only prospective strong rival seems to be Governor Nelson Rockefeller, of New York—it is interesting that Mr. NIXON chose to make available to Mr. Mazo a series of previously unpublished letters of praise for Mr. NIXON from Mr. Rockefeller. In these the New Yorker writes as an ardent supporter of Mr. NIXON for renomination, and one who greatly admired the Vice President's struggles, within the administration, for strong stands for stronger policies.

The Rockefeller letters, by the way, are much friendlier and more intimate than the letters also published in the book from President Eisenhower to his young lieutenant. One of the Eisenhower letters, although addressed "Dear DICK," actually is signed Dwight David Eisenhower." The formal, official signature he puts on laws and proclamations is "Dwight D. Eisenhower," but letters to real Presidential intimates bear the signature "D. E." and those to slightly lesser intimates are signed "D. D. E."

[From the Peoria Journal Star, July 6, 1959]

NIXON IS NO ENIGMA

(By Raymond Moley)

As Vice President NIXON's decisive year approaches, a very great amount of comment about him will be published. The volume of such material is already considerable. Much that has been written in the newspapers, magazines, and books has been reportorial, dealing mostly with the many sensational crises and campaigns in his relatively short life in politics. For the most part, evaluations of him as a man, a statesman, and politician are added as a somewhat hasty conclusion.

Some commentators who have written about him in national magazines are in the process of shifting their earlier opinions. They had accepted rather uncritically the adjectives and epithets thrown at him by political opponents. This was to be expected in politics, since in two Presidential contests the head of the Republican ticket was a great national war hero who, as such, enjoyed a certain immunity. NIXON was made to be the ogre in the wings.

Lengthy contacts with the Vice President on campaign trips or on diplomatic errands have convinced some of these realistic reporters that there is in this young man a great deal of the solid stuff that rates high in public life. He is, they have discovered, a strong, ambitious individual who does his own thinking and keeps his own counsel. He is one of the most accomplished political strategists of his time. Hence, the conclusions of these commentators when faced with the complexities of a first-rate mind and the subtleties of an able political leader, have begged the question. It is common to hear that NIXON is an enigma.

Those who dwell upon this point about NIXON must remember also that he has had ordeals which have sobered him and increased his reserve. He has been hurt by other political figures, even in his own party. Above all, by thrusts in print. This, too, induces caution.

In a new book by Earl Mazo, a painstaking reporter, "RICHARD NIXON: A Political and Personal Portrait," the personality and opinions of the Vice President emerge clearly enough to dispel the cliche that the man is a mystery. There emerges a man who has greatly developed with 6 years of experience in his present office; a strong man who would make a strong President; a firm believer in the two-party system; a supporter of party loyalty and party responsibility; and an experienced and gifted practitioner of the political art who believes that party or personal success depends upon organization.

The final 10 pages of the book will, to most, be the most important of all. Here the author sets down in direct quotes the Vice President's opinions on practically every issue that is likely to concern voters in 1960. These reach to the essence of public affairs. This frankness is remarkable, because the rule in politics is that a candidate for the Presidential nomination should be general and vague about issues.

United Rubber Workers Local 511-O'Sullivan Rubber Corp. Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, many years ago, about the time I reached my maturity, I was employed in one of the largest rubber companies in our country, the Pennsylvania Rubber Co., of Jeannette, Pa. Due to our economic conditions at that time, it became necessary to form a union in order to try to better our living standards. I was elected as the first president of that union, and at the first convention of the international held in the city of Akron, I held the extreme pleasure and honor of being elected to be executive counsel.

I have followed the United Rubber Workers' Union very closely over the years, and have particularly watched the developments at the O'Sullivan strike. I have read many stories and reports, and I believe it would be educational at this time to present to the House of Representatives some observations pertaining to this dispute that may help us in the

consideration of the serious labor legislation now pending.

Labor unions and business corporations are great institutions in our free society. The fundamental and dynamic roles which they both play need no elaboration. I often wonder, however, if many of us do not too frequently think of our unions and corporations solely as institutions—solely as impersonal artifacts—and if we do not forget now and then the individual human beings who are their very substance and reason for being.

It is particularly easy to fall prey to this kind of generalized thinking just from reading our daily newspapers. Union racketeering and corporation manipulations make ready headlines. Yet, in our society as it functions and grows it is the interaction of ideas, laws, institutions and individuals that provides the tangible test of the wisdom with which we order our affairs. To the extent to which we can isolate, study, and interpret these complex social interactions, I believe we can find solid ground to assess our progress or shortcomings and fix our present and future needs. It is in this framework of examining one small and yet significant instance of the interaction of law, the labor union as an institution, the corporation as an institution, and the people concerned with all of them, that I would hope that we might educate ourselves without the clamor or headlines about a facet of our industrial relations in America today.

I would like to focus on the long-standing labor dispute between local 511 of the United Rubber Workers, AFL–CIO, and the O'Sullivan Rubber Corp., of Winchester, Va. I chose this case precisely because it is not amenable to sensationalism. There are no charges of racketeering. There are no charges of collusion. There are no charges of bribery. There is no record of a labor union with a history of suspicion or dictatorship. There is no record of corporate racketeering. Yet, within the law, industrial relations processes have ground to a stop. A local union has been all but destroyed. And, most important, working people have lost their livelihood. As a lawmaker, this kernel of our actual social history interests me much more than headlines. What happened? Where did the industrial relations process fail? We shall find that the law itself was most to blame. The facts are simple.

In April of 1956, the employees of the O'Sullivan Rubber Corp. in Winchester, Va., voted by 343 to 2 in an NLRB election to affiliate with the United Rubber Workers of America. Local 511 of that union was established. Negotiations for a contract and an improvement in wages and working conditions were held. The average wage then being paid by O'Sullivan was 40 to 60 cent below similar organized shops in the heel and sole industry. The negotiations were not fruitful. The union proposed conciliation and mediation; the company refused. The union suggested a panel of clergymen; the company refused.

In May of 1956 the workers voted to strike, 355 to 2. The strike vote was held by secret ballot under the Rubber Workers International Union constitution. The strike began on May 13, 1956. At this time there were 422 workers in the plant.

Who were these workers who voted to join the Rubber Workers, who tried to negotiate a contract, and who were forced to strike? Most of them were raised in Winchester and its environs. Many had worked as youths in the apple orchards of this fertile area. Arthur and Asa Smith are brothers who helped build the O'Sullivan plant in the 1920's and worked there for about 30 years of their lives before going on strike. There is Mrs. Martha Webster, a widow who went to work for O'Sullivan with her brother and brother-in-law 27 years ago. There is Bruace Muse, who earned 25 cents an hour when he began working a 12½-hour day 27 years ago. These and hundreds like them were honest working people who knew little of labor laws and were not concerned with power or personal aggrandizement. They were citizens who exercised their legal right to join a legal union and voted legally to go on strike.

They were not long to remain novices in industrial relations, however. The company immediately began to recruit strikebreakers from the surrounding mountain country. Virginia has a so-called right-to-work law and the State police stood guard at the plant gates as strikebreakers trickled in day by day. These replacements eventually numbered about 200.

Meanwhile, the strike went on. Negotiations were resumed, broken off, resumed again, and stalled. The company steadfastly refused to allow impartial parties such as the Commonwealth attorney for Virginia to help mediate the dispute. In January 1957, the Rubber Workers Union began the first consumer boycott campaign in its history against O'Sullivan products. The union turned out leaflets, bumper stickers, press releases, radio programs, and slogans. Rubber Workers from other local unions visited shoe-repair shops and shoe companies, asking them not to buy O'Sullivan heels.

The Taft-Hartley law relating to boycotts produced a paradoxical situation. Rubber Workers International President L. S. Buckmaster has said that the secondary boycott provisions of the Taft-Hartley law make a successful primary boycott, which is theoretically legal, almost impossible. For example, O'Sullivan has developed a plastic material for automobile dashboards and other uses that is being sent for processing to plants organized by the Rubber Workers. Buckmaster says:

> You have the following fantastic situation: Rubber Workers in plant X pay dues each month. Sixty cents goes into a strike fund to help the O'Sullivan strikers. But the plant is processing O'Sullivan material, and under the law union rubber workers cannot refused to work on scab-made goods. Under the Taft-Hartley law, union rubber workers are forced to come to the aid of the O'Sullivan Corp.

Some businessmen rallied to support the O'Sullivan Corp. just as organized labor generally supported the Rubber Workers. One businessman crusaded for O'Sullivan as a classic example of a small concern beset by big labor bossism.

Here again this labor dispute presents a good opportunity for a national case study of industrial relations. For what kind of union is the Rubber Workers? Was this in fact a case of labor bossism at work? This I can answer firsthand for it was my privilege to serve as the president of Rubber Workers Local No. 22 in Jeannette, Pa., in my district. I know the Rubber Workers' constitution. I know its provisions for secret votes and democratic elections. I know its leaders. Also, I know something of its reputation.

At the time of the United Rubber Workers' convention in Long Beach, Calif., there appeared on September 27, 1956, the following editorial in the Akron Beacon Journal, a Knight newspaper:

REASON TO BE PROUD

"No place in the United States will you hear the integrity of the United Rubber Workers questioned, and I am as proud of that as you are."

With those words, Sherman H. Dalrymple, first president of the United Rubber Workers, concluded his speech at the union's convention in Long Beach. He drew a rising ovation, which was appropriate.

What Dalrymple said was true. The convention delegates knew it and had reason to be proud.

Employers at times have found the United Rubber Workers hard to get along with, we suppose, but when it comes to honesty, this union has been a model from the beginning.

Dalrymple and his successor, L. S. Buckmaster, and other international officers of the union are men of integrity themselves. This explains why the United Rubber Workers has enjoyed such a fine reputation up to now. For the future, protection is contained in the democratic process which is the union's cardinal rule.

Corruption is found in unions which are controlled by dictators.

Nobody controls the United Rubber Workers but its 200,000 members.

More recently, the same Knight newspapers—Akron Beacon Journal—printed an article by its labor writer, Ken Jacobson, on May 17, 1959, headed:

URW MEMBERS HAVE AN ACTIVE VOICE IN EVERYTHING OF ANY SIGNIFICANCE THAT THE UNION DOES

The strikes in the rubber industry pose an interesting question: "Do we really want the union democracy which is causing such a stir in Congress?"

Passage of the amended Kennedy-Ervin bill, with its tacked-on bill of rights designed to protect the rank and file, wouldn't affect the United Rubber Workers in the least.

URW members already enjoy more democracy than the bill provides.

Some weeks ago, Kenneth McGuiness, an attorney for the House Labor Committee (which must OK the Kennedy bill before it becomes law) asked me to send him a copy of the URW constitution.

I asked him about it later. McGuiness, a Republican and a former counsel for the National Labor Relations Board, replied: "Gosh, that's a model constitution. No legislation now before Congress could give these fellows any more union democracy."

URW members have an active voice in everything of any significance that the union does.

There is no room for an all-powerful czar who can dictate policy to the membership.

A Jimmy Hoffa—if he cared—could tell strikers in his union: "All right, boys, this thing has gone far enough. I want you back in the shop on Monday." And back they'd be.

This couldn't happen in the URW.

URW President L. S. Buckmaster could not order an end to a strike any more than he could start one.

The most Buckmaster—or any other URW president can do—is recommend.

Clearly, this is no union dominated by labor bosses or racketeers.

In Winchester, Va., however, events were moving to a climax for the O'Sullivan employees who had joined a union. No longer was the major factor in the situation to be the on-again-off-again negotiations. Whether or not a mediator could be found was soon to become academic. The law was to be brought to play a major role in the outcome of this dispute.

Section 9(c)(3) of the Taft-Hartley law says:

No election shall be directed in any bargaining unit or any subdivision which, in the preceding 12-month period, a valid election shall have been held. Employees on strike who are not entitled to reinstatement shall not be eligible to vote.

A few weeks after the required year had elapsed after NLRB certification of the Rubber Workers as bargaining agent for O'Sullivan employees, the company instituted a petition with the NLRB to have the union decertified. The NLRB held the appropriate election in October 1957. The union lost, 288 to 5. The Smith brothers, who had been No. 1 and No. 2 on the O'Sullivan seniority list, with more than 60 years' combined service between them, were not allowed to vote. Neither were the several hundred others who had joined the union and gone on strike. This was no breakdown in free collective bargaining, tough as that might have been in this case. This was no result of sinister or evil forces. This was the work of the law of the land. The law which was intended to give meaning to collective bargaining became the tool of its destruction. Local 511 all but collapsed.

The local did not, in fact, die. The picketing continued. The boycott continued. Proceedings were instituted by the company before the NLRB, and the case relating to these matters is now in the courts. But the case is in the courts today on an issue of free speech, not of collective bargaining. No litigation will restore the voting rights of these strikers to decide their destiny. The Taft-Hartley law, particularly section 9(c)(3), settled this dispute in collective bargaining once and for all—in favor of strikebreakers.

I spoke earlier of the interactions of ideas, law, institutions, and men as the dynamic fabric of our society. The case I have cited shows clearly how the law can work an injustice. It is in the power of Congress to change, and I pray that we do so. Now, several legislative proposals have been made which would amend section 9(c)(3) to give economic strikers the right to vote in representation elections but which would establish arbitrary or administrative time limits on the exercise of that right. One proposal, for example, would cut off the economic strikers' right to vote after they have been on strike for more than 6 months. Such a provision is but a stay of execution for a certain time. It would not have altered the events at O'Sullivan one bit.

The injustice of this part of the Taft-Hartley law was recognized by the late Senator Taft, who urged its amendment.

President Eisenhower in 1954 referred to this section when he said:

As the act is now written, employees who are engaged in an economic strike are prohibited from voting in representation elections. In order to make it impossible for an employer to use this provision to destroy a union I recommend that in the event of an economic strike the National Labor Relations Board be prohibited from considering a petition on the part of an employer which challenges the representation right of the striking union.

Earlier the President had also said:

I have talked about the Taft-Hartley Act with both labor and industry people. I know how the law might be used to break unions. That must be changed. America wants no law licensing union-busting, and neither do I.

It is time that we give meaning and substance to these thoughts by properly amending this law.

How Big Is the Feed Surplus?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to my remarks in the RECORD on July 7, I include the second in a series of articles prepared by Mr. Alvin F. Bull, managing editor of Wallace's Farmer, dealing with the farm problem. The article appeared in the June 20, 1959, issue of Wallace's Farmer:

HOW BIG IS THE FEED SURPLUS?

(By Al Bull)

About 60 percent of Iowa's bumper 1958 corn crop is surplus. That's a blunt way of illustrating the size of 11 million tons expected to be left over from the Nation's 1958 crop of feed grains.

Feed grains include corn, grain sorghum, oats, and barley.

One would expect some carryover from a bumper crop like last year's. But the 11 million tons added to 59 million left over from previous years gives real cause for concern.

Most of the buildup has come since 1952. We started that year with about 20 million tons of feed grain carried over—about the same amount with which we started into World War II.

Each year since, we've been adding to the total—usually from 4 to 10 million tons a year. Now it looks like the carryover this fall will total 70 million tons.

How much is 70 million tons? About four good Iowa corn crops. About enough to feed all the Nation's livestock for the rest of the year.

Of course, not all of this is surplus. Some carryover is desirable. It protects the Nation from possible food shortage due to unfavorable weather. It is also an asset in case of war. Even then, it needs to carry us only until our tremendous productive capacity can be put into play.

In the Agricultural Act of 1954, Congress placed the normal corn carryover at 15 percent of a year's supply. So let's set aside 22 million tons as the amount we'd like to keep for the Nation's welfare.

That leaves about 48 million tons of surplus this fall. All turned into hogs, it would mean close to 100 million head—about 15 percent more than will be slaughtered this year.

Even this isn't the whole story. Wheat was not included with the feed grains. Price supports have almost priced it out of feed use.

Wheat used for livestock has dropped from around 300 million bushels in 1945 to 36 million last year. But it makes good livestock feed when the price is right.

Two of three wheat bills now in Congress would free future surplus wheat production for feed use.

Surplus wheat already in storage is pretty certain to end up as livestock feed, too.

How much could this amount to? Wheat carryover on July 1 is estimated at more than 38 million tons. Deducting about 10 million (30 percent of year's needs) for normal carryover leaves 28 million tons as surplus.

Together, feed grains, 48, and wheat, 28, surpluses will total about 76 million tons, still leaving normal carryover.

While this feed was being held off the market, we've been using feed grains at an increasing rate. Expected 1959 use for livestock is 22 percent above the 1952 level.

Exports, with Government assistance, have more than doubled during that period. Other uses have held steady.

Nor can increased plantings be blamed for the surplus accumulation. Fewer acres are planted to feed grains and wheat now than in the 1940's.

Zooming yields hold most of the answer. Take corn for example.

Over the Nation, average corn yields have increased about 50 percent since 1940. Agronomists estimate another 30 percent increase is possible by 1972. Much of our future yield boosts will have to come from increased fertilizer use. So we're not likely to get it all at present price levels.

Yields of most other crops show a similar, though less sharp, upward trend.

Projecting present trends for production and use of feed grains over the next 2 years isn't encouraging, either. Extra acreage planted to corn this year promises a crop to rival last year's record output. In spite of the higher livestock numbers expected next year, some addition to carryover is likely on October 1, 1960.

Even for the 1960 and 1961 crops, most factors point to feed production greater than needed for heavy livestock feeding.

USDA projections carried to 1975 also indicate that we'll have no trouble producing enough feed grains and livestock for 230 million people anticipated by then.

So, in a nutshell, here's where we stand now:

1. Agriculture is able to produce more than enough food for the growing population—at least through 1975.

2. Feed grain surplus this fall is expected to total close to 76 million tons. This is nearly enough feed to produce a 2-year supply of pork.

Stocks under CCC control usually equal all of the surplus and part of the desirable carryover. Storage charges on these stocks have reached a point (about $1 billion per year) where many city folks and their Con-

gressmen are growing restless about the expense. So are many farm folks.

Still, under present farm programs, the surplus—and storage costs—will continue to mount steadily.

3. We're not willing to eat much of the surplus as grain—at any price. Exports have already been pushed above normal by Government assistance. Even giving our surpluses away poses big problems. Other uses have just held their own. No breakthrough is expected in any of these areas.

About the only outlet for surplus feed grains and wheat is through livestock. But this doesn't appeal to livestock producers.

All of the current production, fed to livestock, would bring near-ruinous prices. Each 1 percent boost in livestock production brings a 2- or 3-percent drop in prices.

We have an unwanted 6-month supply of surplus feed running up all the storage bill taxpayers will stand for. This is the core of the problem that must be dealt with in any farm program thinking.

Military Influence on Defense Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take this opportunity to insert my remarks which I delivered on July 8, 1959, to the Special Investigations Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee which is investigating the influence of retired military officers on defense contracts.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to appear before this Special Investigations Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee to give you the benefit of my thoughts regarding the influence of retired military officers upon defense procurement.

As you gentlemen remember, during the consideration of the defense appropriations bill, I introduced an amendment which would bar funds to defense contractors who provide compensation to retired or inactive military or naval general officers who have been in such retired or inactive status within a period of five years from the date of the passage of the act.

Recently I introduced a bill, H.R. 8069, which amends section 2306 of title 10, United States Code, and adds a new subsection, f, which prohibits the head of any agency from negotiating a contract with any defense contractor who employs or retains any individual who, within a five year period immediately preceding such employment, served on active duty with an armed force in the rank of colonel or higher in the Army, Marine Corps, or Air Force, or as captain or higher in the Navy or the Coast Guard.

My bill provides two exceptions. It does not prevent (1) the negotiation of a contract for research or development with any college or university because of the employment of any person by such college or university as an instructor or teacher, and (2) does not apply to any contract entered into with a contractor during any fiscal year in which the aggregate of the payments made by the United States to such contractor on that contract and all other contracts entered into during that fiscal year with such contractor by the military departments will not exceed $1 million.

EXISTENCE OF INFLUENCE AND NEED FOR EFFECTIVE ACTION

The House Appropriations Subcommittee on defense appropriations on Page 42 of the 1960 report indicated its concern over problems which arise as a result of the acceptance by retired senior officers of employment in responsible executive positions with defense contractors.

In 1956 the Committee on Government Operations in House Report No. 1891, 84th Congress, inquired into the Navy jet aircraft procurement program, and on page 44 of its report recommended that: "the Secretary of Defense should review the laws and regulations relating to the employment in industry and Government of retired military officers and make recommendations for the clarification and amendment to protect the military officers and the public as well."

Five years and $200 billion of defense appropriations later, have you seen any such recommendations by the Secretaries of Defense or the Bureau of the Budget or our Commander in Chief?

The President's $77 billion budget is the greatest this country has ever seen. Fifty-nine percent of $45,805 million is allocated to the national security; $13,938 million of the military budget is allocated to procurement, the purchase of aircraft, missiles, ships, and other military equipment. It is in this area that we must eliminate the waste in order to help the taxpayers.

Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson in their book, "U.S.A. Second Class Power?", dramatically point out the relations of defense contractors and retired military personnel. The chapter commencing on page 164, "Profits versus Patriotism" relates sufficient details to arouse a lethargic Nation into effective action. I urge this committee to call men like Colonel Nickerson, who declared that "high ranking officers of the Air Force, including general officers, get to thinking about retirement and the job as head of missile research with Lockheed or some other firm" and "sales officers of aircraft companies in Washington are 'primarily lobbyists' and 85 percent of the aircraft sales are with the Government. These firms put pressure through direct contacts by representatives of the aircraft industry with all levels of the Pentagon."

I recommend this book to you as it might open your eyes as it did mine to situations which cry out for preventive action.

This problem is so important in my opinion that a full fledged inquiry should be made with the assistance of an adequate staff, and this in my opinion does not mean only two investigators. Here we are dealing with billions of dollars which ultimately affect our tax structure and our Nation's safety. A cursory inquiry will not satisfy the demands of Congress and the citizens who are ready to spend billions for our country's defenes and not 1 cent for military influence.

It is said that Pentagon influence cannot be proven because procurement officers will not speak for fear of destroying their future advancement. It is said by others that such military influence is minimal. It is said that procurement officers await the day when they shall retire so that they can join defense contractors at lucrative salaries. It is asserted that procurement officers are motivated by a desire to feather their future nests and thereby grant negotiated contracts when the items lend themselves to competitive bidding. It has been reported by the Renegotiations Board that negotiated contracts comprise 90 percent of contracts, that competitive bids comprise the remaining 10 percent.

At the tail end of the situation is the recapture of excessive profits. Since 1951 defense contractors have voluntarily or involuntarily disgorged $1½ billion. Last year procurement contractors disgorged $112 million. Whatever is the fact, I sense that there is an odorous and unsavory aura created by the extensive hiring of retired military personnel. This practice of hiring retired officials smells to the high heavens and races with missiles and aircraft to outer space.

It is my opinion that the decision of a procurement officer to make awards to defense contractors should not be and must not be coerced into a state of imbalance due to a featherbed complex or a former relationship based on prior career subordination or friendship. The decision must be liberated from all parasitic influence and made with an objectivity designed to obtain the most effective product at the most equitable and competitive price.

Present statutes and military regulations are ineffective and inadequate. These statutes and regulations apply to conflict of interest. I quote the applicable statutes:

First, 10 U.S.C. 6112–(b) (1956):

"If a retired officer of the Regular Navy or the Regular Marine Corps is engaged for himself or others in selling, or contracting or negotiating to sell, naval supplies or war materials to the Department of the Navy, he is not entitled to any payment from the United States while he is so engaged."

Second, 67 Stat. 437, 5 U.S.C. (Supp. IV) 59c (1953):

"No payment shall be made from appropriations in any act to any officer on the retired lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps, Regular Air Force, Regular Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service for a period of 2 years after retirement who for himself or for others is engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale of or negotiating for the sale of any supplies or war materials to any agency of the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service."

The distinction between these two statutes should be carefully noted. The first act applies (a) only to retired officers of the Regular Navy and Regular Marine Corps, (b) as long as they hold their retired status, (c) who for themselves or others, sell, contract, or negotiate for the sale of naval supplies or war materials to the Navy Department. The second statute applies (a) to retired regular officers of all Armed Forces—and other listed Government departments—(b) only for a period of 2 years after retirement, (c) who, for themselves or others, sell, contract, or negotiate for the sale of any supplies or war materials to the specified Government departments—including the Department of Defense. Neither statute applies to Reserve officers; and it appears that neither statute applies to retired permanent enlisted personnel, advanced to commissioned rank on the retired list under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 6151 (1956).

Title 18, chapter 175, section 281, provides for a fine of $10,000 or a prison sentence for whoever being the head of a department or other officer or employee of the United States or any department or agency thereof, directly or indirectly receives or agrees to receive any compensation for any services rendered or to be rendered by himself or another, in relation to any matter in which the United States is a party or directly or indirectly interested, before any department, agency, court martial, officer, or any civil, military, or naval commission.

The next section of 281 reads as follows: "Retired officers of the Armed Forces of the United States, while not on active duty, shall not by reason of their status as such be subject to the provisions of this section. Nothing herein shall be construed to allow any retired officer to represent any person in the sale of anything to the Government through the department in whose service he holds a retired status."

The enforcement of statutes or regulations leaves much to be desired. An article by a newspaper reporter, Jack Steele, demonstrates the inadequacy of the law where a retired Navy lieutenant was forced to forfeit his retirement pay during an 8-month period in which he allegedly sold beer to officers' clubs and ships' stores. It might be refreshing also to find out who distributes the liquors to officers' clubs and it is timely to learn which watch companies sell to the Post Exchanges at Fort Myer and Fort McNair. Anonymous people have written to me that military people have obtained these concessions for certain companies.

MANNER OF DETERRENCE

What methods are available to eliminate Pentagon influence in defense procurement contracts? Present statutes are apparently inadequate. The proposals of two Senators who have recently introduced legislation imposed the burden on the officer who is used and abused. Such proposals, in my opinion, will not solve the problem. My proposal is designed to eliminate the source of evil, to curb the profiteer who uses Pentagon influences by denying the opportunity of profits. Letters and articles have raised a howl that retired officers have a right to earn a living. They certainly do, but not at the expense of John Q. Public, the taxpayer who pays their retirement benefits.

LENGTH OF LIMITATION

My desire is to eliminate influence without impairing the good. If an officer recognizes that employment at premium salaries is not forthcoming upon retirement, contracts will definitely be let on merit rather than upon the basis of anticipated employment. It has also been said that defense contractors are badgered constantly by officers seeking to obtain employment upon retirement. If contractors recognize that for a period of time they cannot use officers for their influence, they will not be so prone to hire retired officers except for their technical skill. Some of my colleagues feel that a 5-year prohibition is too drastic; others feel that 3 years is reasonable; and some claim that 2 years is ample.

I have made an analysis of the retirement dates of retired officers whose names were listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Air Force, Army, and Navy furnished me with the retirement dates of those identifiable officers. I submit my analysis and conclusions to this committee for its consideration.

The following figures are based on information supplied to me:

Of the 197 retired Army officers who have latched on with defense contractors, 26, or 13 percent, retired since January 1, 1958, or within 2 years; 57, or 30 percent, retired since January 1, 1957, or within 3 years; 105, or 53 percent, retired since January 1, 1955, or within 5 years.

Of the 100 retired Air Force officers who have latched on to defense contractors since retirement, 30 percent have been retired within the last 2 years, 50 percent within the last 3 years, and 71 percent retired within the last 5 years.

Of the 274 retired naval officers who have latched on to defense contractors since retirement, 56, or 20 percent, have been retired within the last 2 years; 122, or 44 percent, have been retired within the last 3 years; 184, or 66 percent, have been retired within the last 5 years.

[In percent]

	Retired since—		
	1955	1957	1958
Army	53	30	13
Air Force	71	50	30
Navy	66	44	20

It would seem, therefore, that if we prohibit employment from within 2 years from date of retirement, we would not reach a substantial number of people; if we adopt a 3-year period, we would prohibit a little less than one-half of retired employees; if we adopt a 5-year prohibition period, then we eliminate approximately two-thirds of the employees who were retired officers.

So long as the practice of negotiated contracts and letter contracts is continued, and so long as defense contracts are let on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis, there will be very little control of defense expenditures. Negotiated contracts, i.e., noncompetitive, which comprise 90 percent of defense contracts, are by their nature subject to human frailties, motives, and influence; letter contracts are granted because of urgency of speed and blindness of cost, and, consequently, are subject to human errors and frailties; cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts are expensive because of uncontrolled costs: Some of the elements of such uncontrolled costs are expensive advertising, and high salaries of retired military personnel. Action is imperative because Government defense appropriations and spending cost accompany the endless cold war at the average rate of $1.2 billion a month. Our economy will not permit unnecessary expenditures.

Don't Penalize First-Class Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 29, 1959:

DON'T PENALIZE FIRST-CLASS MAIL

It seems to us unfortunate that the Eisenhower administration has proposed, at this time, an increase of 1 cent in the rates for first-class mail and airmail. The present 4-cent letter rate is only a few months old. The suggested rise would take it to 5 cents and airmail to 8 cents.

This projected mail rate boost comes at a time when magazine sales at newsstands have been greatly diminished and magazine publishers are exerting strenuous efforts to raise their circulations through mailed subscriptions.

It appears decidedly unfair that an increase in postal rates should apply only to first-class and air-mail while users of second- and third-class mail continue to evade their fair share of mail costs.

Why magazine sales have slumped at newsstands we don't know. There could be a number of factors—competition of television, increased outdoor activities, new and varied pursuits and hobbies taken up by many persons. But it is not very convincing for magazine publishers to say, in explanation of reduced newsstand sales, that people prefer to buy through yearly subscriptions rather than go to the newsstand.

If this is really the preference of magazine purchasers, they should be required to pay for this service.

The fact appears to be that in a number of cases magazines are being offered at subscription rates so low that they are practically giveaways.

Now, the obvious truth is that under such open-handed circulation policies second-class mail will in a few years be bogged down by a perfectly stupendous load of magazines. At higher mailing rates? Not if the magazine publishers can help it. They would be vastly pleased to let first-class postal rates go on making up the deficit for second- and third-class mail. And it can't be doubted that with mounting quantities of magazines in the mail the postal deficit would be astronomical.

Even when first-class mail was carried with a 3-cent stamp it paid its own way. During the present 4-cent era it definitely runs in the black and helps to defray part of the Post Office Department's losses on other classes of mail.

The Government is in the business of public service, not to show a profit. To raise letter mail to 5 cents would be an additional tax on this service. Furthermore, such a 25-percent increase should imply a considerable improvement in general postal service.

But the added time, effort, and expense which this proposed penny increase is supposed to cover would not be devoted to providing faster first-class mail delivery but to the handling of a greater amount of second- and third-class matter.

The Inquirer has always believed, and has said so many times, that the publication industry—that means newspapers, too—should pay its own way; that holds, also, for third-class mail. There is no reason why these should, in effect, be subsidized by higher rates on first-class mail. Such a levy is unfair, unnecessary, and inflationary.

The administration's higher rate schedule on first-class and airmail has been introduced, through the Post Office Department, in the Senate. It has not yet been offered to the House. But when it is, the proposal should be given a prompt heave-ho, out, by both Chambers of Congress.

Meanwhile, we believe the magazine publishers should carefully reappraise their subscription sales policies. If they are going to rely on the Post Office instead of the newsstands to market their products they should face up to an equitable payment for the service and not depend on a subsidy made possible by higher rates on first-class mail.

Forced Labor in the U.S.S.R. Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a letter dated July 3, 1959, from Mr. Jay Lovestone, director of international publications of the AFL–CIO, together with the text of an article entitled "Forced Labor in the U.S.S.R. Today," written by Paul Barton and taken from the July issue of the AFL–CIO Free Trade Union News. As I have said in the past, it is refreshing to again be reminded of the

realistic attitude which American organized labor views the present situation in the Soviet Union and it is especially helpful to have the enclosed article brought to the attention of Members of the House at this time. We all should be aware that, no matter what Communist propaganda may endeavor to say, the practice of slave labor and slave labor camps is just as prevalent in the Soviet Union today as it ever was, if not more so.

The letter and article follow:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., July 3, 1959.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BENTLEY: In recent weeks, several prominent public figures have visited the Soviet Union. During the course of their visit, these American observers have made public statements or serialized in some of our Nation's leading newspapers articles dealing with conditions in the U.S.S.R. In the main, these articles have emphasized the official Soviet line that, since the death of Stalin, all forced labor and concentration camps have been abolished in the U.S.S.R.

As you know, it was upon the initiative of American labor that the United Nations, several years ago, investigated and condemned the extensive forced labor system in the U.S.S.R. and Communist China. In view of the aforementioned articles, we requested Paul Barton, an outstanding student of Soviet economic and labor affairs, to survey the situation and provide us with the actual facts.

The Barton report is herewith sent to you in advance of its publication in the AFL–CIO Free Trade Union News. Should you have any questions or want further clarification after perusing this report, please send us your queries. We will do our best to provide you with the information you may want.

Thank you for your kind interest.

Sincerely yours,

JAY LOVESTONE,
Director, International Publications.

[From the AFL-CIO Free Trade Union News, July 1959]

FORCED LABOR IN THE U.S.S.R. TODAY

(By Paul Barton)

On Sunday evening, May 17, 1959, Radio Moscow broadcast the message addressed to the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by the participants in and important conference which had gathered together a large number of state security officers, in the presence of representatives of the government and of the party. The following is a significant excerpt from that message:

"The 21st congress of the Communist Party fully defined the role and the position of state security in the Soviet state, as well as the tasks which it is to carry out in the political service of the Communist Party. The resolutions of the Congress emphasized the need for a continued reinforcement of the state security services. The congress also specified that numerous government functions are gradually to be transferred to the jurisdiction of social organizations and that the repressive functions of the state are gradually to be reduced. We fully realize, however, that the reduction of repression in our country does not in the least mean that we shall have less to do or the machinations of our enemies will decline."

LEGEND SHATTERED

It would be difficult to imagine a more shattering contradiction of official propaganda which, especially with the help of credulous foreign visitors, would like to make the outside world believe that the horrors of the Stalin era belong to an irrevocable past. And since, by being constantly repeated, this legend becomes increasingly widespread we should be grateful to the officials of the political police for having drawn up their message to central committee in such characteristically clear and straightforward language.

This is not the first time that the lies of the Soviet Government, so obligingly repeated by some Western experts and tourists, have been shattered by its own servants. In fact, the same thing happens each time when experts in the subject of repression begin to discuss the problems of their trade.

For example, there has been a great deal of talk about the so-called reform in the carrying out of the penalty of deprivation of liberty in the prisons and camps; it has been claimed attempts would henceforth be made to reeducate the detainees rather than punish them. But B. S. Utevski, one of the Soviet experts best qualified in this sphere and the author of a handbook which was an authority in the thirties, "The Soviet Policy of Corrective Labor," Moscow, 1935, simply states that there is no such thing. This is what he writes in his article, "Fundamental Problems of Social Legal Theory Relating to Corrective Labor," published in the review Soviet State and Law, in March 1957:

"Even the consequent carrying out of the task of reeducating the convicts does not mean that the task of punishment disappears from the work of corrective labor institutions. * * * The very fact of seeing any contradiction between punishment and education constitutes an error."

Utevski returned to this theme in a report which he presented to a conference on the corrective labor law, which assembled in Moscow in May 1957 and of which the same review published a detailed report in its December 1957 issue. And it is by no means Utevski's personal opinion only. Other experts who took part in this conference expressed an identical point of view. The following is an excerpt from the report:

"G. Z. Anashkin, S. S. Studenikin, and B. S. Nikiforov emphasized in their contributions the idea according to which the task of reeducating the prisoners should play the principal part. The proposal was made that, during the first period of their punishment, the various categories of criminals should be obliged to perform heavy manual labor, and should then, at the end of a specified period, be transferred to more skilled work. * * * B. S. Nikiforov showed that in the work of the corrective labor institutions there are always present, independently of the character of these institutions, certain elements of punishment which achieve the educational aim only in the last resort and particularly by means of coercion. * * * B. S. Nikiforov emphasized, in this connection, that there is no question of opposing the penalty to punishment, but of determining the significance and the position to be accorded to the latter, which is, like education, one of the elements of the penalty."

Thus, although some of the policies of A. Y. Vyshinski, the infamous prosecutor in the witchcraft trials, have been treated with reserve for some time, his doctrine that education is best practiced through punishment and that, consequently, the more severe the punishment, the more effective is the education, are fully maintained.

DECREE NEVER PUBLISHED

Another example: official propaganda has often spoken of the government's resolution, dated October 25, 1956, finally to do away with the concentration camps and to replace them by two systems of detention: prisons and corrective labor colonies; in pursuance of the same decision, prisoners would, henceforth, be confined within the district in which they normally lived, instead of being deported to distant areas.

No decree containing provisions of this kind has ever been published in the Soviet Union. Former inmates of the camps of Vorkuta, Inta and Potma, whom I questioned on this matter after their repatriation in the West, had never heard of a transformation of the concentration camps in which they were imprisoned into corrective labor colonies; and some of them were still in the camps in autumn 1957, that is, a year after the alleged reform was adopted.

Still more important, the report of the conference of May 1957 once more provides proof to the contrary. The minister of the interior declared at the conference that, since the number of "corrective labor institutions" had diminished, "more favorable conditions have thus been created for an effective control of the distant institutions." There is thus no question, for the minister in charge, of liquidating the great complexes of camps set up in various God-forsaken places, at Kolyma, Norilsk, Vorkuta, and elsewhere, but only of organizing matters in such a way that they should cease to be states within a state, escaping more or less from the authority of Moscow.

Furthermore, certain participants in this conference specified that the term "corrective labor institutions" means prisons, camps and colonies. This is what the report has to say about it:

"The speakers maintained that the steps taken by the party and by the government to improve the work of the institutions within the jurisdiction of the Ministry of the Interior have contributed in many ways to the consolidation of socialist legality in the work of these institutions and especially in that of the corrective labor camps and colonies."

And further:

"Considerable attention has been paid to the system of detention in the prisons and the practice of transferring the inmates of corrective labor camps and colonies to prisons, and vice versa."

SENT TO DETENTION CAMPS

Moreover, since the supposed abolition of all such camps, a certain number of verdicts sentencing the accused to detention in a camp, have been reported in the Soviet provincial press, for example in Bakinski Rabochi for November 14, 1956, Zarya Vostoka for December 2, 1956, Pravda Vostoka for February 24, 1957, Turkmenskaya Pravda for April 14, June 11, June 25, July 17, and July 24, 1957.

There is certainly no question of denying that the concentration camps and forced labor have undergone important changes in the last few years, and especially since the strikes and uprisings in the years 1953–55. But it is necessary first of all to clear away the confusion created by official propaganda and by naive observers, and to state the basic fact that camps and forced labor still exists in the Soviet Union. For only on this basis is it possible to understand the changes of these last few years.

In the last 10 years or so, the Soviet forced labor system has been going through a serious crisis. A glance at the data concerning the population of the country will suggest the reason for this. In 1940, the U.S.S.R. had between 193 and 196 million inhabitants. Under normal conditions, it should by now have had more than 250 million. But the census carried out last January showed less than 209 million. (Izvestia, May 10, 1959). The 200 million mark was not reached until spring 1956.

The loss of some 40 million inhabitants which these figures reveal cannot be wholly attributed to military casualties or to the

low birth rate during the war years. Mass deportations have also played an important part in bringing about this situation.

This is demonstrated most clearly by the data relating to the numerical disproportion of the two sexes, which is very serious even when one considers the country as a whole.

According to the census of last January, the total number of women exceed that of men by 20 million. But this figure is trifling in comparison with Naum Jasny's estimates, based solely on official data. In 1955, there were, in the kolkhozes (collective farms), only 3 adult men to every 10 adult women; so that, perhaps for the first time in human history, the birthrate is, at present, lower in rural areas than in cities.

On the other hand, in the vast regions covered by enormous concentration camp complexes and peopled mainly by convicts and ex-convicts, there is a disastrous lack of women. For example, in the town of Norilsk, which forms the center of one such complex at the western extremity of Eastern Siberia, the Japanese prisoners have collected, with admirable patience, all the data which it was possible to obtain. From this it appears that the numerical proportion of the sexes there was eight men to one woman.

In the face of so alarming a demographical situation, it was no longer possible to carry on the mass deportations at the same rate without causing irreparable damage to the national economy. After having drawn abundantly on the reserves represented by the satellite countries, the authorities, around 1950–51, were forced to recognize the fact that the sources of recruitment for the camps had dried up and that it was necessary, henceforth, to make more efficient the exploitation of those prisoners who were already available.

It was at last realized that the use made hitherto of the prisoners was not only inhuman but also uneconomic. By way of illustration, we cite the Vorkuta conditions where there was one dead per sleeper in the construction of the railway; in the mines, there were two dead per every meter sunk in depth.

The first steps toward greater efficiency aimed at a reduction of the death rate. Common-law prisoners were separated from political prisoners and subjected to less harsh conditions; food, clothes, and medical services were gradually improved; the enterprises attached to the camps, which had always worked with the most primitive installations and tools possible began to get better equipment. Beginning with the summer of 1953, they were transferred from the authority of the MVD and entrusted to specialized economic ministries (mines, nonferrous metals, forest exploitation, etc.)

As the capital invested in these enterprises increased, the employment of physically unfit men and the generally low output of the prisoners' work became increasingly more burdensome economically. The release of invalids, the stimulation of productivity by offering inmates the hope of release before completion of their sentence, and the transformation of as many prisoners as possible into deportees became increasingly urgent. It is, however, typical that the government did not decide to adopt these reforms—desirable from a strictly economic point of view—until the prisoners extorted it from them in a bitter struggle, through the strikes and uprisings which had broken out in the camps beginning in the spring 1953.

What is the status of the concentration camps and of forced labor following these reforms? The total number of prisoners has decreased considerably. But the overwhelming majority of those who have been released from the camps have not become free citizens (if this term can be applied to any of the inhabitants of the Soviet Union); they are obliged to remain in the district where they were imprisoned and to continue to work in the same enterprises as before. Thus, what has happened in most cases was merely a transfer from one category of forced labor to another.

The decrease of actual prisoners in the camps varies from district to district. Very marked in the western parts of the U.S.S.R., it grows less so as one travels eastward, The Japanese repatriated from Kolyma at the end of 1956 estimate that the number of prisoners in this vast system of camps in northeastern Siberia has actually remained the same. The fact remains that many prisoners have been transferred from camps in the west to those in the east.

INCREASE OF FORCED LABOR

At the same time, there is an increase of forced labor in the prisons. In 1955, construction was started on a whole series of large new prisons—for example at Kotlas, at Sverdlovsk, and at Novosibirsk. On the other hand, a report on the well-publicized prison of Butyrki in Moscow, published in Izvestia of September 13, 1956, shows that the prisoners are henceforth obliged to perform forced labor, organized in a way similar to that practiced in the camps. This fact is confirmed in a study by B. S. Utevski, published in the review "Soviet State and Law" in March 1957. This author also states that the detention in prison should, after the reforms of the camp system, be inflicted on men who are to be punished with particular severity. This proposal was made into law by the new penal legislation, adopted December 25, 1958.

Finally, there is the extension of forced labor without detention. During 1957, most of the Soviet Republics passed a law aiming at the intensification of the struggle against antisocial and parasitic elements. This law authorizes the banishment of a citizen for a period of not less than 2 and not more than 5 years, without any judicial process, by a simple vote of a citizens' meeting—if the verdict thus passed is confirmed by the executive commitee of the Soviet of the district or of the city.

One can get an idea as to the application of this new law by reading in Pravda Vostoka of July 13, 1957, that a kolkhoznik was condemned to be banished for 5 years for being too preoccupied with his individual garden plot and for having neglected his compulsory work in the fields of the kolkhoz.

On the whole, the present situation regarding the concentration camps and of forced labor is clear enough. Because of the serious demographic crisis, and in consequence of the prisoners' uprisings, the whole system is gradually falling to pieces.

But the authorities are not, because of present difficulties, losing sight of long-term prospects. While throwing ballast overboard, they do what is necessary to safeguard the essence of the institution throughout this critical period. Thus, they preserve the possibility of developing the institution in another direction, if a more favorable situation should arise.

Cultural Exchange, Kozlov Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, how crazy can we get? We send arms and money overseas to fight communism. We tell our allies to stand firm; then we pull the props from under them by entertaining a faker like Kozlov. The real enemies of communism abroad feel we are doublecrossing them when they see these accounts of our lovey-dovey parties with such bloody fiends as Kozlov and Mikoyan. All of us should read the following by Ruth Montgomery:

KOZLOV STAGES A TV EXTRAVAGANZA, DIMPLES AND ALL

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON, July 3.—Dimpled, wavy-haired Soviet Deputy Premier Frol R. Kozlov starred yesterday in a television extravaganza which should strike envy into the hearts of very Madison Avenue entrepreneur.

The Kozlov comedy was staged at the Statler-Hilton Hotel before an assemblage of some of the world's top news correspondents, who found themselves playing straight man for some of the slickest propaganda ever served over American airwaves.

Without benefit of coaching from actor Robert Montgomery—whose star TV pupil is President Eisenhower—Kozlov faultlessly read his Red speech, flashed his dimples, gracefully waved a soft right fist for emphasis, and bedazzled his coast-to-coast viewers.

He purred about peace, praised our wonderful country, dripped honey over friendship and peaceful coexistence. With superb acting ability, he managed gently to chide his audience for even pretending to believe that dear old Russia could possibly be thinking of aggression.

Absolutely, positively the only goal of the Kremlin, he winningly remarked over and over, is to give the peace-loving Russian people the shortest workweek and highest living standards in the world.

"Is it possible for people with such vast aims to contemplate war?" he cried dramatically, then paused for exactly the right amount of time before answering himself with an explosive "Certainly not."

"We are the servants of our people," the deputy premier murmured, so disarmingly that you could almost forget the millions who lie rotting in their graves because they dared to question their unwanted leaders.

The corn was never thicker than when the strangely bewitching Commie tried to whip up sympathy for the $170 billion Russia had to spend to repel the German fascist invaders who destroyed hundreds of villages.

How sad, you almost felt yourself thinking, until you remembered that the late, unlamented Josef Stalin himself brought on the deluge by his pact with his nefarious, two-timing partner, Adolf Hitler.

Kozlov paused twice during his speech to permit a translator to repeat his gracious lies in English. During the final translation, Kozlov seated himself beside Ambassador Mikhail (Mike the Smile) Menshikov, and as he played with a spoon seemed to be cracking witticisms in an unending flow of small talk.

The two Russians, chuckling and dimpling together, looked for all the world like a couple of Midwest auto salesmen waiting for the floor show to begin at the local Elks Club.

A couple of times, after fleeting glances of concern at the busy translator, Menshikov penciled notes, showed them to Kozlov, and then slipped around his chair to lay them on the podium for the Russian translator.

The speech, with its translation, ran so long that only 10 minutes remained for questions. Here again Kozlov had the upper hand. Unlike all other Press Club guests, he had insisted upon the right to censor and select which of the written questions he would deign to answer.

Only one of the six drew a reply of obvious significance. Asked if Russia would use

force, in the event that Western foreign ministers refused to make West Berlin a free city, he replied:

"If we fail to reach agreement at the Geneva Conference, then our Government will be compelled to conclude a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic * * * and if a war is unleashed and force is used, that force will be met by force."

Congress, generally taking a ho-hum attitude about the stark and naked warning, seemed to think there was nothing new in the threat.

Assistant Senate Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, who attended a Senate luncheon for Kozlov yesterday, commented after today's speech:

"He struck me as a confident, determined man who knows where he's going—and as a man who is prepared to make no concessions whatsoever."

The future can take it from there.

Idea for an Institute of the South Seems To Possess Many Very Interesting Possibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to a recent article from the Florida Times Union which raises an interesting idea originally expressed by Dr. Richard K. Morton, of Jacksonville University. It seems to me that this idea possesses many interesting possibilities and I hope that persons who are intereted in this idea will contact Dr. Morton at Jacksonville University giving him the benefit of their suggestions. I have known Dr. Morton for many years. He was formerly pastor of a leading church in Jacksonville, Fla., and is now in the field of education at Jacksonville University. In my opinion, he has a fine mind and is trying to do everything he can to benefit mankind; and, in my opinion, he does this very effectively. The article is as follows:

THE IDEA FOR AN INSTITUTE OF THE SOUTH SEEMS TO POSSESS MANY VERY INTERESTING POSSIBILITIES

(By Robert T. Pittman)

The idea for a broad institute which would bring together each year leaders in many diverse fields to discuss region-wide problems of the South has been presented by Dr. Richard K. Morton, dean of the evening college at Jacksonville University.

Dr. Morton visualizes a gathering, perhaps here in Jacksonville, of the best minds in the South devoting serious attention to some major political, social, economic, or scientific problem. To our region, which sometimes seems to have more than its fair share of problems, this seems likely to be an attractive proposal. If so, Dr. Morton hopes others interested will communicate with him. He is willing to form a temporary committee to lay the original plans for an Institute of the South.

To this writer's knowledge, it would be unique for a region to attempt to find solutions, which would be at least a partial goal, in such a manner. If such an institute exists elsewhere in the world, it is not so broadly conceived and certainly not dedicated to a single region in a single nation. The South's highly developed regional consciousness might make success possible where other regions would fail.

Morton's idea was first presented to a local club several years ago. But it then entered a dormant stage. In 1958 Dr. Morton included the suggestion as a recommendation for the consideration of Jacksonville University, which he thought might sponsor such a meeting. However, it was decided that because of the financial situation the university would be in no position to consider it while the all-out effort toward securing accreditation was in progress.

A recent editorial in the Times-Union intended to stimulate thought as to how the South can best achieve understanding of its culture brought the idea to the surface again.

Of course, when any such idea is in its formative stages, a thousand questions arise as to exactly what would be the purpose sought. Dr. Morton sees two major objectives of the institute. It would seek, through the presentation of expert opinions, to help the region crystalize its thought on subjects considered. Secondly, it would present a picture of the southern mind to outsiders.

What subjects would be discussed? How would it be financed? Who would attend? Where would it be held? When would it be held? These are but a few of the questions that as yet cannot be given definite answers.

In Dr. Morton's view, the range of annual subjects would be almost unlimited as long as it was an important subject to the South. Everything from industrial relations to education to race relations would be a possibility. The topic would be selected well in advance by a qualified committee.

How to find the money to finance such a meeting each year would be the toughest nut to crack. Dr. Morton thinks that perhaps the Florida Legislature, which passed a $500,000 bill to "sell the South" to the North (later vetoed by Governor Collins), might look favorably upon such an institute. Besides "selling the South," the institute would have the added advantage of spending its money in the State. Other possible sources of money might be one of the various foundations, public subscription, or organizational sponsorship.

Who would attend? "My idea," says Morton, "would be to invite a selected list of southern industrial leaders, educators, heads of community organizations and religious groups and others who would contribute to the sessions."

The question arises as to whether nonsoutherners would be invited. This would be decided by the sponsors, of course, but it would appear necessary if the southern viewpoint is to be communicated by any method other than the mass media.

Dr. Morton does not think the institute's meeting place should be limited to one city because so much would be gained by moving it from State to State. Jacksonville's central location in the Southeast would give our city an inside track, it would seem. The new city auditorium would provide an almost ideal convention hall.

"To my knowledge there is no assembly or institute or other agency which does exactly what I have in mind," says Dr. Morton. "Maybe it is neither practical nor advisable, but it seems to me that it would be worthwhile to start some such project as this. And I should like to see what some others think about it."

One of the major obstacles of such an institute would be the diversity of opinion that exists in many fields within the South itself. This often has led observers to refer to "the many Souths."

This is especially true in the field of race relations, the problem that overshadows all others today and promises to do likewise in the future. Not only do opinions vary along geographical lines in the South, but almost every individual has his own specific opinion.

There is the idea, anyway. In spite of all the ifs, ands and buts, it appears to be an idea with good possibilities.

Poison in Your Water—No. 140

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the El Dorado (Ark) News of April 13, 1959, entitled "The Pollution Problem."

THE POLLUTION PROBLEM

There are many odors emanating from Washington, D.C., these days, and not all of them are political in nature.

Take that beautiful stream, the Potomac River, for instance. The stench from this stream rivals anything that has occurred, politically, in the Nation's Capital for generations, and this covers a lot of territory.

The Potomac is so polluted today that no one, ignorant or foolhardy, would dare to swim in its waters. Even to get accidentally spilled in the water brings serious danger of contracting any number of serious diseases.

Pollution of the Nation's rivers and streams is a problem that endangers the health of the people, and the growth of the Nation.

Sadly enough, we have evidence of pollution of lakes and streams right here in the four States area.

In its convention in Shreveport the other day, the Red River Valley Association took up the pollution problem and there are indications that the RRVA will throw its full weight behind efforts to halt pollution of waterways in the valley.

Industries and communities which fail to correct practices which pollute lakes and streams should be dealt with promptly and effectively. There are antipollution laws which must be rigidly enforced. Other laws should be passed if the present laws prove ineffective in curbing this problem.

The Potomac River should serve as an excellent example of what happens when citizens drag their feet on this subject.

Pollution is deceptive. To a visitor in the Nation's Capital, the Potomac is indeed a beautiful stream. The river is spanned by bridges carefully designed to fit into the scenery. Along its grassy banks are such tourist attractions as the Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials. The river is wide, and during much of the year its waters are deceptively clear and blue.

One would think that the centerpiece of beautiful Washington—the Potomac—would be as clean, as well kept as its monuments, parks, and parkways.

The river, in fact, is worse than ill kept, a Washington correspondent reports. Its condition is disgraceful. Its waters are an open sewer along part of the Washington waterfront during some of the year.

A Member of Congress recently described the river in this way:

"Beautiful parkways and sweeping green lawns border both sides of the river, but anyone picnicking here or driving by on a still summer day would be nauseated by the smell of decomposing sewage and the sight of repulsive materials in the stream."

Fish which go up the river in the spring to spawn have difficulty getting through the polluted water, even when rains have brought down more than the usual amount of water to dilute the sewage. Only the roughest and hardiest of fish ordinarily inhabit these waters, and to catch and eat one is a health hazard.

The wide river is a favorite spot for boating enthusiasts. On pleasant days, cabin cruisers, outboard motors, sailboats, and canoes journey on its waters. Washington-Lee High School in Arlington, Va., has won three national schoolboy championships with its rowing teams trained on the Potomac. But water sports are dangerous to health, because the spray from motors and oars carry disease germs.

Not a pretty picture, is it?

What makes it even uglier and more ominous is the fact that it can—and has—happened elsewhere in this beautiful country. And it could happen here.

El Dorado and the four States area has a great stake in the future, with its splendid lakes and rivers. We cannot be too stern in our demands that antipollution laws be enforced.

The Gentleman of Song

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, on June 26 it was my honor and privilege to participate with the good people of Mount Vernon, Ohio, in commemorating the 100 anniversary of the composition of "Dixie" by Daniel Decatur Emmett, who was born, died, and is buried in this typical American town in my congressional district. A 3-day celebration of this event under the sponsorship of the Mount Vernon Kiwanis Club was a huge success in the opinion of countless citizens from many parts of the country who attended this affair in tribute to a humble man whose songs will live forever. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I made on this occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE GENTLEMAN OF SONG

(Address of Representative ROBERT W. LEVERING, at Mount Vernon, Ohio, in connection with Daniel Decatur Emmett celebration June 26, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, visiting dignitaries, ladies, and gentlemen, I am deeply honored to be with you on this occasion and to pay tribute to an humble gentleman, Daniel Decatur Emmett, and to his songs that have lived so long.

As you all likely realize, I have introduced legislation which, if enacted, would cause to be printed a stamp commemorating Daniel Decatur Emmett and this 100th anniversary of his most noted composition, "Dixie." I cannot be too hopeful about the success of my legislation, considering all the other momentous and important issues facing the Congress in these closing months of the first session, but I have been happy at the manner in which we have been able to engender a new interest in "Uncle Dan" Emmett, in Mount Vernon, and in his songs.

"Dixie" still has a substantial place in the hearts of many men. The largest radio station in Atlanta, Ga., opens and closes its program days with the playing of "Dixie." Columnists in all parts of the country have taken an interest in both "Dixie," and "Uncle Dan" Emmett, and, all in all, the evidence is clear that "Dixie," 100 years after its birth, still is very much alive throughout the United States.

Mount Vernon rightly is proud of "Uncle Dan" Emmett, and his memory. I think it is fine that the members of the Kiwanis Club here, and such good citizens as Ogden Wintermute, would continue to stimulate this interest and accentuate the interest in Daniel Decatur Emmett's life and works.

In 1703, Andrew Fletcher, of Saltoun, in a conversation with a friend, said: "Give me the making of the songs of a nation, and I care not who makes its laws." Percy Bysshe Shelly, one of the greatest poets of world history, declared in 1821 that "poets are the unacknowedged legislators of the world."

It is possible that in the long future Daniel Decatur Emmett will become one of those honored few who make the most lasting indentation on the world, through "Dixie" and his other poetic music.

Although virtually every adult in the country knows "Dixie," relatively few, I daresay, are familiar with the impact it has had on our Nation's life.

"Dixie" was the great rally cry of the Confederates in their ill-fated attempt to rebel against the Union. When Pickett's men charged at Gettysburg, they were singing "Dixie," to the accompaniment of the inspired drummer boys of the Southland. Yet, "Dixie" was used as a peace offering by the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, at the dawn of national reunion. "Dixie" was the air to which the boys in blue kept step as they stormed San Jacinto Hill and as they liberated Cuba from the hands of Spanish tyranny. It has become one of the most beloved songs ever to be written in the United States of America.

I am happy that Dan Emmett, its composer was born and reared in this town of Mount Vernon, the capital of Knox County, where my people have been living for generations, the area it is my honor to represent in the Congress of the United States. "Uncle Dan" Emmett made a great indentation on the people of his day, and, as fate has decided, he has made a great indentation on the people who came after him. Yet, this was a man of meager formal education, who joined a wagon circus as a drummer boy when he was a mere lad and at 15 composed "Old Dan Tucker," one of his greatest songs that my mother used to sing to me when I was a child. He was an Irishman, and as an old minstrel he carried always in his pocket a little volume of his songs, which he labeled, "The Patriotic Songs of America." Among them was "Dixie," of course.

Uncle Dan Emmett was, for some years, a contemporary of Abraham Lincoln, and was known to Lincoln, if not actually known by the Great Emancipator, the man Carl Sanburg has described "as hard as rock, but as gentle as drifting fog."

The fact that he wrote "Dixie"—he called it "I Wish I Was In Dixie's Land" originally—on a cold, wet week-end in New York City in the early Spring of 1859 is not the only reason we pay tribute to him.

After the Confederate forces had surrendered at Appomattox Courthouse, President Lincoln, who was in Richmond at the time, returned immediately to Washington. There was a great celebration at the White House that evening, at which several members of the Cabinet appeared. The U.S. Military Band marched to the White House lawn to help celebrate the victory. Lincoln was called to the balcony to greet the crowd. Through the cheers, the leader of the band asked the President for his favorite selection.

Lincoln promptly called back: "Play Dixie." We have captured the Confederacy, and now 'Dixie' belongs to the Union."

Another version of the same incident is that in Mr. Lincoln's response to a public serenade in front of the White House on the evening of April 10, 1865—the day after Lee's surrender—in which, promising more extended remarks the next evening (which proved to be his last public utterance), he dismissed the crowd with these words:

"I propose closing up this interview by the band performing a particular tune which I will name. Before this is done, however, I wish to mention one or two little circumstances connected with it. I have always thought 'Dixie' one of the best tunes I have ever heard. Our adversaries over the way attempted to appropriate it, but I insisted yesterday that we had fairly captured it. I presented the question to the Attorney General and he gave it as his opinion that it is our lawful prize. I now ask the band to give us a good turn upon it."

It is said that Abraham Lincoln remarked often that "The Blue Tail Fly"—another of Uncle Dan Emmett's famous songs—was his alltime favorite song.

As Uncle Dan once pointed out, he was the only man north of the Mason-Dixon line allowed to sing this song all during the Civil War in any theater, concert hall, or place of amusement. Of course, it was the great national song of the forces of the rebellion in the Southern States.

But we are all proud today that the Civil War was not the end of "Dixie," the song or the section it personifies. As I have pointed out, Abraham Lincoln himself, once the cruel war was over, wanted "Dixie" to be sung throughout the country in order to help bind up the Nation's wounds and to make all Americans, North and South, realize that we are one Union, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

In traveling through the South, on a tour that began at Newark, Ohio, on August 22, 1895, the Al G. Fields' Minstrel, presenting Uncle Dam Emmett in person, made one of the more remarkable records ever chalked up by a minstrel company. The theaters were packed wherever they appeared. When the company reached Richmond, Va., there was a rousing reception for Daniel Decatur Emmett. The Daughters of the Confederacy showered him with flowers; the Governor and representatives of the old Virginia families called upon him in delegations, and the theater was packed night after night.

Mr. Fields later described the tour in these words:

"Uncle Dan was not in the best voice after he had marked his fourscore years, but every time he appeared before the footlights to sing 'Dixie,' the audience went wild. It seemed as though they would actually raise the roof. Every man, woman, and child would rise in a body and simply overwhelm Uncle Dan with applause. It was great. It brought back memories of the grizzled men who bore arms for the Southland, the desolate camps, the fields of defeat, the enthusing recollections of victory. The Confederate soldiers had sung 'Dixie' on the march and in their camps. The widows, wives, and daughters recalled the occasions on which the song had been sung while the men were valorously fighting for the cause that was so dear to all of them."

Wherever the troupe appeared—in Charlottesville, Va., in Atlanta, Ga., in Wilming-

ton, Del., in Nashville, Tenn., recordbreaking crowds turned out and Uncle Dan, a modest man, was feted by the great families of that area and era. Through it all, he remained as humble and as gentle and as fine and kind as he always had been among his neighbors back home in Mount Vernon. In spite of his genius for playing on the heartstrings of the people, he remained as comfortable as an old pair of shoes, among people of all kinds, and he was so unaffected in his actions that many individuals actually called him eccentric, because he lived and acted in the simple, modest ways he wanted to live and act. I think that this simplicity, this gentleness, this lack of affectation, always has been and likely always will be the mark of true greatness. Jesus of Nazareth walked among the people as one of them. He loved the people and he lived plainly. The same was true of Saint Francis of Assissi. It was true of Socrates and Plato and Aristotle, and, of the greatest of our mighty dead. The great men of the world, in my observation, have deigned the trappings of power and the pomp of ceremony. They have realized that their gifts are God's gifts, and that their role is not to try to appear great by lording it over their fellow men, but to be great by doing the things God has made it possible for them to do.

The last performance of the season of the Al G. Fields minstrel company was at Ironton, Ohio, on April 11, 1896, and Uncle Dan, in his customary speech following his song, said: "This is my farewell trip and my last appearance. This is my goodby to the public."

The audience cheered him so much that night, it was recorded, that it seemed as if the performers could never go on with the show. The troupe disbanded in Columbus 2 days later. Dan Emmett remained there 1 day to make a few purchases and then came home directly to his little cabin, as happy as a king returning to his kingdom. He told his neighbors: "I'm back just in time to put in a mighty nice garden."

To the reporters who called on him, he made this statement: "I am not insensible to the uniform kindness and marked attention that has been mine on this trip, but such a lot of the same lavishness became too monotonous, and home and quiet looks good to me."

Daniel Decatur Emmett came onto the stage of life on October 29, 1815, in a little cottage here in Mount Vernon, Ohio. He stepped off the stage of life, in peace and quiet, when the final curtain was lowered on June 28, 1904, having lived 89 years. His request was that he be buried in the gray suit which Al G. Field had given him. Then, after appropriate ceremonies, he was buried next to the wife he had loved as a young man, in the family burial plot.

Mount Vernon does honor to itself to pay tribute to this plain, humble man who brought so much joy and inspiration to the people of all America, and the world.

Backfire in the War Against Insects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 19, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I have received a timely letter from the National Wildlife Federation by Charles H. Callison, conservation director, which I believe all sportsmen and the people of the United States should note carefully.

I strongly urge reading the article, "Backfire in the War Against Insects," from the June 1959 issue of Reader's Digest, which presents a real challenge to sportsmen and our citizens who are interested in conservation and our natural resources, including the protection of wildlife:

BACKFIRE IN THE WAR AGAINST INSECTS
(By Robert S. Strother)

The United States is engaged in an intensive war against destructive insects. The weapons employed are powerful and widespread, and so is the controversy they have engendered. Billions of pounds of poisons were broadcast over 100 million acres of cropland and forest. More billions of pounds are being spread across the Nation this year—against spruce mudworm in northern forests, grasshoppers in nine million acres of wheatland in the Midwest, white-fringed beetle in the Southeast; against sandflies, gnats, Japanese beetles, corn borers and gypsy moths. The U.S. Department of Agriculture is only one of the large-scale users of insecticides. State, county and even local groups also employ them, sometimes in cooperation with USDA, sometimes alone.

The new insecticides, often used as massive sprays from planes, kill birds, fish and animals along with insects of all kinds, good as well as bad. The costs of the campaigns in money, destruction of wildlife and possible harm to human health are not adequately known. The need for them is hotly challenged and hotly defended.

Says Dr. George J. Wallace, Michigan State University zoologist, "The current widespread program poses the greatest threat that animal life in North America has ever faced, worse than deforestation, worse than illegal shooting, worse than drainage, drought, oil pollution; possibly worse than all of these decimating factors combined."

The USDA points to the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in Florida as an example of what spray programs can accomplish. It also cites thousands of letters from grateful farmers all over the country. "Benefits to agriculture and the public," says USDA, "far outweigh damages that have occurred. Claims of wildlife destruction are greatly overstated."

Nobody knows for certain just how much damage is done, but there have been indications. In Florida, when a 2,000-acre tidal marsh was treated with dieldrin for sandfly larvae, a biologist was on hand. His report: "The fish kill was substantially complete. The immediate overall kill was 20 to 30 tons of fish, or about 1,175,000 fish, of at least 30 species. The larger game and food fish succumbed most rapidly. Then crabs devoured them; next day the crabs themselves were dead."

Large numbers of dead and dying birds, mostly robins, were found on the campus of Michigan State University in the spring of 1955. Indications were that death was due to insecticide poisoning, and subsequent investigation disclosed the chain of events. In the previous year, campus elms had been sprayed against bark beetles, carriers of the fungus which causes Dutch elm disease. Earthworms eating the leaf litter accumulated DDT in their viscera. When spring came and the worms emerged from the thawed ground, the robins ate the worms and died.

The annual elm spraying was continued. Its effect on reproduction among surviving robins was startling. In the spring of 1957 zoologists searched the 185-acre north campus for nests. Only six were found. Of these, five produced no young, and the fate of the sixth was undetermined. Late in June a 3-day search for young robins found only one—all this in an area that in 1954 had produced, on the basis of sampling counts, at least 370 young robins.

The first public outcry against massive spraying arose in 1957 during the USDA campaign against the gypsy moth in southern New York. Planes flew over at low levels, discharging a fog of DDT-impregnated kerosene on three million acres, including densely populated communities in Westchester County and on Long Island. Commuters awaiting their trains were sprayed, as were dairy farms, ponds, vegetable gardens and children, some of them three times.

Tempers flared, and 14 citizens charging careless use and official arrogance went into Federal court demanding an injunction against aerial spraying. After an extended hearing their application was denied.

Another and louder outcry was in the making. According to reports, 27 million acres in nine Southern States from eastern Texas to South Carolina were teeming with South American fire ants. These quarter-inch-long ants, it was said, had captured much of the South's best farmland and were eating their way north and west, sucking plant juices, killing young wildlife, and swarming in vicious assault on men in the fields. Their onslaught, if unchecked, might not stop short of California and Canada.

To combat the menace Congress voted an emergency appropriation of $2,400,000 for USDA. Plant Pest Control crews, without prior field testing, started an aerial broadcast of heptachlor, a powerful chlorinated hydrocarbon of the DDT family. They treated 700,000 acres before the appropriation ran out. The USDA now has asked Congress for another $2,400,000 for the second step in a long-range poisoning program. Does the fire-ant threat justify this costly campaign?

To get a firsthand view I went to Alabama, where fire ants have flourished for 40 years, and talked with people for, against, and in the middle of the program. Some remarkable facts emerged.

The foremost is this: the fire ant is not a serious crop pest; it may not be a crop pest at all. Dr. F. S. Arant, chief of the zoology-entomology department at Alabama Polytechnic Institute, told me, "Damage to crops by the imported fire ant in Alabama is practically nil. This department has not received a single report of such damage in the past 5 years. No damage to livestock has been observed. The ant eats other insects, including the cotton boll weevil. It is a major nuisance, but no more."

Though USDA circular No. 350 asserted that the imported fire ants often attack newborn calves and pigs, are fond of quail and chase brooding hens off their nests to eat their chicks, researchers at Alabama Polytechnic could rarely induce fire ants, even starving ones, either to eat plants or attack young animals. Instead, the insects became cannibalistic and ate one another.

Farmers and cattlemen detest the fire ants because their ugly 2-foot-high mounds clog mowing machines, and the ants bite when the farmer gets down to clear the blades. But none of the farmers I talked with had suffered any crop damage from fire ants. To control them, all farmers have to do is pour insecticides into the individual mounds or disk insecticides into the soil along wth fertilizers—two successful, low-cost methods developed by the agricultural experiment stations of Alabama and Mississippi.

Last September, 52 experts, including a USDA contingent of 5 were present at a fire-ant research meeting in Auburn, Ala. Dr. L. D. Newson of Louisiana State University challenged anyone there to go on record as saying that the fire-ant-eradication pro-

gram could be justified by damages to crops or animals. There was no answer.

What was the effect of the 1957–58 fire-ant campaign on wildlife? Dan Lay, Texas wildlife biologist, reported from Hardin County: "On May 12, before the poisoning, the fields were noisy with birds singing for territorial establishment. Dickcissels, red-winged blackbirds, and meadow larks were building nests and laying eggs. Forty-one nests with eggs were found in one clover field."

Then the planes came, scattering tiny pellets of clay containing 10 percent heptachlor. The poison covered the ground, 7 to 12 sugar-size granules to the square inch. The birds ate poisoned insects, pulled worms through poisoned soil or absorbed the poison through their feet. Within a day they began to tremble, went into convulsions and died. Orphan broods hatched and died in their nests. By June 3 only 3 of the 41 nests in the clover field remained occupied. Birds along the roads were reduced 95 percent.

It was the same in other areas sprayed: quail and killdeer wiped out; doves, woodpeckers, snipe, mockingbirds, cardinals, woodcock, hawks, wild turkeys, shrikes, and many other species almost exterminated.

Animals died, too. A racoon which had been seen rolling frenziedly in the road was later found dead by the roadside. Four fox pups were found dead in their den, poisoned by food brought in by their mother. Fish, turtles, snakes, rabbits, opossums, squirrels, armadillos were killed.

Today fish and game commissions in most of the afflicted States, finding the cure worse than the disease, have demanded a halt to aerial spraying. "It's like scalping yourself to cure dandruff," said Clarence Cottam, former official in the Fish and Wildlife Service.

"Sickening," said Charles Kelley of the Alabama Conservation Department. "These people can kill more game in a month than our department can build up in 20 years." Kelley handed me one of the USDA warnings given people whose lands are about to be doused:

"Cover gardens and wash vegetables before eating them; cover small fishponds; take fish out of pools and wash pools before replacing the fish; don't put laundry out; keep milk cows off treated pastures for 30 days, and beef cattle 15 days; cover beehives or move them away; keep children off ground for a few days; don't let pets or poultry drink from puddles."

"How can any official read that and still say the losses of wildlife are insignificant?" he demanded.

Last year, under the prodding of Representative LEE METCALF, of Montana, whose interest grew out of the wholesale destruction of fish in the Yellowstone River following a mishap in spraying DDT, Congress conducted hearings on the pesticide problem and set aside $125,000 for studies to learn what we are doing to fish and wildlife. All witnesses agreed basic research was badly needed. They raised many unanswered questions.

Do repeated small doses of the poisons impair the reproductive ability and lower the survival rate of the young in animals and birds? Most of the new chemicals retain their killing power in the soil for 3 years at least. Can they still kill after 5 years? Ten? Nobody knows.

What of the microorganisms that create soil fertility in the first place? What of the bottom organisms in streams and bays, on which marine life feeds? Do they accumulate the poisons? Since pesticides kill mice-eating hawks, owls, and foxes as well as rodents, and beneficial as well as harmful insects, may we not find ourselves without natural allies in the war on pests, and become wholly dependent on ever-stronger chemicals?

What about insects developing immunity, just as some germs have become immune to penicillin? The housefly and the mosquito were the initial targets for the new sprays. Now some common species of these insects are 1,800 times more resistant to DDT than were their ancestors of a few years ago. Are we trading a costly temporary victory over other pests for disaster in the form of super insects later on? Nobody knows.

And finally there is the greatest question of all: how serious are the hazards to human health? Doctors are increasingly troubled by the possibility that DDT and its much more poisonous descendants may be responsible for the rise in leukemia, hepatitis, Hodgkin's disease, and other degenerative diseases.

It may take years to find the answers to some of these questions. But one thing seems plain enough: aerial spraying needlessly kills wildlife and should not be done except in small areas and real emergencies.

Our forests flourished without chemical help through eons of time, and man has practiced agriculture with reasonable success for 100 centuries of recorded history. The new pesticides have been in general use for 15 years. "Surely," says Dr. Fairfield Osborn, noted conservationist, "we would be wise to halt massive spraying until we know what effects the toxins are having on ourselves and our animal coheirs to this planet."

Dr. Wallace has made a grim prophecy: "If this and other pest-eradication programs are carried out as now projected, we shall have been witnesses, within a single decade, to a greater extermination of animal life than in all the previous years of man's history on earth."

This may be a wildly pessimistic view. Nobody knows. But why risk it?

Russian Propaganda and Bluff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the question of just how much of Russia's claim to superiority in all phases of defense is sheer propaganda should be evaluated and toward that end we should have information concerning the sources of the data which certain columnists and politicians so glibly recite as indicative of the supremacy of the Russians over the Western democracies in the filed of aeronautics, missiles and nuclear weapons.

The Washington Evening Star of July 6 carried the report showing the latest figures released by the Soviet Government from which we now find how badly we were misled by the Communists as to their real losses in World War II and how such misinformation shaped our policy toward the U.S.S.R. at a time when the free world was trembling at the threats of an aggressor whose gun, we now know, was quite evidently not loaded.

As a matter of fact, the Russian war losses had so decimated her manpower reserves that quite evidently she has never been and is not now in a position to wage successful war with the free world. Also it is to be noted that women outnumber men 55 to 45 percent and that 48 percent of her population is concentrated in her cities.

Mr. Cecil Holland, the author of the Star report, in quoting the July issue of Population Bulletin has this to say:

"The postwar crisis in manpower," the study adds, "might be the key to this secretiveness, because the U.S.S.R. certainly was aware that the demographic (population) facts would reveal a serious, inherent weakness impairing her bargaining position, a weakness from which she could not quickly recover."

The study said this weakness also might partly explain Soviet warlike behavior in the postwar years and her enslavement of such satellite countries of dubious economic assets such as East Germany and Hungary.

The population blackout and "poker-playing bluff" plus "a sense of intense compulsion and dedicated spirit," the study said, contributed to the force which won for Russia "many postwar concessions and diplomatic victories."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have been "taken into camp" in this instance and there is nothing to prove that many of their current boasts of military superiority are not also cut from the whole cloth. In a series of articles appearing in True magazine, Mr. Lloyd Mallan has persued most convincingly the theory that the Russians presently have neither the capability nor the know-how to put into production an ICBM that can be zeroed on American targets, much less launch a sun-circling satellite which they claim without any verification whatsoever and without the slightest chance of their claims being scientifically refuted.

And why should anyone outside of Russia want to delude us as to Russia's capabilities? Well it is quite obvious that there are several groups who will profit if America can be kept off balance by the red herring of Soviet invincibility. And who are they? The military, first, since they have a vested interest in increased appropriations for defense and missile procurement; second, the manufacturers of such military hardware; third, the scientists who are riding the crest of the wave of apprehension since the launching of Sputnik I; fourth, the educators of the country who find the demand for an expansion of educational facilities to meet the Soviet threat sweet music to their ears; and finally, the columnists who are always seeking the sensational with the assurance that they never have to reveal the sources of their scare propaganda.

All of which is not to say that we should not proceed with reasonable dispatch to maintain our unquestioned superiority, both in the development of supersonic weapons as well as the strengthening of our conventional military structure. We should not, however, allow these alarmists-for-a-price to scare us into crash programs that can result in the acquisition of stockpiles of outmoded devices and at the same time plunge us into ruinously inflationary spending.

U.S. Security Endangered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a very timely editorial which appeared in the July 3, 1959, Los Angeles Herald-Express discussing the need for swift action to formulate a program to screen civilian defense workers.

In the editorial the Herald-Express points out the fact that our defense plants are a part of our Military Establishment behind the lines and that we must have a means to prevent agitators, spies, and saboteurs from stealing information and otherwise doing damage to our military projects. A recent Supreme Court ruling held that defense plants cannot screen civilian workers to check their loyalty and integrity on grounds that such screening has never been authorized by the Congress or President.

A bill is already before the House to revive the screening program. On July 8, Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER introduced a bill which would give the Secretary of Defense congressional authority to establish an industrial security program.

I believe that the Congress should act without delay to authorize an industrial security program for until such action is taken there will exist a dangerous gap in our security efforts.

The editorial follows:

[From the Los Angeles Evening Herald Express, July 3, 1959]

U.S. SECURITY ENDANGERED

This country cannot run the risk of endangering the national security whether it be in time of war or in time of peace.

Today the national security has been placed in jeopardy by a ruling of the Supreme Court that defense plants cannot legally screen civilian workers to check on their loyalty or their integrity. The Supreme Court ruling is based on the fact that such screening was never authorized by the President or Congress.

Therefore, it is the immediate obligation of the administration and Congress to plug the hole by formulating a program that will stand up against legal maneuver and attack.

Until such action is taken the Government cannot prevent Communist agitators, spies, and saboteurs from infiltrating the defense plants as workers, stealing classified information, and doing untold damage to our most secret and important military projects.

A defense plant, where secret weapons and parts for them are made, while being private enterprise, is actually a part of our Military Establishment behind the lines. Our survival depends upon their building our planes, our ships, and our tanks. We know and the Government knows that workers in such plants must be loyal. They should welcome the chance to be checked and screened, for their survival as well as ours depends upon their endeavors.

At the same time, workers have the right to the assurance that whatever screening program is devised will protect them from slander, malice, lies, and dubious evidence. It is surely the duty of the Government to make sure evidence against any worker is free of prejudice and perjury.

Our national security is endangered until such time as the administration or the Congress drafts a program which will insure the loyalty of workers and at the same time safeguard individual rights.

That should not be difficult, but time is short.

Congress and the President must act—and act now.

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, civil defense is, first of all, a family and a local matter. The people themselves have to taken an interest and do the job or we cannot have an effective civil defense. Every community must be prepared to meet any conceivable emergency before we can have real civil defense throughout the Nation.

Prince Georges County, located in the Fifth Maryland Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, has one of the most active civil defense organizations in the Nation. It is composed of 45 well-organized, well-trained community units under the directorship of R. Hal Silvers. The Prince Georges County agency, Mr. Speaker, believes that one of the purposes of civil defense is to save lives and reduce suffering in the event disaster strikes. It carries out programs and projects to educate the people on rescue procedures and how to protect themselves in any kind of disaster, whether it be a disaster created by enemy attack or a natural disaster. Recently the Prince Georges County agency issued a pamphlet which in abbreviated form outlines potential health hazards and procedures applicable at the scene of accidents involving atomic weapons and/or radioactive materials. The booklet was designed to specifically educate various public safety officials on suggested safety precautions. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of this bulletin, as follows:

RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS, ATOMIC WEAPONS, ACCIDENT HAZARDS, PRECAUTIONS, AND PROCEDURES

SECTION I—GENERAL

1. Purpose: The purpose of this memorandum is to present unclassified information on safety precautions, potential health hazards, and procedures applicable at the scene of an accident involving atomic weapons and/or radioactive materials.

2. Background: Atomic weapons and/or radioactive materials may be transported by aircraft, truck, train, and naval vessel. In each case, weapons and components are installed in special containers which are securely fastened to the transport vehicle by carefully designed tie-downs and mountings. Stringent safety measures have also been incorporated in the design of all atomic weapons. The latter measures, combined with existing handling and transportation procedures and equipment are designed to preclude a nuclear explosion in the event of any accident, even of a military aircraft in operational exercises. It is emphasized that for all atomic weapons in combat aircraft, a specific sequence of positive actions is required to ready them for a nuclear detonation.

3. Possible hazards: Even though atomic weapons are so designed as to prevent a nuclear yield in the event of accidental detonation, there is still a probable hazard commensurate with conventional weapons and materials. The two components of a nuclear weapon that constitute the most probable hazard in the case of an accident are (1) the high explosives and (2) the plutonium. Other components may produce hazards, but they are of such a nature that precautions taken against explosives and plutonium are more than sufficient for their control. It should be kept in mind that accidents involving nuclear weapons or components will usually involve other materials in more widespread use, such as gasoline or other volatile and explosive fuels. If fire occurs, acrid, suffocating, and toxic fumes and smoke will probably be generated by the combustion of surrounding materials. In that event, normal procedures and precautions applicable to the type of fire should be taken.

(a) High explosives: Most atomic weapons will contain conventional high explosives in varying amounts up to many hundreds of pounds. These high explosives comprise the major hazard associated with accidents involving atomic weapons. Due to the probable presence of high explosives in any atomic weapons shipment, accidents or fires involving such shipments must be treated as would accidents or fires involving conventional high explosives. The following is a summary of knowledge concerning high explosives and their danger and should be applied to atomic weapons where appropriate.

(1) Detonation: In any accident involving a high explosive there is some possibility of a detonation occurring. The detonation may range from a very small one to one of considerable magnitude or it may be a series of small explosions. The breakup of the weapon due to impact or a small explosion will probably result in the local scattering of small pieces of high explosive. Rough handling as well as accidents may produce powdered explosives. Most explosives are more unstable in these conditions and are more apt to detonate due to changes in temperature and/or shock. Exposure to sunlight likewise increases the sensitivity of the explosive and changes its coloring, usually making small pieces and powder difficult to distinguish from their surroundings. Thus, it is unwise for anyone other than trained demolition personnel to attempt clearing an area of broken high explosives.

(2) Fire: If a nuclear weapon is enveloped in the flame of a gasoline fire, the high explosive may ignite, burn, and in most cases, detonate. These detonations may also range from one large to several small ones. It is extremely difficult to extinguish large quantities of burning high explosives. Whenever burning high explosives are confined, as in an intact weapon, detonation may occur at any time. When high explosives burn, "torching" (jets of white flame coming out of the weapon) may be observed, but torching is not always evident before detonation. High explosives may melt at comparatively low temperatures, flow out of the weapon and resolidify. In this state, they are extremely sensitive to shock. If unconfined, high explosives may burn with the production of toxic gases and leave a poisonous residue. Ignition or detonation of the high explosives in a nuclear weapon involved in a fire can be prevented if the temperature of the explosives is kept below 300° F.

(3) Disposal: Only personnel specially trained in high explosives disposal should attempt to clean up, recover or dispose of high explosives.

(4) Nuclear yield: While it is not feasible to predict the exact effect of an accident involving high explosives, it is considered that the possibility of accidental nuclear explosion of a nuclear weapon is so remote as to be negligible.

(b) Plutonium: Plutonium contained in an atomic weapon may become dispersed as small particles as the result of impact or detonation of the high explosives, or as fumes if a fire occurs.

(1) Body effects: When small particles of plutonium are suspended in the air, it is possible to inhale them and thus deposit plutonium in the lungs. It may also get into the body through swallowing, but in such cases only a small percentage is retained by the body, since the plutonium is in a highly insoluble form. Cuts in the skin provide a third source of entry through which plutonium may enter the bloodstream. Plutonium is not a hazard if it remains outside the body, because it is an alpha emitter. The alpha particles have a very short range and lack the ability to penetrate the skin.

(2) Amount available: Field experiments indicate that the principal potential source of intake of plutonium into the body is inhalation during the passage of the cloud resulting from the detonation of the explosive, or a fire. Safety restrictions have been placed on the number of atomic weapons per shipment, so that the plutonium, inhaled from an accident would not result in serious injury. Once the fine particles have been deposited on the ground, the hazard is markedly reduced. Whereas it is always desirable to reduce to a minimum the intake of plutonium, where necessary one may enter or remain in a highly contaminated open area for short periods of time (up to several hours) after passage of the cloud.

(3) How to avoid: When fighting a fire involving plutonium, contamination of rescue personnel can be markedly reduced if they remain upwind and uphill from the accident. Conventional mechanical breathing apparatus or dust filter masks, goggles, and protective clothing will reduce contamination for those who must enter the smoke. Members of the special radiological teams wear full protective clothing, since they usually remain in the area for considerable lengths of time; however, the nonavailability of any or all of these items should not hold up rescue operations. Potential hazards in buildings can be reduced by shutting doors and windows and turning off ventilation equipment.

(c) Other radioactive materials: Accidents involving cargo type air, sea, and/or vehicle transports should always be approached with caution until the absence of radioactive materials can be ascertained. Radioactive materials are generally transported in heavy, lead lined, sealed containers, and may be handled safely under emergency conditions provided the shipping container is undamaged.

If the container is damaged, broken, or melted, all rescue personnel must be withdrawn from the area, except as required to save lives, pending arrival of special radiological teams.

Radiation commonly encountered will be the more penetrating beta and gamma radiation.

SECTION II—EMERGENCY PROCEDURES

4. General:

(a) The Department of Defense, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and the Prince Georges County Civil Defense Agency have specially trained and equipped radiological assistance teams prepared to deal with accidents involving radioactive materials.

(b) In the event of an accident involving atomic weapons or cargo vehicles suspected of carrying radioactive materials report the incident immediately to the nearest military installation, AEC office, and the Civil Defense Agency. Give brief details of the accident, and if an aircraft is involved, its type, i.e., transport, bomber, or fighter.

5. Action:

(1) Rescue and assist injured personnel as practicable.

(2) Notify military installation, AEC office, and Civil Defense Agency of the accident (and of the type of vehicle involved) and give them any information available as to whether nuclear weapons could be or are involved. They will in turn dispatch their own men to the scene of the accident and notify the Joint Nuclear Accident Coordinating Center as appropriate. In addition, pending arrival of the special teams, the activity called will provide advice regarding the incident.

(3) Clear area of all nonessential personnel to a distance of at least 1,500 feet or more. Maintain exclusion of the area until arrival of radiological assistance team.

(NOTE.—If a weapon is involved, there is always the danger of a detonation of the conventional high explosives.)

(4) Organize other witnesses to keep sightseers away from the accident. In the open, an exclusion distance of 1,500 feet should be established because of the potential hazards from the direct blast effects of a detonation of conventional high explosives, but cover must be taken even at this range from secondary missiles flung into the air by the explosion. If there has been no explosion and it is suspected that a bomb is involved, there may still be an explosion.

(5) If there is a fire and if weapon is not burning or engulfed in flames, attempt to extinguish fire in the normal manner (from upwind side only). Keep weapon cool. Tests have shown that very early application of water spray from two 2½-inch all-purpose-fog nozzles will keep temperature of weapon below 200° F. when nozzles are positioned on each side of weapon to envelop it in the spray. (Stop water if it accelerates burning.) The high explosive should not explode if the temperature is kept below 300° F. Do not use foam on a bomb where it will act to trap heat inside. Foam is an insulator and may act to retain sufficient heat to detonate the bomb.

(6) If weapon is engulfed in flames or if the high explosive is burning (torching), clear area out to at least 1,500 feet of all personnel; do not attempt to fight fires.

(7) Avoid smoke and clear downwind area, but if dense smoke must be encountered for long periods of time, dust filtering masks, goggles, or breathing apparatus should be used. These are not needed for short stays in the smoke and their nonavailability should never hold up rescue efforts. Although there may be a toxic, caustic, or minor radioactive hazard in the smoke, short incursions are not likely to be serious and will not be lethal. Personnel who have entered smoke in the crash area must report to the special team for monitoring, and, if necessary, decontamination after initial action is over.

(8) After the burning has subsided, and if the special teams have not yet arrived—

(a) Do not attempt to clean up the scene of the accident.

(b) Do not permit reentry into scene of accident by anyone. Rope off scene in a semipermanent manner.

(c) Organize all personnel that may have been contaminated to preclude the spreading of plutonium about the environs and so that they can be monitored by the special team on arrival.

(9) Follow advice of the special radiological teams upon their arrival.

Labor Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD George Todt's column "Why Labor Reform Gets Nowhere," appearing in the July 2, 1959, Valley Times. The Valley Times serves California's San Fernando Valley, which is so ably represented in Congress by our colleague, Congressman EDGAR W. HIESTAND.

The editorial follows:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION

WHY LABOR REFORM GETS NOWHERE

Whether reform is possible in the field of labor legislation, which Congress is now debating, still remains to be seen.

The august solons have been at it for more than a year and thus far nothing tangible has been turned into law.

To this date there has been little or nothing at all shown in the way of progress—despite the revelations of the McClellan committee which have rocked the Nation to its foundations.

One of the more obvious reasons why we have no ready labor remedial legislation by this time is simply because the leaders of organized labor haven't put their personal stamp of approval on some of the features which many believe a strong bill must incorporate in order to be really effective.

As a result, we are constantly hearing cries from interested parties to the effect: "George Meany says he can live with this bill." Or "Walter Reuther doesn't feel that he can go along with that bill." Even perhaps "The AFL–CIO will let the bill pass if we go this far—but any farther would ruin its chances to pass in Congress."

Now such outcries ought to seem at least a little strange to all of us, if we are fair-minded citizens. And this includes our top-bracket friends in organized labor, too. Let's take a look at the other side of the coin for a moment.

Let's consider a hypothetical example: Suppose that the McClellan committee had turned its identical type of evidence in to be considered by the Nation—but, instead, the corruption uncovered had been on the side of business, medicine or farming?

If an outraged public might demand that remedial legislation ought to be proposed for any of the examples given—who, then, would we naturally expect to write the bills? Ought it to be the National Association of Manufacturers or the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in the case of business? The Farmers Union in the case of the farmers? The American Medical Association in the case of medicine? Or should we expect the Congress to write its own remedial legislation for any such affected groups without favor or partiality shown to anyone and with nothing except the public welfare in mind?

Most of us would prefer that Congress might pursue the last course mentioned in a courageous manner designed to favor, as octogenarian Frank Buchman is wont to say, "not who's right, but what's right."

Actually, this is the only realistic attitude with which our legislators ought to approach the controversial labor question these days. Nobody I know of wants to set organized labor back in its legitimate gains of the past 50 years. But at the same time, it ought to be equally understandable that

most American citizens today don't want the leaders of this powerful giant to run roughshod over the public in our country, either.

Let's play ball on this particular matter and expect our legislators to be fair and square with all of us. Let's have a proper bill that favors nothing except the public interest. This means, in the last analysis, Joe Doakes. Who's a better man to be considered here?

Congressman EDGAR W. HIESTAND, whose district covers a large portion of the San Fernando Valley, believes that we should expect the following items in any labor law which can be actually called effective:

1. Protection for innocent third parties (usually small business) and the public against the malicious secondary boycott.

2. Protection for workers unwilling to join a union against coercive blackmail picketing.

3. Return to workers and small business the right of a "day in court," by closing the jurisdictional gap between Federal and State law.

4. Protection of the rights of individual union members, especially the right of secret ballot in electing officers and setting policy.

5. Safeguards to prevent reprisals against union members who speak out against union bosses, or who act or vote against union dictates.

6. Safeguards for workers' money in union treasuries and pension funds.

Some union members believe that their own unions may now provide such safeguards, in addition to others already on the books, but we must remember that this is hardly the case of uniformity throughout the Nation.

Let's assure to all union members the exemplary treatment which may be found in certain of the more salutary labor organizations whose democracy is readily upheld by their memberships.

Can we really be said to have democracy in its best sense unless it is available to all who qualify under its terms?

Passaic Honors a Soldier of the Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time an editorial that appeared in the Passaic Herald-News of Passaic, N.J., on Wednesday, July 1, 1959.

The editorial follows:

PASSAIC HONORS A SOLDIER OF THE PAST

Unveiling of an oil painting of Maj. Frederick E. Rohrbach at Passaic's City Hall recalls an outstanding military figure in the city's history.

The company he led successfully through a bloody battle in World War I was Passaic's historic successor to other home guard companies in all previous wars going back to colonial New Jersey. In the days when Acquackanonk Landing was just a cluster of buildings on River Road all able-bodied men between 16 and 60 were automatically members of the home guard. They were required to keep a musket and ammunition in good shape and had to muster from time to time to prove they were ready to defend their homeland. Major Rohrbach's portrait stands as a kind of symbol for all local veterans, present and past.

The major was more than a soldier, however. He was a popular figure in his day, a gentleman as well as a good commander, and for many years a city tax assessor. Many will remember him as the marshal in a steady succession of Memorial Day parades.

Unlike some cities, Passaic has no statuary of local figures and few portraits in public places. The painting of Major Rohrbach is therefore all the more valued by the city. Those who made it possible should feel well repaid.

Federal Aid for Sewage Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to make available to my colleagues an editorial appearing in the July 1 issue of the Des Moines Register, which supports the House-passed bill to amend the 1948 Water Pollution Control Act.

Iowa's need for plants to control water pollution is possibly typical of her sister States, and I believe that this editorial very ably implies the heartfelt thanks of the local governments, health officials, conservationists, and all the citizens of my State for the initiative taken by the Congress to provide an aid program which is doing a good job in correcting a serious water pollution problem.

The editorial follows:

FEDERAL AID FOR SEWAGE PLANTS

Iowa communities stand to receive greatly increased amounts of Federal aid to attack the State's water pollution problem under a measure recently passed by the U.S. House. The measure will allow the Government to double existing Federal grants for construction of local sewage treatment plants.

The present program dates from 1956, when Congress approved a 10-year plan to cut down pollution by aiding expansion of sewage facilities. The Federal Government agreed to put up 30 percent of the cost of an approved project, or $250,000, whichever is greater, if local communities financed the remainder. Congress set a ceiling of $500 million for the 10-year program and has been putting up around $50 million of matching funds each year.

The funds are allocated to the States under a formula based on population and need. Iowa has been receiving in the neighborhood of $830,000 each year. The funds are earmarked for projects by the State health department, which establishes priorities on the basis of the seriousness of a community's water pollution problem.

The Federal aid funds have served as a major inducement for communities to plan and construct sewage treatment plants. In Iowa, some 52 projects have benefited from Federal aid funds in the last 3 years. Since the program has been in effect, $2.7 million of Federal funds have resulted in $11.5 million of sewage plant construction in the State.

Nationally, $119 million of Federal aid funds have resulted in expenditures of more than $400 million of local funds in the last 3 years. This is far short of the spending needed to catch up with the growing water pollution problem. The U.S. Public Health Service estimates construction will have to total $575 million annually for the next 8 years to keep up with pollution loads. The Iowa State Health Department reports it has 26 applications for projects on file for which there are no funds, with many additional projects in the State in need of financing.

The Housed-passed bill would stretch out the aid program for an indefinite period and boost the ceiling on expenditures from $500 million to $1 billion. The amount Congress could appropriate in any one year would be raised from $50 million to $100 million.

This measure is in sharp conflict with President Eisenhower's proposals. The President proposed an appropriation of only $20 million for sewage plant aid and called for termination of the program at the end of this year. The President wants the States to have sole responsibility for financing sewage construction. The administration would help States finance the projects by allowing them to collect a part of the present Federal excise tax on telephone service.

It isn't certain that all States could or would earmark this revenue for sewage plants. Some States have constitutional restrictions on the way such taxes can be spent. It is debatable, also, whether water pollution is a problem from which the Federal Government should be divorced. As the League of Women Voters, which looks favorably on the new legislation, points out:

"No single community within any State regards its own pollution problem as entirely its problem. As long as water runs downhill, as long as rivers ignore State boundaries, water pollution is everybody's—a national—problem."

The danger of Federal-aid programs is that once begun they are extremely difficult to cut down or eliminate. But Congress in this case can hardly be blamed if it refuses to give up a program for which there is a proven need, which is getting the job done and which States are showing no enthusiasm to undertake.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

Commencement Day Address by Hon. Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania, at Suffolk University, Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, recently I had the great pleasure of attending commencement exercises at Suffolk University and was privileged to hear the splendid commencement address delivered by our distinguished and able colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. Senator SCOTT describes the position of the moderate in American politics with insight, with clarity, and with an illuminating touch of humor. Senator SCOTT's address was well received by his hearers at Suffolk University and I think it will be well received by the country.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENCEMENT DAY ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR HUGH SCOTT, AT SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY, BOSTON, MASS., JUNE 21, 1959

For a long time you have looked toward this happy day when you could close your books and be sprung by this great institution upon a waiting world. You have survived final examinations. You have invited your families to see you wind up in a burst of glory and a swirl of academic gowns. You are planning to heave a sigh of relief once you have diploma in hand.

I have been called in by President Munce and Judge Donahue to prevent that sigh from settling over your minds like a damp blanket. I have been asked to tell you—in a way that will penetrate through the shock of final grades, these and oral examination—that the dictionary definition of commencement is in fact the real meaning of this day; bachelors you now are, or even masters of learning, but your marriage with life has yet to be consummated.

Why do college administrators and out-of-town Senators bother you with mighty alarums on a day when you should be ending, not beginning to worry?

We are compelled by an attitude similar to that of a parent who looks upon a child and thinks, "There is so much this young life can do. These are the things I would do if I could start over again."

In other words we—the administrators and the Senators—see room for vast improvement in our society. Although we have not entirely given up on our contemporaries, we believe that, statistically, we can get the best odds right here on college campuses.

There is a novel display in the lobby of the Department of Commerce Building in Washington. It is called a census clock and last Tuesday it showed that the estimated population of the United States had reached an even 177 million. In 1950, the time of the last census, the population of our land was but 151 million.

That means 26 million more people to earn money and to make things, to ride our highways, to be protected against fires at home and conflagrations abroad, and to pay taxes into the great open maw of governments: Federal, State, county, municipality, and to forth. These 26 million more people make us a bigger country with greater promise and greater responsibilities.

While we grew, the rest of the world grew, indeed at a much more rapid pace. And if this Nation is to fulfill its responsibilities to a large and growing world it needs an increasing infusion of new blood and new ideas.

Unfortunately too many of our citizens would prefer to heave that comfortable moist sigh of relief and let some one else enthuse, plan, and work for the public good, let others assume the increasingly complex responsibilities of the U.S. citizenship.

We are back now to the dictionary meaning of commencement. May each of you here step out from under the academic robes with firm intent to accept the responsibilities of citizenship.

Use the thinking man's intellectual filter: Challenge the obvious. By all means, prepare to challenge the type of dogmatic thinking which characterizes the right and left colorations of the politico-economic spectrum.

Entrenched along the right flank is bourbonism—not the kind you drink, but the kind you think. The term, of course, referred originally to the Bourbons who once ruled much of Europe, of whom it was said, "They never learn anything and they never forget anything." One associates Bourbonism with an armor-plated defense of the status quo.

Bourbonism in the United States is exemplified by those who still fight social security, the right of collective bargaining, mutual security programs for our allies and friends abroad, and oppose such Government programs as support for research in medicine and fundamental sciences. There are still people in public life today who are carrying on love affairs with the past. Their defense of their status quo is in reality an attack upon yours since progress is your most important product.

Another roadblock to progress, manning the left flank, is the panacea of the green poultice, advocated by those who would cure everything by the application of more money. They rely increasingly upon Government-sponsored security as against the harder course of strong-fibered individual enterprise. The green poultice enthusiasts are encouraging the growth of governmental paternalism, the promise to vote benefits out of the pockets of some people into the pockets of others.

In Congress we think of them as rocket launchers. When President Eisenhower proposes legislation that is designed for the best interests of the country and has a reality of purpose, they do not bother to consider his proposals. They launch their bigger, noisier schemes which burst upon the front pages like so many Fourth of July rockets—and have about as much usefulness as a red-white-and-blue explosion. And one man's rocket is often the fire on another man's roof.

Both these schools of dogmatic ideas, bourbonism and green poultice, collapse when challenged by thinking people.

People who espouse such extreme ideas take advantage of Americans' tendency to disagree with what you say but defend to the death your right to say it. It is a national tradition that we tolerate extremism. But do not be trapped into believing that in tolerating you must also subscribe to extremist thinking.

I belong to the unsung school of moderates. So does almost every one of you. A moderate is not as spectacular as one who fires off rockets. He seldom seems as valiant as those who would die at Balaklava for outmoded issues.

But we do get things done. We try to enact legislation for all the people rather than for favored groups. We would have our Government provide for those in need, but not create new needy. We want our Government to conduct its affairs fairly and honorably. And we want our Government to be on a paying, rather than a subsidized basis.

We need people who want to get things done rather than merely get their names in print; people who want laws rather than political issues; people who would prefer to be public servants rather than public house heroes.

We need the support of you, the thinking people, who have the foresight, the education, and the civic motivation to support good government.

Will Forests Pay Off More in Future Through Recreation or Lumber?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on the recent Fourth of July weekend, millions of American families took to the highways to find recreation in State and National parks, forests, beaches, and waterways. Many found these areas crowded. Facilities in some places were greatly overtaxed. These were the conditions found by our citizens in the year 1959 when our Nation's population is 170 million. What will the July 4 vacationer find 40 years hence when our population is expected to top the 300 million mark, but the available land area will be the same as in 1959?

An approach toward forecasting these future conditions was discussed at the Citizens Conference on Pacific Northwest Forest Resources at Reed College on June 19, 1959, by Mr. George M. Henderson, vice president of the First National Bank of Oregon. Mr. Henderson is a serious student of the forest

products industry of the Pacific Northwest, and his talk at the Portland conference provided an especially penetrating analysis of how forests may be utilized in the future for recreational purposes.

Mr. Henderson pointed out that national parks, national forests, and State parks in Oregon and Washington attracted 10 million visitors by actual count in 1950; 29 million in 1958. By straight-line projection, he anticipates 300 million visitors to these areas by the year 2000. I was especially impressed by one of Mr. Henderson's conclusions:

When we think of trying to crowd 10 times as many people into these recreational areas 40 years from now as we have in them now, it indeed seems shortsighted for us to resist the protection and development of areas of outstanding recreational value.

I have introduced legislation to establish national seashore park areas in Oregon and elsewhere in the Nation because of my belief that lands should be dedicated now—while relatively undeveloped and unexploited—so that unique scenic and recreation areas will be available to meet the demands of future years. I think Mr. Henderson's talk before the Citizens Conference in Portland confirms the necessity for such action. He explains that the forest products industry is the largest source of employment in our home State of Oregon. Yet, there is evidence that by taking some small parts of our forests out of timber production in order to fully supply adequate recreational planning for the future, we actually will gain in economic values. Value of forest products in Oregon and Washington last year was about $2 billion, and estimated income from the tourist industry was $713 million. Mr. Henderson has said:

When we realize that the amount of log-cut cannot be increased, even though there will be a substantial increase in value of finished product, whereas the number of tourists can increase without limit during the next 40 years, it is entirely reasonable to suppose that the value of the tourist industry will far exceed that even of the timber products industry 40 years from now.

If we are to leave a heritage of natural resources so that they can be utilized for recreation in future years, steps must be taken now, today, to preserve the areas which afford possibilities for such future use. I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some excerpts from the able and wise address by Mr. George M. Henderson of Portland, Oreg., delivered at Reed College on June 19, 1959.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROLE OF PACIFIC NORTHWEST FORESTS IN ECONOMY OF OREGON AND WASHINGTON

(Talk by George M. Henderson, vice president, the First National Bank of Oregon, Portland, Oreg., at Citizens Conference on Pacific Northwest Forest Resources, Reed College, June 19, 1959)

The purpose of this discussion is to take an objective look at these forests of ours and to relate the resources which they encompass to the daily lives of individuals, businesses and government functions of the States in which we live.

We all have seen reams of reports on how many logs are cut and boards are sawed each year, and how many people work in the woods and mills and other forest products plants. But to be useful, such figures must be related to the overall activities of our people in these and other fields of endeavor.

* * * * *

There are many ways of breaking down this forest area for reporting purposes. Probably the most common within the industry is to talk of the Douglas-fir region and the pine region, these dominant species do not occur with any regard to State or international boundaries.

Douglas-fir, the world's favorite construction wood, grows along the Pacific coast from British Columbia to northern California, where it blends into the redwood.

The pine forests extend from British Columbia and Alberta, down through eastern Washington and Oregon, into Montana and Idaho, and to the east and south, far beyond the geographical confines of the Pacific Northwest. There is an estimated 408 billion feet of Douglas-fir; 162 billion feet of pine, and 331 billion feet of secondary species in the forests of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, for a total standing timber inventory of 901 billion feet of commercial saw timber in the Pacific Northwest States. This is 44 percent of all the standing timber in the 49 States. Oregon contains half of the Douglas-fir in the region, and more than one-third of the world supply of this fine timber.

Oregon also contains half of the region's pine timber, while secondary species, principally hemlock and true firs, bring Washington's total to about three-fourths of Oregon's. The two States together contain 72 percent of the Pacific Northwest total.

* * * * *

With 90 percent of the region's land which is above 5,000 feet elevation being in Federal ownership, skiers use national forest land very heavily.

Picnics probably account for more forest visits than any other, except plain sightseeing.

Wildlife is a great forest attraction for sightseers the year around, and hunters in season.

All of these recreational attractions of Oregon and Washington are almost wholly dependent on forest lands and their streamflow. How many people use our forests for recreation?

Growth of use in State parks, National parks, and National forests provides a good basis for evaluating the present interest and probable trend in recreational visits. In 1950 these developed areas in Oregon and Washington attracted 10 million visitors. By 1958 the visits had risen to 29 million. Dr. Richard McArdle, in his recent report, "Program for the National Forests," forecasts a doubling of recreational use of those lands in the next 10 years and a tenfold increase in 40 years. If we apply this same growth rate to our 2 States, we can picture almost 300 million visits to these State and Federal parks by the year 2000, with a similar increase in recreational pressure on all timberlands.

Translated into economic impact, we see that the tourist industry of Oregon and Washington has grown from a $331 million business in 1939 to $608 million in 1958, and an estimated $713 million this year, or about double in 20 years. Based on national population growth estimates, it is reasonable to conclude that the tourist business of the Pacific Northwest, which is inseparably related to our forest recreational resources, will be a many-billion-dollar industry 40 years from now.

One of the other great forest resources is grazing land. Often the significance of forests to the stock-raising industries is overlooked. Cash receipts of farmers from sale of sheep, cattle, and wool amounts to $150 million annually in Oregon and Washington, and forest rangelands contribute importantly both for grazing use and as sources of water supply.

Of the more than 2 million cattle and 1 million sheep in the two States last year, about a quarter of a million head ranged under national forest permit. In all, perhaps half of all stock animals grazed in high summer timber or protected low-country forests during the year.

Many ranches would not be profitable economic units if they did not have access to vast acres of forested grazing land, both privately and publicly owned, for use as a summer range.

One further forest resource should be called to mind in this brief evaluation of the economic meaning of our forests. That is our water supply.

Often we take for granted our seemingly limitless supply of pure, fresh water. Although there is justification for taking the rainfall for granted (especially during Rose Festival time in Portland), controlling the usefulness of that rainfall after it reaches ground is another vital forest function.

Another speaker will point out the tremendous value of forests in storing rainfall and releasing it during dry months to provide the year-round river flow that has made possible the present 8 million kilowatt power generation and the 30 million kilowatt power potential of the Columbia Basin.

The Columbia River system pours an average of 253,000 cubic feet per second of water into the Pacific Ocean; while hundreds of smaller streams flowing directly into the Pacific and Puget Sound carry another 165,000 cubic feet per second from the rain and snowfall of Oregon and Washington.

Combined, the terminal rivers of these two States carry 418,000 cubic feet per second—almost one-half million cubic feet per second, which is about one-quarter of the total volume carried by all the rivers flowing from the contiguous 48 States, the national total being 1.8 million cubic feet per second.

Irrigation and flood control combine with power to create a tremendous total value to the watershed control exercised by the forests of the Pacific Northwest.

The dollar value of these water resources cannot be calculated on a basis comparable with annual income from other forest resources. Water is the catalyst which makes every other function of the Pacific Northwest possible. Of course, forests play only a limited role in storing and regulating the supply, yet the prosperity of most other facets of our community life is closely related to sound, long-range planning in management of forests for water use.

Important as are these multiple other uses of forest lands today and tomorrow, the simple facts of our region's economic life are that $3 out of every $10 of income of persons living in the Pacific Northwest results from the wood industry—growing and harvesting trees and processing the wood into the thousands of end products which along with lumber provide an ever-growing demand for the forest crop.

In Washington, total income of individuals this year will reach $6.3 billion. Of this, $1.4 billion, or 22 percent will depend directly or indirectly on the wood products industry.

Oregon's dependence on wood is much greater because Oregon has a greater log-production capacity combined with a smaller population and less non-forest-manufacturing business. In Oregon, the 1959 total income probably will reach $3.7 billion, of which $1.6 billion, or 43 percent will depend on wood products.

So in the two States, $3 billion, or 30 percent of all individual income can be attributed to the business of growing and harvest-

ing timber. This method of presenting the relative importance of the industry is different from the more usual one of simply comparing employment and payrolls. In this review, we have given recognition to related service industries, Government employment and other manufacturing which exist because of the timber industry.

In Oregon and Washington, 151,00 persons are engaged directly in harvesting and manufacturing wood products. Another 13,000 work in industries directly supplying the loggers and allied manufacturers, for a total direct employment in forest-related manufacturing of 164,000. For each person employed in a basic industry, there are slightly more than two others engaged in economic functions which develop around the basic industries. Without basic industry, such service businesses would have no purpose; so if we consider that the "non-basic" employment is stimulated in direct relation to basic industrial activity, then there are 344,000 persons working in service businesses because of the 164,000 engaged directly in forest products manufacture, bringing the total employment impact of wood products businesses to 508,000, or 30 percent of all employment in the two States.

By comparison with agriculture, forest products directly employs 164,000 and agriculture 159,000.

Measured differently, the value of forest products in the two States is $2 billion; about twice that of agricultural products, according to studies by the Industrial Forestry Association.

An assignment of all employment in proportion to activity in basic industries, as has been done here, is not a precise calculation, but it is believed to be sufficiently accurate, and the most reasonable way of measuring the total impact of a particular industry. Failure to consider tourism as a basic industry could be questioned, yet there is no reliable measure of the employment in that highly seasonal business which is so interrelated with other service employment.

So to summarize, as we hear the speakers to follow at this conference, we may recognize that the industry which they are analyzing is one which accounts for $3 of every $10 of income to the people of the Pacific Northwest.

Application of State Antidiscrimination Law—The Issue of Federal-State Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in a speech delivered on the floor of the Senate on June 4, I expressed my concern—both from the viewpoint of the Federal system we cherish and from the viewpoint of human rights—at the fact that the Department of State had advised the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, a public body with quasi-judicial functions, that a finding by the commission in legal proceedings pending before it to compel the Arabian American Oil Co.—Aramco—"to employ persons of the Jewish faith in Saudi Arabia" would adversely affect U.S. interests abroad. Since no party to the proceedings pending before the commission was seeking a finding by the commission to compel the employment of Jews in Saudi Arabia, I expressed the view that the Department was overstepping its proper role in a State proceeding in which the duty of the quasi-judicial body was to apply the law of a sovereign state of the Federal system, and that the Department was misconstruing—with possible consequent mischief—the nature of the New York controversy, which in fact was confined to whether Aramco's employment screening practices violate the law of the State of New York when those practices are applied within New York.

Since the June 4 speech, correspondence between the Department of State and myself indicates that the Department more clearly understands the nature of the New York action and recognizes the fact that a finding prohibiting Aramco from questioning job applicants on a religious basis in New York would not adversely affect U.S. interests abroad, assuming even the relevance of that consideration.

An article in today's New York Times indicates that the correspondence between the Department and myself constitutes new evidence which may cause the commission to vacate its ruling upholding the Aramco position on the basis of the Department's pre-June statements as the Commission understood them. Commission and Department officials meet tomorrow, and it is my hope that my letter to the Department of June 29 will elicit from the Department a clarification of the Department's position along the lines indicated in a letter to me on June 15 by Assistant Secretary of State Macomber.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in yesterday's New York Times, to which I have alluded, as well as a letter written to me on June 15 by Assistant Secretary of State Macomber, and my reply thereto of June 29, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 8, 1959]

STATE GETS DELAY IN SUIT ON OIL BIAS—CARTER WINS TIME TO ASSESS STATE DEPARTMENT POLICY TOWARD SAUDI ARABIA

Elmer A. Carter, chairman of the State commission against discrimination, won time yesterday to discuss U.S. policy toward Saudi Arabia with State Department officials in Washington before deciding what to do about the hiring practices of the Arabian American Oil Co.

Acceding to a request from Mr. Carter, Supreme Court Justice Henry Epstein gave the commission until next Tuesday to decide whether it would accept his suggestion to withdraw a ruling that exempts the oil company from certain provisions of the State Fair Employment Practices Act.

This was an extension of a 48-hour deadline laid down by Justice Epstein on Monday.

As matters now stand, Justice Epstein will rule on a motion by the American Jewish Congress unless the commission withdraws its ruling by next Tuesday. The motion accuses the company of discriminatory employment policies.

Shad Polier, counsel for the congress, said last night that he had no objection to the extension. On Monday he had argued successfully against a request by the commission for an adjournment to September 22.

In support of this request, Henry Spitz, general counsel for the commission, had told the court that new evidence—presumably of a toughening U.S. policy toward Saudi Arabia—had come to light. He had said this could be confirmed only through conversations in Washington.

On Monday, Mr. Polier produced a letter from William B. Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, to Senator E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska.

The letter seemed to indicate that the State Department was anxious to avoid a ruling that would compel the Arabian American Oil Co. to employ Jews in Saudi Arabia despite that country's refusal to accept them.

The implication was that the State Department's concern did not extend to the company's employment policies in New York State.

In a letter to Justice Epstein yesterday, Mr. Carter said he had just been informed that officials of the State Department would see him and Mr. Spitz at 3 p.m. tomorrow.

He told Justice Epstein that if the necessary extension of the deadline were not granted, he would be compelled to rest on the record that was before him at the time the original ruling was made and to ask the court to consider the pending petitions on the basis of the record.

Mr. Spitz said last night that the State Department officials referred to by Mr. Carter were Parker T. Hart, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, and representatives of the legal adviser's office.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 15, 1959.

The Honorable E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: I have for reply your further letter of June 3 regarding the policies of certain of the Arab States which have the effect of restricting the trade activities and admission of persons of the Jewish faith. We appreciate the interest shown in your letter in resolving the very real problems created by these policies.

There is one point with respect to your comments on Mr. Rountree's letter to the commission on which we should like to add a word. Mr. Rountree's letter was in response to a specific series of questions from the commission, in accordance with a resolution of the commission to seek expert advice where matters outside the State of New York may be involved. The Department had, in 1950, similarly provided information with respect to the situation in Saudi Arabia when the problem faced by Aramco was previously examined by the commission. You will note that Mr. Rountree's letter did not refer to a "finding in the proceedings by the commission against Aramco," but specifically to "any finding by the commission which would compel Aramco to employ persons of the Jewish faith in Saudi Arabia." We assure you that the Department does not intend to inject itself in any way into the proceedings of a State court; at the same time, the Department does have an obligation, when requested to do so, to provide State authorities with information respecting the policies of other governments and of our own in foreign lands.

Thank you again for your close interest in this problem. Should you wish to have further information regarding it, the officials of the Department concerned would, of course, be pleased, at any time, to discuss the matter with you.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

JUNE 29, 1959.

Mr. WILLIAM B. MACOMBER,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACOMBER: Your letters of June 15 and June 19 are appreciated. This correspondence from you emphasizes the desirability of a meeting on the subject of Saudi Arabia's successful efforts to promote the imposition of economic sanctions against certain American citizens. Accordingly, Mr. Joseph Josephson of my staff will meet with Deputy Assistant Secretary Parker Hart tomorrow, at my request.

I take this opportunity to comment upon your letter of June 15. I have understood that Mr. Rountree's letter "was in response to a specific series of questions from the commission" in New York. Nevertheless, Mr. Rountree's introduction of a reference to "any finding by the commission which would compel Aramco to employ persons of the Jewish faith in Saudi Arabia" was not a response to a specific question from the commission. The possibility of such a finding was not before the commission, as I have indicated previously. Such phraseology obscurbed the issue and reflected the Department's misunderstanding of the nature of the New York proceedings.

The American Jewish Congress directed its complaint before the New York Commission to the employment screening practices of Aramco—practices which the American Jewish Congress believes are prohibited by New York antidiscrimination law. The complaint was not directed to Saudi Arabia's visa policy. Obviously, New York authorities could grant the relief sought by the American Jewish Congress in the Aramco case without prejudicing or adversely affecting U.S. interests in the Middle East, for the point of reference for Mr. Rountree's remark that U.S. interests might be affected adversely was a wholly hypothetical finding, not sought by the American Jewish Congress nor raised by the legal issues, to "compel Aramco to employ persons of the Jewish faith in Saudi Arabia."

I was pleased to note in your letter of June 15 that the Department recognizes a distinction between a "finding * * * against Aramco" and a "finding (to) compel Aramco to employ persons of the Jewish faith in Saudi Arabia." We are in agreement that Mr. Rountree's expression of opinion was in reference only to the latter hypothetical finding. Since such a finding was never involved in the New York proceedings, I assume that the Department now shares my observation that New York authorities could grant the relief sought by the American Jewish Congress without prejudicing or adversely affecting U.S. interests in the Middle East. The sole issue in the New York proceedings now pending is whether the antidiscrimination law permits Aramco to screen applicants for jobs by religious criteria applied in the State of New York. Whether the antidiscrimination law compels Aramco to employ Jews in Saudi Arabia is not the issue.

It appears to me that irrespective of the Department's intentions, the Department is injected at this moment into the New York proceedings because of Mr. Rountree's letter, which provided the express basis of Commissioner Carter's finding. This involvement of the Department has occurred notwithstanding the fact that the letter by Mr. Rountree was not responsive to the legal issues in the Aramco case and, indeed, had as its reference matters which are outside the provisions of the New York law, the nature of the pleadings, and the inquiry from Commissioner Carter.

Thank you very much for your continued cooperation. You may be assured of my interest in efforts of the Department to resolve the problem of Saudi Arabia interference in the domestic affairs of the United States.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

E. L. BARTLETT.

Voters Want H.R. 7848 Enacted To End the Farm Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7848 calls for legislative implementation of my four-point program to end the farm mess. The four points: First, stop all subsidies right now—they will cost almost $6 billion this year; second, hold a fire sale to get rid of the $9 billion in surpluses U.S. taxpayers have been forced to buy, and pony up another $1 billion in taxes to store each year; third, use part of proceeds of fire sale to buy out or relocate small farmers; fourth, use remaining proceeds to reduce the national debt and reduce taxpayers' burdens.

The small amount of publicity the plan got brought into my office an overwhelming amount of mail. Not one single letter of disapproval was among this mail. It came from rural and urban areas all over the country. I believe this program has the overwhelming support of the American people and would be enacted immediately if the Congress followed their wishes. This specifically includes the Nation's farmers, 55 percent of whom voted in a recent poll to dump farm subsidies completely.

Over the last 3 weeks I have spread on these pages extracts from the various letters I have received. For those who have any lingering doubts about the will of the American people to rid themselves of taxes to finance farm subsidies, I have asked that the following additional extracts be here printed in the RECORD:

I hope your farm bill carries. That bill should have been adopted years ago.

I'm in full accord with your remedy for the farm mess, let's get at it.

Your program to end the farm mess (and how apt the description is) meets with my wholehearted approval.

High commendation is due for your stand on getting rid of farm subsidies now. The wrong should be stopped immediately.

If you can do anything to end the farm mess I shall be grateful to you.

Please continue to do everything within your power to promote your program to end the farm mess. In my opinion, the present program is a ridiculous, asinine waste of taxpayers money.

We are solidly in favor of your program to end the farm mess. We have long deplored this most unrealistic plan as being not only contrary to the natural law of supply and demand, but also another step in the direction of Government control, and a vital one indeed. This we are unalterably opposed to. (These are the views of 10 individuals who signed the petition.)

I think your idea for a solution to the farm problem is a good one.

We are interested in your program to end the farm mess. It certainly is time to stop the farm subsidies, reduce the national debt and start tax reduction.

I am glad to hear you are trying to do something about the farm program. We have tried it too long and it is plain to see it is not the answer. I would like to see your suggestion carried out.

The farm surplus idea is surely meritorious. I wish it could be enacted into law.

Let me say I am firmly behind you on your farm program. Any other approach is simply not feasible.

Cut out the farm subsidy. A farmer is in business like I am and should take his profit or loss.

I am 100 percent behind you with respect to the farm mess, it's outrageous to waste the taxpayers cash, without their permission, in the bargain, and then let millions of pounds of wheat rot, after paying millions to store this, in my opinion is a heinous wasteful crime and should be stopped at once.

My husband and I agree on your views about the farm mess.

I wish to commend you for the first sensible program to end the farm mess that I have heard of. I think that your plan will be fair to the farmers as well as much needed relief to the consumer.

I agree with your program to stop all farm subsidies now, and get rid of the huge surpluses, as a start toward reducing the national debt and taxes.

Stalling on a Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Milwaukee Journal, calling for a civil rights bill this year, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STALLING ON A CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

The promise of Senator JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, majority leader, early last January that the Congress would act on a civil rights bill still hasn't been kept. The Senate got into a long argument the other day on why this is so.

Senator JAVITS, Republican, of New York, blamed the Democrats. JOHNSON retorted that the fault lay with Republicans. After hearings ended on civil rights bills last May there were seven attempt to hold meetings by a subcommittee headed by Senator HENNINGS, Democrat, of Missouri, for the purpose

of writing a bill. Six of the seven attempts failed. Four times, HENNINGS says, there was no quorum. Twice a southern Senator objected to holding meetings while the Senate itself was meeting. JOHNSON says that all the Republicans need do is get their subcommittee members to meetings so that there will be a quorum.

But the real trouble goes deeper than any of this. The fact is that there is woeful lack of agreement on what kind of a bill to consider. JOHNSON himself has proposed a compromise bill. The administration has proposed a weak bill. Southerners want no bill at all. And liberals, including JAVITS, want a strong measure giving the Justice Department the power to initiate suits to enforce school desegregation.

JAVITS' fight is as much with the administration as with anyone else if he would but admit it. The administration strongly opposes a strong civil rights measure such as JAVITS and his group want.

But, whoever is to blame for lack of action, lack of action there is. A promise is not being kept. A need is not being filled. The Civil Rights Act of 1957 has been shown up as weak. Events in the last several years have proved the need for legislation strong enough to get action. The Congress is not providing the tools for enforcing the law of the land.

Fourth of July

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on July 2, 1959, the Hellenic Chronicle, of Boston, Mass., published an editorial entitled "Fourth of July." This is a fine editorial, with great significance. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOURTH OF JULY

Saturday this country observes the 183d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence and the Greek-Americans do not intend to let the date pass unnoticed and unhonored.

Leading their efforts in this direction will be Archbishop Iakovos, who in two letters has urged the million or so souls in his ecclesiastical jurisdiction to pay homage to the U.S. anniversary because of its deep meaning to Greek-Americans, in particular, and to the democratic world, in general.

His Eminence will be leading a special doxology on Saturday at Holy Trinity Cathedral. The half-hour service will be attended by leaders of churches in the New York area and by delegations of fraternal, church and other organizations. The archbishop has asked this.

The Greek Orthodox leader has also asked that every parish in the Archdiocese make efforts at similar observances and he puts forward the reasons why they should.

July 4, His Eminince emphasizes in his letter to his flock, is one of the most significant of anniversaries in the history of the world. He said the holiday has triple meaning for us all. He cited the tradition of principles that resulted when Americans decided they were entitled to basic principles of justice, liberty, and human rights and dignity under God. He cited also the historical significance of the day in which a nation was formed which has been dedicated to a continued struggle to spread justice, liberty and human dignity to all peoples, and said many nations are in danger of losing them and would lose them without America.

In conclusion, the archbishop said the date should be observed for its symbolism, which teaches by the American example that freedom, justice and human rights are attainable, serving as an inspiration, even for those under communistic dictatorship, to this enviable end.

Chances are the majority might still take the advantage of the long weekend and head for the shore, the lakes, the picnic grounds; but it will be possible for all who feel as deeply as His Eminence about the Fourth of July and its significance to attend church and offer prayers for America and its worthy objectives.

It may sound chauvinistic, but it was inspiring to read His Eminence's words on this greatest of American holidays. It is particularly fitting that Archbishop Iakovos makes this effort; for he is the first Greek Orthodox Archbishop to hold American citizenship.

Air Force Missions of Mercy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in these challenging times—particularly when the arch enemy of freedom, communism, through its prime dictator, Mr. Khrushchev, intermittently utters war threats—it is especially important that we maintain a strong defense.

During consideration of legislation relating to the Armed Forces, we recall, however, that at home there are periodic volleys of criticism leveled at the administration of our defense program.

I am well aware, of course, that in administering a program of the scope of our Defense Establishment, it can be expected that human errors will occur. As these develop, corrective action should, of course, be taken. It is important, however, to keep each incident in proper perspective.

We are aware, too, that there are often honest differences of opinion on policies and administration. Acknowledging this, it is important that we arrive at the right kind of decisions by a positive—rather than a negative—approach.

Generally, I believe that our military leaders are doing an admirable job in providing the Nation with an effective defense, even though further improvements can and should be made in the overall program.

In view of the criticism, I am particularly gratified to find, from time to time, reviews of ways in which the armed services—sometimes acting outside of what may be considered a normal military mission—perform tasks that serve humanity and, as a result, create goodwill and respect for this country.

A recent edition of the Milwaukee Journal carried an editorial entitled, "Air Force Missions of Mercy." The editorial outlines a number of splendid ways in which the Air Force has engaged in a wide variety of activities—many of them mercy missions—with fruitful results for the unfortunate people involved, as well as for our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR FORCE MISSIONS OF MERCY

Now and then a particularly dramatic story of some American military mercy mission overseas drifts back to the home folks. Like this week's story from Naples, Italy, that the Air Force is lifting $400,000 worth of medical supplies to Dr. Albert Schweitzer in remote French Equatorial Africa. The airlift was arranged by Lt. Gen. Richard Lindsay, commander of allied air forces in southern Europe.

Actually, Army, Air Force, and Navy units the world around are helping out their neighbors, in projects large and small, the year around.

Last fall, visiting headquarters of U.S. Air Forces in Europe at Wiesbaden, Germany, we learned of a few mercy missions of this organization.

In 1956, 700,000 pounds of food and clothing were dropped to Italians, Sicilians, and Sardinians isolated by snowstorms. More than 100,000 pounds of food were dropped to snowbound Greeks. The following year 400,000 pounds of insecticide was flown in 3 days to Tunisia to combat the worst locust plague in north African history.

This summer, as in years past, the Air Force is transporting German refugee and underprivileged children from West Berlin to West Germany for vacations in the country. Last year 2,000 were given round trips in the Kinderlift.

These are big projects. There are hundreds of smaller ones. A prominent Turkish citizen was dying of fungopneumonia and Turkish medical resources had been exhausted. Americans were asked for help in obtaining a rare drug. The drug was flown from Wiesbaden to Istanbul in 5½ hours and the life was saved.

A United Nations soldier on duty in the Gaza strip suffered a serious head injury. At U.N. request he was flown to the Air Force hospital in Wiesbaden, where two operations were necessary to save his life. Swedish officials thanked the Air Force.

A Greek boy swallowed a screw. It lodged in his right lung. There were no facilities for its removal in Athens. The Air Force flew the boy to Rhein-Main Airbase in Germany, where the base hospital has one of the few thoracic (chest) surgeons in Europe. The screw was removed.

Our military forces overseas are trying hard to be good and helpful neighbors. The reward, for their country, is good will, gratitude, and respect.

Material and Social Progress in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a very thrilling patriotic column written by Mr. George

Todt and published in the North Hollywood (Calif.) Valley Times of July 4, Independence Day.

He precedes his column with the following statement from John Stewart Mill, which seems to me to be in complete conformity with my concept of a proper political and social order in this country:

The only freedom which deserves the name is that of pursuing our own good in our own way, so long as we do not attempt to deprive others of theirs or impede their efforts to obtain it.

I ask unanimous consent that the column by Mr. Todt be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS DAY, A DAY OF CHOICE

Today is America's Independence Day and a splendid time to wave our Nation's flag in earnest. Why not? Where has Old Glory ever demeaned herself? Who is ashamed of the Stars and Stripes?

Let's display our national colors, wherever we may be able to do so, with the utmost of honorable pride.

Frankly, we have something there of which we can well afford to be proud. What other nation on the world stage has ever accomplished so much as ours, and all in such a relatively short period of time?

Here we are not referring to materialistic accomplishments, although we may be said to lead the entire world in this respect—both now and in the past.

However, it isn't materialism—dialectic or otherwise—that makes man great or sets him apart from the lower forms of life which inhabit our planet.

Neither the pyramids of Egypt nor the grandeur that was Rome could ever hope to match the sheer power of the intellectual ideas of our Founding Fathers who gave the world their truly American concept of responsible political freedom for mankind under the moral rule of God.

They said, in effect, that, since we were all the spiritual children of the Creator, He had consequently given to us certain inalienable rights which no mere government comprised of mortal men had either legal or moral prerogative to take away from us in the future.

Therefore our early American Government was set up more as a practical means to guarantee these same inalienable rights—many of them to be found in the first 10 amendments of the Constitution of the United States—than to merely perpetuate a ruling power clique in office.

Because of this new approach to government, in which we indicated that the rank and file of the human family was perfectly capable of governing themselves without recourse to the idiotic notion of rule by "the divine right of kings" or other types of tyranny imposed from above by totalitarian oligarchs of varying descriptions, this land of ours has been choice above all other lands upon the earth.

We have been the envy of most peoples of the world in modern times. Much of their admiration stemmed from the fact that we placed moral and spiritual values first in our scheme of things in former days.

More than 50 millions of Europeans and large numbers of other peoples left their homes abroad, in the course of time, to become American citizens.

They came here because we stressed the dignity of the individual and gave more copiously of the draught of human freedom than men and women had ever before obtained for themselves anywhere else on earth.

This provided, in its turn, tremendous incentive for our people and it acted upon their productive powers like an immense catalyst.

How else explain the rapidity with which we grew from a small country of 3 millions of population on the Atlantic seaboard 175 years ago to a great Nation of 175 million today?

How else explain the fact that the Republic of the United States, with only 7 percent of the world's population in 1959, now owns 50 percent of the world's wealth?

How else explain the fantastic transformation of the American Republic in less than two short centuries of historical time from a rank political upstart into the most powerful Nation on the globe?

The facts are before us to observe and wrestle with, each one according to his or her own intelligence in the matter.

But it ought to be easily apparent, to those who are the most discerning among us, that real freedom and liberty for mankind produces its own special kind of reward. Where man is allowed to push forward under his own power, instead of being pushed along by despotic controls, he produces far and away more for all us than would otherwise be the case.

Man is by nature a competitive entity and nowhere is he capable of thriving better than under the free enterprise system of the United States. Let's keep it if we can. Can we meet this challenge in the future?

Or do we prefer the dictatorship of proletarian mediocrity?

Alaska Rate Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, even before Alaska became a State, the problem of transportation rate regulation there was complex and important to the economy in a very particular way. Alaska is largely dependent upon marine transportation for the importation of all products consumed there. A very small amount of freight is hauled by truck over the Alaska Highway and some moves by aircraft. People desiring to go to Alaska or to leave there must do so by airplane, since American-flag maritime passenger service was discontinued in 1954.

The Alaska Statehood Act provided that regulatory control of marine transportation should remain within the jurisdiction of the Federal Maritime Board. The Civil Aeronautics Board, of course, is the Federal agency having to do with the regulation of aviation and it will continue in charge of intrastate flying until the State is prepared to take over, as well as ruling in respect to interstate aviation.

The Interstate Commerce Commission regulates intracoastal and intercoastal maritime transportation in the other States. Because of the peculiar nature of the Alaska trade—and this is doubtless so of Hawaii also—it has been proposed that a joint board be established.

To me, this makes good sense. It would include representatives of the three regulatory agencies named above. Such a board would be in an advantageous position wihch could not be reached by the three groups working independently. It is my hope that such a board will be established by law and that as a result there may be achieved, among other things, a reduction in Alaska's high freight rates.

In this connection, there was printed in the Journal of Commerce for July 2 an editorial on this subject, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT BOARD FOR TRANSPORTATION

Because Alaska has become the 49th State while Hawaii is getting ready for admission as the 50th, Washington officials are rightly giving some serious thought to problems of regulating transportation between these two areas and the mainland. In the process they are brushing up against some regulatory issues of broader import.

If domestic precedents are followed, the Maritime Board will lose its control over rates in these trades, just as its predecessor, the old Maritime Commission, was compelled by the Transportation Act of 1940 to surrender to the Interstate Commerce Commission its reign over coastwise and intercoastal shipping rates. The argument is that there is no reason why the interstate commerce of the two new States should be governed by practices any different than those prevailing in the other 48.

On the other hand, the conditions that produced the Transportation Act of 1940 do not exist in the Alaskan and Hawaiian trades. Railroads do not compete with water carriers on hauls to and from these areas; consequently there is no question of putting the rates of two competing transport systems under one Federal agency—especially when it is considered that no move is apparently being made to include in the regulatory merger the only other transport system that does compete with shipping lines (though to a limited degree), namely, the airlines.

The administration apparently recognizes this. What it favors, according to a report published in this newspaper yesterday, is a sort of joint board which needs only to be called into play in the event that some conflict develops between the policies following by ICC with regard to continental traffic originating in or destined to Alaska and Hawaii, and the Maritime Board, which would be left in control of shipping rates.

This seems to us a reasonable suggestion. Since the Coastwise Shipping Act prohibits foreigners from carrying any goods between any U.S. Territories or between any U.S. Territories and the mainland, both Hawaii and Alaska are compelled to utilize U.S. carriers entirely for their trade with the mainland. Moreover, their economies are highly sensitive to any changes in freight rates—much more so than those of other States.

Hence, it is important that the Government keep close tabs on these rates, not only as they apply to traffic moving by ship, but as they affect its surface movement, by rail, truck or barge, before leaving or after entering ports on the mainland. A joint board (which ought also, we think, to represent the Civil Aeronautics Board) ought to provide a good way of ironing out regulatory conflicts—provided it is properly staffed and run. It need not be large, it need not meet often and it need not add much to the complexity of transport regulation.

What strikes us, though, and what is apparently striking other people, too, is why the operations of such a board should be limited to Alaska and Hawaii. There are conflicts on the mainland it could help to solve, too.

On several occasions recently, the U.S. Maritime Administration has found it necessary to go hat-in-hand to the ICC and ask that coastwise and intercoastal carriers be given a little better break on rates vis-a-vis the railroads.

There is, of course, nothing spectacularly new about one Federal agency taking the witness chair in a hearing before another. The old Office of Price Administration argued long and fervently against general rate increases before ICC during the war. Both the Agriculture and Justice Departments argued before the Maritime Commission against dual rates in the ocean conference contract system. And so on.

Another consideration to be kept in mind, is that the MA is charged with promoting American shipping, just as the Civil Aeronautics Administration is charged with promoting aviation. No agency has been directed to promote railroads, or trucks, or pipelines. ICC merely regulates.

Yet it is quite possible that it may not be long before two purely regulatory agencies find themselves pursuing different policies as regards movements that, for some distance at least, are directly competitive.

Take, for example, an export shipment from Chicago to Hamburg. If it goes entirely by ship via the Seaway, whatever rate practices are involved fall under jurisdiction of the Maritime Board—to the extent that U.S. law is applicable. If it goes by rail or truck for transshipment at New York, it is under ICC jurisdiction for that distance and under FMB's more limited control for the rest of the way.

It is quite true that shipowners may protest to ICC if they feel that agency is giving the rails too much of a break on rates, while rails may send their grievances to the FMB where the reverse is the case. But is there no way by which the two agencies can rationalize their policies except by the somewhat comic expedient of appearing as participants in proceedings before the other?

A joint board might not provide the whole answer, but it would offer at least the hope of a move in that direction.

Area Development Essential for Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, the Connecticut Department of Labor has just released figures showing that unemployment in Connecticut has increased from 57,600 in mid-May to 60,500 in mid-June. Connecticut thus has the dubious distinction of being the first State in the Union to report a reversal in the seasonal recovery trend.

Last month there was a decrease in unemployment due to the entrance into the job market of students and graduates looking for both temporary and permanent employment. But now we have the disheartening figures just mentioned.

Overall, 5.7 percent of the working population of Connecticut is now unemployed as opposed to 5.5 percent last month. These figures indicate that the current economic recovery will not bring lasting relief to chronically distressed areas. Indeed, 13 of the 18 labor market areas in Connecticut have recorded increases in unemployment in the last month. In eastern Connecticut alone, unemployment in Middletown has increased from 2,200 to 2,300, in Norwich from 1,500 to 1,600, and in Willimantic from 940 to 1,000.

All 10 Connecticut labor markets with more than 6 percent unemployment are now classified as distressed, meaning that they have maintained this level for at least 18 months. These 10 areas include 40 percent of the State's working force and 51 percent of the jobless. Their average rate of unemployment is 7.7 percent. The Danielson area in my own district has the longest tragic history of substantial unemployment in the State, having topped 6 percent ever since March 1955.

Mr. Speaker, these distressed areas in Connecticut, like the other chronically underemployed areas across the country, are unlikely to regain prosperity and vitality without the kind of assistance provided in the area-redevelopment legislation which is still awaiting action in this House. Pockets of distress in almost every State remain to defy the rosy figures of recovery which are given to us daily on such a reassuring basis by the administration. The Connecticut figures just in demonstrate that in some of these distressed areas there is an actual rise in unemployment despite the general economic recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is essential that this Congress act on area-redevelopment legislation this session, despite the threat of a Presidential veto. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the latest Connecticut statistics, based on figures from the Connecticut Department of Labor:

Connecticut—Labor force and unemployment in labor markets June 1959

Labor market area	Civilian labor force (total)	Unemployment (total)	Unemployment as percent of the labor force	Number in excess of 6 percent	Most recent date of start of substantial labor surplus
A. State, total	1,067,200	60,500	5.7		
B. Distressed areas (11) [1]	405,300	31,200	7.7	6,882	
Major (2)	188,300	14,600	7.8	3,302	
Bridgeport	140,700	11,000	7.8	2,558	November 1957.
New Britain	47,600	3,600	7.6	744	December 1957.
Smaller (9)	217,000	16,600	7.6	3,580	
Ansonia	20,300	1,800	8.9	582	August 1957.
Bristol	20,300	1,900	9.4	682	July 1957.
Danielson	15,900	1,200	7.5	246	March 1955.
Meriden	39,400	2,600	6.6	236	October 1957.
Middletown	30,800	2,300	7.5	452	November 1957.
Norwich	21,900	1,600	7.3	286	July 1957.
Thompsonville	27,100	2,300	8.5	674	November 1957.
Torrington	25,700	1,900	7.4	358	Do.
Willimantic	15,600	1,000	6.4	64	December 1957.
C. Nonsubstantial labor surplus areas (7)	652,200	29,300	4.5		
Major (5)	580,900	26,800	4.6		
Hartford	249,800	11,500	4.6		
New Haven	146,300	7,700	5.3		
Norwalk	36,100	1,300	3.6		
Stamford	70,100	1,900	2.7		
Waterbury	78,600	4,400	5.6		
Smaller (2)	71,300	2,500	3.5		
Danbury	29,600	1,300	4.4		
New London	41,700	1,200	2.9		

[1] Eligible for assistance under the House Banking Committee recommendation: i.e., unemployment of 6 percent in at least 18 of the previous 24 months, 9 percent during at least 15 of the previous 18 months, 12 percent during the previous 12 months or 15 percent during the previous 6-month period.

Source: Connecticut Department of Labor.

Bicentennial Celebration of New Marlboro, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the beautiful town of New Marlboro, Mass., is celebrating its bicentennial. The town has honored me by asking me to offer some remarks at the bicentennial celebration this weekend, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of my prepared address:

NEW MARLBORO BICENTENNIAL ADDRESS

It is surely a wonderful honor to be asked to speak to you here briefly on the occasion of the bicentennial celebration of New Marlboro. Too much, we live in a modern world with little or no appreciation for our heritage and the history of our land. For this reason it is heartening indeed to see that you in New Marlboro are taking note of your

rich historical tradition on this 200th anniversary.

In preparing for my remarks today, I discovered a little book in the Library of Congress which may well be worth its weight in gold to any antique book collector you may know. If you are so fortunate as to possess a copy, it may pay off the mortgage on the old homestead. The book was published by a Pittsfield man, Samuel W. Bush, back in 1829 and has a title typical of those days: A History of the County of Berkshire, Mass., in Two Parts. The First Being a General View of the County; The Second, an Account of the Several Towns, by gentlemen of the County, Clergymen and Laymen. The task of compiling this book had been entrusted by a group of interested congregational ministers to the Reverend Mr. David D. Field. The Reverend Field gathered a fascinating group of reports, which have come down to us in this little volume. We learn—as the book itself boasts—of "everything important * * * whether natural or artificial, civil, literary or religious, about the settlement of towns, the formation of parishes and churches, the settlement, dismission and death of ministers, revivals of religion, and sketches of the lives of eminent men."

Of course I was particularly interested in what Dr. Field's book had to tell the reader about New Marlboro. Reverting back to the earliest days of these settlements, the book tells us that in the year 1735 the General Court of His Majesty's Province of Massachusetts Bay ordained that "there be four towns opened upon the road betwixt Westfield and Sheffield," that they be contiguous to each other, and each be six miles square.

Two years later, on June 24, 1737, the necessary surveying had been accomplished and a plat of new townships, numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively, were presented to the assembly which confirmed them to a large group of grantees. The new towns were to be named Tyringham, New Marlboro, Sandisfield and Becket. And so the legal groundwork was laid for the founding of this beautiful town.

We learn from Mr. Field's history that the first improvements in New Marlboro were made by one Benjamin Wheeler, who became the actual original settler. He must have been made of stout stuff, for Mr. Field's book tells us that during the winter of 1739–40, which has to be recorded as one of the memorable hard winters, Wheeler remained the only white inhabitant of the town and continued to fell the forest.

There was an Indian family living at the outlet of Six-Mile Pond, which was generally friendly to Benjamin Wheeler during that first hard winter. But the Indians were afraid that the sound of Wheeler's gun would frighten the deer, so that he could not shoot for game in order to sustain himself. The Indians lent him a bow and arrow, but it appears that Wheeler never mastered that art and spent a rather hungry winter.

We are glad to learn that some of the men in Sheffield, 10 miles distant but the nearest town, came over to see Wheeler on their snowshoes, giving our friend, as the book puts it, "such proofs of their friendship as his circumstances required."

A Berkshire philosopher, drawing on his pipe, fell to meditating on this lonely pioneer. "Picture the fellow," he mused, "sitting all alone in the forest, thinking of the hills back of hills that cut him off from his folks. There must have been times when he felt like running back, but he didn't, and the only thing that ran was the silvery brook near his first rude cabin. They even named the creek Anthony's Brook, after the last Indian to live in the town, and poor old Benjamin Wheeler didn't get so much as a brook named after him, much less a township, like ought to have been done."

But if he didn't get a brook or a township named after him, at least he had the honor of founding this beautiful town, and as we celebrate New Marlboro's bicentennial today we salute your earliest community ancestor.

During the summer of 1740 Benjamin Wheeler, who by that time had doubtless felled enough of the forest to build a cabin, returned to New Marlboro and brought his family to their new home. The history tells us that he lies today in the old burying ground of the town he founded.

Other settlers followed the Wheeler family into this community, and in 1759 the town was incorporated—just 200 years ago, in honor of which we are gathered here today.

As for the part that New Marlboro has played in State and national history, it is gratifying to learn that it was well represented in the Revolutionary War, in the War of 1812, and in the Civil War. In connection with the Civil War we read in a later work that "The town's expenditure on account of the late war, which was never reimbursed, was $25,778.53. The soldiers' record of the town bears the name of 202 men, 21 of whom were killed, or died of wounds, during the service." We may be sure that the town performed its part with equal credit in the modern wars.

So as we stand here today, surveying a history extending through two centuries, we all have reason to be proud—and I hope that although not myself a native of this community, you will allow me to share that pride—in a long, stanch and honorable record. May our descendants, two centuries hence, whatever world they are fated to look upon, have cause for equal pride and rejoicing in the patriotism, happiness and prosperity of this dear and beautiful little community tucked into the Berkshire hills.

Livingston Ludlow Biddle, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of Thursday, July 9, 1959, which reports the passing of Mr. Livingston Ludlow Biddle, Sr., member of a long-prominent Philadelphia family:

L. L. BIDDLE, SR., 80, A PATRON OF ARTS—WORLD TRAVELER AND HUNTER DIES—POET HAD ONE-THIRD SHARE IN $3 MILLION TRUST

PHILADELPHIA, July 8.—Livingston Ludlow Biddle, Sr., world traveler, big-game hunter and patron of the arts, died yesterday in Bryn Mawr Hospital. He was 80 years old and lived at Westview, an estate on Highland Lane, Bryn Mawr.

Mr. Biddle bore the name of one long-prominent Philadelphia family and was reared in the household of another—the family of his mother, a Drexel. He was born in Atlantic City, where his parents, Edward and Emilie Drexel Biddle, had a summer home.

Having shunned the limelight, Mr. Biddle was not so well known as his two brother. The younger, Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Sr., was a prizefighter, Bible teacher, concert singer and colonel in the Marine Corps. The other, Craig Biddle, was a noted sportsman and international tennis player.

Mr. Biddle's mother died when he was 5. His father was a descendant of Nicholas Biddle, the financier. The youth was sent to live with one of his mother's eight brothers, George W. Childs Drexel, who had no children.

Mr. Biddle Biddle lived with them until he married Miss Rosalie Eugenia Carter Law of St. Davids on January 4, 1917. Their home, Westview, was built as a wedding present for them by the George Drexels.

After attending St. Paul's School, Concord, N.H., and graduating from Princeton University, class of 1900, Mr. Biddle became interested in the arts and tried his hand at many of them. He also learned to play the piano and violin, and was the author of a volume of verse, "The Understanding Hills," published in 1916.

But he shunned the world of business. With his two brothers he shared in a $3 million trust fund set up by his maternal grandfather, Anthony Joseph Drexel, financier and founder of Drexel Institute of Technology.

Mr. Biddle did much of his traveling on the *Alcedo*, the large yacht of the late George W. Childs Drexel, onetime publisher of the old Philadelphia Public Ledger. Together, they took several cruises around the world and Mr. Biddle hunted big game in remote regions. He also had a smaller yacht of his own.

For many years Mr. Biddle was president of a hunting club near Stroudsburg in the Poconos. He also served for many years as a trustee of Drexel Institute. He was accounting warden of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Redeemer in Bryn Mawr and a member of the Gulph Mills Golf Club and the Philadelphia Club.

Besides his wife, he leaves two sons, Livingston L. Biddle, Jr., a novelist, and Ernest L. Biddle, a portrait painter.

Some Wise and Moderate Recommendations for the House Armed Services Subcommittee Investigation of the Actions of Retired Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the able subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on Armed Services is currently investigating the actions of retired military, naval, and civilian personnel in connection with the awarding of defense contracts. This is an unfortunate investigation and one to which great public interest has been attached. It is important that the deliberations of the subcommittee be carried out in such a way as not to impair our national defense in the face of a great and continuing Soviet threat.

In that connection I would like to bring to the attention of the House some very thoughtful, helpful, and moderate recommendations as to the course of the inquiry which the subcommittee should follow offered by the very distin-

guished military critic of the New York Times, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, which appeared in that great newspaper on July 7, 1959. The article follows:

SPOTLIGHT ON EX-OFFICERS—HOUSE INQUIRY INTO MUNITIONS LOBBY EXPECTED TO FOCUS ON JOBS IN DEFENSE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

An investigation into an alleged munitions lobby by a House committee, which starts today, will center on the conflict-of-interest laws governing the employment of retired officers.

The study will be conducted by a Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the House Committee on Armed Services. Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Democrat of Louisiana, heads the subcommittee. Its scope, unlike that of the far-ranging, politically tinged investigations of the so-called merchants of death in the early 1930's, is expected to be somewhat restricted.

The subcommittee's advance billings emphasize that major attention will be paid to the problem of retired officers who hold jobs with defense industries. The somewhat unfair implications of this concentration of the retired officer have been tempered by Mr. HÉBERT. He did this by announcing that he expected to extend his investigation to include former Federal civilian employees and former Congressmen in defense jobs.

There is, nevertheless, a danger that some Congressmen, piqued over recent exposures of congressional nepotism, may distort and reduce the value of an investigation that should be far broader than a conflict-of-interest study. Defense industry, particularly the aircraft and missile industry, is a multibillion-dollar business. Hundreds of thousands of people, entire towns and regions and whole industries are now wholly or largely dependent upon defense contracts.

Government-owned arsenals and laboratories complement industries that in many respects are privately owned in form, but could not exist without public moneys in the form of contracts, loans, fast tax write-offs, and other forms of Government aid.

COMPETITION ON WEAPONS

In some cases the two forms of defense facilities—the wholly owned Government arsenal, and the privately owned, Government-supported industry—have vied with each other in the manufacture of competing weapons systems. Thus, it was not only service pride and sponsorship that played a role in the rivalry between the Air Force Thor and the Army Jupiter intermediate-range ballistic missiles. Competition between the arsenal concept and the privately owned but Government-supported industry, also played a part.

The pressures generated within the Pentagon and in Washington by the billions of dollars expended annually for defense are enormous and have been growing. Hence the charge of a munitions lobby.

Local chambers of commerce, municipal and State officials, labor unions, industrial associations, the industries concerned and the Congressmen representing the affected areas all combine to exert pressures in favor of their own areas.

A CALL TO ARMS

When a missile may be threatened with cancellation or cutback, the call-to-arms is like a tocsin.

The missile's value is advertised—sometimes at the expense of the taxpayer. Congressional delegations and public opinion are mobilized, and economic bogeymen are invoked. Calm, nonpartisan, and technical judgments become difficult.

Therefore, the conflict-of-interests statutes involving retired service officers constitute far too narrow a frame for the pending investigation, as Mr. HÉBERT is undoubtedly aware. So far, however, congressional discussion of the problem has focused attention only upon this phase of the problem.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, for instance, has produced a list of 721 retired officers who are employed by 88 companies that have defense contracts. An accompanying statement by the Democratic Senator had overtones that seemed to imply some sinister intent lay behind the facts.

It is possible that some of these officers have utilized their service associations too zealously on behalf of their employers.

Yet Mr. HÉBERT's investigation will show that existing conflict-of-interest laws discriminate against the retired service officer. In the first place, none of them can work—after retirement—for other Government departments without giving up their service retirement pay.

By this provision of the law, the Government loses the services of able men who still have contributions to make in the fields of administration, technology, intelligence and other skills.

RULE HELD DISCRIMINATORY

In the second place, existing laws single out retired officers of the regular uniformed services—but not retired members of the reserve components—for special discriminatory treatment not accorded any other type of Federal employee.

The retired regular officer is subject not only to the criminal code that contains provisions to punish those who conspire against the Government's best interests and are guilty of fraud, bribery or deceit. He is also subject to a plethora of other laws, regulations and decisions of the Comptroller General. Many of these inhibitions are dated by the years or were passed decades ago to cover special circumstances now ended.

There is also discrimination within the services. A retired Navy or Marine Corps officer, for instance, is more severely restricted in terms of his private employment than an Army or Air Force officer.

Mr. HÉBERT's committee, therefore, can do the nation a service if it keeps its investigation in perspective. It should recognize that the retired officer is only a very small part of a much bigger problem; that the retired officer's services are needed both by industry and government; that very few, if any, are guilty of any improper acts, and that a clarification, modernization and codification of the conflict-of-interests laws and regulations—with discrimination eliminated—is in the public interest.

Public Buildings Act of 1959

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7645) to provide for the construction, alteration, and acquisition of public buildings of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly endorse H.R. 7645. I want to congratulate Chairman JONES and the members of his subcommittee for their successful effort in working out a bill which will allow a reasonable public buildings program and at the same time keep it fully under the control of the Congress. I am very pleased to join in sponsorship of this legislation. I hope the Congress will pass this bill without any delay.

Congress Has Duty To Curb Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the public demand for congressional action to curb the usurpations and excesses of the Warren Court continually grows stronger. The people of the country are now aware that the Supreme Court shows no inclination to limit itself to a judicial function. As a result, the public looks to Congress to reinstitute by legislation the proper balance of power between the judicial branch on the one hand and the executive and legislative branches on the other. The general concern over this question is evidenced by the increasing number of editorials on this subject, one of the most able of which appeared in the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., on July 1, 1959, entitled "Congress Has Duty To Curb Courts." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS HAS DUTY TO CURB COURTS

The U.S. Supreme Court, which has been known to keep an eye on the political weathervane, seems to be showing signs of carrying out, with all deliberate speed, something of a strategic retreat.

We have known for some time that at least a few members of the Court were concerned over the popular reaction to the 1954 decision against school segregation. The Court obviously did not anticipate the difficulties that would be encountered in enforcing that decision.

Also, there is a faint hope that the Court is trying to wigwag a signal to some of the lower Federal courts that they, especially the circuits courts of appeals, are moving a bit too rapidly in some instances in reversing district court decisions allowing certain school districts additional time in which to make a reasonable start toward ending racial discrimination in the assignment of pupils.

One such faint sign appeared some 6 months ago when the Court upheld the legality of the Alabama pupil assignment law. Still another appeared when within the last 2 or 3 weeks the Court ruled, in an integration case in Virginia, that State laws should first be construed by State courts before plaintiffs could appeal to the Federal courts.

In this instance, the Court plainly went against several Federal court precedents.

In more recent decisions the Court modified to some extent the precedents it had set in other decisions holding that State laws were invalid in fields in which Congress had legislated. It also modified previous decisions relating to the investigative powers of Congress.

It could have been coincidence, although we doubt it, that these decisions were handed down at the time Congress was debating the Smith bill.

This bill is aimed at curbing the power of the Court to do what it refrained from doing in the last two cases, but which it had done in previous cases. This was to invalidate appropriate State laws and to attempt to tell Congress under what circumstances it could question witnesses in congressional investigations.

The House last week passed the Smith bill by a healthy margin. What the Senate will do is uncertain. The Senate last year rejected by a one-vote margin a similar bill passed by the House, but conservative Senators are sure to make a fight of it.

The leftwing elements, naturally, are opposing it both in and out of Congress. Labor unions and the NAACP are lobbying against it and leftist Senators are saying it would open the way to endless litigation and might lead to the reversal of certain Supreme Court decisions they cherish.

But something must be done to slow down the runaway Supreme Court. A way must be found to persuade or force it to stick to interpreting the law as written and to respect the obvious intentions of Congress rather than taking off on sociological tangents and construing the law according to what the Court thinks it should mean rather than what Congress intended it to mean.

The leftists say the bill goes too far. Actually, it doesn't go far enough in the direction of protecting the rights and powers of the State governments.

But it is a start, and it should be enacted.

In the long view, of course, the answer to the problem of the Court must come from the Court itself. Acts of Congress may provide a stopgap here and there, but only the judiciary can confine the courts to their primary function of interpreting the law as written instead of changing the meaning of the law to fit a pre-determined conclusion as to what is desirable in a given set of circumstances.

This may come about, for eminent judges and some of the most distinguished lawyers in the country have openly expressed their concern over the trend toward the Supreme Court's making law as opposed to merely interpreting the law. This seems to be having its effect.

But, meanwhile, Congress should exercise its power and responsibility to regulate the jurisdiction of the courts.

Slowing Down Security Nonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial written by Mr. Fred Andrus in the Astorian-Budget, Astoria, Oreg.:

SLOWING DOWN SECURITY NONSENSE

The Supreme Court has handed a rebuke to our security-happy Government by holding that some 3 million civilian employees of contractors on military contracts don't have to meet Government security standards.

This rebuke might have a healthy effect on a government that carries the security screening of people to ridiculous extremes. How could the Government possibly make sure of the loyalty of 3 million people. It would take about 300,000 watchdogs to do the job right.

There's a lot of other nonsense in the Government's security program which the Supreme Court decision didn't touch. Too much information is classified. Secrecy cloaks activities of some agencies having little or nothing to do with military matters.

The whole security program needs a complete review and modification. Maybe this Court ruling affecting one phase of it will inspire a whole new look at the situation.

Certificate of Recognition Awarded to Mr. Max Abelman by the Brooklyn Academy of Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting of the Brooklyn Academy of Music held on Wednesday, June 3, 1959, at the Equitable Savings & Loan Association, Brooklyn, N.Y., a certificate of recognition was awarded to Mr. Max Abelman who, for many years, was secretary of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn. The Honorable J. Vincent Keogh, chairman of the awards committee of the centenary dinner of the Brooklyn Academy of Music, and the brother of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], made the presentation. Mr. Justice Keogh's remarks on this occasion were as follows:

Not because his name is first on the list, but because he is first in our hearts, I should like to present a beautifully embossed certificate of appreciation to a great friend not only of Brooklyn but particularly of the Brooklyn Academy of Music. Since so many distinguished bankers are present at this meeting held at one of our most progressive banking institutions, the Equitable Savings & Loan Association, it is interesting to learn that our awardee started his career with the Manufacturers Trust Co. He is, therefore, at home with you bankers. Of course, we particularly associate him with his unselfish work at the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn. Through his personal efforts, kings, queens, premiers, presidents, and persons of high renown, from the four quarters of the globe, autographed the walls of the children's ward at the hospital. All communal activities of varied interests in our great borough were beneficiaries of the tireless, dynamic zeal and enthusiasm of this man whom we honor today by having him accept this certificate as the symbol of the presentation of all the certificates to all you good people whose efforts made the centenary dinner of the Brooklyn Academy of Music such a glamorous social and financial success.

First on the list, first in our hearts, it is a real pleasure to present the certificate of appreciation to one who we pray will long be with his Brooklyn neighbors, a philanthropist, humanitarian, and true gentleman, Max Abelman.

The certificates of recognition awarded to Mr. Abelman read as follows:

The Brooklyn Academy of Music presents this certificates of recognition to Max Abelman for outstanding efforts in furthering the development of culture, education, and the arts, and for strengthening the position of the Brooklyn Academy of Music so that it may better serve the community's needs in the years ahead, as it has so effectively done through the past century.

Through your efforts and those of other public-spirited volunteer workers, the centennial gala banquet was a notable success. The benefits therefrom will give new strength and importance to this distinguished institution of which Brooklyn is justly proud. Its presentation of lectures, discussions, travelogs, and distinguished artists from many lands brings enlightenment and understanding to our fellow citizens. Your help in the effort to provide our neighbors with an enriched life and significant cultural opportunities is gratefully acknowledged in behalf of the centennial gala committee, the governing committee of the Brooklyn Academy of Music, and the trustees of the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences.

ROBERT E. BLUM,
President, the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences.
MAXIMILIAN MOSS,
Centennial Gala Chairman.
A. S. ROSCOE,
Centennial Gala Cochairman.
E. J. LIVESEY,
Chairman, Governing Committee Brooklyn Academy of Music.
W. B. HENDAR,
Vice Chairman, Governing Committee Brooklyn Academy of Music.

The Less Than 90 Days of Service Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of transmittal and a statement from Mr. George Dreisbach, of Freeland, Pa., regarding the less than 90 days of service veterans:

FREELAND, PA., *July 2, 1959.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed is a letter concerning the less than 90 days of service veterans.

It would be helpful if a copy of the letter could be placed in the hands of each member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and each member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Perhaps, the best thing would be to have the letter inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it would—I hope—be seen and read by the committee members of both Houses.

Would it be asking too much to have this done, Mr. FLOOD?

Your views and suggestions will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you very much.

With best wishes I remain,

Sincerely,

GEORGE DREISBACH.

THE LESS THAN 90 DAYS OF SERVICE VETERANS

I was a permanent employee in the U.S. Mint, Philadelphia, Pa., and retired on July 1, 1950, after 33½ years of service. I am 73 years old.

When the draft call came in 1918 for men in my age bracket (I was 32 then) I was placed in deferred classification (not at my request) by the draft board. Sometime later on a call was issued by the War Department for volunteers to serve in the Motor Mechanics Division, I applied, was accepted, and sent to Camp Pitt, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. I was in the Army from October 15, 1918, to December 10, 1918, just 57 days. The ending of the war prevented further service in the Army.

All bills that are introduced in the House and Senate contain the 90 days of service limitations. I would like to offer the following comments in favor of the less than 90 days of service veterans, and offer two suggestions.

All soldiers were in the same Army, regardless of the number of days of service, ready to fight for the same cause; protect the same flag; serve the same country; and every soldier took the same oath to defend the United States of America.

The lives of the more than 90 days of service veterans was disrupted to a greater extent than was the lives of the less than 90 days of service veterans, of course, but the latter would have served days, weeks, months, more than they did if the war had not ended.

Just what is wrong with the less than 90 days of service veterans? What is the magical difference between 90 days, or more, of service and 89 days, or less, of service?

It is hard to understand the discrimination against the less than 90 days of service veterans because the high cost of living; the prices of commodities; sickness, and the excesive medical costs involved, affects the one group as much a it does the other group.

May I repectfully offer the following suggestions: (1) That all veterans who served 89 days, or less, be granted the full annuity and benefits when they attain age 70, or have already passed that age; or (2) all veterans who served 29 days, or less, be granted one-third the full annuity and benefits; and all veterans who served 30 to 89 days, inclusive, be granted two-thirds of the full annuity and benefits.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE DREISBACH.

Khrushchev's Economic Offensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 5 years ago Carroll Kilpatrick wrote an article entitled "Malenkov's Trade Weapon." That was before most Americans took seriously the Soviet economic offensive. Today this distinguished correspondent of the Washington Post and Times Herald brings his thesis up to date in an article, "Khrushchev's Economic Offensive," which appears in the summer number of The Virginia Quarterly Review. I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Virginia Quarterly Review, Summer, 1959]

KHRUSHCHEV'S ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

I

Nearly 5 years ago, I argued, in an article entitled "Malenkov's Trade Weapon," that the free nations should coordinate their foreign economic policies as a bar to Soviet economic penetration. At that time, the Russian trade offensive was in its very early stages; almost no one envisioned the possibility of a serious Chinese Communist trade drive. Now, with both having moved into high gear, and with the Eastern European satellites having become major Communist trading powers, the free nations are confronted with a complex and far-reaching challenge.

In recent months, three related developments of great significance have emphasized the significance of this challenge. The first is that Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev has relaxed the old Stalin policy of economic self-sufficiency. The second—possibly a major reason for the first—is that the Communist world's spectacular economic advances have made it necessary to look abroad for new equipment and raw materials to feed its vast industrial machine. Finally, the bloc's aid program has been accelerated.

For the West to fail to note the significance of what is happening would be to make the same mistakes that were made in discounting Soviet scientific and technological advances in the presputnik days.

II

During his visit to this country earlier this year, Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan repeatedly said that Russia wanted to expand its trade with the United States but that American Government restrictions stood in the way. In reply, American officials said that Miyokan was not serious about a desire for increased trade. If the Soviet Union wants to trade with the United States, the officials said, all it has to do is, quite simply, to start trading.

To understand Mikoyan's motives, it is necessary to understand the new role which trade has assumed in the Kremlin's scheme of things. For a Communist state, trade is always a means to an end, not an end in itself; in other words, trade is an instrument of policy. Yet we have often been misled with respect to Soviet trade policy because we have insisted that it was carried out only for devious and harmful political ends. The "Great Soviet Encyclopedia," faithfully expressing the Leninist doctrine, has helped to confuse us with its often quoted statement that "the foreign trade policy of the U.S.S.R. is part of the overall foreign policy of the U.S.S.R."

Today Russian trade involves more than that. It also is part of the overall domestic economic policy of the U.S.S.R. Without discounting the important and often controlling foreign policy aspects, particularly as they relate to underdeveloped countries, it is clear that domestic considerations are increasingly important. In all probability, domestic considerations will receive a higher priority in both Russia and China as Communist industrialization proceeds.

An example was the Russian dumping on the world market last year of tin and aluminum. There was serious distress in the West, especially in some Latin American countries, as a result of the price declines that followed. We may expect similar moves in the future, as Communist countries develop the capacity to allocate more goods for export. But we deceive ourselves in attributing every such action to a desire to make economic warfare on the capitalist countries. It is fairly well established that Moscow had another motive: to obtain pounds sterling for purchases in Malaya, Ghana, South Africa, and New Zealand. The Kremlin looked around for something it could spare which could be sold for sterling; tin and aluminum were found to be available.

This is not to say that Russia does not use its expanding economic power for political ends. The recent experience of Finland is instructive and should be a warning to all countries not to let themselves become dependent upon Communist trade. By a simple turn of the economic screw, Moscow caused considerable economic dislocation in Finland and brought about the fall of the Finnish Government. Although Russia seemed to be primarily upset becauses its trade relations with Finland had not worked out satisfactorily, there were also political considerations. In the first place, Moscow never liked the Fagerholm government, a coalition of all non-Communist parties, which took office on August 29, 1958.

For the first time since the war, the government included Finland's Conservative Party—a businessman's party, with 29 seats in the 200-man Diet, which favored closer economic ties with the West. Also for the first time since the war, the coalition government showed potential signs of real strength, capable of attacking Finland's economic problems on a realistic basis. That was as disturbing to Moscow as to Finland's Communists.

Most experts now think that the decisive factor resulting in the cancellation in the fall of 1958 of all trade relations and the withdrawal of the Soviet Ambassador was more prosaic. The Finns were losing interest in Russian imports. The independent Finnish businessmen and consumers found that imports from Europe and the United States were more attractive in price and quality. The most notable example was automobiles. After the war, when no other cars were readily obtainable, the Finns purchased all the Russians cars possible.

By 1958 the Finns began to show a marked preference for European cars, and Russian cars could be seen piling up unsold on the docks in Helsinki. There also was trouble over steel. Under the Soviet-Finnish trade agreement, Finland agreed to purchase a specified amount of Soviet steel in 1958. But during the course of the year, Finnish manufacturers found that they could purchase steel cheaper in Europe than in Russia. Russia would not meet the world price, and so the Finns did not buy all the Russian steel they had originally agreed to purchase. They offered instead to take Russian raw materials like petroleum, cereals, cotton, sugar, and coal.

Moscow, however, insisted that the agreement be carried out to the letter. When Helsinki could not force Finnish shipbuilders to buy steel they did not need or to pay the higher price for Russian steel, Moscow canceled the trade agreement, leaving the Finns, who do 25 percent of their foreign business with the Russians, in an extremely difficult position.

At the heart of the problem was the fact that Finland was selling more to Russia than Russia was selling to Finland. Hence, Russia was going into debt to the Finns to finance its purchases in Finland. That was particularly galling to a big country with ambitions to become a leader in world trade. Moscow forced the Finns to form a new government as the price of renewing the trade agreement.

The world's neutralists who are interested in increased trade with the Soviet Union or Red China would do well to study the history of Finland's recent experiences with her big neighbor.

Both Russia and China, as well as the eastern European satellites, are moving forward industrially with great determination, energy, and skill. As their domestic economic power grows, their power as traders will increase. They will require more imports to satisfy the demands of their industrial enterprises. They will find it necessary—and easier—to allot a larger part of their production for exports to pay for needed imports. Already China is cultivating the markets of southeast Asia because it sorely needs the benefits it can derive from foreign trade. Almost at the same time that Russia canceled its trade with Finland, China canceled its trade with Japan, in an attempt to embarrass the Japanese Government during an election campaign; but because Japan was in no way dependent upon China's trade the cancellation had little or no political or economic consequences in Japan.

III

Premier Khrushchev outlined the Soviet's primary domestic eocnomic aim when he told the 21st Soviet Communist Party Congress this year that the fundamental economic task is to overtake the most highly developed capitalist countries in per capita production. Not only Khrushchev but other Soviet leaders have said that the basic economic task of the U.S.S.R. is to surpass the industrial lead of the United States at the earliest possible moment.

While virtually all the experts regard these claims as exaggerated, particularly as to overcoming the United States in per capita output, they take Khrushchev's ambitions seriously. With Russia's larger population, its rigid discipline, and its intense concentration on essential production, it is moving from a position of a poor second to the United States to that of a strong second. As Russia and its allies grow industrially, they will become an increasingly serious threat to free world trade relations.

Since Stalin's death, there has been a sharp increase in the foreign trade of the Communist countries. This has been notably true with respect to trade between the Eastern European satellites and the Middle East.

The story of the Eastern European satellites—which had a stronger prewar trade history than Russia—suggests that both foreign policy and domestic economic considerations are involved. The satellites have been the spearhead of the Communist trade drive in the underdeveloped areas. Between 1954 and 1957, for example, the satellites showed a 90-percent, or $400 million, rise in trade with less developed countries.

In 1955, the satellites outranked Russia in trade with the Afro-Asian countries by about four to one and in 1957 by about three to two. The satellite trade drive, according to a study by Jan Wszelaki for the National Planning Association, has evolved as much from the area's large-scale industrialization program and consequent need for primary products as from political motives—if not more.

Soviet imports from Eastern Europe, as Wszelaki found, have allowed the Soviet Union to relieve many of its shortages, to speed its economic development and to concentrate upon high priority targets, "including production of expensive modern armaments and, lately, deliveries of equipment to uncommitted parts of the world." Like the Western Powers, Russia increasingly requires imports. No doubt a study of Russia's long-range needs would show the importance of imports in the future just as similar studies have shown the need in the United States.

Between 1955 and 1957, total Soviet foreign trade increased from a total of 26 billion rubles to 33 billion. Soviet trade with nonbloc countries increased at a faster rate—from 5.7 billion rubles to 9.3 billion. Soviet trade with the United Kingdom between 1955 and 1957 rose by about 33 percent, by about 60 percent with West Germany, by nearly 20 percent with France—and by 2 or 3 percent with the United States. With Canada, the increase was by about 300 percent, but it was from a very small base.

American officials are entirely justified in saying that Russia is not concerned with establishing "normal" trade relations, that it is interested in trade with America only for what it can get out of it and that it has little or no interest in buying consumer goods. Khrushchev said last year, in talking about the need for chemical factories, that it would be "expedient" to order the equipment in capitalist countries. In that way, he said, the Soviet Union would be given the opportunity "for quicker fulfillment of the program for the construction of new chemical enterprises without wasting time on creation of plans and mastering the production of new types of equipment."

That comment alone should be sufficient argument for the West to coordinate its foreign economic policies. Certainly chemical factories should not be sold to Russia without a quid pro quo. If Russia wants to buy our technical know-how, it should be permitted to do so only in exchange for economic or political considerations important to our side. In other words, if Russia seriously wants to trade, as Khrushchev and Mikoyan have said, trade in other than consumer goods should be permitted only after negotiations and concessions.

IV

Early last summer Khrushchev wrote to President Eisenhower proposing an increase in trade between the two countries. He said it could amount to "several billion dollars over the next several years." Mikoyan apparently convinced some American businessmen that there were real opportunities for trade but for the stringent controls the Government puts on exports to Communist countries.

But both Khrushchev in his letter to the President and Mikoyan in his talks at the State Department said that trade could be expanded only if the United States would grant long-term credits. Thus, they acknowledged that Russia is short of foreign exchange and also short, for the time being, of goods it would like to sell abroad. The suggestion for credits "was presented to me as an absolute precondition to increased trade during my talks with Mr. Mikoyan," C. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, said after the Mikoyan visit.

Since the Soviet leaders must know that the Johnson Act forbids the extension of credit to a country that has defaulted on its debts to the United States, American officials concluded that the Soviet appeals were hollow and designed for propaganda purposes. The appeals were almost certainly designed to try to destroy this country's restrictions on strategic trade with Russia. Dillon reminded Mikoyan that during World War II the United States shipped some $11 billion of lend-lease goods to Russia and that it is the only important country that has not settled its lend-lease account.

It is important to remember that the United States made no claim for payment of war goods shipped under lend-lease, but it has claimed $2.6 billion for civilian-type goods. In 1951, this country offered to settle the entire claim for $800 million over a long period. Russia offered $300 million. Mikoyan showed no inclination to revive the talks—possibly because Russia still has serious foreign exchange difficulties and does not want to use its gold hoard.

Russia's foreign exchange problem is best exemplified by its determination to export automobiles—one of the commodities in shortest supply in the Soviet Union. Although it produces only about 125,000 cars a year, it has allocated about a fourth or fifth of this number for export, primarily for prestige and political purposes but also to obtain foreign exchange. The extreme difficulty of doing business with Russia on normal pricing terms is shown by the fact that although the cars sell for 10,000 rubles or more in Russia, they have been marketed in Greece for 3,300 rubles, in Iceland for 4,700, in Sweden for 4,400, and in Argentina for 2,500 rubles. As long as such discrepancies exist, Russia cannot be accepted as a reliable trading partner. If Russia wants to improve its trade relations with the United States, its pricing policies suggest an avenue for negotiation. Likewise, if negotiations should start, the United States should insist upon some kind of assurances against haphazard dumping operations such as those last year in tin and aluminum.

If Moscow were interested in trade for its own sake, it would not find the West's strategic controls onerous. Dillon invited Mikoyan to begin trading but of course the Russian visitor was not interested in buying refrigerators, automobiles, and other consumer goods. Mikoyan was more interested in wrecking the strategic controls so that he could purchase chemical factories and other technological developments.

"When we hear the Soviets complaining about our export controls," Dillon said, "we must remember that the Soviet Union, through its state trading monopoly, maintains complete control over all exports, permitting only those which are considered to suit the Soviet objective of the moment."

Actually, the United States is buying more from Russian at present than Russia is buying here, with the Soviets probably using the dollars obtained from this favorable exchange for purchases in other countries. Russia's difficulties in selling here are partly the result of the abrogation by Congress at the time of the Korean war of most-favored-nation treatment. The denial of most-favored-nation treatment means that tariffs on Russian goods brought into the United States often are higher than those charged on similar goods from other countries. Mikoyan complained bitterly about this to Dillon and at length in his report on his visit to the 21st Party Congress. Nevertheless, most-favored-nation treatment certainly should not be given to Russia without concessions of equal value on her part.

As for controls, they are a proper if not complete protection for American technology against Communist pirating practices. The difficulty is that many of our allies, notably Great Britain and West Germany, have less stringent controls and are much more eager to encourage unrestricted trade with the Communist nations. Nevertheless, the controls have bought the West time and they should not be abandoned simply because Moscow complains or because some business is lost.

Overly restrictive enforcement of controls on our part, however, sometimes plays into the hands of Russian propaganda unnecessarily and denies business that might as well go to American as to European firms. The recent case of the steel pipe order is an example of bungling on our part. Although steel pipe is not on the prohibited list, the Commerce Department, despite mild objections from the State Department, denied a license for the export of $2.6 million worth of steel pipe to Russia. The order then was placed in West Germany. A more flexible approach to the problem on our part would have been more realistic.

While the least developed countries should view any trade deals with the Communists with great suspicion, and all countries should avoid becoming dependent upon Communist trade, a powerful nation like the United States should not fear trade with

the Communist bloc per se. Our objective is to protect our interests and to obtain political and economic concessions from a powerful antagonist for the trade arrangements we enter into. We recognize that Russia has more to gain from the trade relation than we do, and we should be wary. We want to be sure there are compensations to us.

V

Trade is, after all, a two-way street. In order to import, the Communist countries must export. In other words, they must produce goods for export to pay for goods received. We should not be afraid of trade when the rules are followed, and we have much to gain in seeing to it that the Communist countries grow in their dependence upon trade. In the long run, trade may help to relieve tensions, and Paul-Henri Spaak may be right in saying that "a rich Communist is probably less to be feared than a poor Communist."

Nevertheless, our immediate interest is not in making the Communist rich but in preventing him from using his expanding economic power to disrupt the Western alliance. We shall probably need to use a pragmatic approach for a number of years. We know that the Russians and the Chinese want expanded trade. We have already said that we have no objections to virtually unlimited trade in consumer goods, except with the Chinese Communists, with whom all trade is barred. We are now in the process of expanding the trading lists, which should not be cause for alarm if we drive hard bargains and negotiate political and economic points in dispute as we move toward fewer restrictions. The way in which the Soviets act and in which they live up to their trade agreements should prove invaluable tests of the Kremlin's good intentions. If there are other moves toward more normal political relations, the stage would then be set for additional trade negotiations.

We should take care, however, to see that Russia does not make any free country dependent, as Finland has become, upon its trade. If necessary, we should be willing to make uneconomic deals to take Egyptian cotton or Ceylonese rubber to enable such countries to maintain their economic independence of the Communist orbit. At the same time, we must at all times work to enlarge the area of free world cooperation in economic and political matters, doing all we can to strengthen the economic unity and cooperation of the friendly nations.

Wilkes-Barre's Irem Temple Wins Acclaim in Parade at Atlantic City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Wednesday, July 8, 1959:

IREM WINS ACCLAIM IN PARADE AT SHORE

Irem Temple won acclaim from the many thousands who lined Atlantic Avenue and the boardwalk and filled Convention Hall yesterday morning for the 85th imperial council sessions which got underway with the escort parade.

Parade honored Imperial Potentate George E. Stringfellow, of Crescent Temple, Trenton, N.J., who 10 days ago made an official visitation to Irem Temple at the outdoor ceremonial at the country club.

Headed by Potentate David N. Schooley, Irem had approximately 400 members in the line of march with its brass band, bugle corbs, Arab patrol, legion of honor, chanters, police, ceremony producers, stagecrafters, string band, appointive officers, and members of the divan. Irem was 25th temple to pass in review in the 5-hour parade of uniformed organizations of 47 temples.

Specifically acclaimed were Irem's band of 60, one of the largest musical organizations in the parade, and the string band in feathered mummers' costume, the military pomp of the bugle corps, the precision marching of the Arab patrol and legion of honor, and the singing by the chanters.

Irem will participate with all units in the spectacular illuminated parade tomorrow night on the boardwalk to welcome the incoming highest officer of Shrinedom, Dr. Clayton F. Andrews, of Sesostris Temple, Lincoln, Nebr. Again Irem will be 25th in the line of march in a parade expected to take 5 hours to pass the reviewing stand. R. Lanning Ransom will be parade marshal for tomorrow night's parade, filling the same capacity he held yesterday.

T. Edison Cooke, president of Irem Temple's oriental band and bugle corps, has had his name proposed as a candidate for an office in Association of Shrine Oriental Bands with representation from 141 temples. Business meeting of the association will be held this morning.

Irem caravan of nine buses will return Friday morning, leaving Madison Hotel at 9 a.m. and arriving in Wilkes-Barre about 3 p.m.

Automotive Legislation Is Needed—H.R. 880 and H.R. 883

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been attempting, for the last 6 years, to have reform legislation enacted for the automotive industry.

On January 7, 1959, I introduced H.R. 880 and H.R. 883. The first is a measure to require certificates of fitness in the sale of automobiles and the other prohibits tampering with speedometers.

On July 7, 1959, it was my privilege to appear before the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in support of these bills.

The following is a transcript of my testimony:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK, JULY 8, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

May I at the outset thank you for the opportunity of being invited here to express my views on this important legislation you are considering. At the same time I want to take a moment to commend the distinguished chairman and his distinguished colleagues on this subcommittee for their continuous and continual attention to this very important subject of attempting to make our highways safe and, as a necessary coincidence of that, to try to make automobiles safe and to make automobile drivers do their share, as well as the automobile manufacturers, in improving the safety of our highways.

If it is agreeable to the chairman, I will submit my formal statements for the record in support of H.R. 880 and H.R. 883, and ask that they be made a part of the record.

I will briefly summarize them for the committee. I think that in that way we can save some time.

Mr. ROBERTS. Without objection, those statements will be filed for the record.

(Mr. MULTER's statement in support of H.R. 880 is as follows:)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity afforded to me to submit to you my views in support of my bill, H.R. 880.

The bill as introduced requires a certificate of fitness by the manufacturer of any motor vehicle which is shipped, sold, transported, et cetera, in commerce. Such certificate of fitness must state that (1) the motor vehicle and all parts and accessories have been inspected and found in good working order, safe and ready for operation on the public highways and in complete accord with all specifications as set forth in all descriptive and advertising matter; and (2) the vehicle has been road-tested for at least 100 miles and found in good operating condition after having been so road tested. The bill prescribes a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both. The act shall take effect 90 days after enactment.

If this bill is enacted into law, it should prevent "lemons" from getting into the hands of customers. You, gentlemen, are familiar with the District of Columbia case in which a dissatisfied customer painted lemons all over his new automobile and drove it through the streets of Washington. This is not good for the customer, the car dealer, or for the manufacturer. It is, indeed, poor public relations.

As we understand the law in the District of Columbia as it stands today, there is nothing to prevent a dissatisfied customer from painting lemons on a new car. In this case the car dealer sued for an injunction under a District of Columbia traffic regulation prohibiting the painting of articles on automobiles. On appeal the traffic regulation was declared unconstitutional on the grounds that it was an infringement of free speech. It is hoped that such dissatisfaction by all concerned would be obviated by the enactment of this bill.

The requirement that the vehicle be road-tested for 100 miles assures tht the vehicle will be in good operating condition when it is sold to the customer. The bill also requires that all parts be inspected, including vital parts such as the transmission, steering gear, etc. We all have heard of those fantastic cases where the steering gear has come off in the hands of the operator, or the motor has literally dropped out of the car, or a defective wheel has collapsed as in the case of *MacPherson* v. *Buick Motor Co.* (111 N.E. 1050 (1916).

Another important aspect of this legislation is the requirement that the motor vehicle and its constituent parts be in complete accord with all specifications as set forth in all descriptive and advertising matter. There is no doubt that some advertising has gone beyond "mere puffing" and does not truly represent the product.

It goes without saying that this bill is in the public interest. It is also in the interest of the manufacturers, the car dealers, and car purchasers.

A somewhat analogous situation may be pointed out in the certificate of air worthiness required by the Civil Aeronautics Authority before a plane will be allowed to take to the air.

It is true that special provision is made for the required inspections, and that air-

planes have not yet reached the volume output of motor vehicles. But motor vehicles, of present power, are still a dangerous instrumentality, and some more effective measures must be found to insure that mechanically, at least, the likelihood of danger from inherent defects is reduced to the minimum. My bill is a step in that direction.

Clearly, my bill will, if enacted, help to prevent automobile accidents due to defective cars and parts. It will protect the public from physical injury, instead of forcing them to seek redress through legal process by tort action for money compensation. No amount of money can ever compensate for a maimed human body or for the death of a loved one.

This bill will take the doctrine of caveat emptor—let the buyer beware—out of new-car sales. In other words, if an unfortunate new-car buyer now, perchance, draws a "lemon," the attitude is that he is just "unlucky." The new-car dealer finds it difficult to iron out the mechanical "bugs" in a "lemon." This bill would take the onus off the dealer—the present 90-day warranty—and place it on the manufacturer, where it should have been all of the time. Obviously, it is easier for the manufacturer to check for these defects through the course of the manufacture of the vehicle, and after its completion by the road test, than it would be for the dealer. Under the present procedure, we are locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen.

It is most unfair to the dealer to require him to correct inherent mechanical weaknesses in the manufacture of an automobile, lemon, or otherwise. It is not fair to subject a dealer's reputation and name to the painting of lemons on a car purchased from him and parade such car through the streets of any community.

It was Mr. Justice Holmes who said that an automobile was potentially a lethal weapon. It is just that when in good condition in the hands of a poor driver. It is the more so when in bad condition in the hands of the best driver.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize the public interest aspect of this legislation, and the safety feature. I repeat, if this bill would save just one human life, it is worthy of enactment. Some of you may know that I have been interested in the enactment of this legislation for a number of years.

I thank my distinguished colleagues for the kind of attention they have given me today.

(Mr. MULTER's prepared statement in support of H.R. 883 is as follows:)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity afforded to me to submit to you my views in support of my bill, H.R. 883.

H.R. 883, 86th Congress, requires the manufacturer of a motor vehicle to seal the speedometer thereof so as to prevent tampering therewith or to prevent its operation. The bill defines terms used, namely, manufacturer, motor vehicle and commerce. It prescribes a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year or both.

It is commonly believed that it has become the practice for some used and new car dealers to tinker with the speedometer of their cars before placing them on the market. This has become so commonplace that it is almost considered "caveat emptor." Some car dealers feel that it is "mere puffing."

Let us examine this procedure of turning the speedometer back. Is it not really dishonest and morally indefensible even if considered on the same level as "the morals of the market place" in the words of Justice Cardozo? It is closely analogous to the sharp horse traders practice of a bygone era of doping horses to prime them for a particular trade or sale. If my bill is enacted it will be a step in the direction of probity in new and used car sales. I believe that we all agree that that there is a need for a step in this direction.

Frankly, gentlemen, if I personally were going to buy a used car or a new car, I would want to be assured of the "correct" mileage on the speedometer, be it high, or be it low, before purchasing such automobile. I think I am entitled to know the correct mileage on the speedometer when I purchase an automobile, as this is a primary consideration in determining the remaining useful life of the vehicle.

If enacted, this bill would do just that. Is not the public entitled to this protection? Is not this bill in the public interest? Is not this bill long overdue? Is it not a fraud to tell a customer that the mileage of a car up for sale is 30,000 miles when in fact, and the seller knows as a fact, the mileage of such automobile is 60,000 miles?

Can such a deliberate and intentional falsehood going to the heart of the consideration be classified as "mere puffing"? If the mileage is not a primary consideration, why do some car dealers practice this deceit of turning the speedometer back? Surely, it is done for the purpose of misleading and influencing the customer to buy when he has relied on the low-mileage reading.

Certainly, if the representation as to mileage is not already a material representation—as I believe that it is—the fact that the Federal Government would see fit to regulate such mileage by Federal law would make such representation a material fact without a shadow of a doubt.

It has been held that the setting back of an automobile speedometer to deceive customers as to material facts constitutes fraud. *Lizana* v. *Edward Motor Sales Co.*, 141 So. 295 (1932). The court in that case said:

"It is established in decisions in this State that the setting back of speedometers for the purpose of deceiving customers as to material facts constitute fraud. In the case of *Nash Mississippi Valley Motor Co.* v. *Childress*, 156 Miss. 157; 125 So. 708, it was held that representations by a seller of an automobile with reference to the mileage of such car constituted representations of a material fact on which the buyer had a right to rely, and that it is a matter of common knowledge that machinery of all kinds depreciates in value from wear and tear, and that the value of a secondhand automobile is largely dependent upon the number of miles it has been driven."

In regards to a new car, it has been held that the buyer of an automobile was entitled to rely on the representations of the seller or his agent that he was getting a new automobile, and he was not required to make a careful examination which might not have disclosed even to a mechanic that the automobile was not new, but had traveled about 1,500 miles, or that it had been in use by another buyer for 2 months.

In *District Motor Co.* v. *Rodill*, 88 A. 2d 493 (1952), a District of Columbia case, the court held that a buyer is entitled to rely on a speedometer reading to determine the all-important factor of mileage unless he has been put on notice, and the dealer is therefore under a duty to disclose his knowledge relating to the falsity of what the speedometer shows.

I say to you gentlemen at this hearing that such sales methods are nothing more than pure fraud, as indicated by the above three cases. It should be outlawed by a Federal statute without delay.

Now, I do not want to imply that all car dealers engage in this type of practice. It is the old story of the sharp operators which require policing in order to protect the reputable dealers and, of course, the public.

I think that the reputable dealers will support my bill. In fact, I think that my bill will aid used and new car sales because of the rehabilitation of buyer confidence which will be gained by the knowledge of customers that they can rely on the speedometer reading of a given car.

I am sure that you can see the need of legislation to correct this loophole in the law. We lawmakers have a public trust to enact just such legislation as this. If a positive attitude is adopted toward this legislation, this bill will be enacted into law and will be an instrument for accomplishing an enormous amount of good.

I have stated that it is a fraud to tamper with the mileage of a speedometer. Some of you gentleman may be thinking at this moment, why is this bill then necessary, as there are already laws punishing fraud, as indicated by the cited cases. The answer is that the ordinary law of fraud is not doing the job because of the difficulty of detection and proof. There is a dearth of cases as compared to what we have good reason to believe goes on in practice. It is required in this bill that the speedometer be sealed, thereby preventing tampering in the first instance without the necessity of catching the culprit redhanded, which is always very difficult.

I thank you for the kind attention you have given me today.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am sure that you know I have been interested in this subject for a long time, and I have testified before this committee in previous sessions as well as on the Senate side. Directly in line with what the chairman said in his opening statement, is a clipping I have in front of me from the Wall Street Journal with the headline, "Shake, Rattle, and Roll—Ailing Autos, Shoddy Service Anger Owners, Bring Wrath on Dealers," and so on.

It goes on to tell the story about the automobile and the manufacturers of automobiles and the service of automobiles so well known to all of us. Strange enough, this clipping is dated July 19, 1957.

Of course, there are many others who could provide and my files are full of clippings to the same effect.

The first of my bills would seek to require a certificate of fitness to be issued by the manufacturer of any motor vehicle which is shipped, sold, or transported in interstate commerce.

The necessity of that, I think, is almost self-evident. The manufacturers for years have been delivering automobiles to the dealers under an agreement requiring the dealers to put them in shape for delivery to the purchasers. The dealer, because of the economic conditions involved, or other considerations, will then deliver the car, too frequently, after a superficial inspection and then stall the purchaser until the guarantee has run out. Then he will undertake to make the repairs or the corrections in the automobile that should have been made at the factory before it was sent on to the dealer. You cannot blame the dealer too much for that operation, because the economics of the situation probably require it. It is bad business ethics, of course, but bad business ethics many times will give way to the need to make a profit in order to stay in business.

Instead of spending his own labor and time and energy to put a machine in good shape for delivery ready for operation on the road, he will wait until he can make a charge for it. The certificate of fitness to be issued by the manufacturer will put the burden where it belongs, on the manufacturer of the automobile to make sure that it is fit for use before it leaves his place of assembly or manufacture for delivery to the dealer. Today the manufacturer requires the dealer to deliver the car in good condition.

I also provide in the same bill that there should be a road test of at least 100 miles by the manufacturer before he delivers that automobile to the dealer for sale to the ultimate consumer.

The other bill, H.R. 883, would seek to prevent one of the frauds that is perpetrated on the buying public almost every day in the week, in connection with the sale of either a new automobile or an old automobile. The purchaser today too frequently has no means of knowing how far or how long, or how many miles, that automobile has traveled before it is delivered to him. You probably know that many automobiles are delivered from the manufacturer, from his point of assembly to the dealers, by driving them over the highways and delivering them for sale to the customers as new cars.

Of course, the abuses are even more frequent in the used car trade where, no matter how far the car has been driven before it is put on the used car lot for sale, one of the first things done by most used car dealers—not all of them though—is to turn back the speedometer. Instead of showing that it has been driven for 60,000 miles, it shows that it was driven for 20,000 miles. Many times the speedometer is not connected at the factory before the automobile is put on the road for delivery to the dealer. When it gets to the dealer's shop, the speedometer is connected. It may run 100 or 200 miles and then, too, many of these cars will be used for demonstration by the dealers with the speedometers disconnected until they are ready to make the sale.

The speedometer may run 100 miles or 2,000 miles. It may be used 1 month or 2 months before finally delivered to the customer as a new car. Whether it is a new car or used car, the fraud is just as great and I think that my bill, H.R. 883, by requiring the speedometer to be sealed and with a provision to prevent tampering with the speedometer, will eliminate that fraud. There is not any doubt that there is a civil remedy. If the purchaser of the car, used or new, can find out and adduce proof in court that the speedometer was rolled back, he can get damages in a civil court.

My bill contains penal provisions and it will not be necessary to prove the person rolled back the speedometer or prove, by calling witnesses, that the speedometer was actually rolled back. My bill will prevent tampering with the speedometer in the first instance and require it to be sealed. If the seal is broken it has been tampered with.

The dealer, as well as the customer, will get some notice that there is something wrong with that car so far as the speedometer is concerned.

That, in brief, gentlemen, covers the proposals that I submit to you for consideration in connection with any legislation you will report to the full committee, and which your full committee may then see fit to report to the House.

I will be glad to try to answer any questions that any of the members may have.

Mr. ROBERTS. The Chair would like to thank the gentleman from New York for his interest in this subject and to thank him for his appearance before the committee.

The effects of your two bills are understood by the committee and I would say that your bills will certainly receive the interest and consideration of this subcommittee.

Are there any questions, gentlemen?

Mr. SCHENCK. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

First, I would like to make a very brief statement of commendation to our chairman. It has been my very distinct privilege and pleasure to work with him ever since the beginning of the former Subcommittee on Highway Safety and I have been pleased to continue that association. I want to commend him most sincerely for his continual interest in this very vital question of highway traffic safety and to commend him for his work as well as to share with him in the expression of the very splendid statement he made at the opening of this hearing.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to commend our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], for his long interest and efforts in behalf of highway safety and for the legislation he has presented.

Specifically, I note that in H.R. 880, page 2, lines 3, 4, and 5, Mr. MULTER proposes that the vehicle be road tested for at least 100 miles prior to sale and found to be in good operating condition after having been so road tested.

I am assuming, Mr. MULTER, that you are referring to a road test by the factory?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHENCK. Do you have any information, Mr. MULTER, as to the possible cost in time or money of such road tests and how they will affect the price of the automobile?

Mr. MULTER. No, I have no estimate of what that would cost. You may recall that in 1957, when I testified in support of a similar bill, I required in that bill much more extensive testing. Then the automobile industry did come forward and indicated that that would run the cost of an automobile so high that it would be impossible to sell an automobile at a reasonable price if they had to comply with all of the road testing required.

I am sorry that they did not come forward at the same time and tell us what kind of road testing, or to what extent they could afford to engage in road testing. When I introduced this bill, I took the minimum of 100 miles for road testing. If that is going to be too costly, I think the burden is on the manufacturers, the automobile industry, to come forward and tell us what kind of road testing they can afford to give us.

As Mr. Justice Holmes said, an automobile is a potentially lethal weapon. In the hands of a good driver, a bad automobile is certainly just that. Of course, in the hands of a bad driver, even a good automobile becomes a dangerous weapon.

Let us assume that we are only going to have good drivers. We cannot afford to let them be driving bad automobiles with defects that can be traced directly to the manufacturer. They ought to come forward and say, if this 100-mile provision for road testing is going to be too expensive, first, what it is going to cost and if that is too expensive, arrive at some medium or something that will be fair to them and at the same time fair to the consuming public so that we can get a good automobile coming from the manufacturer in the first instance.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, if I understand correctly the total production of automobiles in the current year would be somewhere between five and six million new cars to test each one of them 100 miles would require a good many millions of miles of road work and a considerable number of man-hours by experienced drivers.

At the risk of indicating my age, may I call attention to the fact that in Dayton, Ohio, there was a time when we built an automobile known as the Speedwell and the Maxwell, and the Stoddard-Dayton. At that time each of those cars was road tested before the body was applied and I recall some of the road testing difficulties even under those conditions without crowded highways.

Probably Mr. MULTER would feel that the thorough inspection system now being used by most manufacturers would give adequate assurance for the condition of the car or would he still feel it ought to be actual road testing?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I do firmly believe that only the road test, whether the 100-mile test, or something less than that, only the road test will do the job. The inspection can only indicate to the eye that each of the parts is in place and unless he is going to take the trouble to test each bolt, nut, and screw to make sure that it is firmly fastened, and operating properly, visual inspection will never do the job.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, if I may just ask one other question regarding H.R. 883 which proposes a complete certificate upon delivery of the car, what happens on the so-called bootleg car about which we have heard a great deal? That is, the car which is not sold by an authorized factory representative or dealer; who would be responsible for such certification?

Mr. MULTER. I think the certification in the first instance or the responsibility for the certification should be that of the manufacturer. I think to a large extent it would stop some of that bootlegging because the manufacturer will deliver his certificate to the legitimate new car dealer. It is possible that the new car dealer, if he is going to engage in bootlegging and turn that car over to somebody else, will probably turn the certificate over along with it. If the bootlegger cannot deliver the certificate at least the purchaser is on notice that something is wrong.

My bill requires a certificate to go along with the new car. If I do not get a certificate, I should assume I am not getting a new car.

Mr. SCHENCK. I appreciate my colleague's answer to that question and perhaps there could, or could not be, a transfer of certification. If there were such a transfer, it might be meaningless because of alterations?

Mr. MULTER. I think that is so, sir.

Mr. SCHENCK. Do you believe that this same certification should follow the so-called used-new car?

Mr. MULTER. A used-new car?

Mr. SCHENCK. Yes. In other words, any used car or so-called new car, at a lesser price on the basis that it was used—this may or may not be true—but that brings up a difficult situation, I think.

Mr. MULTER. Yes; it does present a somewhat difficult situation. However, again there, if it is a used car it should not have a new car certificate. If the man is willing to go to a used-car lot and take the chance of buying a new car slightly used, he is on notice as to what he is getting. If he is stuck, it is his own fault. If he is looking for a new car, he should not go to a used-car lot. It is just another method of bootlegging.

The dealer says, "This was just run around the corner by one of the executives of the manufacturing company and I got it at a low cost and you can have the advantage of that."

Then the buyer is on notice that he is getting something less than full value.

Mr. SCHENCK. Therefore, he should not expect service on a so-called nearly new car?

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. SCHENCK. On this same situation, how would you propose to administer the sealing of the speedometer and maintaining the seal? Would that be done by authorized speedometer service stations or authorized car dealers or authorized repair shops? Just who would have authority to unseal a speedometer, correct its operation and seal it back again? Who would administer that program? Who would police the program and see that these provisions were complied with?

Mr. MULTER. You have touched on a very important phase of the situation which is not covered by my bill. The speedometer, like any other part of the automobile, may get out of order and may require repair or may not be working properly and must be

reset. Again, somebody will have to do the job and somebody will have to work on it. I do think that it would require some further study and probably an additional provision added to the bill so as to indicate who would be authorized to make those changes, repairs, and who would be authorized to do the resealing. If the burden is to be on the manufacturer in the first instance, he complies when he delivers the car to the new car dealer. As to what happens to it after that, of course, I think we would have to put the responsibility on someone, or set up some method where there would be authorized persons to make those changes and repairs.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the splendid answers of our colleague from New York [Mr. MULTER] and his long interest in these very important problems and his splendid cooperation. I surely hope that he will continue in his efforts to give us the benefit of any additional information or ideas he may have as to the changes he may want to recommend.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman from Ohio and I would also like to thank him for his gracious and generous statements and the way he has devoted himself to this problem. He has worked very hard in the past 3 or 4 years in trying to find some solution to this problem.

Are there any further questions?

Mr. DEVINE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MULTER, in your studies on this general subject have you come up with any percentage figures that would indicate the number of new cars involved in accidents or fatalities as a result of lack of certification or defective parts in processing?

Mr. MULTER. I have no figures I can give to the committee that would be of such a nature that you could rely on them. Unfortunately, so many accidents occur with the driver being killed where we just do not know what the cause was. We do not have a system, as we do have with the airplane, so that when there is a serious accident we immediately send out a corps of investigators to determine what happened; whether it is human failure, mechanical failure, or something foreign to the machine. We do not have anything like that and I do not suggest we can have anything like that with reference to the automobile. There are just too many on the highways to try to go to each scene of an accident and find out precisely why the accident happened. I am sure that from the reported cases that have gone through the courts over the years there are any number of accidents that are due to mechanical defects inherent in the machine before it was delivered but there is no way of proving that with exactness.

There are cases like the Buick case that went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court where they held the manufacturer liable because of an inherent defect as a result of which the wheel fell off. There are any number of other cases of that kind but we just do not have the statistics because you cannot put your finger on it and say that the manufacturer is responsible for the accident.

Mr. DEVINE. Would you say then that the need for this legislation which you propose is based on a lack of quality and workmanship on the part of persons manufacturing these cars and no longer taking pride in doing a good job, and just throwing them together?

Mr. MULTER. I would not like to make the charge that broad. I do realize that the manufacturers by and large are trying to do a good job and by and large they are delivering good automobiles to the dealers and to the buying public. I will go into any new dealer's showroom or service station with any member of this committee—you pick out the service station, and I do not care what the manufacturer of the car is or whether the service station is in Washington or in any other metropolitan community—it is not quite as bad in the smaller communities—but I will go to the floor of that showroom or into the service station where he has a new car ready for delivery and go through that car with you and point out manufacturing defect after defect which has not been corrected.

Mr. DEVINE. Of course, we are getting into a small segment of automobiles that are brandnew, going from the manufacturer to the dealer that we are trying to take care of in this legislation.

I think you should be commended for your interest.

I do know, however, that across the United States there are 16 or 18 States now that have compulsory vehicle inspection which does not necessarily relate to you, but all automobiles.

If my recollection is correct, it is variously predicted that from 4 to 9 percent of the motor vehicle accidents and fatalities are the result of defective equipment. We understand that, in that connection, it is very difficult to determine what defect caused an accident but I wonder if we are not referring here to the 1 percent and not the other 5 or 6 or 8 percent that do involve mechanical defects?

Mr. MULTER. I concede that it is a small percentage we are addressing ourselves to but that small percentage affects human bodies and human lives. If we can save one life by the enactment of a bill like this, I think we will have done a good job. Incidentally, with reference to inspections I think the laws of most of the States—I am not familiar with those outside of New York—but in New York that inspection is required after the automobile has been on the road and used. It is not required of the new car. If it is required of the used car, the car that has been driven around, why should not inspection be required in the first instance before the car gets out on the road? That is what my bill would seek to do, require the manufacturer to certify that he has really driven this car, or had it driven, and that it is now ready to operate on the road.

Mr. DEVINE. In connection with your provision in this one bill relating to the sealing of speedometers, I do not quite follow your testimony—I have not examined the bill too closely—but in the event it is discovered that the seal is broken, who is going to be prosecuted?

Mr. MULTER. I think that anyone can file a complaint. I am sure that the prosecutor would not act on his own but almost anybody could file a complaint, either you or I, as the purchaser of the car, could file a complaint.

Mr. DEVINE. The same rules of evidence would apply. You have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a certain individual is responsible for tampering with the speedometer.

Mr. MULTER. I think that both Mr. Schenck and you are making a good point as to the tampering with the speedometer. It may be that the bill goes too far in trying to prevent tampering. I think everybody would agree that we should prevent it, but in attempting to prevent it, we want a good bill to do the job and not one which will just stir up a lot of litigation.

It may very well be that that part of the bill requires considerable study and improvement.

Incidentally, I do not pretend that either of these bills is the last word. I hope that the committee can improve them and I hope that the bills can be improved upon by those who testify, particularly those representing the manufacturers, the automobile dealers, and so on. They can give you some ideas as to how to improve these bills. I think that we go a long way if we just take that part of H.R. 883 which calls for the sealing of the speedometer at the factory. That will eliminate one of the evils.

Mr. DEVINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Richard Nixon: A Political and Personal Portrait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a new book, a national bestseller, that should be of interest to every American.

The book is "RICHARD NIXON: A Political and Personal Portrait," by Earl Mazo. This is an important book about a very important man, which has been written with care and integrity by the national political correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune.

Of the many fine reviews I have seen, I would like to have printed in the RECORD two which are particularly thought provoking. One is by William S. White, nationally syndicated columnist and Washington correspondent for Harper's magazine. The other is by Max Freedman, Washington correspondent for the Manchester Guardian of Great Britain. Both these correspondents are well known and highly regarded by Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have these reviews printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 28, 1959]

VICE PRESIDENT NIXON: FAIR VIEW OF A COMPLEX MAN

("RICHARD NIXON: A Political and Personal Portrait," by Earl Mazo; 309 pp.)

(Reviewed by William S. White)

There are, in the journalistic-literary sense, many Richard M. Nixons. Indeed, he has never been quite real; he has been put forward as rather more or very considerably less than human.

Earl Mazo's biography is, accordingly, an extraordinary achievement, and it makes all previous explorations in "Nixoniana" look quite puerile. Indeed, it is a distinguished contribution to the practical letters of politics and no small service even to politics itself.

True, Mr. Mazo has not wholly explained this infinitely complicated politician, this public man who alternately turns a harshly combative and a coolly philosophic face to the country. No one anywhere, not even the Vice President himself, I suspect, could quite do that. But Mr. Mazo has produced a Nixon who is on the whole believable, if still enigmatic in details of character and personality. He has provided what has never been remotely provided before: a calm, a rational, and a fair frame of reference within which the people can judge the man who may well be their next President.

This is a straightforward job by one of the best of American political reporters. Though it involves a vast clutch of facts these, happily, are facts laid out with the movement and color of life still in them. There is, too, an occasional cool humor and a faint touch of that restrained and agreeable cynicism which divides the men from the boys in political writing. The tale runs strongly from start to finish, and it runs with sustained suspense, even to one who had felt reasonably familiar with the fantastic career of RICHARD MILHOUS NIXON.

Mr. Mazo gathered up his material with earnest care. And he has also put this material down with high respect for, and perceptive use of, the English language. You will never yawn, I think, as you read this basically dispassionate but knowing work about a strange man and a strange political era.

For there is much here beyond RICHARD NIXON; there is an evocative recapture of the real history and the real mood of the Eisenhower-Nixon tenure and of its odd impact upon the Republican Party—a party which the President has yet to carry, though twice he has carried the country.

What emerges, to one reviewer, are some things that are arresting and quite certain and some other things that are arrestingly speculative. As for the sureties: RICHARD M. NIXON is a tough, profoundly able, politician; certainly the ablest in every measurable way that the GOP has developed in these past 20 years. He understands his profession as few have done—and about 10 times as well, one would say offhand, as his nominal chief, Mr. Eisenhower. He is a man of a chill courage and of a great loneliness; a politician of far more candor than many credit; a politician with a bleak special awareness of the role of blind fate in all careers—including his own.

As for the uncertainties: Is NIXON a basically fair politician—specifically, is he, at bottom, a divisive politician? Is he big enough to be big in great power; say, in the Presidency? Is he a man of deep convictions? Mr. Mazo does not attempt explicitly to answer these questions. My own notion, at first and before I had quite finished the book, was that this was a pity; that he had deliberately turned his eyes away from anything that might be described as editorial, and so has avoided any personal and final evaluation. Later on, I felt that his restraint here had been right after all. By this at least he avoided the good-guy-or-bad-guy implications which stick like damply foolish labels on much of our political literature. And, better yet, having marshaled the evidence he simply left it for the reader to bring in the ultimate verdict.

It should not be supposed, however, that there is no indication at all as to how Mr. Mazo feels. His treatment of NIXON's history suggests, for example, that he believes Mr. NIXON was hardly more sinner than sinned against in his California Senate race against Helen Gahagan Douglas. The NIXON participation in the Alger Hiss affair appears as an honorable and useful one. What Mr. NIXON said in the 1954 congressional campaigns—and I, for one, have felt that this wildly and bitter partisan passage raised a far more serious question of his Presidential availability than any other—is not deeply treated. There is, however, not the slightest suggestion that this omission (as I see it, at any rate) has any motive of protecting NIXON. More probably, Mazo simply thought he had dealt sufficiently with the issue of divisiveness. If the book has a shortcoming, this is it.

All the same, this work is urgently recommended to all open-minded people; it raises a powerful question against the simple, automatic reckoning of many men and women that "NIXON won't do." It skillfully, and for the first time, appraises the record, and this it does, on the whole, fairly and competently. It is no ecstatic NIXON campaign biography, as some other books have been, and it is no shrill emotional attack. It is a first-class work, an honest work, and it ought to have a wide hearing.

[From the Manchester Guardian Weekly, June 25, 1959]

A NEW STUDY OF MR. NIXON

(By Max Freedman)

WASHINGTON, June 23.—Mr. Earl Mazo is a brave man. He has written a biography of Vice President NIXON without once suggesting that he is a devil or a saint. The result is easy to predict. For the next few months his mail will quiver with abusive letters, friends will ask him if he really meant what he wrote, and his more sensitive colleagues will allow the whole episode to rest in a chivalrous silence. Most people look at Mr. NIXON not with their eyes but with their prejudices. The usual comment moves between the extremes of generous praise and calculated abuse. Balanced judgment is regarded as a kind of inexcusable neutrality in a conflict between right and wrong.

Mr. Mazo, the national political correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune, knew all about these hazards before he began his task. He was resolved to write an honest, penetrating, measured study of one of the most memorable political careers of our time. This certainly is no campaign biography written to glorify its hero as a leader without blemish or fault. Nor is it the ultimate account, based upon the private papers of Mr. NIXON and expressing the final verdict on his story. Mr. Mazo has admitted the faults and pointed to many of the mistakes. But out of a knowledge of Mr. NIXON's career that surpasses the work of all previous biographers or critics who have touched this controversial theme, he has written incomparably the best book on Mr. NIXON and crowded it with insights invaluable to the understanding of today's political debate.

The figure that emerges from Mr. Mazo's analysis must be treated with respect by anyone who values the arts of leadership. Curiously enough, the final estimate is not very different from the private assessment of the most important Democrats in Washington. They may think they could defeat him next year in the presidential race. But they have no illusions about Mr. NIXON's robust and resourceful campaign if he should be their opponent. Mr. NIXON often wonders if the Democrats are wise in saying that Governor Rockefeller would be harder to beat. Suppose the Republicans come to believe them. What happens then? The Democrats might find themselves opposed by the new star of the Republican Party instead of by the battle-stained veteran. This would be a strange sequal to the "hate NIXON" campaign.

Except for an occasional frigid episode, relations between Mr. NIXON and Mr. Rockefeller have been cordial and generous. The book is sprinkled with tributes to the Vice President from Mr. Rockefeller. On foreign policy the two men have the same outlook and philosophy. They are not divided by the differences which separated Senator Taft from Mr. Eisenhower. Nor does Mr. NIXON conceive it to be his duty to speak for one political group or one economic philosophy in the Republican Party. He sees himself as a unifying force in his party, eager to organize its fighting faith for every national campaign. This loyalty to the party's cause is known and respected by Republicans in all parts of the country. It helps to explain his popularity with the men who control the Republican organization. Mr. NIXON believes that the Republican candidate for President in 1960, no matter who he may be, will have to run on the record of the Eisenhower administration. That partly explains the zeal, sometimes the excessive zeal, with which he threw himself into election campaigns. The rest of the explanation can be found in the amazing and unprecedented fact that he had to do most of this campaigning by himself. Never in American history has any Vice President carried so vast and so controversial a burden.

In 1950 Mr. NIXON entered the Senate by defeating Mrs. Helen Gahagan Douglas by a majority of 680,000 votes in California. It was a dirty campaign—dirty on both sides. Mr. Mazo shows in a masterly political analysis that Mrs. Douglas' supporters started many of the rough and shameful practices which later were developed with dexterous ruthlessness by Mr. NIXON. This section of the biography will bring a sense of justice to an impartial minority; but Mr. Mazo had better brace himself for an avalanche of protests from California.

In pitiless detail Mr. Mazo exposes the blunders of Mr. Harold Stassen's campaign in 1956 to remove Mr. NIXON from the vice presidential nomination. This tale has never been told with such exact and punishing accuracy. Every mistake made by Mr. Stassen is recorded with icy precision, down to the last incredible demand that the Republican National Convention postpone its nominations for the Vice Presidency for 24 hours to give his faltering campaign another chance. Perhaps the most valuable new material in the whole book is contained in the chapters describing Mr. NIXON's ordeal in his most recent trip to Latin America. Mr. Mazo produces unanswerable evidence to prove that Mr. NIXON was the victim of a Communist campaign of violence and intimidation. It must be added that several of the Governments were shamefully negligent or cravenly neutral in the face of this Communist conspiracy. It is impossible to deny, when confronted with Mr. Mazo's impressive evidence that Mr. NIXON was in alarming danger of assassination. Knowing these risks, Mr. NIXON might have shown greater restraint in arranging the details of his tour. That remains an open question. What is beyond all dispute is the mixture of courage and composure displayed by Mr. NIXON during every phase of this tragic experience.

Mr. Mazo, a distinguished reporter, has not tried to emulate the arts of the missionary. He is not seeking to convert anyone. But in this book, published by Harpers, he has set down the facts with courage and honor, separated myth from reality, and given us a portrait of the actual man instead of feverish glimpses of a hobgoblin. It is an admirable achievement.

Back-Door Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, South Dakotans were glad—and taxpayers in general ought to be glad—last week when the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] centered the national spotlight on the practice of "back-door raids" upon the Treasury of the United States.

During debate on the mutual aid bill Senator CASE made a point of order against giving the Development Loan Fund a 5-year blanket authorization to borrow $5 billion from the overburdened Treasury and lend it for uncertain repayment in the soft currencies of underdeveloped nations.

Senator CASE took the position that this was, in effect, an appropriation and should receive the scrutiny of the Appropriations Committee.

As a result of his point of order, a compromise was worked out which makes the authorization for the Development Loan Fund subject to review by the Appropriations Committee. In addition, the committee is to conduct a study of the whole concept of "back-door financing" carried on by some two dozen agencies and is to make recommendations.

Senator CASE's successful fight brought much favorable comment from newspapers and other media across the land. But probably the most succinct comment appeared in an editorial in the Scripps-Howard newspapers, including the Pittsburgh Press of July 6.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, captioned "One 'Back Door' Locked," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 6, 1959]

ONE "BACK DOOR" LOCKED

Temporarily, at least, the Senate has restored the lock on one of the "back doors" through which many, many billions of taxpayer dollars have been siphoned out of the Treasury in recent years without any check by the Appropriations Committees of Congress. Or much of a check by anyone.

In the obfuscated lingo of Washington, this particular "back door" is known as "authorizations to expend from public debt receipts." What it means is that Congress simply orders the Treasury to go out and borrow however much money some agency wants and thereafter the agency is on its spending own.

Although the Constitution forbids drawing money from the Treasury except via specific appropriations, passed on by Congress, this ban has been violated for 20 years in the case of 2 dozen or more agencies.

These agencies now owe the Treasury upward of $25 billion. This accounts for that much of the national debt.

Well, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee wanted to add another $5 billion to the debt by giving a proposed new agency, the Development Loan Fund (DLF) a blank check for this amount. No appropriations. No controls. In effect, the DLF would have had this money in perpetuity, to use as it pleased without question from Congress.

Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, pulled the string on this gimmick, by raising a point of order. He cited the constitutional mandate. If somebody had raised the point years ago, the national debt would be a lot less.

As a result, the Senate compromised. It agreed to appropriate directly to the Development Loan Fund $750 million for 1960, $1,250 million for 1961.

In the words of Senator BYRD, "nothing could be more fiscally irresponsible" than the Foreign Relations Committee's proposal. Now that the Senate has slammed that door, would it be too much to hope that it might padlock some of the others?

Piggyback: New Concept Applied to an Old Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a very informative address "Piggyback: New Concept Applied to an Old Doctrine" made by Morris Forgash, president of the United States Freight Co. before the San Francisco Bay Area Chapter, National Defense Transportation Association, at Fort Mason, San Francisco, Calif., on June 25, 1959. Mr. Forgash is one of the outstanding businessmen of our country. There is no one better qualified to discuss the subject of his address than Mr. Forgash. He is also a great American and a businessman and a citizen who looks to the future of our country with faith, confidence, and vision.

PIGGYBACK—NEW CONCEPT APPLIED TO AN OLD DOCTRINE

(Address by Morris Forgash, president United States Freight Co., before San Francisco Bay Area Chapter, National Defense Transportation Association, Fort Mason, San Francisco, Calif., June 25, 1959)

I am happy to have the opportunity to meet with you—to shake hands and chat with you informally—and to make this formal appearance on your program.

Though I traveled across the continent to get here I could very well, in lieu of the customary greeting, have addressed you as "friends and neighbors." The jet age has shrunk the Nation and the world, and made neighbors of the cliff dwellers of New York City and San Francisco.

We have another thing in common—we are fellow members of the National Defense Transportation Association. As members of that organization we have come together—from industry and Government—from the military and the various modes of carriage—because of our common interest in the defense aspects of transportation. And yet we all realize that transportation cannot be maintained in a strong defense posture unless its various segments find and occupy their most useful roles in the domestic economy of the Nation. It is in recognition of this fact that the national constitution of National Defense Transportation Association states as one of its basic objectives—"to sponsor and encourage the promotion and progressive development of scientific and practical improvements in all forms and phases of transportation and related communications, especially as to all military and defense requirements."

That is a splendidly conceived objective. It has meat in it. The words "sponsor and encourage" imply action—not mere lipservice to the things in which we believe. The words "progressive development" and "practical improvements" show that as an organization National Defense Transportation Association realizes our goals will not be achieved by wishful thinking or high sounding theory. We must be concerned with practical things if we are to achieve defense preparedness.

I do not know what you are doing here in your chapter to implement the objectives of National Defense Transportation Association. Certainly by inviting persons to come here and discuss with you their ideas about improved transportation you are fostering understanding and only understanding can breed progress. I am known to have some very decided views about current developments in transportation and I am not so naive as to believe that they are entirely noncontroversial. You may disagree with some of the things I have to say, and you are free to form your own opinions, but if I can cause any of you to want to go out and do something about the "status quo" I will be fully compensated for my trip. For whatever else we may think about our transportation system, we know that it cannot stand still.

You and I belong to a very fortunate generation of traffic and transportation people. More change, more progress has taken place in transportation during our lifetime than in all of the centuries since the invention of the wheel. And yet the past is only prologue. We stand on the threshold of developments so revolutionary that we can hardly afford to go to sleep lest we wake up as outdated as Rip Van Winkle.

The wisdom and understanding with which we solve the issues in transportation that right now are literally knocking at our door will profoundly affect the economy and security of the Nation—even of the world. As Chairman OREN HARRIS of the House Interstate Commerce Committee recently said, we must be visionary about transportation. Engineering and technology are only tools by which transport progress can be achieved. The tools are ready to our hand, but vision is necessary in their application. It has always been thus.

It is a paradox of human nature that visionaries always have had to run the risk of being called fools by their contemporaries. That may be one reason why steamboat navigation, demonstrated workable by Basco de Caray in 1542, waited nearly three hundred years for "Fulton's Folly" to make it an acceptable media of transportation. It could, in part, account for the fact that the visions and inventions of Leonardo da Vinci yellowed on the drawing boards for hundreds of years before most of them were put to practical use in the nineteenth and twentieth century.

I am here to talk to you about another modern development in transportation that is new only in its concept—piggyback. Piggyback, as a practice, is very old. More than a hundred years ago, in the middle 1800's, sectionalized canal boats were transported on flatcars between points in Pennsylvania. Establishment of through rail service between the points involved dried up that early form of piggyback.

Dun's Review recently carried a reproduction of an old print showing the piggyback service pioneered by the Long Island Rail Road in 1884. It consisted of the moving of farmers' produce-laden wagons between points on Long Island and the East River—four wagons to the flatcar. The teams hitched a ride on the same train in specially built boxcars.

A more modern version of piggyback—the transportation of steel containers on flatcars—was inaugurated by the railroads in 1921. This was widely hailed as a sound and progressive idea in transportation. It caught on with the shipping public and looked as though it had a great future. But theory, in the form of prescribed formulas of rate-making, collided with practicality, and the service died for lack of customers.

The railroads experimented with several rate bases for the early container service. They discovered that rates on a per-mile basis, with a minimum charge per container, was the most practical basis. This basis of rate publication was drawn into litigation before the Interstate Commerce Commission

and the Commission, in 1931, prescribed a new formula, based on classification of the freight in the containers. That was the end of the container service of that era, for the shippers simply would not buy it on the basis prescribed.

In the 2 decades that followed the container experiment, various other limited excursions in the piggyback field were made by individual railroads. For example, the Great Western began hauling trailers on flatcars between Chicago and St. Paul in 1936 for a charge to the public of $42.50 per trailer, minimum 20,000 pounds. Shortly thereafter the Great Western established the same charge for hauling the trailers of motor common carriers. The Commission approved the charges involved, but said that when they were applied to loaded trailers tendered by the motor carriers they were, in legal effect, "divisions" and not "rates."

From the decision in the Great Western case there evolved the so-called "substituted service" arrangement, which is the basis of what we now call "plan I" piggyback. The motor carrier simply substitutes a rail movement, in trailer-on-flatcar service, for a part or all of its highway movement, and pays the railroad a flat charge which, in legal theory, is called a "division". The railroad "concurs" in the motor carriers' tariffs.

The New Haven Railroad was among the carriers that experimented with piggyback in the doldrums decades and, in 1954, it petitioned the Commission to settle certain legal questions which had arisen with regard to the service by means of a declaratory order. All types of carriers, as well as shippers, participated in the formal proceedings which ensued. The motor carriers strongly contended that railroads might not handle their own freight in trailer-on-flatcar service without obtaining a certificate to operate as a motor carrier. The Commission rejected this argument.

The Commission also held, in the New Haven case, that motor carriers may not utilize rail piggyback service at published rail rates. It said that to do so the motor carrier would have to act in the dual role of common carrier and shipper, which it could not lawfully do. However, the Commission said that the substituted service plan, which it had previously approved in the Great Western and other cases, could be employed by the motor carriers.

While the Commission thus has several times approved the so-called substituted service plan, or plan I piggyback, the legal basis for such plan, in the opinion of many astute lawyers with whom I have talked, is subject to serious question. Under such plan the motor carrier solicits, bills and rates the traffic and he may not, consistent with the decisions, take the freight beyond the scope of his own operating authority. He utilizes the railroad, in substitution for his own over-the-road haul. The railroad does not know or care where the freight comes from or where it goes—it deals only with the motor carrier, and the motor carrier is, in fact, the only shipper which the railroad knows in the transaction.

The term "coordination" unfortunately seems to mean different things to different people and as a result is creating a great deal of confusion, which may tend to slow up this vitally important development. The confusion that I am referring to is the loose manner in which the term "substitution" is used synonymously with "coordination." The fact of the matter is that they represent two separate and distinct concepts. As I have stated, plan I represents a service performed by a railroad in substitution for highway service, and does not constitute a coordination of the two forms of transportation. Substitution of one form of carriage for another is clearly not coordination. Coordination is a combination of two or more services in a conjunctive sense. If such a practice is to serve any useful purpose, the combination must have as its objective the attainment of the maximum advantages inherent in each mode of transportation. One should be the extension of the other and not a mere substitution. There is a natural reluctance on the part of managers of different modes of carriage to admit that there are limitations on their particular media, and thus the give and take necessary for effective coordination has not voluntarily come about.

At all events, following the New Haven case, plan I arrangements were established on a fairly extensive basis, primarily in the East. It received a good deal of publicity but it has not lived up to its advance billing. In fact, it is on the decline, particularly on some roads. The Pennsylvania Railroad handled fewer truckers' trailers in 1958 than in any year since 1953. This plan can obviously not be depended upon to fulfill the promise of coordinated service which piggyback holds for the shipping public.

Plan II piggyback—the railroad's own service—which also was given the Commission's blessing in the declaratory order proceeding in the New Haven case, has been established on a much more extensive basis than plan I. Under this plan the railroads simply transport the freight tendered by their own shippers in trailers on flatcars instead of in boxcars. Their rates for this service are generally on a basis comparable to the truck rates.

Plan III and plan IV piggyback are the most recent applications of this new concept to an old service. They were, by all odds, the fastest growing of the plans until their expansion was arrested by the Interstate Commerce Commission which, beginning early last Summer, has suspended all new plan III and IV rates and placed existing rates under investigation.

As a lifelong student of transportation, and as one who has devoted perhaps as much time and study to the potentials of piggyback as any other man in the country, I see in these plans the answers to questions about coordinated transportation that have been sought for generations. I so advised the Commission in testimony which I presented in support of the plans in the pending cases.

Plan III, as you may know, involves the transportation of freight in trailers that are owned by the shipper and tendered by him already loaded and ready to be placed on a flatcar. The railroad places the trailers on and takes them from the flatcar. Under plan 4 the flatcar as well as the trailer is shipper-owned. The railroad's function under this plan is simply to pull the flatcar, loaded with trailers, from ramp at origin to ramp at destination.

There is a physical resemblance between all four of the piggyback plans, but plans 3 and 4 are so advanced in their concept that to draw comparisons we might as well go all the way back to Long Island's wagon train in the 1880's. The boldness of these latter plans is that they break with traditional methods of pricing carrier service. Because the service performed by the railroads is stripped of all non-essentials—the expensive terminal services—and reduced to pure transportation, it has been possible to discard the cumbersome and antiquated formulas of rate-making and fixed charges on a simple, sensible, and profitable basis.

Rates for plan 3 and plan 4 piggyback are stated in flat amounts per movement, terminal to terminal, loaded or empty. To arrive at the amount per movement all the railroad has to do is to determine how much it must charge per car mile to cover its costs and meet its revenue needs. The freight classifies itself based on the simple factor of how much you can load in a car. Almost all of the elements that complicate the pricing of rail service for movement in box-cars—terminal handling, transfers, empty car mileage, freight loss and damage—are either eliminated or performed by the shipper.

To some people this break with tradition in the manner of fixing freight rates may seem like killing a sacred cow. Because it is new it will be suspect. Because it is simple, whereas we have been conditioned to think of rate-making as complex, this innovation in pricing will be, in fact has been, attacked as unsound. It will "break down" the rate structure, you will hear some people say.

These bogeymen are made of straw. The fact is that the simplified plan of rate-making makes sense to the shippers and makes money for the railroads. And it is the most significant movement in the direction of self-help that has been taken in decades. The Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, in reporting the bill that became the Transportation Act of 1958, said:

"There has been a failure (by rail management) to recognize changing conditions, times, and tastes. A failure to compete aggressively for business by use of modernized equipment, by adjustments in plant and financial structures, as well as failure to adjust rates to compete effectively for traffic."

Piggyback plans 3 and 4 are an answer to the foregoing charge and challenge.

The Senate Committee, in the same report, said:

"The enormous growth of commercial private carriage of property by motor vehicle in recent years, resulting as it has in a continuing erosion of huge volumes of traffic that would otherwise be available for transportation by public carriers, is a serious problem for the railroads and other common carriers."

As long ago as 1956 it became apparent to thinking men in transportation that shippers, in increasing numbers, had discovered they had another choice in the selection of a medium to move their goods—their own trucks. No need to talk to such shippers about traditional ratemaking concepts—what the traffic will bear—value of service—common carrier liability. They could figure the cost of providing their own trucks in the only terms that had any significance to them—total dollars. They could compare the standards of service with that offered by common carriers. What they wanted to know from common carriers was how much and how fast. And in their choice of taking public transportation or leaving it lies the real problem of the transportation system of the United States.

Under Piggyback plans 3 and 4 the railroads, for the first time, have offered the shippers a service and a price both of which can be realistically compared with the alternative of private carriage. This is not only the most practical—it is the only effective means that has been devised for stopping the erosion of common carrier tonnage to private channels, and from that standpoint alone it could be the salvation of the common carrier system.

Important as it is, the redirection of the transportation of freight into professional and more economic channels is not the only cardinal virtue of piggyback plans 3 and 4. The simple and sensible method of pricing which they represent is of enormous advantage to all shippers, whether or not they have a choice of public or private carriage—and of course not all shippers have that choice. Without hiring experts or anaylsts shippers can figure their transportation costs with certainty and budget them with confidence for management purposes.

Because piggyback offers almost damage-free transportation shippers can depend on selling all of their product to customers

without figuring on collecting damages for a significant amount of their freight. Expensive and totally unproductive claim departments can be reduced or eliminated.

The greatly increased speed in transit which is possible by use of piggyback plans 3 and 4 wil produce benefits in several ways. Goods tied up in transit are dead inventory. Delayed or unpredictable arrivals cause dissatisfaction, loss of sales, and economic waste. The ramp-to-ramp movement of piggyback cars, without unloading, transfer, or terminal delays, will shave days from transit time and enable completely dependable scheduling of deliveries.

Benefits accuring to the railroads from the use of piggyback plans 3 and 4 are equally spectacular. Because the charges apply whether the trailers are loaded or empty; a 100-percent load factor is guaranteed for the first time in history. For the first time the railroads can, through use of these plans, concentrate on the business of railroading and quit worrying about the incidentals of transportation. They have little or no switching, labor, or material costs in the conditioning of cars—no car distribution cost. And they can measure their costs of producing service against their revenues with a degree of certainty never before possible.

Finally, these plans result in benefits to the transportation system, to the economy of the country, and to the national defense, that are of immeasurable value. Take the long-sought, eloquently praised, but always elusive matter of coordination of transportation. Coordination is the only designated end goal of our national transportation policy that has completely evaded the grasp of carriers and regulators alike.

Piggyback plans 3 and 4 provide an economic approach to the problem. Since the containers or trailers employed are interchangable, and can move with equal facilty on rubber tires or steel rails, the choice of movement reduces itself to practical and economic rather than artificial standards. The choice of services, and the extent of use of each, thus becomes a rather simple choice, and under plans 3 and 4 it remains with the shipper.

Compare this with piggyback plan 1, where there is a substitution of one form of carriage for another, but the service itself, and the price exacted, are the service and rates of motor carriers. The choice is not that of the shipper at all, but of the motor carrier, and if there are economic advantages involved they do not reflect themselves in what the shipper pays. This, to my way of thinking, is not coordination at all, but substitution.

It will occur to you that not all shippers are or will be in a position to use piggyback plans 3 and 4, no matter how widespread the service might become. That affords me an opportunity to say a word about how the freight forwarder fits into the picture. It is a pleasant duty which I undertake, because I am connected with the forwarding industry both in an individual and in a representative capacity.

For more than a hundred years—since before the railroads had through service and through rates—freight forwarders have been recognized as coordinators of transportation. They have fitted each innovation and development in transport, as it came along, into the plan of their service. Their function as a coordinating medium is recognized and protected by law.

Freight forwarders thus are in a position to make fully available to the whole shipping public, the economic advantages of piggyback. As a separate, independent, specialized carrier, endowed with a free choice of underlying media of transport, the forwarder can extend the advantages of piggyback plans 3 and 4 to shippers wherever they are located. Forwarders are, or at least are in a position to be, the catalytic agent in the picture, and if they are not artificially restrained in the use which they can make of this new concept of transportation there is no end to the public advantages which we may expect with the march of time.

Now when I come to speak of the defense potentials of piggyback I must ask you to be a little visionary and look beyond the present uses of plans 3 and 4 which I have described. Piggyback and its relatives, sometimes called fishyback, birdyback, or something else, embrace the entire field of containerized transportation. We have been using our transportation systems as warehouses, as packing stowage concerns, and for almost everything else, with transportation as a by-product of their effort. The tremendous duplication of labor, of materials, and of transportation facilities has made transportation the costly product that it is today, fighting to protect its traffic against complete amateurs who provide their own service. We simply have to start thinking in terms of developing completely interchangeable units of equipment that can move over the highways, the rails, the waterways and high seas, and even in the air, without rehandling of cargo.

One of the most cogent reasons for standardization was stated by Commissioner Winchell of the Interstate Commerce Commission in a recent speech, as follows:

"In a competitive transportation system such as we have in this country, one might expect that the purchase of containers would be dictated by the individual needs of the purchasing carrier, with little thought to whether the container could be interchanged with the representative from another mode of transportation. It must be recognized, however, that to secure the fullest advantages from containerization, all transport agencies must agree upon a program for standardizing containers, especially in such essentials as tie-down and lifting devices. Carriers investing large sums in so-called captive containers may, a few years hence, find themselves burdened with obsolete equipment. The genius of this country has been in the way in which it has been able to take new concepts and employ them in a manner which brings out their fullest practical use. There is no reason to believe that the development and use of containers will prove an exception."

Many organizations and groups have been studying the problems of containerization but until recently they have been moving at a rather leisurely pace, at least insofar as any tangible evidence of their activity was concerned. Recently the National Defense Transportation Association sparked activity in the field by appointing a special subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, to explore means of crashing through some of the barriers in the field of containerization.

Industry, the carriers, and the military are all well and ably represented on our subcommittee and it has been a working subcommittee. We have held a number of meetings and, considering the tremendous scope and knotty complications of the subject, we have made astonishing progress. Our conclusions are pretty well firmed up, but we will not release them until we have done some checking with other agencies or groups concerned with the problem. I can tell you at this time that the thinking of our subcommittee is pretty well focused on a 40-foot unit as a maximum, with a limited number of multiples thereof, and that a public announcement of its definite conclusions may be forthcoming within the next 30 days.

In considering the standardization of any type of equipment we must consider the problems and the requirements of the basic interests involved—those of the shipper and those of the transportation agencies. The interests of the shipper revolve around the prime objectives of economy in material handling and the physical loading and unloading at various transportation facilities and the transfer of the container to and from his place of business. These interests find greatest expression in a container which he can utilize for his exclusive needs and the only remaining requirement is the publication of a freight rate under which to move it economically. It is readily apparent that the interest of the shipper dissolves most abruptly if, after making large capital commitments, he cannot move about the loaded and empty containers under rates, rules and regulations which can reflect or give promise of reflecting a reasonable economy in the overall operation. A proper freight rate is, therefore, the only proverbial "bridge" which can breathe life and reality into this revolutionary development. This is indeed the critical area within which the Interstate Commerce Commission has the opportunity of playing the deciding role.

On the other hand, the interest of the transportation agency not only parallels those of the shipper, but goes several steps beyond—the carrier requires a container which is compatible with the handling of almost any type of freight tendered for carriage—small l.t.l. lots as well as large ones short of a full truckload. He must look for and expect reduction in platform and other handling costs, the elimination of the physical transfer of the freight itself at terminals, and reduction in cost of local pickup and delivery, particularly in the case of the large lots, by elimination of breaking bulk at origin and/or destination freight house.

The concern of the military with standardization of containers and with effective implementation of means for their complete interchangeability among types of carriers, is understandable. We have the most massive and comprehensive transportation system on the face of the globe, but we must remember that France once had the most massive fortification system ever devised by man, and when the Maginot Line crumbled under, what was then modern warfare France fell. We cannot afford to let our transportation system become our maginet line for lack of modernization and imagination.

Modern warfare cannot be waged with yesterday's weapons, and we cannot modernize our transportation plant on the eve of Armageddon. Flexibility—speed—interchangeability will be as important as capacity—in fact may be the measure of capacity in any present day defense effort. To the extent that we can provide for the transfer of lading from rail to truck to vessel, or the reverse, or any combination thereof, we will help to revitalize the facilities and lifelines of transport. Freight in interchangeable containers can be kept moving while a railroad track or yard, or a bridge or highway are being repaired.

The standardization of containers and the practical adaptation and encouragement of their use through plans such as piggyback Plans 3 and 4, will increase not only the utilization but the capacity of our overall transportation plant. By encouraging private acquisition and ownership of trailers and flatcars, these plans will result in the building up of vast pools of equipment at no expense to the carriers. Even in peacetime we are periodically plagued by car shortages and, from a defense standpoint, the situation at present is frightening. The Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in testimony just a few days ago before a Senate subcommittee trying to find the solution to freight car shortages, said that there are just two principal causes of car shortages—inadequate car ownership and failure to utilize existing equipment efficiently. Piggyback Plans 3 and 4 should go

a long way toward relieving both of these causes.

Chairman Tuggle pointed out in his testimony that the ownership is actually less today than it was during World War II, despite the generally expanding economy. In the 10-year period, 1949–59, freight car ownership declined by almost 60,000 cars. This poses a serious problem from the standpoint of trade and commerce—the problem is critical from the standpoint of national defense.

Even in the short time and to the limited extent that piggyback plans 3 and 4 have been in effect, the trailer and flatcar fleet has been materially increased and the builders are working at top speed. The public has dared to risk money in the purchase of equipment even with legal questions about piggyback service still unanswered. Given a green light, and with the expansion of the service that is bound to come because the shippers are clamoring for it, the privately owned equipment fleet will grow to enormous proportions and stand as a defense reserve that nobody has even suggested we can otherwise obtain.

As to the failure to utilize existing equipment efficiently, of which Chairman Tuggle spoke, his fellow Commissioner, Arpaia, in a speech last March, said that flatcars in piggyback service were reported to be averaging 175 miles a day, and that some were being used as much as 450 miles a day. I don't know the source of his information, but I can tell you my experience is closer to the 450-mile figure. And that compares with an average of 47 miles a day for all freight cars in 1957. Piggyback has thus literally added a new dimension to transportation, and a new weapon to our arsenal of defense.

Old and accepted ways of doing things, like old shoes, are comfortable and we are loathe to discard them. But we cannot afford the luxury of rejecting this new and revolutionary concept of transportation. It was a hundred years between the first application of piggyback that I mentioned to you and piggyback plans 3 and 4. We cannot afford to wait another hundred years for a new idea to evolve.

In the interest of more efficient and economical service to the general public—in the interest of strengthening and coordinating the transportation system—in the interest of a dynamic, flexible, and adequate defense transport plan, we must nurture, encourage, and support this adventure in progress.

Science and engineering, teamed with the productive genius of America, will solve the mechanical and technological problems I have outlined—the standardization of equipment, the mechanics of interchange, the perfection of techniques. But we must depend upon vision for acceptance of the idea involved, and upon wisdom and understanding and patience to carry us through the experimentation to the ultimate perfection of that idea.

Senator Morse, a One-Man Team When Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial entitled "A One-Man Team When Necessary," published in the Greater Oregon, a weekly newspaper published in Albany, Oreg. It is a very unusual kind of editorial. It is unusual because it discusses in warm, friendly, and complimentary terms the man who is the most controversial man in the U.S. Senate, and a man who has undoubtedly received more newspaper criticism, certainly in recent months, than any other Member of the Senate.

I should like to read a few paragraphs from the editorial before I ask to have it printed in the RECORD. The editorial reads in part:

What will our history books tell of this era in which we are now living Well, we are willing to make a prediction as to what they will say about one man—and that is Oregon's Senator WAYNE MORSE.

Here it is. We predict that our senior Senator will be referred to in history books as "WAYNE MORSE, a one-man ball team when the need arises, playing all the positions and making a minimum of errors.

This excellent editorial goes on to develop the baseball analogy in very interesting terms, and concludes with this paragraph:

The only position our Senator MORSE does not play is that of umpire. The people of Oregon act in the capacity of umpire. They call the plays as they see them, and they always call him safe.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial about a really great U.S. Senator be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greater Oregon, June 5, 1959]

A ONE-MAN TEAM WHEN NECESSARY

We like to make predictions in our editorial columns, and we want to make an early one in this month of June. This is the month our State's centennial exposition opens, when we will relive our historical past. Seldom do we stop to consider that we, too, are making history, right now in the present.

What will our history books tell of this era in which we are now living? Well, we are willing to make a prediction as to what they will say about one man—and that is Oregon's Senator WAYNE MORSE.

Here is it. We predict that our senior Senator will be referred to in history books as "WAYNE L. MORSE, a one-man ball team when the need arises, playing all the positions and making a minimum of errors."

Sometimes people are too close to the present to assess the ability of others with the proper perspective. Some no doubt will think this is true of us. However, we are confident that Senator MORSE's record of home runs will win him recognition as an outstanding all-around player. Some people are good ball carriers, which may be good enough for some events. But it takes more in top league competition; a man must have a lot on the ball and not count on the rest of the players for that extra effort which may be the margin of victory.

As a pitcher, MORSE has a fast ball he can send over home plate at a sizzling speed. He also has some tricky curves and slow drops that are hard for opponents to figure out but are a big help to his team. As a catcher, no one will deny that he catches more criticism from the press than any other Senator. That may be due in great measure because he never hesitates to speak out when he feels it is in the best interests of the home team, and he is always in there pepping up the other players.

At shortstop, MORSE also is a whiz and at least once he kept us out of war with Red China. Even when a long fly ball is knocked into left, right, or center field our Senator gets under the ball and hauls it safely in. He is an excellent long stop as well as shortstop.

Politics is one of the toughest games we know of, but when Senator MORSE is running in an election he never fails to touch all the bases and has never been thrown out. He is a good batter, too, and bats as good as he gets. He never gets caught off base, or put out in a double play.

It matters little to Senator MORSE that the Portland dailies and others of the one-party press may boo, throw pop bottles, and hurl insults at him. He doesn't let criticism bother him, but keeps in mind the goal that must be achieved if his team of State and country is to triumph.

The only position our Senator MORSE does not play is that of umpire. The people of Oregon act in the capacity of umpire. They call the plays as they see them, and they always call him safe.

Help for the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the editorial in the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, published under date of Wednesday, July 8, is so well written and to the point that I hope my colleagues will take the necessary time to read it and understand the hope of those of us who live in metropolitan areas:

HELP FOR THE CITIES

President Eisenhower's veto of the housing bill emphasizes how dependent the rebirth of the Nation's cities is on Federal assistance.

The housing bill was an omnibus measure which included several programs connected with housing. Among these was the program under which urban renewal projects were made possible through help from the Federal Government.

With that help cut off, the cities would be left stranded without the funds necessary to continue the rebuilding programs. Actually, the urban renewal program is more than a housing program. It is a program to create new life in the cities, to rescue them from the deadening encroachment of deterioration. While it does provide housing units, it provides much more. It can change the entire character of wide areas—economically and culturally.

The aims of other programs in the housing bill are not nearly as broad and would not have the impact of urban renewal.

Newark, along with several other cities in New Jersey as well as the rest of the country, has been looking forward to Federal aid for several projects which will mean a great deal to the city's future. It would be a severe blow if these had to be abandoned.

Fortunately it is not likely that this will happen. While there are sharp differences of opinion on housing projects, there is general agreement on the value and the need for the urban renewal program. There is criticism that it fails to meet the needs of the smaller cities and that the cost could be pared down.

But the fundamental concept of the Federal Government assisting the cities has not been challenged. That being so, an acceptable program undoubtedly will emerge. Perhaps it should be divorced from a catch-all housing bill and be considered on its own merits as a city assistance measure.

Productivity Challenge From Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in these days of high speeds, growing complexities, and rapid outbreak of varied events we find little time to review, analyze, and cast an appraising eye over some of our long-term programs and the long-range developments affecting them.

We come to take for granted situations to which we have become accustomed; and may be partially blind to developments that have been working silently while we have been otherwise occupied.

Our trade agreements program is a case in point. I do not say that we have failed to give attention to it, but some of the developments in the background have been passed up without sufficient notice. I am impressed, for example, with the fact that this country seems suddenly to be confronted with an outflow of gold, a decline in exports, an increase in imports, and a scramble by many of our exporting industries to find in oversea countries facilities for manufacturing the goods for export that they have been accustomed to make in the United States.

This is an alarming development, not because it represents a flight of capital but because it reflects a deep, underlying change in our international competitive situation—not something temporary or hardly worthy of attention. There can be little question that, after many years of economic policy pursued in one direction at home and in the opposite direction abroad, we now face a virtual crisis in our foreign trade situation.

We no longer have the comforting thought that has always come to our support in the past, namely, that we have nothing to worry about because of our vast lead in technology over other countries. The day is gone when we can be indifferent to the fact that our wages are several times higher than those of our competitors. We no longer enjoy the lead in productivity per man-hour that once formed the bulwark of our defense; nor are we likely to regain it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fact of the first magnitude and should arouse use to an early and thorough reexamination of our position. Recently an examination of our current position, contrasting it with the accustomed situation of past years was made by one who has devoted much time and labor to the foreign competitive situation. Mr. O. R. Strackbein, who is chairman of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, spoke before the Drop Forging Association in Spring Lake, N.J., presenting a long-range review of this country's international economic position.

I commend Mr. Strackbein's analysis and views to all members of this body as worthy of perusal and most serious consideration. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present his address:

PRODUCTIVITY CHALLENGE FROM ABROAD

(Address of O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy before the Drop Forging Association, Spring Lake, N.J., June 22, 1959)

For many years since the advent of mass production in this country American industry stood in the forefront among the industrial nations of the world in point of productivity per worker. The moving production line, interchangeability of parts, labor-saving machines and finally automation were American developments in response to a mass market. The fast-growing population and the gospel of high wages as practiced by Henry Ford opened the way to a torrent of goods and gadgets such as no one in the Old World had dared entertain even in dreamland.

In American technology achieved such wonders of production that within a generation our crates and packs, bales and barrels spilled over our outer borders, across the seas and found their way into markets all over the world. Our industry, armed abundantly with ingenious machines and devices, heavy crushers and grinders, singing gears and screeching saws, turned out pieces and parts in fast tumbling succession. There was nothing like it elsewhere in the world.

In the United States wages rose to a high level but so did output per man-hour, particularly in the mass production industries. This higher productivity kept unit prices low. In fact, the high productivity made possible the high wages. As a result the much lower wages prevailing abroad were no source of worry to the giant producers in this country. Foreign productivity was relatively low and therefore no great threat. Even some of our smaller industries were able to hold their own in competition with the wage-starved countries overseas.

Obsessed with the notion that this was to be the permanent order of the universe and assuming that we had no real need of much competitive insulation against the rest of the world, while at the same time hungering for markets that would absorb our burgeoning surpluses, we began 25 years ago a program of economic disarmament. Pressed as we were by heavy economic frustration during the depression and the consequent high emotional buildup, we characteristically jumped in with both feet. We thoroughly hated the tariff and turned upon it the usual outpourings of wrath and ridicule; and went after it with muscle and meat ax. We felt very virtuous as we cut and ripped the tariff wall to pieces.

We moved rapidly in the direction of free trade and sought to liberate world trade in the image of Adam Smith's philosophy of 1775, while at home we ran in the opposite direction as fast as we could to upset the free market, by interfering with nearly all factors of production through public controls and forced inflation of prices and wages. To date we have lowered the average protective effect of our tariff approximately 80 percent. This we did while we were creating high vulnerability by raising cost burdens at home through legislative enactments such as farm price supports, minimum wages, obligatory collective bargaining, etc. Meantime the combined forces of the State Department and the White House virtually nullified the relief measures provided by Congress as remedies against individual cases of severe injury caused by the exposure.

In very recent years, i.e., since the cumulative effect of the Marshall plan made itself felt, the United States has come into a new world economic position. This position differs greatly from both our prewar position and even from the first 10-year postwar period; but the seeds of the change were sown throughout those years.

A world technological transformation has erupted on the scene and the end is not yet. This transformation has far-reaching economic implications for the United States and American industry, agriculture and labor. It would be inaccurate to refer to it as an overseas industrial revolution since it lacked the characteristics of a revolution, industrial or otherwise. Nevertheless the results, as they are bearing in upon us, have much of the impact of a revolution.

What has really happened has been a great technological leap by many foreign countries, especially in Europe and Japan. This leap was fomented, nurtured, financed, or underwritten by the United States. Since 1949 when foreign aid began to function on a grand scale we have shipped, inclusive of commercial exports, $30 billion worth of machinery and equipment to other countries. This represents a vast amount of mechanical installations, equal to more than half of the new machinery added by industry in the United States in the same period.

This crowding into one decade of a technological advancement that otherwise would have required a generation or more plus billions of dollars in research and development for its achievement has shaken and reshaped the world of trade and foreign competition.

No longer is the United States the great technological center of the world nor the sole source of mass-produced goods. We are being challenged by our foster children in nearly all quarters. Just as we once outgrew the tutelage of the mother country, to her everlasting amazement and irreversible loss, so our technological offspring in a number of other countries no longer need us. Thanks to our generosity they can outdo us almost at will, in many instances meeting and easily defeating us on our own home grounds.

How could such a result spring from the well-meaning policies of so strong a nation as the United States? As well ask, how could Rome have fallen? How could England lose her empire and mastery of the seas?

The makings of our present discomfiture have unfolded before our very eyes; but people with their eyes wide open often will not see.

There is no mystery. We have systematically handicapped our production with increasing cost burdens while extending our technology abroad free of much of this burden.

To be sure, our own productivity has also risen; but it has not jumped as it has in many, though not in all, lines in foreign countries. We too have installed much new machinery and equipment; but we merely substituted better machinery for existing machinery in most instances. There was no great leap in productivity. Beyond that we had powerful labor organizations that were ready, willing, and able to call for higher wages in proportion to increased productivity. Foreign labor organizations are behind ours in bargaining capacity for reasons that show little likelihood of an early catch-up.

Thus while we improve our productivity we did not achieve lower prices for reasons that must be very obvious, but not at all limited to high wages and high profits. In other countries the exchange of modern machinery for handicraft production or for a low order of mechanization, in many instances meant a remarkable leap in productivity; and the labor unions did not wrest the gain from the owners in the form of proportionately higher wages. Thus was the competitive position of the foreign producer improved in his contest with American producers.

Of course, this was not all. The machinery that we shipped under foreign aid was subtracted from the tax burden of the receiving countries and added to ours. In the total, including all other taxes, this, however, did not play a heavy role but was part of a pattern. Many other cost burdens that found no counterpart or equal in other countries were heaped on our producers.

Our farm price support program was one. Here the discrepancy became very clear because of the water-edge competition. Our higher domestic prices attracted imports in swiftly rising volume in such cases as potatoes, cheese, and cotton. When imports rolled in, our domestic products were bought up by our Government at support prices and the Treasury stood the loss. In short order we imposed restrictive import quotas. Otherwise our cotton production would have been driven off the map. Even so we have lost heavily in our share of the world cotton market; and we have not recovered despite our sale in foreign markets at world prices in recent years. Our domestic cotton prices are 25 percent above the world price. Our cotton textile manufacturers pay this higher price while our foreign competitors pay the lower world price. This is an odd but little-known fact. Foreign countries then manufacture our cotton and ship back textiles at lower prices than our domestic industry can meet.

We would also have been overwhelmed with wheat from Canada and elsewhere but for the imposition of a highly restrictive import quota. Of this there can be not the least question. Canada alone would have routed us. The same would be true with respect to dairy products. Denmark, France, Holland, Italy, Switzerland, New Zealand, Canada, and perhaps others would have destroyed our dairy industry. It too is price supported. We saved the industry through import quotas.

However, in the case of industrial products the Government has steadfastly adhered to a tariff-cutting program while refusing import quotas, except recently in the case of oil, where the national defense factor won the day. Yet in industrial products we have become no less vulnerable than in agricultural products; in fact more so in recent years because of the foreign technological buildup. The only difference is that the Government is not committed to a price-support policy or a guaranteed price on industrial products as in the case of agricultural products. Nevertheless many of our industrial products suffer from as much incapacity and handicap in competing with imports as do farm products; but "no import quotas" is the cry; and even now a new tariff-cutting conference has been scheduled in Geneva for 1960.

Our obligatory collective bargaining law, minimum wages and time and a half for overtime, paid vacations, old-age benefits, unemployment compensation, etc. have also contributed to increased production costs to a degree not found in most other countries, if any.

These observations and those relating to agriculture are made with no reflection on the merits of the legislation involved. We are concerned with the byproducts.

Atop of these various cost-raising measures fell the costs of World War II and the postwar heavy defense expenditures. Probably more than the others, these war and defense outlays put us on a plateau of prices and costs.

To be sure, ours is a lusty and powerful economy. Possibly it was able to carry the burdens; and possibly it could continue to do so, provided it were maintained in balance and provided we were still the island we were, the center of technology, the invulnerable and incomparable world industrial leader, the one place where the much vaunted know-how of the world was held in monopoly.

This, we must acknowledge, is no longer the case; and this fact puts us in a different world from the accustomed one. We can no longer ignore the changed competitive facts without great peril.

The difference between domestic and foreign costs is so distinct in numerous lines, including the mass-produced items such as automobiles, iron and steel, textiles, etc., that our exports are shrinking while our imports rise. Since the beginning of 1958 our exports have dropped 20 percent. On the other hand, imports have increased in the first quarter of 1959 compared with the first quarter of 1953 by some 6 percent. Also, since the beginning of 1958 we have lost $2.6 billion in gold; i.e., we have been running a deficit in our total foreign account.

Hundreds of American companies are today making preparations to meet this situation. Some are expanding foreign manufacturing facilities; others are arranging for foreign production, either in the form of foreign branch plants, foreign licensees or partly or fully owned subsidiaries, while yet others are making import arrangements for parts to be used in their domestic assembly plants.

These are but the natural symptoms of a deep-seated condition that will not likely yield to an early change. On the domestic side we moved toward high prices, high employment, high consumer purchasing power for years, all buttressed by governmental policy; whereas in the foreign trade field we worked toward free trade, unhampered competition, and a general free market policy, the very opposite of the domestic goal. Then we outfitted the world or at least our most competent competitors technologically.

So have we painted ourselves into a corner.

Our wages and prices are high for obvious reasons. Their inflation is the fruit of national policy, war costs, unparalleled defense outlays and, to a much lesser degree, foreign aid.

High wages, high profits, and high prices, all going hand in hand, have made us vulnerable to import competition and have begun seriously to shrink our foreign markets, for reasons already set forth. Our capital seeks two goals: (1) Automation in the technological field, to keep costs down, and (2) refuge in other countries in order to find cheaper labor.

Automation, in the short run, at least, creates unemployment. It may also reduce the amount of plant expansion that otherwise would be necessary. Thus, with more than half a million new workers coming on the scene each year, unemployment will tend to become chronic, except for possible spurts.

Migration of a part of the export departments of many of our industries overseas will bypass labor, suppliers, and services, and will shrink our exports. In some cases our expatriated capital will turn on its own source and compete right here at home with our domestic producers.

All this drift overseas will not and cannot correct the situation. At home we will push automation to keep costs down, thus shrinking employment without correcting the situation because other countries will also continue to mechanize and the gap will widen. Foreign technology, we must remember, has been catapulted onto a new dimension. In the past 6 years alone we have exported $21 billion of machinery, including foreign aid. This compares with about $40 billion of new manufacturing equipment added by our own industry in this country in the same years. In the past 10 years thousands of productivity teams from abroad have been invited into our factories and shown the very entrails of our technological system; and they have not gone away without notes and images. They now have the means of making greater technological gains than we because they work from a lower base.

Even this is not the whole story. Perhaps the most important of all is the breaching of the psychological barrier against mass markets in Europe. The Europeans, long wedded to a compartmentalized market and relatively small production units, have had a taste of our system and they have bought it. Not that there will not be difficulties with the Common Market and the proposed Free Trade Area. That is to be expected. Disagreements have already erupted; but we must assume and even hope that they will succeed.

Europe and Japan, too, now have the underpinnings of mass production. They are both launched on the mass production plane. They have labor and technological skills equal to ours. Their labor organizations on the other hand are weak; and this fact will assure further competitive advantages from technological advances as they take place.

Before long these countries will be in full cry on our trail, having just recently, as industrial history goes, got our scent. The race is not that of the hare and the tortoise. We ourselves grafted long legs on the slow-moving creature; and we do not now need to loiter or go to sleep in order to be overtaken; for even if we do our dead level best we will learn that we have already squandered much precious time.

There are those who in recent times have recognized the uncomfortable position in which we find ourselves in the matter of international competition; but so irrational has been the condemnation of the tariff, one of the great stirrups of our national ascendancy, that in a chorus these people say "but tariffs are not the answer."

Tariffs or quotas, to be sure, are not the full answer, but I would say that they are the minimum point of departure. It is imperative, if we are to get out of the corner, that we make available the flexible use of the tariff and import quotas as they may be needed as a holding operation. In my judgment we proceed at our own peril if we refuse to recognize the international competitive realities and fail to face them.

Bunion Derby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has been so kind as to send me a copy of an editorial which appeared recently in the Rhinebeck Gazette under the above caption.

It will be of interest to each and every Member of the House and many others, I am sure.

[From the Rhinebeck Gazette, Rhinebeck, N.Y.]

BUNION DERBY

The great, domed, U.S. Capitol—probably the best-known building in the world—rests on a human anthill whose subterranean traffic is rapidly approaching that of New York's Times Square.

To add further to the simile, Capitol Hill also has its subways—one with electric

monorail cars which have been long in use connecting the Capitol with the old Senate Office Building—the other still a hole-in-the-ground that fails by 300 feet (and $4 million) to link the new Senate Office Building with the legislative chambers.

But, for the 436 Representatives, their hundreds of aides, secretaries and clerks, official visitors and the ever-growing volume of folks-from-home, transport to and from the Capitol and the two House office buildings (soon to be three), and over longer distances, is still strictly heel-and-toe. And traffic generated by the House is estimated at 7 to 12 times that of the Senate. Also, its mighty wearing on the solons who aren't as young as they used to be.

The time-honored hiking that can waste as much as 2 hours of a Representative's day is not only extravagant, but the thought of a bunion-bound space-age Congress is more than slightly ludicrous. To surround our solons with elegance, yet provide no transportation is something like buying a suit without pockets.

Stored Grain Not Our Only Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to my remarks in the RECORD on July 7 and 8, I include the third in a series of articles prepared by Mr. Alvin F. Bull, managing editor of Wallace's Farmer, dealing with the farm problem. The article appeared in the July 4, 1959, issue of Wallace's Farmer:

STORED GRAIN NOT OUR ONLY SURPLUS

(By Al Bull)

Suppose, by saying some set of magic words like hocus-pocus, we could cause the mountainous surplus of feed grains to vanish.

This would make a lot of folks happy—for a while. But it wouldn't solve the farm problem.

The same productive capacity that built the surplus would start turning out another one.

The surplus isn't due only to bumper crops like in 1957 and 1958. We've added at least 4 million tons of feed grains to carryover each year since 1952.

This doesn't even include the tremendous stockpile of wheat which is destined for feed use eventually.

The full impact of this excess hasn't been felt because most of it went into CCC storage. It's still there waiting for a chance to come back to market and be turned into livestock.

Let's go back a few years and see what would have happened if we had been feeding up the grain as we went along. In 1953, hog prices averaged $21.40. We added 4.7 million tons of feed grains to the carryover that year. But if that grain had been turned into hogs, slaughter would have increased about 12½ percent.

Each 1 percent increase in hog numbers drops prices by 2 to 3 percent. Using 2 percent, the national average price would have skidded to about $16.

With corn at $1.49 average, few hog men could have made a profit.

In 1956, hogs averaged $14.40. Corn was $1.29. Feeding the 1955 crop carryover to hogs would have dropped prices to about $11.50. Again, no profit for the year for hog men.

Now, what about this year? Feeding the expected carryover from only the 1958 crop would cut prices about in half.

Let's look a little closer at use of feed grains in 1959.

We're feeding about all the hogs we can at a reasonable profit for the average producer.

There's certainly no room for more layers. Egg prices are already low.

Feeding many more cattle would knock profits out of the beef business. Prices are propped up by a shortage of cows and grassfeds for slaughter. Supply of fed beef is actually high.

In short, we're using up nearly a maximum amount of feed grains. And there's still likely to be 11 million tons left over from the 1958 crop. That would make a big start on a new surplus.

The story is much the same for the years just ahead. Projections by agronomists and economists at the Agricultural Adjustment Center at Iowa State University indicate a continued overproduction.

Why do grain stocks keep building up? Not because of increased acreage. We're growing fewer acres of feed grains than in the 1940's. That's still true when soybeans and wheat are included.

But yields continue to climb. And we're using our grains more efficiently in production of meat, milk, and eggs.

Corn yields, for example, are up 50 percent since 1940. During that time population increased 30 percent, but stomachs did not increase in capacity.

Other crops, too, show upward yield trends. Oat yields are up about 12 percent since 1940.

The end is not yet in sight. Fertilizer use can still be expanded. Hybrid sorghums show further promise. Continued but generally slow gains are expected from improved breeding in other grains.

Improved machinery and better management can increase yields through timely operations and lower harvest losses.

On top of this, the big supplies of oil meal from expanded soybean acreage encouraged feeding of protein supplements. This both added to the total feed supply and stretched it by improving the efficiency of feed use.

Broilers provide a spectacular example of increased feed efficiency. In 1940, it took 4.9 pounds of feed to give a pound of gain. Now 3 pounds does the same job. And USDA expects 2.2 pounds of feed to give a pound of gain by 1975.

Similar gains, though not so striking, are expected with other livestock.

Meat type hogs, for example, are more efficient in use of feed. Lardy hogs needed 40 pounds more feed to get market weight in Ohio tests.

Milk production per cow continues to grow faster than papulation. The nation's hens keep setting new records for rate of lay.

Beef production is getting more efficient, too. Stilbestrol alone brought a 12 percent cut in feed needed for fattening a steer.

Production testing to locate fast-gaining, efficient blood lines is gaining favor over the Nation. In years ahead, livestock is sure to use grain more efficiently.

At the same time, feed grain production promises to keep pace with growing population—and probably to grow even faster.

So, in summary, the present surplus is a big worry to all who are concerned with farming. But it's not the only problem we face.

Ability to overproduce, perhaps at an increasing rate, means that time alone is no solution to the farm problem.

The Housing Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the long expected Presidential veto of the omnibus housing bill has caused wails, of anguish from a number of Members of Congress, as they had stated they had submitted a compromised vetoproof bill. This connotation was that of the sponsors, even though it was as unrealistic as could be. There should be no surprise occasioned by the veto. The President clearly stated the serious objections to the vast new spending obligations it contained. The President has also made recommendations for a sound program that will provide jobs, business and good housing for all our citizens. I believe such a program is necessary and will support its enactment in this session.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial from the New York Times dated July 9, 1959, and also a column by Arthur Krock in the same paper that day.

[From the New York Times, July 9, 1959]

THE HOUSING BILL VETO

The congressional managers of the vastly complicated housing bill took a gamble and lost. Far from watering down the bill, as some of the raw dollar figures might have indicated, they actually made it the vehicle for some major innovations. The departures from current law and practice included in the bill would have meant new Federal intervention in sectors of the economy where there has never been intervention before. Most of these innovations were objectionable to the President on philosophical as much as fiscal grounds.

It is doubtful that the President would have vetoed the bill simply because it contained slightly more spending authority for slum clearance than he asked, or even because of its provision reauthorizing the unused portion of the 1949 public housing law. But when Congress threw in completely new programs of Federal loans, subsidy prices for mortgage purchasers and a new device for pumping Federal funds into the private mortgage market, a veto became inevitable. A combination of political good sense and an awareness of the Government's very real fiscal problems should have made the bill's managers more cautious.

The Democrats can still emerge from this fray with a victory of sorts—both for themselves and for the Nation's cities. We share their belief that the President's original proposals for slum clearance and public housing were too small.

There is every prospect that, in the spirit of compromise he has often shown in the past, the President would sign a bill limited to meeting the urgent needs of the present, even if it contained slightly more dollars in the slum-clearance-public-housing sector than he proposed. But he will not sign a bill that make radical changes in our housing laws. If the key men in Congress approach the question in the next few weeks in a spirit of trying to get done what needs to be done, there may yet be a progressive and satisfactory housing bill in this session.

[From the New York Times, July 9, 1959]

CONCERNING WHAT IS MORE THAN HALFWAY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 8.—The vetoed omnibus housing bill, of Democratic origin, was modified by the Senate-House conferees in some respects from the drafts separately approved by the two branches of Congress. But the specific features listed by the President as the reasons for his veto certainly do not sustain the implications of this passage in Senate Majority Leader JOHNSON'S protest of the President's action:

We on this side of the aisle * * * will try to meet those who differ more than halfway.

In its final form the measure was one of those legislative packages which are accurately called "omnibus" because they are common carriers. This package lumped such diversified projects as nursing homes, college housing and classrooms, slum clearance, and scholarships. The public expenditures it authorized tripled those proposed by the administration. They would have lengthened the road to a balanced budget, discouraged private financing by furnishing direct public funds and, by providing for Treasury borrowings for housing in a boom period, fed the forces of inflation. As the President pointed out, "The way the bill is written a few large cities, by making early application, could tie up all the funds available under the urban renewal program." Finally, the measure included provisions which carry out New-Fair Deal economic concepts the President has opposed ever since he campaigned in 1952, and added some new ones.

SHRUNKEN TAPE MEASURE

If a bill with these aspects is an example of Senator JOHNSON'S measurement of "more than halfway" toward the accommodation of fundamentally opposed principles, his legislative tape measure has shrunk badly from the times earlier in this session when he used it for more accurate calculation. But the majority leader, in his criticism of the veto, made another measurement of the President's message which cannot be rejected until it is tested by subsequent events in housing legislation.

"We are told in effect," the majority leader said to his colleagues, "that the program of the executive branch must be accepted without the crossing of a 't' or the dotting of an 'i.' * * * Congress and the country are now confronted with an all-or-nothing attitude (by the President)." This was his estimate of a message which, though it specifically cited 13 of the 50 provisions of the bill as the basis of disapproval, did denounce the complete product as "defective," "excessive," "extravagant and inflationary," and listed 6 definite provisions as "the sound basis" for revised housing legislation.

HE MAKES AN OFFER

But Senator JOHNSON'S impression of an "all-or-nothing" position by the President was immediately challenged by two Republican colleagues, one of whom had voted for the conference report, and the other against it. And this challenge produced a proposal by the majority leader that not only was novel but suggested that JOHNSON is prepared to use a more accurate tape to measure what is "more than half way" to the President's position.

Senator KUCHEL of California, the Republican who opposed the bill as Congress sent it to the President, prophesied "we can go forward now and draft a long-overdue housing bill which will be written into law." Senator JAVITS of New York, who voted for the bill the President vetoed, expressed the belief that "the differences can be compromised [in a new draft adhering strictly] to the facts and merits of a housing program." Very interesting, said the majority leader, and "I appeal to my friend from New York to attempt to ascertain what might be achievable." This put it up to JAVITS to discover how the President and the supporters of the bill he vetoed can reach agreement on what are the "facts and merits" to which the next draft can be "strictly" limited.

Democratic National Chairman Butler's criticism of JOHNSON'S philosophy of leadership will not be allayed by the Texas Senator's expressed willingness to make another try for what is "achievable" by compromise with the President. But at one point in his protest JOHNSON sounded much more like Butler than himself when he predicted that, if an "all-or-nothing" veto "appealed" to one-third of the Senate, this one-third would not "be here next year to be appealed to." That's the way the Chairman talks all the time.

World Refugee Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an excellent editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of Wednesday, July 1, 1959:

WORLD REFUGEE YEAR

Today marks the beginning, for the United States, of the World Refugee Year, an international effort aimed at improving the lot of the more than two-and-a-quarter million souls who are now homeless or rootless owing to war and other catastrophe.

In Western Europe there are some 130,000 such refugees, 30,000 of them still in camps. The most pitiable are the so-called hard-core cases, victims whose age or whose varying disabilities have impaired their chances for permanent settlement. In the Middle East there are a million Palestinian Arab refugees. In the Far East, more than a million refugees from Communist tyranny and aggression, most of them in Hong Kong, but many too in South Korea and Vietnam. To this list must be added a couple of hundred thousand Algerian refugees now in Tunisia and Morocco; and, as the latest unfortunates, refugees in India from Tibet.

The World Refugee Year was established by a U.N. resolution which had the sponsorship of the United States and eight other nations. The year is intended to tie together efforts of the U.N. itself, national governments, private agencies, and individuals in dealing with the problem of refugees, and to dramatize their plight. The problem calls for differing answers: more liberal immigration policies, instruction in employable skills, economic development of host countries, increased aid in food and clothing, and, in the overall, plenty of money.

Much has been done to settle refugees since World War II. West Germany itself has absorbed some 12 million refugees into its economic and political life. But the problem is global; and it did not by any means end with World War II, no more than did totalitarian aggression.

"This is a year," President Eisenhower recently told a group of distinguished Americans who conferred in preparation for the World Refugee Year, "to focus the concern and the ingenuity—and the generosity—of the world on the continuing problem of refugees. Perhaps, with such a mobilization of effort * * * it may even be possible to resolve some particular refugee problem. This would be a great step forward, and we can all hope for such progress. In any event we must further our efforts to create lasting international understanding of and concern for this problem, which I fear will be with us for a long, long time."

Freedom of Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the vital problem of freedom of space has been ably analyzed by the distinguished international lawyer, Chester Ward, in the following article found in the July 1959, issue of Navy magazine:

FREEDOM OF SPACE

(By Rear Adm. Chester Ward, USN, Judge Advocate General of the Navy)

Space is much like the sea. Just as a tiny island is surrounded by the vast reaches of the Pacific Ocean, so does cosmic space surround our tense and troubled world. The scale of space and its dimensions are infinitely greater, but the analogy remains sufficiently close to have deep significance from a legal viewpoint. From a strategic standpoint also space is much like the sea, in that it has its own unique military significance. As explained by Lt. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, U.S. Air Force, Commander of the Air Research and Development Command.

"Space * * * is a medium in which many military missions can be accomplished more effectively than in any other. * * * When viewed as a medium, in which freedom to operate will have decisive military significance, space assumes critical proportions. This fact becomes doubly important to national security—indeed even to national survival, when we relate to this medium the military role of present and future space vehicles."

Centuries of experience of seapower, and the mature law of the sea, are the major realistic guides we have in entering the age of space vehicles and in developing the law of space. Applying the legal technique of reasoning by analogy, we can project the wisdom and experience of the law of the sea into the law of space.

Freedom of the seas is a rule of the law of nations. For two centuries the United States has supported this rule of freedom. It has been good for us and good for the whole world.

Let's look at the record of the past to see what this rule of freedom of the seas has meant to us. Then let's look ahead to see what a similar rule of freedom of space can mean to us in the future. National extinction may be the penalty for failure to develop and to understand space power the way we have developed and understand seapower.

Freedom of the seas has fostered international commerce, friendship, understanding and prosperity. It supplied the legal support for worldwide deployment of British seapower to build and maintain the pax Britannia—longest period of peace since the fall of the Roman Empire.

In the cold war of Communist aggression the doctrine of freedom of the seas has become critical to the preservation of peace without appeasement. It helps to assure the survival of the United States, of our people, of our free Government, and of our allies of the free world. We have staked our survival on collective security.

The strength of our collective security depends largely on the effectiveness of U.S. seapower in binding together the nations of the free world. The effectiveness of our seapower depends in turn upon its mobility and deployability. Adm. Arleigh Burke links together the three key words: "Seapower, mobility, and freedom." Explaining this relationship, he says:

"Naval forces are more important in the missile age than ever before. Mobility is a primary capability of navies. Support of our free world allies depends upon the ability of the Navy to move, unhampered, to wherever it is needed to support American foreign policy. This is the great contribution of U.S. seapower toward the progress of free civilization."

The rule of international law recognizing freedom of the seas is vital to the mobility of our seapower and to the ability of our Navy to move unhampered throughout the world.

Like most good things, like our other freedoms, we are inclined to take freedom of the seas for granted. We assume that it will be always with us—without any effort on our part—without cost or sacrifice or even intelligent interest. Like our other freedoms, however, freedom of the seas is in danger.

As they do with our other freedoms, Communist aggressors seek to whittle down its scope and effectiveness. The threat to this freedom is not merely theoretical—it is actual and imminent. Last year at Geneva the United Nations held a Conference of Plenipotentiaries of 86 nations of the world to codify the law of the sea. At this conference nations led by the Communist bloc attempted to restrict the freedom of the seas in three different ways. Each one of these restrictions would advantage the Communist colonial empire and disadvantage the United States and the free world.

How is it possible for the same rule of law restricting the freedom of the seas or freedom of space imposed by international law or established by international agreement, to advantage the Communists and disadvantage the free world?

The answer lies in the magnitude of the land mass dominated and enslaved by communism, plus their gigantic force of conventional land-based military power. Their 13,385,368 square miles of land mass threatens to swallow our mere 3,082,809 square miles. That vast disproportion in their favor gives them many strategic advantages. All of their communications and logistic supply lines are internal, and do not depend upon freedom of the seas in peace or control of the seas in war. Their advantage in land mass in which to disperse ballistic missile launching sites could become decisive if we do not adequately pursue our counterbalancing advantage of superior sea-based missile power. They can and have, however, dispersed both their industry and their population much more effectively than we ever can. They have vast land areas in which to test missiles and nuclear and hydrogen warheads.

To offset these strategic advantages the United States has relied on freedom of the seas in peace and control of the seas in war. In the future we may have to rely equally upon freedom of space to assure our own survival in freedom.

The three restrictions on freedom of the seas the Russians sought to impose on us at Geneva were: (1) To expand national sovereignty over the high seas from the traditional 3-mile limit out to 12 miles; (2) to deny the use of space over the ocean for the testing of nuclear devices; and (3) to restrict the high seas as areas for military maneuvers. All three propositions sound—at first—harmless and fair. But look at them more closely. The apparently slight extension of national sovereignty from 3 to 12 miles along the 280,000 miles of coastlines of the world would remove 3 million square miles from the high seas where freedom has heretofore prevailed. Furthermore, these particular 3 million square miles would be critical in many strategic areas of the world. Many international rights would be wiped out completely and large areas of high seas squeezed into national lakes. Russia has the longest coastline in the world and would gain most geographically as well as strategically. The restrictions would hamper the movement of free world seapower which Admiral Burke holds so essential to bind together the oceanic coalition of countries upon which our collective security depends.

Not only the mission but the constituency of Russian seapower would be advantaged, since their approximately 500 submarines would be given a potential haven 12 miles wide stretching the hundreds of thousands of miles of the coastlines of the world. Our surface and surface airpower could not hunt and kill Communist subs in these super "covered ways" (as Winston Churchill called even the 3-mile limit neutral havens) without violating the sovereignty of neutral nations. We obey international law.

The second Communist attempted restriction is fairly transparent. Because we are a have-not country as to land areas in which to test nuclear weapons, we have had to resort to ocean areas for some of our major tests. The Russians, of course, can test behind the privacy of their own curtain in the vast land areas which they dominate.

The third attempted Russian restriction—that of limiting naval maneuvers on the high seas—presents one of the most immediate analogies to our space problems. After our President and our Congress had both officially issued declarations and resolutions expressing our desire that outer space be reserved for peaceful uses, and after our delegation in the United Nations had proposed and strongly promoted United Nations action, not only for the peaceful use of outer space but also for international cooperation in peaceful uses to benefit all mankind, then the Russians came along with a proposal in the United Nations that the use of outer space be restricted to nonmilitary purposes. To understand the true significance of this, let's look at what could have happened, if ever since the end of World War II, freedom of the seas had been abolished and use of the high seas had been restricted to nonmilitary purposes under an international agreement similar to the one presently proposed for space. Under traditional international law—as shown in the accompanying illustration [not printed in RECORD]—the right of naval forces to concentrate in international waters is unquestioned. The presence of the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean has been an important factor in U.S. and U.N. efforts to preserve the peace during the various crises in that area, especially in Lebanon last summer. In each case the forces of aggression were held back. In the Pacific, the 7th Fleet has done the same.

Now it sounds very peaceful to propose to restrict the use of the high seas to nonmilitary purposes, but without the 6th and 7th Fleets, peace could not have been so effectively stabilized over the past 14 years. Time after time since World War II, incipient small wars could have spread into world wars, or else small strategic nations would have been forced into virtual surrender by the overwhelming land mass power of the Communist colonial empire.

Thus the seapower of the United States—although representing tremendous and effective military power—is a great force for peace without surrender or slavery; and is a powerful deterrent to war and aggression. But an international agreement restricting the high seas to nonmilitary uses would have paralyzed its power for good.

Just as it is necessary to make nonaggressive military use of the high seas, under the doctrine of freedom of the seas, to preserve the peace and to insure the survival of the free world, it may and very probably will be necessary to make such use of freedom of space until the Communists give up their continuously asserted objective of world conquest and world communism, or certainly until the Soviet Union displays a sincere interest in promoting the bona fide peaceful use of space.

Both the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States have long ago officially enunciated their deepest desires and determinations that outer space be preserved for peaceful purposes.

Exclusively peaceful uses cannot be assured prior to meaningful and enforceable disarmament agreements. Meanwhile, the United States can, will, and is advancing the United Nations program for international cooperation and international programs in the peaceful use of space. But, to deter war and to secure national survival of the United States, we cannot foreclose ourselves against reliance on the new resources of space to strengthen our deterrent posture and thus preserve both peace and freedom.

To take just one outstanding example, Lieutenant General Schriever, referred to above, in his recent testimony before the Subcommittee on Governmental Organization for space activities of the Senate Committee on Astronautical and Space Sciences, discussed the possibility of the "massive, annihilating, sneak attack" and pointed out that with the advent of multimegaton space weapons, the advantage of striking the first blow will be so great that "not merely security but national survival too might well be at stake." Then, making his point that in the face of this threat, "the opportunities of maintaining and strengthening our deterrent posture lie principally in the space vehicles," General Schriever explained:

"The roles of the reconnaissance satellite and of the warning satellite, strangely enough, are not often identified with our deterrent posture. Yet it is obvious that, with ballistic missiles traveling 5,000 miles in approximately 30 minutes, the value of intelligence and of early warning of missile launchings has assumed unprecedented importance. Satellites will provide us a manifold means of extending our present military capabilities in these areas. Security does not permit detailed discussion of these programs. It is clear, however, that if warning of Soviet missile launchings exceeded in minutes the reaction time of our own missiles, they would be strongly deterred from initiating such an attack. Satellite warning system makes this possible. It should also be pointed out that these surveillance systems are passive in nature and will be powerful servants of world peace and security.

"Ballistic missiles, reconnaissance and warning satellites are by no means the only space systems now under development. There are others which will also more effectively perform military missions. To name a few—there are the communications, the weather, the navigation and the mapping and charting satellites. These will perform important military functions for all three services. They will also have important nonmilitary applications."

Thus, we should all realize that like freedom of the seas, freedom of space is vital to U.S. survival. If, to preserve the peace, to secure the necessary warning against a massive surprise attack, and to save the lives of scores of millions of Americans, it turns out to be necessary to set up in space a system of early warning statellites, then the United States should be free to do so. National self-preservation is the first principle of international law.

Unsafeguarded international agreements restricting the use of space might well fore-

close us from taking steps necessary to preserve our national existence. Nor can we afford to forget the double danger that in addition to the risks of terms in any agreement which would advantage the Communists and disadvantage us, we are bound by international agreements, whereas the Communists historically violate their obligations under such agreements.

In this connection we must keep constantly in mind the warning stated by the President of the United States in his most recent state of the Union message to Congress:

"We cannot build peace through desire alone. Moreover, we have learned the bitter lesson that international agreements, historically considered by us as sacred, are regarded in Communist doctrine and in practice to be mere scraps of paper. The most recent proof of their disdain of international obligations, solemnly undertaken, is their announced intention to abandon their responsibilities respecting Berlin.

"As a consequence, we can have no confidence in any treaty to which Communists are a party except where such a treaty provides within itself for self-enforcing mechanisms. Indeed, the demonstrated disregard of the Communists of their own pledges is one of the greatest obstacles to success in substituting the rule of law for rule by force."

Space is free now—the way the high seas are free. Practically no two legal theorists on the law of outer space agree as to just where national sovereignty in air space ends and outer space begins. Some theories range from 10 miles out to 30 miles out to 1,000 miles out. Other theories are based on velocity and orbit of space vehicles or termination of the drop hazard. But wherever it begins, the consensus of authority is that space is free. One very good reason for this is that thus far no one has devised an effective method for making cosmic space unfree.

Space is free now: let's support this essential freedom—which may mean national survival in the future—the way we have and will support freedom of the seas.

Italian Descendants Fight the Smear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Titusville Herald of Titusville, Pa.:

ITALIAN DESCENDANTS FIGHT THE SMEAR

Some law-enforcement agents and other Government officials who are careless with their words would have us believe that crime in this country is run by the maffia. Because the original maffia existed in Italy, this assertion, for which so little proof appears to exist, is a smear on all Americans of Italian descent.

This is resented, and justifiably so, by the Order Italian Sons and Daughters of America. They have taken up the challenge tossed to them by Harry Golden, famous Carolina editor, in his best-seller, "Only in America." Wrote Mr. Golden:

"In crime books and in radio and TV dramas the Italian has become almost a stereotype for the gangster and mobster. This, of course, is not only unfair, but untrue. Yet what makes it remarkable is that the Italians do nothing about it."

The Order Italian Sons and Daughters of America has come forward with a course of action which asks the President and other top officials to stamp out relentlessly any nationwide organization of criminals of Italian origin, if they find that such exists. If none is found, the order wants an official statement to that effect. It also asks that full civil rights protection be given to all Americans of Italian origin; that newspapers, radio and television stations observe the same code for Americans of Italian origin in news stories relating to crime as they do to other minority groups; and that all law abiding loyal Americans of Italian origin support this program.

These are reasonable requests, and the Herald strongly urges their fulfillment.

Send Me a Letter—Send It by Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 23, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Newsweek magazine, page 22, for July 13, 1959:

THE MAIL MUST GO THROUGH, BUT CAN IT PLOW THROUGH THIS OBSOLESCENCE?

Early on the morning of June 20, 1860, a bronzed, muscular youth strode out of the post office at St. Joseph, Mo., with a leather mail pouch, swung into the saddle, and set off westward at a full gallop. Riding hard, stopping only to change horses, the youth covered 75 miles before he passed the mail pouch to a fresh horseman. Riders changed, horses changed; but the new Pony Express moved steadily on, day and night, across the Great Plains, out through the Indian country, over the Rockies, through the desert, and across the High Sierras. On June 28, a rider brought the dusty pouch from St. Joe into Sacramento, Calif.—almost 2,000 miles away. The U.S. mails had traveled across the West at an average speed of better than 10 miles per hour—a record that was to stand until the Union Pacific drove a golden spike at Promontory, Utah, and spanned the continent with a railroad.

Today, in an age of supersonic aircraft and the instantaneous transmission of messages from outer space, the U.S. mail often travels no faster than it did on the Pony Express more than 99 years ago.

It can still take 8 days for first-class mail to go from St. Joseph, Mo., to Sacramento. Slow mail is a problem that jumps geographical borders, crosses party lines, ignores social distinctions, and hits every literate citizen in the Nation.

The Post Office Committee of the U.S. Senate recently ran a series of tests to find out just how bad the service is—and found it took 2 days for a letter to cover the 370 miles between Bristol, Va., and Washington, D.C. (average speed: 8 miles per hour), and it took almost 6 days for one to cover the 3,000 miles between Forest Grove, Ore., and Washington (average speed: 23 miles per hour).

The Senators on the committee thought the test mailings were bad enough, but some of their personal experiences were worse. During the congressional debate over Hawaiian statehood, a group of Hawaiians sent Washington's Democratic Senator HENRY JACKSON an air shipment of 5,000 letters endorsing his support of the bill. JACKSON received the shipment 15 days after they were mailed and 5 days after he had successfully maneuvered the bill through the Senate. The committee chairman himself, South Carolina's Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, recently received an invitation to attend the opening of a new pier near Charleston—7 months after the letter was mailed.

Is the U.S. mail service all that bad? The answer, in a word, is "No."

Without any question the great bulk of the Nation's first-class mail is processed and delivered in 1, 2, or 3 days. A continuing series of nationwide tests conducted by Newsweek since January shows that about three out of four first-class letters will arrive on time. A broad rule of thumb is that a first-class letter will be delivered in 1 day, plus 1 day for every 500 miles it has to go. But the Newsweek survey turned up scores of exceptions. Among them:

New York, Times Square–New York, Fifth Avenue (two blocks), 3 days.

Los Angeles-New York (2,450 miles), 8 days.

New York–Detroit (628 miles), 3 days.

Palo Alto, Calif.–San Francisco (31 miles, 4 days.

Columbus, Ohio–Washington, D.C. (392 miles), 4 days.

Portland, Oreg.–New York (2,990 miles), 5 days.

San Diego, Calif.–Lemon Grove, Calif. (10 miles), 4 days.

Atlanta–Denver (1,440 miles), 5 days.

Such exceptions—frequent, inexplicable, and inexcusable—are bad enough, but there are any number of experts in and out of the post office who worry that the American postal system may get worse. For the U.S. mail is growing faster than human hands and existing machines can handle it.

Considering the built-in handicaps, the wonder is not that delivery of a letter may take 3 or 4 days, but that delivery is made at all. The truth is that Arthur Summerfield, the 58th U.S. Postmaster General, must operate one of the world's biggest businesses with hand tools and hand labor; many post-office methods stand untouched from the day when Benjamin Franklin was sworn in as the 1st Postmaster General in 1775.

Since then, the U.S. Post Office has expanded into colossal proportions, and become a catchall for all kinds of stray Federal activities. It registers aliens, takes the deer and grouse census, and provides flags for funerals of old soldiers. It is banker ($5 billion annually in money orders alone), detective agency (50,000 investigations of mail burglary and theft last year) and seamstress (8 million mail bags sewed up in 1958).

For its main business, carrying the mail, the Post Office covers millions of miles of highway, railroad, air, and water routes—from the Arctic almost to the Equator. It operates helicopters, and has tried, at considerable expense, mail-by-missile. But it still operates 103 horseback routes, too (e.g., from Sumerco to Sod, W. Va.), 7 foot routes (e.g., from Pippa Passes to Mallie, Ky.), and 1 dogsled route, on St. Lawrence Island in the Bering Sea. All in all, the Post Office employs 538,000 postmen; spends $3.5 billion yearly; and carries two-thirds of all the mail in the entire world.

The Post Office's job is herculean; its methods, however, are incredibly old fashioned. For 150 years, while private industry put itself through the industrial revolution, turned machinery to the tasks of drudgery, and made or moved its products better, faster, and cheaper, the U.S. Post Office looked firmly the other way. Now the whole system is nearing its inevitable crisis. The volume of mail has jumped in 20 years from 26 billion pieces to 61 billion pieces. In the next 15 years, it will double today's total.

VOTES

Part of the Post Office's problem lies in the political nature of the system. Local post-

masters are appointed not to deliver mail, but to deliver votes. Almost every new administration in Washington appoints its party chairman as Postmaster General. There is little incentive to replace postal clerks, who can vote, with machines, which can't vote.

"The idea has been that if you have a mass of bodies you can smother the mail, and get it delivered by the sheer weight of numbers," says Maurice B. Feimster, who has seen nine postmasters come and go during his 40 years at postal headquarters.

Neither the politicians, who sit in for a few years at a time, nor the bureaucrats, who actually run the Department really wanted a change, especially after the depression began. Then, instead of cutting personnel and stepping up efficiency, the Post Office launched makework projects—opened new mail routes, built new post offices.[1]

At the end of World War II, the Post Office found itself in deepening trouble. A flood of new cars and the switch to air travel altered national transportation patterns, forcing the railroads to drop 7,800 of the 10,000 trains the Post Office had relied on to carry the mail. The mass movement to the suburbs placed heavy new demands on mail-delivery systems geared to cities. And the letters piled higher and higher. Postmen could no longer smother the mail; now the mail was smothering the postmen.

DO SOMETHING

How did the Post Office react? In the spring of 1945 its representatives asked a House Appropriations Committee for money to buy 1,500 stamp-vending machines. Sitting around the table later, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the committee, warned them: "You had better do something about research and modernization before it's too late."

Three years later, the Hoover Commission on Governmental Reorganization emphatically urged the Post Office to get a move on for its recommendations. And in 1949, Congress appropriated $150,000 to help the Post Office figure out where to begin; and Jesse M. Donaldson, first career postman to serve as Postmaster General, set up a five-man engineering staff. But as it turned out, service actually deteriorated during Donaldson's regime. He cut residential deliveries from two a day to one a day in April 1950, and he later began cutting business deliveries.

After the GOP won the White House in 1952, President-elect Eisenhower handed Arthur E. Summerfield, his campaign manager and Postmaster General-designate, a three-part directive which instructed him to: Improve service, cut deficits, and raise morale.

FIRST PRIORITY

To Summerfield, the No. 1 directive was "cut deficits." And he did make a great show of doing this. He closed down some small and inefficient post offices, and he abolished many backwoods mail routes. During his first 3 years in office, he was able to return $250 million of his appropriations to the Treasury. (He had to get part of the money back from Congress, later.)

Mostly, though, Summerfield attempted to cut deficits by increasing revenues. Year after year, he asked Congress to boost rates—on first-class mail, on airmail, on second-class mail (magazines and newspapers), on third-class mail (advertising circulars).

Since the earliest days of the Republic, since 1789, in fact, when George Washington complained about the first post-office deficit, Congress, which holds the constitutional authority over the post office, has insisted that the post office is not primarily a business—but a public service. In 1799, Congress formally ruled that postal expenses were a legitimate cost of government. Again and again—from 1845 to 1958—Congress consistently spelled out the same message: Never mind the deficit, give the people service.

UP, UP, UP

Summerfield steadfastly refused to accept this philosophy. And, finally, in 1958, Summerfield won out. Congress raised the rates on second-class and third-class mail; it boosted first-class mail to 4 cents and airmail to 7 cents. Summerfield still wasn't satisfied. He is now asking for a 5-cent rate for first-class mail.

When it came to improving the service, however, Summerfield followed the policy of making haste slowly. He painted the mailboxes red, white, and blue; put ballpoint pens in the post offices, and decentralized operations to give 15 district postmasters the power to make routine decisions—but, at the same time, he cut down further on business deliveries.

And yet, the post office was so backward until Summerfield came along, that, even though he made haste slowly, Summerfield has done more to modernize it than any of his predecessors. Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, who heads the Senate Post Office Committee, concedes that the system now is at least "moving in the right direction."

All of the post office's present mechanical innovations, and some still under development, will be installed in a $20 million super-post office now being built in Providence, R.I. When this new post office goes into operation next year, mail will come in by helicopter and truck, move—untouched by human hands—into the building on conveyors, and be culled, faced, stacked, canceled, and sorted into bundles—all in a few minutes. The Providence post office is part of present plans to build 12,000 new post offices and distribution centers over the next 5 years.

CONFORM OR PAY

In the post office, as in industry, automation is sure to bring changes. Postal clerks will have to be upgraded, and paid more money. And mail must be, to some extent, standardized. The automation engineers are already insisting that everybody use the same, long legal-size envelope for letters. What they hope to do eventually is eliminate present classes of mail. All standard envelopes would be charged the same rate and sent, air or rail, whichever was faster. Everything else would be charged a higher rate. But Congress will have plenty to say about that.

When Postmaster General Summerfield leaves in 1961, mechanization and modernization will have gained a foothold in the U.S. postal system. What happens after that is problematical, for the Post Office remains a political structure and the cost of modernization will be enormous, well into the billions.

Is it worth it? Representative MURRAY, House Post Office chairman, thinks not. "The public doesn't really expect fast service," MURRAY said recently. "If it did, the people would be willing to pay more money for it. If you or I want to get a message across in a hurry, we reach for the phone or send a wire."

So long as mail continues to be delayed, and it will be, recent efforts and expenditures may seem wasted. But Summerfield has at least roused the system and taken steps to get it moving. F. L. Elmendorf, president of Robert Heller & Associates, Cleveland management consultants who have been working with the Post Office for a decade, believes that Summerfield's biggest accomplishment has been to put down a solid foundation for future progress.

THE ONLY HOPE AUTOMATION

Mechanization and automation offer the only real hope for improvement in the U.S. mail service. At present, the Post Office's use of hand labor is staggering: Every single letter, postcard, package, or whatever—61 billion pieces yearly—must be picked up, read, and put somewhere an average of 12 times. To eliminate hand labor, the Post Office has installed conveyor-belt systems in Washington and six other big-city post offices. Now mail is stacked in baskets, placed on the conveyor belt with a guide card, and an electronic eye trips a robot-like arm that pushes each basket off in exactly the right place. The Post Office is also experimenting with many other ingenious, laborsaving devices. Among them:

Transorma: This Dutch-built mail sorter was on display at the World's Fair in New York in 1939, but not until 1955 did the United States decide to try one out. With the one Transorma now being tested (in Silver Spring, Md.), 5 operators can sit at keyboards and sort 15,000 letters an hour against 7,500 an hour by hand.

The Bell: Designed and built in Belgium by a subsidiary of International Telephone & Telegraph Co., the Bell went into operation in the Antwerp post office more than 5 years ago. Early last year, one was set up in the main Washington post office. The result, this machine also enables post office workers to sort twice as fast as they could by hand.

The Boxer: Still under development, the Boxer will be the first American-made mail sorter. A joint project of Rabinow Engineering Co. (a Post Office consultant), Burroughs Corp., and Pitney-Bowes, Inc., the Boxer will come in several sizes, for large and medium post offices. The biggest model will have 12 keyboards, and will be able to sort up to 36,000 letters an hour, to 300 cities.

The Greller: This is the post office's first semiautomatic parcel post sorter, now in operation in Baltimore. As each package moves by on a conveyor belt, an operator punches a keyboard, and a memory unit follows the package and pushes it off into any one of 21 package chutes. A similar package sorter, the Webb, has been installed in the main post office in Washington.

The Eye: Intelligent Machines Research Corp., of Alexandria, Va., has built an electronic scanner that can actually read typewritten addresses. The Eye may be the big breakthrough in the post office's sorting problem. A pilot model of the Eye can read 18 destinations and drop each letter in the proper slot. Future models of the Eye may take over all mail sorting in major terminals.

At every step in its progress, however, the post office must still contend with human error. When Detroit's postmaster proudly announced the opening of a new, semiautomated mail conveyor system in late 1956, scores of public officials turned up for the unveiling. With public attention focused on the new "Mail-Flo System" that would speed handling of Detroit's main mail terminal, little had been said about the fact that some of Wayne County's tax bills were at that moment lost in the mails. But on the big opening day, as the shiny new conveyor system hummed along reassuringly, an alert Detroit Free Press reporter spotted the missing tax bills, collecting dust in a corner of the building. A postal clerk had evidently dumped the bills there and forgotten about them.

[1] In one hasty project, a Pittsburgh post office was built without a single letter drop in it.

Statement Commemorating the Opening of World Refugee Year by the Right Reverend Monsignor William F. Kelly, S.T.D., Director, Diocesan Resettlement Council, Diocese of Brooklyn, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted by unanimous consent of the House I am pleased to include with these remarks the following learned statement commemorating the opening of World Refugee Year made recently by the Right Reverend Monsignor William F. Kelly, S.T.D., director, Diocesan Resettlement Council, diocese of Brooklyn, N.Y.:

During the 1957 International Migration Congress held in Assisi, the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward E. Swanstrom, executive director of the Catholic Relief Services (NCWC), suggested there be an international population year to direct worldwide attention to the acute problems of peoples who were refugee, displaced or surplus.

A group of British Parliamentarians made a proposal limiting it to refugees. Subsequently, on June 5, 1958, the General Assembly of the U.N., with only the Communist nations opposing, adopted the United Kingdom resolution for World Refugee Year, June 1959–June 1960.

President Eisenhower issued a proclamation from the White House on May 19, 1959, inviting all citizens to support accredited programs developed to assist refugees during World Refugee Year. Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER and Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY have introduced identical measures to implement U.S. action in this matter.

Pope John XXIII, on June 28, 1959, broadcast a worldwide appeal particularly asking Catholics to aid their unfortunate brothers uprooted by war or political changes. The Pope called upon world governments to throw open their frontiers ever more generously and speedily to bring about the human and social resettlement of so many unfortunate people.

The word refugee accurately pinpoints the temporal conditions of men and nations, of freedom and things human. It would seem to be a litmus test whether society is built for man or man for society.

The word "refugee" apparently entered the English language through the French from the Latin. Originally it appears to have been one who sought shelter or protection, thus refuge, from danger, for which reason he fled. Hence a refugee is ordinarily one who flees persecution, or who feels compelled to flee because of fear of persecution, on account of race, religion, or other human circumstance. In our days it is usually limited to political refugees, in sharp contradistinction to economic refugees (those who flee to improve the opportunities for their economic livelihood).

Refugees, unfortunately, cross the pages of history as far back as it is recorded. It is sometimes difficult in history to distinguish refugee movements from simple migration movements. It is generally accepted that the refugee, as David or Coriolanus, as Einstein or Sturzo, is dependent upon the mercy of those who receive him. The early pilgrims, for the most part, are properly classified as refugees as were also the Quakers who settled in Pennsylvania. It was left to our modern era, however, for the first time to witness this phenomenon on a worldwide scale. It is in the historic political tradition of the West to offer political asylum. Americans, alive to their history, will recall their own glorious tradition, an apt expression of which is found in Emma Lazarus' immortal inscription on the base of the Statue of Liberty.

Christians, as their spiritual forbears the Jews (who were a nation of refugees), have an especial openness of heart to refugees. As a people we began with our infant Christ, in exile with His virgin mother and foster father, fleeing the wrath of Herod. The Holy family, as Christian refugees, found refuge in pagan Egypt where peace and bread through work was made available to them. In this matter, Pope John recently declared that "The lot of those who live in exile far away from their homelands has always evoked in a very special manner the motherly solicitude of the Catholic Church, which could not forget the words of Christ, its divine founder, 'I was a stranger and you took me in; naked and you covered me; * * * in prison, and you came to me'."

Where are the refugees? The worldwide range of refugees includes, among others, Tibetans in India, Indonesias in Saigon, Chinese in Macao. Then there are Palestinians in Transjordan, Pakistan, and Tunisians of Italian ancestry in addition to many other groups. Finally, there are the multitudes of east Europeans who have fled beyond the Iron Curtain.

In this total picture of refugees, it will be seen that they come from the diverse nations and languages, cultures and religions of the earth and are scattered in vast numbers across the hemispheres. For one should recognize that beyond the frontiers of communism, there is also, in large sections of the Western World, as Dawson notes, a movement in revolution. This results in a vast uprooting and dispossession of enormous numbers of people whose courage and fidelity, in many instances, move them from home into an unknown land and a dark future.

Why is this World Refugee Year? Unfortunately, what is out of sight is often also out of mind. The utterly miserable conditions of fellow humans who suffer because of their convictions or because of their race or religion or being out of step with tryannous regimes, affronts the human spirit. If an ancient Carthaginian born Latinist, Terence of Rome, could properly declare that "nothing human is foreign to me," one may reasonably ask how can any informed person remain complacent today unless he abdicates his conscience.

Unfortunately, very few Americans have actually witnessed the conditions of life in a DP camp, or have actually worked with refugees. It is understandable that, being unaware of the plight of their fellow humans, so many seem indifferent. It is a tragedy that many people are unmoved by worldwide poverty, hunger, and distress.

The purpose of the World Refugee Year is to awaken interest in all people through widespread accounts of refugee problems which, actually, are the problems of all. What is often the problem of all becomes the problem of none. Hence the voluntary agencies of the land, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, are undertaking an extensive campaign in this matter.

The World Council of Churches stated in a recent message that "We are convinced that in our day and generation our greatest human tragedy is that of the refugee—homeless people all around the world. The refugee and his family have, for more than a decade, been a challenge to our confession and compassion, and must be a first call on the ministry of those whose Lord had nowhere to lay His head."

What can be done for refugees? The worldwide refugee problem is an international problem that requires an international solution. The United States, as a member of the family of nations, in addition to making funds available to help alleviate the conditions of misery, will be expected to admit a token number, its fair share, of the small number of refugees that have to be resettled. The vastly larger number of refugees will be indefinitely resettled in or near areas where they are now located.

The refugee question is part of the larger question of contemporary demographic problems. The world population is expanding at a faster rate in the underdeveloped than in the industrial areas. If this continues without positive correlative increase at a more rapid rate in the production of food and fiber, of goods and services, it is already apparent that there impends the danger of widening and intensifying world poverty and misery. National security as much as Christian principle urge Americans and other well-off nations to attend to the demands of social justice as well as the needs of human misery. We must learn that we cannot hope to survive unless we learn to share.

It is too often ignored by us Americans that, in the words of a good friend, Premier Ali Khan of Pakistan, we live on a fabulously prosperous island in a vast sea of misery in which hundreds of millons of people are trying to keep their heads above water. Through the bounty and mercy of God, and the industry and ingenuity of our citizenry, we in the United States are singularly blessed and therefore heavily obligated. As is well known, our annual per capita income is above $2,000, while for two-thirds of humanity it is $100 or less. It is said that America's increasing wealth is such that the average American is happily able to save more in a year than the average person elsewhere unhappily earns in a year.

What can be done to help resolve or at least alleviate refugee problems? Governments, we are informed, should make additional financial contributions toward the permanent solution of refugee problems; they should also make reasonable relaxations of their immigration regulations to make possible admission into their lands their fair share of the smaller numbers of refugees who have to be resettled elsewhere; and they should also include provision to care for some of the sick and aged.

What can the individual do? He should encourage his government to pursue indicated policies; he should help individuals such as Father Pire, O.P., and others who are helping to establish the refugees where they are now located; he should help the voluntary agency of his choice, such as the Catholic Relief Services (NCWC) and the Diocesan Resettlement Council, or other appropriate agency in his own area; if possible, he should seek to learn at first hand from one of the locally resettled refugees some of the harsh realities confronting refugees; he should promote discussions, conferences, and other suitable means to achieve the aims of the World Refugee Year, contribute to support their programs, and, finally, pray to the Holy Family in Exile for the restoration of all things in Christ and thus bring to an end the need for refugees.

Not a few observers expect world conditions may yet become worse, that we shall be called to assume heavier burdens. Though the challenge is formidable, there is also great hope and great opportunity. Christopher Dawson reminds us how effective was the early preaching of the Gospel in the cosmopolitan centers such as Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome, where numerous uprooted, denationalized people huddled with great spiritual hunger. We today witness ominous movements of people, with many flocking into urban areas, such as Calcutta, Hong Kong, and Tokyo. From these centers

will emerge, in God's own time, new apostles of Christ.

This is the time for planting; the harvest will come later. Christian aid to the uprooted refugees across the world will surely open the door of Christian vision to them, of Christ and the dignity of man in freedom, eventually to the triumph of Christian ideal and principle.

Pope John XXIII invokes from his heart the protection and special favor of the almighty and merciful God upon all those individuals and groups who hasten the fulfillment by participating in any way—as we ourselves will do according to our means—in the success of the World Refugee Year.

Bastrop County (Tex.) Has Great Industrial Potential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 16, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Weldon D. Mays, president of the Smithville, Tex., Chamber of Commerce, has sent me an excellent article published in the May 7, 1959, issue of the Smithville Times describing the great potential of Bastrop County. The article refers to a discussion of the resources existing in central Texas, in which Bastrop County is located, by Mr. E. M. King, past president of the Colorado River Industrial Development Association. Mr. King calls attention to the great opportunity to develop and use the resources for the benefit of all the people living within that area.

The article is as follows:

BASTROP COUNTY HAS GREAT INDUSTRIAL POTENTIAL.—E. M. KING CITES DAM POSSIBILITIES

Exciting possibilities, just short of astounding many people, exist in central Texas of which Bastrop County is the main focal point. This has been revealed in a somewhat recent civil engineering survey of Bastrop County in particular, and few counties in Texas surpass central Texas' natural resource potential, according to E. M. King, past president of the Colorado River Industrial Development Association, often referred to as CRIDA.

"Many undeveloped resources," continued Mr. King, "are to be found all through central Texas. These rich industrial resources are such as water, mineral deposits, electrical power production, cheap fuel such as lignite, together with flood control, irrigation, fish and wildlife conservation.

"Bastrop and Lee Counties possess a wealth of lignite for industrial purposes. It is abundant from one end of the counties to the other, and makes available cheap fuel for factory consumption or electrical power production. Various clays and timbers are found throughout Bastrop County.

"Some 1,500 square miles of territory watershed empty the waters of streams into the Colorado River between Austin and Smithville. Seven surging streams such as Bartons Creek, Onion, Wilbarger, Walnut Piney, Cedar, and Alum Creeks extend many miles into the interior of central Texas and in times of excessive rainfall pour their turbulent and raging soil-enriched waters into the Colorado River, to be carried on into the Gulf of Mexico. A rainfall of 5, 6, 8, or 10 inches between Austin and Smithville will cause untold damage. With Bastrop County receiving the full impact of this devastating flood and passing it on to all of the low-lying rich valley region of La Grange, Columbus, Wharton, Bay City, the loss is staggering.

"Vivid is the memory of the devastating floods of the past which had their origin between Austin and Smithville. The several dams of the Highland Lakes region are doing an excellent job of holding back the waters of the far western region, but nothing has been done for central Texas when heavy rains and cloudbursts occur in the 1,500-square-mile area below Austin. The foothills of Bastrop offer a natural for flood control. With the 38,000 square miles above Austin protected by great dams of Buchanan, Lake Travis, Granite Shoals, Inks, Marble Falls, and Lake Austin, it is neither feasible nor understandable to ignore—and continue to ignore—the value of flood control below Austin. To allow the destruction of thousands of acres of rich, productive farmland all along the Colorado River to the Gulf of Mexico when the hills of Bastrop offer sites for flood control is not compatible with intelligent reasoning.

"The civil engineering report previously mentioned specifically cites the mouth of Alum Creek, 3 miles upstream from Smithville on the Colorado River, as a site for such a dam. Data provides information that such a dam at the mouth of Alum Creek will impound some 65,000 acre-feet of water, and will provide power for the production of some 65 million kilowatt-hour units of electrical power annually. In times of power shortages this is no small figure, coupled with hydroelectrical power, lignite for the production of electrical power is likewise available.

"Built in the foothills of Bastrop County, a dam impounding some 65,000 acre-feet of water, a minimum number of acres of farmland would be affected or removed from crop production. It can easily be seen that Smithville at 270.14 feet above sea level and Austin at 407.27 feet there exists a difference of 137 feet. With Alum Creek at 280 feet and a safety flow line of 318 feet, a dam height of only 38 feet is needed, resulting in a savings of thousands of acres of farmland. This dam will provide not only an ample supply of water for the irrigation of 23,000 acres of irrigable land in Bastrop County, but irrigation and soil conservation go hand in hand. Only a small effort so far has been made to conserve and utilize one of our greatest natural resources—water. With both the State and Federal Governments becoming acutely aware of this problem, water commissions have been set up for the study of this problem. It is a known and recognized fact that in times of excessive rainfall below Austin thousands of acres of rich farm soil are carried on into the Gulf of Mexico, and that in times of deficient rainfall this same soil is parched and nonproductive.

"Proper water conservation will also provide excellent fish and wildlife conservation. This can also be an important factor in central Texas. The impounding of surplus water can create an industry of far-reaching effect. Summer camps and summer homes on both sides of the river lake from Smithville to Bastrop, with fishing and resort recreation will bring many people from hot crowded sections of our cities. It could become an asset of enormous value to Bastrop County and the surrounding area.

"It is time," concluded Mr. King, "for the intelligent, thinking people of central Texas to use the resources at hand and to bring to life a prosperity within their reach. Few places surpass or even possess the natural resource potential of central Texas, and all that is needed is intelligent action."

Sewage Contamination in Irrigation Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the major portion of the seventh in the Rocky Mountain News series published in Denver on June 27.

In this article, Bill Miller reports how secondary sewage treatment, which Denver fails to provide, is needed to remove such virus as polio, coxsackie, ECHO and infectious hepatitis from the effluent. Thus, my constituents beyond Denver's city limits are exposed not only to the nuisance of smelly, contaminated water, but also to a real health hazard.

Miller's last paragraph speaks eloquently for the wisdom of collective metropolitan solutions to water problems. I am happy to report that there is now a joint sanitation commission planning a joint attack on pollution. There will be no Federal support for cooperation, however, unless H.R. 3610 is approved by the Senate and signed by the President.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Denver, Colo., June 27, 1959]

METROPOLITAN DILEMMA

By 1937 Denver had a primary sewage plant in operation.

But now, since the area's population has increased tremendously, this question has been raised:

Does primary (removal of solids from sewage) treatment completely remove disease-carrying bacteria?

Dr. Stuart G. Dunlop, associate professor of microbiology at the Colorado School of Medicine, has been researching the problem off and on for 25 years.

His answer:

"It would appear that the public health hazard associated with the use of sewage-contaminated water for the irrigation of truck crops to be consumed raw is not so great as has been assumed in past years."

This sound encouraging but Dr. Dunlop adds:

"Nevertheless, the fact that the water has been shown to be contaminated indicates that a potential hazard still exists. Every effort must be made to provide adequate treatment of all domestic and industrial wastes before these wastes are discharged into streams to be used later for irrigation purposes."

AGREE WITH DUNLOP

Officials of the U.S. Health, Education, and Welfare regional office agree with Dr. Dunlop about the potential health hazard.

As far back as 1956, Edmund C. Garthe, regional sanitary engineer, warned:

"Sewage emerging from Denver's present treatment plant is in almost as bad a condition as when it entered."

He added that the treated sewage, which is dumped into the Platte River and which soon enters irrigation ditches, has all the makings for causing many cases of diseases.

Denver answers by saying there is not a case on record where it has been proven that Denver's effluent has caused a single case of any disease.

The potential diseases the doctors are talking about are typhoid and gastroenteritis, an inflammation of the lining membranes of the stomach and intestines, both caused by the salmonella bacteria. Shigella, another strain, produces bacilliary dysentery.

GOOD EVIDENCE

"There is also fairly good evidence that primary treatment of sewage will not remove such virus as polio, coxsackie, ECHO, and infectious hepatitis," Dr. Dunlop added.

Dr. Dunlop also stressed the nuisance and mental health hazard of odors arising from sludge beds along ditches and streams.

He points out that where there is water there are children.

"You simply can't stop kids from going into streams and rivers," he said. "And when these waters are carrying bacteria, there's always the chance of direct infection."

But the question about contamination of vegetables continues to intrigue Dr. Dunlop's scientific mind.

From his research, he concludes that Colorado's climate and irrigation methods used by Colorado farmers are perhaps more responsible than sewage treatment for preventing spread of disease through vegetables.

"Enough research has been accomplished to show that this type bacteria does not survive in an area where the air is dry, the humidity is low, and there is plenty of sunshine," he said.

IRRIGATION METHOD

"In addition, the common method of irrigating in this area is simply to allow the water to flow in furrows between the rows of plants and not to flood the field.

"Thus any organisms in the water would probably have to be splashed onto the leaves and stems above the ground or be conveyed to the plant by some other means.

"Root crops, on the other hand, might be contaminated. Overhead sprinkling as practiced in some areas might present a different problem."

However, Dr. Dunlop continues, the organisms are present in water which receives effluent and are present in irrigation water.

"If the micro-organisms, to some extent, are being absorbed by the soil, is there a possibility of our underground water and our wells being contaminated?" he asked. Only further research, he said, will bring an answer to this puzzler.

U.S. Representative BYRON JOHNSON of Denver has charged that certain chemical operations at Rocky Mountain Arsenal already have caused some underground water pollution.

The potential health hazard, he said, will remain with us until the situation is cleaned up on an areawide basis.

COMPLETE TREATMENT

"This means complete treatment and chlorination of effluent before it is dumped into streams," he said. "It also means complete purification of all our water, including coagulation, sanitation, filtration through said and chlorination before the water is given back to the public."

He realized, he said, that this would be the ideal.

"But when we are dealing with the health of the public, why should we strive for anything less than the ideal?" he asked.

And the ideal cannot be achieved, he added, unless the entire area works together. One treatment plant dumping raw sewage into a stream can spoil the work of other plants which do an excellent job of cleaning up sewage.

Army-Navy-Air Force Register Pays Tribute to Sylvanus Thayer, "Father" of West Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of that excellent publication, the Army-Navy-Air Force Register contains an article by Col. R. Ernest Dupuy which pays deserved tribute to Sylvanus Thayer, often called the "father" of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

I call the attention of my colleagues to this splendid article, which relates the accomplishments of the outstanding educator and inovator who not only made West Point the center of American technology, but has properly been described as the founder of American technological education.

Colonel Dupuy's article is most timely, for Sylvanus Thayer has been nominated for membership in the Hall of Fame at New York University.

As a graduate of West Point myself, I find this article of exceptional interest. I commend it to my colleagues for their careful perusal.

THAYER OF WEST POINT FAME: HIS PUPILS SET THE PACE—FATHER OF MILITARY ACADEMY MAY WIN NEW HONORS

(By Col. R. Ernest Dupuy)

Sylvanus Thayer, West Point's "Father," and the founder of technological education in the United States, has been nominated for listing in New York University's Hall of Fame for great Americans. If elected, the great educator will find himself in the company of four of his most illustrious pupils already enrolled there—Grant, Lee, Sherman, and Stonewall Jackson.

One hundred and fifty-one leaders in American science, art, literature, education, law, and religion will weigh Thayer's qualifications for admittance in the 1960 quinquennial selection.

THAYER'S NOMINATION

Thayer's nomination, presented by Gen. Anthony C. McAuliffe (U.S. Army, retired), president of the Association of Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy, reads as follows:

"He transformed the U.S. Military Academy at West Point into the source of technology in the United States. During the formative period of the Nation—from 1818 to 1868—both Government and private industry called on Thayer's West Point graduates—their sole existing instrumentality—to harness the Nation's waterways, build its railroads, improve its harbors and explore and map its vast expanses.

"In the field of education Thayer's scientists, mathematicians, and civil engineers leavened not only all institutions of technological learning established subsequent to the Military Academy, but also many of those in the general educational field already in existence."

MILITARY LEADERS

"He evolved, through his pedagogical acumen and inspirational leadership, the West Point system which has produced military leaders from the War with Mexico to Korea. Four of Thayer's pupils are today in the Hall of Fame: Ulysses Simpson Grant, Robert Edward Lee, William Tecumseh Sherman, and Thomas Jonathan 'Stonewall' Jackson."

It was in 1817 that Thayer, then a brevet major of Engineers, was personally selected as Superintendent of the Military Academy, by President James Monroe. The young officer, a veteran of the War of 1812, had just returned from a 2-year tour in France, where he had familiarized himself with Napoleonic military history, studied the methodology of the famous Ecole Polytechnique, and collected more than 1,000 technical books which went to the West Point library.

At that time West Point, which had been created in 1802, was a struggling little school, with no established curriculum and but little discipline among the cadets.

SWEEPING REFORMS

Thayer at once instituted a series of sweeping reforms. The basis of his then revolutionary pedogogy was that the 4-year course he established would be a novitiate, in which the students would live in an atmosphere of Spartan simplicity and under impartial and impersonal character-forming discipline, both military and educational.

The honor system he established, which is still West Point's pride today, had as its basis, in his own words, the fact that "a cadet does not lie, cheat, or steal."

Thayer's new concept—a blending of liberal arts and science—was launched at the very moment that the demands of the industrial revolution and our own national expansion were calling for a new type of builder and teacher; a man who could solve the problems of a machine industry resting upon the practical findings of physics and chemistry.

So, while West Point graduates—between the years of 1818 and 1860—were pioneering in the fields of exploration, railroad building and metallurgy, others of them also were being drafted in the realm of education, particularly technological.

West Point books: The first civilian engineering school, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute at Troy, N.Y., was founded in 1824. But not until 1835 was its first class of civil engineers graduated; four young men who had been instructed from the textbooks written by West Point professors.

In 1846 Harvard's Lawrence School of Engineering was founded; in 1847 Yale instituted its Sheffield School of Engineering, and in 1852 the University of Michigan established an engineering department. West Point graduates headed the staffs of all three of these schools.

Meanwhile the demand waxed for West Pointers as teachers of science and mathematics in our general collegiate institutions.

In 1839 Virginia Military Institute was established. Francis H. Smith, West Point 1833, was its first superintendent. Around him he gathered a select group of other West Pointers, among them Thomas J. Jackson, who would later go down on history's rolls as "Stonewall."

In 1845 the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis was founded. To its staff went Henry H. Lockwood, West Point 1836. He would remain at Annapolis until 1870, as professor of mathematics, gunnery and natural and experimental philosophy. Other West Pointers, too, served at the Naval Academy, but Lockwood in particular is remembered as the "grand old man" of Annapolis.

Early years: Through those early years of West Point the personal influence of Thayer on education in the United States grew to a remarkable extent. Two instances are especially worth notice, since they affected

the future of two of America's most prominent liberal arts colleges.

George Ticknor, one of Harvard's great educators, in 1821 led a campaign for rejuvenation of that university's curriculum and methodology.

The system then existing in the civilian colleges, Ticknor declared, "was no longer able to satisfy the requisitions of higher education which are now beginning to be made on all sides."

Ticknor's remedy was the adoption of Thayer's principles as used at West Point. Its graduates, Ticknor wrote, were sent out "at the end of 4 years instructed with a degree of thoroughness which would of itself cast a reproach on any of the colleges of the country."

Ticknor, who was a lifelong intimate of Thayer, based his recommendations on observation of the first 3 years of West Point's progress under his friend's control. By 1825 Harvard had adopted many of Ticknor's recommendations, including departmentalizing of the institution, splitting of classes into small sections "according to proficiency," and a recasting of its annual examinations.

Thayer remained at the head of West Point until 1833, when he resigned after refusing to compromise with President Andrew Jackson's political meddling with the careers of certain cadets.

Returning to line duty with the Corps of Engineers, Thayer was engaged in constructing coastal fortifications, particularly around Boston Harbor, until his retirement in 1863 with the rank of brigadier general.

BUILT WELL

Thayer had indeed built well. Up on the Hudson they call him "Father of West Point." He can with equal validity be called the father of the Nation's technological education.

Urban Renewal Stymied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 26, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend remarks, I wish to call the following letter to the attention of my colleagues. This is one of a number of letters I have received expressing in simple terms the distress of responsible citizens with the President's veto of the housing bill. May I point out that the urban renewal program in the city of Berkeley which is referred to is one of two major slum clearance programs with communitywide support in the Seventh District of California which are now stymied:

Hon. JEFFERY COHELAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COHELAN: I consider that the Presidential veto of the housing bill has done great harm to our domestic economy. I know that you have worked for passage of the housing legislation, and I appreciate your efforts.

I cannot measure from here the possibility that the veto can be overridden, but such an outcome does not appear likely. My point in writing to you now is to urge that you continue your work for housing legislation by seeking speedy passage of a bill which will sustain the urban renewal, college housing, and FHA programs.

You may have heard that the Berkeley City Council recently decided to embark on an urban renewal program, acting upon the recommendations of a large and communitywide citizens' committee which made a careful study of urban renewal and its possible usefulness to the city of Berkeley. I doubt that the months of work by these citizens and the positive action by the city council can be made effective unless and until Federal assistance is available.

I hope that legislation to continue these programs will have your support and that you will seek to secure passage of such legislation at an early date. I am still counting on meeting you when you return to California.

Very truly,

RICHARD B. MITCHELL.

The Challenge of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful and farsighted estimates of the national problems confronting our educational system was delivered by Gov. Foster Furcolo of Massachusetts at the commencement exercises at Harvard University on Tuesday, June 11, 1959.

It was a most important address because within it is expounded a most clear evaluation of our educational problems in the light of the threat of Russia to surpass America, and also most significant recommendations as to what the Federal Government should do to gain leadership in the modernization of our educational systems and the coordination of all of our educational systems into one comprehensive program.

Gov. Foster Furcolo, whom you will remember as a former Congressman from the First District of Massachusetts, is a distinguished scholar, a graduate of Yale University and Yale Law School, and an outstanding governor. He has always had a keen interest in expanding and developing more effective education for the young men and women of our country.

ADDRESS AT HARVARD UNIVERSITY BY GOV. FOSTER FURCOLO

President Pusey, fellows of Harvard College, members of the board of overseers, and distinguished guests, when I saw the motto "Veritas" it gave me a thrill to know I was once again at the greatest university in the world [applause] but the wind blew away the first two words which happen to be "Lux et." [Prolonged laughter.]

Once again it is my duty and also my privilege to address this distinguished company of the sons and daughters of Harvard at these exercises. In order to participate, most of you here had only to go through 4 years at Harvard. For me to participate, I had to go to the trouble of being elected Governor although I must confess it was not solely for that reason that I sought the governorship.

It seems there never has been a period in history when the cause of the advancement of learning was so imperiled—and when there existed, with all their dread implications, simultaneous challenges of such great consequence both to the Nation and to the great university.

I need hardly remind your distinguished President of the struggles which Harvard College itself underwent during its early days. But in those early days, the Legislature of Massachusetts, noting the financial distress of Harvard in 1652, recommended a system of voluntary contributions from the United Colonies to maintain "the President and certayne fellowes and poore scholers."

During the next administration, that of President Chauncey, the salary of the President was paid from the collection of an additional annual tax on the towns of the Bay Colony which was referred to as "The College Proportion."

It should be perfectly obvious, however, that an enlarged system of education is even now on the horizon. The farmers of New England "who gave wheat and corn to Advance learning and Perpetuate it to Posterity" will find their counterparts in the millions of American citizens who will be called upon to pay their "College Proportion" just as they pay their income taxes today for the services and security which are furnished by the Federal Government.

I think all of us here today will agree that the United States is racing against the stopwatch of history in a continental struggle to train and develop the best minds and talents of the Western World. If indeed, the United States is not so engaged—then certainly we should be.

We in this country pride ourselves on our leadership in education, but if we read the testimony before Congress we are taken aback at the charges of some of our greatest scientists and military leaders: to wit, that in 10 years we shall be pitifully behind the Soviet Union in the production of engineers and teachers—underscoring a solemn appraisal that the United States is today no longer the leader in mass education, but is simply living off its backlog of educated citizens.

What do we do in this situation? When the cause of learning is so imperiled, and when the Nation's security is endangered, how do we meet these dread challenges of overwhelming consequence to the Nation and to the university?

For its part, the great university will have to reexamine its role within the educational system, and it will have to adjust so that it may lead and assist at the same time. It must provide leadership not only for the private educational institutions but also for our whole public educational system. The excellent private colleges in America must not be permitted simply to become feeding grounds for the graduate schools of the great university.

The system of national public education, for which we have no alternative but to prepare, must be guided—nurtured—and protected by the great university.

I need only restate the wise words of former President Eliot of this university, which though spoken many years ago, are touched perhaps with a sense of what was prophetic not only in his time but in ours also: The actual problem to be solved is not what to teach, but how to teach. The revolutions accomplished in other fields of labor have a lesson for teachers. New England cannot cut her hay with scythes, or the West her wheat with sickles. When millions are to be fed where formerly there were but scores, the single fishline must be replaced by seines and trawls.

The hard fact of the situation is that our population is expanding so fast that certain results naturally follow, and must follow:

1. Our educational facilities, our classrooms, and our teachers, are insufficient to serve the entire mass of people.

2. For a public school population that has multiplied 80 times in less than 100 years, and is still growing, the cost of providing the necessary facilities is prohibitive except to the vast resources of National Government.

The most informed sources in this country estimate that our financial needs for education during the next 10 years will run to more than $40 billion. And I might add, parenthetically, that these same 10 years might possibly be America's last timetable if our estimates concerning Soviet progress in training Soviet youth are correct. It all means that some national system of education is on the horizon. And one reason is that any such sum involving billions of dollars will have to be provided by the National Government—there is just no other source. And even these vast funds will have to be used with all economies possible.

Our Nation has already committed itself to a multibillion-dollar program for Federal highways. Are we rich enough to provide money for roads but so poor that we neglect to provide the funds to educate our youth? Will we merely build roads, or will we also build our youth and build the Nation's security at the same time?

If we do not—one might wonder whether the words of one of your poetic sons, T. S. Eliot may not have had a bitter augury when he wrote, in "The Rock":

"In the land of lobelias and tennis flannels the rabbit shall burrow and the thorn revisit, the nettle shall flourish on the gravel court, and the wind shall say: 'Here were decent people: Their only monument the asphalt road and a thousand lost golf balls.'"

Now assuming the necessary costs of what I might refer to as the revolution in public education are to be met, then the greatest demand on all of us—State and university alike—will be to design an education which will make the most efficient use of teaching resources. And this is of paramount importance because teaching resources will inevitably be limited.

We will have to design an education that must not suffer any impairment of quality—an education of the highest quality but with perhaps a faculty only half as large in proportion as is now customary in our institutions of first rank.

It is inevitable that future mass liberal education in this country will have to be structured upon the base of a drastic increase in efficiency, an increase in efficiency that privately endowed institutions, by and large, have not as yet accepted.

If there must be an increase in efficiency in education—which calls for leadership in the educational field—whence will come this leadership?

It can come from government, but it would be better elsewhere. It can come from the masses, but it would be an unwise leadership in that event. It can come from the ordinary run-of-the-mill college or university, which would mean ordinary, run-of-the-mill leadership. Or the leadership could come from the great college or the great university, which would mean great leadership. That, properly, is where the leadership belongs.

Does that mean leadership in changes that are not necessary to the great university, itself—the adoption of an efficiency that it can afford not to have? We must understand that it is not a question of whether the great university can afford a luxury that others cannot. Rather, it is a question of leadership, and the great university cannot afford to lose leadership. The truth is that education, itself, cannot afford to have the great university abandon its leadership in any field pertaining to education—and the Nation itself cannot afford such a loss, either.

And when we think of sputnik and world peace, we come face to face with the sobering realization that the cause of world peace cannot suffer such a loss either.

Leadership is not always something to be attained by striving for it. Sometimes it is thrust upon us—perhaps inescapably, perhaps even unwanted. One phase of leadership will be to improve the quality of education. Another is to make that education available to constantly increasing numbers of students. Another is to furnish education as economically as possible without impairing its quality. In the long run, unless we have adjusted education to those goals, we will have failed.

Perhaps the chief factor in making possible savings in the operating costs of public institutions of higher learning will be an adjustment of the presently existing teacher-student ratio. A change in the existing ratio alone of 10 students to 1 teacher (which is the national average), to 15 or 20 to 1, would in the next ten years make possible savings of hundreds of thousands of teachers, and billions of dollars.

Some months ago, it was my pleasure to discuss the subject of teacher-student ratio with President Eisenhower, and to suggest to the President an exploration of the truth of the almost universally held premise that smaller classes resulted in higher pupil achievement.

I made this suggestion to the end that there might be greater educational opportunities for the youth of America—and at the same time the most effective use of the billions of dollars which we will have to spend.

Why should we examine the validity of the almost universally held teacher-student ratio theory? Because, and this will probably amaze you as it did me, when I first began my own study of it—it may not be sound, and I stress the word "may."

In making my own exploration of the subject some time ago, I found to my astonishment that the Encyclopedia of Educational Research reported, and I quote: "Among the more than 200 research studies of class size and pupil achievement that were undertaken in the past fifty years, it was found that 40 percent of the research reports favored large classes, and only 22 percent favored small classes. The more recent studies showed 50 percent favored large classes, and 21 percent favored small classes. The remainder felt there was no significant difference either way. Factual research studies found better than 2 to 1 that pupil achievement is higher in larger than in smaller classes."

Now all those studies may be wrong—but do they not at least indicate that a full and complete and authoritative review of the teacher-student ratio is warranted? By educational authorities—not governmental.

Incidentally, just two months ago, I received a letter advising me that the Department of Engineering Mechanics at the University of Kansas made a recent study and reported that students in classes of sixty, who have generally made A in previous college work, do just as well as the same group in classes of twenty, and the same is true for students with B, C, or D averages.

Since the meeting with the President, I have met with members of the President's Cabinet and some of the leading educators of America, and it has been informally agreed that a study of this important criterion for accrediting colleges and universities ought to be made, with the ends in view which have already been suggested.

I ought to emphasize what I have already stated before, that the highest quality of our educational process must be preserved. It is within such a frame of reference that we must take a second look at the most recent studies on this subject, all of which cast serious doubt on the widely held theory that the quality of education improves as the number of students to teachers decreases.

There are also two recent reports which have been financed by the fund for the advancement of education. The first of these was the new college plan, presenting a major departure in higher education and published in 1958; the other was memo to a college trustee, which is very recent and reports on the financial and structural problems of the liberal college. Both of these reports have recommended a teacher-student ratio of 20 to 1, or double the present national average.

What would result? Let me quote the last paragraph of my letter to President Eisenhower:

"If full and careful investigation by an unimpeachable survey establishes that the teacher-student ratio should be revised upward, resulting in more students per teacher, it will unquestionably mean:

"1. Greater educational opportunities for more students.

"2. Improved educational achievement by students.

"3. Better pay for teachers—and more effective utilization of qualified teachers.

"4. An easing of the teacher shortage problem.

"5. A saving to Massachusetts taxpayers and to every city and town in the State of many millions of dollars a year—and every year in the future—thus saving Massachusetts hundreds of millions of dollars.

"6. A saving to every State in the Nation, which means the taxpayers of the Nation will be saved billions of dollars."

Anyone who deals with budgets, local, State or national, knows that the greatest, or at least one of the greatest expenditures in any budget must go for education. And it will increase in the years to come. So the savings run to billions of dollars, billions every year.

It is difficult in the midst of these pleasant exercises to convey that sense of urgency which those of us feel who must help provide for the thousands of young men and women to whom no college doors will be open this fall. But if the great university does not become concerned, no one will.

Surely it is easier in terms of the condition of the world today, to rephrase again the goals of survival and improvement of human life which must be the necessary and parallel objectives of the entire free world.

The state, by which I mean the government in the classic sense, must look to the great university in this time of crisis, and the great university must look to the state—for we, through no fault of our own, and by dint of events which sweep today over the entire face of the earth, are put to the greatest test of our lives.

The state must provide the means, and the great university must give of its best efforts to provide the leadership, so that we may keep faith with those who follow us.

We in this country honor education, and, if I may paraphrase Plato: What we honor in our country—that we must cultivate.

More Than Money Involved in Battle of the Budget—"Life Line" Broadcast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEITH THOMSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the daily radio broadcast, "Life Line," is a patriotic and religious educational program produced in Washing-

ton and carried by many radio stations throughout the country. "Life Line" features the commentaries of Wayne Poucher, who appears to be a close and constructive student of public affairs.

I would like to call to the attention of Members a recent "Life Line" broadcast by Mr. Poucher on the subject of the Federal budget and what is involved in the effort to hold it in line.

His calling attention to the evils of overextending Federal aid programs is particularly significant. This is a favorite device of the spenders. Right-thinking people must overcome the spenders' efforts to plant the thought in the minds of American people that there is free money in Washington. The Federal Government has no money that it does not either take from the people in the form of taxes or borrow to their credit. There seems to be no suggestion on the part of anyone to raise taxes, and any responsible person knows that the borrowing has already been overdone.

One of the worst effects of the Federal aid approach is the further destruction of States rights and local control of local affairs. By dangling Federal aid money as the bait, they dictate how State and local governments will expend their resources. In many cases, this has created problems for the State and local governments in taking care of their more urgent responsibilities, rather than to help them in the solution of their problems.

I, for one, am more than just a little tired of small pressure groups attempting to use Congress as a vehicle for spending the people's money on programs which they cannot get the people themselves to support at home.

I have obtained a copy of Mr. Poucher's broadcast, which reads as follows:

The battle of the Federal budget has to do with money—a very great deal of money. But, at the same time, this battle is not concerned primarily with money.

More than money is involved. This battle is concerned with the survival of a design for our Nation's life, worked out over the generations—a design strong, delicately balanced, built to endure, if we will let it endure.

We, the people of the United States, will continue to be urged, by every kind of persuasiveness, to demand that the Federal Government adopt all sorts of new schemes for paying the States, with their own money, to take care of their own people.

The money will be taken from you. It will be red-ink money, of course. Its expenditure will further unbalance the budget, stimulate inflation, add to the national debt, increase the unbearable and growing interest burden. This added spending will lower the value and honesty of the American dollar, weaken us in trade with other countries, and leave us vulnerable to subtle Soviet attack through manipulation of gold or other economic pressures.

That is a long list of evils, all having to do with money. And yet, I repeat, the economic effect of this spending is not the most important effect.

If these new programs, presented so enticingly, for more Federal aid to the States are carried through, the greatest injury will be the injury to the sovereign freedom of our States and to the liberties which can be safeguarded only if that sovereign freedom is preserved.

The American principle that State and local governments should take care of the needs of their people is part of the traditional American emphasis on the individual and the family. Local governments are closest to the individual citizens and, thus, most likely to be answerable to them. Central governments are always farther removed from the individual citizens. They operate by mechanical rules, which treat human beings almost like things—whether the problem is education, medical care, welfare, or anything else that directly concerns people.

There is another strong reason why the sovereign freedom of your State is important to you and your family every day. It is the means, chosen by the Founding Fathers, to make sure that power is divided.

That is the first axiom of American freedom. The makers of the Constitution tried to insure, for all time, the division of governmental power. They were doing exactly what they thought the most important task of all when they placed strict limitations on the power of the Central Government.

We Americans have, in the sovereign independence of our States, a political design as beautifully fitted together and as delicately balanced as that God-made miracle which we call a bird. And our kind of government—like a bird—can live and soar, or it can be wantonly destroyed.

No more effective method has ever been invented to destroy the delicate harmony of our Federal-State system than that bribery of the States that goes under the name "Federal aid."

Do you, personally, want more such bribery? Are you willing to help destroy the beautiful design for balanced power, which the Constitution gave us in trust for future generations and which is our greatest gift to other peoples, who are yearning to be free?

We can nobly save or meanly lose our freedom from monopoly government. We can insist that our sovereign State must do its own work, and that local units do their own work, with no bribes from Washington asked for or taken.

Or, we can do nothing.

If we, the people, choose to do nothing, we will be acquiescing in the loss of the seeds of life and liberty for our children and our children's children.

Operation Bootstrap—Reservation Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, since the introduction of my Indian self-help bill, which I have termed "Operation Bootstrap—Reservation Style," I have received dozens of letters from Indians, organizations interested in Indian problems, industrial organizations interested in new locations, and chambers of commerce who see in this program a realistic inducement for industries to locate in areas which are presently nonindustrial.

In the preparation of the bill, I followed as closely as possible the commonwealth provisions of a similar program which has proven highly successful in Puerto Rico. There the commonwealth had entered into contracts with industry to construct necessary facilities and then lease or sell them to the company on a long-term basis. In addition, they have offered the company complete tax exemption for 10 years.

As a result of the program, some 600 industries have been located in Puerto Rico with the result that many thousands of people have obtained permanent employment. The standards of living on the island have materially improved, good housing has replaced slums, water and sewer facilities have been financed, and the people have been enabled to lift themselves up by their own bootstraps.

The same program can do the same thing for the Indian reservations of the Nation. One hundred years of effort to solve the Indian problem by attempting to make farmers and ranchers out of all of them, attempting to raise their standard of living through per capita payments, doles, and relief have only proven detrimental instead of beneficial. A full dinner pail, a weekly paycheck, and a church to attend on Sunday is as essential to the Indian as to the non-Indian. He will lift himself up by his own bootstraps if given freedom of opportunity, unhampered by Government regulation and controls.

The bill leaves the matter entirely voluntary with the tribes to accept or reject, but if they should accept the program it gives them the authority to contract with industrial organizations, and when such contract is approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the company would be eligible to fast tax writeoff and exempted from Federal tax for a 10-year period. The tribe is authorized to borrow money either commercially or through the Indian revolving fund for construction of the plant, selling or leasing it on a long-term basis.

Such partnership between the tribe and the manufacturer, designed to provide steady employment for the Indians, would be an incentive on the part of both to make the operation of the plant successful and continuing. Indians have demonstrated their ability and their skills. Absenteeism in industrial plants on reservations is, in every instance, lower than normal. When they have jobs and employment, they, too, have demonstrated their desire to lift themselves up by their bootstraps.

Federal housing programs and housing loans would be available in the communities around such a plant where the employees have a steady source of income. The accomplishments of Puerto Rico could be duplicated on many of the Indian reservations of the West. It is the only solution to the Indian problem and a means of industrializing nonindustrial areas.

Indian reservations are generally located in areas where industry is sorely needed to balance the economy of the area. Such a program would be as beneficial to the State and area as it is to the reservation. While the program is providing opportunity to the Indian people, it is, by the same token, providing opportunity for the community and State as a whole.

The American Bankers Association's Summary Report Showing How the Legislation Was Intended To Be a Giveaway of $16.8 Billion

SPEECH
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1120) to amend the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System against deposits and to eliminate the classification "central Reserve city."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, S. 1120 is a completely unnecessary piece of legislation. All members of the committee and all other Members of the House who have spoken on the subject have emphatically stated that it is not the congressional intent to approve or sanction the Federal Reserve's reducing the amount of Government securities it now holds, and not the congressional intent that the money-creating shares will be changed in favor of the private banks in allowing increases in the money supply.

So, since the House is on record as disapproving any change in the money-creating shares in favor of the member banks, for the member banks as a whole, and approves only certain adjustments in favor of the New York and Chicago banks to be offset by increases in reserve requirements of the Reserve city banks, then clearly there is no need to pass the bill. Everything the committee members wish to be done can be done under the present law.

NO GIVEAWAY, NO BILL NEEDED

The only thing of a practical nature which the bill will now do is to eliminate the central Reserve city classification for the New York and Chicago banks. And in doing this Congress is going against the advice, recommendations, and pleas of the Federal Reserve Board, which has said that this will take away a power which it needs to be able to prevent inflation. Furthermore, in doing this, the bill violates an agreement which the American Bankers Association made with the Federal Reserve Board which was that the bankers would support the bill as the Board was persuaded to recommend it, and not insist upon the elimination of the central Reserve city classification.

As I have pointed out, the Federal Reserve Board has complete authority under present law to remove either Chicago or New York, or both, from the central Reserve city classification. The Federal Reserve Board could remove both cities from the central Reserve city classification and leave the classification vacant. But it would have the classification there as a standby authority which it could use in the event that large inflows of credit into these money market centers made it essential that the Board raise reserve requirements of the banks in these centers. At least the Board would have a means of meeting such a situation without also having to raise reserve requirements of all of the Reserve city banks over the country, to which the New York and Chicago banks will now be wedded.

And as the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has admitted, the only reason for overruling the Federal Reserve Board's judgment as to what it needs to control inflation is that he and some of the other Members have been working on the Federal Reserve Board for several years in an effort to get the Board to take the New York and Chicago banks out of this classification, and the Board has steadfastly refused to do it. Since the Board has resisted the pressures for this so far, certainly it has felt very strongly that the central Reserve city classification is, as it has said, essential to its ability to control inflation.

As for allowing the banks to count their cash as reserves, as a means of helping the country banks, the bill is also completely unnecessary. As has been pointed out, the country banks have only $1.2 billion of cash. So if the Federal Reserve should decide to permit these banks to count all of their cash against reserves, the effect would be that of reducing their required reserves by only $1.2 billion. Yet the Federal Reserve now has authority to reduce the country banks' reserve requirements against demand deposits by $1.5 billion, and to to reduce the country banks' reserve requirements against time deposits by another one-half billion dollars. So the Federal Reserve has unused authority to reduce country banks' reserve requirement by $2 billion.

THE ABA'S REPORT WILL SHOW WHAT THE HOUSE HAS NOT APPROVED

Now, I have pointed out several times that the Members of the House would have been able to understand much more quickly what this legislation was originally intended to do, but which all the sponsors now say it will not do, if the committee's record had contained the report of the American Bankers' Association, which sets out the original legislative proposal and states its purposes. The committee's record contains a lengthy report prepared by the staff of the Federal Reserve Board which sets out the Board's recommendations and reasons for amending the ABA's proposal. It would have been much easier to comprehend the net effect of the bill if the Members of the House had been able to compare both the ABA's proposal and the Federal Reserve Board's recommended amendments, and I believe that the record which is now being made should contain at least the ABA's summary report.

The American Bankers' Association's report was prepared by its economic policy commission. This commission was composed of the deputy manager in charge of the economic policy commission, plus the secretary of the commission, plus 12 officers of private banks located in the East and Midwest, and as far West as Indianapolis. Their names will appear in the proper place in the ABA's report, which I will insert in the RECORD following my remarks.

The ABA's full report to the Federal Reserve Board setting out its proposals for this legislation is a printed document of some 166 pages. It is titled "Member Bank Reserve Requirements" and is dated February 1957. This is much too long a document for including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There is, however, a shorter document. At the same time the full report was submitted, the economic policy commission also prepared a summary of its report, which is titled "A Plan for Member Bank Reserve Requirements." This is only 38 pages long. It appears to have been prepared for wider distribution than the main report. I will insert this shorter report in the RECORD, after making a few explanatory remarks which may help the Members understand it more readily.

What, in the main, was the ABA's plan? First, it was to eliminate the central reserve city classification. Second, it was to reduce required reserves of all member banks—all three classes—to a uniform 10 percent against demand deposits. Third, it was to reduce required reserves of all member banks against time deposits to a uniform 2 percent. Fourth, it was to count vault cash against reserve requirements.

In addition, the ABA's proposal was to make these reductions largely mandatory.

In replying to this plan, the Federal Reserve Board made certain objections.

First, it objected to eliminating the central Reserve city classification because, as I have pointed out, it claimed that this will interfere with its ability to control inflation.

Second, it objected to a law which would make it mandatory that it reduce required reserves of the member banks by any predetermined date. The reason for this objection is, as the Board's report makes clear, the mandatory requirement would seriously interfere with the Federal Reserve's ability to transfer its securities, to offset the reductions in reserve requirements and thus prevent the reductions' causing a runaway inflation.

HOW THE ABA'S REPORT IS RELATED TO THE BILL AS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE

How closely is the ABA's report connected to the Federal Reserves recommendation's and to the bill as reported by the committee? Let me cite a few extracts from the record.

In his testimony before the subcommittee, Vice Chairman Balderston of the Federal Reserve Board said:

> The Board has given consideration to the careful and comprehensive study of the problem of reserve requirements and the proposals for changes made by the Economic Policy Commission of the American Bankers Association, and also to other plans for fundamental revisions in the reserve requirement structure. The Board has concluded, however, that far-reaching changes in the law are not necessary. In particular, the Board opposes, for reasons already stated, the abolition of the three Reserve classes of banks. It would also not favor a mandate to reduce reserve requirements to any predetermined level by a given time. With the amendments proposed, along with other provisions of existing law, the Board would have

adequate authority to make any changes in the structure and level of reserve requirements that are likely to be appropriated under present or foreseeable conditions. (Subcommittee hearing, p. 6.)

And almost identical language appears in the formal report which the Board submitted to the committee.

Representatives of the American Bankers Association appear to have negotiated with the Federal Reserve Board and obtained an agreement that it would recommend the ABA's proposed legislation, with modifications. And, as an incidential point, it also appears that the ABA agreed to support the Board's proposed modifications. This is indicated by the following questions and answers during the testimony before the committee by witnesses whom I might identify.

Mr. Daniel W. Bell, president and chairman of American Security & Trust Co., Washington, D.C., was a member of the Economic Policy Commission of the American Bankers Association which prepared the ABA's report originating this legislation. Just as he completed his prepared statement to the subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the following colloquy took place, with the subcommittee chairman, Mr. BROWN.

Mr. BROWN. Gentlemen, I think you have made a splendid presentation.

I would like to ask you a few questions. With the authority contained in the bill which permits the Board to fix lower reserves for banks in central Reserve cities or Reserve cities on the basis of character of business transacted, do you believe there is any need to continue the designation of central Reserve cities?

Mr. BELL. I did not get the last part of your question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROWN. Do you believe there is any necessity to continue the designation of central Reserve cities?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out, the Economic Policy Commission of the American Bankers Association made quite a study of this subject and made several recommendations, among which was the elimination entirely of the classification of cities.

We do not feel that there is any logical reason for continuing the classification, and of course that applies to the central Reserve cities. However, in our conferences with the Federal Reserve Board in trying to come to some agreement on all of these matters, we agreed to support this bill even though it retains the central Reserve city classification. We do not think there is any logical reason to continue the classification, but the Federal Reserve Board feels that there may be some occasion when they will want to use that classification, so as to differentiate in the reserve requirements as between central Reserve and Reserve cities. (Subcommittee hearings, p. 198.)

It is Mr. Bell's statement that "in our conferences with the Federal Reserve Board in trying to come to some agreement on all of these matters, we agreed to support this bill even though it retains the central Reserve city classification" which leads me to state that the bill, as reported, violated that agreement. And I might add that I find this admission that the Federal Reserve Board negotiated an agreement with the bankers, as to what legislation it would recommend, a little shocking.

Then, turning to Mr. David M. Kennedy, who was also appearing as a representative of the American Bankers Association, the chairman asked the questions and received the answers cited below. Incidentally, Mr. Kennedy who is an officer of a Chicago bank, did not approve of the proposal to remove the central Reserve city classification:

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. KENNEDY. I personally would favor continuing the central Reserve city designation. I agree with what Mr. Bell said, as to the negotiations between the ABA and the Federal Reserve Board, that there was discussion leading to eliminating all the designations, and that would be all to the good if you could work out formulas that would give and take and equate the Reserve picture. (Subcommittee hearings, p. 198.)

So here, too, we find Mr. Kennedy agreeing to what Mr. Bell said concerning negotiations between the ABA and the Federal Reserve Board.

HOW THE BILL AS REPORTED COMPARED WITH THE ABA'S PLAN

How then does S. 1120 as reported by the committee compare with the ABA's original plan for required reserves? With a minor exception the bill would permit everything to be done, the ABA's report specified, though it stops short of requiring that every thing be done. The bill, as reported, would have permitted 10 percent reserve requirements against demand deposits for all member banks. It would have permitted the counting of vault cash against required reserves. The only thing requested by the ABA which the bill did not permit is reducing required reserves against time deposits to 2 percent. The minimum for time deposits would remain at the 3 percent, as in the present law. This difference of 1 percentage point amounts, however, to only one-half billion dollars of reserves. So, insofar as the Fed's holdings of Government securities is concerned, the total difference between S. 1120 as reported and the ABA's plan amounts to one-half billion dollars.

HOW THE ABA COMPUTED A $16.8 BILLION GIVEAWAY

I come now to the ABA's estimate of what the effects of its plan would be on the Federal Reserves' holdings of Government securities. The ABA's report called for its plan to be put into effect gradually, with the last installment to be made by June 1962, which is 3 years from the present time. All computations presented in the ABA's report are shown, however, with June 1956 as the starting point. In other words, the effects of the ABA's plan are presented as things that were to occur between mid-1956 and mid-1962. And the ABA report provides an estimate that the effect of the reduction in required reserves which it proposed would be that, by mid-1962, the Federal Reserve would have $16.8 billion less in Government securities, and the private banks would have $16.8 billion more in Government securities, than would be the case if required reserves were not changed.

The estimate is in two parts:

First. The additional amount of Government securities which the Fed would have to add to its mid-1956 holdings to provide for the increase in the money supply expected to take place by mid-1962, if no shift were made in the money-creating shares as between the Fed and the private banks. This is estimated to be $7 billion additional which the Fed would require, by mid-1962. The ABA's plan calls for the private banks to acquire this $7 billion instead of the Fed.

Second. A portion of the Government securities which the Fed had already acquired and was holding at mid-1956 to be transferred over to the private banks by mid-1962. The ABA report estimates this amount to be $9.8 billion.

Let me quote, now, from the ABA's report on these two components of its proposed transfer of Government securities to the private banks.

Speaking of the expected growth in the money supply between mid-1956 and mid-1962, the report states:

Looking ahead, it is clear that the needs of the public for currency and bank deposits will increase with the growth of the American economy. To meet these needs, it will be necessary to expand the reserve base of the banking system either by creating more reserves through open-market operations or by reducing reserve requirements.

* * * * *

To be more specific, if past relationships between production, currency, and deposits are approximated in the future, then over the next 5 years demand deposits will increase by something like $20 billion, time deposits by about $12 billion, and currency in circulation by more than $3 billion. If such an expansion were to be met without reducing reserve requirements, it would be necessary to supply the banks with about $7 billion of additional reserve balances by means of open-market purchases of Government securities by the Reserve banks.

It would be far better to provide for this growth by lowering the reserve requirements of member banks over the coming years. (ABA's report, pp. 12 and 14.)

So according to the ABA's estimate, its plan would have resulted in the private banks acquiring, without cost, $7 billion of Government securities which the Federal Reserve would have acquired, also without cost, between 1956 and 1962, if reserve requirements were not reduced.

Speaking of the amount of securities already in the Fed's portfolio by mid-1956 which the ABA expected to be transferred to the banks, without cost to the banks, by mid-1962, the ABA's report states:

If the Commission's proposals were in effect at the present time * * * required reserve balances that member banks must maintain at the Federal Reserve banks would be $9.8 billion lower (53 percent lower) than their actual current level. (ABA's report, p. 26.)

Thus according to the detailed estimates set out in the ABA's report, its plan for reducing required reserves would have the banks create the money to acquire $7 billion of Government securities which the Fed would otherwise be expected to add to its holdings between mid-1956 and mid-1962—many of which have now been added—and have the Fed transfer out to the banks $9.8 billion of the securities it was holding as of mid-1956—making a total of $16.8 billion.

THE ABA'S SLEIGHT-OF-HAND WITH ITS GIVE-AWAY ESTIMATES WHEN PRESENTED IN CHARTS

In reading through the ABA's summary report, however, it will be interesting to note some sleight-of-hand tricks that are played with these estimates at points where the report sets them out in charts which make the estimates conspicuous. At these points unexplained substitutions take place in the figures which tend to minimize the size of the ABA's proposed raid on the Treasury. This is a raid on the Treasury, of course, because the interest payments on all of these securities which the ABA proposed to take away from the Fed are paid back into the U.S. Treasury. If and when these securities are transferred to the private banks, the interest payments will go into bank profits. Furthermore, the amount of the principal of these securities would have to come out of the taxpayers' pockets if and when the Federal debt is ever reduced.

At page 28 of the report there appears a chart which purports to show the effect of the ABA's plan on "required reserves" as between mid-1956 and mid-1962. Unfortunately, the chart cannot be reproduced in the RECORD. But beginning at page 26 and continuing on page 29 the figures used in making the chart are specified. Here the $9.8 billion which was to be taken from the Fed's portfolio as of mid-1956 suddenly becomes, without explanation, only $8 billion. The report states:

On the basis of these projections, total required reserves (including vault cash) would be about $5 billion lower in June 1962 under the commission's plan than they are at the present time, and required reserve balances of member banks would be about $8 billion lower.

The difference between the $5 billion and the $8 billion appearing in this sentence is apparent. There is to be $3 billion in vault cash, which is to count against required reserves. But how the total "reserve balances" became $8 billion when it was previously $9.8 billion is not explained.

Similarly, in the chart the $7 billion of additional securities which the Fed was expected to acquire between 1956 and 1962, if reserve requirements were left unchanged, becomes, without explanation, only $4 billion. The report states:

Chart II also shows that if the existing reserve setup were to remain unchanged, required reserves would increase by about $4 billion by 1962.

Then the report continues, arriving at a total of $12 billion for the two figures:

Comparing this with what would happen under the commission's plan, it can be seen that the adoption of the plan would make a net difference of about $9 billion in the case of total required reserves and about $12 billion in the case of required reserve balances.

At page 31 of the report, however, there is a chart presenting the same data, or what purports to be the same data, but this time to show the effect of the ABA's plan on the Federal Reserve's holdings of Government securities. This is the other side of the coin; whatever reduction is made in the member banks' required reserves must equal the reduction made in the Fed's holdings of Government securities. So having arbitrarily reduced both components of its estimate to add to a total of $12 billion in the previous chart, the new chart adheres to the $12 billion total. Interestingly enough, however, this chart makes a further substitution of the figures which must add to the $12 billion. And it does so in a way which minimizes the amount of securities that are to be transferred from the Fed's already-existing portfolio at mid-1956. Apparently the report writers think it does not seem quite so bad to take away securities which the Fed would acquire in the future, as it does to take away securities which the Fed had already acquired and was holding at mid-1956.

So here the additional amount which the Fed was to acquire between mid-1956 and mid-1962, which had first been $7 billion, and then had become $4 billion for purposes of the previous chart, now becomes $7 billion again. Then by the convenient device of subtracting $7 billion from the previously determined total of $12 billion, the report arrives at a figure of only $5 billion as the amount which is to be transferred from the Fed's 1956 holdings. The report states:

Chart III gives an idea of the increase that might occur in Reserve bank holdings of governments over the next 5 years if present reserve requirements were to be retained and the reduction in these holdings that might be accomplished if the Commission's plan could be put into effect within that time. The estimated increase under the first assumption would be around $7 billion, whereas the estimated reduction based on the second assumption would be about $5 billion, a difference of $12 billion.

This juggling, then, provides a basis for the report to make a statement concerning the effect of the ABA's plan on Federal Reserve bank earnings which minimizes the loss in earnings in a most convenient way. The report states:

Such a decrease in the Reserve banks' securities holdings could easily result in a moderate decline in their income. On the basis of the 1955 yield and portfolio figures, a reduction of $5 billion in these holdings would reduce the banks' annual earnings by something like $85 million.

FOR BANKERS' INTEREST THE ABA LOOKS TO THE FUTURE; FOR THE PUBLIC INTEREST, IT LOOKS AT THE PAST

So we see a loss of a mere $5 billion from the Fed's 1956 portfolio, instead of the $9.8 billion which is the report's specific estimate, does not seem nearly so bad as the actual loss of $16.8 billion which the ABA's plan would bring about by mid-1962. And who would object to the Government's giving the banks a mere $5 billion? We may conclude that where their own interests are concerned, the bankers are looking to the future, but where the public interest is concerned, they look only to the past.

The ABA's report is as follows. I have inserted the original page numbers at the beginning of each page so that my quotations may be easily found:

[P. 4]

INTRODUCTION

There is widespread agreement that the present system of member bank reserve requirements is not well adapted to present-day conditions. In general, the existing setup is an anachronistic carryover from earlier banking practices and legislation. However warranted these requirements may have been in former times, they are now outmoded, illogical, and inequitable.

In the hope that it might be able to shed new light on the problems involved, the economic policy commission embarked 2 years ago upon a comprehensive study of this subject, the results of which are summarized and highlighted in this report. Those who wish to explore the subject in greater detail, especially if they are inclined to be dubious about some of the commission's conclusions, are cordially invited to examine the full text of the commission's study entitled "Member Bank Reserve Requirements."

In making its study, the commission has been greatly aided by the research and thinking that has been done on this subject within the Federal Reserve System and by the voluminous literature from other sources. The commission also wishes to acknowledge its debt to the many bankers, academicians, and Federal Reserve officials who have been extremely helpful in conducting this study.

The commission approached its task with considerable diffidence, wondering whether it might find itself bogged down in a morass of insoluble complexities. As the research progressed, however, more and more points began to emerge with considerable clarity. As a result, the commission has finally been able to formulate a concrete plan for reserve reform which, in its judgment, provides a satisfactory solution to this important problem.

While numerous differences of opinion have naturally been encountered, the commission has found, to its gratification and rather to its surprise, that there exists fairly general agreement on certain main propositions which underlie its plan, namely:

[P. 5]

1. That the chief function of member bank reserve requirements is not to contribute to bank liquidity but is rather to serve as a fixed part of the mechanism of monetary management.

2. That the present high requirements should be substantially reduced over the years ahead to enable the banking system to accommodate the monetary and credit needs of our growing economy.

3. That when reserve reform is undertaken, we should move in the direction of a geographically uniform system of reserve percentages.

4. That vault cash should be treated as a reserve asset.

On the other hand, the commission's proposal for a reduction to 2 percent in the reserve requirement for time deposits will strike many as rather novel, and its rejection of the idea of differential treatment of interbank deposits will doubtless encounter some disagreement.

On one point, the commission wishes to place particular emphasis, namely, the need for adopting an integrated program of reserve reduction and reform. From time to time since the establishment of the Federal Reserve System in 1914, various plans have been proposed to meet the recognized need for reform of the member bank reserve setup. These efforts have not met with much success, one important reason being that most of these proposals would have resulted in higher reserve requirements for many banks. Now, however, with total reserves far higher than they need to be, there is an excellent opportunity to work toward lower requirements for practically all member banks and to achieve reforms at the same time.

Overall reduction in legal reserve requirements and thorough-going reform of the reserve structure, therefore, are twin objec-

tives that should be pursued together. The commission's plan is designed to accomplish both of these two basic objectives.

The proposals outlined here should not be construed as implying any departure from the flexible monetary policy pursued by the Federal Reserve in recent years. The commission is in full accord with the Federal Reserve's objective of promoting stable economic growth without inflation and it believes that the proposals set forth in this report would make an important contribution to that goal. These recommended changes should be accomplished over a period of years in a series of steps so timed as to be in harmony with monetary policy. In this way, the necessary job of revamping our reserve setup can be accomplished without having any unstabilizing effects upon prices, production, or employment.

The commission believes, therefore, that it would be desirable to enact appropriate enabling legislation at an early date, so that the Federal Reserve will have the requisite discretionary powers to work toward a really logical reserve setup as economic conditions permit.

[P. 6]

THE PLAN IN BRIEF

The economic policy commission recommends the adoption of a specific program of reduction and reform of member bank reserve requirements. The nature and timing of the steps to be taken in accomplishing the plan would be entirely at the discretion of the Federal Reserve authorities. The program contemplates the following actions to be taken over a period of years:

Recommendation 1. Eventually reduce reserve requirements for demand deposits to 10 percent

The current high level of reserve requirements for demand deposits is the result of historical accident. The extraordinary circumstances which originally gave rise to it have disappeared. The reserve percentages should be reduced over a period of years from the present average level of 16.5 percent of net demand deposits to 10 percent, which is the approximate average level that prevailed prior to 1936. This would enable the banking system to meet the public's future monetary and credit needs that will be generated by our growing economy.

Recommendation 2. Eliminate geographical differences in reserve requirements for demand deposits

The 10-percent reserve requirement for net demand deposits should apply uniformly to all member banks. At present, requirements for various banks differ considerably depending on where they happen to be located. These distinctions are based on outmoded theories and are a source of inequity. As reserve requirements are reduced, we should move to a uniform system.

[P. 7]

Recommendation 3. Authorize the Federal Reserve to vary the reserve requirement for demand deposits over a range of 8 to 12 percent

The commission believes that the Federal Reserve should have authority to vary the reserve requirement percentage for demand deposits over a reasonable range in order to be able to cope with unusual developments that might conceivably arise. Opinions naturally differ as to how much latitude of this kind the Reserve Board should have; but it seems clear that the range of its existing authority, established more than 20 years ago, is considerably more extensive than is needed under present-day conditions.

The commission therefore recommends that, whereas the requirement for demand deposits should be reduced to 10 percent and maintained at that level except under unusual circumstances, the Federal Reserve should nevertheless have authority to raise this requirement to as high as 12 percent or to reduce it to as low as 8 percent of net demand deposits.

Recommendation 4. Eventually reduce the reserve requirement for time deposits to 2 percent

A legal reserve requirement for time deposits of member banks adds virtually nothing to the safety or liquidity of these deposits and is unjustified from the standpoint of monetary management. The present 5-percent requirement clearly discriminates against savings departments of member commercial banks in competing with other thrift institutions. For these reasons the requirement should be substantially reduced as conditions permit. When it has been reduced to 2 percent, it should remain fixed at that level for all member banks.

Recommendation 5. Permit the inclusion of vault cash in legal reserves

This is long overdue. There is no reason today for not allowing banks to count their vault cash as part of their legal reserves. Wide support exists among bankers and Federal Reserve officials for a more rational treatment of this item of banks' working reserves.

It should be emphasized that these recommendations are not a collection of isolated propositions but that they constitute a single integrated program. All of them are closely tied together in one package. To untie them and deal with them separately would destroy the commission's plan as a comprehenive program for accomplishing the twin objectives of reserve reduction and reform.

[P. 8]

THE PLAN IN DETAIL

The question of the role of legal reserves in our banking system is of fundamental importance. It has a major bearing on such problems as the amount of reserves needed, the form in which they should be kept, and how deposits should be classified for reserve purposes.

There are two basic views of the role of reserve requirements. The older view, still held by some, is that the primary purpose of reserves is to contribute to bank liquidity. The more modern view is that this is no longer the main function of reserve requirements and that they are important today primarily because of the function they perform in monetary management.

Credit-control function of reserves—a basic premise: Just how much do reserve requirements actually contribute to bank liquidity?

It is clear that required reserves cannot be used to any great extent to meet cash withdrawals, since they must be maintained. True, the law permits a member bank to let its reserve balance recede below the minimum level for a few days, provided the requirements are maintained on the average over the computation period. A bank also could run a small reserve deficiency for a while if it were willing to pay the legal penalty, and under some circumstances the penalty can be waived for a limited period. Also, of course, when deposits are drawn down, a small portion of the required reserve backing becomes excess and can be paid out by the bank.

These liquidity features of a bank's legal reserve provide some limited flexibility in managing the bank's money position from day to day. From a practical standpoint, however, required reserves are virtually immobilized and contribute to bank liquidity only to a negligible extent.

Cash needs of individual banks must be met largely by drawing upon excess reserves and other cash assets, by liquidating short-term Government securities and other secondary reserve assets, or by borrowing from the Federal Reserve. It is now universally recognized that for the banking system as a whole, liquidity depends, ultimately, on the ability and willingness of the Federal Reserve to supply additional funds to the banking system in periods of stress.

[P. 9]

Some bankers and others, although willing to concede that required reserves contribute little to the operating liquidity of going banks, continue to think of legal reserves as an important protection for depositors in liquidating institutions.

It is true, of course, that the required reserve of a liquidating bank will generally have been kept intact, whereas other assets could have shrunken in value or become frozen. In the days before deposit insurance, a bank's legal reserve did provide some readily available cash for making payments on depositors' claims.

While this limited protective aspect of legal reserves was no doubt of some importance before the advent of deposit insurance, it never provided anywhere near adequate protection for depositors in closed banks. In fact, it was for this very reason that a completely different approach to the problem was adopted, namely, Federal insurance of bank deposits.

Let us now examine the nature of the role performed by legal reserve requirements in the area of monetary management.

The key to general monetary control is the ability of the Federal Reserve to influence the reserve position of the banking system through its discount and open-market powers. Legal reserve requirements constitute a fixed part of the mechanism through which the influence of these instruments is transmitted to the member banks. They are the fulcrum on which these credit-control levers rest. If they did not exist, there would really be no truly reliable brake on the expansion of bank credit and Federal Reserve policy could not effectively regulate the volume of bank lending and investing.

In short, member bank reserve requirements today have little significance from the standpoint of contributing to bank liquidity but they have enormous significance from the standpoint of monetary management. It is obviously essential to keep this fundamental fact in mind in approaching the problem of reserve reform.

The commission's conclusions and recommendations are based squarely on this credit-control view of the function of legal reserves. This is a fundamental premise of our reasoning.

Criteria of a good system of reserves: Since reserve requirements constitute a vital part of the credit-control mechanism, it follows that the chief criterion for a good system of reserves from the standpoint of the broad public interest is that it should contribute as much as possible to the effectiveness of monetary management. Would various changes in the reserve arrangements weaken or strengthen the credit-control powers of the Federal Reserve authorities? As will be seen, this fundamental consideration is given major weight throughout this report.

[P. 10]

Another criterion is that the reserve arrangements should be administratively workable. They should be adapted to existing banking practices and should be reasonably easy to understand and apply.

If member bank reserve requirements are excessively high, they will unnecessarily restrict the flexibility of the banking system and impair its ability to serve the banking needs of the public. They will also discriminate against member banks as compared with other competing financial institutions. As a practical matter, too, they will discourage membership in the Federal Reserve System. It seems clear that required reserves should not be far in excess of the amount needed to enable monetary management to operate with maximum effectiveness.

Finally, the distribution of the reserve burden among the member banks should be fair and logical. Inequities and inconsistencies inherited from the past should be eliminated if possible.

These are the criteria that the commission has applied in working out its proposals.

Recommendation 1. Eventually reduce reserve requirements for demand deposits to 10 percent

There is noting sacred about the present reserve requirements; they are the result of historical accident. Other countries, such as England and Canada, do very well with substantially lower cash reserves. For more than half its history, the Federal Reserve System itself had much lower requirements than at the present time. The era of high reserve requirements was launched under very unusual circumstances and should not be considered permanent.

Prior to 1936 member banks were required to hold reserves of 13, 10, and 7 percent against demand deposits, depending on whether a bank fell into the central reserve city, reserve city, or country member bank reserve class (table I). In 1935 the Federal Reserve Board was authorized by Congress to double requirements and did so within 2 years. More recently, the Board has lowered requirements on several occasions but today, at 20, 18, and 12 percent for the three reserve classes, they are still far above their pre-1936 level.

High reserve requirements—and how they got there: The extraordinary events that led to the doubling of reserve requirements are worth examining. After the reduction of the gold content of the dollar in 1933–34, gold flowed into this country from abroad in huge amounts. During the years 1934–41 our monetary gold stock increased by $19 billion. As a consequence, excess reserves of member banks piled up to historically high levels and undermined the influence of the Federal Reserve over the banking system. The effectiveness of open-market operations was nullified because excess reserves were so large in relation to Reserve bank holdings of Government securities. Open-market sales of Governments by the Federal Reserve could have absorbed only a small portion of these excess reserves.

[P. 11]

TABLE I.—*Member bank reserve requirements*

[Percent of deposits]

Effective date of change [2]	Net demand deposits [1]			Time deposits
	Central Reserve city banks	Reserve city banks	Country banks	
1917—June 21	13	10	7	3
1936—Aug. 16	19½	15	10½	4½
1937—Mar. 1	22¾	17½	12¼	5¼
May 1	26	20	14	6
1938—Apr. 16	22¾	17½	12	5
1941—Nov. 1	26	20	14	6
1942—Aug. 20	24	------	------	------
Sept. 14	22	------	------	------
Oct. 3	20	------	------	------
1948—Feb. 27	22	------	------	------
June 11	24	------	------	------
Sept. 16, 24 [3]	26	[4] 22	[4] 16	[4] 7½
1949—May 1, 5 [3]	24	21	15	7
June 30, July 1 [3]	------	20	14	6
Aug. 1, 11 [3]	23½	19½	13	[5] 5
Aug. 16, 18 [3]	23	19	12	[5] 5
Aug. 25	22½	18½	------	------
Sept. 1	22	18	------	------
1951—Jan. 11, 16 [3]	23	19	13	6
Jan. 25, Feb. 1 [3]	24	20	14	------
1953—July 1, 9 [3]	22	19	13	------
1954—June 16, 24 [3]	21	------	------	5
July 29, Aug. 1 [3]	20	18	12	------
In effect June 1, 1956	20	18	12	5
Present statutory requirements:				
Minimum	13	10	7	3
Maximum	20	20	14	6

[1] Demand deposits subject to reserve requirements, which beginning Aug. 23, 1935, have been total demand deposits minus cash items in process of collection and demand balances due from domestic banks (also minus war loan and series E bond accounts during the period Apr. 13, 1943–June 30, 1947).

[2] Reserve requirements unchanged for 19 years—from June 1917 to August 1936.

[3] 1st-of-month or midmonth dates are changes at country banks, and other dates (usually Thursdays) are at central Reserve city or Reserve city banks.

[4] Under temporary authority granted by Congress in August 1948 and expiring in June 1949.

[5] Effective at central Reserve city and Reserve city banks.

[6] Effective at country banks.

Source: Federal Reserve Bulletin, October 1956.

[P. 12]

It was under these unique circumstances that reserve requirements were doubled to reduce the huge volume of excess reserves.

World War II changed this situation completely. The banking system was called upon to absorb large quantities of Government securities and to meet heavy demands for circulating currency. The surplus of excess reserves rapidly disappeared and in addition, the Federal Reserve pumped additional reserves into the banking system by purchasing Government securities on a vast scale.

Actually, reserve requirements could have been reduced during the war to meet some of these monetary and credit needs. Unfortunately, this course was not followed and the banking system emerged from the war with high reserve requirements and with the Reserve banks holding about $25 billion of Government securities.

The contrast between prewar and postwar conditions is shown by chart I. For the past decade member banks have had scarcely any excess reserves beyond the minimum amount now considered as normal for operating purposes. On the other hand, the Federal's holdings of Government securities have remained about 10 times as high as they were before the war and are obviously more than ample to absorb any increase in excess reserves that might result from gold inflows or other factors. In fact, they actually exceed the total volume of member bank reserves by $4.5 billion.

In short, the unique circumstances that induced the monetary authorities to move to high reserve requirements have long since disappeared. There is no longer any justification for maintaining requirements at such a high level.

Reserve requirements and the growth of our economy: Looking ahead, it is clear that the needs of the public for currency and bank deposits will increase with the growth of the American economy. To meet these needs, it will be necessary to expand the reserve base of the banking system either by creating more reserves through open-market operations or by reducing reserve requirements.

The first approach, that of augmenting the reserves of member banks, would commit the Federal Reserve authorities to a large-scale program of open-market purchases of Government securities designed to inject additional funds into the banking system. This would necessitate a further increase in the size of the Federal Reserve's portfolio which, it is widely agreed, is already excessively large.

To be more specific, if past relationships between production, currency and deposits are approximated in the future, then over the next 5 years demand deposits will increase by something like $20 billion, time

[P. 13 (chart I)]

[P. 14]

deposits by about $12 billion, and currency in circulation by more than $3 billion. If such an expansion were to be met without reducing reserve requirements, it would be necessary to supply the banks with about $7 billion of additional reserve balances by means of open-market purchases of Government securities by the Reserve banks.

It would be far better to provide for this growth by lowering the reserve requirements of member banks over the coming years. This would "unlock" a portion of what are now legal reserves and would free these funds to support an expanding level of credit and deposits. Banks could also utilize these newly-freed reserves to meet increasing demands for currency on the part of the public.

For member banks, legal reserves are barren assets. If reserve requirements remain unnecessarily high, they will inhibit the flexibility of the banking system and prevent it from performing the role it properly should fulfill in meeting the monetary and credit needs of our growing economy. Member banks obviously should be required in the public interest to maintain an ample amount of legal reserves. On the other hand, they should not be required to maintain an amount of reserves far greater than is necessary. This is the situation today and it will become even more aggravated over the years ahead unless reserve requirements are substantially reduced.

The Commission is of the opinion, therefore, that the reserve percentages for demand deposits should eventually be reduced to 10 percent for all member banks. A reduction of this magnitude would enable the banking system to meet the monetary and credit needs of our growing economy while still leaving the requirements high enough to enable the Federal Reserve to do an effective credit-control job.

Recommendation 2. Eliminate geographical differences in reserve requirements for demand deposits

The burden of carrying non-interest-bearing reserves should be distributed equitably and logically among the member banks. The present system of geographical distinctions in member bank reserve requirements is gravely deficient from this standpoint. It is characterized by numerous inequities and inconsistencies and is based on ideas that no longer have relevance. While it may have had some merit in the past, changes in banking conditions have rendered it obsolete.

Background of the geographical system of reserve requirements: Present member bank reserve arrangements are an offspring of the old pyramidal structure of national bank reserves. In 1864, New York and certain other cities were designated by law as redemption centers for notes of interior

[P. 15]

national banks. National banks not located in redemption centers had to have redemption agents in one of these cities and kept part of their legal reserves on deposit there. Banks in redemption centers other than New York, in turn, had to have redemption agents in New York and kept part of their legal reserves on deposit with national banks located there. Higher legal reserve requirements were imposed on redemption center banks than on interior national banks.

Although the system of redemption agents was dropped in 1874, the classification of cities for reserve purposes was continued—apparently on the theory that national banks holding redeposited reserves of other national banks should be required to hold larger reserves for reasons of safety.

This scheme may have been reasonable under conditions existing in the past but it certainly is not today. The establishment of the Federal Reserve System abolished the whole framework of redeposited reserves. The Reserve banks became the sole depositories for member banks' legal reserves. Nevertheless, the old reserve classes were continued. Apparently, the theory that a bank doing a large correspondent business should bear extra-heavy requirements became the new rationale for maintaining these distinctions.

What makes a Reserve city? Today the classification of cities as Reserve cities is not based upon any consistent set of criteria. Essentially, many cities are in this category

because at some time in the recent or distant past local banks desired to be so designated.

Originally, based on legislation enacted in 1864 and 1887, there were 16 Reserve cities and one central Reserve city. Subsequently additional cities were added to the roster of Reserve and central Reserve cities by the Comptroller of the Currency on the application of local banks. The only objective criterion that had to be met was a minimum city population.

The Federal Reserve Board, which now has the responsibility of classifying cities for reserve purposes, has also added to and subtracted from the list of Reserve cities. Currently, the Board considers a variety of factors, including city population, size of correspondent business, and the location of Federal Reserve banks or branches thereof, in reclassifying cities. Nevertheless, no Reserve city is downgraded if local member banks desire to continue as Reserve city banks.

Inequities of the present system: With this background in mind, let us examine our inherited reserve classifications in the light of modern conditions.

Currently, legal reserve requirements for net demand deposits are 20 percent for central Reserve city banks, 18 percent for Reserve city banks and 12 percent for country member banks. These distinctions supposedly implement the theory that banks holding large interbank deposits should be subject to higher reserve percentages than banks with small correspondent accounts. Assuming

[P. 16]

for the moment that this theory has some validity, is it in fact efficiently implemented by the system of geographical variations in reserve percentages?

As the Nation has grown, new financial centers have developed and old ones have declined in relative importance. The geographical pattern of interbank balances has shifted considerably. Many country member banks that have acquired large balances due to other banks have naturally been loath to accept the higher reserve percentages of Reserve city status.

Many Reserve city banks, on the other hand, have seen their balances due to other banks decline in relation to their other deposits but have resisted reclassification to country member status for fear that such action might disrupt their correspondent business, detract from their prestige, or deprive them of certain advantages with respect to deposits under applicable State laws.

It is true that central Reserve and Reserve city banks as groups still hold extensive interbank deposits and have higher ratios of interbank deposits to total deposits than country member banks as a group. However, the Reserve categories are so arbitrary and include such diverse banks that hardships and inconsistencies inevitably result. As indicated above, the selection of Reserve cities has not been closely geared to variations in the types of business in which individual banks are engaged. The Reserve classification of cities has lagged far behind fundamental changes in the banking structure.

Another inconsistency is that Reserve classifications are usually applied to all member banks in a given city or in outlying areas of central Reserve and Reserve cities. This discriminates heavily against many small neighborhood banks, located in central Reserve or Reserve cities, which have only negligible balances due to other banks.

Finally, the higher reserve percentages of central Reserve and Reserve city banks are imposed on all demand deposits, not just interbank deposits. Therefore, for example, the present 18 percent requirement for net demand deposits applies equally to Reserve city banks which have little correspondent business, or none at all, and to Reserve city banks whose interbank deposits are a substantial portion of total deposits.

A particularly illogical feature of the present system is the treatment of central Reserve city banks in New York and Chicago. Prior to the establishment of the Federal Reserve System, New York and Chicago banks were at the apex of the pyramidal structure of bank reserves. Today 85 percent of the resources of the banking system is held by member banks and these institutions must keep all of their legal reserves at Federal Reserve banks. Moreover, as new financial centers have grown up throughout the country, the position of the central Reserve city banks has been gradually transformed. While they still have very large balances due to other banks, these balances have declined in relation to their total deposits over the years. Many Reserve cities today have higher ratios of bankers' balances to total demand deposits than New York or Chicago. Yet the principle of a higher Reserve requirement for central Reserve city banks that was established many years ago still persists.

[P. 17]

Therefore, even if we were to accept the theory that reserve requirements should be higher for banks carrying relatively large correspondent balances, it is clear that the existing reserve setup implements this theory only to a limited extent and that it results in many inequities and inconsistencies.

Some who adhere to this theory have proposed that these defects be remedied by moving to a system of requirements resting squarely on types of deposits and by imposing a higher requirement on interbank deposits than on other deposits. This raises the basic question as to whether the theory itself actually does have validity under modern conditions.

Extra reserves for interbank deposits? Interbank deposits fluctuate more than certain other types of demand deposits. This is true because many transactions are cleared through these accounts and because out-of-town banks often draw on their city balances when funds are required to build up balances with the Federal Reserve, to meet local loan demands, or for other purposes. Some people have reasoned that because of their greater instability, interbank deposits should be subject to higher reserve requirements than other types of deposits.

Clearly, this idea is based on the outmoded theory that the main function of legal reserves is to provide liquidity. It is true that the more a bank's deposits fluctuate the greater are its liquidity needs. However, higher legal reserves are not the answer. Since member bank reserves cannot be drawn down extensively below the legal limit without incurring penalties, they cannot be utilized to any appreciable degree to meet deposit fluctuations.

A high reserve ratio for interbank deposits not only cannot be supported on liquidity grounds but would also present serious administrative problems. Difficulties would arise with respect to the treatment of cash in process of collection and balances due from banks, which may now be deducted from gross demand deposits in computing deposits subject to reserves. In addition, so-called livestock banks would present a perplexing problem, to which a satisfactory solution has never been found.

In 1948 a Federal Reserve staff committee advocated a high reserve requirement for interbank deposits as a transitional step toward a uniform reserve setup for all member banks and for all demand deposits. This was deemed necessary at that time because the Federal Reserve was then supporting Government bonds at par and it was not appropriate to reduce the overall level of required reserves. Under those conditions, the temporary provision of extra reserves for interbank deposits would have bridged the transition to uniform treatment of all demand deposits. Today, however, there would be no need whatever for such a transitional step which would be illogical and would create hardships for many banks.

The commission therefore recommends the elimination of the geographical differentials that now exist in reserve requirements.

[P. 18]

Recommendation 3. Authorize the Federal Reserve to vary the reserve requirement for demand deposits over a range of 8 to 12 percent

At present, the Federal Reserve Board may at its discretion vary reserve ratios for demand deposits for 13 to 26 percent for central Reserve city banks, from 10 to 20 percent for Reserve city banks and from 7 to 14 percent for country members banks. Should the Board have discretionary authority in this area, and if so, how broad should such authority be?

Changes in reserve requirements and monetary policy: The original reason for giving the Federal Reserve Board authority to vary reserve requirements was to enable the Board to cope with the large volume of excess reserves produced by the heavy gold inflow following the devaluation of the dollar in 1934. These were unmanageable by traditional methods of central banking control because at that time the Reserve banks' holding of Government securities were entirely too small.

It was intended that changes in the reserve percentages be restricted to emergency situations or other unusual conditions. In later years, however, more reliance came to be placed on changes in the reserve percentages as an instrument of short-run monetary policy. This was the case in the early postwar years when the Federal Reserve undertook to support the market for Government securities and thus could not employ open-market operations for purposes of monetary restraint.

There is widespread agreement that monetary policy should be effectuated primarily through the Federal Reserve's discount and open-market operations rather than through changes in reserve requirements. Open-market operations in particular are a far more flexible instrument of monetary control and, in fact, have usually been used to offset part or all of the impact of reserve requirement changes anyway.

In 1948, for example, virtually all of the increase in reserve requirements was counteracted by open-market operations and the chief result of the requirement increase was that member banks were forced to part with about $2 billion of their earning assets. Bankers naturally felt that they were being rather heavily penalized for the sake of very doubtful benefits to the economy.

Today, of course, the banks are far less liquid than they were in 1948 and there would be real danger that an increase in requirements would make bank credit entirely too tight in some areas. This is doubtless a major reason why the Reserve authorities have refrained from using an increase in requirements as part of their program for curbing credit expansion in recent years.

Under some circumstances, therefore, increases in reserve requirements may be ineffectual as an instrument of credit control and under other circumstances they may be entirely too effectual and dangerous. In

[P. 19]

either case they would penalize member banks and discriminate against them as compared with other financial institutions.

The commission concludes that increases in reserve requirements should not be utilized for ordinary credit-control purposes.

It would be unwise, however, to eliminate all of the Board's authority to raise reserve requirements for demand deposits. No one can foresee what conditions may lie ahead. The powerful impact on bank reserves that changes in reserve requirements can exert might be needed to deal with some future emergency. Moreover, if inflexible ratios were established by statute, there is a possibility that they would be set at an excessively high level.

Reductions in reserve requirements are in a very different category than increases because they do not involve the same dangers and inequities. In fact, they may be quite useful at times when it is desirable to make additional reserves available throughout the whole banking system.

How much latitude does the Board need? It seems obvious that the latitude of the Board's authority to vary reserve requirements should be ample but that it should not be far greater than would be needed to deal with an emergency situation. The mere possibility that the Reserve Board might raise the reserve percentages substantially at some future date is an element of uncertainty which forces the prudent banker to keep a larger proportion of his funds invested in secondary reserves than he would otherwise need.

Certainly, if new legislation were being written today, there would be no justification for establishing the wide leeway that was provided by the 1935 legislation. At that time, a doubling of the requirements for demand deposits would have meant an increase of only about $2.5 billion in required reserves. Today, due to the enormous increase in deposits, a change of as little as one percentage point would involve about $1 billion of reserves, and the range between the upper and lower statutory reserve limits is nearly $11 billion.

This range is far greater than would be needed to deal with an emergency situation. The development that would be most likely to produce such an emergency would be very large gold imports. It is hardly conceivable, however, that gold could come in so fast and in such vast amounts that the effects on excess reserves could not be offset by open-market operations. Since the end of World War II additions to our gold stock have never exceeded $2.2 billion in any 1 year, and the net increase for 1946–55 was only $1.2 billion.

If, however, by any chance, we were to gain huge amounts of gold over a period of years, there would be ample opportunity for the Federal Reserve to obtain any additional legislative authority it might need in order to cope with the problem. When we consider that total gold holdings outside the United States and Russia are only about $16.5 billion and that world gold production (outside Russia) has averaged less than $1 billion a year since 1950, the possibility of our running into such a situation seems remote indeed.

[P. 20]

The commission is of the opinion, therefore, that the proposed 8 to 12 percent range would be ample for any emergency that might arise.

Recommendation 4. Eventually reduce the reserve requirement for time deposits to 2 percent

Should member banks be required to maintain a legal reserve for time deposits? If so, how high should such a requirement be? Should it be fixed by statute and remain constant or should it be subject to change by the Federal Reserve Board?

To answer these questions, it is necessary to consider what functions, if any, a legal reserve for time deposits performs. Does it contribute to the liquidity of these deposits and is it useful from the standpoint of credit control?

What functions, if any, does such a requirement perform? As discussed earlier in this report, legal reserves contribute very little to bank liquidity. For an individual bank, liquidity for operating purposes is provided primarily by the bank's secondary reserves. As for closed banks, liquidity of deposits is assured chiefly by deposit insurance and the insurance coverage is particularly high in the case of time deposits.

As we have seen, the principal function of legal reserve requirements today is to serve as a basis for monetary control. From this standpoint, is there any justification for imposing any legal reserve requirement on time deposits?

Demand deposits of commercial banks are part of the money supply and are properly subject to control by the monetary authorities. The situation with respect to commercial bank time deposits, however, is clearly very different. They cannot be used directly as a means of payment. They are in the same general category as mutual savings bank deposits, U.S. savings bonds, and other liquid forms of personal savings.

In the past, some students of banking have suggested that the legal reserve ratio for time deposits should be set near the level established for demand deposits. They argued that the distinction between demand and time accounts was not sharp enough to warrant separate treatment under the reserve regulations. A wide differential betwen the reserve ratios for demand and time deposits, it was feared, would encourage some banks to evade the reserve regulations by indiscriminate application of the time label to accounts which were actually demand accounts in practice.

There is little or no basis for such fears today. The Federal Reserve Board has clearly defined the types of accounts that may be counted as time and savings accounts for purposes of computing legal reserves. Moreover, banks today are very careful in classifying deposits. Actually, the incentive for questionable practices in classifying bank

[P. 21]

accounts might well be reduced as a result of the adoption of the commission's proposals. If the reserve percentage for demand deposits were reduced to 10 percent and the percentage for time deposits to 2 percent, the differential would be smaller for central reserve and reserve city banks than it is today.

As far as credit control is concerned, the extension of bank credit based on commercial bank time deposits is no different from credit extension by savings institutions. In neither case is there any expansion of the money supply. There is merely a transfer of funds from savers to borrowers. From a credit-control standpoint, there is no more reason for having reserve requirements for commercial bank time deposits than for imposing such requirements on competing thrift institutions.

Discrimination against member banks: In view of these considerations, it seems clear that the present reserve requirement for time deposits discriminates against member banks. No other thrift institutions are required to keep this kind of reserve for this purpose.

Currently, for example, member banks are required to maintain reserves equal to 5 percent of their time deposits on top of the currency, working balances and secondary reserves of short-term securities that they keep for liquidity purposes. In contrast, savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks are required to keep reserves solely for liquidity purposes, not for credit control, and they can maintain these reserves largely, if not entirely, in the form of income-yielding securities. Nonmember commercial banks in a number of States can also count certain securities as part of their reserves for time deposits.

Over the past several decades, commercial banks have lagged behind their three major competitors for the public's savings—mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, and life insurance companies. Since 1920 the total resources of these three noncommercial bank savings institutions have increased over eightfold, while commercial bank time deposits have increased only fourfold. The share of commercial bank time deposits of the public's savings has dropped sharply.

Among the factors contributing to this trend is the fact that commercial banks have not been able to match the rates of return paid to the public by other savings institutions. One reason for this is the burden of non-income-yielding reserve balances that member banks must keep against their time deposits.

Substantial reduction or elimination of the reserve requirement against time deposits would be a step toward putting member banks on a fairer competitive basis with other financial institutions.

The proposed 2 percent reserve for time deposits: From what has just been said it might be concluded that legal reserve re-

[P. 22]

quirements for time deposits should be eliminated altogether. Instead, the Economic Policy Commission proposes the adoption of a 2 percent legal reserve for these deposits.

This recommendation is tied directly to the commission's proposal that member banks be permitted to count their vault cash as part of their legal reserves. Member banks hold some vault cash to meet withdrawals of time deposits. If time deposits were completely exempted from reserve requirements, banks with large savings departments would benefit unfairly to a small degree by virtue of being able to count all their vault cash, including the portion held to take care of the operating needs of their savings departments, toward their required reserves for demand deposits. It would be neither logical nor fair to permit cash held in the savings department to constitute part of a bank's legal reserve against its demand deposits. A reserve requirement of 2 percent against time deposits would be more than adequate to avoid such an anomaly.

Should the proposed legal reserve requirement for time deposits be subject to discretionary change by the Federal Reserve Board? At the present time, the Board may vary the reserve ratio from 3 to 6 percent.

Since, as we have seen, a reserve requirement for time deposits is unwarranted from a credit-control standpoint, it follows that the proposed 2 percent reserve ratio should be fixed by statute and not be subject to change by the Federal Reserve Board. It should remain, as now, uniform for all member banks.

Recommendation 5. Permit the inclusion of vault cash in legal reserves

The present status of bank vault cash is one of the more conspicuous inconsistencies of the regulations governing member bank reserve requirements. Prior to 1917 vault cash was one of the specified legal reserve assets under the original Federal Reserve Act and, before that, under the National Bank Act. At the present time, at least part of the legal reserves of nonmember banks may be held in this form.

There is widespread agreement that vault cash should be counted as part of legal reserves of member banks. The Federal Reserve authorities have repeatedly gone on record as favoring this change.

Logically, vault cash should have the same reserve value as balances at the Federal Reserve banks. Most of the currency is issued by the latter or has to be obtained from the Federal Reserve by drawing on reserve balances. Federal Reserve notes and reserve

balances are equally liabilities of the Reserve banks.

Elimination of vault cash from member bank legal reserves in 1917 was prompted by a desire to concentrate more of the Nation's gold stock in the Federal Reserve banks under the unsettled conditions of the war period. During the 1920's it was feared by some people that permitting member banks

[P. 23]

to count vault cash as a legal reserve asset would result in the impairment of reserve positions and the lending power of the Reserve banks. This might have come about as a result of heavy withdrawals of reserve balances in the form of gold. Withdrawals of Federal Reserve notes would also have weakened the reserve position of the Reserve banks since at that time they were required to hold larger reserves against their notes in circulation than against their deposit liabilities.

Today these reasons for excluding vault cash from legal reserves no longer exist. Member banks cannot, of course, withdraw gold from the Federal Reserve. Nor would the conversion of reserve balances into currency have any adverse effect on the reserve position of the Federal Reserve banks since the law now prescribes the same reserve backing for Federal Reserve notes as for Reserve bank deposits.

Permitting member banks to count vault cash in their legal reserves would mean that part of these reserves would be held at the banks in the form of currency and part would be on deposit at the Federal Reserve. While there is an advantage to the Federal Reserve in having some of the required reserves of member banks maintained in the form of balances on its books, complete centralization of reserves at the Federal Reserve is unnecessary. Nor is there any likelihood that banks would convert a significant portion of their reserve balances into currency. Banks generally follow the policy of holding as little cash as possible.

Since there is no danger of large-scale withdrawals of currency by member banks, there is no reason for limiting the amount of vault cash that banks can count as legal reserves. Bank vault cash should have full reserve credit.

[P. 24]

PUTTING THE PLAN INTO EFFECT

Changes as far-reaching as those proposed in this report cannot be put into effect overnight, but will have to be accomplished over a period of years. The Reserve Board should have full authority with respect to the detailed execution of the plan, including the choice and timing of the various intermediate steps. By reducing reserve ratios whenever the Board believes it to be appropriate, fairly steady progress can be made toward a permanently lower level of reserve percentages. Similarly, the transition to a framework of uniform requirements and the inclusion of vault cash in legal reserves can be effected by a series of intermediate steps if the Federal Reserve authorities so desire.

It goes without saying that the phasing of the various steps should avoid interfering with current monetary policy. This aspect of putting the plan into effect will be discussed in a later section of this report.

It is impossible to say in advance just how long it will take to accomplish the commission's recommendations. The commission is of the opinion, however, that it might be desirable to set a tentative target date of 5 years with provision that the Federal Reserve Board have full authority to extend the target date by a year at a time if in its judgment such extension proves to be desirable.

Advantages of a target date: The establishment of a target date, even one that can be subsequently extended, should help the Federal Reserve authorities to attain the objectives of the plan within a reasonable period of time. For one thing, it would constitute the adoption of a clear-cut policy of achieving reserve reduction and reform as rapidly as circumstances permit and would give some indication of the general magnitude of the reductions in reserve requirements that might be expected to take place each year when circumstances permit. This would condition the financial community to regard such reductions as normal rather than abnormal actions.

[P. 25]

At present, reductions in reserve requirements are expected only under unusual conditions and are regarded by many people as signalizing an easy credit policy. If this view continues to be widespread, it could militate against making steady progress toward lower requirements.

A target date has the additional important advantage that it will give definite assurance that the two objectives of reduction in reserve requirements and reform of the reserve structure will be pursued simultaneously. No proposal for recasting the reserve structure can hope to win wide banker support unless it is combined with overall reserve reduction in a single legislative package.

The importance of adopting a concrete program designed to achieve definite objectives can hardly be overemphasized. Without such an overall plan, little or nothing may be accomplished in the way of reserve reduction and reform. If we are to make real progress toward an improved system of member bank reserve requirements, a definite plan, formally adopted and widely understood, is needed.

[P. 26]

EFFECTS ON THE MEMBER BANKS

If the commission's plan is adopted, what would be its effects on member banks' reserves? How would the reserve gain be distributed among the various classes of member banks, and how would the plan affect bank operations over the years ahead?

Efforts on total required reserves of member banks: If the commission's proposals were in effect at the present time, total required reserves (including vault cash) would be $7.7 billion lower than their actual present level of $18.4 billion, as of June 30, 1956). Required reserve balances that member banks must maintain at the Federal Reserve banks would be $9.8 billion lower (53 percent lower) than their actual current level. These computations may be seen in table II.

Actually, of course, the commission's plan could be put into effect only over a period of years and its ultimate effects on the amount of member banks' reserves will depend upon future changes in bank deposits and currency in circulation. As time passes, more and more of the reserves released through reductions in the requirement ratios will be required to support an expanding money supply.

Although it is obviously impossible to say just what these changes will be, some idea of their possible magnitude can be obtained by projecting past rates of growth into the future. On the basis of such projections, chart II shows the approximate changes that might occur over the next 5 years in total required reserves (including vault cash) and in required reserve balances if the commission's plan were to be put into effect within that time. The methods employed in making these projections are described in detail in the full text of the commission's study.

On the basis of these projections, total required reserves (including vault cash) would be about $5 billion lower in June 1962 under the commission's

[P. 27]

TABLE II.—*Required reserves on member banks, by class of bank, under present reserve provisions and under proposed economic policy commission formula*

[Based on deposit figures as of June 30, 1956; figures in millions of dollars]

	Central reserve city banks		Reserve city banks	Country banks	All member banks
	New York	Chicago			
Net demand deposits	21,044	5,504	38,282	34,495	99,325
Time deposits	3,438	1,314	16,803	19,986	41,542
Present reserve requirements:					
Against demand deposits	4,209	1,101	6,891	4,139	16,340
Against time deposits	172	66	840	999	2,077
Total	4,381	1,167	7,731	5,138	18,417
Required reserves under E.P.C. plan:					
10 percent of demand deposits	2,104	550	3,828	3,450	9,932
2 percent of time deposits	69	26	336	400	831
Total required reserves	2,173	576	4,164	3,850	10,763
Less vault cash (June 27, 1956)	151	31	684	1,302	2,168
Required balances with Reserve banks	2,022	545	3,480	2,548	8,595
Differences between present requirements and requirements under EPC plan:					
Reduction in total required reserves	2,208	591	3,567	1,288	7,654
Reduction in required balances with Reserve banks:					
Dollar amount	2,359	622	4,251	2,590	9,822
Reduction as percent of present requirements	53.8	53.3	55.0	50.4	53.3

NOTE.—Figures may not add to exact totals due to rounding.

[P. 28 (chart II)]

[P. 29]

plan than they are at the present time, and required reserve balances of member banks would be about $8 billion lower.

Chart II also shows that if the existing reserve setup were to remain unchanged, required reserves would increase by about $4 billion by 1962. Comparing this with what would happen under the commission's plan, it can be seen that the adoption of the plan would make a net difference of about $9 billion in the case of total required reserves and about $12 billion in the case of required reserve balances.

Effects on required reserves of various classes of member banks: An important feature of the commission's plan is that its effects on reserve balances would be distributed quite equally among the various classes of member banks.

If the plan were in effect at the present time, required reserve balances with Reserve banks would be about 50.4 percent lower for country member banks, 55 percent for Reserve city banks, and 53.7 percent for central Reserve city banks. This relatively even distribution of reserve gains results from the combined effects of the commission's proposals for the reduction of reserve requirements for demand and time deposits and the inclusion of vault cash in legal reserves. The computations may be seen in table II.

It should be emphasized that a reasonable equality of reserve gains can be achieved only if all the main elements of overall reserve reduction and reserve reform are handled together as an integrated program.

Effects on banking operations: The accomplishment of the commission's program over the years ahead would add to the flexibility of the banking system. In rapidly growing communities, the reserves freed by the plan would help banks to meet local demands for loans. In other instances, banks would be enabled to restore some of their secondary reserve assets which have been depleted in recent years. In either case the banks would be in a better position to serve their communities.

There would, of course, be some effects upon bank income, though it would be very difficult to estimate what these effects might be. Lower requirements would eventually enable the banks to expand the volume of their lending operations and to add to their holdings of securities. On the other hand, reserve requirement reductions could easily have some depressing influence upon interest rates—just how much, it is impossible to say. This would reduce the income of banks not only from their additional loans and investments but also from most of the assets they already hold.

The chances are that on balance bank income would probably be benefited. If this should turn out to be the case, it would be all to the good. Over the years ahead banks will require additional income to strengthen their capital accounts and to attract and retain the competent personnel they will need if they are adequately to serve the needs of the public for banking services.

[P. 30]

EFFECTS ON THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

What would be the effects of the Commission's plan on the position of the Federal Reserve banks? And how might it influence membership in the Federal Reserve System?

The Reserve banks Government securities portfolios: There seems to be considerable agreement that the Federal Reserve banks should work toward a reduction of their enormous holdings of Government obligations. At the present time the Reserve banks hold about $24 billion of Governments, an amount far in excess of their needs either for earnings or for credit control.

The commission's proposals contemplate a moderate reduction of these holdings over the years. On the other hand, unless reserve requirements are reduced, the Federal Reserve will have to pump more reserves into the banking system to enable it to meet the growing monetary and credit needs of our economy. Thus the Reserve banks would be confronted with the necessity of engaging in large-scale open-market purchases of Government securities for an indefinite period ahead. This would not only result in further expansion of the Reserve banks' portfolios but it would also eventually put pressure on their own gold certificate reserve ratios, especially if there should be an outflow of gold from this country.

Chart III gives an idea of the increase that might occur in Reserve bank holdings of Governments over the next 5 years if present reserve requirements were to be retained and the reduction in these holdings that might be accomplished if the commission's plan could be put into effect within that time. The estimated increase under the first assumption would be around $7 billion, whereas the estimated reduction based on the second assumption would be about $5 billion, a difference of $12 billion.

[P. 31 (chart III)]

[P. 32]

Reserve bank earnings: Such a decrease in the Reserve banks' securities holdings could easily result in a moderate decline in their income. On the basis of the 1955 yield and portfolio figures, a reduction of $5 billion in these holdings would reduce the banks' annual earnings by something like $85 million.

Since 1948 net profits of the Reserve banks have averaged about $305 million per year. The statutory 6-percent dividend on capital stock has amounted to less than $15 million annually. Clearly, the Reserve banks' remaining Government holdings amounting to $18 billion or more would continue to provide them with far more income than they need.

It is true that the Government would lose a small amount of revenue, since about 90 percent of the Reserve banks' annual earnings after dividends are now being voluntarily paid over to the Treasury. However, the Reserve banks were never intended to be a source of revenue to the Government, and policy regarding the level of required reserves should certainly not be determined on the basis of the effect on Federal Reserve payments to the Treasury. * * * roughly half of the revenue loss would be made up by the increased income taxes paid by the new holders of the securities.

Membership in the Federal Reserve System: At present about half of the commercial banks in the United States have elected to stay out of the Federal Reserve System. High reserve requirements imposed on member banks discourage membership in the System. A substantial reduction in these requirements would largely eliminate this obstacle and encourage membership, especially if the ceiling percentages were lowered as well. Additional membership in the System would obviously enhance the Federal Reserve's usefulness, including the effectiveness of monetary policy.

[P. 33]

EFFECTS ON MONETARY MANAGEMENT

As we have seen, the main function of legal reserve requirements is to contribute to the effectiveness of monetary management. How would the commission's plan affect this function?

Effects of the lower ratio of reserves: As part of the mechanism for credit control, the essential role performed by reserve requirements is to serve as a fulcrum, a fixed point through which the effects of discount and open-market operations are transmitted to the banking system. Experience in the United States and elsewhere has demonstrated that requirements do not have to be high to perform this function. A fulcrum of 10 percent of demand deposits serves just as well as one of 16 percent.

To be sure, a lower level of reserve percentages would affect the ratio of monetary expansibility. Depending on what the reserve ratios are, each dollar of reserves can support several dollars of bank credit and deposits. Consequently, the creation or extinguishment of a given amount of reserves can lead to a potential change of several times that amount in bank loans and investments and in bank deposits.

At a lower level of reserve ratios, the potential leverage effect of a change in reserves is greater, of course, than at a higher level of reserve ratios. Hence, changes in reserves not initiated by Federal Reserve policy, such as shifts of funds from member banks by the Treasury, would have a greater potential effect on credit expansion or contraction. However, this would also be true of the countering effects of the Federal Reserve's open-market and discount operations. The increase in the potential leverage would therefore have no appreciable influence on the effectiveness of monetary policy one way or the other.

[P. 34]

Effects of the reduction in the Federal's portfolio: As mentioned earlier, the carrying out of the Commission's plan would result in some reduction in the Reserve banks' holdings of Government securities. Would this weaken the Federal's credit-control powers?

Definitely not. As already discussed, the Reserve banks now hold far more securities than needed for credit-control purposes. The sale of only a small fraction of the System's holdings would completely absorb all excess reserves. In fact, ever since the end of World War II, these holdings have been well in excess of total member bank reserve balances, required and excess.

In sum, the Federal Reserve's portfolio is today far more than adequate to cope with any possible gold inflows or other contingencies that might tend to create excess reserves. It could be substantially reduced without any risk whatever in that direction.

Uniform reserve percentages and deposit shifts: The Reserve authorities have at times complained that the existence of geographical variations in reserve requirements results in uncontrolled changes in required and excess reserves. When funds shift from banks with high requirements to banks with low requirements the result is an increase in the level of excess reserves in the banking system as a whole. Such an increase may have no relation and, indeed, may run counter to current Federal Reserve policy. Similarly, a shift of funds in the opposite direction may also have undesired effects from the standpoint of monetary policy.

Uniform reserve percentages for all member banks would eliminate these perverse effects of deposit shifts and would thereby ease the task of monetary managers.

Effects of counting vault cash as reserve: Permitting member banks to count vault cash as reserve would in no wise hamper the credit-control operations of the Federal Reserve. Since member banks reserve balances and Federal Reserve notes are equally liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks, and the Reserve banks are now required to maintain the same gold certificate reserve backing for both; it is a matter of indifference to the Reserve authorities whether the member banks keep all of their reserves in the form of deposits at the Federal Reserve or whether they keep part of them in their own vaults.

As a matter of fact, inclusion of vault cash as part of reserves would probably make very little difference in present banking practice. Most banks would still hold their vault cash to the minimum needed for operating purposes. Some banks, however, might be encouraged to hold unneeded currency over very short periods instead of returning it to the Reserve banks and having it shipped back to them a few days later. This would reduce currency shipments and save expense to the Reserve banks.

[P. 35]

Masquerade of demand deposits: Years ago, the argument might have been made that lowering reserve requirements for time deposits might induce some banks to disguise some of their demand deposits under the time label in order to evade the higher requirement for demand deposits. This argument has little or no application today. The Federal Reserve Board has clearly defined what are and what are not time de-

posits for the purpose of computing reserve requirements. Also, banks have far less incentive to induce depositors to shift their accounts to the time category than they did in the days when interest was paid on demand deposits. Today, the extra interest cost would far outweigh the benefit to the bank from a lower required reserve.

Moreover, if legal reserve requirements were reduced to a uniform 10 percent for demand deposits and to 2 percent for time deposits, there would actually be even less incentive to reclassify deposits than there is now, because the differential would actually be smaller for reserve and central Reserve city banks than it is under the present ratios.

The commission concludes, therefore, that its proposals would in no wise weaken the credit-control powers of the Federal Reserve authorities, and that they would serve in some respects to improve the efficiency of the reserve setup as part of the mechanism for monetary management. Of course, that still leaves the question as to whether the transition to the lower level of reserve requirements would complicate monetary control. This question will be discussed next.

Effects on the volume of money and credit: Would the transition to a lower level of reserve requirements entail serious risks of any kind? Would reserve reductions have any undesired effects upon the volume of money and credit? Would they perhaps have an inflationary influence?

It should be borne in mind, of course, that the proposed changes would be accomplished by intermediate steps over a period of years, with the timing left entirely to the discretion of the Reserve authorities. Also, a large part of the reserve funds released by these changes would be needed to accommodate the needs of our growing economy. Reserve requirement reductions would be the best way of meeting these normal growth requirements.

It should be emphasized also that it is not contemplated that all of the reserves released under the plan would be used as the basis for a multiple expansion of bank credit and deposits. If the reserves released at any time are excessive in the light of current monetary conditions, the Federal Reserve can easily absorb them by open-market sales of Government securities.

In short, there is no reason for assuming that adoption of the plan would result in any greater expansion of money and bank credit than would occur if reserve requirements were to be kept at their present high levels.

[P. 36]

The plan does not conflict in any way with the continuance of the type of flexible monetary policy pursued by the Federal Reserve in recent years aimed at curbing undue credit expansion or contraction. In general, it should be possible to make fairly steady progress toward the goals we recommend. For example, instead of using open-market purchases to meet seasonal needs for additional reserves or to facilitate Treasury financing operations, the Federal Reserve could release reserves by a small reduction in the reserve percentages or by permitting an additional percentage of vault cash to count as reserves. Such a policy should enable the System to work quite consistently toward a lower overall level of reserve requirements without inflationary risks. In the event of a recession, of course, reserve reductions might be speeded up considerably.

As mentioned earlier, there will be need for a clear-cut understanding on the part of the public as to just what the reserve objectives are, the reasons for them, and how they are to be accomplished. This is important in order to prevent reserve reductions from being misinterpreted as always being steps to promote credit ease. The adoption of a definite target date, even one that can be postponed, will make it easier to carry out the plan without any undesired effects on public psychology.

To be sure, there might be some periods when reserve reductions might have to be postponed to avoid interfering with monetary policy. However, even when the Federal Reserve is pursuing a really tight money policy, there are good arguments for meeting seasonal and growth requirements by reserve reductions or changes in the status of vault cash rather than by open-market operations—provided, of course, that it is made clear, as could easily be done, that the reductions do not indicate a reversal of monetary policy. One of these arguments is that it might enable the Federal Reserve to adhere to a restrictive credit policy with less danger that insistent demands for bank credit might produce a liquidity crisis in the banking system. This is an important point to consider at the present time when so many banks have used up most of their secondary reserves and are approaching a fully loaned up position.

In any event, the commission's plan provides complete flexibility with respect to the selection and timing of the steps to be taken and there is no reason why its implementation should interfere with the Federal Reserve's flexible monetary policy.

[P. 37]

CONCLUSION

The desirability of a substantial reduction in member bank reserve requirements over the coming years seems evident. Also, the whole reserve structure should be shifted to a more logical and equitable basis.

The commission's plan provides a method of accomplishing these two goals simultaneously. In this way, it will be possible to effect a smooth transition to a desirable reserves set-up without hardship to individual banks and, as we have seen, this can be done without weakening the effectiveness of monetary policy.

The plan is based on a broad and comprehensive approach to the whole problem of bank reserves. Only such an approach can insure that all the needed reforms will be accomplished and that a reasonable balance of benefits to the various classes of member banks will be achieved. If we were to approach the problem in a piecemeal fashion, seeking limited objectives, our efforts might well result in the perpetuation of many inconsistencies and inequities and perhaps the creation of new ones.

The commission's proposals would not only result in a much more equitable distribution of the burden of carrying required reserves, but would also improve the efficiency of the reserve mechanism as a credit-control device.

Another major virtue of the plan is its relative simplicity. In contrast with the complexities involved in many proposals, the suggested new reserve arrangements would be easy to apply and to administer. Moreover, the plan does not contemplate a sharp break with traditional banking concepts and practices.

Finally, we wish to emphasize that the plan can be put into effect without unduly benefiting some categories of banks or unduly penalizing others. One of the big obstacles to reserve reform has been that most proposals would have resulted in higher requirements for some banks. This can be avoided by coupling reserve reform and overall reduction of reserve requirements. In

[P. 38]

fact, if the problem were handled as the commission suggests, the resulting reductions in required reserve balances, as compared with present levels, would be just about even, percentagewise, for the various reserve categories of member banks. This is important from the standpoint of the acceptability of the plan to bankers, throughout the Nation.

The period ahead should afford a good opportunity to put into effect the proposals contained in this report. The commission is convinced that the accomplishment of this program would constitute a major improvement in the American banking system and that it would lead to important benefits to the Federal Reserve System and to the public.

[P. 39]

ECONOMIC POLICY COMMISSION, 1955–56

Evans Woollen, Jr., president, American Fletcher National Bank & Trust Co., Indianapolis, chairman.

E. Sherman Adams, deputy manager in charge of economic policy commission, American Bankers Association.

Murray G. Lee, secretary, economic policy commission, American Bankers Association.

Daniel W. Bell, president and chairman, American Security & Trust Co., Washington, D.C.

Sidney B. Congdon, president, the National City Bank of Cleveland.

Mervin B. France, president, Society for Savings in the City of Cleveland.

Adrian M. Massie, chairman, the New York Trust Co.

Frederic A. Potts, president, the Philadelphia National Bank.

Herbert V. Prochnow, vice president, the First National Bank of Chicago.

Rudolph E. Reichert, president, Ann Arbor Bank, Ann Arbor, Mich.

John W. Remington, president, Lincoln Rochester Trust Co.

Lester E. Shippee, chairman, the Connecticut Bank & Trust Co., Hartford.

Edward Byron Smith, executive vice president, the Northern Trust Co., Chicago.

J. Harvie Wilkinson, Jr., executive vice president, State-Planters Bank of Commerce and Trusts, Richmond.

The President's Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, this Congress and the country face no more important decision than what to do about our programs of military assistance to other free and friendly countries, designed to increase their capacity to do what they most want to do, namely, to defend their national independence against Communist pressures from without and intrigue within. A special committee was set up by the President months ago to study this problem. The committee headed by the Honorable William H. Draper, Jr., and composed of 10 genuinely outstanding citizens, all with vast experience in this general field, has submitted its report. That report speaks for itself and must be studied soberly by each of us.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter to the President from Chairman Draper summarizing the committee's recommendations, the President's reply to Mr. Draper, and the President's letter to the Speaker, transmitting the report and the President's

concurrence in the committee's recommendations.

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE
TO STUDY THE U.S. MILITARY
ASSISTANCE PROGRAM,
Washington, D.C., June 3, 1959.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Based upon continued studies since our first interim report on March 17, 1959, we are submitting to you our second interim report. This report deals with "The Organization and Administration of the Military Assistance Program."

We expect to submit to you in the near future our recommendations on the economic assistance program.

We reiterate our unanimous belief that the United States and the free world are gravely threatened; that the military threat of the Communist dictatorships is greater than ever; that, likewise, the Communist economic and political threat and capability are increasing.

While there is at the moment no widespread military conflict with the Communist bloc, free world forces bolstered by our assistance are in fact confronting the enemy on many fronts. In certain areas, hostilities are suspended only by uneasy truces.

We have seen the development in recent years of a new dimension of the Communist threat: The effective use by the Communist dictators of military and economic aid programs. These dictators, not accountable to their people, move with great speed and flexibility in using their aid programs in support of their aggressive aims to take over or subvert additional free world countries.

The scope and purposes of our military assistance program have changed markedly since the program was begun some 10 years ago as a hastily instituted series of measures to meet Communist aggression in particular areas. Our programs have now grown to include assistance to nations which are clearly threatened with aggression or subversion. From mere reaction to overt actions our policy has developed into one of anticipation of threatened events and the building of collective security. It has thus become a basic portion of the defense structure of the free world and a bulwark of the long-range security interests of the United States.

Concurrently with the evolution of this concept, the nature and character of our military assistance program have undergone significant change. Our early programs consisted largely of shipments of conventional weapons drawn from post World War II stocks. Today, to meet the manifest needs of an adequate free world defense posture, new weapons having varying degrees of complexity appropriate to particular areas, are required.

Since many of the threatened free world nations are not capable of producing and paying for essential weapons, there is a clear need for military assistance. To eliminate or drastically reduce military aid to a country which is part of the present front line defense would constitute disengagement or withdrawal. This would, as certainly as in war, result in the loss of free world positions. And, since the threat will be with us for a long time, our planning and programing should be grounded on a long-term approach.

The administration of the military assistance program has greatly improved through the years. Nonetheless, there remain serious deficiencies in planning and execution. These require correction if military assistance is to make its maximum contribution. We are convinced that our assistance programs must be administered with increased speed and greater flexibility, and that this can be done effectively under our democratic processes.

An urgent need in this field is so to organize the administration of the military assistance program that our aid can be provided on a selective basis in timely anticipation of threatened aggression. Only so can we build the kind of collective strength that must underlie our efforts to deter or turn back those tempted to use force to achieve the subjugation of free nations.

By this, we do not mean to imply that all of our existing military assistance programs must be regarded as a permanent part of our national security position. For unless we do a selective job in this respect we surely run the risk of dissipating, in response to competing demands of many nations, the quantities of materials and support available year after year.

For this reason we recommend that there be reflected in the administrative process the substantive concept of selectivity, namely, that a continuing critical program review be provided in the executive department; that such review be made in the light of our basic national security strategy and that of the free world, that such review take into account the ability of other nations to provide their own share in the concept of true mutual security; and that any military assistance proposals which are not found conducive to the security interests of the United States be eliminated from our military assistance programs. Without such continuing reappraisal and evaluation, there is danger that such programs tend to continue simply through their own existing momentum as a drain on limited resources beyond the period of their real need. Without such technique of selectivity in its administration, even this essential program cannot long endure.

The Committee is convinced that the key to successful administration of the program lies in an effective working relationship between the Departments of State and Defense. This will require restraint by the Deparment of State against becoming involved in the details of operations, a willing acceptance by the Department of Defense of competent and timely foreign policy guidance, the development in the Department of State of a thoroughgoing capacity to provide this guidance, and a workable system through which proper execution of plans and adequate ability to effect necessary changes in programs is assured. The central role in such a system of meaningful and effective foreign policy guidance, utilized on behalf of the President and the Secretary of State, must be that of the State Department.

The Committee recommends acceptance of the following two basic concepts:

(1) The strengthening of the position of the State Department on the policy level of military assistance planning and an increased assurance of the conformity of the Military Assistance Program to foreign policy and to related assistance programs.

(2) The focusing of responsibility on the Department of Defense for planning, programing and execution of military assistance within the framework of policy guidance laid down in the National Security Council and by the Department of State.

Our principal recommendations giving effect to these two concepts are:

Military assistance should be planned and programed on a long term basis, covering a period of three and ultimately five years.

There should be a continuing authorization for the military assistance appropriation, in order to provide a sound legislative framework for multi-year planning and programing.

The military assistance appropriation should be placed in the Department of Defense budget, in order to center responsibility for administering the program more positively in the Defense Department.

Military assistance plans should be formulated within order of magnitude dollar guidelines to insure feasibility and should be approved by the Secretaries of State and Defense before implementation.

The Department of State and the Ambassadors should participate at an earlier stage in the development of military assistance plans.

Military assistance planning and programing should be further decentralized to the U.S. Unified Commands overseas and to the Military Assistance Advisory Groups.

Provision should be made for more adequate consultation with recipient countries during military assistance planning.

The Department of Defense should have clearer operational responsibility for planning, programing and execution of military assistance.

The executive branch should assure that funds for the procurement of military assistance material are made available to the military departments more promptly after appropriation; the military departments, in turn, should accelerate procurement and supply actions to expedite actual deliveries overseas of military end items.

There should be established within the Defense Department a Director of Military Assistance.

There should be established within the Defense Department an independent evaluation staff.

Highly qualified and experienced personnel should be asigned to the program.

Most of the changes we recommend can be carried out by actions within the executive branch. However, two of our recommendations are dependent directly or indirectly upon legislative action. They are:

(1) That you include the request for the military assistance appropriation for fiscal year 1961 in the Defense Department budget and submit it to the Congress in a separate title of the regular Defense Department appropriation bill, with the appropriations to be made directly to the Department of Defense; and

(2) That at the current session of Congress you request a revision of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to place the authorization for military assistance on a continuing basis.

Our recommendations are set out in greater detail in the report we are submitting to you. The remainder of our report consists of a discussion of the background of our recommendations and specific procedures for putting them into effect.

In our judgment, acceptance of our unanimous recommendations should lead to substantial improvement in the administration of the military assistance program. The extreme complexities of the program are such, however, that maximum results can be obtained only with the continuous command attention of all top level personnel in the executive branch responsible for the various parts of the program.

Respectfully submitted.

DILLON ANDERSON.
JOSEPH M. DODGE.
ALFRED M. GRUENTHER.
MARX LEVA.
JOHN J. MCCLOY.
GEORGE MCGHEE.
JOSEPH T. MCNARNEY.
ARTHUR W. RADFORD.
JAMES E. WEBB.
WILLIAM H. DRAPER, Jr.,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 24, 1959.

The Honorable WILLIAM H. DRAPER, Jr.
Chairman, the President's Committee To Study the U.S. Military Assistance Program, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: I want to thank you and the other members of your Committee for the thoughtful Second Interim Report of the President's Committee To Study the U.S.

Military Assistance Program, which was summarized in the letter of June 3, 1959, submitting the report.

Let me say first that I fully concur in your Committee's judgment as to the high importance of assuring that the military assistance program is organized and administered as efficiently and effectively as possible. Your exploration of these aspects of the program has been most useful and timely.

Your Committee in its June 3 letter unanimously recommends acceptance of two basic concepts:

(1) The strengthening of the position of the State Department on the policy level of military assistance planning and an increased assurance of the conformity of the military assistance program to foreign policy and to related assistance programs.

(2) The focusing of responsibility on the Department of Defense for planning, programing, and execution of military assistance within the framework of policy guidance laid down in the National Security Council and by the Department of State.

I am fully in agreement with these concepts.

I also consider the principal recommendations outlined in the letter of the Committee for effectuating these basic concepts to be valuable and well reasoned. Two of these recommendations, providing for a continuing authorization of military assistance and appropriating for military assistance as part of the Department of Defense budget, require legislative action. In transmitting copies of your report to the Congress, I am indicating my support of these proposals. I have also approved the substance of a legislative proposal to clarify the respective responsibilities of the Departments of State and Defense in the military assistance program.

The remainder of the principal recommendations contained in your letter of transmittal largely pertain to administrative actions which could be taken within the executive branch without additional legislative authorization. These proposals as I interpret them are acceptable to me, and the appropriate executive agencies are now making a detailed study of these proposals and will give to me, for my early consideration, recommendations with respect to their implementation.

I am in complete accord with your conclusion as to the necessity for continuing reappraisal and critical evaluation of our military assistance programs to assure that such programs do not tend to continue simply through their own existing momentum beyond the period of their real need.

May I once again thank you and the members of your Committee for the earnest study of and constructive suggestions about our vital military assistance program. In these troubled times I can think of no more important problem upon which the devoted attention of outstanding citizens is needed. As I have noted many times, our military assistance program is a vital part of our total security effort.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 24, 1959.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I transmit for the consideration of the Congress a report on the organization and administration of the military assistance program, submitted to the President on June 3, 1959, by the President's Committee To Study the United States Military Assistance Program.

I am in full agreement with the basic concepts enumerated by the Committee in its letter, and urge that the Congress provide for continuing authorizations for the military assistance program, and hereafter make appropriations for military assistance to the Secretary of Defense under a separate title in the Department of Defense budget. In addition, I believe that legislative action along the lines suggested by the executive branch is necessary to clarify the responsibilities of the Departments of State and Defense in the administration of the military assistance program.

The remainder of the principal recommendations in the Committee's letter largely pertain to administrative actions which could be taken within the executive branch without additional legislative authorization. These proposals as I interpret them are acceptable to me, and the appropriate executive agencies are now studying them and will make appropriate recommendations for my early consideration and approval with respect to their implementation.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Our Nation Should Not Help Other Nations To Raise Their Standards by Lowering Ours

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the headlines in today's papers should be the subject of serious study and congressional action. The President of the United States has announced a public threat to call Congress into a special session if it fails to give him the amount of money he is demanding for so-called foreign aid.

This comes within 48 hours after his veto of a public housing bill which contained in it urgently needed housing for our educational system, housing for the aged, slum clearance, and urban redevelopment, designed to make our crowded cities a healthier and better place in which to live.

It is inconceivable that this Nation must continue its shameful neglect and starvation of public education, indifference to the need for adequate medical care, the crowded and blighted areas in our big cities which cry aloud for remedy, the inadequacy of our airport system, the needs for stream clearance, flood control, and the need for public facilities which are so demanding that a nation must be at its lowest ebb of national pride and public ambition to allow such conditions to exist and, in fact, to grow. We talk about foreign aid no longer on the basis of military necessity, but rather from the high plane of Christian principle and humane considerations, while at the same time, the facts as contained within the reports of our own congressional committees show that while the talk is on a high plane, the actual operation of our economic aid is one motivated by economic greed, and the desire for exorbitant and untaxed profits.

How can any person, with any knowledge whatsoever of the situation, seriously believe that this ticker-tape prosperity, heralded by this administration as the sign of an industrial boom, has any sound foundation under it?

One of our leading colleagues in the Congress, CHESTER BOWLES, of Connecticut, has this to say about the Eisenhower "boom":

> Statements by Ike and others have caused a rush from bonds into stocks and real estate by investors. As a result, prices of common stocks and real estate have increased by tens and tens of billions of dollars. If this continues, these so-called values will eventually collapse, as they have collapsed in the past. When this occurs, it will be the millions of small investors, many of whom were frightened into the market by irresponsible fear talk about inflation, who will be hurt most grievously.

CHESTER BOWLES is not alone in his fear of the future under the present economic "dream-walking" policies of this administration.

One of the outstanding economists in the country, Leon H. Keyserling, former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, said:

> In the face of the current economic recovery, we are now threatened by redoubled revival of the regressive (Government) policies which converted the recovery of 1955 into the stagnation of 1956 and 1957 and the recession of 1957–58.
>
> The Federal Reserve Board is now reactivating with a vengeance the tight-money policy. In accord with the misguided Federal Reserve Board policies, the administration is asking for the removal of ceilings on interest rates. Budgetary retrenchment is again being given precedence over the neglected priorities of our national needs.

At this very moment in the economic struggle between the steel workers of this Nation, and the steel mill operators of this Nation, the President by indirect interference in talking of economy at home, budget balancing, vetoing of legislation designed to aid the economy of this country and to continue the upward climb of our standard of living, while at the same time, pouring billions of dollars into the economic blood stream of competitive industrial nations, talks glibly about holding the line, freezing wages, and in a grand gesture, calls upon the steel workers to continue to negotiate at their present level of income.

Walter Reuther, head of the giant United Auto Workers, whose union's welfare fluctuates with every pulse of the economic bloodstream of America, has this to say, as he struck hard at the policy of tight-money, high interest rates, cutbacks in Federal spending for public needs, and curbs on wage increases advocated by Ike, in the name of fighting inflation:

> These economic policies have plunged the Nation into recession twice in 5 years and have sowed the seeds of a third recession after a brief period of relative recovery.

Those of us who try to keep an even balance in our regard for the need of international friendship and international well-being, without neglecting the necessities of our own economic welfare, watch with great apprehension, the little publicized reports, statistics, and findings of various State governments

and Federal Departments, as our economic life flows back and forth across the lines of prosperity and recession.

Robert M. Shaw, a Labor Department expert, made this blunt statement last week:

> Many factory workers laid off during this recession may never get their jobs back—improved technology has made it unnecessary to continue these jobs.

The figures back up Shaw's statement for factory output, for May reached its highest peaks. But factory jobs were still 600,000 fewer than in May 1957. Likewise, on our national railroads, and if we are to believe the letters that we receive as Congressmen from our great national railroad system, the railroad industry is a sick, and failing economic enterprise, and yet—there has been a sharp contrast between the soaring traffic loads being carried by the railroads, and the very slow dribble of rehiring of furloughed workers.

On another front, and one that has too long been neglected because we are in the position of having a "bull by the tail" and not knowing how to let go, the economic front controlled by our international trade is a trade that is no longer based upon the needs of nations, but rather has been perverted into an economic tool in an attempt to control the policies and political climate in the nations of the world. It is estimated that the trade balance this year will show a drop in exports from a high of the last fiscal year of $23 billion to approximately $16 billion in exports—and an increase of $19 billion to somewhere around $21 billion in imports. It does not take an expert economist to figure out that we are trading raw goods, which produce a minimum of payroll jobs, for finished manufactured goods, which demand a maximum of man-hour and payroll production.

I have tried on numerous occasions, to point out to Congress that this Nation, with its high standards, will be hopelessly lost in a trade war with nations having low standards, low wages, corporate combines without restriction, little or no minimum guarantees in wages, working hours, living conditions, and educational facilities.

There was a time in the beginning of this generation, and later a little over a decade ago, when lowering of tariff walls, giving military aid, and economic assistance to many of the nations of the world, was a proper and much-needed governmental expenditure on our part. However, that day has reached its climax—that period belongs to the past. We are faced now with the realities of the situation, and we seem to lack either the mental capacity, or the moral courage to cope with the situation.

While leading economists publicly state that there is a serious and growing crisis in our Nation because of the drying up of investment spending for productive facilities in our Nation, this President and profit-seeking big business and moneylending banks are demanding that this Congress pass legislation giving even greater incentives and concessions to those who have already, and are planning in the future, to curtail their American production and to produce their products in foreign countries to be shipped back into this Nation under the same trade and brand names, while their former employees walk the streets in despair, and in many instances, become the objects of charity.

There can only be one answer if this Congress fails to look into the billions of dollars being expended to build up competitive enterprise abroad from the viewpoint of economic realities and that answer will be more unemployment, greater taxes, and a definite lowering of the American standard of living for those who depend upon payroll jobs for their livelihood.

If ever a single amendment to a major bill pointed up the weakness in the whole subject, an amendment added to the foreign aid bill by the Senate of the United States ought to cause every person with any awareness whatsoever of the precarious position we find ourselves in economically, to become concerned over the change in the philosophy behind foreign aid today and what it was at the beginning.

That amendment says in part, that aid will be withheld from any nation whose government expropriates the investments of American citizens in corporations, or enterprises within this Nation. This, then, is the crux of the situation. If economic and foreign aid is a matter of life and death for the American people, how then, can we say that stopping the profits of American investors in any country negates the necessity for this country a requirement of their help and friendship.

Is anyone so foolish as to believe that our national security depends then upon the sanctity of profit-making investments abroad? I condemn the philosophy and the logic which puts profit for personal and corporate gain above the welfare of our Nation and its people.

I condemn the philosophy and the logic which justifies the vetoing of expenditures for housing in our own Nation, while at the same time, expending millions of dollars under the President's directions for housing and educational facilities abroad. I condemn the philosophy and the logic that promotes the construction of production facilities abroad under the guise of mutual aid, which, in turn, shuts down our factories, and creates unemployment.

These things I condemn, and not because I am unmindful of the needs of others, but somehow, I cannot believe that nations that have been in existence for centuries, whose cultures, arts, and sciences go back into antiquity, should be classified as needy and underdeveloped nations.

I have, and will, support my Government in its efforts to help peoples of other countries to better their conditions, but I refuse to stand by idly and watch this Nation help other nations to raise their standards by lowering ours.

Has the West Lost Its Soul, Its Will To Live in Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following challenging article from Western World by Mr. Michel Didisheim, a Belgian writer who is also a businessman serving as head of the economic research and planning division of Sabena Airlines. While probably no one of us would agree with all Mr. Didisheim writes, his article sounds two very greatly needed notes. It shatters the complacency and unjustified optimism still found in so much of the West. And it demonstrates that courage and willingness to sacrifice are present in abundance among people who stand undaunted under the direct threat of Communist power. Such calls to discipline may yet save us—if heeded.

THE DEBASEMENT OF THE WEST

(By Michel Didisheim)

Is anyone today still unaware of the debasement of the free world? Is there one honest man who at the bottom of his heart is not at times ashamed of belonging to the West?

Public opinion, too often aroused by crises that are far too numerous, has grown utterly indifferent to the ballet of the Big Four. The helplessness of governments, their endless beating around the bush, their pettiness and their refusal to face the facts have led to a great weariness. Is this a prelude to surrender?

For 10 years, the Koreas and the Dien-Bien-Phus led us to believe that the threat was purely military. For 10 years a divided West thought in terms of defense, in terms of square miles that must not be lost. Self-satisfied and smug, the West assumed an attitude of aristocratic condescension, not for a moment thinking of the economic and psychological aspects of the struggle.

The Suez crisis confirmed the progressive attrition of the preceding years. The paralysis of Western leaders when faced by the Hungarian crisis, the Syrio-Egyptian Anschluss and the launching of the sputnik left us bewildered. And the Baghdad coup sanctioned the failure of our foreign policy, and started the West on the way to general breakdown and surrender.

Since the West's intervention in the Near East and the show of strength at Quemoy last year, it would have been reasonable to expect a recovery. But the last chapter in the tale of suspense, the Berlin crisis, has shown how divided we really are, notwithstanding apparent unanimity.

What emerges is not so much our decision as our lack of initiative; none of these crises was engineered by the West. We are satisfied to plug up a leak here or there, leaving the general flood unchecked. We refuse to mend our ways, and concentrate on rearguard action, instead of on reorganization.

In his recent warning to Red China, President Eisenhower recently stated that there would be no more Munichs. But we go from one Munich to another. Since the criminal policy of Yalta, we have gone from one with-

drawal to the next, losing our honor, our very reasons for existence. After that, what remains?

At one point, the Western World held all the winning cards. It was strong and rich, it controlled most of the means of production and even had absolute military strength. This it refused to use. Its component states were all intent upon their private interests, at the expense of the commonwealth of free nations. The old states were bogged down in the routines of a superannuated policy and succumbed to systematic immobilism.

And now, suddenly, we wake up to face Russian science, to face the colossus China and the fait accompli of an Arab world. And we are surprised.

The time is ripe for us to consider the conditions of our survival, to pass in review the criteria to be demanded of a policy pro bono publico.

Some clear minds have understood the danger and have succeeded in convincing the West that, in the future, the struggle would be an economic one. Even the Russians have confirmed this. And what have we done to take up their challenge? Have we mustered our forces? Have we braced ourselves for this new type of competition? And do we really understand that we have been outdistanced in this race?

The same lucid minds have shown the meaning for us of the awakening of the African and Asiatic nations. The importance of the underdeveloped countries has become clear: they could constitute the strongest instruments in the hands of the Reds if an anti-Western solidarity emerged from their common feeling of frustration. At Cairo, the Soviets even proposed to the underdeveloped countries that they stop exporting their raw materials to the Western powers. This plan has not succeeded so far. Then Western diplomacy fell into the clumsiest trap set in the past few years: Berlin. For the last 6 months and for God alone knows how many months to come, Berlin has been and will be our leaders' one concern. The Russians are delighted. Time works for them.

"WE WILL BURY YOU ALL"

The overt purpose of international communism is and remains the domination of the world. Any doubt on this score can be dispelled by Khrushchev's jokes and epistles. When, after a few vodkas, from behind his notorious "hearty good fellow" mask, he told Western diplomats, "We will bury you all." He was very serious indeed.

Our leaders make the great mistake of never reading. The Communists have set down not only their aims but their methods. Marx, Lenin, and Stalin have written voluminous works whose doctrines are applied to the letter. And all this has been published and is available to all.

This makes very instructive reading. It foresees everything: The cold was as well as the policy of smiles, gentleness as well as violence, how to exploit nationalisms, to sow doubt and discord, and to wage local wars. Tactics may vary, but the strategic aim remains the same. Chapochnikov modernized von Clausewitz and explains the cycle of wars and peace.

The Soviets deliberately bring about crises adapted to their needs of the moment, with certain precise aims in mind. They seek:

To create a diversion, to fix our attention on a question of secondary importance.

To destroy the myth of intrinsically superior states by forcing them to negotiate with lesser powers, and thus causing them to lose face.

To undermine the opponent's morale by threatening him with the nightmare of total war.

To spread discord among allies if these do not agree on common action.

To weaken the adversary by forcing him to keep up heavy military expenditures.

How well all this applies to the Berlin crisis, a crisis that is obviously artificial. It was devised in order:

To divert the attention of the West so that it would not be able to take advantage of the explosive situation that existed in China last fall after the launching of the communal program.

To use this diversion as a cover for Communist penetration into Iraq, into Syria, and who knows, into north Africa.

To keep the spotlight, as popular interest in scientific competition began to flag.

To create a belief in coexistence, in the possibility of permanent disengagement and even the hope of a solution of the German problems, all this with the obvious goal of dividing and weakening, of spreading doubt and confusion.

To keep alive the ghost of permanent threats so as to hide internal or economic difficulties.

If we consider how literally the Soviets apply the recorded principles of their international policies we cannot but be convinced that permanent coexistence is a delusion and that any long term agreement is unthinkable. For these imply a minimum of equity and respect for the pledged word, and neither of these terms has any meaning in Russian. To them coexistence is a way of putting us to sleep, a delayed, peaceful annihilation.

The question is how long the Soviets will be able to continue in this manner. For while the West may be threatened, there is no doubt that the Russian Empire is threatened likewise. The rising standard of living and the higher level of education will cause the masses in Russia gradually to become bourgeois and consequently more demanding. Public opinion will have to be taken into account. In the long run, and however much those in power try to check it, a liberalization will inevitably occur.

The satellites and the other customers of the U.S.S.R. represent a permanent danger to the Soviets. On the one hand the U.S.S.R. can trust them only so far, and on the other hand they are more open to Western influence.

China, one would like to believe, may become a real rival if not an enemy. We must exploit this rift. We have here a clear indication of our first objective: though coexistence, as it is considered at present, cannot be permanent, it will at least allow us to gain time and perhaps to get over the present cirtical moment. It will give us leisure to organize and make plans for our survival, while expecting, not a military elimination of Russia, but a transformation, a liberalization of the regime that is certain to take place notwithstanding the periodical tightening up with which we are familiar.

We must take time to meditate. We must learn anew how to think and to think in new terms, in a constructive way, putting aside our pride of old nations that have been insulted and belittled. Above all we must plan far ahead and stand firmly by the goal we will have set ourselves. Me must not follow the Russians.

We must substitute a dynamic and enterprising policy for the present one which is static and defensive. We must recover the initiative which we have left too long to the Kremlin. We must exploit its weaknesses, make use of its dissensions with other countries, and invent courageous and novel policies.

To begin with let us draw up demands as unacceptable as theirs, such as the evacuation of the countries of Eastern Europe. Let us make them as uncomfortable as they make us, when they bring about a situation to which any reaction on our part will turn to our disadvantage. Let us make more and more demands, insist more and more, wear out the enemy and keep him off balance. All this without ever forgetting our aim, to gain time. For whatever the Soviets think, if time does not work in favor of the capitalist regimes, it is less harmful to capitalism than to totalitarianism.

THE ACHILLES' HEEL OF THE SOVIETS

There is another area in which we can seize the initiative. It is the very one in which the Russians believe themselves the strongest and it concerns the peoples of Asia and Africa; of South America too, perhaps.

In this age of simultaneities, men have come to understand in relative terms the sort of conditions in which they live. They feel a resentment against rich nations, comparable to that which, within the nation, the have-nots feel toward the haves. From this feeling of frustration, itself often legitimate, may well spring an international class-consciousness that may prove fatal to the West.

The Soviets have made clever use of this powerful ferment to further their ends. They have been successful in an experiment in accelerated social and economic transformation and are ready to let others profit from what they have learned. They have launched a program of economic and technical aid which is very expensive, but to which no obvious political strings are attached.

In the eyes of the peoples of densely populated and underdeveloped countries, the Chinese experiment is still more fascinating. First of all, because it is truly Asiatic. Secondly, because the Chinese started from scratch, as most of these peoples will have to do. They faced, at the same time, both the problem of feeding themselves and that of building up capital. We must understand that the problem of the West's conflict with the East is one with that of its relations with the underdeveloped countries.

How can we win over the proletarian nations? The financial aid of the United States as it has been distributed up to now is both insufficient and badly used. It has not raised the standard of living of the masses. From this fact to the conclusion that the only possible successful method is that of communism, there is only one step.

Thus, it is most important that the Western nations counter the Communist program with national ones, with programs that will be able to electrify and spur the nation and make it willing to undertake the necessary effort.

Only then will the West be able to intervene discreetly. But, first of all, it must rid itself of its prejudices: it must give up belief in its own superiority; it must give up the idea that democracy is universally applicable.

Right now what can we do? We can help economically, financially, technically. We can welcome Afro-Asiatic students to our universities, we can bring our great productivity into play. We can help the underdeveloped countries to political, material, and spiritual independence. But our help must be free from the tinge of politics.

Later, when we have recovered our prestige and regained the respect of the world, when we have done what Christian peoples should have done long ago, we will be able to go on to a second stage, to turn the weapon of anticolonialism against those who are now brandishing it, and show them up as the only true imperialists, as the most reactionary regime in the world, which they certainly are.

To carry out our policy we must create a set of conditions that do not exist at the present time. It would take an article, or even 10 volumes to describe each of the elements of the environment that we must create.

First, we must learn to work together; divided we will surely fail. The lack of agreement during the Suez crisis made this truism all too clear.

We must create a political NATO. All nations must agree to delegate full powers in matters of international politics to a supranational Organization for Public Safety. This authority will have to plan, to take decisions and to act as executive. This is the only way to agree on one policy.

In the second place it is imperative that the West create a united Ministry of Information. We do not know how to sell what we have, and think propaganda the exclusive privilege of dictatorships.

We forget that we are dealing with a totally unscrupulous power. We can no longer oppose it with only the traditional arguments of good faith and objectivity.

On the home front there are two jobs to be done: First we must put an end to the illusion of peace at any price.

The Soviets are as afraid of us as we are of them, but we are playing into their hands when we fail to oppose thoughtless trends that repeated threats have imposed upon the masses.

CAN A DEMOCRACY MEET THIS CHALLENGE?

The second task is related to the first. It is certain that, in the years to come, as one crisis follows another, we will have much need of restraint and austerity. For one thing, assistance to the underdeveloped nations will be very costly. How shall we explain to the taxpayer that he is paying for his survival? Will the democracies be able to convince contending private interests to submit to the general good?

These different factors imply a certain danger. As always in times of crisis, democracies risk losing their liberty when trying to defend it.

This trend has started. During the coming critical years, the democracies will have to be careful not to sink into dictatorship while adapting themselves to new conditions.

When we consider the failure of our foreign policy, when we think of how the West betrayed the White Russians and abandoned the countries of Eastern Europe, when we think of how the West has failed in Africa and Asia, we may well ask: "Is the West still worth fighting for?" Are we not living in the past? Is it not part of normal evolution for the world of tomorrow to be a world of robots?

In conclusion, why must the West necessarily survive—by the grace of God?

Marxism—in outward appearances, at least—has something to offer which is certainly attractive to peoples which are not so prosperous or so wary of traps as we. As an alternative, we offer very vague notions such as liberty and equity. Men in rags have no use for these notions: they are a luxury which awakens no echo.

To combat an ideology, a pseudoreligion, we propose a way of life: Democracy.

The world, in spite of temporary quarrels, is moving toward political unity; it has been shaped on a Western pattern, even according to a European pattern. It has adopted our techniques, our form of government, our parties. Communism and materialism, science and the arts, are all the products of Western thought. The code of values which the world observes, at least in form, is a Christian one.

And yet, the West has no soul. In the eyes of Asia and Africa it merely represents fat living, a sickening opulence, a shameful materialism and selfishness.

Will the West be able to spread a doctrine other than that of the belly? What message will it bring? Our dollars alone will be unable to finance our survival.

And why survive?

Because the West is the only universal civilization with a conscience; today it is ashamed and wants to reform.

Because theoretically at least, the rule of law has replaced the arbitrary rule of force.

Because the world of tomorrow will be characterized by a certain giganticism, and only the West, with its public opinion, its conscience, its wealth, will be able to keep it from becoming monstrous.

Because soon, in this world of oppression and conformity, in this world without poetry where treason and falsehood have become common coin, the West will be the only place where man can still breathe freely.

Plan for a World Science Youth Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in the ideological struggle between the free world and the Communist-dominated world, the efforts to influence the minds of the younger generation are of paramount importance. While the spokesmen for communism seek to confuse youth and to hold out false hopes for them, it is our task to keep our young people informed and to get the truth across to them.

It was the great English statesman Burke who said:

Tell me what are the prevailing sentiments that occupy the minds of your young men, and I will tell you what is to be the character of the next generation.

This is as true today as it was in Burke's day. No one is perhaps more aware of it than the leaders of the Kremlin who utilize every opportunity to exploit the enthusiasm and the energy of youth, as well as its lack of experience in world affairs and in the ways of certain conspiring men. Lenin, the archconspirator of them all, once said:

We need young forces. The youth will decide the issue of the whole struggle, the student youth and still more the working class youth.

I believe it is high time for us to recognize the importance of youth—and especially its natural thirst for knowledge, its idealism, and its universal desire for greater opportunities—so that these qualities can all be utilized toward keeping the free world in a true state of freedom. We must encourage and help guide our youth toward a better understanding of world problems, an appreciation for international amity, and a desire for international cooperation.

One of the primary ways to achieve this is by providing youth with wider opportunities in the fields of science, scientific research, and technology for the benefit of all mankind. Young people must be given the opportunity to acquire broad knowledge in these fields and to apply this knowledge in the interests of humanity. They must also have the freedom to exchange their knowledge and their findings in science and technology with youths of other countries, so as to obtain the best possible cooperation and understanding which would also help promote better human relations in other endeavors.

I am, therefore, introducing a concurrent resolution authorizing the President to issue a call for a World Science Youth Conference, to which are to be invited youth and youth leaders of all countries, including the Iron Curtain countries, who have demonstrated an interest in science, scientific research, and technology. This World Science Youth Conference is to be held in 1961 in Seattle, Wash., at a time when the World Science Pan-Pacific Exposition, also known as Century 21 Exposition, is in progress in that city.

On May 21, 1959, President Eisenhower submitted a message to Congress pertaining to U.S. participation in the Century 21 Exposition and requesting certain funds for use primarily in connection with exhibits which are planned to promote greater interest and understanding of certain basic science areas on the part of young people and adults. This matter has been referred to the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, of which I have the honor to be a member.

U.S. participation in the Century 21 Exposition was established under Public Law 880 of the 85th Congress, approved on September 2, 1958. Of the three purposes listed for the exposition, the second one is described as follows:

(2) Depict the role of science in modern civilization.

Under the circumstances, I believe that a World Science Youth Conference to be held in conjunction with the exposition would be most appropriate and an excellent way to promote interest in science among youth.

Specifically, my resolution proposes that the youth conference shall afford the young people and youth leaders participating therein an opportunity to exchange views and opinions on the following problems:

First. The development of science for peaceful purposes, rather than for war or destructive purposes.

Second. Scientific and technological developments in the fields of agriculture, industry, and commerce, which can be used to assist the underprivileged and underdeveloped countries of the world.

Third. The adaptation of scientific and technological advances to improve health and education and raise the standard of living in all countries.

Fourth. Seek ways and means of providing a greater incentive to the youth of the world to acquire scientific and technological knowledge, as well as the needed educational opportunities to acquire such knowledge.

The resolution further provides that the World Science Youth Conference should submit specific recommendations for an international program designed to encourage the youth of the world to pursue scientific and technological projects and research for the benefit of all mankind.

I should like to suggest that, when the call to the youth conference is issued, invitations should also be sent to youth representatives of Iron Curtain countries so that they and the nations they represent may have the opportunity to see for themselves that the free world is earnestly interested in the peaceful develop-

ment of science and technology, and that it genuinely desires for all mankind to live in peace. I am naive enough to believe that perhaps some good may come out of this effort.

It is my feeling that an international youth conference devoted to scientific progress would serve as a great boon to the cause of freedom. It would demonstrate to the newly independent nations of Asia and Africa, large and small, neutral or friendly to either West or East, that the Western World is truly aiming to achieve world peace and human progress, not war and destruction. Freedom-loving peoples everywhere would be quick to realize that we are seeking to help all youth and to provide them with greater opportunities for a better life.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that we stand to gain a great deal through this proposal in winning moral support, greater prestige, and worldwide recognition of our efforts. Congress can launch this effort by prompt passage of my resolution.

Presbytery of San Joaquin Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. McFALL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD today and call to the attention of the Members of Congress a resolution recently adopted by the Presbytery of San Joaquin approving our Government's position on recognition of Red China.

The resolution prepared by the social education and action committee, headed by Rev. George W. Chrichton, reads as follows:

RESOLUTION

"We, the committee, move adoption of the following resolution:

"No. 1. That we approve the action of our President and Department of State and our Government in general in refusing to recognize the Government of Communist China or her admission to the United Nations.

"No. 2. That we approve the action of our Government in endeavoring to place our country in an adequate state of preparedness to combat any further armed aggression by any Communist country, the supporting of other countries, willing to assist us, with money and arms.

"No. 3. That we urge representatives of our denomination in the National Council of Churches to oppose any effort on the part of the council or its departments or committees to recommend the recognition of Red China or her admission to the United Nations or any similar action contrary to the spirit of this resolution."

ACTION CONCERNING PETITION OF THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF EXETER, CALIF.

The presbytery by a unanimous vote approved this petition and all of its provisions: "Whereas the deliverances of the Fifth World Order Conference of the National Council of Churches, in session November 18 to 21, 1958, proposed the admission of Red China to the United Nations; and

"Whereas the News, a newsletter published and distributed by the National Council of Churches, in its new release dated November 26, 1958, and immediately following the deliverance of the fifth world order conference, gave support to the proposal of admitting Red China to the United Nations; and

"Whereas the wide dissemination of this deliverance and support by the National Council of Churches on this news release created the opinion that the member churches of the National Council of Churches had or would give approval to this proposal; and

"Whereas the Exeter Presbyterian Church, through its session and with the approval of its congregation, strongly opposes any proposal that would support Red China or its admission to the United Nations: Therefore

"The Exeter Presbyterian Church respectfully petitions the presbytery of San Joaquin to enter a strong protest to the seemingly untimely distribution of the report of the fifth world order conference and apparent endorsement of the proposal by the National Council of Churches, and that this protest, when approved by the presbytery of San Joaquin, be delivered to the General Council of United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America and a copy of the protest, and the action of the presbytery concerning the protest, be delivered to the office of the National Council of Churches in New York City. This protest was approved by the session of the Exeter church December 10, 1958, and by the congregation January 13, 1959."

The report, as a whole and all of its recommendations were adopted.

Hard Money Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "'Administered' Cost of Money—High Interest—Is Cause of Inflation," published in the newspaper Oregon Farmer-Union of June 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"ADMINISTERED" COST OF MONEY—HIGH INTEREST—IS CAUSE OF INFLATION

What about this issue of inflation and the "sound dollar"? What is the cause of inflation? And are the proposed remedies fair to farmers, wage earners and small business men?

The subject of money has many pitfalls. Ever since William Jennings Bryan fought it out on a platform of free coinage of silver, money has been a favorite subject of American politicians. It is again projected as a leading issue in the coming campaign by President Eisenhower's call for a "sound dollar."

At the risk of getting out on a limb, here are a few unorthodox thoughts on inflation and its causes.

Demand and supply are no longer reliable guides in determining prices. This is because prices are now administered by hugh monopolistic corporations, such as the motor companies, irrespective of demand and irrespective of supply. Even when demand was falling, as in the recent depression, prices of automobiles were raised. This completely ignores the so-called law of supply and demand. The auto companies could do it—and get away with it—solely because they are so big and because they have nearly an airtight control of the market.

The same thing is true of the price of steel and many other basic commodities in the economy.

Why cannot the same rule be applied to the price of money, otherwise known as interest? We think the same rule is being applied to money. The cost of money or credit today is just as much an administered price as the cost of other monopolistically controlled commodities in the market.

A few days ago, the great New York banks which largely dominate the credit market in the United States, raised the price of credit—the prime interest rate—to 4½ percent. That meant that those borrowers with the highest credit rating in the Nation had to pay 4½ percent. Other banks all over the Nation have followed—or will follow—this pattern. Lesser borrowers will, of course, pay much more than 4½ percent.

As this administered price of money is raised, and all interest rates go up, their effect on inflating prices all through the economy will soon be felt. Homebuilders will have to pay higher interest rates. Farmers borrowing money to harvest their crops will pay higher interest. Businessmen borrowing to expand their business will pay more for interest. And worst of all, the cost to the Government of borrowed money will go up and up and up. There is now talk of raising the interest rate on Government bonds to 4½ percent. A raise of 1 percent on Government bonds adds nearly a billion dollars a year to the interest bill of the Federal Government.

It is this monopoly control of credit which is the prime factor in causing inflation. Not higher wages but higher interest is the real villain.

What is the remedy for this higher interest rate—this administered cost of credit?

The remedy is a comparatively simple one—if the right political forces are in power. That remedy is for the Federal Government to furnish real competition in the money market to this monopoly control of credit. In other words, let's have a little mixed economy applied to money. Let's have some credit yardsticks just as we now have electric power yardsticks in the form of Federal dams which tend to keep down the cost of privately generated electricity. If the Federal Government would again institute the direct loaning of Federal credit to farmers and homebuilders, as it did during the forties and to some extent until 1952 when Eisenhower became President, you would see the interest rates fixed by private banks drop in a hurry.

This policy of having the Federal Government furnish part of the credit needs of the Nation would not undermine the free enterprise system. As a matter of fact, it would tend to strengthen the free enterprise system. For it is an axiom of the new economics that the free enterprise system cannot survive unless the Central Government actively intervenes to assure adequate purchasing power, competitive prices where monopolies would otherwise take over, and low interest rates to maintain an expanding economy.

This may be very painful to certain groups in the population. But it would be very helpful to the vast majority. And in the long run, it would assure a healthier free enterprise economy. It is the real answer—the only answer—to the kind of inflation which faces us today.

Appendix

Communist Psychological Warfare Against the United States and the Rest of the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it has long been recognized that Communist tacticians utilize insidious techniques in their campaign of psychological warfare against the United States and the rest of the free world. These techniques are frequently veiled, disguised, and camouflaged.

Maj. Gen. Lewis S. Griffing, Deputy Commanding General, 4th U.S. Army, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., has thrown the light of expert comment on these techniques in a recent speech.

Because of the timely and continuing importance to the Nation of this subject matter, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. LEWIS S. GRIFFING, USA, DEPUTY COMMANDING GENERAL, 4TH U.S. ARMY, FORT SAM HOUSTON, TEX., AT FOURTH OF JULY PROGRAM, FORT SAM HOUSTON, TEX., JULY 4, 1959

We are met here today to commemorate one of the most significant days in world history. It is the anniversary of the official beginning of the American Revolution, the day on which that great document, the Declaration of Independence, was formalized. On that day our national existence began. Think carefully what that has meant to the world in the 183 years since that great event.

From the 4th of July 1776, when those great founders of our country declared to the world our Nation's independence, to the 4th of July 1959, this country has moved to the pinnacle of world leadership. It is an amazing record—from a mere handful of courageous leaders and volunteers to the mightiest Nation in the world in a comparatively insignificant fraction of the span of the history of mankind as we know it.

We may well be proud of that record, and for its many facets which together present a picture of unparalleled progress. It is a picture of a people who have gained unprecedented power—politically, financially, and militarily—almost overnight, so to speak, and who have used that power not for world conquest or domination, but to rescue and assist and lead by christian example the weak and the helpless everywhere.

We are a people who cannot be led into war by our friends, but who can be provoked into it only by the overt acts of international criminals who seek world conquest or domination by force. We do not have to beat our breasts and proclaim it—we have lived it during the period of man's greatest progress in material things. And our form of government insures that this moral code will continue.

We take pride in our military history, which has insured, often against tremendous odds and at great sacrifice of life and national treasure, the preservation of our revered form of government.

The 145 streamers on the Army flag represent not only great sacrifice, but great honor to the U.S. Army and the heroes who gave it soul and body. They were not mercenaries, or blind slaves of tyrants. They were champions of the right—champions with a mission—champions of the present and the future generations who, God willing, will live in freedom.

Each streamer contains a thrilling story of men who did not want to go to war, but who were willing to sacrifice all they held dear in the unceasing struggle to develop a world in which the individual will be free from injustice—from either his own or another government.

The world recognized, and we marvel today, at the courage of those signers of the Declaration of Independence and the volunteers of the Army who fought to insure a place in history for that Declaration. The odds against their fortunes, their lives, and their sacred honor were tremendous. It must have presented an almost impossible situation, facing the world's mightiest army and navy with nothing but raw courage and faulty flintlocks.

But we are now engaged in just as deadly a war. Here in the middle of the 20th century the weight of tyranny—political, economic, social, and military—is still heavy on the shoulders of men. It is unceasingly engaged in maneuvering by any means—mostly foul—to bring about the opportunity of crushing all men with its killing weight.

Its name is communism—and its slaves are legion. And it is a greater tyrant than George III ever thought of being.

Our military forces, like the Minutemen, are faced with almost impossible odds, if one considers just the number of men in uniform. So we must, like the Minutemen, be versatile. We must be prepared to fight an all-out nuclear war. At the same time, we must be prepared to fight any type of war, anywhere, to keep the Communist tyrant from his goal of world conquest.

In the field of military power the United States has made significant strides. We have been and are continually improving our physical preparedness with new ground, sea, and air vehicles, weapons, methods, and equipment. But we need also mental preparedness—an understanding of what faces us and the mental fortitude to meet that threat.

Let me speak frankly. We and the other free people of the world are engaged in mortal struggle with the Communists. To the Communists the cold war is not a holding operation, nor a prelude to a hot war. The current struggle is the main bout, the decisive offensive, conducted on an unlimited scale, with total victory as the goal.

Right now—this very moment—the Communists are aiming a barrage of propaganda and espionage at freedom-loving countries the like of which we have never seen. We can talk about total war or the "big kill" and take great satisfaction in reading about the invention of more and more destructive and ultimate weapons against which there is no defense. The Communists, nevertheless, have brought one-third of the world under their iron control. How have they done this? Not by total war. They have accomplished their ends by shrewd diplomacy, propaganda, deception, the blackmail of threats, fifth-column subversion, guerrilla forces, and, where expedient, localized shooting wars.

Witness the fact that now with Tibet 18 limited war situations have occurred since the end of the shooting in World War II in 1945.

Is anyone here so optimistic as to believe this piecemeal aggression will stop?

We are engaged in a psychological war with the Communists. Are we prepared to fight this psychological war? Are we aware of the symptoms of this type of warfare? Do we recognize them? Have we the mental ability, resourcefulness, and determination to resist Communist propaganda, to identify it, to denounce it, and to fight back?

What are the signs of psychological warfare in which we are engaged?

If we pause long enough to analyze what's going on in the world today, the method of attack is obvious. It consists of two basic objectives of the Kremlin, as far as the United States is concerned.

The first may be called the economic strangulation of the United States. Some of the symptoms are to cut us off from raw materials from abroad, to destroy markets for our manufactured goods, to stop the flow of U.S. capital abroad—to drive away friends and allies.

The second objective is aimed at crippling the United States from within. The way of life we have built up over generations comes under attack. Our institutions, our industrial structure, our culture, our ideals, and our great free-enterprise system which has produced the highest standard of living the world has ever known are the prime targets.

They promote strife and dissension among labor and management, or among races, creeds, and classes. They discredit our customs and culture. We are painted to the rest of the world as the warmongers, they as the peace seekers.

Also used are the "trojan horse" technique which penetrates, subverts, and gradually takes over weak governments and countries; the "big lie" and "red herring" methods which consume our attention and energy in refuting something which was never true in the first place; treaties, agreements, promises are kept or broken as they fit the Communist overall assault. The "now-you-see-it—now-you-don't" or "shell game" method, which alternately raises false hopes and frustrations among free people, hoping to undermine our will to resist.

"The "wrong ball" system in which the Communists very adroitly build up a crisis in one place and while everyone is alarmed and concerned about it, quietly move into a completely different place and take over. Berlin and Iraq may be current examples.

These insidious techniques employed by the Communist tacticians are numerous and used with skill, deception, and foresight. They are mixed with the soothing ointment of peaceful coexistence. Other examples of their deception are: "Let's end the armament race"; "Let's prohibit the atom bomb"; "Let's pull our troops out of Korea and Germany"; "Let's disengage in Europe."

Look at the evidence so that we may stay mentally alert and avoid getting caught in these pyschological traps.

Mental preparedness is just as vital to our survival as physical preparedness.

It concerns me and I know it does you also that we are weak in this area. Certainly we are reminded of our obligations often enough but are we getting the idea across to all the people?

When we look at the trend in juvenile delinquency, hoodlumism, and general disrespect for law and order, it gives us cause to wonder. There seems to be a certain lethargy and an unwillingness to face up to what is happening to and in the United States and the free world. In other words, our fourth weapon or the psychological weapon is by no means comparable to our physical capability.

Today we should look into our hearts and make sure we do not fail to keep that faith. On each Fourth of July we should read again those words which proclaimed liberty throughout the land in our Declaration of Independence and which have since served as inspiration to the oppressed everywhere.

Unlike the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence provides no frame of government. It offers no pattern of human society, no specific blueprint for the future. But it contains a body of abiding truth. Lenin and Stalin lie embalmed in Moscow, symbols of Communist tyranny. Our own Constitution, by contrast, is enshrined as a symbol of our devotion to a government of laws, not men. The Declaration of Independence is a perpetual reminder of the purpose of these laws—of the only valid purpose of all laws—to provide and perpetuate a society within which all men can enjoy the largest feasible degree of liberty and attain the fullest measure of happiness.

The Declaration is revered in all corners of the earth by the free and those who would be free. Their hearts are stirred by it partly because of its historic associations and its success, partly because of the beauty of its phrases, but chiefly because men perceive that it is as universal as it is national. Its historic American faith can be simply stated in dateless language.

By birth all men are equal, not in ability or condition, for that has been untrue in all the ages of which we have any record, but in the possession of fundamental rights. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are mentioned in the great charter; but more important than any list is the "truth" that men possess these rights, not because of race or creed or station, but because they are human beings. Here is the eternal answer to bigotry and intolerance of any and every sort.

Government and other form of public control is a means to human well-being, not an end in itself. Man is not made for the state but the state for man, and it derives its just powers only from the consent of the governed. In extreme cases, like the one in 1776, this "truth" justifies political revolution, and in all cases it provides the criterion by which any government or institution should be judged. No sort of rule can justly rest on power alone, and here is the eternal answer to all forms of tyranny over the persons, the property, and the minds of men.

The wondrous phrases which were written on our first Independence Day into the official creed of the newborn Nation were an expression of ideals, not immediate realities. In every generation since, some men have scoffed at them, some have given only lip service to them, and others have been distressed by the slow and imperfect attainment of them. But the gradual realization of the wisdom of the great Declaration has inspired American citizens, soldiers, and statesmen to their noblest actions.

The Declaration's most eloquent testimony was that given by Abraham Lincoln on the anniversary of Washington's birthday in 1861, when he said:

"I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence. I have often pondered over the dangers which were incurred by the men who assembled here (in Philadelphia) and framed and adopted the Declaration. I have pondered over the toils that were endured by the officers and soldiers of the army who achieved that independence. I have often inquired of myself what great principle or idea it was that kept this Confederacy so long together. It was not the mere matter of the separation of the colonies from the motherland; but that sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but, I hope, to the world, for all future time."

On the 4th of July 1795, 11 years after the historic struggle for American independence began, a Dr. Samuel Willard, who incidentally was one of General Meloy's forebears, made what was then called an oration. I can do no better than to quote briefly from it. To me it stated then our case for today as clearly as words can:

"On this joyful, this memorable day how ought our hearts to glow with gratitude towards that Almighty Being, who appeared for us in our darkest scenes of adversity and danger, and has conducted us to a state of unequalled happiness and prosperity. Let us evince the grateful feelings of our hearts by acting in correspondence with the dignity of our natures, and agreeable to the strictest rules of morality and religion.

"Happy are we as a nation and happy shall we continue to be, if we have only the virtue to know and prize the source from whence our happiness proceeds. And here let me ask: are there any who would knowingly prefer licentiousness, anarchy, and confusion, before peace, harmony, and good Government?—we would hope there are but few but very few among us, who would answer in the affirmative. How pleasing would it be should the several republics and the individuals who compose them, cordially harmonize under our present form of civil Government. In the meantime we may do much to render ourselves and our acquaintance happy in the prospect. Let us attend only to fair and rational arguments. Let us not be led astray by idle harangues or by objections without any foundation. Let us exert ourselves to sow the seeds of harmony and concord; and let us adhere to our Constitution as the rock of our political salvation. Should our Government continue stable and energetic—should piety, virtue, industry, and frugality be encouraged—should luxury and vice be discountenanced: America may then hope the continuance of those blessings which she has already realized, and which luxuriant imagination has heretofore painted out. Her estimation with foreign nations will increase. Her arts and manufactures will flourish. Her husbandmen will find a ready vent for the productions of their farms. Commerce will spread her whitening sails to the four winds of heaven. The remotest regions of the earth will be visited by her ships and benefited by her exportations. Her free-born sons will enjoy the sum of human felicity and transmit it entire to the latest posterity."

In a few moments our current version of Old Glory goes down and in its place will be raised the 49-star flag—the additional star for our new great State of Alaska. In another year Hawaii will be added.

Fix your eyes on that grand old flag, and take from that look the inspiration which is always there. Nothing must ever take away that symbol which is the United States of America.

Study of Poison Spray Effects Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 29, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on June 21, 1959, the Department of the Interior endorsed legislation, which I have cosponsored in the House (H.R. 5813), to increase the scope and value of the research now being conducted to determine the effect of pesticides upon fish and wildlife resources.

Pointing a finger at the need for such legislation is the Salt Lake Tribune in its editorial of June 29. The editorial follows:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, June 29, 1959]

STUDY OF POISON SPRAY EFFECTS OVERDUE

The Interior Department's recent appeal for a greatly expanded research program into the effects of pesticides on fish and wildlife surely will be echoed by concerned organizations and individuals throughout the country.

The problem has proved of much greater magnitude than originally believed and the research program should be permitted to expand as wisdom dictates, Ross Leffler, Assistant Interior Secretary, said in a report to Congress.

It should not be too much to hope that the program will be expanded even beyond the recommendations of the Department and also include a thorough study of the effects of insect poisons on humans and domestic animals.

The Interior Department estimates that the use of pesticides will increase so greatly that by 1975 the wholesale value of such materials used each year will approach a billion dollars. That would compare with $40 million worth used in 1940 and $290 million worth in 1956.

"One-sixth of all the croplands and millions of acres of forests, rangelands and marshlands are treated annually with these chemicals," Leffler said.

"Most of these areas are important wildlife and fish habitats. Some chemicals persist in the soil for periods of 3 to 5 years or longer.

"Certain food chain organisms, such as earthworms, living in treated soil or waters, tend to concentrate poison in their body tissue. Hence, birds, fish, and other aquatic creatures are affected when they feed upon the contaminated organisms," the report said.

"Studies made to date have shown that DDT may kill fish and other aquatic life when applied at dosage rates in excess of one-quarter pound per acre. Two pounds per acre will kill birds and cause heavy mortality among mammals."

Pheasants, quail, and other species exposed to amounts which do not cause death suffer delayed effects in the form of reduced reproductive capacity and survival of their young.

"Persistent high levels of DDT have been found in the bodies of fish months after temporary concentrations in the stream had dissipated," Leffler reported. "Bird numbers in several of the areas treated with Heptachlor for imported fire-ant control have been found to be reduced 75 to 85 percent. Populations of quail, wild turkey, and rabbits also were decimated in some of the areas."

It would also seem reasonable that DDT and other chemicals ranging from mildly toxic to dangerously poisonous might be passed on to human consumers through veg-

etables or fruit which have been sprayed or through concentrations in milk and meat.

After a great deal of soul searching and debate, Congress last year tightened regulations empowering the Food and Drug Administration to control flavorings, sweeteners, and a host of other chemical agents known as food additives. The law applies chiefly to chemicals deliberately placed in food going into commercial channels. The teeth in the law require pretesting by manufacturers before an additive is placed on the market.

Poisoning through accidental or deliberate heavy use of insecticides remains largely in a no-man's land of controversy and confusion. Powerful conservation organizations are fighting vast aerial spraying programs such as that for fire ants in the southern States, but what of the lowly homo sapiens whose strawberry beds happen to be in the way of his neighbor's spray gun?

It is time a thorough study was made of what conceivably could prove to be a mammoth self-poisoning program being carried on by the American people.

Getting the Job Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the delegates to Delaware's annual convention of Federation of Democratic Clubs were recently given an opportunity to hear one of our distinguished younger Members, Senator VANCE HARTKE, deliver an enlightening address on affairs in Washington.

Senator HARTKE's able analysis and presentation received widespread comment throughout the First State.

In order that others may benefit from his observations, I ask unanimous consent that his timely and interesting message entitled "Getting the Job Done," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GETTING THE JOB DONE

(Address by Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, to annual convention of Federation of Democratic Clubs, Dover, Del., Apr. 25, 1959)

Nearly 3 years ago I was at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago as an observer, the young mayor of a struggling industrial city down on the Ohio River in southern Indiana. Here, I met representatives of the great State of Delaware.

My associates and I struck up acquaintances with several men from the State in which I appear tonight. Since then many things have happened to the country, to your State and mine, to our party, to me personally. In a sense, they are interwoven.

They form a part of the tapestry that is the state of the union, 1959. The central theme of that tapestry is largely that of our party.

In the heat of the summer of 1956 I could not know that your great Senator, ALLEN FREAR, and I would become friends and associates in the U.S. Senate. It is, in part, this association which brings me here tonight.

But before I discuss any further the things I have come to talk over with you, I want to say some words about your distinguished Senator. He is one of the most respected and best liked men in the Senate. Even when someone has differences of opinion with him his opponent acknowledges the intelligence and the sincerity of the Senator from Delaware. I know Delaware is proud of ALLEN FREAR as I am to serve with him.

So we are together tonight in part because of ALLEN FREAR—my friend and yours. We are together in part because of the failings of our opposition. We are together in part because of our Democratic program and leadership. We are together because of our mutual success.

It is a success upon which we draw for for inspiration for the future. Ours never was a party to promise rather than perform. Or to look backward and not forward. Or to be content with a record of the past.

You and I know and glory in the record of past achievement by Democrats in the White House, on Capitol Hill, in your own State capitol, and in mine. But this is not enough.

With victory have come obligations and responsibilities. I report to you in all sincerity and humility. We are accepting them.

We cling to the ideas and ideals of a party devoted to service, a party concerned with the welfare of the people who together make up this Nation.

If I have learned anything in Washington, it is that not everything is clearcut right and wrong, black and white, good and evil. People of differing views—even within our party—can have equally deep convictions. These keep our party healthy as different views have kept our Nation healthy.

To find common ground among these differing views is not compromise of ideals or principles. It is, rather, getting the job done.

There are those in politics who play to the grandstand rather than work with the them to get the job done. I heard an old hand ask one day, "Do you want us to make a lot of noise about this or do you want to get legislation passed?"

I am proud to report to you that most of the Democrats on Capitol Hill want to get legislation passed. And this was the mandate of the voters which last fall gave us almost a 2 to 1 majority in the Congress—and if the recent polls are correct, that majority would be larger if it were election day today.

They saw in our party the doers. We seemed to have the new young faces. We seemed to have the vigor and the program—the ideals and the ideas. We seemed to be willing to work to get the job done instead of just talking about it.

And what have we done to carry out the mandate we were given?

In the Senate we have passed—

A bill to help areas with heavy unemployment to help themselves.

A new housing bill, which includes funds to revitalize our large cities, clear slums, help ordinary people own homes and assist our veterans.

An airport construction bill designed to get caught up with the jet age.

Hawaiian statehood.

Assistance for educational TV.

Continuation of jobless benefits for those out of work long periods.

An extension of the draft.

Participation in the world bank monetary fund.

A workable labor reform bill which, while it does not contain everything that everybody believes should be in such a bill, was approved by committee 13 to 2 before winning a floor okay this week.

A plan for a study of unemployment and how to lick this problem which today finds some 4½ million Americans out of work.

Considering that we have been in session only about 3 months and considering that there has been a flood of minor legislation, I believe the record we are writing in Washington is one of which all Democrats can be proud.

It is being done with thorough investigation, adequate debate and due deliberation.

This is the trademark of real leadership. The U.S. Senate is blessed with many great Democratic leaders. But a great deal of the credit for our record must go to our majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON.

In view of some of the things which have been said about the leadership, I would like you to know that the majority leader has never been too busy to discuss legislation with me, to listen to my ideas and to trade information and ideas. Senator JOHNSON has made this a practice with anyone who seeks him out.

I wonder if we have not come so far in recent years that we Americans have forgotten what real leadership is.

If there is anything for which we may indict the Republican Party on a national level, it is for not doing what has been necessary for the well-being of the vast majority of the people. There is great fear right now, for instance, whether there may be some vetoes of our work in Congress.

Unfortunately, when we received our mandate last November, the White House and the administration did not go with it. If the people could have had it within their power to do so, I feel certain they would have given us this additional authority.

Instead of leadership in the administration, however, we continue to have sham—study, stall, and stumble.

More than a year ago we were told that the unemployment problem was improving. The tune remains the same. Not long ago Labor Secretary Mitchell said he would eat his hat if unemployment did not drop below 3 million by October.

And what about the 3 million who are left? There seems to be no concern for them among the stalwarts of the administration.

Some weeks ago Secretary Flemming of Health, Education, and Welfare announced a program of assistance for better schools. He proposed—in all seriousness—that we pass the program now because it is needed now, but postpone putting it into effect for a year or two.

Meantime, the administration asked Congress to pay certain bills due next year this year.

Now, this is foolishness.

If we Democrats would propose anything like this, we would be held up for national ridicule in the newspapers of the country.

But I suppose we have come to expect not alone lack of leadership and lack of concern, but often a lack of good commonsense as well.

Our administration has now embarked on a program of bungled budget balance. In the first place, this so-called balanced budget is a fairy tale.

If we raise taxes and fees of seven different kinds—and if business improves some 30 percent, and fail to assume our proper responsibility—then the President may have sent us a balanced budget.

But balance itself is not the test. If it were, then the sure method would be to remove all taxes and spend nothing. Result: Income 0, spending 0.

Government is designed to accept responsibility and to do a job. If we are attacked or if your friends are attacked, we will fight. This is our resolve.

Of course, we must work to keep our spending within balance of what we expect to take in. But you can balance your budget at home by buying yourself a new car instead of food, or a fur coat for the wife instead of milk for the children, or a new roof on the house instead of new lights in the living room.

What we Democrats have said thus far is that we are concerned that there is unemployment and a need for so many things here at home. We are worried about the state of our Armed Forces and our defense research and production. We are worried about an adequate farm program. These things cost money. So do airports, hospitals, roads, houses.

Every spending proposal that comes before Congress is getting careful scrutiny because of this. We are going to decide that we need food and milk before a new car or a coat. We are going to decide whether we should rewire the living room or fix the roof. And we believe we can probably do both.

We are determined to balance the budget, not because this is an end, but because it is the right way to proceed.

We are equally determined to bring back prosperity because this is right and because we know recession is something we cannot afford.

We are determined to have better education, less sickness, more and better housing, a better defense, a workable farm program, hospitals, parks—new tomorrows, greater futures, better living for all of us.

The people have confidence in us.

We are going to perform—just as we have been performing in the past.

Contrast the performance of the past 6 years in Congress with that of the past 6 years of the Republican national administration—or for the moment go back more than 6 years. I recall too well during the recent recession the attempt to pacify the fears of the people held out these reassuring thoughts: Have no fear. Everything is going to be all right. Prosperity is just around the corner. We will not have another depression like the thirties. And here is why: We have fouhd built-in economic stabilizers. They are:

1. Unemployment insurance.
2. Social security programs.
3. Bank deposit insurance.
4. Stock market controls.

These built-in economic stabilizers will prevent another depression.

And they probably did.

But where did these far-reaching, forward-looking programs originate? Did they come from the Madison Avenue slogan masters? No. They came from clear-thinking Democratic administration. When they were proposed, they were violently objected to by the Republicans. Yet, in time of stress, danger and fear, the Republicans reassuredly pointed to these Democratic measures as the safeguards of the Nation. And as I said a few moments ago, during the past 6 years contrast the forward-looking programs of the Democratic-controlled Congress with the inept administration, the same clear contrast of action compared to inaction, retrogression compared to progress, looking forward compared to looking backward can be found.

Our party and our country will profit most from a program of action * * * decisive, bold action to solve the problems and get the job done. I am less concerned about who leads this fight or the exact course it will take than I am about getting on with the task.

I am far less concerned about who will lead us in 1960 than I am whether he will have the tools with which to lead. We must give him the program, the record, the accomplishments. With this, he will win, whoever he is.

Your part in this is to help us with ideas, ideals, and advice. It is to correct us when we are wrong, boost us when we are right. It is to tell the story of what we are doing, how we are doing it and why.

We are, I believe, on the threshold of greatest success, success in which everyone in this room can benefit morally and materially.

Let us promise each other, now, we will work together to get the job done.

American Youths Break Down the Barriers of Misunderstanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, last week I introduced a bill for the establishment of a Department of Peace.

At that time, in a colloquy with the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I referred to the contributions to international understanding that are made by the student exchange programs.

I characterized these young people as roving ambassadors. Though without skill in the formal arts of diplomacy, they speak the language of the heart and thus break down the barriers of distrust and suspicion which so often divide peoples and nations.

Recently, in the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald and in my hometown newspaper, the Elkins Inter-Mountain, there were reported two incidents of students who are conducting their own voluntary cultural exchange programs. The stories were well written and carry an appeal and a challenge. These young people express in their actions the youthful enthusiasm and idealism which transcends national boundaries and move the world closer to a true international community.

I commend these articles to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, July 3, 1959]

STUDENT RUNS HIS OWN CULTURAL EXCHANGE PLAN

(By Jean White)

Harry Morgan, a college senior who sells $1 shares in friendship to underwrite his own private exchange program, is ready to take four visiting foreign students on a goodwill tour across the United States.

This is the fourth year his "Ambassador for Friendship" program has been on the road, and the Morgan entourage is traveling in style this time.

"I needed a car," the 25-year-old Rutgers University student explained simply. "So I wrote a one-page letter to George Romney (president of American Motors Inc.) and told him about our exchange.

"A few days later he called and asked: 'What color?'"

So Harry and his four ambassadors from overseas now have a red and white, air-conditioned, power-steered, power-braked Nash Rambler for their 13,000-mile trek.

Traveling along with Harry are an economics major from Pakistan, a political science major from Italy, a civil engineer-lawyer from Argentina, and an artist from the Philippines.

They're traveling on $1,500 and American hospitality.

"If we see a prosperous looking farm, we stop and tell the farmer how lovely his barn is and get invited to supper," says Harry.

On their 3 days here, the Morgan ambassadors are guests of the Statler Hotel. Hilton hotels in five other cities also will be hosts to them.

Harry raised the $1,500 this year by asking service and women's groups to buy a share in international understanding. In 1957 and 1958, he raised $3,000 each year. This time school work curtailed his fundraising so he decided to take four foreign students already studying here but without money to travel.

The idea of a private exchange program came to Harry in 1953 after a stint with a Friends work group in Holland on flood relief. He's worked at his project ever since.

[From the Elkins Inter-Mountain, July 6, 1959]

YOUTHS HAVE FAITH IN FELLOW MAN—VOUCH FOR NATION'S HOSPITALITY

(By Eldora Menjum)

Two Arizona teenagers arrived in Elkins over the holiday weekend singing the praises of their fellow men.

"We've traveled 4,000 miles on the hospitality of the American people," said 16-year-old Dave Burns, who with his companion, Bob Smelick, 17, spent the night in Elkins at the YMCA.

The Central High School students of Phoenix, Ariz., had set out from home 3 weeks ago to attend the National Student Council convention in Pittsburgh. Their school couldn't afford to pay their expenses as delegates, so the two youths decided to hitchhike their way to the convention city.

Not only did they reach Pittsburgh without difficulty, but they have toured all the major cities along the east coast.

Carrying their bedroll with them, the two lads have slept on porches and in basements and have been invited to many a stranger's dining table in their 3-week-long expedition.

"We've spent less than $60 each," said one of the youths, as he explained that they visited YMCA's in many towns to find overnight lodging.

Neither of the young men had ever traveled east of the Mississippi. So their first yearn was to visit New York City where they spent 4 days. They also visited Atlantic City, N.J., and Washington, D.C.

"We baled 10 tons of hay for our lodging and a real feast in Lancaster County, Pa.," said Burns.

In the Nation's Capital, our Congressman took us out to lunch, and we saw the sights. We passed the office door of Vice President RICHARD NIXON, and decided to go in and pay him a visit. But one of the receptionists reminded us he was in Russia.

"We didn't do much actual thumbing," reminded Burns. He said they answered advertisements in the motor travel section of newspapers and shared rides or helped drive person traveling to various sections.

Homeward bound and just outside of Washington, D.C., a Pentagon employee picked them up and gave them a lift for 20 miles. He let them out along the deserted roadway about dusk with a storm threatening from a distance. He was turning off the highway in another direction. The motorist

continued on his way for some 10 miles, but became worried about the two youths left alone alongside the road and returned to pick them up and take them home with him for the night.

Near Petersburg, the lads were hitch-hiking when a minister and his family picked them up. The pastor drove them some four miles and then invited them to come home to join in a family dinner.

Burns, son of a Lutheran minister and State oratorical contest winner, said he and Smelick became acquainted with Miss June Myles of Elkins, at the National Student Council convention. Miss Myles, president of the student council at Elkins High School, representing this city at the meeting.

While in Elkins, the two youths visited at the George Myles residence.

Smelick, president of Central High student council and president of Salt River Valley Presidents and Vice Presidents Association, must be back in Phoenix, by July 10. For on that date, he leaves by plane for an all-expense paid trip to Boy's Nation, the site of the convention—back in Washington.

The Arizona youths caught a ride to Elkins from Petersburg with James Reese, of Fairmont, an auditor who was spending some time in Elkins before continuing to Parkersburg. He gave the boys a lift on to Parkersburg as he departed this city.

Representative Fulton on U.S. Defense Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is sometimes overlooked that while the Soviet Union is a distant neighbor, Moscow being 4,700 miles from New York, it is also a fact that the U.S.S.R. is only a few miles distant across the Bering Strait from our 49th State, Alaska, and within relatively short range of our advance bases throughout the world. Representative JAMES G. FULTON, the senior minority member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, and a senior member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, has written an important commentary on this question published in the Sunday, June 28, Washington Post and Times Herald.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, June 28, 1959]

WHERE SHOULD THE UNITED STATES CONCENTRATE ITS DEFENSE BUILDUP?—REPRESENTATIVE FULTON SAYS FORWARD BASES PUT A PREMIUM ON IRBM MISSILE

(By Representative JAMES G. FULTON)

Big nation power plays today are as fast as a big league baseball game. A crack of the bat or a line drive down center field, and the strategic positions of the teams change and the stands are electrified.

The two big league powers, United States of America and U.S.S.R., are and have been winning and losing ball games for the last 12 years. But it is still a tight series and no one has a really decisive advantage.

Anybody who tries to give the results of this world series during the tight 12th game is permitting his bravery to get beyond his reason.

Neither the U.S.S.R. nor United States of America has such overwhelming strength that it can eliminate the other. Each has sufficient current strength in various fields so that neither could destroy the other without being nearly destroyed itself, which is clearly unprofitable.

So, does the argument of who is ahead in the ICBM race really profit us? In the missile and rocket field, each nation surpasses the other in different ways but neither presently has an effective strategic superiority.

We have no information that the Soviets have operational ICBM weapon capability, nor do we know that there has been a successful target reentry by a Soviet ICBM in which the CEP (circle of probable error) has been accurate enough to indicate that it is at this date even a partially successful military weaponry system. I challenge anybody to prove otherwise.

Statements giving the U.S.S.R. this capability are pure guesswork. Of course, the Soviets have their IRBM land range, and their southwest-to-northeast ICBM land range, largely over Siberia. But successful missile flights of the length that the United States has completed over the Atlantic missile range from Cape Canaveral to Ascension Island, would fall in the Pacific Ocean on Russia's ICBM range. Their range is too short for land fall and there is no evidence of successful Russian ICBM sea reentry shots such as this country has publicly announced.

There is no doubt of American superiority in the guidance and control fields, and in tracking and telemetry. We and our allies have a worldwide network of ground stations aiding us in these fields. The U.S.S.R. has none outside of her territory and satellites.

Do not underestimate our advances in the production and use of IRBM's for the defense of the United States and the free world from European bases, as well as from over 250 free world bases scattered everywhere. We can get to a target with more missiles, more accurate CEP, in half the time and at half the expense of the ICBM long-range missiles.

Russia must depend on an ICBM range of 4,000 to 8,000 miles launched from her own territory. The United States has been smart in moving her defenses to forward bases outside her borders with ranges for ICBM missiles of only 400 to 1,500 miles to target areas on the average.

Why should the United States take Senator SYMINGTON'S advice and adopt Russia's strategy of ICBM's? Now—we should fill out our U.S. defense production immediately to support our forward bases which give us defense in depth, and we must now continue emphasis on research and development in the ICBM field rather than production.

We should not now make the decision to match Russia's 1961–62 strength as predicted by Senator SYMINGTON to be 3,000 ICBM's—they are probably the "Big Bertha" cannons of World War I transferred to world war III.

The ICBM capability of all nations has been tremendously handicapped already by the high-space nuclear shots by the United States in September 1958, in the South Atlantic which can knock out most of our present electronic missiles guidance systems.

Address by Hon. Dennis Chavez of New Mexico, Before Non-Partisan Statehood Association of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the Non-Partisan Statehood Association of Puerto Rico, at San Juan, P.R., on July 3, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE DENNIS CHAVEZ, U.S. SENATOR, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW MEXICO, BEFORE THE NON-PARTISAN STATEHOOD ASSOCIATION OF PUERTO RICO, SAN JUAN, P.R., JULY 3, 1959

My friends of Puerto Rico, I am most happy to be with you and to discuss with you briefly what I believe are matters of importance to every person on the island.

It is not my purpose or intent to interfere in any way, shape, or form, in the political business of Puerto Rico, or to tell you how you should run your political business. I am most happy to feel that under your present status, and under the Governorship of the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín, you have made great advancement, both politically and economically.

But there are other things, in my opinion, in which you are interested—whether you want to continue under the present political status or want to become part of, and not only an associate to, the United States of America.

I repeat—what you do, I still maintain, is your business.

I, for one, believe it is in the interest of your future welfare, your economic progress, and the history of your past under the American flag, to be part of, and not associated with, the United States.

What are the requirements for statehood?

Hawaii and Alaska aside, the case for Puerto Rican statehood can stand on its own merits.

The traditionally accepted requirements for statehood are defined in a 1953 report (Senate Rept. No. 1029) of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee as follows:

"1. The inhabitants of the proposed new State are imbued with and are sympathetic toward the principles of democracy as exemplified in the American form of government.

"2. The proposed new State has sufficient population and resources to support State government and carry its share of the cost of Federal Government.

"3. A majority of the electorate wish statehood."

Does Puerto Rico qualify? I firmly believe that it does.

No one who knows the beautiful island and its industrious people can doubt the Puerto Ricans' devotion to democracy. Puerto Ricans distinguished themselves with great valor on the battlefields of World War II and the Korean war. They have demonstrated a keen awareness of the Communist menace to freedom. Their determined ef-

forts and sacrifices to provide widespread education, adequate housing, proper standards of health, and opportunities for their youth—all by means of democratic processes—are akin to our own deepest aspirations and methods for achieving them.

Does Puerto Rico meet the population requirements? Look at the statistics. Its 2.3 million is over 10 times the population of Alaska and almost 4 times that of Hawaii. Actually, 24 States of the Union (not including Alaska and Hawaii) have less people than does Puerto Rico. In fact, the island contains more than Nevada, Wyoming, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Delaware put together. Moreover, while Alaska has only 1 city with a population of over 25,000, and Hawaii but 2, Puerto Rico has 6.

A further requirement for eligibility is that the proposed new State can support State government and carry its share of the cost of Federal Government. Puerto Rico's economic self-development is impressive. Puerto Ricans have demonstrated a remarkable industriousness and self-sufficiency. In 1957, the last year for which figures are available, the island exported merchandise valued at $457 million and imported a total of $732 million worth of goods. Of that total, a whopping $640 million worth was purchased in the United States, while Puerto Ricans shipped us over $430 million worth of products.

Unfortunately, comparative statistics for Hawaii and Alaska are not available. But statistics showing the trade of all three with other nations of the world are published, revealing again that Puerto Rico leads. In 1957, Puerto Rico's imports from other countries totaled around $93 million, compared with Alaska's $3.8 million, and Hawaii's $27 million. On the other side of the ledger, Puerto Rico's exports to other countries amounted to more than $27 million, compared with Alaska's $8.5 million and Hawaii's $20 million.

What of the third requirement, that a majority of the electorate wish statehood? It must be remembered that Public Law 600 which was submitted to the Puerto Rican people on June 4, 1951, for their acceptance or rejection authorized them to "organize a government pursuant to a constitution of their own adoption." Delegates to the constitutional convention had no opportunity to vote on statehood inasmuch as the convention concerned itself exclusively with setting up a commonwealth form of government. Public Law 600 did not imply such a restricted frame of reference. In any case, Public Law 600 does not set an irrevocable status for the island. There is still the opportunity to put the question of statehood before the electorate.

I, for one, urge that a plebiscite be held as soon as possible. And I hope that our Puerto Rican citizens vote for statehood.

What are the advantages of statehood?

Admission of Puerto Rico to the Union has a number of striking merits. The Communists throughout Latin America have seized upon Puerto Rico as an issue to stir up old resentments against the United States. Everywhere Vice President NIXON went in South America, and Dr. Milton Eisenhower in Central America, they were assailed with Communist-inspired accusations of United States imperialism in Puerto Rico.

Of course we know that Puerto Ricans voted to stay affiliated with the United States—and they can vote to secede any time they want to. Puerto Rico is our best propaganda weapon to counter the Communist big lie.

Admission of Puerto Rico as a State would abruptly pull from the Communists one of their major propaganda weapons in their campaign to drive a wedge between the United States and its Latin American neighbors.

Another point to be considered is the strategic geographic location of the island. It stands at the gateway between the Caribbean and the Atlantic and athwart the approaches to the Panama Canal. Extreme nationalist sentiment which wants independence is today far in the minority. Yet in Puerto Rico's still indeterminate political status, the Communists could have readymade allies among a handful of resentful people who would seek any ally in their struggle to achieve independence. Statehood would end forever this insidious threat.

For Puerto Ricans, themselves, statehood would bring incalculable benefits. Those who have made their homes in the United States would certainly feel an added sense of belonging to the community.

Full-fledged citizenship, on a par with citizens of other States of the Union, would imply the responsibilities as well as the privileges which Puerto Ricans already enjoy. These responsibilities—electing representatives and Senators to Congress, and paying taxes for the support of their Federal Government—far from being burdensome, would put the Puerto Ricans on an equal psychological footing with citizens of every other State.

There is one remaining argument for Commonwealth status.

In the final analysis, the only possible argument left—both on the mainland and in Puerto Rico—against statehood, is the one of economic advantages under the Commonwealth. We hear fervent arguments to the effect that the tax concessions which Puerto Rico can offer new investors are a decisive factor in attracting new industries to the island. I believe, on the contrary, that the sense of political insecurity growing out of the neither fish-nor-fowl status of the island is a major barrier to investment of capital in the island.

Many mainland investors today look upon the island with a degree of suspicion. They have read the sensational stories about the attempt to assassinate President Truman and of the shootings from the gallery in the House of Representatives.

We know that those were the deplorable actions of a handful of fanatics. But potential investors, wondering about the unsettled political status of the island, probably recall the incidents, and think twice. Once Puerto Rico took its place alongside its sister States in the Union, once the Puerto Rican people had registered their final, irrevocable intention to cast their lot permanently with the United States, all doubts would necessarily disappear.

Another prong in the economic argument used by Commonwealth supporters is that with statehood, Puerto Rico would have to pay Federal income taxes and excise taxes, spelling economic ruin for the island. It can be argued just as cogently that such advantages are offset by the loss of Federal appropriations, which accrue to the States.

I hold that the economic, cultural, psychological, and strategic advantages weigh heavily in favor of Puerto Rican statehood. Whatever the outcome, I think that Puerto Rico should have a plebiscite on the question of statehood to find out the real wishes of the Puerto Rican people. Whatever your views, I urge you to vote. For your vote is the essence of the democracy, which in the final analysis, is the fundamental political right we all share.

The admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union casts a new light on Puerto Rico's status. Creation of our 49th and 50th States buried once and for all the old arguments used to block Puerto Rico's admission. The old arguments are dead.

Opponents on the mainland to Puerto Rican statehood used to argue that Territories outside the continental limits of the United States should not be integrated into the Union. The fact that Puerto Rico is closer to Washington, D.C., in travel and communication time than Boston and New York were when the United States was founded, left die-hard opponents unmoved. Now, however, the questions of continental contiguity and distance are no longer even open to debate. Neither Alaska nor Hawaii are contiguous. Alaska's capital lies about 3,000 miles from Washington; Honolulu about 4,800 miles; while San Juan is but 1,550 miles away.

Then there was the contention that the historical, linguistic, cultural, and racial differences between Puerto Rico and the mainland would make statehood inadvisable. Pointing to our own Spanish heritage in the Southwest and in Florida made only a little dent in that argument. The admission of Hawaii to full-fledged membership in the Union pulls the rug out from under that point of view. Everyone knows that over three-fourths of Hawaii's population are non-Caucasians, with orientals predominating.

We have outlined and briefly discussed requirements.

Let us for the moment discuss the military participation of Puerto Rico in the forces of the United States since 1898. In the First World War, in the Second World War, in Korea, thousands of your citizens who were serving the United States in an American military uniform (and not the uniform of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) did not come back to their dear ones or to be buried in this beautiful island.

The Veterans' Administration advises that as of December 1958, Puerto Rico had 114,000 veterans who served the United States of America, in American uniforms and following the flag of the United States in war—willing to make the supreme sacrifice, if need be, for the flag they followed.

Puerto Rico contributed many fine men, the soldier, the corporal, the sergeant, up to and including generals, such as Gen. Raul Esteves, General Codero, and Gen. Pedro del Valle of the U.S. Marines, who commanded the 3d Division at Okinawa. He didn't lead troops of the associated Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, but American—U.S. Marines.

Going a little further on the number of veterans that you now have—if you were a State, in my opinion, you would have not only a 200-operating-bed hospital at San Patricio, you would have hospitals sufficient to take care of the 114,000 veterans.

But who will fight for them?

At the moment in Washington, as far as Puerto Rico is concerned, under your present status—and I do not doubt the sincerity of purpose, the desire and inclination of your Resident Delegate to help the veteran, he can't vote to give that veteran 1 cent, or provide 50 cents for the construction of a hospital. It is not his fault. It is the island's status.

Think it over. Think carefully.

There should be a plebiscite, submitted under congressional direction, to the people of the island to determine just exactly what they want the island to be.

I thank you good folks for your patience and indulgence. Hasta luego.

Government Bond Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Government Bond Interest,"

published in the New York Times of July 1, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 1, 1959]

GOVERNMENT BOND INTEREST

Representative WILBUR MILLS and other senior Democrats on the House Ways and Means Committee have reportedly come to the sensible and responsible conclusion that the administration's request to abolish interest rate ceilings on Government bonds should be granted. But they are also reported to be under heavy pressure from the rank and file of the party to refuse this assent, under a threat of defeat of the legislation in the House.

It is difficult to imagine that in a final showdown a majority of the Members of Congress, acting out of ignorance or ancient prejudice or pure partisan politics, should act to hamstring the Treasury. This is a matter of great seriousness. While the value of the dollar would not evaporate if the Treasury were forced to sell only short-term securities for a few more months, such a condition could not continue for long without frustration of the whole mechanism of financial restraints on which the dollar is founded. Allan Sproul, the great central banker who used to head the New York Federal Reserve Bank, has recently called the past year's flood of short-term issues "frightening," and he is right.

Obviously the Treasury must do a better job of education to persuade doubtful Members of the elemntal facts involved, including the fact that this legislation will not be a cause of higher over-all interest rates for private borrowers. But in the end the key role will fall to Mr. MILLS, Speaker RAYBURN, Senator JOHNSON, and the other leaders of the party. Passage of this legislation is a difficult thing to ask of the Democratic leadership, but the very essence of leadership is assumption of responsibility on the tough ones.

Realism Needed—Evacuation Absurd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a recent column entitled "Porter on Civil Defense," which was published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, one of the Nation's leading newspapers, on July 9, 1959, is worthy of thoughtful consideration. Philip W. Porter, its author, was a soldier in World War II and is a noted news commentator.

I believe the column presents convincingly the waste of the taxpayers' money on the utterly useless program, the absurd setup, and the inept management by high-salaried bureaucrats of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. I commend this article to my colleagues in the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 9, 1959]

PORTER ON CIVIL DEFENSE—SENATOR YOUNG RINGS BELL WITH ATTACK ON WASTE OF MILLIONS ON ABSURD SETUP

(By Philip W. Porter)

Senator STEVE YOUNG, of Ohio, is making hay with his campaign to put some commonsense into civil defense. This week he has the lead article in the Saturday Evening Post, and the Post is extremely shrewd in guessing what subjects people are really interested in.

For a guy who was the great unknown nationally a year ago, and low man on the totem pole in Ohio Democratic campaign meeting, Steve has proved several times in recent months that he is no slouch at getting the headlines. He picked out a real ripe one when he chose civil defense as a target.

Our National Government is full of waste and absurdity, and compared to some (such as buying up farm surpluses and borrowing money to build warehouses to store them) civil defense is peanuts. It only wastes millions, whereas the farm program wastes billions. But it's such obvious nonsense that it's a wonder someone hadn't tackled it before. It's only a small nest of bureaucrats, but almost completely useless. They don't know where they're going, and never have.

REALISM NEEDED

Something useful might be done in civil defense. If the masterminds would come down to earth. Up to now, the big pitch has been evacuation in case of enemy attack. They've placarded escape highways, tested sirens and occasionally tried dry runs, notably around Washington, in which key Government offices would be moved out into the country. But, as YOUNG points out in the current article, that's old stuff now, based on the idea that we'd have some warning of a missile attack. Today's intercontinental rockets would give about 15 minutes warning, if that.

Even if adequate warning were given, it's impossible to imagine the populace of a city of several hundred thousand moving out by automobile. We can't even get traffic to move in snowstorms, rush hours, and on holidays. The only way they could move would be on foot. But we auto-minded characters would never stoop to that.

Today, YOUNG says, the need is to devise a realistis plan for people to hide and thus escape radiation fallout. Evacuation is as outmoded as a Civil War cannonball, but something might be done to sell the idea of small shelters, he believes. One could be located on your own lot for about $100.

EVACUATION ABSURD

I've long believed the notion of evacuation is absurd. I don't see much point, either in the Federal Government subsidizing State and local civil defense officials. It's true that the civil defense men have performed tireless, valuable, unpaid service in times of storm or flood disaster and they often assist police in directing traffic, but local communities could organize such auxiliary volunteer police forces, if they wished, without the pretense that they would become useful in civil defense.

We know perfectly well that if a big bomb should land on us, the nearest military commander would proclaim martial law, anyway. If the Federal Government simply must scatter money to States and cities, it could best be spent in offering first-aid courses through the Red Cross.

After writing a recent piece on this subject, I got a throughtful letter from a man who was once in the middle of this nonsense, and knows what he's talking about, Harry Temple, of Sandusky. Listen to what he wrote:

"I was director of civil defense in Sandusky during 1950 and 1951. I took a course in civil defense ot the Staff College in Washington. I read all the pamphlets put out by the National and State offices and in none of them did I find a well defined and thought-out workable plan. I finally came to the conclusion that I was wasting my time, so I quit the job. * * * I never did find any evidence that many of our people read this stuff. They seemed to be allergic to reading, or else found it too much work and some, I suspect, did not know how to read.

SUGGESTS TV AID

"When you wrote of the sensible thing like taking instruction. I wonder if it would be possible to have simple lessons on TV at stated hours when the family could attend?"

Sure, it would. But then the jobholders in Washington would have to give up writing and mailing those pamphlets which no one reads, and making signs for highways which no one is ever going to use, and buying sirens which no one pays any attention to.

I don't believe STEVE YOUNG is going to sell the idea of backyard shelters, either. The only sensible thing to do is abolish the entire present setup, have a high-level unpaid commission study the problem, let the military make plans for coping with an emergency, and get the Red Cross to go on TV with first aid instruction. But that would be too simple and sensible.

Rhode Island Couple Aided After Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Hospitable North Dakota Town—Rhode Island Couple Aided After Fire," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RHODE ISLAND COUPLE AIDED AFTER FIRE

The most hospitable place in the world to a young Providence couple is a little North Dakota town of 700 population named Hebron.

It was there last Sunday that William G. Leonard and his wife, Merle, saw their new Volkswagen, loaded with personal belongings, destroyed by fire. Mrs. Leonard narrowly escaped serious injury.

The couple was driving from Providence to Fairbanks, Alaska, which they intended to make their permanent home. Mr. Leonard is the son of Providence County Sheriff John P. Leonard and Mrs. Leonard of 173 Vermont Avenue.

The younger Mr. and Mrs. Leonard stopped at a service station in Hebron for emergency repairs to the car's fuel system. The car was raised on a hydraulic lift. Mrs. Leonard stayed inside the car to operate a gasoline tank valve peculiar to Volkswagens.

A pool of gasoline formed on the garage floor. A man dropped a match and there was an instant fire. Mrs. Leonard, at a shout from her husband, jumped to the floor and was uninjured. The mechanic suffered second degree burns and was hospitalized for 2 days. Damage to the garage was estimated at $8,700.

That was when Hebron's hospitality began. A family whose own son is in the Marines took them in. They were passed from home to home for meals, with each hostess preparing something really special.

A department store gave Mrs. Leonard clothes. More than 50 residents of the town contributed to a fund sponsored by Hebron's weekly newspaper, the Hebron Herald.

The young couple stayed in Hebron 2½ days while they got organized. Then they took the train to Providence.

In a way, their trip to Fairbanks would have been a return home. They resided in the Alaskan city for a year while Mr. Leonard was an airman at Ladd Air Force Base. Mrs. Leonard taught the first grade at the base school and was planning to take a summer course at the University of Alaska.

Since the fire in North Dakota, Mr. and Mrs. Leonard have changed their plans. They will stay in Providence and Mrs. Leonard will continue her studies at Rhode Island College of Education.

The couple especially treasure a letter which accompanied the fund the people of Hebron raised. It said, "We are deeply sorry that your trip to your new home in Fairbanks was so tragically interrupted in the fire that destroyed your car and possessions.

"While money alone cannot compensate for your loss, we hope this expression of our concern will in some way help you to adjust your plans and get you back on the road toward a happy and successful life.

"We hope this gift will help you remember Hebron, N. Dak., as a friendly community, with people who are interested in strangers passing through, rather than just a community where ill fortune befell you."

Some Losing Sight of Idea Behind Joint Chiefs Setup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Norfolk-Portsmouth (Va.) Ledger-Dispatch and Star for June 19, 1959.

This article was prepared by the well-known military observer, James Elliott, and contains a thoughtful and penetrating analysis of the value inherent in free discussion among the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I believe that Mr. Elliott's able presentation warrants the careful attention not only of the Members of Congress but of the general public as well.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Norfolk-Portsmouth (Va.) Ledger-Dispatch and Star, June 19, 1959]

MILITARY REPORT—SOME LOSING SIGHT OF IDEA BEHIND JOINT CHIEFS SETUP

(By James Elliott)

NORFOLK.—A lot of responsible persons, it seems, have lost their perspective over the importance of the functions of the Joint Chief of Staff.

The ink is hardly dry on the 1958 reorganization bill and already it has become a popular pastime for many to make whipping boys out of the Joint Chiefs in what appears to be deliberate attempts to magnify struggles between them over the adoption of individual weapons systems.

Inherent in this thinking, of course, is the undercurrent for a single Chief of Staff. Proponents of that totalitarian concept say it is necessary for swift decisions with no waste of time.

If recent history is any criterion however, this complaint is hardly valid. At Suez, quick, decisive action on the part of the Joint Chiefs and the American forces—while the British and French were dawdling about trying to determine what they should do—won attention the world over. The Joint Chiefs wasted no time at Jordan. They wasted no time at Lebanon—Marines were going ashore in something like 7 hours after the order was issued and TAC's units were in Adama, Turkey, in about 20 hours. Neither was there indecision at Formosa. As in a football game, the wisdom of the coach (Joint Chiefs of Staff) is lost in the clamor over the players (forces in the field).

Complaints against the Joint Chiefs of Staff emphasize bickering and haggling in ominous tones as though it were something to be avoided when actually the differences are no more than expressions of sound, individual judgments in an attempt to draw out the collective wisdom of all the Chiefs of Staff.

This generation of ideas based on each man's pattern of thoughts, on his own concepts, on his own skills, based on different information and different experiences is, by design, aimed at allowing the Joint Chiefs of Staff to offer counsel to the President, Secretary of Defense and the Congress.

This system is the very basis for America's democratic way of life. The framers of the Constitution shaped it into a system of checks and balances to prevent a totalitarian system. And the Joint Chiefs of Staff is no more than a means of checks and balances.

Already some Congressmen are complaining that the level budget and the influence of the President and Secretary of Defense over the Joint Chiefs of Staff has restricted them in providing Congress with the frank appraisals it needs to shape the Nation's military posture. Under the present system, however, they are able to obtain a difference of opinion—however restricted it might be. And with a single chief of staff, Congress would get only the information the military Solomon at the top wanted to give. The single chief of staff would also have in his hands more than half the budget. Entrenched in such a position, he could conceivably become powerful enough not only to write his own legislation, but also to originate his own money bills and to get them passed by Congress substantially as written.

Criticism of the Joint Chiefs system is, in effect, an effort to penalize free thought, differences of opinion and collective wisdom. The single chief concept is as farfetched as doing away with both political parties in Congress so there would be no debate. Such a road leads to autocracy, not democracy.

The real fault with today's system is the lack of action of the part of the Secretary of Defense plus the restrictions placed upon the Joints Chiefs of Staff by the level budget.

The level budget forces the Joint Chiefs to compete for a limited number of dollars. As a result, they have been forced to accept programs they do not privately consider adequate. And in the absence of any pat and positive solution to meeting the world's problems they obviously will have differences because nobody can say for sure what the answer is.

Retired Military Officers Entitled to Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, there has been some criticism of former military officers taking jobs with industrial concerns who are contractors or potential contractors with agencies of the U.S. Government. From what I have been able to learn, there is little or no danger in this situation. Gen. Maxwell Taylor has stated he has never known of any case where a former military officer has influenced or tried to influence his former coworkers in the Pentagon. Admiral Rickover and others have testified along the same line.

Men who have been in the military for many years have acquired certain skills which are of value to industrial concerns, and these concerns are justified in trying to utilize these skills. As for the officers themselves, after leaving service, they are justified in locating positions where their skills are of value.

I certainly know of no case where a former officer was given a job as a reward, or payoff, for some favor he rendered while in service.

Now, Mr. President, let me go a step further. I have been asked if the lobbying of former military personnel in the Halls of Congress is a problem. My answer is that it certainly is not. I have not observed or been made aware of any such lobbying which could be frowned upon. I have heard no complaints in this regard from any other Senator.

The word "lobbying" has been given an evil connotation which is undeserved. As for myself, I have never found the activities of lobbyists as obnoxious. I am always glad to listen to the arguments of interested parties on both sides of a question. I therefore appreciate the benefit derived from the arguments of lobbyists. I think a Member of Congress should listen to the strongest possible arguments on both sides of a question, and then make up his mind.

In connection with the criticism of former military officers, there appeared in the Baltimore Sun of Saturday, July 11, 1959, an excellent editorial, which I think all should read.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial, titled "No Need to Despair," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO NEED TO DESPAIR

Having graduated at West Point or Annapolis in 1920, having served with credit during the normal career time, a man retires with the modest emoluments allowed by a routinely grateful people. He is then employed by another man who has business with the Defense Department. In the course of his service our general or admiral has picked up quite a feel for the technicalities

of defense. His new employer hires him with that information frankly in mind. Just as frankly, his new employer remembers that he was at school with A, who now is buying hardware for the Army, or with B, who is a hardware buyer for the Navy.

When our retired admiral or general makes his way to Washington he is quite likely to drop in on his former classmate. There will be easy and reminiscent talk about respective wives and no doubt the reciprocal conning of desk or wallet photographs. Genial lies about the beauty of daughters and the prowess of sons will be exchanged. And then, a little by a little, the talk will get around to defense needs, and more explicitly, to defense contracts. And first thing you know, the old friend with power to buy may have bought something from the old friend who has a line of goods to sell.

A situation fraught with great possibility of abuse and exploitation? Unquestionably. One in which the public interest might very easily be lost sight of in the glow of old memories and present congenialities? Again unquestionably. If the selling admiral is a low fellow and his buying or contracting friend is just as low or lower, then all sorts of sinister possibilities open up.

But how often do they happen in real life? Not very often, says Thomas S. Gates, Jr., the Deputy Secretary of Defense. Not very often, says Admiral Rickover, never one to sugar the frailties of men. Would a new law help any? Maybe a statute commanding the two old friends to be honest and mindful of the public interest? Maybe a law requiring the two old friends not to get together at all? Maybe a law denying employment in service-connected industry to veterans of any service? A little legislation might, indeed, nibble here and there at the edges of the problem At its center we will just have to rely now as always on the personal integrity of all involved. Only the unworldly will think this a reason to despair.

Tribute to Will J. Driver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address by the Honorable A. F. Barham, delivered to the Osceola Kiwanis Club, Osceola Ark., on June 25, 1959, in honor of the late Honorable Will J. Driver, a former Member of the House of Representatives, and one of Arkansas' distinguished statesmen.

I may announce at this time that on August 11 a memorial ceremony will be held at the dedication of a statue to Judge Driver in the city of Osceola. All Members of Congress, including the Members of the Senate, have been invited to attend. It will be my honor and pleasure to be present on that day, and to deliver the address in connection with the dedication of the statue to Judge Driver. I hope many Members of Congress can attend.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SWAMPY WILDERNESS BECOMES AN AGRICULTURAL EMPIRE

For centuries prior to the early 1900's, the greater part of the land in Mississippi County, as well as in many other counties lying to the south of it, in what is sometimes called the St. Francis Valley or the St. Francis Basin, often referred to as eastern Arkansas, comprised a great wilderness. This vast area of fertile land had been subject to annual overflow from the Mississippi River almost since the beginning of time. Deposits of silt from these floods continually enriched it. It was covered with valuable timber. As this timber was removed, the land was of little value to its owners, because in its overflowed condition it could not be placed in cultivation. Even ordinary rains kept it too wet. There was no drain to carry this rainfall away. Much of the water that did not evaporate had to be absorbed by the earth. Water, whether deposited by floods or rains, could seldom find its way into such streams as the St. Francis, Little River, or even the Mississippi before its levees were built, because strange as it may seem, in each case, the river bank, except for a few occasional breaks, was higher than the land on either side of it. The levee, built across these bayous or drains apparently running into the Mississippi River did not obstruct draining of the lands behind the levee because these bayous carried water away from and not into the river at flood times.

This overflowed condition produced swarms of Buffalo gnats and mosquitoes bringing malaria, much suffering, and often death to the inhabitants. One old settler has been heard to remark that all of the early graveyards were founded on chills and fever. Every home able to afford it, had at least one bottle of Grove's or Mendenhall's chill tonic, while doctors and druggists carried prodigious stocks of calomel and quinine, thought to be the only salvation for victims of malaria. A far better remedy would have been to knock a hole in the rain barrel and police and empty all other water containers—always breeding places for mosquitoes.

Mr. R. E. Lee Wilson, Sr., founder of Lee Wilson & Co., at Wilson, Ark., being the owner of thousands of acres, was in the foreground of the battle for drainage. He began his efforts as early as 1901. Several different drainage districts were organized, and to raise money for the work assessments of benefits were levied against each tract of land. These benefits were pledged to guarantee the payment of bonds issued and sold by the district to raise money for the work.

But the mighty Mississippi River proved by the high waters of 1912 and 1913 and the consequent levee breaks at Wilson in each of these years that no amount of drainage canals or ditches could protect the area from overflow if the levee failed to withstand the high waters in the Mississippi. Something must be done to curb her and prevent a repetition of these floods. The levee was wholly inadequate. Its base must be widened and the levee itself must be built much higher and banks must be revetted to prevent wave wash. This was the verdict of U.S. engineers as well as engineers and members of the board of directors of St. Francis Levee District, the agency that had acted for the taxpayers in building the levee in the first place.

After these great floods of 1912–13, land, still cheap, became cheaper and farmers often experienced great difficulty in procuring money with which to make crops.

Then, Judge Will J. Driver came along. He had served his district as circuit judge for 8 years and retired to the practice of law. His people elected him to Congress where he served from 1921 to 1939. As a landowner, he was very conversant with the prime necessity for protection against floods. Perhaps the fact that he and his father had helped so much to organize the St. Francis Levee District and obtain practically all of the right-of-way through Mississippi County and his father had served as its second president, had caused him to give great study to the flood problem which confronted his people. At any rate he gave his time to the further study of ways and means to remove the menace of these frequent high waters, levee breaks and floods incident to them in the almost annual rampages of Old Man River. He became a member of the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Committees in Congress and devoted much of his time to the subject in hand.

In cooperation with levee board engineers, he began seeking a sure remedy to stop these disastrous levee breaks. A law written and formulated by him enabled the building of greatly enlarged levees, much higher and stronger than ever before, the revetment of banks to prevent wave wash which helped to undermine the levee and bring about breaks in it, straightening the big river in many places, deepening its channel and removing obstructions to its flow so as to hasten the discharge of these large volumes of water into its outlet, the Gulf of Mexico.

This work was done at the expense of the United States and under the supervision of levee board and Army engineers. Mr. Driver had convinced Congress against rather formidable opposition at first that the matter of the prevention of floods along the Mississippi River was primarily the responsibility of our National Government and not of the taxpayers of the affected areas.

Today, due to the successful planning of Mr. Driver, his many associates throughout the St. Francis Basin and United States engineers, the Mississippi River is no longer a dread and a menace to our people. Its former devastating floods are no more.

Thanks to redredging of channels, Old Man River is now a useful servant and an integral part of America's great transportation system. With its boats and barge lines it moves a vast amount of freight between north and south, much of it going overseas.

This great work was the result of the efforts of the man we propose to honor and whose memory we desire to perpetuate with a monument.

The citizens and business interests of eastern Arkansas are all indebted to our former Congressman, Hon. Will J. Driver, who thus spent the best years of his life in their honorable and efficient service. It would be too great a task to set down here all of the many fine services rendered by him to his people.

The St. Francis River, our greatest outlet for drainage has in recent years proven very troublesome because it has been filling with silt and other elements which obstruct its flow. At best its current moved very slowly because of sand bars, bends, willows, and other things which tended to slow it down.

Today, the St. Francis, from its mouth to near Marianna has been widened, deepened, and straightened. This work is being done at the expense of the Government under Mr. Driver's flood-control law. When it is completed, it is believed that our drainage will be ample for all purposes.

Since he and his father, the late John B. Driver, who was its second president, had so much to do with organizing and putting the St. Francis Levee District into operation, we do not feel that these remarks would be complete without the following excerpt from the History of the St. Francis Levee District, compiled and published in 1945 by men who knew of the great services rendered by Judge Driver:

"It can truly be stated that no citizen of the levee district has contributed more to the work and success of the levee district

or has been more devoted to the welfare and progress of the people of the district than Judge Driver."

To those who would know more of Judge Driver and his fine records, and are interested in the history of the development of the St. Francis Basin, we earnestly suggest that they procure a copy of the History of the St. Francis Levee District and read it carefully.

WHO WAS THE FATHER OF DRAINAGE AND FLOOD CONTROL IN MISSISSIPPI COUNTY?

From time to time claimants of this honor have appeared, but when confronted with the cold facts of history, these pretenders, have usually subsided and abandoned their claims.

Great as his services were, and as indispensable as they were to the levees and drainage, we do not claim for Mr. Driver that he was the father of either drainage or levees. We are quite sure, however, without the plan worked out by him and the levee board engineers to control the flood waters of the Mississippi River, drainage ditches would have been of little lasting value—hardly worth their cost. We would not want history distorted by any such claim.

The absurdity of these spurious claims is easily seen when it is known that long before the unfortunate and disastrous war between the States, many of the landowners along the Mississippi and, for that matter, most likely along the other streams which flow through the lowlands of eastern Arkansas, had begun to build levees to protect their lands from overflow. It seems reasonable to presume that one so anxious to protect his land from floodwaters as to build a levee, would also provide ditches to drain off the surface water caused by excessive rainfall.

This practice produced only a patchwork system of levees and drainage ditches, for not all landowners were financially able or had the gumption or energy to build them, even just for their own protection. This system left many gaps, through which the water from these rivers flowed into the lowlands, even then referred to as the St. Francis basin.

From 1861 to 1865 while the war was in progress, probably no new levees were built by landowners and such as they had could not be kept in repair and suffered great damage from the floods of those years. When the war ended, sporadic efforts were made by the more progressive landowners to restore their levees, and of course, ditches.

Practically every worthwhile citizen understood that a much greater effort was imperative. That these lands could not be developed without much higher and stronger levees, channel dredging, and bank revetment. They also knew that local interests could not pay for these great improvements.

Congressman Will J. Driver was ready, able, and willing to undertake the job of providing these improvements. It was his superb leadership as a member of the Flood Control Committee in Congress, that brought about the happy situation we now enjoy.

Where there once was only a swamp, there is now a vast agricultural domain. Our farms are equipped with every kind of modern machinery needed for the maximum production of very kind of crop and palatial farm homes are to be found everywhere.

WILL J. DRIVER AS A CITIZEN

From the very beginning of his career, Mr. Driver was in the forefront of every movement for the betterment of Osceola and Mississippi County. About 1907 he acquired the tract of land lying between what are now St. John and Elm Streets in Osceola and laid it out in town lots, building concrete sidewalks on both sides of most, if not all of the streets. This venture he called the Osceola townsite addition. He sold the principal part of the lots in this addition to white people but that part lying south of Ford Avenue named for his friend, the late E. M. Ford, and the part lying north of Semmes Avenue, named for his old friend, the late Capt. S. S. Semmes, then one of the leading lawyers in Osceola, to colored people. The part between Ford and Semmes Avenues, he reserved for white people. Quinn and Hale Avenues were named for his lifelong friend, the late Mr. J. W. (Pappy) Quinn, and for his friends of the Hale family, all very prominent in the business and social life of that time. He made many gifts of property and money to the public. Prime examples of his generosity to his hometown are his gifts of the lots upon which the courthouse, the public library, and the U.S. post office in Osceola now stand. The deeds conveying these lots recite a consideration of $1, and even that sum was probably never paid.

THE LIGHT PLANT

He, with the late D. Fred Taylor, Sr., formulated and put into execution the plan which resulted in the ownership by the city of Osceola of the waterworks and electric light plants, thus giving to our city for the first time, wholesome water from a deep well and an ample supply of electricity for electric lights and power. These plants have been carefully maintained and enlarged to fit the needs of modern living conditions. Under the able management of Mayor Ben F. Butler, and aldermen, D. N. Morris, Garner Robbins, Ed Teaford, R. E. Prewitt, Ralph Wilson, and Ray Morgan, they have provided profits with which to pay for many fine improvements in Osceola, just a few of which are a fine swimming pool, many well paved streets and very necessary extensions of the sewerage system. These and the recently installed water purifying system have contributed in a large measure to the health and convenience of our citizens. No city of comparable size in Arkansas has a finer public utility service or more paved streets than has Osceola.

HELPS BRING RAILROAD TO OSCEOLA

In 1901, Mr. Driver, in cooperation with his good friend, the late Mr. E. M. Ford, incorporated the Deckerville, Osceola & Northern Railroad Co. This company purchased a logging road that had been projected for several miles in a northeasterly direction from Deckerville, Ark., by the Pond-Decker Lumber Co. It connected at Deckerville with what is now known as the "Frisco Railroad." Pond-Decker Lumber Co., in which Mr. Ford was a stockholder, owned a large sawmill at Deckerville. This logging road had been built by the company to bring timber to its mill. The Ford-Driver combination extended their railroad into Osceola in the year 1901, thus giving Osceola a railroad connection with the outside world. Later, the Deckerville, Osceola & Northern Railroad was extended to Luxora. Still later it was sold to the "Frisco" and that part of it between Luxora and Evadale is now a part of its main line between Memphis and St. Louis.

HELPS PROVIDE OSCEOLA WITH A TELEPHONE SYSTEM

About the beginning of this century Osceola was without telephones. Lack of means of quick communication was very irksome to the citizens of this growing little city.

Judge Driver, with the able cooperation of the late Mr. R. C. Rose, the late Dr. Thomas G. Brewer and others, under the name of Tri-State Telephone Co. provided Osceola with its first telephone system. It was a very efficient one and probably the first in Mississippi County. For the first time, Osceola had long-distance connections with the outside world.

The telephone system proved to be a very profitable investment. It was finally sold to the Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.

Mr. Driver rendered his people a lifetime of fine and intelligent service.

His career was one of kindness, generosity, and efficiency. One of the finest indexes to the character of the man is to be found in his great contributions to the needy. No one in distress, whether white or colored, ever appealed to him in vain for help. However ragged and dirty he might be and regardless of his station in life, no one who appealed to him was ever refused help. Whether it was for money, sound advice, or both, he always responded generously.

WILL J. DRIVER MEMORIAL COMMITTEE,
A. F. BARHAM, *Chairman.*

Henry J. Kaiser, Jr., Supports Federal Aid to Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, improvement of the Nation's educational system cannot be accomplished without increasing expenditures. It has become more and more apparent that Federal revenues must be tapped for this purpose, because the burden of State and local taxes for operation of schools has about reached the ceiling in most parts of the United States.

At a recent meeting of the National Education Association, one of America's outstanding industrialists, Henry J. Kaiser, Jr., spoke out in favor of Federal aid to education. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Milwaukie (Oreg.) Review, written by State Senator Monroe Sweetland, in which he comments on the views of Mr. Kaiser. The editorial was published July 1, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukie (Oreg.) Review, July 1, 1959]

LISTEN TO HENRY KAISER, JR.

Not every industrial leader is more concerned about his income taxes than the security of the Nation. Latest to make clear where he stands is Henry J. Kaiser, Jr., in an address this week at the National Education Convention at St. Louis. Moreover, he made it clear that he, as one of the Nation's most powerful industrials spokesmen, favors effective and quick Federal aid to local education.

"We cannot have the kind of educational system we need without money," Kaiser said. "We need classrooms. We need more teachers. We need the means of making the teaching profession an attractive one. And a greater proportion of this money may well have to come from Federal sources."

Kaiser said that, speaking as a businessman and a layman, he thought it shocking that teachers were asked to get along on an average salary of $4,500 a year. Teachers, he said, should be among the highest paid people in our society, if we want quality education.

"One of the great tasks remaining to us in the 20th century," he added, "may lie not in the direction of super weapons, but in the

discovery of new political meanings, and new moral and human goals.

"We have whole new cities to build. New tasks, new professions for our workers yet to be created. Instead of quailing before this challenge we should be exulting in the opportunity to throw our national energies into action, for the sheer joy of achievement."

In Oregon and in all States which export much of the wealth produced within their boundaries, the necessity of Federal tax rebates for schools is urgent. Only Uncle Sam's long arm can equalize opportunity by bringing back here a fair tax share of the wealth of our forests and utilities, our land and our industries, held by the coupon clippers in New York and Chicago, in Los Angeles and Miami. This should be a major objective of Oregon farm and home owners whose real property taxes for education are already burdensome.

Ineffectiveness of Loyalty Oaths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Oaths and Disclaimers," written by Graham DuShane, editor, and published in Science magazine for July 10, 1959.

The article, I think, presents an excellent summary of the arguments for the enactment of S. 819 and clearly states the position of the academic community on the issue. I draw particular attention to the statement made in the editorial that the present provision of the law is both ineffective and imposes unnecessary financial and administrative burdens on the colleges and the Government.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OATHS AND DISCLAIMERS

On June 24 the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported the Kennedy-Clark bill, S. 819, a bill that would eliminate from the National Defense Act of 1958 the section that requires a teacher or a student who applies for a loan or a grant under the provisions of the bill to sign an oath of loyalty and an affidavit that "he does not believe in and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence * * *."

What will happen to the bill now is anybody's guess. The action of the committee in reporting it put it on the Senate Calendar, but it will not come up for a vote unless the Senate majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, decides to put it on the agenda.

In the hearings on the bill (a copy of the testimony may be obtained from your Senator) the great majority of those who testified—the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and representatives of the American Council on Education, the Association of American Colleges, and the American Association of University Professors, among others—strongly favored elimination of the disclaimer affidavit. Opinion about the loyalty oath was divided—some thought it perfectly proper, some thought it proper but ineffective and cumbersome to administer, and some thought it improper in that it singled out students and teachers as a special class whose loyalty was impugned. Those who felt this most strongly wondered why other recipients of Government aid—farmers, veterans, bankers, airline operators, and so on—were not also required to take a loyalty oath.

The middle position was represented by those who were willing, in some cases reluctantly, to let the loyalty oath stand, but who were strongly in favor of eliminating the affidavit or disclaimer oath. Thus, both the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges, as well as many individuals, agreed that the disclaimer was undesirable. It was objected to, as was the loyalty oath by some, for discriminating against teachers and students, for being superfluous if the loyalty oath were retained, for being a test oath of opinion reminiscent of the religious and political test oaths of bygone ages, and for being vague (what organizations one is supposed not to believe in is nowhere specified) and possibly unconstitutional.

The arguments advanced against the disclaimer oath on the basis of principle are somewhat subtler. They center around the importance of trust in the educational process and in democracy. Fairly representative of this stand is the comment of the American Association of Colleges to the effect that the disclaimer affidavit created "apprehension and timorousness on college and university campuses" and that the "real security of the country lies in the maintenance of freedom of spirit as well as in fact, and that democracy depends upon trust in the individual."

This is a good and moderate statement, but it does not go far enough. Neither the oath nor the disclaimer is going to give pause to anyone who is disloyal to the country. Thus, both are ineffective and impose unnecessary financial and administrative burdens on the colleges and the Government. We agree with Secretary Flemming and others that the oaths are unnecessary, that our present security laws provide adequate safeguards, and that anyone who violates them "should be prosecuted immediately under the laws designed directly and specifically for such offenses."—G. DuS.

America's Farmers Deserve Economic Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on June 13 I had the pleasure of accompanying my good friend, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, to my home district of Wisconsin. He was there to talk to members of the Pierce-Pepin Electric Co-op, who were holding their annual meeting at Ellsworth, Wis.

Senator HUMPHREY has a long and strong interest in the rural electrification program, an interest which is part and parcel of his broad interest in the fate of the family-type farmer. During his 10 years in the Senate he has led the fight for economic justice for America's farmers. Time and time again he has introduced and fought for legislation aimed at helping our rural folks help themselves achieve their rightful place as first-class citizens in our economy.

Since I came to Congress in 1953 I have had the privilege of working with Senator HUMPHREY on bills dealing with various parts of the complex farm problem. During this session we are cooperating on the self-financing and self-regulating Humphrey-Johnson dairy marketing program, which would guarantee dairymen 90 percent of parity at less than half the cost of the present dairy support program, and the Johnson-Humphrey milk sanitation bill, which would allow the free flow of high-quality milk in interstate trade. I have also introduced Senator HUMPHREY's food for peace bill in the House because I heartily agree with the Senator's belief that it is far better to enlist our food abundance in waging peace than to be faced with the prospect of enlisting our sons for war.

Senator HUMPHREY has compiled a "farmer's bill of rights" containing 12 basic standards from which farmers should never retreat. He included this bill of rights in his speech to the rural electric co-op folks in my district—a speech which, under unanimous consent, I would like to have printed in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

THE FARM CHALLENGE

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota)

There is no gathering of any kind which gives me more pleasure than a meeting of the members of a cooperative, folks joined in a common endeavor to make life better for everybody. So I am glad to be here and happy for the opportunity to greet you, to wish you good fortune in the continued health and strength of the Pierce-Pepin Electric Cooperative, and to discuss ideas with you on present farm problems and prospects ahead.

And it is also a source of real pleasure to be here today with my good friend, cooperator and fellow legislator, your outstanding Congressman—LESTER JOHNSON.

LESTER JOHNSON actually started the Wisconsin Democratic revival back in 1953 when he won this congressional seat in a special election. Things have been looking up for the Democrats ever since, not only in Wisconsin but all over the country.

But LESTER'S victory meant more than a new era for Democrats. It also meant a great deal to all farmers, Democrats and Republicans alike. He has become a real champion of agriculture in the House of Representatives, has been a great help—and privilege—for me to have such an able partner on legislation of importance to Wisconsin and Minnesota, dairy farmers as the Humphrey-Johnson dairy bill and the Johnson-Humphrey Milk Sanitation Act establishing national standard under the Public Health Service.

He has arranged for hearings in poultry and egg problems in the House next week, and I am working in the same direction in the Senate.

You are fortunate in Wisconsin in having other good friends of agriculture, such as my good friend Senator BILL PROXMIRE, and your capable Gov. Gaylord Nelson. BILL PROXMIRE can always be counted upon to stand solidly with friends of agriculture. He is an effective member of our Senate committee.

While I am mentioning Wisconsin names, I cannot overlook another young man who has made a great and continuing contribu-

tion in your behalf. He is Bob Lewis, one time editor of the Wisconsin REA News, the boy from the Wisconsin family farm who has never forgotten his first royalties. His father, George Lewis, pioneered the REA cooperative movement in Wisconsin, and Bob has carried on in the same tradition of service. He was formerly administrative assistant to Senator PROXMIRE. I am so pleased that Governor Nelson has Bob as his right-hand farm adviser, his agricultural coordinator. Bob Lewis is a man who knows what he is fighting for.

In all fairness, I might add that agriculture welcomes and recognizes friends from either major political party. We who put the welfare of farm people above partisanship appreciate the consistent support of Republicans such as Senator MILT YOUNG, of North Dakota, and your own Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, who have refused to go along with this GOP administration's wreck-the-farmer policies.

After 10 years of fighting battles for farmers in Washington, I know something about who you can count upon and who you cannot. The sure test of faithful performance is a consistent record of support for agriculture throughout the years.

What really counts, is having people in public office who really care, and who really understand your problems and want to do something about them.

That certainly goes for the REA, as well as general farm legislation.

I believe in all kinds of cooperatives, but I have a special place in my heart for the rural electric cooperatives. You have not only brought light and power to the rural areas of America, you have also strengthened the entire farm cooperative movement by teaching more farmers the value of working together to help themselves.

Our rural electric co-ops have developed strong and courageous leadership because of the very necessity to resist continuing attacks upon your great program. If there is a single destructive trick that foes of your organizations have not used or tried to use in the last 6 or 7 years, I cannot name it. I know, because I have been in the thick of your battles, shoulder to shoulder with men like Clyde Ellis of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Perhaps it appears that we have just lost a round in our most recent REA fight—the attempt to override the President's veto on the Humphrey-Price bill. But let me tell you something; it was a mighty hollow victory for foes of REA, when two-thirds of the Senate voted in your behalf, and we only missed by four votes having a similar two-thirds vote in the House.

I am proud of that fight, and my own part in it, with your backing. When we found out 2 years ago that the Secretary of Agriculture was attempting to take over the loan-making authority of the REA Administrator, I insisted that Secretary Benson come before our Senate Committee on Government Operations to explain what he was up to.

I acted in good faith, because Secretary Benson had promised in 1953 not to change the operational pattern of REA if he were given authority over its functions under the President's reorganizational plan.

You may recall that Ezra "took a walk," and refused to appear, even though my official authority as chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Reorganization called for acting as a watchdog over his administration of the authority given him.

Secretary Benson virtually hid out until Congress adjourned. So when Congress returned, my first act was introduction of legislation restricting his authority and returning it to the REA Administrator where it belonged.

This time Secretary Benson could not escape coming before our committee—and he was unable to convince a majority of the committee he had acted in good faith. The result was the enactment of the Humphrey-Price bill by both Houses of Congress.

Yet, it was vetoed, despite the expressed intent of Congress as to how the program should operate. And the Republican administration, from the White House down, exerted every pressure in the world to sustain that veto.

We lost by just four votes. And, I don't think I have to remind you, four Republican votes in Wisconsin for REA could have turned the tide in your favor.

More was involved than just this simple REA organization act. If we could have broken the back of "government by veto," it would have opened the door to great strides forward in giving farmers other help they have been asking for—a better farm program, seeing that farmers have a chance to earn a decent farm income while at the same time cutting down the tremendous losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Yes; if four Republican Congressmen from Wisconsin had voted differently, our immediate legislative future for agriculture would have looked a great deal brighter.

Yet even in supposed defeat we have served notice on REA-wreckers that a vast majority of this Congress is not about to let this great program be crippled. And we have put the brakes to efforts of this administration to hike your interest rates on REA loans. That alone was worth the effort.

Now I want to talk to you today about more than just the great REA program.

You are farm people. The purpose of your REA cooperative is to better enable you to do a good job as farmers. Farming is your business. Yet it is even more—it is your way of life.

I am sure that uppermost in your minds is the future of American agriculture—and the extent to which your Government is going to help you, or neglect you, in your struggle for economic justice—in a time of serious economic distress.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as a long-time friend of American agriculture, your problems are of grave concern to me.

They should be of serious concern to all citizens, urban or rural, for we all have a stake in what happens to agriculture.

The Democratic Party has received a powerful mandate from the farm people of America to right the tragic wrongs that have been done to American agriculture under the Republican administration in Washington.

Remember, it is the Republican program that is such a mess today, as much as they would like to duck responsibility.

It is the Republican program and it has been Republican bungling that has made such a costly mess of it without producing any effective results for farm people.

It is high time for some changes to be made.

But it is only fair to warn you that the Congress is working under extremely serious and inescapable limitations. We cannot do everything you wish we would do. We cannot do everything we want to do.

First, we are working under the limits imposed by the President's veto power. I think it is only fair and accurate to expect that the President will veto any bill we might pass which will do anything substantial to raise farm prices.

This means that Congress is limited in what it can do for farmers to what can be passed by a two-thirds vote over a Presidential veto.

Secondly, Congress is limited in what it can do for farmers by the veto power which is held by the Secretary of Agricultrue.

You have seen how good farm programs can be ruined by unsympathetic administration. The power of the Secretary of Agriculture to negate the intent and spirit of Congress is great.

The Secretary's power to veto by administrative action limits the good that Congress can do for farmers to those things that are so simple, so direct, that the results can come through to the farm in spite of all the foot-dragging and hostility that it will encounter as it passes through the Department of Agriculture's hands.

Despite these severe handicaps, at least some of us in the Democratic Congress are determined to develop a workable program that will help the farmers of America.

You can mark it down as absolutely certain that the Democratic Congress will not let the administration pull down the temple of agricultural programs completely in its final hours, as it has seemed determined to do.

The Democratic Congress will never, never, never give Ezra Taft Benson the zero-parity floor he has asked for. We will not give him the marketplace, no-parity gimmick he has asked for either.

The Democratic Congress will not allow the administration to get away with putting a penalty tax on the refunds that your cooperatives pay to their patrons.

The Democratic Congress will not let the administration jack up REA interest rates, nor throw the REA co-ops to the wolves of Wall Street.

You can count on that. You can bank on it. You can bet your economic lives on it—and that is exactly what the stakes are in agricultural policy today. For while the administration has a powerful veto weapon to use against Congress when it tries to help the farmer, we have a veto power of our own when it comes to acting on the administration's plans to harm the farmers. And we will use it. We will not give up a single inch.

This tragic era for agriculture—the dark era of Ezra—has had a good and constructive result along with all the misery and waste. So it seems to me, at any rate.

It has made us grow up and come of age in our thinking about farm policy.

We now realize that the real argument in farm policy should not be over methods and details. The real argument is over basic objectives.

Are you for a program to help the family farm? Or are you against the family farm? That, my friends, is the real issue, the real dividing line, in farm policy debate today.

Almost any farmer in America can think up the general outline of a farm plan that will work—if there is a will to make it work.

Methods are important. Details are important. Some will work better than others. Some well-intentioned ideas might not work at all. We need highly skilled technical experts and conscientious administration to carry out our farm programs. But our trouble is not for lack of ideas and conscientious, skilled people to put them into effect. The Department of Agriculture is overflowing with fine, dedicated career public servants—who could make a farm program work and work well, if they were given a chance.

Regrettably, the public attitude toward agriculture has been so deliberately distorted that we now need to mobilize better understanding on the part of all American people as the first step toward the new and better farm program some of us are seeking.

America's farm policies need to be reexamined and clarified in terms of objectives sought in the Nation's interest—not just in terms of political slogans or cliches designed to turn city resident against farm resident, and even farmer against farmer.

Before we can enact any effective new farm legislation, we need to make clear what our purposes and objectives are.

That's what some of us are trying to do in Congress now, while we are working on new and better legislation.

All the legislative history behind the development of farm programs in America confirms that our objective and purpose has been to assure the American people of a continued abundance of food and fiber, to offer America's farmers an opportunity to achieve economic equality with other segments of our economy, and to preserve and protect America's traditional pattern of family owned, family operated farms as the type of agriculture best adapted to our democratic way of life.

In more recent years, there has been added a new objective in the ineerest of the entire Nation—the purpose of using our abundance as a useful and effective humanitarian arm of better international relations.

Repeatedly, the Congress of the United States has restated its intent to uphold these objectives, in one way or another.

But these objectives are being challenged—we have heard our blessings of abundance criticized as a curse.

We have heard that even 90 percent of equality—let alone full equality—is more than farmers are entitled to in our economy.

We have heard disturbing yet increasing talk of encouraging a complete change in our historic pattern of farming, to put more emphasis on bigness and efficiency, less on human values and problems of rural living. We have heard less concern about perpetuating our family farming pattern, and more and more about giving way to the pressure of mass operations.

Serious questions of public policy are involved, if we are to cross that line.

It is not a change of direction toward which we should be allowed to drift or be pushed, without fully knowing the consequences.

The most damaging product of the age of Ezra is the dangerous erosion of America's will to do justice for her farm people.

For the first time in the history of our Nation, a cancer of doubt has arisen in the public consciousness as to the merit of our family farming system—the most efficient agricultural production system in the world.

The swift rise of vertical integration provides the mechanism whereby big concentrated business and financial interests can extend their domination over agriculture. This will leave the farm family on the farm. But it will take away its economic independence. The farmer will be told what to grow and where to sell, and the absentee-corporation farm director will control what the farmer gets for his efforts. This is but corporate collectivism—with private agricultural commissions.

This ominous forecast for American agriculture holds a powerful, fascinating allure for all too many people in our country today. Its allure has been heightened immeasurably by the discouraging, demoralizing shambles that the Republican administration has made of our farm programs. There is a growing sentiment in our country for just giving up on the farm problem.

This sentiment is strong among those who do not understand the tremendous values and strengths in our family farming system, nor the unusual problems which farm families must face. There are millions and millions of citizens in our population who are far removed from the soil. Their number is increasing year by year. Domination of agriculture by centralized corporate power appeals to many of them as an easy way out of the farm problem.

And it appeals even more strongly to those who simply do not care about what happens to farm people.

But I am one of the people who care, and so is LESTER JOHNSON, and so is Senator PROXMIRE. And I believe that there are many more elected Representatives like us in the Congress of the United States.

Rather than stumble and drift along blindly because of a vacuum of sound farm policy leadership from the present administration, farm people and city people alike need to do some soul searching, and some honest appraisal of what we really want—and the alternatives we face. Perhaps I can be helpful in that direction today, by outlining to you my own guidelines for trying to develop a new and better farm program.

We need an agricultural stabilization program far less costly to the American taxpayers than the present inexcusable mess—yet one that is far more effective in its protection of family farmers and their contribution to the American economy.

We can, and must, have both.

We need an agricultural stabilization program that provides more equality of opportunity for agriculture to keep pace with the rest of our expanding economy in terms of income, yet one that does not make the farmer dependent on the Government for that income.

We need a program that recognizes the need for and encourages farmers to help themselves through cooperative action for bargaining power in the market place and for whatever production adjustments that may be necessary to make the best use of our human, soil, and water resources.

We need a program that recognizes and is tailored to the vast technological changes, yet does so without sacrificing the human and social values of our traditional American pattern of family owner-operated farms.

We need a program that recognizes the farmer's stewardship responsibility for conserving productivity of our land for the sake of future generations, yet recognizes too that the entire Nation shares that same responsibility—and must share in the cost of seeing that it is properly done.

We need a program that really does something about surpluses—making use of what we have, and adjusting production to keep from building up more beyond the level of possible need.

Above all, we need a national food policy closely meshed with our farm policy, so that we can better gear our productive resources to the needs of humanity at home and abroad—instead of producing for Government storage bins.

If the choice facing us rests between abundance and scarcity, consumers and farmers alike have a vital stake in abundance—wisely used. Farm abundance has done more to check inflation and the increase in the cost of living than any other single factor in our economy.

Until we as a Nation face up to our social responsibility of deciding what we are going to do about the areas of hardship and suffering in our own midst—and to what extent we are willing to share out potential abundance with hungry peoples of the world as a force for freedom—until these questions are resolved, it appears morally wrong to insist that American agriculture drastically curb its output below levels for which human need exists.

Society must recognize that in the long run, it pays the price one way or another.

Is it not cheaper—and far better—to enlist our food abundance in waging peace, than to be faced with enlisting our sons and mobilizing our economy for war?

It is not cheaper—and far better—to invest some of our abundance in raising the living standards of low-income groups in our country, rather than turning to a scarcity philosophy that can only force up food costs to all segments of our society.

American agriculture is offered no alternative other than following the pattern of monopoly industry, in cutting back its production to the point where it can receive more income for less output, it will be consumers of the Nation who will pay the bill.

Farmers would like to produce in abundance, if that abundance is wisely used, and they can receive a fair return for their investment, their managerial skill, and their labor.

Yet there is no reason why farmers alone should subsidize other segemtns of our society already receiving a greater proportionate share of our national income, nor any reason why farmers alone should bear the costs of producing to meet the needs of underdeveloped areas of the world, in the interests of America's foreign policy.

If consumers want the price protection of always having a little more than enough to eat, if the Nation wants the valuable asset of abundance in a world of need, then the public must recognize that there is a public interest stake in Government providing a climate of conditions in which farmers can survive economically.

You cannot do it by writing off farm people as second-class citizens, who are not to share in the general prosperity and progress of the Nation.

You cannot do it by throwing farmers on the mercy of the free market for what they sell, when the costs of what they buy are bolstered and supported by all kinds of built-in protectors.

Food is basic to national life.

Price protection, farm credit, conservation assistance—all such farm programs are but means to an end—not the end itself.

There is no simple answer to achieving these objectives, no one panacea for the entire farm problem. Neither can any one bill meet all the problems we face.

But reasonable men should be able to agree on combining an entire kit of economic and program tools in order that each commodity may be handled in the manner best suited to its unique needs.

We need more adequate credit designed to family farm requirements. We need better conservation programs. We need more research directed into utilization of our abundance. We need a food stamp program to increase consumption among our aged, our handicapped, our dependent children, and our unemployed. We need greatly expanded uses of our food internationally under a food-for-peace program.

Yet with all of this, we need the Government's cooperation with farmers toward more adequate income protection and production adjustment. We can do it through combined use of income equalization payments to producers, through marketing orders and agreements, through orderly marketing loans and direct purchases, through marketing quotas, through payments in kind in some instances, through greater rural development aid and through Government sanction of farmers banding together to help themselves when they develop and accept programs to do so by majority vote of producers.

Far from regimentation, such a program offers the real freedom farmers need—freedom from poverty, freedom from economic domination, and freedom of choice as to the alternatives they prefer in seeking to avoid the hardship of the wildly fluctuating free markets over which they now have no control.

These are not pie-in-the-sky proposals. They are sound and practical and should be achieved, if American agriculture mobilizes its forces and carries its true story to the rest of the American people.

And with such a program, I am sure, we can at long last secure for all agriculture assurances which I have termed my "farmer's bill of rights," as standards from which farmers should never retreat.

They include:

1. The right to full equality of economic opportunity.
2. The right for improved standards of rural living.
3. The right of reasonable protection against natural hazards.
4. The right to extend agricultural free enterprise through cooperative action.
5. The right to public cooperation and assistance in conserving and saving the soil.
6. The right to preserve the social and human values of family farming.
7. The right to decent land tenure which encourages the desirable goal of farm ownership.
8. The right to a democratic voice in his own farm program.
9. The right to benefits of an expanding world trade.
10. The right to a long-term program of food reserves to protect consumers against costly scarcity.
11. The right to assurance that land reclamation development will result in establishment of new family farms, not factories in the field.
12. The right to the entire Nation's support for use of food and fiber as a force for freedom throughout the world.

These, I believe, are the basic rights of American agriculture.

They are not new rights. They are not rights of special privilege, gained through misuse or abuse of tremendous power over the lifelines of the Nation's food supply.

Rather, they are rights of historic precedent, earned by the great and continuing contribution of agriculture to American life—the fulfillment of the Nation's needs in peace or war, in good times or bad, at personal profit or loss.

They need to be restated now only as a guiding beacon of light, cast upon the darkness of present confusion over America's farm policy.

They must be just as zealously guarded against forces which seek to destroy them, as we guard other historic rights, privileges, and responsibilities of freedom in our democracy.

Citizens' Union Urges Mayor To Reorganize Title I Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 15, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent disclosures in New York City indicating faulty procedures in the administration of the title I program, I think my colleagues in the House will be interested in the following comment recently made by the Citizens' Union:

CITIZENS' UNION URGES MAYOR TO REORGANIZE TITLE I PROGRAM

The Citizens' Union today released a letter it has written Mayor Wagner urging a complete reorganization of the title I slum-clearance program. The letter, signed by Citizens' Union Chairman Milton M. Bergerman, follows:

"DEAR MAYOR WAGNER: I am writing on behalf of the Citizens' Union to urge you to proceed promptly with a thoroughgoing reorganization of the city's title I slum-clearance program.

"Some weeks ago the Citizens' Union addressed a series of questions to the mayor's committee on slum clearance. We received answers, and we then asked the committee to open some of its files to us. We and others subsequently examined some of the records. As a result a good deal of light has been thrown on the manner in which the title I program has been conducted up to now, and some major weaknesses have been disclosed.

"The chairman of the slum-clearance committee has now declared that title I in New York City is a 'dead duck.' Like the report of Mark Twain's death, this report is highly exaggerated. The exposure of certain weakness of administration should simply lead to a sounder and better organization of future title I operations.

"Whatever has been accomplished in the first 10 years of operation of the slum-clearance program, it is unquestionable that a vast job of rebuilding the city's deteriorated areas remains to be done. Now is the time to put the program on a sound, constructive basis.

"Two major weaknesses have been revealed in the present procedure:

"1. Title I has been administered by a scratch committee in a haphazard fashion. There has been no sound advance planning and organization.

"2. Title I has been a bonanza for some miscellaneous groups of persons who have found it a safe and easy way to make a lot of money without giving anything in return. Of course, there are exceptions. There have been a very few responsible persons and groups who have performed creditably both as initial sponsors and as salvagers of projects that were initially given to the wrong people.

"We now urge you to ask the city administrator to make an immediate study and to prepare a plan for handling present and future title I operations. As tentative suggestions, we offer the following:

"1. Comprehensive planning for redevelopment of deteriorated areas should be a function of the city planning commission. The commission should draw up a comprehensive plan which will not only designate appropriate areas for redevelopment, but will also indicate the proper type of development for each area, whether luxury apartments, middle-income housing, subsidized housing, or business or industrial use.

"2. An extensive operation such as the title I program should not be in the hands of a scratch committee. A formal operating organization should be set up. This organization should have full authority to administer the work of obtaining reliable sponsors and supervising their activities, including the clearance of the sites, the relocation of tenants, and reconstruction of the area.

"We believe that a new setup along these lines will have the effect of interesting many more responsible developers than at present and will put new life into the title I program."

Forthcoming Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress is working on reform labor legislation, various segments of our citizenry and press are pondering the issue and formulating opinions on this highly controversial matter.

From the editorial section of the Houlton Pioneer Times, a popular northern Maine weekly, comes this poignant and persuasive observation:

[From the Houlton (Maine) Pioneer Times, July 2, 1959]

MORE ABOUT FORTHCOMING LABOR LEGISLATION

Two weeks ago we discussed one of the phases of pending labor legislation that is to be acted on by the House of Representatives, that commends itself to the thoughtful attention of every citizen of this country.

This was along the theme that the Kennedy-Ervin bill, soon to be considered, is, in its present form, ineffective, without teeth and too mild to correct the most flagrant abuses of which some labor organizations are guilty.

The first major issue was the bill of rights for union members which Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, declares must be an integral part of this changed law if that law is to do the job it should. We agree with Senator MCCLELLAN on that point. we believe most of our readers will if they give the issue serious thought.

Second major issue is the question of the right of union leaders to put picket lines around a place of business and use secondary boycotts to force employees to join a union.

This is the most flagrant kind of duress which abridges the rights of both workers and employers. On this question Senator MCCLELLAN believes that employees should be free to determine whether or not they want a union. He contends that, if a majority of them do not want a union, they should not be forced into one.

Branding organizational picketing and secondary boycotts as instruments of economic coercion used to thwart the will of employees and used as an instrument to perpetuate racketeering in labor-management relations, the chairman of the famed McClellan rackets committee, which turned the spotlight on these and other offensive practices of labor organizations, firmly believes union leaders should be deprived of these rights.

You might ask what possible interest there could be in this section of the country on labor matters when there are so few that we have to contend with hereabouts and those that do exist are of a somewhat different character than those who so vigorously sponsor the Kennedy-Ervin bill.

Our view is that because the abuses of blackmail picketing and secondary boycotts are so completely un-American and because they can have such a far-reaching and destructive effect on enterprises far from the scene of a labor dispute and be such a real menace to small business, they should be completely abolished.

If this is true, and we believe every red-blooded American will agree that it is, then it is the duty of every citizen, whether he would be directly affected by such reform or not, to request his Congressman to vote to put teeth into the Kennedy-Ervin bill when it comes up in the House and to have no part of the present milk-and-water version.

It seems to us this is a time for the House of Representatives to do what the Senate apparently did not have the courage to do.

Congressman CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE is your Congressman. His address is House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

This We Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include

the following article by Dr. Louis M. Orr, of Orlando, Fla., president of the American Medical Association, entitled "This We Believe."

THIS WE BELIEVE

(Inaugural address by Louis M. Orr, M.D., of Orlando, Fla., president of the American Medical Association, at presidential inauguration ceremony, American Medical Association, 108th annual meeting, Convention Hall, Atlantic City, June 9, 1959)

President Eisenhower, Dr. Larson, fellow physicians, and friends, in taking office as president of the American Medical Association I do so with gratitude and humility. I am aware of the responsibilities of my new position. And I am determined to carry out my duties with all the dedication at my command.

Tonight, I consider it my duty to speak out on certain fundamental ideas which are vital to medicine, to America, and to mankind.

Medical progress through the years has been inspired by a particular type of man:

Those who learn from the past, but face boldly up to the future: who work at the day's task, but work and dream, also, for tomorrow's progress.

These are the men who blaze the trail for humanity.

But they must breathe the air of freedom; and they flourish best in those times and places where all men respect knowledge, value personal initiative, and applaud quality.

They have flourished in America—in this young nation which, from its beginnings, has cherished the ideals of individual freedom and self-reliance. They have flourished, as the green bay tree, whether in medicine, industry or the other professions. For it is the spirit of democracy to encourage action, cooperation, and the striving for excellence.

Today, however, we can perceive distrubing trends in our country; and they concern all thoughtful men. In confronting these trends, we would be wise to pause for a moment and study the past, because from the past we can learn important lessons for the present.

Modern medicine, for example, traces its traditions back to Hippocrates, the Greek physicion and teacher. He taught his students the facts about the art and science of medicine as they then existed. But Hippocrates gave them much more than facts; he also gave them a sense of values and ethics. He taught the physician's obligation to the patient; respect for the individual; compassion; the doctor's duty to impart his knowledge to others.

Greek children were taught the meaning and value of freedom. The Greeks knew that their country was free only because they as individuals were free, and they accepted full responsibility for maintaining and protecting that freedom. They were willing to pay the price because they valued freedom above everything else. They achieved greatness not because their country was large, or rich, or blessed with abundant natural resources, for they had none of those advantages. Greece left an indelible stamp on history for one reason only: it gave birth to a spirit which for 2,500 years has sparked hope in the minds and hearts of men—the same spirit that underlies the promise of America.

When Greece and Rome eventually fell, they were conquered not by outside aggressors by a decline in their moral and spiritual strength. Describing what happened, Miss Edith Hamilton, the famous classical scholar, has put it this way:

"In the end, more than they wanted freedom, they wanted security, a comfortable life, and they lost all—security and comfort and freedom. Is not that a challenge to us? Is it not true that into our education have come a slackness and softness? Is hard effort prominent? The world of thought can be entered in no other way. Are we not growing slack and soft in our political life? When the Athenians finally wanted not to give to the state, but the state to give to them, when the freedom they wished most for was freedom from responsibility, then Athens ceased to be free and was never free again."

Miss Hamilton's words have a pertinent, almost ominous ring, for us Americans today.

Are we teaching, living and developing all of the potentialities of our democracy?

Are we standing up for the individual over the group or the State?

Are we concerned with the moral and ethical basis of our society, or do we worry more about money, and the things that money can buy?

Are we exploring all possible ways and means of solving our problems through self-reliance, initiative and cooperation, or do we more and more give up without question and accept intervention and eventual government control?

Let us appraise the road we are to travel.

One road leads to rigid and unworkable compulsion; to deadening uniformity and to the loss—yes, the inevitable loss of that individualism and vitality which has made American medicine a pace setter in the world.

This, we must not lose.

This road we must not take.

The other is the road of the free spirit; of dedicated men and women voluntarily working together; of sustained and heartening progress in the never-ending war against the killers and cripplers of mankind.

This is the road we have followed. This is the road we must follow.

For in this way—and in this way only—can we continue to make medicine a faithful servant to mankind.

As citizens, we believe in individual freedom, individual rights, individual responsibilities.

We believe that the basic element of progress is not compulsion but voluntary cooperation; not force but reason; not blind obedience but independent intelligence; not timidity but faith—faith in man, faith in ourselves, faith in God.

We believe that freedom, to survive and grow, can never be placed upon a shelf and forgotton, but must be fought for again and again, day after day, by men and women willing to stand up and to be counted. We reject any philosophy alien to these beliefs.

We know that we must continue to furnish the best possible health care to every American—and this emphatically includes the older citizen.

We know that we must continue to improve and broaden voluntary health programs in preference to compulsory programs that lead to waste.

We know that we must continue to defend the unfettered, inquiring mind for medical progress depends upon the relentless quest for truth by minds that are free.

This is not merely an opinion; it is a significant lesson of history, true yesterday, true today, true always.

For the practice of medicine is more—much more—than merely facts and experience. It is new knowledge, new ideas; a blending of the best of the old with the best of the new. It is the "invincible belief" of Louis Pasteur that "science will triumph over ignorance, that the future will belong to those who have done the most for suffering humanity."

As doctors of medicine it has been our responsibility to watch men, women and children in their darkest hours and to seek to heal and help them.

Anyone who has done this knows that there is inside every man an unquenchable spirit linked to life and love, mercy and hope and the eternal values that come from the Creator.

Upon this knowledge is built our firm belief—the belief that the fundamental obligation of our profession is to maintain medicine's role as the faithful servant of mankind.

Now, and for always—this we believe.

Federal Milk Marketing Order Unfair to District of Columbia Consumers and Midwest Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Al Steadman, agricultural writer for the St. Paul Pioneer Press, St. Paul, Minn., has an excellent editorial on the cause and effect of the recently adopted Federal milk marketing order for the Washington, D.C., area.

I am in full agreement with the views expressed in Mr. Steadman's article. The new Federal order works a hardship against milk producers in the Midwest, milk consumers in the District of Columbia area, and taxpayers all over the country. This is another example of barriers erected against the free flow of milk between the States. My national milk sanitation bill is aimed at breaking down trade barriers and allowing consumers in all parts of our country to get the Midwest's wholesome, yet economical, milk.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Al Steadman's editorial. It follows:

CAUSE AND EFFECT

On June 1 a new Federal milk order went into effect for the Washington, D.C., area, greatly cutting down the flow of milk from outside regions to home consumers and defense agencies in the Nation's Capital.

On July 1, exactly a month later, prices on home-delivered milk in Washington were boosted to 48 cents a half gallon. This is 13 cents a half gallon or 6½ cents a quart higher than the price now being paid for home-delivered milk in the Twin Cities. That difference is about twice as much as the cost of transporting whole milk from the Twin Cities to Washington. Some of that increased cost to consumers is attributed to a recent wage increase of 8 cents an hour for milk company employes.

The rest of the increased milk cost is the District of Columbia consumers' burden in carrying the new Federal milk order with its restrictions against outside competition. Washington consumers don't have any vote, so they have even less standing than consumers generally have in Federal milk order proceedings of the Department of Agriculture.

But among the Washington consumers in this instance happen to be many tax-supported institutions including all of the national defense agencies that buy milk for soldiers, sailors, or airmen.

So Midwest dairymen are in a position to sympathize with the helplessness of those agencies and of Washington home consumers. Our dairymen would like to sell them milk cheaper but the Government won't allow it.

This region would like to have a whack at the defense milk business. But, like Washington consumers, Midwest dairymen have equal standing with the insiders only when it comes to paying Federal taxes. When it comes to selling milk, cream, or concentrated milk to those national defense agencies that our boys help to staff and man, the U.S. Government now says "nothing doing."

Living Portrait of a Potential U.S. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable comment regarding Earl Mazo's new book on Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON. The following review by Mr. Willard Edwards should be of interest to all:

LIVING PORTRAIT OF A POTENTIAL U.S. PRESIDENT

(Reviewed by Willard Edwards)

The difficulties of unbiased biography are magnified when the subject is not only very much alive but a comparatively young politician and office holder, in midcareer, both hated and admired, the target of fears and hopes as a potential President of the United States.

Earl Mazo, an experienced Washington correspondent, has surmounted these obstacles by a magnificent reporting job—the kind of dogged digging for detail and tireless pursuit of the truth that breathes life into a portrait.

Here is the first complete, factual, unvarnished examination of the deeds, thoughts, philosophy, and ambitions of a highly complex figure whose political success story, in a short 13 years, is one of the marvels of this era.

The bare facts of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's public career make exciting reading. When these are combined with a disclosure of many hitherto hidden chapters, frank revelations by NIXON himself of his reactions to dramatic episodes, and a perceptive analysis of his qualities, the narrative becomes absorbing history.

Armed with a wire recorder, Mazo interviewed 307 friends and enemies of NIXON, scattered from Washington, D.C., to California. As one of those thus cross-examined at length, this reviewer can testify to the author's skill as an exhaustive questioner. He searched forgotten records and labored thru the mountains of printed material based upon the young Californian's headlong rush to the political heights.

In 2 dozen private interviews with NIXON himself between December 1957 and January 1959, Mazo searched diligently for this "controversial" character's views on subjects from Taft to television. These "off the record" conversations, embodied in a final chapter, are remarkable in their direct approach to matters often ruled taboo by politicians.

When he was first assigned by his newspaper to cover NIXON's activities, Mazo had a preconceived aversion—based on published accounts—to the Vice President's personality and methods. When he took a furlough to gather material for this biography, traces of this hostility remained. After 15 months he had 200,000 words of manuscript. In an effort to attain "balance," he confesses, he culled 100,000 words, all, in his phrase, "pro-NIXON."

What remains is an equitable accounting, hiding neither the creditable nor the questionable. Mazo finds NIXON a paradoxial combination of qualities that bring to mind Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and Joseph R. McCarthy. Nixon's foes will not like the conclusion, produced by the logic of events recorded here, that the qualities of the first two men have become predominant as the Vice President has matured.

The book is bursting with fresh material. There is much new detail about one of the most theatrical incidents of a presidential campaign—the "Nixon fund" episode of 1952—which was converted by the then 39 year old running mate to General Eisenhower from disaster into triumph. His resistance to pressures from high quarters, urging that he quit the ticket, is told for the first time.

From the days of the Alger Hiss case, when NIXON first attained national prominence, to the exciting events of his South American tour last year, when he faced murderous assault in Caracas, this account shows the Vice President steadily advancing in self-assurance, wisdom, coolness under fire, and a fatalistic belief that he is being borne along, powerless to resist, on the stream of history.

His ambition is not as fierce as many think, Mazo says. Three times he has faced the possibility that the President's illness might make him the Nation's Chief Executive. He was numb with shock on the first occasion; he faced the prospect calmly on the third. Politically bold, a conservative with a practical yardstick, he would be the "hardest driving and most controversial" President in 50 years, and no one, "whether in dismay or admiration," notes his biographer, can expect that he would be a weak Executive.

GTA Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the GTA Daily Radio Roundup, of Tuesday, July 7, 1957.

There being no objection, the Roundup was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP

Big corporations with their armies of tax lawyers, efficiency experts, and technical advisers know how to make sure that every last bolt and squirt of oil on a production machine pays for itself time and time again. But there isn't one farmer in a million who is rich enough to hire one expert, even though the cost is tax deductible.

Still, nowhere has the big drive for efficiency been so bally-hooed as on the farms. From the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the machinery makers, the big farm magazines the word to farmers has been: "Boost efficiency. Buy more machinery. Use less labor. Beat the cost-price squeeze."

So what has happened? Farmers are loaded with machinery, much of it bought on credit. Now the question is, is it paying off? Does more machinery mean more efficiency? That's a hard question to answer. We haven't seen much reliable research on the economics of how much more profit a farmer earns through buying more machinery. So we are indebted to a report on this subject by an independent reporting agency that publishes a newsletter called "Agribusiness Outlook." What it has to say may come as a surprise to most farmers. Here's what Agribusiness Outlook says:

"There's strong evidence that farmers have been oversold on the economic benefits of more and better farm machinery and too-rapid expansion. For agriculture, as a whole, increased mechanization simply isn't doing what it is supposed to do—cut production costs and increase income."

What's the evidence? Well, listen to these statistics and figures. Agribusiness Outlook reports that the farmer's "unit production costs haven't been cut by mechanization. Out of each dollar of sales income, the farmer now has about 82 cents cash costs to pay, compared with 65 cents in the base period of 1947 to 1949. Output per man-hour on the farm has increased 32 percent since 1948 but output per unit of farm machinery and motor vehicles declined 40 percent."

Agribusiness adds all this up to show that farmers have held their gross income about level at $30 billion a year, but only by increasing production 18 percent in the last ten years. But it cost them 28 percent more to get that 18 percent production increase. Agribusiness concludes that "the farmer will continue on the technological treadmill as long as the economic benefits are absorbed by higher prices for supplies, equipment, and service, or until they can pass along their own rising costs through greater bargaining power."

We've just skimmed the surface on the facts and figures in this Agribusiness Outlook report. If you would like more information why not drop in at your local co-op elevator. The manager will have a copy of the report that you can look over. Or, drop a postcard to Farmers Union GTA in St. Paul and we'll send one direct to you.

We think you'll agree, after examining the facts, that lower farm prices and all-out production are not the answer to the farm problem. And the 23d of this month is the time for the Nation's wheat farmers to make to make their decision. A "Yes" vote in the wheat referendum will hold the line on both production and prices.

The following is an excerpt from a news story in the July 7, 1959, issue of the St. Paul Pioneer Press:

"LIKES GTA-TYPE BROADCAST—IKE EYES WEEKLY SHOW

("By Robert E. Lee, Pioneer Press Washington Bureau)

"WASHINGTON. The political effectiveness of the generally antiadministration broadcasts of the (Farmers Union) grain Terminal Association has captured the respect of President Eisenhower.

"The Pioneer Press Washington Bureau is informed by sources close to Eisenhower that he wishes the Republican party could put on something like the GTA broadcasts emanating * * * from St. Paul. The President doesn't dream of doing it on a daily basis; he'd settle for one a week starting next February and running up to election day in November. Eisenhower is said to be aware that the constant hammering of the association and GTA General Manager M. W. Thatcher against his programs and for theirs is getting a message across. He doesn't like the message but he seems to be sold on the technique.

Proposed Solution of the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, our farm problem is one that requires solution in the interests of both the farmers and the taxpayers of this Nation.

Many proposals are being advanced for a solution of the problem, and I have just received a most interesting suggestion from Mr. Paul Walther, of the Weber Flour Mills Co., of Salina, Kans., which is worthy of the study of every Senator.

I ask unanimous consent that the proposal be made a part of these remarks and printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proposal was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED SOLUTION OF THE FARM PROBLEM

To the impartial economic observer there can be no doubt that the present methods provide no solution for the farm problem, because all the schemes tried so far defy any and every sound economic principle.

Under the loan and price-support program the farmer was given a guaranteed outlet at a guaranteed high price which could have only one result, namely, to increase the production some more.

Production control by acreage reduction and production quotas for every single farmer in the country is also no solution. Besides being socialistic and defying our free enterprise system, it had no practical results because only the poorest land was taken out of wheat production and with the help of improved farming methods even bigger crops were raised on the reduced acreage.

Now it is proposed to reduce the wheat acreage some more, not to permit the farmer to use the retired wheat acreage for other crops, in return for which the loan price is again to be raised and on top of it the farmer is to be paid a dole for doing nothing and letting part of his land lay idle.

Higher prices will curtail domestic consumption some more, exports will require tremendously increased subsidies, and still the production will be far greater than what can be consumed and can be given away.

While in the past it was a farm problem, meaning that one economic group had some difficulties, by now it has grown into a national economic disaster. By draining these untold and ever-increasing billions of dollars from the Treasury, without accomplishing anything, it has become the principal cause that the budget cannot be balanced. This inevitably will step up the tempo of inflation and the end result will be terrible economic chaos.

Twenty-five years of continuous dismal failure should be time enough to convince even the most enthusiastic supporters of these so-called New Deal fallacies that they will not and cannot do the trick. It is high time that the fact is realized that all these programs have one basic weakness, namely, the surplus commodities are not put to economic use.

I, therefore, would like to suggest once more an economic approach which would provide a permanent solution for the entire complex farm problem without any Government help or interference with the natural developments of agriculture.

I propose that the Commodity Credit Corporation be changed into a mixed corporation under private management.

The present methods of establishing parity prices should be abolished. When farming became highly mechanized and diversified, it became an industry and should be treated as such.

Only by putting interest on the original investment, maintenance and depreciation, and manpower labor cost per acre on one side of the ledger, and the present average yield per acre on the other side can a fair average price per bushel of wheat be determined which would allow the farmer to cover his expenses and assure him a fair profit in relation to the time and effort spent in raising this particular crop. The present methods are utterly ridiculous because they do not take into account the reduced labor cost and the tremendously increased yield per acre. It is also economic nonsense to set some arbitrary prices 9 to 12 months in advance, regardless of future developments. It further should be clear that the same price cannot be declared adequate if farmers have a bumper crop or if they have a near failure.

A Board of Economic Advisers, appointed by the President and approved by Congress, should cooperate with the management of the Corporation to establish for a period of 3 to 6 months minimum and maximum prices for the three major grain crops—wheat, corn, and milo. If prices go below the established minimum, the Corporation starts buying until normal prices are restored. If prices go above the established maximum, the Corporation starts selling to prevent inflationary price rises.

The Corporation will carry at all times a reasonable emergency reserve of the three grains. All surpluses remaining after domestic consumption and legitimate efforts are taken care of are to be converted into fuel alcohol.

When buying the grain, careful selection would be necessary. Only the best qualities, suited for prolonged storage, should be added to the reserve, and low grades, subject to early deterioration, should be immediately converted into alcohol.

In times when our domestic prices are above world prices, it would be one of the obligations of the corporation to make part of the stocks available for export. Special care should be taken to place mills in a competitive position to maintain and if possible to extend foreign markets for American wheat-flour and corn products. The losses to be taken on these export sales would be prorated over the remainder of the stocks, increasing slightly the cost price of the grain which it is to be converted into alcohol. This will be a temporary necessity only because it can be expected that our domestic prices and world prices eventually will meet again.

By establishing a guaranteed market and fair and reasonable prices for these three grain crops all other Government loan or support activities as well as all controls and regulations for all other farm activities can be abandoned. One or the other of these three grains can be grown anywhere in the country and farmers will not be so foolish to produce tobacco, cotton, soybeans, peanuts, or any other crop in excess of normal needs if they can have better returns per acre from and a guaranteed outlet for these standard grain crops.

It also would be instrumental in adjusting the meat and dairy production to the actual demand. No dairy farmer will produce milk, cheese, or butter surpluses when he can at all times sell his surplus corn at a fair profit to the Corporation.

But above all, every farmer can do what is best under his particular conditions and nobody will be coerced by Government regulations which cannot be elastic enough to fit the varied conditions in the different parts of the country and at the same time be strict enough to be effective.

In setting up the Commodity Credit Corporation as a mixed corporation the Government should retain 51 percent of the stock for the one and only purpose to make sure that the Corporation is run strictly for the economic interest and benefit of the country as a whole and to prevent that any individuals or any special group could derive any unjustified profits or advantages from the activities of the Corporation.

The remaining 49 percent of the shares should be offered to the farm organizations representing the producers of the grain.

The elevator interests and grain trade who will be called upon to handle and store the grain.

The milling industry who will have to granulate the grain for the distilleries.

The distilleries who produce the alcohol.

The oil industry who will have to absorb the end product.

As can be expected all kinds of objections will be voiced by the oil industry and it therefore would only be fitting to consider shortly the effects of such a measure on the oil interests.

It goes without saying that the cost price of this fuel alcohol will be considerably higher than the cost price of fuels derived from crude oil. Conceivably this fuel alcohol could be used to advantage in the production of synthetic rubber or as jet-fuel but for simplicity's sake let us consider that it would be used entirely to be blended with gasoline. Since the fuel alcohol has a much higher octane quality, the crude oil could be refined at a higher yield, reducing the cost of the gasoline and the alcohol then would restore the octane to the required rating. Since the alcohol would be distributed to refineries in proportion to their capacity they would be all in the same boat and if any change in the price for gasoline would be necessary it would be the same for everybody.

In comparison to the enormous quantities of gasoline used, it would take only a small admixture of this higher priced fuel alcohol to absorb it and it can be expected that the price of the gasoline would not be raised more than about one-half cent per gallon. However, in the beginning stages, when the high priced surpluses carried now by the Government will primarily be used, it is conceivable that the price increase for gasoline could amount to about 1 cent per gallon. If this would be considered undesirable, all that would be necessary would be to reduce the gasoline tax by the same amount per gallon. Nobody would be hurt and still the Treasury would be approximately $6 billion better off because they would not have to pay anymore all these billions for ineffective farm supports.

Another objection from the oil interests no doubt would be that this fuel alcohol would take the place of considerable quantities of natural oil products. With full production on the farms and restored prosperity in the rural sections of the country, the consumption of gasoline will increase tremendously and offset at least part of this additional supply.

An added advantage would be that it would help to stretch our potential reserve of natural oil and postpone the day when oil will have to be extracted from shale or coal under very unfavorable economic conditions and at extremely high costs.

It is of utmost importance to keep always in mind that this conversion of grain into fuel alcohol is intended to be only an emergency measure to dispose off the horrible surpluses now in Government hands and the overproduction in the immediate fu-

ture. The use of grain for fuel alcohol will gradually taper off as feed and food consumption slowly but surely will catch up with the increase in production.

A thorough examination of my suggestions by economic experts will show that the results would go far beyond solving the farm problems. Instead of spending these enormous amounts for farm supports the general farm income will be restored to full parity with other sections of our economy, resulting in greatly increased tax returns from the rural sections. Not only would we have again a balanced budget but the national debt could be reduced, reversing the present inflationary trend and restoring sound economic conditions in our great country.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL WALTHER.

The North Still Has Much To Do To End Bigotry and Discrimination Within Its Own Boundaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, earlier in this session I have spoken in the Senate of the fact that we of the northern States still have much to accomplish in the vital realm of race relations. Bigotry, discrimination, and unfairness have by no means been eliminated above the Mason-Dixon Line. It is, of course, politically safer for a northerner to assail Little Rock than to criticize Levittown. Yet we should constantly be aware of the mote in our own eye, when we discuss the unfortunate circumstances which prevail in certain of the southern States. Let us not look so hard at the distant horizon that we overlook what is going on right at our own shoelaces.

For example, of the 39 States outside the South, only 19 have established FEPC practices to eliminate discrimination in employment. Only 9 States outside the South have enacted laws to forbid discrimination in publicly-assisted housing projects. In 30 other States outside the South, no official action has been taken to end any kind of discrimination in housing.

Now a further humiliation has occurred. The West Side Tennis Club, in Forest Hills, N.Y., the site of many international tennis championships, has denied membership to one of the most illustrious Americans in the land, Dr. Ralph Bunche, a former winner of the Nobel Peace Prize.

Dr. Bunche and his son were excluded from membership in the West Side Tennis Club because they are Negroes. There was no other reason other than that for the action taken. Yet Dr. Bunche has won international renown as a diplomat and as Under Secretary of the United Nations. In view of the fact that some 65 percent of the people of this earth have skins which are not white in color, we can only imagine the adverse impact which such an episode must have on the prestige and influence overseas of our Nation. One such incident can erase all the beneficial propaganda carried on for years and years by the Voice of America. Was it not Emerson who said, "What you do speaks so loudly that I cannot hear what you say."

Furthermore, there has recently been reported in the press the fact that an eminent Chinese scientist who had faithfully served this country in various scientific capacities was denied admission to two beaches in Maryland because and his family were non-Caucasians. What must have been the reaction to that report in the teeming nations of Asia and Africa?

Mr. President, a great American newspaper, the New York Times, has published a militant and challenging editorial in its edition of July 10. The title of the editorial is "Privacy at Forest Hills." It discusses the impact of the episodes which I have been discussing, when we seek to attain or hold the friendship of the countless millions in the underprivileged nations of the earth where most of the people are black, yellow, or brown in color. We do a great deal of lecturing to other countries about democracy; yet we can only speculate on what those people say when they learn that one of the greatest diplomats America has ever produced cannot, with his young son, join a tennis club where America has set the stage for its international and national tennis matches.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, with my remarks, the editorial from the New York Times of July 10, entitled "Privacy at Forest Hills."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 10, 1959]

PRIVACY AT FOREST HILLS

The West Side Tennis Club in Forest Hills, Queens, is two things: First, it is a private club which, in this land of the free, is entitled to choose its members according to taste; it might require all members to have red hair or to have an intelligence quotient of 150 or more or, possibly, of 100 or less; second, it is a club with some national and international significance as long as it remains the stage on which international and national tennis matches are played.

In its private capacity the club may choose, as it has done, to deny membership to the son of Ralph Bunche or, in general, to deny membership to any Negro or any person of the Jewish religion. In its public capacity, as an institution with some diplomatic functions, the club has no right to make these discriminations. We do not exaggerate when we say that the refusal of the West Side Tennis Club to accept Ralph J. Bunche, Jr., or any other qualified young man of whatever race or religion, hurts the cause of the United States the world over.

We seek to hold or gain the friendship of Asia's and Africa's millions. Incidents such as that at Forest Hills will undo much that has been accomplished by the sweat and devotion of our true ambassadors, who have striven in obscurity and under hardships to exemplify an ideal that Sir Henry Newbolt gave to the International Tennis Club of Great Britain: "The brotherhood that binds the brave of all the earth." For such men, and for many of us who stay at home, Ralph Bunche, winner of a Nobel Prize, superbly courageous, highly intelligent, cultured and compassionate, belongs among the elect of our generation. No group could exclude Ralph Bunche without signifying its own spiritual poverty.

The same copy of this newspaper which brought the news from Forest Hills also told of an eminent Chinese scientist who, after serving this country well in his specialty, was refused admission to two Maryland beaches because he and his family were not "Caucasians." On the same day President Eisenhower found it necessary in his press conference to reject "the theory that prejudice, religious prejudice should rule our choice of candidates and officials in this Nation."

We cannot do anything about the West Side Tennis Club's membership requirements. We may suggest that if it continues to make such requirements it should no longer be considered representative of American public opinion in tennis or in any other area. We might also suggest that those who control Maryland's beaches, or any other beaches, reread some of the amendments to the Constitution and possibly one or two decisions of the United States Supreme Court.

There are a number of extravagances we cannot afford in our present struggle to keep Western civilization alive and thriving. One of these extravagances is that stupid and cowardly thing, racial and religious prejudice.

The Laying of the Cornerstone for the Extension of the East Front of the U.S. Capitol, July 4, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on July 4 this year, a significant event occurred in the laying of the cornerstone for the east front of the Capitol. This ceremony marked another milestone in the history of this edifice which holds a special place in the hearts of freemen everywhere.

Since I have been in Congress I have been intensely interested in this building and its history. It has been very difficult to piece the complete story together, however, because adequate records have not been kept of proceedings like this.

So that future generations might not have the same difficulty I place in the RECORD a full account of the program as it actually took place, including the address of President Eisenhower, the remarks of the distinguished Speaker, and the Masonic ceremony which was a part of the proceedings.

It is also fitting that some facts and interesting information about our Speaker who was the prime mover of this important project, Mr. SAM RAYBURN, and the Architect of the Capitol, George Stewart, should be included as a part of this historic record:

PROGRAM OF CEREMONIES AT THE LAYING OF THE CORNERSTONE OF THE EXTENSION OF THE EAST CENTRAL FRONT OF THE U.S. CAPITOL BY PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 4, 1959, 12 O'CLOCK NOON

Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol: Hon. Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Chairman; Hon. Richard M. Nixon, President of the Senate, member; Hon. Everett McKinley Dirksen, minority leader of the Senate, member; Hon. Charles A. Halleck, minority leader of the House of Representatives, member; Hon. J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol, member.

OPENING OF CEREMONIES

The Honorable J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol, opened the ceremonies with the following statement:

"Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, distinguished and honored guests, the ceremonies of the laying of the cornerstone of the extension of the east central front of the U.S. Capitol will now commence. I now slightly digress from the printed program and call upon the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate, for the invocation."

INVOCATION BY DR. HARRIS

Prayer, Cornerstone Laying, Capitol Extension, by Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, Saturday, July 4, 1959

"God of our fathers and of their succeeding race: We come seeking Thy grace and favor as with grateful and contrite hearts we bow reverently at this shrine of each patriot's devotion whose white dome in these days of destiny is lifted into the view of all the earth, as it is revered from sea to shining sea in this free land of hope and glory.

"In this high hour we would be conscious of the unsullied form of one who, in the agony of Valley Forge, lifted up his heart to Thee and who, after victory had come, laid the cornerstone of this edifice of state which loomed prophetically in his heart, but which was a promised land he was never to enter.

"Amid all the babel of today's angry voices we would listen to the calm and reassuring voice of the Father of our Republic, who being dead, yet speaketh, as turning from all pedestals of selfish ambition he warns us, in this year of our Lord, that without a genuine religion decay of moral standards and values follows as the night the day.

"Where there are signs of crumbling deterioration in the fabric of our freedom may there be fashioned out of the very ground of democracy stronger and fairer columns of spiritual verities, of religious faith, of moral integrity, and of high principles that scorn expediency.

"As the stately cathedral of our cherished liberties is thus constantly rebuilt and restored as the centuries pass, may it always be that the glory of the latter house may be greater than the glory of the first, as at the altar of national devotion a nation of freemen lifts the never-ending prayer, 'America, America, God mend thine every flaw.' And so—

"On this stone now laid with prayer,
Let our faith rise strong and fair;
Ever, Lord, Thy name be known
Where we lay this cornerstone.

"By wise master builders squared,
Here be living stones prepared
For the temple near Thy throne,
Under God, its cornerstone.

"We lift our petitions in the name that is above every name. Amen."

PRESENTATION OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Architect of the Capitol then presented the Chairman of the Commission, with the following remarks:

"It is my great honor and high privilege to present the Chairman of the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN."

INTRODUCTION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Chairman of the Commission made the following remarks in introducing the President:

"Mr. President, members of the Commission and friends, we meet here today in historic surroundings, on the grounds of the Capitol of the United States.

"On September 18, 1793, President George Washington laid the cornerstone of the Capitol of the United States on these grounds.

"And it was here on November 17, 1800, that the second session of the Sixth Congress of the United States met for the first time in the infant city of Washington.

"In 1851 President Millard Fillmore laid the second cornerstone on these grounds.

"Today, on July 4, 1959, we meet to lay a cornerstone for the rebuilt east front of this Capitol.

"This is a building of which all citizens of the United States—whether they have seen it or not—are proud.

"The Capitol of the United States houses the legislative branch of the Government which must act before there are any laws to execute or any laws to interpret.

"We trust that this whole building will stand throughout the ages, and it will unless irresponsible and mad men determine to destroy everything. We express the hope here today that this will never happen.

"So on this another historic day of the laying of the third cornerstone on this hill, we have another President of the United States to lay this stone in the person of the present President of the United States, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower."

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, HON. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

"Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stewart, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we are here today for the ceremonial laying of a cornerstone—a ceremony that has twice before marked the history of this building, the Capitol of the United States of America.

"By this symbolic gesture we do more than to recognize and provide for new needs resulting from national growth. We rededicate ourselves to the principle of representative government. We reaffirm our devotion to the values upon which this Republic rests.

"These values, unequivocally stated in the Declaration of Independence, in our Bill of Rights, and in other parts of that remarkable document, the American Constitution—are both the hallmarks and the hand tools of freedom. In a free society they must be prized and they must be used, lest freedom wither.

"In the collision of ideas between freedom and despotism, freedom is neither won nor held in a climate of spiritual stalemate. Its preservation is a many-sided and never-ending task.

"Complacency today speeds the erosion of liberty tomorrow. Inertia will destroy it; dynamic dedication assures its lasting vitality.

"On this Fourth of July, 183 years since our Nation embarked on its course of independence, we are reminded that our Declaration of Independence did more than galvanize the idea of freedom for our own people.

"'The generation that produced our Declaration of Independence,' said Lincoln, 'meant to set up a standard maximum for free society which should be constantly looked to, constantly proximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere.'

"Each of these three cornerstone ceremonies has marked stages of America's evolution.

"In 1793, when President Washington laid the cornerstone of the original Capitol Building, a young but vigorous Nation was struggling into political existence.

"Fifty-eight years later, when President Fillmore laid the cornerstone of the House and Senate wings, the Nation was no longer in its infancy.

"On that day a proud Daniel Webster extolled the progress of the United States since 1793—from 15 States to 31; from 209 post offices to 21,000; from 35 colleges to 694—and why it had become necessary to enlarge the Capitol Building.

"Again this ceremony represents growth. America has come a long way since the laying of the 1851 cornerstone.

"Yet it is somehow unnecessary to commemorate this occasion by reminding ourselves of the bare statistics of cultural and material growth—for example, that our Nation's colleges and universities have grown from 694 to 1,957.

"Rather, we come here today to remind ourselves of our responsibilities, to the world and to ourselves.

"We come here to rekindle our faith that this building, the central home of America's representative Government, will house wisdom, understanding, and compassion for all people.

"Finally, we gather on this Fourth of July, as our forefathers did at Independence Hall, more than ninescore years ago, to emulate them as they pledge their common adherence to basic principles, and their common obligation to uphold these principles regardless of differences of opinion, even of policy.

"So long as we never waver in our devotion to the values on which these men began the building of the Nation, no differences of partisan policy or partisan feeling can cause America to falter on her upward course.

"As we now lay this new cornerstone in the U.S. Capitol, we are grateful for the courageous beginnings of a new Nation, represented by the first stone; for the pioneering effort and the bountiful growth represented by the second; and for the confidence that if we make ourselves worthy, this third stone will forever symbolize America's unending purpose to lead along the path toward peace, with justice for all peoples."

LAYING OF THE CORNERSTONE

At this point, Mr. Stewart stated, "We will now proceed with the laying of the cornerstone."

The President of the United States, accompanied by Speaker Rayburn, Senator Dirksen, and Mr. Stewart, descended to the site of the cornerstone and proceeded to lay the cornerstone, spreading mortar with the trowel used by the first President of the United States, Hon. George Washington, in laying the first cornerstone of the Capitol in 1793, and also using the gavel used by the first President of the United States on that occasion and by President Millard Fillmore on July 4, 1851, at the laying of the cornerstone of the Senate and House wings of the Capitol. The trowel and the gavel were presented to the President by the Grand Master of Masons, Reuben A. Bogley, Jr., and were returned to him by the President after their use.

At this point in the proceedings the President departed from the Capitol.

MASONIC CEREMONIES

Following the convening of the Grand Lodge of Masons of the District of Columbia

by Most Worshipful Brother Reuben A. Bogley, Jr., Grand Master, at the Masonic Temple, on Saturday, July 4, 1959, at 10:30 a.m., the grand lodge proceeded to the site of the cornerstone commemorating the construction of the east front of the U.S. Capitol at Washington, D.C., to perform their ritual in laying the cornerstone in accordance with the principles and practices of the craft of Freemasonry. This ceremony was performed at the request of the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol.

The cornerstone, lowered during the ceremonies attended by the President, was raised and the Masonic ceremonies attending the cornerstone laying were commenced.

The Grand Master of Masons accompanied by the officers of the Grand Lodge surrounded the cornerstone for the purpose of carrying out the Masonic service. In calling attention to the fact that the Grand Lodge was assembled for the purpose of laying the cornerstone of the U.S. Capitol and that the members, as Masons, being taught that we should implore the aid of our Supreme Grand Master in all laudable undertakings, requested all to join the reverend and worshipful grand chaplain as he invoked the blessing of Almighty God. The prayer of the grand chaplain, Rev. Edward Gardiner Latch, D.D., follows:

"O, Eternal God, who art the source of life, the supporter of freemen and the Saviour of the world—we pause in silence before thee and before this undertaking, invoking Thy blessing upon us and praying that in that spirit we may do our work.

"We are mindful of the experiences which bind us together and for our faith in democracy which makes us one people. Petty are the vices which divide us and great are the virtues which unite us. So, we pray, remove from our mind all narrowness, all prejudice, all fear, and may the power of a passion for the princely principles of goodness, truth, and beauty rule all our minds and all our hearts to the end that we may now and ever be the land of the free and the home of the brave.

"May this cornerstone be the symbol of our spiritual foundation, making and keeping us, as a people, the champion of justice, the safeguard of freedom, and the guarantee of democracy in our world. We pray in the name of Him by whose truth men shall be free—Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

The grand master then proceeded with the prescribed rites and ceremonies of the Masonic fraternity, the whole of which follows:

"GRAND MASTER. Right Worshipful Grand Treasurer, you will deposit in the case the several articles as they are called by the Right Worshipful Grand Secretary."

The following Masonic deposits were made:

Masonic Code, District of Columbia, 1951 edition.

Proceedings of the grand lodge, 1958.

Masonic calendar, 1959.

Replica of Bible upon which Brother George Washington took the oath of office as the first President of the United States on April 30, 1789.

History of Fredericksburg Lodge No. 4.

Replica of the trowel employed by Brother George Washington at the laying of the original cornerstone of the U.S. Capitol on September 18, 1793.

Chronological facts concerning the George Washington gavel used by Brother George Washington on September 18, 1793.

History of Potomac Lodge No. 5.

The following deposit was made by the Chairman of the Commission, Hon. SAM RAYBURN: Sealed envelope containing a copy of his remarks.

The following deposits were made by the Architect of the Capitol, Hon. J. George Stewart:

Articles deposited in the cornerstone of the extension of the east central front of the U.S. Capitol, July 4, 1959

House document No. 385, 58th Congress, 3d session: Extension and completion of the Capitol Building, report of the Joint Commission, March 3, 1905.

Hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 84th Congress, 1st session: Legislative appropriations for 1956, request for authorization of the project and for $5 million to start project.

Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, 84th Congress, 1st session on H.R. 7117, "Making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes": Legislative branch appropriations, 1956, request for authorization of the project and for $5 million to start project.

Hearing before a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, 85th Congress, 2d session, on S. 2883, "A bill to amend the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, to eliminate the requirement that the extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion of the U.S. Capitol be in substantial accord with scheme B of the architectural plan of March 3, 1905," February 17, 1958: Extension of the U.S. Capitol Building.

Legislation Appropriation Act, 1956, Public Law 242, 84th Congress, 1st session, approved August 5, 1955, H.R. 7117, "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes": Authorizing extension of the Capitol project. Creating Commission to direct the project. Providing initial appropriation of $5 million.

Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1956, Public Law 406, 84th Congress, 2d session, approved February 14, 1956, H.R. 9063, "An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes": Amending original law, Public 242, 84th Congress, 1st session. Granting indefinite contract authority.

Mimeographed statement setting forth text of Public Law 242, 84th Congress, 1st session, as amended by Public Law 406, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957, Public Law 624, 84th Congress, 2d session, approved June 27, 1956, H.R. 11473 "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes": Providing additional appropriation of $12 million.

Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959, Public Law 86-30, 86th Congress, approved May 20, 1959, H.R. 5916, "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes": Providing additional appropriation of $4 million.

Minutes of meetings, Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol: First meeting, March 26, 1956; second meeting, August 30, 1957; third meeting, February 21, 1958.

Directives of the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol to the Architect of the Capitol authorizing letting of contracts and performance of work under the project: August 5, 1955; July 24, 1956; October 28, 1957; February 24, 1958; March 25, 1959.

Press releases issued by the Architect of the Capitol at the direction of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol: April 20, 1956; February 21, 1958; June 23, 1959.

Reports:

Report of the Architect of the Capitol on the preliminary plans and estimates of cost for the extension of the U.S. Capitol, August 1957.

Copy of foregoing report as carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, proceedings and debates of the 85th Congress, 1st session, Washington, Friday, August 30, 1957, pages 15151 to 15158.

Report of the Architect of the Capitol dated February 13, 1958, to the Senate Committee on Public Works on the project.

Report of the Architect of the Capitol, March 24, 1958, to the Chairman of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, transmitting a report of the Associate Architects for the extension of the Capitol project, supplementing report of the Architect of the Capitol, dated February 13, 1958, to the Senate Committee on Public Works.

Report of the Architect of the Capitol on the status of the project as of May 8, 1959.

Other items:

Coin, bearing the name and bust of Millard Fillmore, found during excavations in the removal of the portico and steps.

Telephone directory, U.S. Senate, February 1959.

Telephone directory, U.S. House of Representatives, 86th Congress.

Copy of the official program of the cornerstone laying, July 4, 1959.

Speech of President Eisenhowever, autographed Dwight David Eisenhower, July 4, 1959, delivered at the ceremonies of the laying of the cornerstone July 4, 1959, taken from the lectern upon completion of the speech and deposited in the cornerstone. This speech was placed in an envelope.

Sealed envelopes from Members of Congress and others.

Weather map, July 4, 1959.

Newspaper accounts of the ceremonies.

Photographs:

East front of the Capitol prior to start of the project.

Groundbreaking, February 24, 1959.

East front of the Capitol with portico removed.

Signatures of the Architect of the Capitol, Assistant Architect, Second Assistant Architect, and other members of the office staff; names of east front project field employees; and a list of contractors working on the project and their employees.

The trowel was presented to the grand master, who explained: "The trowel will be used in spreading the cement which shall unite this building into one common mass. May the trowel symbolize to us the spreading of the cement of friendship and affection which should unite the brotherhood of man into a sacred band, among whom no contention should ever exist save that noble contention, or rather emulation, of who can best work and best agree."

Cement was first spread by the grand master and thereafter by Speaker Rayburn, Senator Dirksen, and Mr. Stewart, and the stone was lowered into place by three distinct motions to its proper position at the cornerstone of the foundation.

The Architect of the Capitol presented the working tools of the profession to the grand master, the square, the level, and the plumb, saying:

"Most Worshipful, the necessary preparations having been made for laying the foundation-stone of this edifice, I present you the square, level, and plumb, those useful implements of the craft by which you will be able to ascertain that the material which is to constitute the chief cornerstone of the future edifice, and which you are about to lay in its appropriate position, is well formed, true, and trusty."

The grand master handed the square to the deputy grand master, the level to the senior grand warden, and the plumb to the junior grand warden:

"GRAND MASTER. Right Worshipful Deputy Grand Master, what is the proper implement of your office?

"DEPUTY GRAND MASTER. The square, Most Worshipful.

"GRAND MASTER. What are its moral and Masonic uses?

"DEPUTY GRAND MASTER. To square our actions by the square of virtue, and prove our work.

"GRAND MASTER. Apply the implement of your office to that portion of the foundation-stone that needs to be proved, and make report.

"DEPUTY GRAND MASTER. Most Worshipful, I find the stone to be square. The craftsmen have performed their duty.

"GRAND MASTER. Right Worshipful Senior Grand Warden, what is the proper implement of your office?

"SENIOR GRAND WARDEN. The level, Most Worshipful.

"GRAND MASTER. What is its Masonic use?

"SENIOR GRAND WARDEN. Morally it reminds us of equality, and its use is to prove horizontals.

"GRAND MASTER. Apply the implement of your office to the foundation stone and make report.

"SENIOR GRAND WARDEN. Most Worshipful, I find the stone to be level. The craftsmen have performed their duty.

"GRAND MASTER. Right Worshipful Junior Grand Warden, what is the proper implement of your office?

"JUNIOR GRAND WARDEN. The plumb, Most Worshipful.

"GRAND MASTER. What is it Masonic use?

"JUNIOR GRAND WARDEN. Morally it teaches rectitude of conduct, and its use is to try perpendiculars.

"GRAND MASTER. Apply the implement of your office to the several edges of the foundation stone, and make report.

"JUNIOR GRAND WARDEN. Most Worshipful, I find the stone to be plum. The craftsmen have performed their duty.

"GRAND MASTER. This cornerstone has been tested by the proper implements of operative masonry, and I find that the craftsmen have skillfully and faithfully performed their duty. I therefore declare the stone to be well formed, true and trusty, and correctly laid according to the rules of our ancient craft. May the all-bounteous Author of Nature assist in the erection and completion of this building, protecting the workmen from every accident, and may He long preserve this structure from decay."

At this point the symbolic use of corn, wine, and oil becomes a vital part of the ceremony, and is best described by the following wording of the Masonic ritual:

The deputy grand master presents to the grand master the vessel of corn, saying:

"DEPUTY GRAND MASTER. Most Worshipful Grand Master, it has been the immemorial custom to scatter corn as an emblem of nourishment. I therefore present you this vessel of corn."

The grand master scatters the corn upon the stone, saying:

"GRAND MASTER. In the name of the Great Jehovah, to whom be all honor and glory, I now scatter this corn, and invoke a continuation of the prosperity and manifold blessings which He has unceasingly bestowed upon our country and its people."

The senior grand warden presents the vessel of wine, saying:

"SENIOR GRAND WARDEN. Most Worshipful Grand master, wine, the emblem of refreshment, having been used mystically by our ancient brethren, I present you with this vessel of wine."

The grand master pours it upon the stone, saying:

"GRAND MASTER. In the name of the Holy Saints John, I pour out this wine to virtue. May the Giver of every good and perfect gift bless and prosper all our undertakings and inspire the present generation with wisdom and virtue to transmit to the latest posterity, unimpaired, so priceless a heritage.

The junior grand warden presents the vessel of oil, saying:

"JUNIOR GRAND WARDEN. Most Worshipful Grand Master, I present you, to be used according to ancient custom, this vessel of oil.

The grand master pours it upon the stone and extending his hands, says:

"GRAND MASTER. I pour out this oil, an emblem of joy. May health, prosperity, and peace, symbolized by corn, wine, and oil, plenteously abound throughout the length and breadth of our land. May the Great Ruler of the Universe bless and consecrate the edifice which shall rise on this foundation stone.

"Amen. So mote it be."

The grand master then strikes the stone three times with his gavel, and the brethren give the public grand honors three times.

These ceremonies having been completed the working tools were returned to the Architect, the grand master admonishing him in the following words:

"Worthy Brother having thus, as Grand Master of Masons, laid the foundation-stone of this structure, I now deliver these implements of your profession into your hands entrusting you with the superintendence and direction of the work, having full confidence in your skill and capacity to conduct the same."

The closing feature of the Masonic ritual is the charge addressed to all the people by the grand master. This charge follows:

"Ladies, gentlemen, and brethren, be it known unto you that we be lawful Masons, true and faithful to the laws of our country, and engaged by solemn obligations to aid in the erection of public buildings by placing in position the chief corner-stone whenever called upon to do so by those having charge of the same. These ceremonies which you have witnessed have come down to us from time immemorial, and are in themselves invaluable to us as purely symbolic of that spiritual building which each one of us is engaged in erecting during our natural life; and as in this temporal building about to be erected we have proved the chief corner-stone to be well formed, true, and trusty, let each one of us be sure that in the spiritual building our chief corner-stone be likewise well formed, true, and trusty."

Benediction

Upon conclusion of the Masonic ceremonies, Mr. Stewart asked Rev. Bernard Braskamp, the Chaplain of the House of Representatives, to offer the benediction.

Dr. Braskamp then pronounced the following benediction:

"Now may the Lord bless you and keep you; the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you; the Lord lift up the light of His countenance upon you and give you peace, through the merits and mediation of the Prince of Peace we ascribe unto God, the Supreme Builder and Ruler of the universe, all majesty, dominion, and power. Amen."

At the conclusion of the ceremonies the grand lodge returned to the Masonic Temple and was closed in due and ancient form by the grand master.

The officers of the grand lodge, F. A. & A. M., of the District of Columbia, are as follows, and were assisted in the ceremonies by three visiting grand masters:

Reuben A. Bogley, Jr., grand master; J. August Johnson, Jr., deputy grand master; Ralph W. Wolfe, senior grand warden; Convass B. Dean, junior grand warden; Raymond N. Babcock, grand secretary; Dean Hill Stanley, grand treasurer; George W. Feidt, grand lecturer; Edgar E. Bageant, grand lecturer emeritus; Edward G. Latch, grand chaplain; John H. Eiseman, senior grand deacon; Charles B. Gilley, junior grand deacon; Harry B. Savage, senior grand steward; Lex L. Dodds, junior grand steward; Richard H. Hart, grand marshal; Alfred J. Steffen, grand sword bearer; Charles T. Macdonald, grand pursuivant; Karl T. Weimar, Jr., grand tiler.

Assisting: S. Dexter Forbes, grand master of Virginia; A. Wayne Reed, grand master of Maryland; Charles W. Lewis, grand master of Delaware.

The masters, officers, and large numbers of members of the 48 constituent lodges under the jurisdiction of the grand lodge were present at the opening of the grand lodge and at the ceremonies on Capitol Hill, and rendered brotherly assistance and encouragement to the grand master.

Assisting in the Masonic ritual were the master and other officers of Fredericksburg Lodge No. 4, A.F. & A.M., of Fredericksburg, Va.; the master and brethren of St. Johns Lodge No. 1, A.Y.M. and F. & A.M., of New York City; the master and members of Potomac Lodge No. 5, F.A.A.M., of Washington, D.C.; and the master and members of Alexandria-Washington Lodge No. 22, A.F. & A.M., of Alexandria, Va. These brethren brought with them the masonic treasures now entrusted to their keeping and described in the accompanying history.

"Bibles, travel, square, level, and gavel

"The Great Light of Freemasonry, the Holy Bible, used in these ceremonies comes to the Grand Lodge of Masons of the District of Columbia through the courtesy of St. John's Lodge No. 1, A.Y.M. and F. & A.M., of New York City, and it was upon this Bible that George Washington took the oath of office as the first President of the United States on April 30, 1789, in New York City, and also succeeding Presidents, upon request, the last being President Dwight D. Eisenhower on January 20, 1953.

"The other Holy Bible used by the grand chaplain is the property of Fredericksburg Lodge No. 4, A.F. & A.M., of Fredericksburg, Va., comes through their courtesy, and is the Bible upon which President George Washington assumed his masonic obligations.

"The trowel, the square, and the level are used through the gracious cooperation of Alexandria-Washington Lodge No. 22, A.F. & A.M., of Alexandria, Va. These implements were employed by Most Worshipful Brother George Washington, designated Grand Master of Masons, on the occasion of the laying of the original cornerstone of the U.S. Capitol on September 18, 1793, and by succeeding Presidents in similar ceremonies at other U.S. Government structures, and by officiating dignitaries to lay cornerstones of churches, schools, cathedrals, masonic and other temples. The plumb is the proud possession of the Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia, and has been used by dignitaries of public and semipublic office, and by grand masters of Masons for many years.

"The gavel is the property of Potomac Lodge No. 5, F.A.A.M., of Washington, D.C., and is used today through the courtesy of that lodge. The gavel was first used by President George Washington at the original cornerstone laying of this building on September 18, 1793, and on numerous similar occasions by other Government officials, including President Millard Fillmore on July 4, 1851."

Others appointed by the grand master to assist the Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia are as follows:

Bearer of the great lights: Brothers Francis W. Springer, master (St. John's Lodge No. 1, New York City) and Edward H. Cann, grand junior warden (Fredericksburg Lodge No. 4).

Bearer of the lesser lights: Brothers J. August Johnson, deputy grand master; Ralph M. Wolfe, grand senior warden; Conbass B. Dean, grand junior warden.

Trowel: Brother Odie R. Howell, Jr., master (Alexandria-Washington Lodge No. 22).

Gavel: Brother James R. Hughes, master (Potomac Lodge No. 5).

Square: Brother Reuben A. Bogley, Sr., past grand master.

Level: Brother Renah F. Camalier, past grand master.

Plumb: Brother William E. Schooley, past grand master.

Corn: Brother Horace S. Allen, past grand master, Delaware.

Wine: Brother A. Wayne Reed, grand master of Maryland.

Oil: Brother S. Dexter Forbes, grand master of Virginia.

Masonic committee: Renah F. Camalier, past grand master, chairman; Reuben A. Bogley, Jr., grand master; Reuben A. Bogley, Sr., past grand master; William E. Schooley, past grand master; Edwin S. Bettelheim, Jr., past grand master; R. Baker Harris, past grand master; Raymond N. Babcock, grand secretary; Samuel T. Beacham, past master; Crawford C. Heerlein, past master; James C. Smith.

SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN'S ROLE

I think it is fitting and proper to call to the attention of the House, and through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to the attention of future historians, the leading role played by Speaker SAM RAYBURN in this enormous undertaking.

"Mr. SAM'S" love of the historic, the traditional, the familiar is legendary. He is a man with great reverence for the past, and his feeling for this Capitol Building and its traditions might be likened to the pride which an archbishop has for his ancient cathedral.

But the Speaker also is a great believer in commonsense. When he became convinced by the testimony of expert engineers and architects that an extension of the east front was the wise, sensible thing to do, he gave the project his undivided backing.

For a time a great storm broke out with angry protests from some newspapers, private citizens, and the leadership of the American Institute of Architects. One newspaper declared, "The Capitol does not belong to SAM RAYBURN."

On the floor of this House, the Speaker replied, "Propaganda does not drive me around, because I do not know anybody around here who can take criticism better than I can. I am not afraid of it. When I am right, as I think I am on this proposition, nobody is going to drive me off it."

For the past 4 years Speaker RAYBURN has devoted countless hours to this east front project, watching each detail of its progress. People around the Capitol know him as the most active of all the "sidewalk superintendents" who are watching this mammoth undertaking with great fascination and a realization of its historic importance.

On August 5, 1955, the President signed the bill setting up the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol which put this project into motion. When the Commission had its organization meeting on March 26, 1956, Speaker RAYBURN was unanimously elected its chairman, a position he has held ever since. He was nominated by the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, who was minority leader of the House of Representatives.

In the summer of 1956 the first contracts were let for the east front project, and the Commission made it clear that it was determined to have it completed in time for the inauguration of the next President of the United States in January, 1961.

In the spring of 1958 a great storm of protest arose over the carrying out of the project. Bills were introduced in both the House of Representatives and the Senate to halt the project.

I had introduced such a bill in the House of Representatives, but after making an exhaustive personal study of the matter and after personally inspecting the building and learning firsthand of the absolute necessity for the project, I announced to the House of Representatives on March 31, 1958, that I was withdrawing my bill, giving my reasons for it.

Speaker RAYBURN took the floor to discuss the project.

"Architects of great worth who have looked at it say that it (the east front) is a hazard to human life. They say it may fall down. Suppose that the best judgment of men everywhere is that this is a hazard and that it should come down. What difference is there between extending it out 32½ feet and doing this necessary work for the convenience of Members, and reestablishing it where it is?" he asked.

The Senate voted down, 47 to 32, an effort to halt the project.

On May 28, 1958, Speaker RAYBURN appeared before the National Press Club for the first time in many years, and he chose the east front extension as the subject of his address.

He pointed out that the most important purpose of the project is the preservation of the building itself, but that additional advantages of the plan are the correction of the architectural defect caused by the overhanging dome of the Capitol, and also the creation of desperately needed additional space in the Capitol for work purposes.

The Speaker reminded his listeners that "our Capitol was not a building constructed in its entirety at one date, to remain frozen and unchanged in any detail for all time to come. It has been added to, altered, and improved as commonsense and changing needs dictated."

RAYBURN declared that "any time I am convinced that the Congress needs more room to discharge its work for the American public, I will ask each and every time for additional space."

He recalled the statement of a colleague that "the Capitol is a workshop, not a museum."

On August 26, 1958, the first scaffolding arrived to be used in the dismantling of the old east front, which began immediately thereafter.

The ground breaking for the new east front took place on February 24, 1959, when Speaker RAYBURN used a silver spade to break the ground.

In his speech on that occasion he declared that "I am one of those who has a great regard and respect for tradition. I like the old things if they are historic. I want them to be used as long as it is possible to use them. We did not remove this east front because we needed more room. It was removed principally because it was in a dangerous condition.

I might say that in this building is housed the legislative branch of the Government, that part of the Government that is closest to the people because it comes directly from the people. The legislative branch of the Government is the most important branch of the Government because there would be no laws to execute if the legislation were not passed by the Congress. There would be no laws to interpret if the Congress did not pass laws to be interpreted," the Speaker continued.

"The east front of the Capitol, when this work is over, will be built of beautiful, light gray, almost white, Georgia marble. And it is my hope that we will be able to sandblast the Senate and the House wings, because many people do not know that they are of light Massachusetts marble. When this old hill has sitting upon it this magnificent, almost white structure, it will be the pride and joy of everyone."

J. GEORGE STEWART, ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

On October 1, 1954, J. George Stewart was appointed by the President of the United States as Architect of the Capitol. Upon assuming office he became the eighth man to hold the position since it was established, in 1793—following William Thornton, Benjamin Latrobe, Charles Bulfinch, Thomas U. Walter, Edward Clark, Elliott Woods, and David Lynn. He is the second man from the State of Delaware to hold this office, William Thornton having become a citizen of the United States in Delaware on January 7, 1788.

Mr. Stewart serves as a member of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, the Capitol Police Board, and the District of Columbia Zoning Commission.

He is charged with the structural and mechanical care of the following buildings: The Capitol, Senate Office Buildings, House Office Buildings, Capitol Powerplant, Legislative Garage, Robert A. Taft Memorial, Library of Congress Buildings, U.S. Supreme Court Building, and the U.S. Court of Claims Buildings.

Mr. Stewart is also charged with the operation of the House Restaurants and the U.S. Botanic Garden (as Acting Director).

He is responsible for the acquisition of real property and for the planning and construction of buildings and other improvements committed to his care by the Congress. At present the major construction projects are: Construction and equipment of the nearly completed additional Senate Office Building; remodeling of the Old Senate Office Building; construction and equipment of an additional House Office Building and remodeling of the present House Office Buildings; development of additional areas as part of the Capitol Grounds; construction of security vaults and underground transportation systems; extension and completion of the Capitol Building; and changes and improvements to the Capitol Powerplant.

The Architect of the Capitol is in charge of the works of art in the Capitol, totaling about 340; administers the laws governing Statuary Hall; arranges for the reception of new statues from the States, with the attendant ceremonies of acceptance.

In cooperation with the proper authorities, he makes arrangements for ceremonies and ceremonials held in the Capitol and on the grounds and for the reception of visiting dignitaries.

Every 4 years, the inaugural stands are built under his direction and he cooperates with other officials in carrying forward the inaugural ceremonies at the Capitol.

Mr. Stewart was born in Wilmington, Del. He was educated in the public schools of that city and studied at the University of Delaware in the engineering school from 1907 to 1910. He left the university in 1910, without taking his degree, to join his father's construction firm—Stewart and Donohue. In September of last year, the University of Delaware admitted him to the degree of bachelor of science in engineering, class of 1911. The citation for conferring this degree stated that: "In his position as Architect of the Capitol * * * he has deeply impressed those with whom he has worked * * * as a man of sincerity, vision and courage.

"John George Stewart, it is now 47 years since you normally would have received your degree. You have richly earned it by your accomplishments."

In his association with his father's firm, he served in all departments of his general construction business—as water boy, timekeeper, apprentice mason, gang foreman, superintendent, partner, and, finally, as president of the company.

From January 1935 to January 1937, Mr. Stewart served as Representative in Congress from the State of Delaware.

From January 1947 to February 1951, he was with the District of Columbia Committee of the U.S. Senate. He served as clerk of the committee for 2 years. Be-

ginning in 1949, he served as minority clerk and professional staff assistant.

In 1952 and 1953 he was engineer consultant to the Lands Division, Department of Justice. He was also engineer consultant for the Corps of Engineers (Washington District).

Mr. Stewart is licensed in the State of Delaware as a professional engineer.

In May of 1957, he was elected an honorary member of the American Institute of Architects as "one who has rendered distinguished service to the advancement of architecture and the allied arts and sciences."

Other activities:

Member of Delaware State Emergency Relief Commission, 1931 and 1932. Appointed by Hon. C. Douglass Buck, Governor of Delaware.

Member of original Delaware State Athletic Commission, 1932 to 1934. Appointed by Hon. C. Douglass Buck, Governor of Delaware.

Foreman of New Castle County, Del., Grand Jury, 1939.

For 5 years, chairman of building and grounds committee, Wilmington General Hospital.

That Impossible Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to insert the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times on June 24, 1959:

THAT IMPOSSIBLE INFLATION

In the month April 15–May 15 the consumer price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics broke out of the narrow range of 123.6–123.9 to which it had been confined since May of last year.

Now there is no basis in this fact for the conclusion that we are off on a new inflation spree. But the situation focuses attention on the statement made by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS 2 weeks ago in criticizing the President's proposal to raise the ceiling on interest rates on the Government's long-term debt. "A great deal of the present difficulty," declared Mr. DOUGLAS, stems from the "'scare' talk about 'monetary' inflation, which does not now exist, and a refusal to do anything about the 'administered' price inflation, which does exist. The administration has been shouting 'inflation, inflation,' so long and so hard that a great many people in this country have been unnecessarily frightened concerning the value of the dollar and the stability of the Government."

We venture to suggest that if the country has been frightened about inflation it has not been because the President has called attention to the actions of Senator DOUGLAS and his spending-minded colleagues in Congress. We would like to suggest that if the country has been frightened it is because of the actions themselves—the continuous attacks on the monetary authorities for refusing to pursue the policy of unlimited easy money, the deficit of $13 billion for the fiscal year soon coming to an end, the insistence by this group on trying to keep active the long discredited theory that inflation can come into being only in the presence of the full employment of the country's labor force and productive facilities and the naive attempt to justify a program of perpetual pump priming by invoking the equally discredited quantity theory of money.

Both the Senator from Illinois and the joint congressional committee of which he is chairman completely missed the boat in their report on the President's Economic Report made public in March. They are not likely to recover their lost prestige by their present extraordinary position that (1) inflation is a practical impossibility, and that (2) if we do have inflation the responsibility will not be that of the spenders in Congress who, in a period of full-fledged recovery, have dedicated themselves to a policy of continuous cheap money and Government spending, but that of the President, who was inconsiderate enough to call public attention to the inflationary nature of the program.

Two Soviet Visits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the good will shown the Bolshoi Ballet by the American people and our appreciation of their art, I am sure, have indicated to the Russian people our will to increase understanding, in the same way that the enthusiastic reception accorded in Moscow to American pianist Van Cliburn communicated itself to us. Our receiving a diplomatic visitor is not inconsistent with our determination to defend freedom in our relations with the Soviet, nor is the American gracious reception to the Bolshoi dance group inconsistent with our inborn rejection of the Communist philosophy and that for which it stands.

Life magazine has published an article regarding Sol Hurok, the American who arranged for the Bolshoi Ballet to come to this country. It should be noted that the Bolshoi came here on a commercial basis, and not under official U.S. sponsorship and that it worked well and tastefully. Mr. Hurok has served well U.S.-U.S.S.R. cultural interchange.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPRESARIO WHO BOOKED THE BOLSHOI HUROK'S BALLET COUP CAPS 50-YEAR CAREER

(by Joseph Roddy)

As Russia's incomparable Bolshoi Ballet makes its four-city tour of the United States, it is accompanied by a stocky, pashalike man wearing a black crush hat and carrying a gold-topped cane. Just as he did for 21 nights at New York's Metropolitan Opera House, he will probably attend every performance, and each evening, from a strategically located box seat, will applaud lustily and beam approvingly at the audience, every member of which he considers his personal guest.

Sol Hurok is fully entitled to both his enthusiasm and his proprietary attitude, for the Bolshoi's American appearance is entirely his creation, the final result of more than 30 years of labor and the crowning achievement of his career as the great impresario.

The august pronouncement "S. Hurok presents" has appeared at the top of posters and playbills for so long that many concertgoers think the name must be some form of typographical invention. Hurok is, however, very real: he lives well and breathes deeply and he almost always gets very worked up about what S. Hurok presents. He awaited the Bolshoi's opening with unabashed eagerness. "For this," he said, "people have been waiting 50 years. When the curtain goes up there could be nothing but horses on the stage and they'll still think it's grand." The Bolshoi opening (Life, April 27) had no horses, but it had almost everything else an impresario could ask for, including some of the most ecstatic reviews the ballet world has ever seen.

THE LIMELIGHT PLUNGER

Hurok is in every sense a true impresario: A show-business producer of flamboyant mien, vast ambition, and an exhilarating conviction. The conviction is that any stage or concert attraction the impresario chooses to present is made all the more attractive by the fact that he has chosen it. Unlike ordinary producers who collect money from others to put on shows that have profit-making possibilities, the impresario is a limelight plunger who pours his own money into productions of his own choice. All the risks and all the rewards are his alone.

P. T. Barnum, a roistering connoisseur of circus freaks in the 1950's, was the first American of positive impresario stature. Sergei Diaghilev, an enormous Russian who hobnobbed with Stravinsky, Piscasso, and Nijinsky, and who produced ballets and operas throughout Europe in the early 1900's, was the Continent's best specimen of the breed. Both Billy Rose and Mike Todd showed early promise, but Rose is now inactive and Todd died before he could reach full impresario status. Today Hurok stands virtually alone on his lofty pinnacle.

"In a business I would be a millionaire 10 times over," Hurok says, "but this is not a business, it is a disease." The short, rotund Russian, who is now 71, has brought some of Barnum's broad-gaged manner to his trade. Impresarios are expected to live and talk big, and Hurok plays the role with gusto. Almost every day he lunches at New York's expensive Pavillon restaurant where, between forkfuls of boeuf à la mode, he utters melancholy pronouncements on the state of the world. Mankind is in such bad shape, in fact, that it is in desperate need of more Hurok attractions, especially the ballet, which Hurok calls "bolly," and dramatic presentations like England's Old Vic repertory company, which he calls "Uld Wick."

Through his heavy horn-rimmed glasses, Hurok views the artistic world as a patchwork of music, drama, or dance attractions waiting to be found worthy of the "S. Hurok presents" label. To sign up those that are worthy, Hurok has been ranging the world for the last 50 years looking for the singers, instrumentalists, dancers, or actors who can meet his standards and yield him about 15 percent of their gross at the boxoffice.

Hurok's 35-man New York staff, aided by scouts in Europe, turns up the prospects, but Hurok alone makes the choices. To do that, he temporarily divests himself of his impresario manner and plays the role of the average customer looking for his money's worth. Arriving unannounced at a prospect's concert or recital, Hurok pays his way into the theater and, while being shown to his seat, plots out his path to the nearest exit in case he should find himself bored. When the performance begins Hurok waits to see what effect the artist will have on him. As he expresses it, "I have to feel them my-

self." If the right kind of feeling comes over him, Hurok then looks about the hall to see if the same thing is happening to the rest of the customers. If there is complete conformity between what Hurok feels and the audience shows, he will sit through the entire performance and drop back stage afterward, resuming his impresario manner and proposing a contract. If there is not, he heads unobtrusively but swiftly for the exit.

Over the years the system has worked amazingly well, although Hurok has had his share of magnificent flops. In 1926 he confidently signed up the Habimah Players from the Moscow Art Theater, and when the troupe opened at the Mansfield Theater in New York just 39 paying customers were in their seats. Hurok was on hand to count them because he had not been able to bear it any longer in Chicago, where an S. Hurok touring opera company was singing Boris Godunov and losing thousands of dollars for him every week. Says Hurok today, "When people don't want to come, nothing will stop them."

Hurok got his start in 1908 signing up free performances for political rallies in Brooklyn. A 20-year-old immigrant from Russia, he had skipped out of his father's hardware business in the Ukrainian town of Pogar 2 years previously and got right back into the hardware line in lower New York. On Sundays he would hawk silverware to afford the concert tickets he needed to size up the artists who might help his political candidates. Presently Hurok decided that if he could get performers to play for him free at a ward hall, he could probably get them to play for him for money at Carnegie Hall.

Violinist Efrem Zimbalist, a fellow Russian immigrant, was Sol's first bigtime attraction. That was in 1912 and at the time the impresario could devote only lunch hours and nights to booking concerts because he was busy the rest of the time selling nuts and bolts in the hardware store. But by 1916 he was able to switch full time to being an impresario and he soon signed up such notables as the great Austrian contralto Ernestine Schumann-Heink, the eminent Russian basso Feodor Challapin and the famous Russian ballarina Anna Pavlova. Over the years Hurok Attractions (agents merely have clients, but impresarios have attractions) have given more than 100,000 performances. Pianist Artur Rubinstein, violinist Isaac Stern, guitarist Andres Segovia, singers Marian Anderson, Jan Peerce, and Roberta Peters, monologist Emlyn Williams—all have borne the label. Hurok regards all his performers as the world's finest artists and himself as a part of their acts.

EXPLAINING ISADORA TO BOSTON

Like any impresario worth his gold-topped cane, Hurok has had to learn to live with crisis. One day back in 1922 he heard with horror that one of his stars, the celebrated dancer Isadora Duncan, had denounced her audience in Boston for what she called its false puritanism and had showed the intensity of her beliefs by baring her bosom. The late Mayor James Michael Curley retaliated by ordering Isadora to leave town, and Hurok had to race to Boston to try to explain Isadora to the city. He has since helped shovel out snowbound ballerinas, returned Chicago hotel towels stolen by a basso, built stages on a day's notice in Mississippi, and even done his best to reconcile a pair of enraged Russian choreographers who were about to wage a pistol duel in Central Park.

But there have been rewards as well as crises. Hurok loves to hobnob with his eminent attractions, and among his proudest possessions are pictures of him at parties waltzing with British ballerinas Margot Fonteyn and Moira Shearer and doing the conga with Katherine Dunham. He only wishes he had brought a photographer along with him the time he foxtrotted with Anna Pavlova at the Palisades Amusement Park.

The relationship between Hurok and many of his artists is less personal now than it was years ago, for these days he tends to conduct most of his transactions with their governments. Most ballet troupes and repertory theaters outside the United States are state-supported ventures, and Hurok's manipulations to get them here under his private auspices have already produced the first American appearances of the Royal Ballet (once the Sadler's Wells) and the Old Vic from London, the Comédie Française from Paris, the Inbal Dancers from Tel Aviv and the Kabuki players from Tokyo. The Hurok eye for a new act has not lost its sharpness during these high-level transactions. In London some years ago he watched the changing of the guard at Buckingham Palace and took an old showman's fancy to the paradings of the Guards regiments. In a flash he decided that such pageantry had enough box-office potential to pack Madison Square Garden five times straight at a $6 top. He was right: for the past 4 years Americans have delightedly watched the Scots Guards and other bagpiping groups by courtesy of Hurok. "Hurok is the sort of fellow," one of his friends says, "who thinks about the 42d Airborne Division a lot differently from the way you or I do."

Although he has had great success in dealing with the artists and governments of many countries, Hurok for years has had a special compulsion to acquaint American audiences with the best things from his Russian homeland, and that drive is what finally resulted in the Bolshoi Ballet's coming to the United States this spring. Back in 1929 Hurok had the Bolshoi signed up, but at the last minute the deal fell through. It has taken him 30 years to make good on it.

"Believe me," said the impresario recently, "if I would know in advance the trouble I am having to get the Bolshoi, I could put up a 100-story building instead." In 1954 when Hurok, for the hundredth time, asked the Russian Government for the Bolshoi Ballet, he was told he could have it—but first he must bring over the Moiseyev Dancers, a much less famous troupe. The Moiseyev tour last year was a brilliant financial success. But Moscow still stalled: Hurok could have the Bolshoi, yes, but now he must sign up the Beryozka Folk Dancers, a relatively obscure band of 53 women and 5 accompanists. He did so, and again the reception was excellent.

Finally last November Hurok thought he had the Bolshoi sewed up. Travel arrangement were made and theaters booked. Everything seemed set. Then it was all off: the troupe wanted to prepare a new work for its American tour and would postpone its visit to the fall. In January the word was yes again, in February it was no again. Hurok in despair dropped the option he had on the Metropolitan Opera House for April.

It was only late in February that the final okay came. Presumably it was prompted by the enthusiastic reception that Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan saw the Beryozka Dancers receive in Chicago during his U.S. tour. Hurok hastily renewed his option on the Metropolitan and triumphantly unveiled the Russians there last month. Even so he knows his troubles are not over. When the Bolshoi was in London in 1956, anti-Communist literature tossed into the troupe's buses upset the cast, and one day a dancer found bits of broken glass in a dish of ice cream, leading the troupe to suspect sabotage. "I know what will happen," says Hurok. "Someone gets a bad ice cream here and Khrushchev calls up Hurok."

Although the old impresario has now landed his most sought-after catch, he has no intention of retiring. To him the world's best hope for peace is the kind of cultural exchange that he so splendidly provides. The Moiseyev dancers were delighted by what they saw in the United States and Hurok hopes the Bolshoi will be too. In July he will bring over still another group of Russian dancers and singers. After that, who knows? Some Hurok observers suspect that the impresario has his eyes on even bigger things. "Do you suppose it's the summit conference?" one of them asked. "Think of the billing. S. Hurok presents—The heads of state."

Address by Dr. O. Meredith Wilson to 1959 Graduation Class of University of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a moving and thoughtful charge to the 1959 graduating class of the University of Oregon, given by Dr. O. Meredith Wilson, president of the University of Oregon. It is a challenge, as well.

Dr. Wilson's address is particularly significant in this centennial year of the State of Oregon, because he has emphasized the historic implications of the westward movement which brought frontiersmen to search for the Northwest Passage, for the elusive Columbia River and for a route across the continent. As Oregon once pioneered in settlement of the wilderness, our State now leads the way in many important educational advancements—as demonstrated by the address which I herewith present by the able president of the University of Oregon.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY DR. O. MEREDITH WILSON TO 1959 GRADUATION CLASS OF UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

We are met together in the centennial year of our State, the occasion being to acknowledge the years of serious and productive intellectual inquiry by our graduating classes. In addition to those who are honored here today, we have earlier this week in Portland, in appropriate and separate ceremonies, conferred University of Oregon degrees upon 226 men and women, among them 62 nurses, 68 doctors of dentistry, 66 doctors of medicine. The cumulative figure for degrees awarded in these four ceremonies, of which this event is climax, will be 1,722.

You new alumni are a cosmopolitan company. Among you are represented citizens of 39 States and 26 foreign countries. You are joining a distinguished cavalcade of more than 34,000 who already hold degrees from the University of Oregon, and an additional 100,000 who, for less than the years required to earn a degree, have attended this university and take pride in the name of Oregon.

In a few moments you candidates will march by to receive your degrees. It, there-

fore, becomes my obligation to charge you with responsibilities appropriate to your expected new honors and status. Since these new responsibilities should logically follow from the education you have received, it would be well to begin with what you are.

The late Sidney Fey, a distinguished author of diplomatic history, on retirement was honored at a banquet. After being regaled by admiring colleagues and students, he responded by reading a paper which had been prepared by one of his students years before, which he had never dared submit to a scholarly journal, but which he thought merited attention. It had been written by Robert Benchley, who perhaps had not read much diplomatic history, in response to a request for an essay on the disputes over fishing rights off the Banks of New Foundland. It began, "Dear Professor Fey, much has been written about the Newfoundland fishing rights from the point of view of the United States. Even more has been written from the point of view of the British. Rather than review this material which, I am sure, is familiar to you, this paper will be written from the point of view of the fish."

Speaking from your point of view is not easy, as I was reminded recently when I remonstrated with my eldest daughter about late hours. Her reflex response, I'm sure intending no disrespect, was, "Daddy, I wish you were alive today." Yes, difficult as it is for me to speak for you, I am emboldened to do so because 4 years of working with you have made me fond of you; and because through the Emerald and Old Oregon you have spoken your minds with admirable candor. Brant Ducey, writing in Old Oregon, represents you as not too interested in space travel—as wanting to see the rest of this world before leaving it; as especially concerned about nuclear warfare, which you describe as "the delicate balance of terror"; as saying the major unsolved problems are international; as having been spawned in depression, raised in war, and possessed of a dubious future; as victims of pressure for conformity with no forceful people and no explorer attitude; as lacking confidence in your own generation.

Your discontents are wholesome. They are a necessary precedent to planned improvement. But confident self-respect must be joined with discontent. And resignation must be replaced by determined action. It, therefore, may be useful to put some of your concern into proper perspective. The delicate balance of terror is the product of amoral forces that were spawned before you were conceived. These forces are a part of your environment but not a part of your responsibility. The failures that led to international disease were ours. The moral confusion which surrounds you is what threatens to beat your generation. That confusion is our creation. To be a beatnik requires only that you resign yourself to live in the hopeless state we have prepared for you. To be a man requires much more of you.

One of you has said, "We have no forceful people and no explorer attitude." In keeping with Oregon's centennial it is fitting that I remind you that we owe everything to the will to explore.

The New World was forced onto the consciousness of Europe by the courage and persistence of Columbus and the faulty calculations of geographers. In any respects the discovery of America was more shocking than would have been a flight to the moon. The moon every European had seen. Though space flight was impossible, the idea was available in fable and Mother Goose rhymes. But until 1492 America was not even an idea. Then suddenly she rose out of the cold mists west of the Azores and east of Cathay as an unknown factor to breed rumors of witchcraft and to inspire tales of the New Atlantis or Utopia where man would yet learn to understand man, and perhaps to love him.

Once discovered and recognized for what she was, this New World loomed as the great American nuisance, and much that was learned about her was revealed by men who were seeking ways through or around her. Europe did not want America, but a shortened route through her to the markets of the East.

First the search for the Northwest Passage, and then hope for a great river of the West, which men called the Mighty Oregon, brought this area into international controversy. But, even among the very early seekers along the Oregon shores, a lust for knowledge and a scientific point of view were to be found.

Capt. James Cook (1778), sailing in time of war, was so generally recognized as a man of science that the enemies of England instructed their fleets to respect his mission as he groped along the shores of the Northwest or sailed the wide Pacific. And, Jean Galaup, Count Lapérouse (1786), commissioned by France, confided to his log that his voyages would be devoted to the "Noble science of discovery." Lewis and Clark, whose mission was military, were, nevertheless, enjoined to bring back all possible scientific data, and Lewis was put to school in Philadelphia in preparation for his scientific obligations. We entered history as an object of science.

The noble science of discovery has not lost its nobility nor its significance. The fact that some of you have seemed to find your generation wanting in the explorer attitude is clearest evidence that you value it. In the midst of your doubts I read with pleasure that you have developed a capacity to think more critically and more independently. One of you said, "If someone says it's raining my first reaction isn't to agree—I get up and look outside for myself—even though I'm living in Oregon"; and from another: "Everything was clear and neat in high school, but here it doesn't always equate and if nothing else you learn to accept that fact."

Watching you through 4 years, seeing you accept responsibility, listening to your growing concern for the significant aspects of campus life, the faculty has learned to admire you, and has developed a confidence in you that you may lack in yourselves. Any generation that recognizes the importance of exploration, sees the world as an untidy set of unsolved problems, and is thoughtful and independent enough to go see for itself, "even though living in Oregon," is a generation of hope, not of despair.

You are right; the explorer's attitude is of first importance. Not what you know but what you demand to know is the measure of your education. Not the conditions of life as you find them, but what you insist that they become will be the measure of your manhood. Your interest in knowing more would be legitimate if supported by nothing more than mankind's restless, divine curiosity. But it now has more imperative voices speaking its cause. It is, in fact, legislatively enjoined upon us by the National Defense Education Act, the statement of purpose of which is as follows:

"Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women. The present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available. The defense of this Nation depends upon the mastery of modern techniques developed from complex scientific principles. It depends as well upon the discovery of new principles, new techniques, and new knowledge."

This is but legislative recognition of Alfred North Whitehead's striking dictum, that "the race that does not value trained intelligence is doomed."

But the trained intelligence now needed is not simply the encyclopedic mind that can regurgitate any known principle. What is more required is the innovator, the mind that has original power, the mind that can move with freedom and order from the known to the unknown. As Congress declared: "[We] depend * * * upon the discovery and development of new principles * * * and new knowledge."

I, therefore, charge you to employ confidently the sharpened critical faculties that you carry away from Oregon in courageous, even audacious exploration of the jungle of moral, political, and diplomatic confusion that surrounds us, and pray hopefully that you will find for us all a new route to that land of peace whose shores we all restlessly seek, where every man may sit under his own vine or fig tree and learn war no more.

O. MEREDITH WILSON,
President, University of Oregon.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of July 11, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, 5th District of Texas)

A FABLE (?)

Once upon a time two men went into the building business together. Partner A agreed to draw up a budget for the firm and sign the checks to pay the monthly bills. Only Partner B, however, was empowered to authorize expenditures. Though the business got off to a good start, Partner B began to purchase items beyond the budgeted necessities, each item seeming desirable, if not necessary, for the welfare of the business. When Partner A complained about exceeding the agreed budget and said there wasn't enough money to pay the bills, B retorted: "Well, you're running the paying end of this business, and," (wagging a finger) "don't run up a deficit. Besides," said B, "I have reduced spending on some of the items we did have budgeted, namely, office furniture and decoration. I'm saving money." "Yes," Partner A rejoined, "but you are running around charging other items we didn't budget; and on top of that you authorized a subcontractor to withdraw construction funds from our bank account as he needs it."

Not convincing his partner, but facing the stark reality of more due bills than money at the end of the month, "A" had but two alternatives, short of bankruptcy. Either he must raise more income or borrow money from the bank to cover the bills. He arranged a 90-day loan. Meanwhile, old "B" continued to make unbudgeted purchases, charging them to the firm's account, and the subcontractor was drawing money directly from the bank account as he needed it.

The 90-day loan was extended and increased. Then, unable to extend the loan again, a loan from another bank was arranged to repay the first. As time passed,

and the spending and refinancing continued, Partner A knew that a sad day of reckoning was coming.

A tried to counsel his partner: "The way we're spending more than we're taking in and borrowing more to cover our debts, our credit is getting shaky and I am having difficulty refinancing. Even now I am forced to pay higher interest rates. We've got to tailor our spending to our income, and now, before our creditors lose confidence in us." To this wise advice, his partner replied: "Now, wait a minute. Each of these things I am buying is something our company ought to have—a colorful neon sign, the automatic opening door, the brocade draperies, carpeting—these things add class and are necessary for the welfare of our business, for our success and growth."

As though A didn't have troubles enough, B often added insult to injury by loudly criticizing the company's growing indebtedness, and the fact that A was having to pay higher interest rates for the borrowed money. Sometimes he even slyly inferred that his partner was just paying these higher rates as sort of a favor to his banking friends. As fiscally responsible partner A pondered this stalemate, his problem loomed larger. How could he reason with this fellow who was consistent only in his appalling misunderstanding of even the most rudimentary facts of economic life? How could he avoid alarming the creditors? And how could he explain the situation to the other investors whose money was involved? Finally, how could he set them on the course to solvency?

Fable? Now let's look at Government: Partner A, the administration, prepares our budget and must sign the checks to pay our bills; but only partner B, the Congress, may authorize expenditures, and is expected to provide the income (through taxes) to pay the bills. As spending by Congress exceeds income ($13 billion last year), the administration must meet its bills by borrowing more money, and refinancing older debts as they come due. Since there is more demand for available loan money—for the use of other people's savings (and that $13 billion worth of Government demand is quite an item in itself), the price for the use of money automatically goes up. And that's all interest really is—the price paid for the use of money. The more people who want to use what money is available, the higher will be the price charged for it.

The root problem again is spending. Without continual deficits and the inflation they cause, the Government's borrowing problem would not be as acute, nor would interest rates go up. Ironically enough, however, some of the very Congressmen who vote for the big spending want also to decrease the Government's income (taxes) and will loudly blame the administration for any rise in our indebtedness or in interest rates.

It's no wonder that the technical nature of this subject often confuses the voter and that political orations larded with such terms as "tight money," "monetizing the debt," etc., only serve to worsen the confusion. As soon as enough voters understand that interest rates are not "set" by anybody; that interest is simply the price for the use of the commodity, money, and is regulated by supply and demand just as every other price must be; that when the Government must borrow heavily in the short term loan market, it thus competes for the use of money with newlyweds who need furniture and families who need automobiles. Then the administration's problem will be greatly simplified. Then the voter can point his finger at the real culprit, the "big spender" in Congress, reckless in his eagerness to "provide something-for-everybody" (sometimes he calls this promoting growth or expansion) and who refuses to recognize that continued spending beyond income brings inevitably nearer the day of reckoning, and hurts most of all the so-called little man and those average families who foot most of the tax load and are most cruelly hurt by inflated prices.

Shape of Things Ahead on Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 26, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend remarks I wish to include in the RECORD an article by Chalmers M. Roberts, from the July 12 edition of the Washington Post, entitled "Shape of Things Ahead on Berlin." In this article it is suggested that an interim agreement on Berlin may be in the offing, one which might find Russia cancelling its ultimatum for Western withdrawal from the city, but which might also involve Western acceptance of Soviet demands for recognition of its East German satellite. The question immediately arises whether such an agreement is any kind of a victory at all. The article follows:

SHAPE OF THINGS AHEAD ON BERLIN

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

It may be far from clear just how the Berlin affair will end. But as the ministers gather again in Geneva the picture of what may, perhaps will, happen is somewhat clearer than when they recessed 3 weeks ago.

Despite the bluster and tough talk from Nikita Khrushchev it begins to look as though there will be an interim agreement on Berlin which will open the road to the summit. But what kind of agreement? And at what cost to the West?

The Soviet tactic, as has been demonstrated for decades, is to demand the outrageous and if possible settle for part of it. This is the tactic being used in the Berlin negotiations. It is effective now chiefly for two reasons: the geographic facts about West Berlin, isolated in the Communist sea of East Germany, are against the West; growing Soviet nuclear power has emboldened Khrushchev and made the West more willing to compromise just as he hoped.

Khrushchev first demanded that the West get out of West Berlin. Then he demanded that at least it agree on a time when it should end the "occupation" there, suggesting a year and then extending the limit to 18 months. This the West called an ultimatum. But the West in trying to get a Soviet commitment on continuation of its West Berlin rights offered some concessions.

The West offered to limit its garrison to no more than the current 11,000 figure; to curtail the propaganda-subversive activities if the Russians would do the same for East Berlin; to forswear nuclear weapons in Berlin, not in itself meaningful but perhaps meaningful as a first step in the Soviet demand for such a ban everywhere.

Having squeezed the orange and gotten some useful drops of juice, the Russians indicated they would relent on the ultimatum. That was done in the elliptical statement by Gromyko on June 28 denying that Western rights in Berlin would end after the 18-month period of all-German talks. But he did not say how long they would continue.

At best the West probably can get agreement that at the end of the talks—and Gromyko indicated the period could be stretched beyond 18 months to perhaps 2 years—Western rights will still exist but without any commitment on how long. Certainly there will be no Soviet commitment to continue the rights until Germany is unified, as the West proposes.

This kind of agreement, hinted at by Gromyko, now would come as a great relief to the West. But the full price for even this has not all been paid. Secretary Herter indicated on Thursday a willingness to accept parity for East Germany with West Germany on the proposed all-German group. This is yet another step in Western acceptance of the major Soviet demand for recognition of the East German satellite, and thereby of the Soviet control of Eastern Europe. It comes on top of the acceptance of East Germans at the Geneva talks which Gromyko trumpeted as "an important achievement" amounting to de facto recognition.

The all-German group, too, will be an issue of contention. The Soviets and their puppets in Pankow want to use it to bolster further the East German regime. The West does not want that but it will be very hard to escape.

Thus it may turn out that the second round at Geneva will produce a Berlin agreement. The Western allies doubtless would, in such a case, claim a great victory in forcing the Russians to let the West live on in Berlin. But the price of such a victory will be considerable: an erosion of the Western position in Europe.

Soviet pressure on the West will not, of course, stop there. Just what Khrushchev has in mind for the summit is a mystery in the West but it certainly won't be any Christmas present. It will represent some new pressure. The Russians are not indulging in the competitive coexistence game just to stay even; they expect to win.

Herter has tried hard to get on top of the situation he inherited. Probably he has done about as well as anyone could expect, given an administration so determined to hold the status quo abroad and so convinced that the overriding issue is the budget and inflation at home.

OBA Corp. Should Be Complimented for Promoting U.S. Savings Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8107, a bill introduced by Congressman MULTER to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the use of U.S. Savings Stamps for trade promotion, is in direct opposition to our great American ideals of free enterprise. This bill is directly aimed at OBA Corp., an organization founded by a group of public-spirited businessmen, to aid the sale of U.S. savings stamps and bonds by encouraging public collection of the stamps.

These businessmen wish to sell their products, yes, but if they can, at the same time, interest millions of American housewives and their families in pur-

chasing U.S. savings stamps, should this be called a crime?

The Government should be very grateful that there are some leaders of American business who are concerned enough about the economic future of our country to direct hundreds of thousands of dollars toward a reawakening of the savings stamp program. This program is especially valuable to our children, where we wish to encourage thrift and sound economic thought. The OBA Corp. plan to distribute free savings stamps and savings books—none of which cost the Government anything at all—through the use of coupons on various consumer products is entirely consistent with the highest standards of business-Government cooperation as evidenced by the entire savings bond program, and I heartily endorse the program. I wish to compliment the businessmen who have begun this program and I urge others to join with them in this most worthwhile effort.

Domestic Agriculture Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have on several occasions recently attempted in my humble way to point out to the Members of this House that there is no farm problem, that the problem is one of international trade.

I have tried to point out that the job of the Secretary of Agriculture is not one of keeping domestic agriculture production in line with domestic consumption, but rather a job of reducing domestic agriculture production to make room for foreign agricultural imports.

In this connection, one of the most interesting things that has come to my desk recently is a radio address given June 20, 1939, by the Honorable E. H. Everson, then secretary of agriculture for the State of South Dakota. I quote portions thereof because the problem he pointed out at that time is exactly the same problem confronting agriculture and the Department of Agriculture today. In fact, the problem today is the result of 22 years of reciprocal trade. Mr. Everson said in part:

In fact, the determination of our trade policies is left entirely up to the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, and his international associates, with the assistance of the Tariff Commission. No provision whatsoever is made whereby hearings may be held giving an opportunity for our people to present their case before the so-called reciprocal trade treaties are made. Then it is left to the Department of Agriculture to reduce and restrict agricultural production in the United States so as to make room for these agricultural imports. Through the Surplus Commodities Corporation he buys up farm products and holds them over the market and may release them at any time so that legitimate investors are reluctant to invest in these commodities for fear that the Surplus Commodities Corporation may throw their stocks upon the market at any time and thus destroy our prices.

In another part of his speech, Mr. Everson said:

I sometimes wonder just how long you farmers, yes, and you businessmen, too, who are absolutely dependent upon our farm market, will permit yourselves to be deceived by these internationalists and their secret trade agreements. They are not just selling us down the river. No; they are selling us out across the ocean, and they will continue to do so until you raise your voices in protest so that it will be heard so loudly in the Congress of the United States that the Congress and Senate of the United States will know that it is its constitutional duty to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to the end that our basic industry in the United States may be permitted to survive and feed and clothe our 130 million population.

In another point, he said:

Why should we continue to loan money to those foreign nations to purchase our goods and lose both the goods and the money? Why should we continue to import more than $2 worth of farm products for every $1 worth of farm products we export * * * while we are asked to reduce and restrict our own farm production in order to provide an American market here in the United States for these farm products from foreign countries and while we continue to issue billions of dollars of Government bonds, to be paid by our innocent and defenseless posterity, in order to sustain our unemployed who are thus denied their opportunity to produce these things which they need to sustain themselves?

When we call attention * * * to these inconsistencies they tell us these imports are only a drop in the bucket; that they do not amount to anything * * * yet during just 1 week and on just one farm product—meat alone—the imports of these meat products at the port of New York for the week of May 11–17, 1939, was 2,502,224 pounds. Just convert those meat products into carloads of livestock and you would have approximately 250 carloads of livestock at one port in 1 week, mind you, and yet they tell you this doesn't amount to anything, that it is only a drop in the bucket. * * *

This means that 240 cars that could and should be transporting these livestock are idle along the sidetracks while increased freight rates are asked for on an ever-diminishing volume of transportation. It means that increasing millions more men are taken out of productive private employment in the railroads, shops, and processing plants, while farmers are required to curtail their production, thus increasing the cost of production and reducing the income per unit of production all along the line. It is substituting the unnatural, artificial law of scarcity and diminishing returns for the natural law of abundance and of supply and demand. It is substituting internationalism for Americanism. It is subsidizing foreign commerce and foreign producers at the expense of domestic producers and domestic commerce, and, therefore, is at the expense of the vast majority of our American people.

Although the Everson address was made 20 years ago, it is as applicable today as it was then and much more damaging than it was then because we have had 20 years of imports stacked year upon year to add to our domestic agriculture problems.

The Long-Range Threat of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article presented to the Monetary Conference of the American Bankers Association on May 5–8, 1959, in London by Dr. Alfred Schaefer, chief general manager, Union Bank of Switzerland, entitled "The Long-Range Threat of Inflation."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LONG-RANGE THREAT OF INFLATION

(By Dr. Alfred Schaefer, chief general manager, Union Bank of Switzerland)

I. NATURE OF MODERN INFLATION

The inflationary consequences of the French Revolution and of the First World War were destructive but short, and could be cured by appropriate drastic measures. The creeping inflation of our days is more dangerous, because the economic power of the state and the volume of circulating money have increased enormously. Modern inflation is not only an ethical and social problem—it seems to be embedded in the free economy, like a managerial disease. Like a sick organ in the human body, there is in the economy an organ which shows this cancer: the weakening money. No solution can be based only on technical measures. The reconciliation of stable money and full employment is an unsolved problem, and full employment with perpetually rising wages is certainly the most risky experiment of our so-called free economy.

II. POSSIBLE REMEDIES

1. Reaction of the public, the consumer

The public is unorganized, inadequately informed, generally apathetic, confused by the disputes of economists and advisors (Prof. Slichter). It could elect to public office men recognizing the value of stable money, ready to fight for it—but this is a pious hope. Everybody agrees on the social, individual and international perils of too rapid an inflation. But too many believe that inflation is here to stay as part of modern life, that a 2 percent annual loss in the purchasing power of money is not so bad, forgetting that this means 50 percent in one generation and that sooner or later business will have to pay a correspondingly higher rate of interest. It is true that until now long-term bond financing has gone on, that through custom and inertia "wolf" has been cried so often that when the real "wolf" appears few take any notice. This dangerous acceptance of slow inflation helps to create or intensifies the very consequences it fears. Sooner or later the little man will realize these consequences, and then we could have accelerated currency troubles. The signs are increasing—even in the United States of America—and we are all under warning: Soaring prices for shares, stock options as the only incentive to management, buying "growth" instead of "yield," interest for South African goldmine stocks, high interest rates for bonds, preference for index-based bonds, flight into seemingly more stable money. Investors, pension funds, trust funds are all investing 30 percent and more of their capital in stocks and other prop-

erty—often regardless of the price. Soon there could be too little real saving or more negative saving through installment credits and higher taxation.

No buying strike of the unorganized public against high prices for consumer goods seems possible, not even against the probably politically necessary, but economically scandalous world-wide agricultural price supports through subsidies and stockpiling.

2. Reaction of management, enterprise

There is too much lipservice paid to the goal of monetary stability. Management partly accepts slow inflation and adjusts its plans accordingly. A slow increase in prices, i.e. a fall-off in the value of money, seems the best attainable result in the long run for many producers. Increased costs are corrected by increasing prices or avoided by labor-saving machinery, but too quickly increasing capital expenditures create more inflation.

Like the public, management is not much frightened any more about a slump—the welfare governments will help. During the last recession nobody dared to let the slump ride itself out, to accept a really corrective shakeout of the weaklings or a strike of the labor unions—everybody asked for subsidies, relief, Government orders, cheap money, tax reductions, credit injections.

We are therefore already halfway between a pure market economy and a centrally planned economy, in an economy which depends on the decisions of the State, of large-scale firms, groups and other economic units.

We are all sinners against the very roots of our capitalistic society. We psychologically expect and accept the annual round of wage increases as our fate, we would consider ourselves as shylocks if we did not grant a little increase in salary or in fringe benefits to everybody every new year. Kindness is a human quality, softness is an economic mistake.

3. Labor, wages

Wages are the most important, the crucial problem of the capitalistic world of free enterprise. Wages are linked to retail prices, industrial prices to wages, farm prices to industrial prices, retail prices to farm prices—a rigid circulus vitiosus of prices and earnings making true the saying of Fréd. Bastiat a 100 years ago: "La grande fiction à travers laquelle tout le monde s'efforce de vivre aux dépens de tout le monde" ("The great ficton through which everybody tries to live at the expense of everybody else.") The responsibility for inflation is passed from one interested group to another, from employers to labor, and vice versa.

The compensation of workers in money has increased to the last 10 years at least twice as much as productivity. Wages resisted even recessions. It should be borne in mind that, generally speaking, wage increases cannot reasonably be based on increases in the productivity of particular industries. Rather, they must be limited, at the most, to the average rise in productivity of the economy as a whole. In estimating the latter, it is well to remember that both agriculture and the service industries, particularly the latter, in the last 10 years have had average productivity growth rates of some one-half to 1 percent only.

Even in an especially progressive industry wages paid should not be geared to changes in productivity of that industry. Such practices would almost force other industries, whose productivity has risen less, to grant similar wage boosts lest they lose workers lured away by the higher incomes earned in the rapidly advancing industry. Escalator clauses in contracts—introduced on a large scale by the biggest industrial company in the world—set the pace for seemingly sacrosanct increases following every possible increase in the index of living costs, regardless of productivity. Nobody, therefore, is much interested in fighting inflation, because he will soon catch up with higher prices. High and prolonged unemployment compensation relieves the pressure on the individual to find another job or on the unions to reduce their excessive demands. The labor unions are in danger of pricing their members out of the market, especially in the United States of America (hourly wage rate of steelworkers $3, versus $1 to $1.25 in Switzerland, 80 to 90 cents in Germany). Results: Rationalization speeded up too quickly, more people out of work, more productivity, boom begets recession.

Too much political power is in the hands of union leaders, but partly becouse management did not dare to resist the excessive wage demands which set in motion the whole inflationary spiral: From fear of losing out to the competition of other firms, nobody dared to face a real showdown, to accept a prolonged strike.

4. Measures of the State and the central banks

In the long run no help from outside can reestablish a sound monetary balance. Higher taxes mean compulsory saving and are no remedy, because they will be spent by governments and finally passed on to the consumer in the form of higher prices—but the consumer will not accept a lower standard of living.

Since the war Government expenses have everywhere increased through programs for housing, social security, highways, armament, atomic science, etc. Pressure groups push the expansion of their own plans. Everywhere there is a superstate with a superbudget, supertaxation, superwelfare—we cannot increase it without approaching dangerously near the Russian system.

Tax reforms are needed. The fiscal elephantiasis has partly destroyed the efficiency of the interest rate as an essential weapon for securing an equilibrium between money and goods. The interest rate as a factor in cost is less important than the tax burden. It is an absurdity that the tax angle is very often more important than any other consideration. The consequence is a progressive enfeeblement of the efficiency of central bank discount policy. Every increase of the rate hurts Government because it has too great an amount of Treasury bills in the market which cannot be consolidated easily—one more important possible factor for inflation.

The policies of the central banks are necessarily, but perhaps too much, influenced by political pressure groups. A serious restriction of money and credit and an increase of rates are immediately criticized—one has only to remember the accusations during the last few years, when the tightening of the money supply was in reality a very appropriate but feeble measure against an exaggerated credit expansion. And in order to make the policy effective, money must be made not only dear, but also short.

III. CONCLUSIONS

It is bad form to use the word "deflation." Economists call it disinflation. Since the thirties, the fear of unemployment haunts everybody. But full employment gave the labor unions their exaggerated bargaining power, brought the wage inflation as a new and real seat of danger. The wartime dams against inflation broke and only courageous measures of the State, the central banks, and self-discipline of economic groups and labor unions could help. The direct cause of inflation, the continuous increase in the supply of money and credit, the swelling of the stream of money at a rate faster than that of the stream of goods and services must be stopped. Individual savings and insurance, which produce the bulk of much needed investment capital, must be based on the confidence that the value of money will remain more constant than it has been in the last 15 years. Otherwise inflation will strike at the roots of the economy of the free world, and our grandchildren perhaps could go hat in hand to Moscow.

What is the best and immediately necessary measure? Switzerland has not relied on the printing press, has no great surplus in the balance of payments, no budget deficit, no big price-dictating cartels. It may be of interest to raise the question why of all nations Switzerland, whose large foreign trade strongly exposes her economy to price developments abroad, in her cost-of-living index got away with a relatively modest rise to 106 (1953=100), while this index now stands at 108 in the United States of America, 110 in Germany, 121 in England, and 128 in France. It is practically beyond doubt that this favorable development must primarily be ascribed to moderation on the part of labor unions, many of whose leaders—and sometimes even rank-and-file members—often possess a remarkable understanding for the needs of the economy as a whole. What small inflation Switzerland has had, has been the consequence of higher priced import goods and of a worldwide softening of the will to resist, of a tendency to work less and earn more.

We must make up our mind: Sound money and full employment and ever-increasing wages cannot go together. We can count on and must encourage a conservative and courageous policy of the central banks, free of all political pressures. We must accept eventually a period of higher interest rates—dictated by the market—and we must insist on a balanced Government budget. But most of all should we frankly and categorically resist any further automatic wage increases, and abolish any short-term escalator clauses. Higher productivity then will be able to keep prices down and money sound, provided that management will finally feel the moral responsibility to pass technical progress on the consumer in the form of lower prices.

The United States has an international responsibility also in this regard. The dollar has become the measuring stick for others. Between $14 to $16 billion of short-term money are kept by Europe in the United States. Unfortunately, there are some signs that creeping inflation—which continued even during the recession—could go on a little bit faster in the United States than in Europe. It can anyway be assumed that most of the European industrial nations will not inflate faster than the United States. The American balance of payments is passive, the dollar shortage does not exist any more, some gold has returned to Europe—more could flow out if it knew where it could safely go. American investors buy European stocks, partly because the buying power of the dollar is higher in Europe than in the United States.

U.S. competition abroad is crimped by high prices and wages. Import restrictions cannot be any longer a remedy in a climate of freer international give and take. Increased wages for steelworkers would put a major milestone on the road to further inflation. A general acceptance of the idea that a creeping inflation of 2 to 3 percent is inevitable (a la Professor Slichter) would accentuate serious potential risks and endanger the dollar as the yardstick for the world's currencies. Any important wage increase should be refused in the near future—even at the price of a major strike.

The vanishing respect for private property is intimately related to our laxity about the integrity of money. A free society can only stand on firm and durable foundations.

Effect of the New Budget on Water Resource Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very informative address by Elmer B. Staats, Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, delivered before the 46th annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, here in Washington, on May 14 of this year.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECT OF THE NEW BUDGET ON WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Informal remarks by Elmer B. Staats, Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget at the 46th national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

I am glad to speak very briefly here this morning about the Government's 1960 budget as it affects water resources development.

I will not take up your time with a lengthy dissertation on what's in the budget for water resources. You are familiar enough with the facts, I'm sure.

But there are a few key points about the budget that I do want to mention, because what we do in water resources, and how fast we do it, frequently must be decided in the context of the larger perspective of the Government's commitments and resources.

As all of you know, the demands on Govment for expenditures of all kinds are almost infinite. We fact the very basic question of what should be the Government's fiscal policy in times like these. We've got to deal with that question head on.

I think our choices can be defined very simply. One course is to go on spending without regard to estimated revenues in the hope that in the long run our income will overtake our expenditures, and everything will come out even. The other course is to decide that prudent management requires us to confine expenditures to the income that is in sight. That is the policy of the balanced budget, and it is the choice that the President made in his 1960 budget message.

In some quarters, the policy of a balanced budget has been criticized severely as a blind obsession which runs roughshod over the country's needs. It is a little strange that so few of these critics have shown much disposition to urge the new taxes that would supply Government with the revenues to tackle these national needs on a pay-as-we-go basis.

Taxes today are already high, and they are high for one principal reason. National security costs money—a lot of money. Sixty cents out of every dollar we spend in the Federal Government goes to mount our defense in a world full of threats and dangers. Nobody can say for sure how long this will go on, but it will probably go on for quite a long time.

If we aren't willing to pay more taxes, then the only present course by which to increase expenditures is by deficit spending and borrowing. We've done this 24 times in the past 30 years, and today the result is a public debt of $285 billion and an annual carrying charge of over $8 billion. Think of it: $8 billion out of our budget of $77 billion simply goes out in interest payments. More deficits and more borrowing simply would only add to that problem. We have to stop some place and get control of our fiscal affairs, or the toboggan ride will wind up in a ditch.

Now, just because the balanced budget for 1960 ruled out increases in a number of worthwhile fields, it doesn't mean that they are gone for all time. The Federal Government seems destined to develop and improve its services as the needs of the Nation change and grow. The key to the rate of Federal spending is, first, the flow of revenues, and secondly, the choices that must be made among competing demands for priority.

Now, let's take a look at the Federal Government's role in water resources.

Why did the budget exclude "new starts" in 1960? The plain fact is that expenditures in 1960 on flood control, navigation, irrigation, and similar activities of the Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation will come to $1.1 billion—an all-time high. What is more, in the years after 1960, it will take $5 billion to complete going projects, and when we get to 1961 and 1962, annual expenditures will go up still more.

Construction outlays of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, which make up the major part of total water resources construction are estimated to reach $789 million in the current year and to rise to $869 million in 1960. Only once in previous years has this combined total exceeded $800 million—in 1950 it reached $812 million after the long wartime deferments. Expenditures of these two agencies in 1961 are expected to rise above the 1960 record total and to hold at the higher level in 1962, even without new starts. Maintenance, operation, and other costs require $200 million, or more, annually. Thus, even beyond 1962, large expenditures will be called for on going work. That is why it seemed prudent, as the President said in his 1960 budget message, "to take a breathing spell in the initiation of new projects"—not only in the water resources programs, but in the case of veterans hospitals and public buildings as well.

Yet, there are those who may feel that the 1960 budget discriminated against the water resources programs. Perhaps some of you feel that way. In view of the strategic importance of water resources in the Nation's economic development, this attitude is understandable.

But, if you were a scientist, you might feel that other things should be put aside for a time while we concentrate on being the first to get to the moon.

If you were an educator, you might feel that more schools and better-paid teachers were paramount.

If you were a military man, you might give top priority to military demands.

And, if you were a budget officer you would have to fit all these legitimate competing demands into a balanced governmental effort which the taxpayers are able and willing to support.

This we have tried to do and we sincerely believe is the only sensible approach for this year.

And right here, let me make it clear that we must plan for the orderly development and use of our water and land resources. But let me emphasize the word "orderly." It means careful planning, coordinated effort, sensible cost sharing geared to where benefits fall, and realism in the proportions of the whole budget which are allocated to resources developments.

In spite of the record construction program underway by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, as well as the more recent watershed protection and flood prevention programs of the Department of Agriculture, the 1960 budget will make it possible to continue investigations and advance planning of projects and to assemble basic data for future years. It recommends funds for two special river basin commissions to continue their studies for development of the water resources of the Southeast area and the State of Texas. Further, it provides funds for design work and site selection for demonstration plants to develop economic processes for converting saline and brackish water to fresh water in quantities sufficient for municipal, industrial and agricultural use.

Some of you may feel that the budget for 1960 could have included some new starts because the initial impact on budget expenditures would have been very slight. That is true enough for 1960, but the problem comes in the rapid pickup of expenditures in the second and third years of construction, and we already face increasing water resources expenditures in 1961 and 1962.

Very frankly, we face this upward push in going expenditures right across-the-board in 1961. If the Congress goes along on a balanced budget for 1960, without adding to what the President has asked for, we will still have to reckon in 1961 with a built-in growth in expenditures of between $2 and $3 billion. Aviation, outer space, education, and water resources are just some of the areas where expenditures are bound to be higher. Tax receipts may be higher, too, but present indications are that expenditures and receipts will be closely balanced in 1961, leaving at best only a limited margin for program increases or, alternatively, tax adjustments.

And so, while the budget for 1960 does not propose new starts for water resources projects, the fact remains that planned expenditures in this field will establish a new high record. In the general framework of a balanced budget, and in the light of a generally restrictive approach to program expansions, the water resources program is in a strong position.

I should like to touch briefly on another matter of unique interest to this group, namely the issue of an equitable division of the costs of flood control projects as between Federal and non-Federal interests.

As you know, we've had a number of special commissions studying the problem of water resources development. Some of you may feel that the subject has been studied to death. But one consistent idea has come through in practically every one of these studies. They agree that we need a fair and consistent basis for cost-sharing in flood control work, no matter which Federal agency does the work. The lack of uniformity in cost-sharing standards makes it possible to play off one Federal agency against another in order to reduce the local contribution.

I think we should be able to agree that this kind of confusion doesn't reflect any credit on Government. Every Federal agency ought to speak the same language when they are dealing with the same problems. It doesn't make much sense to look at a wide range of actual local shares, all the way from 2 percent to over 60 percent.

We have just transmitted to Congress a draft bill to set standards of cost-sharing which would apply to the flood control aspects of programs of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service. Briefly, the bill provides that non-Federal interests would bear at least 30 percent of the first cost of projects allocated to the production of flood control or flood prevention benefits. The value of lands, easements, rights-of-way, etc., would be counted as part of the non-Federal share, and the balance would be payable over the period of construction or, in certain cases,

over 50 years, with interest. In the case of reservoirs which benefit large areas, the non-Federal interests would bear at least 30 percent of the costs of only those benefits that are significant and accrue to identifiable groups.

I hope you will take a careful look at this proposition. A lot of hard work and effort have gone into it, and it represents a basis for a real improvement in the way we do business. The increase in the average level of non-Federal participation is quite modest, but it strengthens the most effective test of project soundness—the willingness of local groups to put their own money in a joint undertaking with the Federal Government. I will just add this thought, that greater cost-sharing means that we will get more out of whatever Federal funds are available for flood protection.

I will conclude by saying that the Federal Government realizes fully the importance of water resources development to the Nation. At the same time, our Nation faces many needs, as a growing society must expect. The budget provides a point for reconciling and balancing all these needs within the means at its disposal. As imperfect a device as it may be, it nevertheless affords us an opportunity to couple vision with responsibility—two very vital qualities of a free and fortunate people.

"Space Highway"—Circumferential Route 128, Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from this week's Time magazine. It refers to the "Space Highway," the circumferential route 128 which encircles Boston, Mass.

The article points out, as we in Massachusetts so well know, that the great natural resources of our economy in the Bay State are our brain power and genius. The article points out that Boston has been and is the intellectual center of the Nation and is the leader in our Nation's scientific and technological revolution.

Massachusetts and its "space highway" along route 128 will continue to attract pioneering leaders in the electronics industry.

Mr. President, I think I can confidently predict that the industrial boom which we have experienced on route 128 is but a mere prelude to the great economic development which lies ahead for Massachusetts and New England. Massachusetts, the home of new ideas, is indeed grateful to Time for this recognition of its leadership.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTRONICS—THE IDEA ROAD

On road maps, the new superhighway that curls through the pleasant woodlands surrounding Boston is known routinely as route 128. But to U.S. industry, it is known more romantically as the Space Highway. Amid the landscaped woods of the industrial parks along commuter-clogged 128 are tucked scores of low, angular buildings bearing science-fiction names: Trans-Sonics, Tracerlab, Microwave, Dynametrics. These plants add up to the biggest and fastest growing science-based complex[1] in the United States, and provide the Nation's most impressive proof of the vast new industrial potential of the electronics and space age. Beyond that, they are a dramatic demonstration of the fact that behind current new industrial development lies one key factor: new ideas.

For Wall Street, highway 128, the road of ideas, has become a road of enchanting mystery, glamor—and the source of quick profits. Many a Wall Street analyst periodically tours the highway, on the hunt for hot new companies. Few investors can understand what many of the companies make. But their eager bidding to get in on the ground floor has sent the prices of some stocks soaring a hundredfold—and more—in the last few years.

Along the highway, giant manufacturers such as Raytheon, RCA, Avco, and Sylvania are hard at work on missile and space systems. Smaller firms make components and instruments—some of them so tiny that a week's production fits into the rear of a station wagon. Many of them are so sophisticated that even company brass are hard put to explain how they operate. From 128's small companies come devices that can read print optically, or probe space to guide a missile.

OUT OF THE LOFTS

Highway 128 was built to be just a Boston bypass. But in the 8 years since it opened, the roadway has lured 17 industrial parks and $137 million worth of new buildings. Into them have moved 227 companies employing 28,000 people.

Most of the companies started in small lofts, warehouses, or garages in the commercials districts of Boston or Cambridge, looked very much like the radio repair shops and jobbers that surrounded them. To finance samples of new products, the founders dug into personal savings or tapped friends. Cash came from such risk-minded organizations as American Research & Development Corp., which sponsored many science companies (High Voltage, Tracerlab), and from individual investor groups such as those of Laurance Rockefeller, who now is sponsoring one of the 128's newest, Geophysics Corp. of America. As the prototype models succeeded, the young companies outgrew their quarters and moved out to the highway.

The 128 boom burst upon an economically depressed area that has scant natural resources for industry, a limited power supply, and an uninviting tax structure. But it has two overwhelming advantages: a climate for ideas that has been carefully fostered during its 250 years as a U.S. intellectual headquarters, and the opportunity for pleasant living. The Atlantic Ocean is a few miles away. The mountains are only a short drive. Nearby are many science-strong schools: Harvard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Tufts, Northeastern, and Boston University. Says M.I.T.'s Engineering Dean Gordon Brown: "To have a place where research-based companies can grow up, you must have a special climate where people are interested in ideas, where they meet to discuss them. These companies are started by people with an intellectual, venturesome spirit."

[1] Another: the San Francisco peninsula around Stanford University at Palo Alto.

OFF THE BLACKBOARD

Most 128 companies stress their academic bent. Their competitive advantage is sheer brainpower—a blackboard, chalk, and talent snatched from all across the United States. They attract many corporation scientists who want to do advance research at local universities—and then they jealously guard these recruits. Said one 128 president: "We don't let our chief scientist out of town without a duenna." At the same time, route 128 companies draw as part-time consultants the full-time professors and graduate students who want to put their ideas into action in industry (and to reap its rewards).

One of the first companies to utilize the area's resident brainpower is now big, well known and a darling of Wall Street: Polaroid. Edwin Herbert Land, 50, the founder-president who left Harvard to work on his first polarized light project in 1926 and later invented the Polaroid Land camera, actively cultivates an academic atmosphere in the plants. Every year he hires a few Smith or Wellesley girls for laboratory work, considers them a prime source of fresh ideas. Several have made notable contributions to Polaroid's quick photography. "Everyone," says Land, "whether he is a worker on the assembly line or a scientist in the lab, has some real urge and need for creative participation in industrial activity."

WEANING PROCESS

Another firm that leans heavily on the universities is Raytheon, the major missile-maker (Sparrow, Hawk), which was co-founded by M.I.T. scientist Vannevar Bush and is now bossed by Harvard-bred banker Charles Francis Adams (Time, June 23, 1958). Raytheon keeps 30 to 40 university consultants on tap for problems, pays them $75 to $100 a day. Some 128 consultants get up to $10,000 a year ("More than they earn by teaching," says one Raytheon executive).

Faculty boards have become reconciled to the fact that consulting jobs keep many valuable men and women at the university, while they otherwise might be tempted into industry. M.I.T., which stars in both pure and applied research (Dr. Bush developed the first electronic computers there in the 1930's), goes even farther: it feels a responsibility to pioneer techniques for industry. "We get a thing dry behind the ears and wean it," says M.I.T.'s Dean Brown. "Weaning means kicking it off the campus."

Among the companies weaned by M.I.T. and the other schools:

Ewen Knight Corp. grew out of the Harvard doctoral thesis of Harold Ewen. Working with Harvard's Nobel Prize-winning Physicist Edward Purcell (in 1952, for nuclear magnetic measurement), Ewen developed and built equipment to locate and trace hydrogen clouds several hundred thousand light-years distant from earth. This resulted in no less than a remapping of the solar system. With a fellow scientist's $1,000 and his own theories, Ewen started his company in 1952, turned out radiometers (receiving systems for radio telescopes), radio sextants, microwave components. Last year Ewen Knight chalked up $2 million in sales, expects $3,500,000 this year.

High Voltage Engineering Corp. sprang from wartime research by MIT Physicist Robert Van de Graaff, MIT Engineer John Trump, and British Engineer Denis M. Robinson. They started manufacturing Buck Rogers gear in a dreary Cambridge garage, moved to Route 128 in 1956. High Voltage now builds giant (three stories high) particle accelerators that can sterilize materials by firing a stream of electrons through them. The accelerators are also used for high-energy physics studies and for breaking down chromosomes to study their properties, may soon be used commercially to irradiate food

so that it will keep for years without refrigeration. High Voltage is also working with B. F. Goodrich Co. on ion-propulsion engines for spaceships. Its expected sales this year: $7 million.

Itek Corp. started when its president, a wartime aerial-reconnaissance expert named Richard Leghorn (MIT, 1939), borrowed $142,000 from Laurance Rockefeller to buy two science-heavy organizations after the defense-spending cutback hit research in 1957. With these two—Physical Research Laboratories of Boston University and cash-shy Vectron, Inc. (electronics)—Itek began with a well-shaped organization (more than 100 scientists) that would have taken years to build. Though most of its work is classified, and identified only as graphic retrieval, its stock soared from about $1.60 to $60 in a year, counting splits. Among other things, Itek (for "information technology") makes information-processing systems, works in photochemistry, electromechanics. Current sales: $30 million a year.

Farrington Manufacturing Co., a 56-year-old maker of display cases, is one of the older companies that changed course to catch the electronics boom, moved to 128. In 1929 Farrington devised the department stores' Charga-Plate, which gave it entry to two of the 1950s' hottest business areas—credit cards and automatic accounting systems. Four years ago Farrington moved into one of the highway's largest plants (354,000 sq. ft.), there prints credit cards (for Hilton, 35 oil companies, all the airlines), manufactures printed circuits. It also produces a remarkable machine: an electronic scanner that reads, then transmits the information it has read onto cards or tapes that can be used by IBM machines and other automated systems. Expected sales this year: $12 million.

Microwave Associates, Inc. is one of that majority of Route 128 companies that ring up the bulk of sales from products conceived just yesterday. Of Microwave's 400 electronic devices, 80 percent are less than 2 years old. To get some of them, energetic President Dana Atchley Jr., 41, played a favorite 128 game: capture the scientist. Last year Atchley heard that Bell Laboratories had developed a type of semiconductor called the varactor, which amplifies microwave frequency signals and does it with exceptionally low background noise. Atchley wooed one of the key developers of the varactor, Dr. Arthur Uhlir, with stock options and Route 128 living, built a scientific team around him, boosted sales to $6,500,000 a year. The varactor has accomplished some of the most advanced feats in space-age communications, and scientists are working toward using it as an oscillator that could speed up computers 1,000 times.

LURE OF THE OPTION

It is common for scientists to leave giant companies or great universities to join one of 128's spunky newcomers. The stock option holds a particular attraction, as does the chance to participate in some bold, new project at a decision-making level. "Smaller companies can offer participation which the big ones give only to top executives," says Microwave's Atchley.

Generous options and explosive growth have provided many a scientist with a chance to become independently wealthy for the first time in his life, have made millionaires out of some Route 128 scientists. Itek's president Leghorn, together with three other Itek executives, acquired 81,040 shares of the company for $136,880 during the past 2 years; now these shares are worth more than $3,200,000. Shares of other companies on 128 have also scooted up. Compared with their 1957 lows, Raytheon moved from 16⅜ to 57⅜ last week, Polaroid from 30 to 150½. High Voltage Engineering from 17 to 60. In 1959 alone, Microwave has zipped from 5 to 22, Farrington Manufacturing from about 12 to 74.

REMARKABLE OFFSPRING

These orbiting prices also smooth the road to merger. With the price of each share so high, a 128 firm can acquire another company by swapping only a comparatively small number of shares. Thus it can expand without great dilution of its stock. Merger partners are not scarce because many companies want a toehold on 128. "When you are in Boston," says one 128 executive, "your stock sells for around 10 times earnings. As soon as you move to the highway, these bankers cruising up and down discover you, and you're selling at 40 times earnings. That's almost enough to make you move right there."

Corporate marriages are not always happy, but they often produce remarkable offspring. One of the highway's first companies was Bomac Laboratories, Inc., which grew out of an engineering group at Sylvania and produced microwave tubes and devices (1958 sales: $10 million). When Bomac merged with Varian Associates this year, six key employees were piqued because they got less than 1 percent of the swapped stock; in April they stalked off with four others to form Metco (Microwave Electronic Tube Co.) and compete with their former employer. Within 9 days they had a plant in Salem, Mass., financing, firm contracts, and a production schedule calling for June deliveries of microwave tubes. "Within a year," predicts Founder Richard Broderick, former Bomac treasurer, "we'll have 100 employees. And in 3 years, we'll be back on the highway."

BUYING THE FUTURE

How long can 128's whiz kids keep up their phenomenal growth? The companies are heavily dependent on Government contracts, which can be cut back or canceled overnight. Their products often can be copied by competitors. Their financing can fall through if the stratospheric stock market ever tumbles or credit tightens. Their space-age industries can run into rugged shakeouts—just as most other industries have in the past. This means that only those with the wisest managers, the sharpest scientists, and the biggest bankrolls will come through. Even for those, the prices of the stocks are so high that investors are, in effect, paying on the basis of what a company will earn years hence.

Despite these potholes in the road, the bold adventurers on 128 say that the period of biggest growth is ahead. So many research-based companies were being formed around Boston last week that plans were afoot to build another highway, swinging out beyond 128, to accommodate them. The believers in space highway hold that when the climate produces ideas, growth is sure to follow.

Stop Flops Drop Crop Props

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the above title conveys my message.

Man Shall Not Live by Bread Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on June 7, my former senior colleague, and for 12 years a very successful Member of this body, delivered the baccalaureate address at the University of Utah. On June 25 I asked unanimous consent to have former Senator Watkins' address, entitled "Man Shall Not Live by Bread Alone," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The address apparently exceeds the limit of the amount of material which may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD without an estimate. I have discussed this subject with the Public Printer, and have ascertained that the address will occupy some two and a half pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $202.50.

Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN SHALL NOT LIVE BY BREAD ALONE

(By Arthur V. Watkins)

I have a very special reason for gratitude that you have honored me by your invitation to speak on this occasion. My beloved mother, who has passed on to her eternal reward, attended this institution in pioneer days. She always had a warm spot in her heart for this university, a feeling I have shared with her, as I have watched this institution grow and flourish in greatness and the power for good.

The theme I have chosen for discussion is so vast in its possibilities that the time allotted will permit a discussion of only a few of the highlights. However, I sincerely hope that I will be able to use this limited time to get across to you a message that will provoke some serious thinking and, I trust, some constructive action to follow.

My text is taken from St. Matthew:

"Then was Jesus led up of the spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. And when he had fasted 40 days and 40 nights, he was afterward an hungered. And when the tempter came to him, he said 'If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.' But he answered and said, 'It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God'." (Matthew 4: 1–4)

GREATEST HALF CENTURY IN HISTORY

Recently a friend told me with marked enthusiasm that he felt he had lived in one of the greatest half centuries of the world's history. "The great progress in the arts and sciences and in all material developments, during my lifetime," said he, "has been miraculous."

That this has been one of the most fabulous periods of the world's history is generally conceded. Man not only has taken giant strides in his conquest of the world we live in, but new worlds to conquer also are coming into view quicker than we ever dreamed could happen.

We are boring into the bowels of the earth and sending scientists down into the depths of the oceans in our quest for knowledge of our physical environment. At the same time we are probing the smallest forms of matter, and seeking to curb hurricanes and to modify the weather.

There is hardly a spot on this globe that man hasn't been on or over, and jet transports have shrunken the once vast globe on which we live. But that is not enough. Now we are seeking to free ourselves from the force which has held us captive to this earth and we are seriously training men to survive in orbit around our own planet and eventually to explore others.

In the almost unbelievable accomplishments in the material world of today we have living proof of what the Scriptures and our own modern philosophers have declared to be possible: "What man can imagine, he can do."

UNLIMITED OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH

To you—the youth of today—it scarcely need be said that many of these advances into the unknown are essentially by you and for you. We see the evidence of it everywhere. Not long ago I visited Adm. Hyman Rickover of atomic submarine fame in his laboratories and Navy quarters in Washington. When I had been introduced to members of his staff, I remarked to the admiral that they seemed to be very young men. "They are," he replied. "Most of them are 30 years and under. This is a field for youth. Very few others know much about it."

Yes, this is a world of opportunity—of almost incredible possibilities for progress. Would it not be wonderful if we could stay on this note of optimism? But as we speculate on the marvels of this age, we cannot ignore the overtones. We know that we cannot close our eyes to the fact that there is another side to the shiny mirror—one that should be so obvious that even the blind should see it.

It is one of the most ironical paradoxes of history that the age which has produced our greatest progress in the material world has also produced at the same time an environment and forces which threaten the complete destruction not only of all we have created, but of our possibilities of growth for the future. These destructive forces also threaten our very existence upon this planet.

THE COLD WAR BATTLE FOR SURVIVAL

Now we are engaged in a cold war, but, eventually, unless the Communists change their historic long-range objectives and present policies, we must either surrender to them or fight an all-out war.

In this connection it is important to note that many knowledgeable leaders in this country, in and out of Government, are firmly convinced that in our lifetime this world will become either all free or all Communist. They assert the Communist dictators are men in a hurry—that they were badly shaken by the events in Hungary—that they feel they must win before their captive populations become strong enough to overthrow their masters or weaken them so that they will be defeated by forces from without.

There are others who claim to know, who present a contrary view: That Communist nations will agree to coexist with other nations if we are but patient with them; that we are a strong Nation and can become stronger if we will just appropriate more and more billions of dollars for defense. The conclusion appears to be that if we spend enough billions, no one will dare attack us.

Small wonder then, that our people are badly confused and divided. Out of the fog of confusion of claims and counterclaims, it is now becoming clearer by the hour that the issue for civilization, for all of us—friend and foe alike—is one of survival—nothing less.

And it is becoming equally clear that peace—not peace at any price—but peace with honor and justice for all the inhabitants of the earth is an absolute must if the peoples of the world and civilization as we know it are to endure.

Strange, when you think of it, is another paradox of our times: The mad armament race of today is rapidly becoming an intolerable burden on the backs of the peoples of this earth. Yet, no one of any consequence—no responsible leader in that race, for East or West—can be found who will admit that he wants war or that he favors war as a solution to our present international controversies. On the contrary, everyone—including our enemies—claims that he is for peace.

Wars of the past, except World Wars I and II, have been essentially limited conflicts, not involving practically all nations armed with ultimate weapons, as probably would be the case in the event of a third world struggle. The grave questions are: Have the peoples of today come to the point where they must admit their complete inability to live together in harmony because no peace based upon freedom, justice, and equity can be agreed upon? Must it be conceded that ultimately fate must ring down the curtain on this planet in a quick series of searing, burning atomic, and hydrogen blasts that will leave a barren world in smoking ruins? And that following those blasts the very earth on which our race has trod will be so poisoned that it will be unfit for human habitation for generations to come? Is that to be our fate because we are frustrated in all our attempts to secure a just peace?

THERE IS A WAY TO PEACE

In spite of the pessimism and forebodings that have accompanied all of our international conferences with the Communist nations since the end of World War II—and of the conferences that are in process now—there are millions of people—I claim to be one of them—who sincerely believe that there is a way to peace, a way that has never yet been fairly tried by the inhabitants of this earth. This way to peace, they affirm, was embodied in Jesus' reply to the devil, the tempter, when the tempted Redeemer said these words: "It is written man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

This growing group of peace advocates further firmly believe that even in the event that an aggressive enemy, or uncontrollable circumstances, force us into a defensive war, that our ability to defend ourselves against all enemies will be multiplied manyfold if we do not rely exclusively on our economic strength and our armed might, but choose instead to rely, as well, on spiritual strength that comes from God to peoples who also sincerely do their best to live by the words of God as revealed in his commandments to mankind.

In addition to Jesus' own witness—set forth in my text—let me call as supporting witnesses a few outstanding men who have been our leaders in times of extreme stress and who know from firsthand experience what modern war means and what herculean efforts will be required to secure a just peace that will endure.

First let me call our World War I President Woodrow Wilson, one of our great Presidents. In a justly celebrated essay entitled "The Road Away From Revolution," President Wilson declared:

"The sum of the whole matter is this, that our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming permeated with the spirit of Christ and being made free and happy by the practices which spring out of that spirit. Only thus can discontent be driven out and all the shadows lifted from the road ahead.

"Here is the final challenge to our churches, to our political organizations, and to our capitalists, to everyone who fears God or loves his country."

CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP URGENTLY NEEDED

Ponder on this injunction, my friends, because it is a warning even more appropriate for the atomic age than it was when it was written. And please observe that President Wilson stated that our civilization "can be saved only by becoming permeated with the spirit of Christ and being made free and happy by the practices which spring out of that spirit." Note especially that mere lip service is not sufficient; the warning makes it clear and emphatic that the practices which the Christian spirit prompts are all important.

The next witness is Gen. Douglas MacArthur, field troop commander in three wars, and one of the great military strategists of all time. He certainly should be qualified as a special witness on war and peace.

A quarter of a century later than President Wilson's statement General MacArthur uttered this warning from the battleship *Missouri*, following the Japanese surrender in 1945:

"Men since the beginning of time have sought peace. Military alliances, balances of power, leagues of nations, all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. If we will not devise some greater and more equitable system Armageddon will be at our door. The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recredescence and improvement in human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advances in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the past 2,000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

Here, again, I ask you to note that the general placed emphasis upon the reform and improvement of human character.

The third witness is none other than one of the greatest field commanders of World War II, and now President of the United States—Dwight D. Eisenhower. He has been charged with the weighty responsibility of leading us in these perilous days of the cold war and the greatest arms race in world's history. Since he is our leader and since what he does and says by reason of that official leadership is of paramount importance to us all, should we not give serious considerations to his views on this subject?

If he were here physically as a witness, I would address to him this question: "What do you consider to be the principal issue of this contest between the free world and the Communist dictators who have set out to impose their ideology upon the world?"

As recorded in the Christmas issue of Life magazine, 1955, this probably would be his answer today:

"At issue is the true nature of man. Either man is the creature whom the Psalmist described as "little lower than the angels" or man is a soulless, animated machine."

This expression leaves little doubt that the President had in mind the familiar fundamental Judeo-Christian doctrine that man is a child of God and that this earth and all that is in it was created or organized for the benefit of man and that governments are for the aid and protection of man and not his master.

CONTRAST BETMEEN COMMUNISM AND CHRISTIANITY

Coupled with the Communist doctrinaire slogan, "Religion is the opiate of the people," a news item out of Russia in late 1958 fur-

nishes some rather dramatic support to the President's statement of the issue between communism and free nations of the West.

It is a statement of special interest to university students everywhere in the world, who at this time of year are receiving conventional academic honors. Note the contrast in Russia as described in a well-authenticated news report in "Dateline" which reads as follows:

"The official Soviet news agency, Tass, reports that a University of Atheism has been opened in Ashkhabad, capital of Soviet Turkmenistan. * * * The university is offering a * * * course in godlessness to further the spread of 'scientific-atheistic knowledge. * * * And according to the Manchester Guardian Weekly, the civic registrar in East Germany is issuing certificates to those cancelling their church affiliation. The possession of such certificates is compulsory for party officials, officers in the armed forces, students in teacher training colleges, and is now being demanded from teachers in schools and universities."

Now let us consider a further statement made by the President in the Life magazine article already referred to:

"Application of Christianity to everyday affairs is the only practical hope of the world. The result will be fresh vigor in the international effort to build a firm and just peace within the brotherhood of men under the fatherhood of God. Our forefathers proved that only a people strong in godliness is a people strong enough to overcome tyranny and make themselves and others free. Today it is ours to prove that our own faith, perpetually renewed, is equal to the challenge of today's tyrants. At issue is the true nature of man."

SPIRITUAL STRENGTH VERSUS ARMED MIGHT

The comparative worth of armed might with that of spiritual strength was discussed by President Eisenhower before a world religious gathering in Washington in 1954. Said the President:

"Because, my friends, though today we must remain strong, we must remain strong in all the economic and the scientific affairs of the world, we must remain strong militarily for the protection of our firesides and our rights to prevent domination by those who would seek to enthrall us, yet bullets and guns, and planes, and ships, all the weapons of war can produce no real or lasting peace.

"Only a great moral crusade, to determine that men shall rise above this conception of materialism—rise above it and live as people who attempt to express in some faint and feeble way their conceptions of what the Almighty would have us do, that is the force that will win through to victory, and the world will have prosperity and peace—prosperity beyond all imaginings of the past. And science will be developed and devoted to the happiness, the welfare of man, and not to his destruction, and all of us can live together peacefully and happily."

In deference to you shining young products of our academic system, I shall summon as my last witness one from the ranks of the learned men and women who courageously face the challenge of preparing you young people to grapple with today's tremendous problems.

This final witness is Dr. Laurence M. Gould, a distinguished scientist, educator, college president, and author. Dr. Gould has looked beyond the missiles and destructive weapons of the atomic age and found a greater threat to civilization in the heart, in the moral fiber of man himself. Said Dr. Gould:

"I do not believe the greatest threat to our future is from bombs or guided missiles. I don't think our civilization will die that way. I think it will die when we no longer care—when the spiritual forces that make us wish to be right and noble die in the hearts of men. Arnold Toynbee has pointed out that 19 of 21 notable civilizations have died from within and not by conquest from without. There were no bands playing and no flags waving when these civilizations decayed; it happened slowly in the quiet and the dark when no one was aware. * * *

"If America is to grow great, we must stop gagging at the word 'spiritual.' Our task is to rediscover and reassert our faith in the spiritual, nonutilitarian values on which American life has really rested from its beginning."

In other words, Dr. Gould puts in second place the threat of an all-out, world-searing nuclear war. A greater threat, he asserts, is that our civilization will die from within if we allow our moral, spiritual fibers to be destroyed by a false reliance on material, utilitarian values of the type that led to the physical decline and fall of 19 of the 21 great world civilizations.

SUCCUMBING TO INTERNAL WEAKNESS

I shall not call the roll of those civilizations which have succumbed to internal weaknesses. One example shall suffice. What has happened to the glories of ancient Rome? Is not the great Roman civilization just as dead, just as much a rubble heap as if it had been laid waste by a string of nuclear bombs? And what reduced the power, pomp, and glory of the great Roman Empire to a few ruins probed by archeologists or ogled by 20th century tourists: Well, it was not the invading barbarians from the North; they merely took over a dying civilization suffering from a fatal corruption and spiritual rot. And this is the kind of a national fate that Dr. Gould impliedly predicts for our civilization if we don't wake up and repent.

All this may be regarded as strong language for a graduation function, but I feel a heavy personal responsibility to speak out and warn you frankly how I feel about this matter. I do feel strongly about it and I agree most emphatically with Dr. Gould that we are in grave national danger from within as well as without. And I am sure there are millions of patriotic, forward-looking Americans who also fully agree with Dr. Gould.

There are three reasons why I don't mind discussing such a subject frankly with a graduating class. In the first place, young people today are far more tough-minded intellectually than we were in my day. Most of you have lived through a period marked by the greatest world war in history; a brutal blood-letting of American youth in Korea, and a decade of the most intensive and nerve-wracking cold war this world has ever seen. You are conditioned to wars and rumors of wars and destruction; hence, you can look at things realistically and take them in stride—I pay you that compliment.

Secondly, that in spite of the many things that drag us down and make us vulnerable to internal decay, America is one of the greatest Nations of history and has a record of altruism toward other nations without parallel. Millions of Americans who love freedom above life itself believe in their country's destiny as the leader of the free nations of the world and are willing to make almost any sacrifice to help her fulfill that destiny.

Thirdly, Dr. Gould's estimate was not a pessimistic one. He frankly recognized the awful danger facing us, but he coupled his forecast with a simple positive remedy that all of us can contribute to, if we have the will. Let us recall his words: "If America is to grow great, we must stop gagging at the word 'spiritual.' Our task is to rediscover and reassert our faith in the spiritual, nonutilitarian values on which American life has really rested from the beginning."

LIVING THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD

Well, how can one return to the spiritual, nonutilitarian values to which Dr. Gould referred? Simply, by sincerely living the Commandments of God and accepting a higher plane for the guidance of our own conduct—fundamental principles which guided the founders of this country and the framers of our basic charters of democratic government and sustained our people in the dark days of our history.

President Wilson was very positive that our civilization can survive materially only by becoming "permeated with the spirit of Christ and being made free and happy by the practices which spring out of that spirit."

What are these essential principles and practices? Well, time does not permit an inventory, but I am sure most of you learned them in your home, regardless of what your religious faith may be. The precepts of the Golden Rule, for example, are taught in virtually all great religions, and certainly no one would contend that general application of this practice would not vastly improve governmental and social relations here in this country, or in any other nation or nations.

And in spite of our vast gains in science and space technology, no one has ever repealed the Ten Commandments as a code for living. If we could all seriously strive as individuals and as a nation to observe these time-tested principles, transmitted to mankind by the spiritual leaders of the old Hebrew civilization, wouldn't the world be a greatly improved place to live in?

In fact, if we could only hearken to the two great spiritual commandments to man as outlined by Jesus Christ, the social and moral climate here in the United States and elsewhere would improve tremendously.

LOVE THY GOD AND THY NEIGHBOR

Said the Master: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.

"This is the first and greatest commandment. And the second is like unto it, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Just think of what a general application of this spiritual principle could do. Why it could end war itself.

Spiritual leaders for centuries have been valiantly trying to persuade their fellowmen to place such values above the material side of life, and in many cases it has been a losing fight. However, never before in history have we had the twin disasters of nuclear destruction and decay from within, staring our civilization bleakly in the face. Perhaps this awful prospect will generate a belated reformation and amplify the efforts of our spiritual and our national leaders to command the attention of a civilization hellbent for self-destruction unless it repents.

THE DIGNITY OF MAN

There is only one point, one major conclusion to this discussion. It is, simply stated, that you and I—young and old—all of us of the free world, should engage wholeheartedly in a great sustained crusade for moral reform and peace based upon the spiritual foundation of a belief in God and the dignity of man as a son of God, and practices—personal and governmental—that are consonant with such beliefs.

And this crusade should not in any way supplant the activities of our churches—but should be an aid, on a wide scale, to them in this global emergency—in the valiant efforts they are now making for righteousness and a lasting peace.

This is no impractical, visionary suggestion. Based on the fundamental principles I have just reviewed, it is the most practical, positive, urgently pressing thing we can do, and it is of special significance to young peo-

ple who are destined to man the ramparts of liberty and to take over the ships of state under the threat of the world-poisoning mushroom of the nuclear bomb. No graduating classes in my recollection ever went out into a world fraught with greater danger and faced with heavier social and moral problems, than those of 1959. Conversely, no group of young people ever faced a brighter future of technological and material progress if that overwhelming problem of peace and survival can be successfully resolved on a basis of freedom and justice for all mankind.

THE CHALLENGE TO YOUTH

This proposed moral, spiritual drive for strength that will secure and maintain a just peace has never been tried seriously on any large scale as a solution to this tremendous international problem. It, therefore, stands as a stimulating challenge to young, eager minds, trained and ready to carry their share of the burden of trying to solve the present ills and problems of mankind.

In a successful meeting of this challenge you would also help turn the tide against those forces from within which are a deadly threat to our civilization.

INTERNATIONAL SPIRITUAL CRUSADE

I cannot overemphasize the importance of President Eisenhower's repeated statements on this subject. Like President Wilson, he not only is a national leader, but also a widely respected world leader as well. Perhaps no one else in our times is more admirably suited to assume the leadership in such an international crusade—a crusade which he suggested. And I hope and pray that his present good health continues so that he can persevere in his efforts for world peace for many years after he leaves the office of President.

A recent issue of Life magazine reproduced excerpts from some of his private letters, and I was pleased to note that a letter dated November 28, 1958, showed that he was still considering the ways and means of launching such a spiritual crusade to strengthen our own country and the free world, if he can find the right occasion and forum.

"We have too much thought of bombs and machines and gadgets as the arsenal of our national and cultural strength," the President wrote. "Yet in the realm of their respect for spiritual values, all nations which are either philosophically or politically related to our own have a combined potential strength that is indestructible. The great problem is to get people—our own people and our friends—to understand these things and to think of them objectively and with a sense of inspiration and uplift."

It has been said there is nothing so volatile as an idea. And this is one of the most potentially powerful ideas we can explore and adopt.

So I earnestly beseech all of us here at this gathering to think seriously of this problem and to take steps individually and collectively to bring about some results in positive action toward a worldwide spiritual crusade that will bring and maintain peace based on freedom and good will toward all men.

The President, I am sure, and all other leaders of the free world engaged in the quest of a just peace, will appreciate your personal interest and counsel. And we can find, I am equally sure, considerable support among the oppressed peoples in the Communist countries.

THE FUTURE IS YOURS

If the movement flourishes and spreads, you young people will be the captains and the lieutenants in the ranks, just as you will be the core of our defense forces if peace efforts fail and the world succumbs to the terrible folly of war. This problem, of course, concerns us all, but you have the greatest stake in it, even if you are not responsible for getting us into this unhappy predicament. It is your future, your opportunity to build and to improve. Fortunately for all of us, youth is not dismayed by a challenge, and you have the energy, the trained minds, and the youthful enthusiasm and the will to contend with and to solve problems that your predecessors have wrestled with unsuccessfully.

May God bless you and inspire all of us to prodigious efforts, crowned by the rich fruits of success, as we respond to the challenge of building a better and more peaceful tomorrow.

Soviet Naval Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, at a time when so much of our national security concern is necessarily focused on the missile and space race, we must be careful not to overlook the very serious and ominous naval buildup of the Soviet Union.

Adm. James S. Russell, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, discussed the Russian naval buildup and its significance to the free world allies in an address to the National Convention of Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington last May.

In his remarks, Admiral Russell pointed out that in the relatively brief period since World War II, Russia has emerged with the world's second largest naval force. That fact in itself is alarming enough. But even more alarming has been their concentration on submarine development. Admiral Russell said the U.S.S.R. is now believed to have about 450 submarines—far more than this country has in service. In 1956 alone, Admiral Russell said, the Russians built more submarines than the U.S. fleet now has in active service.

Mr. President, Admiral Russell's speech is most informative and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SOVIET SEAPOWER

Address by Adm. James S. Russell, USN, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, before the delegates to the 46th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., Friday, May 15, 1959

The Soviet Navy is the least understood of the Soviet armed forces. This lack of appreciation of Soviet seapower and its implications is probably due to two things. First is the great secrecy with which the Soviets have cloaked their naval development in the postwar period. Except for occasional dark hints that the navy, too, is equipped with all modern weapons, Soviet propaganda has aided this secrecy by focusing attention in the field of missilery and aviation. The second reason concerns our traditional view of Russia as a land power rather than a naval power. The pattern of World War II gave us little appreciation for Russian seapower or its possible future trends.

At the end of World War II, Russia's intransigence and the unfolding of her inflexible adherence to the Communist doctrine caused a startled, divided, and rapidly disarming West to face about and unite in protection against this Frankenstein which had been a World War II ally.

The United States has joined with no less than 42 other nations in cooperaitve defense treaties. NATO, SEATO, ANZUS, and the RIO Pact of the Western Hemisphere are mutual defense organizations in which we have membership.

Place in your mind's eye a map of the world and note that these 42 free nations, who together make an impressive strength, lie overseas or draw power from the sea. These free nations can be described, quite properly, as the World Sea Confederation—a single body politic of the sea. At the center, the United States and Canada form the surging heart. Overseas to the east lie the sturdy limbs of our NATO allies, to the west ANZUS and SEATO, and south the RIO Pact members of South and Central America. Each nation by itself may be small in comparison to the Russian Bear in Eurasia, but, united in freedom, their combination is unmatched.

Joining together these farflung components of free world strength and giving life and being to the body politic are the arteries of the sea.

Now to Soviet leaders, truth stands out: if only they can cut these arteries, mortal damage may be done to the West. If the West loses the sea, it loses all.

In contrast to our Navy, the Russian Navy is heavily slanted toward submarines, and there is, of course, good reason for this. Russia has been impressed with the near successes in two World Wars of submarines as an implement useful to a continental power for cutting the seaborne life lines of belligerents who otherwise ruled the seas

Post World War II, Russia has engaged in a most impressive and significant naval building program. This program has provided her, today, the second largest navy in the world with approximately 28 cruisers, 150 destroyers, over 3,000 naval aircraft, and, significantly, about 450 submarines. This fleet reflects Russia's trend away from a continental outlook, and also her particular interest in the submersible weapons system.

No power in world history has ever had in peacetime as large a submarine force. Two-thirds of Russia's 450 submarines are new long-range ocean patrol types developed in the years after World War II with the aid of German submarine designers. Between 1950 and 1956 submarine construction increased each year, reaching a phenomenal peak in 1956 of about 100 submarines. This means that Soviet shipyards were turning out a completed submarine every 3rd or 4th day throughout the year—an impressive rate indicative of what the machinery of dictatorship can accomplish with its total control of government, industry, materials, facilities, and people whose standard of living can be depressed at will. Thus in the single year of 1956, Russian shipyards turned out about as many submarines as we have in service in the entire U.S. Fleet.

Suddenly this massive rate of production was cut off. In 1957 there was practically no submarine building. In 1958, however, production of a new long-range type was initiated, but at a much slower pace than before.

Quantitatively, we say expect the Soviet submarine fleet to remain at about its pres-

ent level; qualitatively, however, the threat to the free world will continue to grow as the older and smaller submarines are phased out of service and the number of new long-range types increases. These long-range submarines pose a threat not only to our vital traffic across the seas, but to our industrial centers as well, for the Soviets have the capability for arming these submarines with missiles and it must be assumed that some are already so equipped.

Although the U.S. Navy has a long lead in nuclear power, sooner or later nuclear power will appear in Soviet submarines and give them, too, that great tactical advantage which accrues when the ability to remain submerged indefinitely combines with high submerged speed. We must assume also that the Soviets are working on their own version of our Polaris submarine-launched ballistic missile. All of this gives an added dimension to seapower and poses a vastly increased danger from Russia's numerous underseas fleet.

Russia's Navy is modern. Eighty percent of all her combatant ships have been built since 1945, a degree of modernness in sharp contrast to the 20 percent of ours built during the same period.

Russia's Navy is beginning to show itself. Shortly after Stalin died, the Soviets relaxed the cloak of secrecy on their naval program to the extent of sending some of their ships abroad on goodwill visits. The loss of security by such visits has been minimized through sending the same classes of ship—a new cruiser and destroyer—on all subsequent visits. Visits have for the most part been to Scandinavian and Western European countries, but on one occasion—in the fall of 1957—to Latakia, Syria, as a demonstration of Soviet interest in the area.

The Soviets have a double purpose in making these visits. First, by showing first-class, impressive warships abroad they demonstrate their military strength which in turn facilitates diplomatic pressure and intimidation. Second, the crews of these Soviet ships are very carefully indoctrinated as to their behavior toward the local populace. Their purpose, of course, is to convince the inhabitants that there is nothing to fear from Russia, and that alliances such as NATO are plainly unnecessary.

A recent development is the announced Soviet decision to equip a number of submarines to do research in oceanography and on fishery problems. The first of these submarines is in service, and others will probably follow. Although their purpose may be primarily what the Soviets claim, their value for the collection of military intelligence is great.

Still another cold war activity of the Soviet Navy which aids political penetration, is the selling of Soviet warships to neutral nations. Egypt is the best example. Some Soviet destroyers, several submarines, and some smaller craft have already been turned over to Egypt. The Egyptians will have some trouble assimilating these warships and will depend heavily on Soviet technical assistance and training for some time to come. This, coupled with other Soviet military aid to Egypt, gives the Soviets a considerable influence in the military establishment of the United Arab Republic. The Soviets have offered naval vessels to other neutral countries, particularly in southeast Asia.

In Russia's past perfidy, her unwavering adherence to the concept of a worldwide dictatorship of Moscow controlled communism, and in Khrushchev's own words, "We will bury you," there is abundant evidence that Soviet Russia is in a ferment of expansionism. Her navy is designed to further her purpose at a time when to fulfill her ambitions she must turn more and more to the sea. Her navy exists as a direct threat to the free world's defensive alliances which depend upon the sea for their strength.

To meet this challenge at sea we must look to the strength of our Navy and to the efficiency and number of the ships which make up our merchant marine.

What does the future hold? Of one thing we can be sure, the pressure will continue. Those formerly free nations now within the Communist circle will be severely and savagely disciplined, as was Hungary and now Tibet, to insure that they make no deviation from the Communist doctrine. Outside the circle the Taiwans, the Lebanons, and the Berlins will occur at regular intervals. These crises are planned situations each in turn designed to test the free world alliances and the strength of democratic principles.

The vast Russian nation, the masses of whose people are being educated for the first time in history, will some day learn that Marx and Lenin, Stalin and Khrushchev, do not provide the answer to man's existence, but that the true revolution lies in the West where government serves rather than enslaves its people, where man is truly free and enjoys the highest standard of living in history. Meanwhile, we in the West must remain true to our innermost faith in the basic freedom of nations and individuals, and above all, we must not shrink from the burden of preserving the freedom of the seas without which the world cannot prosper.

Agribusiness Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the issue of June 15, 1959, of the Agribusiness Outlook be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the edition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRIBUSINESS OUTLOOK

Agribusiness industries—and not farmers—are the main beneficiaries of the agricultural mechanical revolution. This is due to the severe economic squeeze, whereby farmers absorb higher industrial and service costs but are not in a position to pass along their own increasing costs through higher farm prices.

A highly accredited independent analysis of the farm economic situation reveals that today, as contrasted to 10 years ago, farmers are absorbing in one way or another about $10 billion a year in higher costs of both the processor-handler and farm supply and service industries. (Based on Government statistics.)

Processors and handlers pass back about $4 billion a year increased costs in form of lower prices for farm commodities. Farm supply and service industries pass along another $4 to $5 billion increased costs in higher prices and increased sales—including higher wages and increased taxes both to business and employer.

Farmers, the figures show, could not finance rising costs from current income, so doubled their debt from $10 to $20 billion to to it.

There's strong evidence that farmers have been oversold on the economic benefits of more and better farm machinery and too-rapid expansion. For agriculture as a whole, increased mechanization simply isn't doing what it's supposed to do: Cut production costs and increase income.

Research, education, and farm programs have driven farmers into 5 million separate approaches to technological efficiency, rather than creating a common approach to economic efficiency or guiding them toward group market strength.

Here's what's happened in the 10-year 1947–57 period:

Farm production went up 18 percent but gross cash income held relatively steady at about $30 billion. At the same time, farm costs went up 28 percent. In other words, 18 percent more production gets him the same amount of cash income—but costs him 28 percent more.

Unit production costs have not been cut by mechanization. Out of each dollar of sales income, the farmer now has about 82 cents cash expenditure. This compares with 65 cents in base period 1947–49—and with 92 cents in the depression thirties.

Output per man-hour on the farm has increased 32 percent since 1948 but output per unit of farm machinery and motor vehicles has declined 40 percent.

Net inventory of farm machinery and motor vehicles has increased from $6.9 billion to $18 billion while livestock and crop inventories now are valued at slightly less than the $22 billion of 10 years ago.

Farm labor cost has declined only $220 million a year for 2 million less hired men, while depreciation on equipment (10 percent rate) went from $700 million to $1.7 billion a year; overall capital depreciation went from $1.6 to $4 billion.

Evidence shows it would take gross cash income of $40 billion-plus a year to keep farm income up with rising costs, compared with current average $30 billion.

Meanwhile, the farmer will continue on the technological treadmill—improved technology won't pay for itself—as long as the economic benefits are absorbed in increased costs of suppliers of equipment and materials, and production, marketing and transportation services. Or, until farmers can pass along their own rising costs through greater "bargaining power."

Increased consumption can't solve the agricultural surplus problem. That's the opinion of Lyle Bender, South Dakota extension economist, in a recent study of three consumption-boosting approaches to the problem.

Here's Bender's viewpoint on the three major consumption approaches:

Income approach: An example of this is the food stamp plan of the early 1940's, which also has backers in the present Congress. Bender points out that only about 18 percent of the population has family incomes less than $500 per person annually.

If every family under $500 per capita had their food raised to the same amount consumed by families in the $500–$700 income group, total food purchases in the United States would be boosted by 2.4 percent. This is far short of an 8 percent boost in consumption experts say would be required to help solve the surplus problem.

Price approach: Advocates believe people would eat more food if it were cheaper. This is the approach used by the present administration, Bender points out.

If all retail food prices were reduced 10 percent, Bender estimates total food consumption would increase only 2.1 percent, compared with the eight annual farm surplus.

"However," he emphasizes, "this 10 percent drop in retail price would probably mean a 20 to 25 percent decline in prices at the farm level."

Nutritional approach: This couldn't do the job either, he believes, since "we in the United States are pretty well fed." In 1955, fewer than 10 percent of the families had diets classified as poor, compared with 33 percent in the mid-1930's.

Nutritional deficiencies are not large, Bender says. "Some have argued that overeating is more of a nutritional problem than inadequate nutrition."

Surplus stocks underrated? This was suggested by Dr. Earl F. Crouse, president of the Farm Business Council, Urbana, at the National Plant Food Institute convention the other day. Crouse indicated that United States $9 billion investment in surplus commodities is worth more than generally conceded.

Declaring that subsidies have helped develop agriculture from "a horsepowered economy into an agribusiness economy," Crouse said the United States is faced with "the major public policy decision of how to properly finance food reserves for 180 million Americans."

"As big as our Government stocks appear to the casual observers," he said, "I do not think they are large by realistic standards of adequacy."

Red Chinese Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, we keep getting additional evidence of the failures of the experiments being undertaken by the Red Chinese. The most recent is a report of the findings of Dr. Sripati Chandrasekhar, Director of the Indian Institute for Population Studies at Madras, who visited mainland China in 1958.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release by the Joint—American and Nationalist Chinese—Commission on Rural Reconstruction.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAYS REDS QUIETLY DROP BALLYHOOED EXPERIMENTS

Many experiments widely publicized by the Communist regime in mainland China have been dropped quietly when they proved unworkable, said Dr. Sripati Chandrasekhar, Director of the Indian Institute for Population Studies at Madras, now visiting in Taiwan.

He cited deep plowing, irrigating with hot water to speed germination, and close spacing of crops. Birth control education also has been abandoned, he said, and the official line now seems to encourage population increase.

Dr. Chandrasekhar will make a public address at National Taiwan University, Tuesday morning. He is in Taiwan for a week to study progress in economic development and education as a guest of the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction.

Dr. Chandrasekhar pointed out that population increase on the mainland may be controlled, however, through systems that keep husbands and wives separated because they are employed at separate jobs, or even in separate cities. He discounted the reports, which he said were widely repeated in the United States, that husbands and wives were forced to live apart in communes as a birth-control measure.

The Indian population expert was in mainland China for 8 weeks late in 1958. He said he found in many areas that children and old people have been moved out of family homes and other married couples have been brought in to occupy the rooms they vacated. In nursery homes run by the state the children seem well fed, he commented, and invariably sang Communist songs when a visitor appeared. "They are being raised as robots," Dr. Chandrasekhar said.

Old people are encouraged to do light work in the old people's homes. Dr. Chandrasekhar disbelieves reports that family houses have been pulled down when people were forced into communes. But the family system has been destroyed by Communist practices, he said.

While deep plowing has been abandoned, deep burials are being practiced to avoid using valuable land as cemeteries, he reported. Graves are dug 15 feet deep, and orchard trees are planted on them so that the land remains in production.

In Hangchow, he said, a large cemetery has been made into a park.

He told of visiting the commune of the 16 guarantees north of Chengchow. The guarantees include everything from free marriages to free burials. Dr. Chandrasekhar termed this commune a sort of zoological garden.

People in the cities fare better than those in the country, in his opinion. "The poverty of the old days is gone, but the big show of improvement is in the cities," he said. "The villages are not changed much, except that they are swept clean." He told of an active Communist campaign against spitting in public.

The Red claim of a population of 600 million is probably fairly accurate, Dr. Chandrasekhar said, since it was based on registration of voters, and everyone was required to vote. He was told that 20 million people have been moved from the southeast to the northwest of China. But the Reds have given up trying to depopulate the city of Shanghai. According to Communist statistics the birth rate is now 37 per 1,000 and the death rate 17 per 1,000. Population increased 24 million last year, it is believed.

The best schools and colleges are limited to trusted and loyal Communists, he found. In charge of universities and similar institutions are Communist Party leaders who may have no qualifications for the post they hold.

Many women now hold jobs, draw wages, get divorces and pursue professional careers, Dr. Chandrasekhar said, and thought that they were in favor of the marriage regulations now in practice.

But most person relationships have changed, he said, and few people have friends any more. "There is only Big Brother."

H.R. 7645—Public Buildings Act of 1959

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support H.R. 7645, the Public Buildings Act of 1959. I believe it is necessary and worthwhile legislation. It is a bill which when enacted into law will go a long way toward getting underway throughout the Nation a very necessary program of Federal building construction.

The history of the building construction program in this country from 1902 up to date discloses that there has been only one basic law placed on the books for overall Government building construction. That is the Public Buildings Act of 1926. H.R. 7645 is the first basic and fundamental change to be presented to the Congress since the enactment of the 1926 act. It contains the best features of the 1926 act and adds as well those features which through the years have proved to be workable ones in the development of a sound public building program. It places the authority for public building construction squarely where it belongs, in the hands of the Administrator of General Services. It gives to the Congress the necessary control for a coordinated public building program. It is a bill which was unanimously reported by the House Committee on Public Works, of which I am a member. It has been carefully worked out over a long period of time.

In my opinion, this is one piece of legislation that should be enacted into law during this session of the Congress. As I have stated before, here is a bill that contains the best features of the previous public building laws, adds new features that will further enhance the program and will, when enacted, finally bring about the implementation of a much needed building program. I am happy to support this bill.

Private War on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, since there has been considerable interest manifested in the article "Private War on Communism" published in the June issue of the New Age, the magazine of the Supreme Council 33°, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, southern jurisdiction, United States of America, which had picked it up from the American Mercury magazine, I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it might be more widely available:

PRIVATE WAR ON COMMUNISM
(Hon. B. CARROLL REECE, 32°)

In the late 1920's an ordinary debate in the Czechoslovakian Parliament degenerated into a near riot. The Communist leaders jeered at their opponents, refused to listen to any proposal other than their own, and indulged in wholesale violence as a means of intimidation.

An anti-Communist, meeting Klement Gottwald, Communist leader, outside the hall, asked: "Just what do you Communists really want, anyway? Why are you always so embittered and unreasonable? Why are you against everything and why do you refuse to compromise on even the least im-

portant matters?" Then, before the belligerent Gottwald could reply, the anti-Communist threw the $64 question at him. "What," he demanded, "would you do if you were in the majority instead of being in the minority?"

Gottwald had the answer for that one. "When we take power," he snarled, "we shall hang you, you scoundrel."

The anti-Communist was stunned. "Surely you don't mean that?"

"I mean precisely that," Gottwald threatened. "We intend to hang all you bourgeoisie and bloodsuckers."

The rest of the story is history. Twenty years later the Communists seized power in Czechoslovakia, rounded up their enemies, and rushed them off to concentration camps. Thousands of them—labor leaders, army officers, businessmen, and intellectuals—have not been heard of to this day. Presumably they were murdered on the ground that they were bourgeoisie and bloodsuckers. That is communism in action.

"But," thousands of well-meaning Americans will tell you, "that could never happen in America. The American Communist is a different brand. He could never resort to such methods."

What do the Communists themselves have to say on this subject? Perhaps William Z. Foster is as definite an example as we can cite. In his book "Toward Soviet America," he answers this question with such frankness that event the dullest-witted do-gooder cannot fail to comprehend its full significance:

"The American revolution, when the workers have finally seized power, will develop even more swiftly in all of its phases than has the Russian revolution. This is because in the United States objective conditions are more ripe for revolution than they were in old Russia."

But Foster did not stop at that. He added:

"All capitalist parties—Republican, Democrat, Progressive, Socialist, etc.—will be liquidated—the Communist Party functioning alone as the party of the toiling masses."

Does that have a familiar ring? Does it bear a close resemblance to Clement Gottwald's threat to the anti-Communists in Czechoslovakia? This is the Communists' plan. It is the blueprint to be followed when the day comes for them to take over America. "When we take power," you can almost hear the Communists snarl, "we intend to hang you bourgeoisie and bloodsuckers."

What can you—the ordinary man or woman in the street—do about this threat? First, you must realize that merely being "against communism" is not enough. You must do better than that if you are to become a vital force in saving America from the fate of Czechoslovakia. What shall you do? Here are a few suggestions which should be helpful:

1. UNDERSTAND THE SUBJECT

The American Bar Association in its "Brief on Communism" says:

"There is widespread ignorance and confusion throughout the United States concerning the nature of communism and the objects and purposes of those people in this country and elsewhere who embrace and follow Communist teachings."

In order that you may be certain of your facts, you must read authoritative publications regarding communism, i.e., the American Legion magazine, National Republic, Reader's Digest and the Saturday Evening Post and a few other periodicals which publish objective articles on this important subject.

You should listen to statesmen fired with patriotic zeal, read the publications of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Internal Security, and other congressional organizations which are engaging in this all-out struggle against communism, the battle of the century.

In your reading you will learn that Communists and their vast corps of secret allies are tireless missionaries. They never waste their effort trying to convince or convert each other, but are continually working to seduce and subvert outsiders.

This gives you a valuable cue: Become an equally fervent and tireless missionary for Americanism. Never let a day pass but what you attempt to persuade those who seem less dedicated than you to the American way of life. You will do this by sharing with others the information you have obtained—the tragedies of communism, the glories of Americanism.

2. BE AN EFFECTIVE CITIZEN

Just what does this entail? These things: Take an active and intelligent interest in your local civic, State, and national affairs. Follow your State's legislative and congressional activities. Remember, you are a free citizen of a Republic—not a helpless subject of an all-powerful state. Act the part.

3. BE AN OPINIONMAKER

You will find the Communists and their secret allies have infiltrated every strata of our society—PTA, powerful national organizations, and even some churches. The comrades may have their representatives in your lodge, community, and even in your small local clubs. These people try to direct the activities of every group. They offer suggestions, persist in their opinions, and absolutely refuse to compromise. There is but one way to deal with them. Refuse to agree with them in any detail whatsoever. See to it that you, and others who are thoroughly American, make the opinions, rules, and regulations of your lodge, church, and community.

4. EXPOSE COMMUNISTS

The thing which Communists fear most is exposure. This is because it isolates them from the rest of the population. And isolation, the Communists know full well, means death to their most effective weapon—the fifth column.

"How," you ask, "can the ordinary man in the street do this?"

The process is simple. It consists of two steps: First, recognition that one is a Communist; second, leading others to that realization. It is relatively easy for one to learn the ingredients of communism. He then is in a position to decide that a given individual is, or is not, composed of those elements.

But step two is more difficult. Here is the way the astute citizen proceeds in this aspect of fighting communism:

"Never say," counsels a noted authority on this subject, "that one is a Communist. Instead, cite evidence which will lead others to the inevitable conclusion." He illustrates thus:

"If I point to a two-legged befeathered waterfowl the size and shape of a duck and call attention to its webbed feet, to the fact that it quacks like a duck, that it swims like a duck and eats like a duck and associates with ducks, the average, fair-minded American will conclude that the waterfowl is a duck."

That is an effective way of operating. It enables the other fellow to come to his own conclusion. Your job is to supply the evidence. There is no better way of exposing Communists.

5. ATTEND AND SUPPORT YOUR CHURCH

It is generally known that Communists are frantically and militantly atheistic. "We Communists," Earl Browder has said, "do not distinguish between good and bad religions because we think they are all bad."

"Is there," you ask in complete sincerity, "really a danger that some churches are helping communism?"

J. Edgar Hoover, 33°, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, has this to say on the subject:

"I confess to a real apprehension so long as Communists are able to secure ministers of the Gospel to promote their evil work and espouse a cause that is alien to the religion of Christ and Judaism."

In other words, even among the clergy, you will find individuals who, knowingly or not, are working for communism. Your job, then, as a disciple of Americanism, is to identify these subversives no matter who or where they may be and to expose them.

How?

By applying the very same principles to your church-going acquaintances that you apply to your office colleagues, lodge brothers, neighbors. The fact that one is a church member—or an official in the church—certainly is no guarantee that he is an American. In fact, some of the most dangerous Communists in this country are respected members of various churches. To say that they are wolves in sheep's clothing is a gross understatement.

6. EXAMINE YOUR SCHOOLS

"Give us the child for 8 years," Lenin announced years ago, "and it will be a Bolshevik forever." To that end the Communists have planned for your child in the name of education.

"They mean to take him from the nursery, put him in uniform with the hammer and sickle flag in one hand, a gun in the other, and send him out to conquer the world," reports the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

"If they have their way, he will be guided from the kindergarten straight through college so that he will have anything except a mind of his own.

"He will be trained but not educated. He will be taught to solve problems that are handed to him and to consider it a crime to think for himself. He will be the child-man of communism."

The alarming thing is that this is happening in some elementary and secondary schools, in our colleges and universities Some of the most effective Communists in this country have been teachers.

What can you do about this?

Plenty. Simply apply the same yardstick to the schools and teachers that you used with others. Things equal to the same thing are equal to each other.

Learn what the schools are saying regarding history, economics, social welfare. What do the teachers say about international communism? Do they see it as a real threat or as a fad that amounts to but little? What do these same teachers have to say about Americanism? Is it an outdated philosophy of government or something to be prized above all else?

If you find that a teacher is selling America short, expose him. It is a part of an American teacher's duty, especially today, to instill in the pupil's mind a deep American way of life. Any teacher who fails to do that bears the closest scrutiny tag.

7. PREACH AMERICANISM

It is true that you are but one person. You may feel that you are not too important. And consequently, you may think that there is little you can do, personally, to fight communism. However, you must remember that no matter who or what you are, you are free to take an individual stand on this subject. You can make sure that, every day, through your words and actions, you preach Americanism. And there are more than 160 million people in the United States today. In view of these facts, can there be any doubt but what you and you are a tremendous force?

To adopt this attitude does not mean that you will indulge in a continual flag-waving act. But it does mean that, in your contacts with colleagues in the office, lodge, church, union, and community, you will unwaveringly advocate the principles of free speech and religious freedom, of free enterprise and free elections, equality, justice, trial by jury, and majority rule.

These are the ingredients of Americanism. These are the elements which communism would destroy and Americanism must preserve. Your role in this drama can hardly be overestimated. You, really, are the very keystone of Americanism.

Here, then, is a statement of what you, the individual, can do in this world-shaking struggle between international communism and Americanism. Here are the principles, the steps which you must take if you wish to become an effective soldier in the greatest conflict the world has known. Here, in short, is the blueprint for your private war on communism. See that you use it well.

Nightmares Over Sewage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Rocky Mountain News in the eighth of its series of articles on sewage in Metropolitan Denver, published June 28, describes the complexity and magnitude of the problem.

Reporter Bill Miller refers to bad dreams where the problem is not yet critical, to nightmares where things are already beyond control. Local officials quite apparently are not keeping up with the rapid population growth, as several dozen separate sewer districts go their own way in attacking the problem.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, this article, like others in the News series, deserves publication in the RECORD, so I ask that it be printed there as a representative picture of what many metropolitan areas are up against.

The present Federal law discourages cooperation between areas. The Blatnik bill, H.R. 3610, already approved by the House, is needed to encourage cooperation in metropolitan areas.

The article follows:

[From the Rocky Mountain News, June 28, 1959]

SEWAGE PROBLEMS EXPANDING

(By Bill Miller)

Sewage problems in the Denver Metropolitan area are not confined to Denver and the Clear Creek area.

In their 1957 study, Black & Veatch, Kansas City consulting engineers, surveyed existing sanitary authorities and facilities in a vast area stretching from Golden to Buckley Field and from Castle Rock to Brighton.

This design area, covering all or parts of five counties, comprises 364,000 acres.

The population explosion in this area has been cited as the main cause of sewage and stream pollution problems.

This remains true even though only an estimated 91,000 acres, or 25 percent, are developed for urban use.

Denver and Clear Creek problems were discussed in previous articles.

SERVED BY DENVER

A substantial portion of the area west of and tributary to Denver already is served by Denver. Sanderson, Weir, and Lakewood gulches drain this area which includes 11 sanitation districts, several communities and subdivisions, and Federal agencies.

These, with a 1956 estimated population of 40,500, include: Mountain View, Pearson Woodside, Olinger Gardens, part of Wheat Ridge, Edgewater, East Jefferson County Sewer Association, Jewish Consumptive Relief Society, Mountain Sanitation District, Lakewood Sanitation District, East Lakewood Sanitation District, South Lakewood Sanitation District, Federal Center, West Lakewood Sanitation District, Highland Park Sanitation District, Green Mountain Park Sanitation District, Green Mountain Heights Sanitation District, some 140 miscellaneous connections generally southwest not affiliated with any district, Alameda Sanitation District, South Sheridan Sanitation District, and 320 connections, unaffiliated with any district, along Sheridan Boulevard.

Southeast of Denver, three sanitation districts, Holly Hills, Hi-Lin and Scenic View, with a combined population of 1,400 are served by Denver.

Eight percent of the total area, according to Black & Veatch, is utilized by various State and Federal Government agencies while the balance is either used for agricultural purposes or a land unsuited for development.

The adhesive which binds this entire area together is the Platte River. All drainage, streams, creeks, and minor watercourses wind up in this river.

WATERSHEDS

"Since the customary collection of sewage is by gravity, the various systems of sewage collection and treatment in any area generally are separated by watersheds," Black & Veatch said.

"The wastes from the various treatment works are discharged to the main stream, or its tributaries, within each watershed and consequently the effects of such discharge also are separated and defined by these watersheds."

The Black & Veatch study, prepared for the Inter-County Regional Planning Commission, designated these eight watersheds in the metropolitan area: City and county of Denver; South Platte River (north of Denver, including Brighton); Clear Creek; area west of and tributary to Denver; Bear Creek, South Platte River; Cherry Creek, and Sand Creek.

As has been pointed out, Denver's north and east side plants are inadequate. Both need secondary treatment units to bring effluent treatment up to State department of public health standards.

In addition, the Berkeley sewer main of Denver serves 600 connections in Adams County.

Up until 1954, when Englewood built its own plant, Denver also served 26,000 residents there.

In the Bear Creek watershed, there are several existing sewage treatment facilities.

First, a trunk sewer connected to the Denver system extends along Bear Creek almost to Sheridan Boulevard. It has capacity to serve approximately 46,000 persons in the Bear Creek Valley, in addition to the Denver and College View areas it drains.

NEEDS MORE UNITS

The Federal Correctional Institution has its own treatment plant but, according to Black & Veatch, it needs secondary treatment units.

The Colorado Industiral School for Girls and Fort Logan have their own treatment facilities and they are adequate.

Loretto Heights College, the town of Sheridan and Morrison all have septic tank disposal systems.

The State health department has recommended addition of secondary treatment units to existing facilities at Loretto Heights.

Morrison, where the population has been fairly stable, has no problem unless its population should increase rapidly.

Sheridan, which last October approved a $250,000 sanitation bond issue, is involved in litigation about whether to connect with Denver or Englewood sewage treatment facilities. The bond issue money is to be used to install sewage lines.

South of Denver, along the South Platte River, the key communities are Englewood and Littleton.

Englewood provides complete treatment of sewage for its residents as well as for Brookridge Heights Water and Sanitation District, an area along Santa Fe Drive, Cherry Hills Heights Sanitation District and the South Englewood Sanitation District.

OVERLOAD POSSIBLE

While treatment now is adequate the population boom expected in this area within a few years could overload the plant.

Littleton's plant, according to the 1957 Black & Veatch report, is overloaded.

The two communities recently held several meetings in an attempt to consolidate sewage treatment. But the attempt fell by the wayside and each community is now going its separate way.

The Martin plant has its own complete treatment facilities which according to the State Health Department, are doing an adequate job.

Cherry Hills Village, Greenwood Village and Bow Mar residents have individual septic tanks. So long as the population remains fairly small in these individual areas—and it probably will because of restrictive zoning—the needs of the people are being met.

Castle Rock, however, has a community septic tank from which effluent flows into a series of four lagoons. Sludge from the septic tank is drawn into two drying beds and the residue is used for crop fertilizer. Sanitation experts have advised city officials to construct a raw sewage lagoon system at an estimated cost of $200,000 plus.

The Cherry Creek watershed includes more than 30,000 acres of land but only one incorporated community, the tiny town of Glendale. The two water and sanitation districts, Holly Hills and Hi-Lin, utilize the Denver sewer system.

GLENDALE SITUATION

Glendale, with 150 residents and 80 registered voters, plans to construct a sewage plant along Cherry Creek.

The Tri-County and State Health departments have discouraged the construction. Denver opposes it violently.

In the Sand Creek drainage basin east of the Platte, there are 26,000 acres of land. Included in the basin are Aurora, Fitzsimons Hospital, Altura Sanitation District, part of Rocky Mountain Arsenal and part of Buckley Field.

Buckley has a complete plant which, with minor additions, would be capable of treating sewage wastes from a population of approximately 36,000. But Buckley is scheduled to be abandoned by the Navy. Its future status is unknown.[1]

Fitzsimons has a complete treatment plant that is adequate for a population of 5,000. Effluent is discharged to Toll Gate Creek, a tributary of Sand Creek.

The Altura Sanitation District, which serves a population of 2,500 living near the east boundary of Stapleton Field, has an adequate but heavily loaded lagoon system.

AURORA PLANT OK

Lagoon systems, according to health authorities, adequately serve small population areas so long as land costs are not too high.

---

[1] It has since been transferred to the Air National Guard.

In this system, shallow lakes are built and sewage is drained into the lakes. Algae, which live on sewage, dispose of wastes.

Aurora has a complete treatment plant, built in 1952, that is nearing its population capacity. In 1957 Black & Veatch estimated the plant could treat sewage for a population of 33,000. The city's population now is estimated at 40,000.

In the past, the city has considered additional plants but Black & Veatch warned such coonstruction may lead to further complications and problems like those in other metropolitan areas.

In the drainage area north of Denver there are the three incorporated communities of Brighton, Thornton, and Commerce Town, the Rocky Mountain Arsenal and the South Adams County Sanitation District.

Brighton sewage does not have much effect on the Metropolitan Denver area. Brighton's disposal plant is adequate and its effluent is carried northward by the South Platte, away from heavily populated areas.

Commerce Town, a highly industrialized area north of Denver, is served by the South Adams County Sanitation District which has a complete treatment plant near the confluence of Clear Creek and the Platte.

Thornton is served by a complete treatment plant, built in 1953 and owned by the Northwest Utility Co. The plant had a population capacity of 5,500, was enlarged, but again is reaching the overloaded stage.

Rocky Mountain Arsenal and its sewage disposal facilities are the center of a scheduled Government investigation. Representative BYRON L. JOHNSON has charged that Army Chemical Corps operations at the arsenal have contaminated underground water in a 5-mile strip of Adams County and have threatened Brighton's water supply.

ARSENAL REPORT

Black & Veatch gave the arsenal's sewage treatment facilities a favorable report since the complete treatment available was adequate for a population of 6,000 and it was serving only an estimated 375 persons.

Thus, around the Denver Metropolitan area, the treatment of sewage ranges from extremely bad to fairly good.

Where the problem is not critical, increasing population portends bad dreams for harassed city officials.

Where the problem already is critical, increasing population causes nightmares.

Statement of Louis Ratzesberger, Jr., for the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, Before the House Committee on Agriculture, July 2, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of a personal friend of mine, Louis Ratzesberger, Jr., before the House Committee on Agriculture on July 2.

Mr. Ratzesberger is president of the Illinois Canning Co. and immediate past president of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce.

He is thoroughly familiar with agricultural problems, and I think his statement before the committee merits special attention on the part of every Member of Congress:

My name is Louis Ratzesberger, Jr. I am president of the Illinois Canning Co., Hoopeston. I am immediate past president of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce and a member of its board of directors and agriculture-business relations committee.

This statement is presented on behalf of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, a statewide business organization with more than 16,000 members in over 400 communities in all parts of the State.

The Illinois State Chamber's 93-man agriculture-business relations committee has for 16 years worked with farm people throughout the State to bring about a better understanding of problems of mutual concern to agriculture and business. In the course of these efforts, the importance of a sound agriculture to the economy of our State and Nation has become readily apparent. The recommendations discussed in this statement were formulated as an outgrowth of this close association with the farm leadership in Illinois on a State and local level. The program outlined here offers no easy way out of our present dilemma—it presents an opportunity for lasting strength under our private enterprise system.

You may wonder why a business organization should show so much interest in Federal farm policy. Actually, the answer is simple. We believe the farm situation is one of the most pressing domestic problems facing our Nation today. It affects all our residents, rural and urban alike. Additionally, its international implications are becoming increasingly more serious almost daily. With Illinois business so dependent on a strong farm economy, we anxiously view present surpluses, skyrocketing costs of farm programs and increasing bureaucracy in agriculture as serious threats to the future stability of farm income.

We do not feel capable or feel the necessity of placing the blame for our present problems in agriculture. Current difficulties have developed over a 40-year period and have been affected by prosperity, depression and recession, three wars, a wide variety of growing conditions, tremendous advances in farming techniques and technology, international competition, political considerations, and other factors.

While it is not possible to place the blame for the present situation on any one source, the responsibility for finding a way out of this quandary lies clearly in the hands of Congress. A large share of the burden of leadership needed to bring an end to these wasteful, ineffective, and largely unneeded farm programs must necessarily rest on the shoulders of members of this committee. We urge you to report out to the floor of the House a bill which will squarely attack these problems. Our statement today is designed to give you our views on a course of action we sincerely believe is the most desirable one to follow in drafting this measure.

NEED FOR ACTION

The following facts about the situation illustrate the need for prompt action:

The latest totals of Government-held farm surplus commodities amount to $8.9 billion—just below the all-time high figure registered earlier this year.

We are currently saddled with a surplus of wheat in Government hands large enough to meet all needs for over 16 months and which is costing more than $700,000 a day to store. An estimated 100 million bushels of wheat will be added to present hordes again this year.

The corn situation is little better. We have nearly $2.5 billion worth of Government surplus corn stored around the Nation. All indications point to further additions to surplus stocks of this commodity later this year.

The outlay for all price support activity and U.S. Department of Agriculture services is expected to total $7.3 billion for the fiscal year just ended. Admittedly, some of this expenditure is for the traditional regulatory, research, educational, inspection and similar functions performed for the benefit of all our citizens by the Department of Agriculture. Most of it, however, was spent for price stabilization efforts. Although some of this outlay will be recovered, the percentage lost is great and it represents a heavy investment of Government funds.

The number of persons employed by the USDA amounted to over 88,500 during December 1958. A large proportion of these employees was engaged in farm price support and soil conservation programs. More people are employed by the Department of Agriculture than any other Federal Government agency except the Post Office and Defense Departments. In Illinois alone we have over 1,000 full-time and 6,000 part-time employees working under the auspices of the State and local ASC offices to supervise soil conservation and price stabilization programs.

On the international trade scene we currently subsidize every pound of cotton or bushel of wheat exported from the United States. Experience with cotton exports shows that Government cannot tinker with the price mechanism without seriously disrupting normal marketing processes. Too-high support prices for cotton retarded sales in foreign markets and stimulated production of substitutes at home and abroad.

INDICTMENTS OF PRESENT PROGRAMS

With these comments in mind, we make the following indictments of present programs:

While defended on the basis that they aid the little farmer, price support programs actually provide very little assistance to him because they are based on output. The small farmer who produces little obviously benefits in equally small measure from this price support effort.

Price supports are based on archaic, unrealistic concepts. By use of the parity formula, we have attempted by Government edict to keep a dynamic agriculture harnessed to an economic relationship which existed half a century ago.

Price supports have failed to take cognizance of the fact that price does have a function. It is no secret in Illinois, for instance, that high price supports have encouraged farmers to farm their land more intensively and concentrate their production on crops already in surplus supply. Lower support prices for corn and wheat in recent years would not have encouraged the widespread increase in acreage planted to these crops outside their traditional growing areas. Price supports held at high levels by Government must bear a large share of the responsibility for chasing acreage around the country.

Price supports are far too costly. When USDA expenditures this year amount to an average of $1,500 for every farm in the Nation, represent 9 cents out of every Federal tax dollar, and are equivalent to 56 percent of net farm income, it would seem abundantly clear that we are going too far. Yes; we know that some of the price support money will be recovered and not all the Government farm expenditures are for price stabilization purposes. Acknowledging this, we insist that the cost is still far too high.

Legislation now on the books directly conflicts with other legislation designed to stabilize farm prices and renders them partially ineffective. For example, agricul-

tural conservation program payments to farmers for lime and phosphate add to output of commodities already in surplus supply. In Illinois, over 80 percent of A.C.P. payments have been used for this purpose. Thus we find government subsidizing production while at the same time trying to restrict production with acreage and marketing controls and the soil bank. This practice makes as much sense as pushing the gas pedal of your car to the floorboard at the same time you are applying the brakes.

Farmers face the very real prospect of having an abrupt end written to all farm price stabilization legislation if public indignation suddenly becomes aroused at the waste entailed in present programs. The lesson provided by the potato farmers' experience a decade ago should give us a clear indication of what we can expect if the present farm program is not radically altered. The handwriting is on the wall for all to see. I predict that unless the course of Federal farm price stabilization efforts is not radically changed, the growing disgust and anger of the general public over this waste of tax funds will be translated into Congressional action far more painful than the medicine the Illinois State Chamber is prescribing today.

Farmers, once a bulwark of our free enterprise system, are on the verge of being the most regulated of all businessmen because of a program set up to help them. The longer present programs are continued, the greater the restrictions which must be imposed on their right to run their farms in order to keep the entire house of cards from tumbling down. We see restrictions in one area of production resulting in expansion of others with considerable disturbance of long-established, efficient growing patterns as an undesirable consequence.

Planting restrictions are repugnant to our democratic way of life and will never be imposed to the degree needed to be effective because of the political implications of doing so. Besides, control of acreage planted to a few crops is not enough—rigid control of every acre of farmland in the country would be necessary to insure that American farmers are adequately shackled. The amount of fertilizer, new crop varieties and hybrids, fungicides, insecticides, and pesticides, irrigation, and even the brains applied to specific farm operations would also have to be carefully rationed to make the restrictions effective. I question whether this Congress or any other Congress will wish to go this far.

Although not connected with price support programs as such, subsidies of REA loans are, nevertheless, illustrative of unneeded and unrealistic Government efforts to aid agriculture. These loans are made at approximately half the interest the Federal Government pays to secure the money originally. This is done in spite of the fact that (1) 96 percent of the Nation's farms now have electricity; (2) half of REA power goes to nonfarmers; (3) 75 percent of all new REA customers are municipalities, industries, and suburban residents; and (4) cooperatives are not in shaky financial condition and private sources have money available for loans to them.

A POSITIVE PRACTICAL PROGRAM

In order for the position of the Illinois State Camber of Commerce to be made crystal clear, I emphasize this point: We do not recommend "pulling the rug out from under agriculture." We do recommend, however, immediately taking the steps necessary to (1) redirect the intent and means employed in the Federal farm program toward reestablishing a free market economy for agriculture over a period of time; (2) provide the means to ease the impact of this shift on farmers; and (3) stop Government programs contributing further to the already serious problems of agriculture.

I can point to the following two examples to indicate the practicality of the recommendations we make to you today:

The first deals with the dairy industry. Some dairy farmers and others supposedly interested in their well-being complained long and bitterly about the lowering of Government support prices on dairy products in recent years. The drop has been relatively slight, but it has had a profound effect on the industry and on the burden imposed on the taxpayer. In contrast to what we have faced in the recent past, we now find that there are fewer cows producing more milk more efficiently, demand and supply are much more nearly in balance, Government stocks of dairy products have been reduced to relatively insignificant amounts, and cost of price supports for these commodities is practically nil. Although several Illinois farmers who had a few cows have decided to get out of dairying, I have heard of none going bankrupt, nor do I expect to. Most of those who stayed in the dairying business have enlarged their herds, culled out low-producing cows and have become more efficient, businesslike operators. I can see nothing but good resulting from these developments.

The second example relates to the experience of the livestock industry. The livestock industry has been the recipient of only intermittent price support aid. During 1954 through 1956, the industry wisely resisted an all-out Government price support program. Yet, over the years, cattle and hog producers have fared quite well. Certainly they have seen cyclical fluctuations and received some low prices as well as extremely good prices. Most livestock producers I know feel they are far better off than they would have been if price supports and animal raising restrictions had been applied to their business. If they want to be able to cash in on the good years, they know they must risk the occasional bad ones.

John Strohm, well-known agricultural writer from Illinois, recently surveyed the agricultural economists of the Nation's land grant colleges to learn what they thought about the farm surplus situation and what they thought should be done to correct it. The answers he received from 40 of these economists reveal clearly "the fallacy of trying to cure economic ills with political prescriptions." Mr. Strohm reports that four out of five of these economists believe:

"Any laws further hamstringing the free market will hurt the farmer, the consumer, and the Nation.

"Legislation has not and cannot solve the farm problem, although the 'right kind might help.' But few economists believe we've had the right kind in the past, and most are pessimistic about getting it in the future.

"Schemes in foreign countries to guarantee all farmers a fair income have been costly failures.

"The law of supply and demand is not out of date—there is no substitute for the free market."

We believe these views are worthy of your consideration.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations made by the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce are designed to be fair to farmers, consumers and taxpayers and effectively cope with the present farm dilemma in a realistic manner. We urge Congress to take the following steps:

1. Reduce support prices to levels which will move the current output of farm commodities into use through normal channels of trade.

2. Establish definite termination dates for complete withdrawal of price supports.

3. During the transition away from price supports, base the level of support on dollars-and-cents levels calculated to permit commodities to move into consumption without reference to parity formulas.

4. Immediately discontinue nonrecourse loans as a means of supporting farm commodity prices and, to the extent that support is provided during the transition period, utilize purchase agreements and recourse, interest-bearing loans as the support mechanisms.

5. To make possible the transition to a free-market economy, isolate the existing Government surplus stocks from the market while providing for their orderly disposal over a period of time by means which will not unduly disrupt markets (barter, gifts).

6. Concurrent with reduction of support prices, free the farmer from marketing and acreage controls.

7. Tighten up administration of the conservation reserve program of the Soil Bank and expand it as a means of facilitating resource adjustment in agriculture.

8. Continue public and private efforts to expand markets for farm products at home and abroad on a sound, economic basis.

9. Continue emergency programs for disposal of surplus commodities in foreign countries until surpluses are reduced, but reexamine them with a view to improving their effectiveness and reducing their cost.

10. Reduce restrictions on sales of farm commodities to Iron Curtain countries.

11. Coordinate the interrelated functions of Federal agencies responsible for management of Government-owned land, price support activities, soil conservation work and land reclamation and development projects.

12. Discontinue Federal financing of power and irrigation projects.

13. Sharply curtail spending for the agricultural conservation program and limit it to conservation measures which reduce physical destruction of soil, including such measures as reforestation of watershed areas.

14. Expand and encourage public and private agricultural research and educational programs to reduce production and marketing costs, to develop new uses and new markets and to assist in other ways in the long-range improvement of agriculture.

15. Encourage and help farmers with limited opportunities to move into more rewarding pursuits so as to better their level of living.

16. Set interest rates on Rural Electrification Administration loans at levels reflecting current capital costs.

17. Provide for patron ownership of the REA cooperatives.

CONCLUSION

We sincerely urge you to give thoughtful consideration to this program. We firmly believe it will (1) stop the surplus buildup, (2) lower the cost of the program to the taxpayer, (3) give farmers greater freedom to farm efficiently, (4) stop Government programs which actually contribute to the farm problem, (5) help arrest inflation, (6) enable farmers to adjust to the changed conditions with a minimum of hardship, (7) establish a sound base for agricultural growth and prosperity through initiative, resourcefulness and self-reliance, and (8) halt the trend toward socialization of the Nation's farms and regulation of the Nation's farmers.

On behalf of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce and myself, I wish to express our sincere appreciation to you for this opportunity to appear before you and present the views of this organization on the very important matter of Federal farm legislation.

Thank you.

LOUIS RATZESBERGER, JR.,
Member, Agriculture-Business Relations Committee, Illinois State Chamber of Commerce.

Unregulated Imports of Tuna

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, since 1950 the tuna fishing industry of California has been increasingly damaged by unregulated imports of tuna, principally from Japan. In the course of these 9 years, all of the fleets fishing for tuna out of San Diego and San Pedro have been shrinking in size, and their financial capabilities of staying in business have also been diminishing. During this same period, the market for canned tuna in the United States and the tuna processing industry of southern California have about doubled in size. Thus we have had the curious predicament of half an industry being killed off by imports while the other half has thrived and grown.

The causes for this condition are complex. I, as well as other Members from California, have set these causes forth before this House repeatedly in the past years, and have repeatedly presented them to the appropriate committees of the House, the Tariff Commission, and the appropriate agencies of the Executive, with little effect. It is not necessary to do this again.

The situation of the fishing half of the tuna industry has become so desperate and hopeless this summer under new floods of Japanese tuna, that everyone knowledgeable in respect of the industry has become newly and deeply alarmed. This includes all of the tuna canners, who see their raw material sources shriveling, the labor unions, the associations of fishing vessels, the U.S. Navy, which sees these valuable auxiliary fleets disappearing, and the Department of the Interior, upon whom the Congress put the responsibility in the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 of stimulating the development of a strong, prosperous, and thriving fishery and fish processing industry.

The serious nature of the present situation, coming on top of 9 years of increasingly hard hammer blows on the fleets, has reached the White House, too, and caused concern also to the President. As a consequence of this, Mr. Wilson and I conferred with President Eisenhower on the situation July 8, and recommended to him, with success, the general program set out below.

At the same time that Mr. Wilson and I were conferring with the President, a Government-sponsored meeting was going forward in another section of town, where the Department of State, Department of Defense, Department of the Interior, and the Department of Commerce had called together the leaders of every segment of the tuna processing and tuna producing industry, for the purpose of looking into what, at last, should be done to preserve this industry from utter destruction.

At this other meeting, Mr. Harold F. Cary, general manager, American Tunaboat Association, San Diego, acting as the mutually nominated spokesman of small canners, big canners, fishermen's unions, cannery workers unions, and the associations of bait boats, purse seiners, and albacore vessels—all segments of the entire industry—submitted the statement and recommendations of the entire industry. I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that this is the united position of the entire California tuna industry.

This statement and these recommendations appear to me to be so lucid, comprehensive, and moderate in their tone, that I have asked permission to have them set out in full in the RECORD.

I am most pleased to be able to report to you, Mr. Speaker, that the President has told us that this appears to him to be a practical and sensible approach to these complex problems and that the appropriate agencies of the Executive have already begun preparations of the necessary steps antecedent to asking the Government of Japan for a full range conference on the subject of tuna as recommended in the attached statement from the industry.

Perhaps we are at long last beginning a resolution of problems of this industry which we in California, and the U.S. Navy, value so highly. Perhaps the Executive will at last be able to carry out the mandate which the Congress so bluntly gave it in 1956—the policy of stimulating the development of a strong, prosperous, and thriving fishery and fish processing industry:

STATEMENT

The Congress in section 2 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 declared a policy with respect to the domestic commercial fisheries to be "stimulating the development of a strong, prosperous, and thriving fishery and fish processing industry."

As of this summer 1959, the domestic tuna fishing industry is in critical condition. The relatively healthy condition of the segments of the tuna canning industry, whether or not dependent on domestically produced fish, is thus placed in serious jeopardy. The natural dependency of domestic producer upon the processor and the processor upon the producer means that one-half cannot go down without bringing the other closely behind.

With these things in mind, and having pursued many alternative courses, and also thinking of the policy directive of the U.S. Congress referred to above we, who represent small canners, large canners, unions of fishermen, cannery workers, and owners of purse seine vessels, bait boat vessels, and albacore vessels in southern California where at least 80 percent of domestically canned tuna is produced have developed the attached plan of action which we recommend to the U.S. Government for its present undertaking with respect to the domestic tuna industry.

REASONS, JUSTIFICATIONS, AND OBJECTIVES OF A CONFERENCE ON TUNA BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN

In this document we set forth our reasons, our justifications, and our ideas of the appropriate terms of reference, for a conference on tuna between the United States and Japanese Governments.

REASONS

Our business and its future is inextricably bound up with and virtually controlled by the business and future of the Japanese tuna industries. In the neighborhood of 90 percent of the tuna imported into the United States in its several forms is caught by Japanese fishermen. Half, or a little more, of the canned tuna eaten in the United States will have been processed from tuna caught by Japanese fishermen. Domestic ex-vessel prices of tuna appear to be closely related to, if not governed by, the price Japanese tuna fishermen get for their product in Japan. The wholesale price of tuna canned in the United States is intimately related to the price charged by importers of Japanese canned tuna.

Both Nations fish on resources of the high seas which are the common property of all mankind under international law, and in which neither of us have any private property right or control. Our fishermen are increasingly beginning to operate in the same geographic areas of the world's high seas, and we anticipate that this tendency may increase. Fishermen of both Nations require the same knowledge of sea, weather and fish movements for the same reason, cutting their cost per ton of production. Some domestic canners are now completely, or almost entirely, dependent upon Japanese raw material for their processing activities. Others are becoming so. As a matter of fact the whole U.S. market for canned tuna is almost half dependent upon Japanese produced raw material tuna, and there is some question whether any canner of tuna in the United States could long survive in the market the cutting off of his access to Japanese raw material.

All Japanese tuna imports to this country are handled by two Japanese cartels located in Tokyo, whose activities are regulated by the Japanese Government. No such cartels exist or could be permitted to exist in the United States. In this manner decisions can be, and are, made in Tokyo by these entities which violently affect our economic welfare and operations and frequently even damage Japanese operations in this market. Such decisions taken from such a long distance, by foreign persons, on the basis of inadequate information about this market, on the basis of considerations foreign to U.S. interest, cannot avoid, and customarily result in upsetting the orderly development and operation of the U.S. tuna market, the U.S. canned tuna industry, and the U.S. tuna fishing industry.

For these reasons it is imperative to the orderly development of the U.S. canned tuna market, U.S. tuna canning industry, and the U.S. tuna fishing industry that there be a more full exchange of market, fishing and scientific information between the two countries, a more integrated planning for the future so that a more intelligently and better informed relationship between the two countries can be developed. A formal conference on the whole subject of tuna between the two Governments with each delegation provided with advisers competent in each major segment of the two industries is not only the logical, but practically the sole, remaining means of accomplishing this end.

JUSTIFICATIONS

The question arises as to what reason can be brought forward to justify such a conference in respect of tuna without establishing a precedent for other industries similarly affected by Japanese imports. While adequate precedent has already been established for such procedure, we put forward these justifications which make our case unique.

1. The sea: Both Japanese and United States fishermen work in the same oceans

and our productivity is governed by the same interrelated meteorlogical, oceanographic and biological factors and movements.

2. The property: Contrary to all, or almost all, other industries the producers of tuna both work upon resources that lie in the public domain and over which there is no property right or control.

3. Trade Agreements Act: Most, if not all, other industries similarly affected, have access to escape clause or other escape mechanisms provided in the Trade Agreements Act or related U.S. foreign trade law as affecting the full range of their commodities. We do not.

Approximately 25 percent of the total raw material source of all canned tuna used in the United States, over half of the total imports of tuna in all forms, and by far the most rapidly increasing source of tuna in the U.S. market, consists of fresh or frozen tuna other than albacore (yellowfin, bluefin, bigeye ond skipjack tuna). This commodity bears no tariff, is under no quota, and is not the subject of a trade agreement. Accordingly it does not come within the purview of the various escape procedures and protections provided by U.S. law.

Accordingly an escape clause proceeding in respect to some lesser volume commodity such as loins and discs, tuna canned in brine, etc., has no practical meaning. Furthere such tariffs were not established on the basis of study of the economics of tuna trade. Present duty rates are, thus, unrealistic and even maximization thereof under present law would be wholly ineffectual.

For these reasons and many other compelling reasons, we believe the case for a United States-Japanese conference on tuna rests on a uniquely justified base, in addition to the precedents already established.

OBJECTIVES

We are setting forth here what we consider to be a reasonably full range of topics which should be discussed with the Japanese. This contains long-range, intermediate, and short-range topics extending from oceanography and the natural history of tuna to such controls over specific items of tuna in commerce between the two countries as may be considered necessary.

This full range of topics should be fully explored with the Japanese and as many of the questions arising from them settled by intergovernmental agreement as is possible, with the door left open for meetings in the future to review decisions taken and to reexamine problcm areas left untouched or not possible of agreement at this first meeting.

Irrespective of the range of subjects that the administration feels should be recommended to the Japanese Government for discussion at this time, we believe that such a conference would be eminently worthwhile. It would increase the understanding of the two governments of these complex problems, it would increase the understanding by both industries of the problems faced by the other and it would promote good will between the two governments and between the two industries. There would be practical, long-range accomplishments result from joint action on such subjects which would benefit all four entities mutually. Accordingly we recommend this series of agenda items for this tuna conference:

I. Conservation

A principal obligation on the part of an industry using a public resource is to see that the sustainable productivity of that resource is not impaired by the industry's use of it. This obligation applies particularly to the tuna fisheries, substantially all of whose production comes from resources lying in the high seas and therefore in the public domain of the world.

Presently available scientific information does not indicate that either the Japanese or ourselves are either overfishing any stock of tuna or that such overfishing is imminent in either or both fisheries. On the other hand, the production of tuna from the seas of the world by these two entities was a little less than 400,000 tons in 1952, and may approach 700,000 tons in 1959 (with the Japanese securing all of the increase). A 50- to 60-percent increase in an already major fishery in 7 years' time is considerable. There is reason to think that it will continue to increase substantially in the next 7 years. Seven years' time is not a long period in which to elucidate biological problems whose geographic occurrence may cover half the surface of the earth.

We suggest that discussions under this topic might wish to take these paths as well as others:

1. Relations, if any, between subsurface yellowfin stocks fished by the Japanese in the Pacific and surface stocks of that species fished by the United States in the Eastern Pacific.

2. Biological and fishing intensity explanations, if any, of the sharp drop in catch per unit of effort by the Japanese long-line fishery for yellowfin tuna in both the Pacific and Indian Oceans.

3. Relations, if any, of both fisheries to the wide variations in albacore productivity in the north Pacific as a whole, and in each fishery.

4. Biological relations, if any, of the skipjack stocks of the eastern, central, and western pacific and the effects, if any, of the fishery upon them.

5. Areas of scientific studies on these and related questions not now being studied adequately by either Japanese, United States, or international research agencies in the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Oceans.

6. Methods of such studies that might lend themselves to conformity or broader adoption among these three sorts of research agencies.

II. Efficiency of harvesting

Another necessity of competitive business growth is to bring the product to the consumers in edible form as economically as possible consistent with the principle of providing an adequate, reasonable, and necessary profit. One of the chief costs in a can of tuna, a pound of sashimi, a kan of katsuobushi, or a piece of tuna sausage or ham is the cost of locating a school of biting or nettable tuna and getting it aboard ship quickly.

Experiences of the scientists and fishermen on both sides of the ocean is leading inexorably to the conclusion that the next major step in improving fishermen's efficiency and lowering his cost per ton of production on both sides of the ocean and in its middle, may properly be the elucidation of the relationship between air mass movement, water mass movement and ocean climate, tuna aggregation in commercial quantities, and tuna behavior—and then feeding this information back to the fishermen in a form both timely and useful.

Since we are both looking for the same understanding of the same ocean for the same purpose we believe that it would contribute to the efficiency and speed of progress in this field of study for us to compare notes as to what we know, what is not being investigated that requires to be elucidated, and how this may best be done.

III. Quality of product

A third necessary responsibility that a producing industry has to its consumers is to provide them with a product of highest attainable quality.

This is a matter of substantial difficulty and much discussion between the frozen tuna exporters of Japan and U.S. canners. It is a problem of varying importance between U.S. boatowners and their canner customers. It can be assumed that it is the same between Japanese boatowners and their several types of consumers. This quality problem extends right through the freezing, holding, cooking, and canning parts of the tuna production chain.

Furthermore, a very considerable amount of basic research has been done, and is being done, on tuna quality problems both in Japan and the United States. Since we are working on the same species of raw material and the same end product (as it reaches the American consumer at any rate), and the producing and processing stages between these two points are reasonably the same in both countries, this is a third subject which a meeting could examine profitably.

We suggest some subtopics that could be usefully dealt with: (1) Greening in tuna; (2) biological effects of freezing tuna; (3) use of antibiotics in handling tuna; (4) natural differences in tuna quality related to species, population density, food, season, etc.; (5) effects of present processing methods on pigment changes in tuna.

IV. Efficiency in marketing

A fourth necessary responsibility of an industry producing a staple food is to assure its steady and efficient flow to the consumer, in order that the costs of marketing and distribution do not form an undue part of its cost to the consumer.

The flow of tuna between the two countries in recent years has been marked by fluctuations as to volume and price so much as to substantially affect the total overall cost level of the end product.

For instance, the terrible market upset in the United States in 1951 arose definitely from accidental flooding of the market by the Japanese in the last half of 1950.

For a time in 1954 the price of tuna was abnormally high in both countries, from reasons which appeared to be primarily associated with marketing rather than to fluctuating volumes of raw material or demand functions.

Again in 1957, it seems likely that both the Japanese and American boatowners sold their catches at below their costs of production, and that this very broad situation in the total market grew directly out of errors of marketing judgment made by the Japanese frozen tuna cartel in marketing about 15,000 tons of summer albacore from the 1956 season.

Presently both industries seem to believe that the present market crisis is linked primarily to the introduction of new Japanese Atlantic production in this market beginning last September.

One might wish to examine in the course of discussing this subject:

1. The total production of tuna by both nations (a) by species, (b) by month and year, (c) by types of gear, and (d) by geographic area and sea.

2. The end use of the product (a) by species, (b) by both month and year, (c) by type of end product, and (d) by country of end use.

3. The structure of business enterprises in each country including (a) unions of fishermen and cannery workers; (b) associations of vessel owners; (c) associations of canners, sausage makers, frozen tuna producers; (d) associations of exporters; and (e) the relationships existing among such entities within a country and as between countries.

4. The role of government in each country in (a) providing or assuring capital requirements; (b) research at various levels of production and marketing; (c) controls overproduction and flow of tuna to market; and (d) subsidies.

5. Problems existing that prevent the orderly flow of tuna to market such as (a)

changes in availability of fish to fishermen that contribute to shortages or gluts; (b) shortages of working capital that contribute to dumping at low prices with resultant buying at high prices to replenish depleted inventory; and (c) lack of, or slowness in transmission of, supply and market data that would enable entrepreneurs to better anticipate and interpret supply-demand functions.

V. Market research and development

A cursory examination of the statistics shows plainly that the consumption of tuna in its several principal end product forms (sashimi, katsuobushi, namaribushi, fish sausage and hams, and canned) is growing on a worldwide basis at a rate that may properly be characterized as booming.

One might hypothesize that in this area of the conference may lie the solution of the problems between the two countries, and within each, arising from the tuna trade. The answer to the problems of all elements in both industries may well lie in a further expansion of the total tuna market of the world to the point where demand will exceed supply at present raw material price levels. Although it may be premature to look for such a general solution of these tuna problems to be imminent, the prospects are sufficiently exciting that they should be looked at exhaustively by all parties concerned.

Under this agenda item we believe discussions could be conducted beneficially along these lines, among others:

(a) Projections of demand in each of the several end product markets based at least on population growth anticipated in those market areas.

(b) Types of marketing research and development now being undertaken by both governments in tuna markets and the possible effect of this, or modifications of it, upon future demand.

(c) Flow of marketing data and information between agencies of the two governments as found in such things, for instance, as the Market News Service, MRCA research, Simmons study, etc., in this country and their counterparts, if any, in Japan.

(d) Effect of end product price on the growth of several end product markets.

(e) Use of advertising and other marketing devices and instruments (such as special deals, tuna weeks, joint promotions, provision of material to radio, television, and food editors) in the several end product markets.

(f) Consideration of whether or not the industries doing all that is practicable to promote consumption of tuna and are joint efforts needful or desirable.

(g) Consideration of whether or not the two governments are doing all that can reasonably be expected of them in promoting the consumption of tuna.

(h) Consideration of whether or not a more current and timely exchange of marketing trends, changes, and opportunities information by either or both governments to all branches of both industries could be of practical significance and use in promoting the overall consumption of tuna.

(i) Consideration of why consumers in the several markets buy tuna in its several forms in preference to substitutable protein food, and how these stimuli could be augmented.

(j) The desirability of a continuing, timely, advisory service on the part of government concerning the total production of tuna and its flow to market.

VI. JAPANESE PRICE AND VOLUME CONTROLS

At the present time the situation of the domestic tuna fleets can only be characterized as critical. The five preceding agenda items may in the long term provide remedies in some degree to some of these critically urgent conditions, but by that time there would be little or no domestic tuna fishing industry left.

In Japan exists a perfect mechanism to provide quick and temporary relief to the domestic industry while these complex problems can be competently investigated and dealt with on a more permanent basis. These are the two cartels (1) Japanese Frozen Fish Export Association, and (2) Japanese Canned Fish Export Association. Through these two cartels must pass all tuna destined for the United States. They are empowered by law to control each commodity both as to price and as to volume. Their decisions when ratified by the Japanese Government become binding upon all citizens of Japan. They can move quickly and effectively as they showed again on July 2, 1959, when the frozen tuna export check prices were raised about 10 percent.

We suggest that under this topic discussions between Japanese and the U.S. Governments should lead in these directions:

1. Proper price and/or volume levels of frozen and canned tuna exports to the United States in order to accomplish temporary objectives in this market.

2. The problem of the unearned dividend last year under which the Japanese have got a 250,000 case increase in their canned tuna market here this year as a result not of an increase in consumption in the United States last year but as a result of increased canned tuna going into inventory in the United States.

3. Proper relationships on a longer term basis than indicated in item 1 between price and/or volume level in (a) frozen yellowfin and bigeye from home islands; (b) frozen yellowfin from Atlantic; (c) ship frozen, mothership, and round albacore; (d) loins and discs; (e) tuna canned in brine for household consumption in the United States; (f) tuna canned in brine for institutional consumption; (g) tuna canned in oil; (h) tuna in all forms shipped through or processed in third countries; (i) white meat canned tuna versus light meat canned tuna and relation of these to price and volume structure of frozen tuna and loins exports to this country.

4. Relationship of factors in three above to (a) sausage market in Japan, (b) sashimi market in Japan, (c) Katsuobushi market in Japan, (d) canned tuna market elsewhere in the world than the United States, and (e) frozen tuna market elsewhere in the world than the United States.

5. When and how such price and volume regulations can be established.

6. What mechanism is required to watch their effect, to change or to terminate them, and to prevent their inhibiting competition among elements of the domestic industry in the United States.

One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Bangor Daily News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the Bangor Daily News is now 125 years of age, and during the course of these many years it has performed a splendid service in keeping informed the citizens of northern Maine.

On the occasion of this anniversary, I want to express my congratulations and extend a hearty "happy birthday" greeting to this truly fine news medium, a real credit to the State of Maine:

IT'S OUR BIRTHDAY

Today is our birthday. It marks our 125th anniversary in the newspaper business. With pardonable pride we look back on the past 125 years and take this opportunity to express our appreciation and thanks to all those men and women who have contributed immeasurably to our success. Without their loyalties and skill none of this would have been possible.

In commemorating the occasion, we are publishing this morning a 64-page tabloid that will be included as part of your regular newspaper. We hope you like it. It tells, in part, the story of this newspaper and of the great area it serves.

We are proud to have played a part in the development of this section of Maine and we look ahead with confidence that over the next century even greater things are destined for eastern and northern Maine.

Free Enterprise—Let's Just Try It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a column which recently appeared in the Detroit Free Press, written by Inez Robb. This article is being brought to the attention of this body at the request of a constituent of mine:

FREE ENTERPRISE—LET'S JUST TRY IT

(By Inez Robb)

In my lifetime I have heard so much favorable discussion of free enterprise I would dearly love to see the United States give it an experimental try.

It is not a return to laissez-faire economics I crave, but a halt to leaping socialism.

And to prove that Fearless Fosdick is a quaking coward compared with me, I would, if I had the power, end any and all Government subsidies at once.

That would send the whole Nation, both the "haves" and the "have nots" into a tailspin.

The "haves," who wouldn't have it (a subsidy) any more, would be screaming like banshees until their voices gave out. And the "have nots," who have been giving the "haves" a free ride for years, would be numb with joy.

I would unsubsidy everyone—farmers, oilmen and even illegitimate mothers—and give the law of the marketplace—good old supply and demand, a chance to operate.

Surely, we couldn't be any worse off under free enterprise than under subsidy socialism, with which the Nation ran up a national deficit of $13 billion in the fiscal year of 1958–59.

Under the subsidy system, we are certainly going for broke. And Congress has just voted another increase in the national debt ceiling.

That ceiling is now so far up above the cloudline that I can't see it with a telescopic lens.

It'll have to be raised to $300 billion to enable us to pay interest on the debt. This

is known as a viscious circle in cold cash.

I would cut everyone loose from his subsidy to sink or swim, survive or perish in true Horatio Alger fashion.

Maybe that would help dry up the river of surplus wheat and end the racket in storage facilities for the Nation's surplus commodities.

Maybe if subsidies ceased so would the American miracle of decreasing farm population and increasing farm surpluses.

I would chop off airline and shipping subsidies before the railroads cut themselves in on this melon. And the oil and mineral depletion tax would be out the window.

Only veterans with service-connected disabilities, plus the widows and orphans of men who have died in the military service would be generously cared for by the Government.

There would be no blanket subsidies in the way of free-for-all hospitalization and pensions.

As for subsidization of illegitimate motherhood—that would be out, too. These mothers-for-profit would go off the relief rolls, pronto.

I would propose sterilization of such a woman, after two illegitimate children, and also the men responsible.

Unless this country is willing to give free enterprise a chance by abolishing subsidies and making everyone stand on his own two feet, we unsubsidized taxpayers will be supporting politically powerful minorities the rest of our lives.

Remarks of James V. Day, Director, National Public Relations Commission, the American Legion, Before the Department of Maine Convention, Bangor, Maine, June 27, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to have a personal relationship with Jim Day, and to know him is to recognize that he is one of Maine's outstanding citizens.

Presently Jim is performing a stellar service for the American Legion, acting as director of its national public relations commission.

Late last month Mr. Day delivered an address at an American Legion convention in Maine, and because his remarks touch on matters vital to America, I commend them to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF JAMES V. DAY, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PUBLIC RELATIONS COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF MAINE CONVENTION, BANGOR, MAINE, JUNE 27, 1959

I am deeply privileged to appear before you today and bring official greetings from the national headquarters of the American Legion.

As most of you know, 8 years ago I had the honor of serving as your department commander. That year was a great revelation to me as to just what the American Legion is and what its principles are. Since, I have held other posts in the Legion, and 3 years ago I was selected national director of public relations of our organization.

As national director of public relations, I continue to be impressed and inspired by the forces of good represented in this country by the American Legion. The Legion is without a doubt one of the most powerful organizations of service in this country, not only for veterans but for all the people.

Some of you here attended the first American Legion convention in Maine as World War I veterans. Some of you, as veterans of World War II and Korea, are attending your first convention. But, whether this is your first or your 41st convention—I don't have to tell you that the American Legion is on the march forward.

Our membership record of the past year proves it. Every single day since our national convention in Chicago last September, our 1959 membership has been greater than the corresponding day of 1958. It is now more than 16,000 ahead of last year at this time, and despite the natural rate of attrition, I think it is going to be on the increase for years to come. In Maine, my last report showed you were within 590 of your 1959 goal.

Just what does this upward trend mean to you and me? What difference does it make?

Let me tell you some of the things I read into an increased enrollment. First, it means that there is a growing strength and vitality in the American Legion. We may have celebrated our 40th birthday this year, but the Legion is the youngest 40-year-old you're ever going to meet. There is no hardening of the arteries here.

It means that the prestige of the American Legion is growing—that more and more people are approving of what the American Legion stands for. It means that the enthusiasm, which is self-evident here, will be carried back to your individual posts.

Most important—it means that the American Legion has been performing its mission—that it has been doing the job for which it was created—that the pledge of "service to the community, State, and Nation," is being carried out.

It means that the American Legion has had the manpower, the initiative, and the know-how to be a positive force for Americanism. I don't need to tell you that there are those who find comfort in any sign of weakness in the American Legion. This past year has not been a very good one for them.

In one short speech there is not time to list all the ways in which American Legion posts throughout the country are helping to build better communities.

This summer more than 18,000 high school juniors will be learning the real meaning of citizenship at 49 American Legion Boys States. These youngsters are already leaders in their own schools. Their participation in these workshops in civic and State governments gives them a big boost toward the right kind of community leadership.

I doubt that there are any future Alger Hisses at an American Legion Boys State. As evidence of the public appreciation for Boys State as a training school for future civic leaders, I cite the growing number of youngsters who attend under the sponsorship of other community organizations. We are indebted to those groups for the confidence and support.

American Legion posts are sponsoring 4,333 Boys Scout units. Some 182,000 boys are too busy with the fun and serious business of Scouting to worry the police. The so-called beat generation will get few recruits from youngsters who have been taught to live by the Boy Scout law. The American Legion's role in scouting is also on the ascendancy. During this past year, Legion posts added nearly 100 Scouts units.

Today nearly a million youngsters are playing baseball under the auspices of the American Legion. On the opening day of the baseball season this year, 15 of the 16 starting pitchers in the Major Leagues were graduates of American Legion Junior baseball. A possible professional career in baseball, however, is a very minor part of this program. Its major values are the teaching of sportsmanship, team play, and physical fitness.

During the past 12 months, Legion posts, together with the Auxiliary, the 40 and 8, and the 8 and 40, spent in the neighborhood of $7 million on child welfare and related youth activities. This money was invested in the future of America. The stock market can go up or down. But the money and effort which are devoted to teaching citizenship and building stronger families will always show a return. Now, The American Legion has its own Child Welfare Foundation. It is pioneering in new and promising projects aimed at the prevention of some of the physical and social ills of children.

In the field of civil defense, American Legion light duty rescue squads are being organized in community after community. Legion-sponsored blood donor groups are among the most effective in the country. The American Legion amateur radio network became operational last fall and stands ready to fill a vital communication need in any emergency.

We are convinced that veterans, all veterans, prefer jobs to pensions. This year we have started an active program to stimulate the employment of the older worker. It will not be an easy matter to change almost universal employment practices, but we have made a start. We believe there is a great waste of manpower when business and industry fill all vacancies with men under 45 and force retirement at 65.

These are but a few of our nationwide activities. All of them begin in a post, yours and mine. The individual programs are varied and countless. But they all begin in the same place.

None of us serve the American Legion with the hope of personal credit. We work for and in its because we believe in it, because it is our way of meeting an obligation to our Nation and our fellow veterans.

That is the reason we are so enthusiastic about the new spirit of progress and accomplishment which we sense in this convention and throughout our organization. We recognize that there are still great obstacles and serious challenges. But we want to get on with the job.

This spirit of dedication holds great promise not just for the American Legion but for all veterans—and for the Nation itself.

On the pension legislation now in Congress, we have been sniped at from both sides. The antiveteran group charged us with conspiring to bankrupt the Nation. At the other extreme, we were belabored for failing to advocate pensions for all. However, we did defeat the original bill which had the backing of the administration. The new bill, while it does not do everything the American Legion hoped for, is a tremendous improvement over the original bill. It finally puts World War II and Korean war widows on equality with World War I widows, a proposition the American Legion has been urging since World War II.

The new bill has the support of the Legion because its good features far outweigh the undesirable ones, and that is why we were sniped at. It does not worry us in the Legion. We have too much to do to be bothered about who is getting the criticism or the credit.

The American Legion is and will be highly critical of our national failure to take and maintain an offensive in the struggle between communism and freedom.

There are those people who speak of the "preservation of the Nation," of the need for "national defense," of the "maintenance of our way of life," when actually we need something more. These are negative or, at best, passive ideas. We need not only to preserve—but also to build. We need to advance as well as defend. Few battles are won by the guard detail. Battles are won by the force which takes the offensive, which sends its patrols out into the unknown enemy territory with an objective, and fights to win the objective.

We'll never beat communism mearly by being against it. We will defeat communism only through a vital and dynamic faith in Americanism.

Our duty in this, the nuclear age, is to wage the fight for freedom with all the courage and vigor we can muster. The international conspiracy of atheistic communism threatens us with total extinction through the deadly destruction wrought by the devastating weapons of this era.

The FBI tells us that Soviet espionage activities in this country expose the fallacy of so-called peaceful coexistence. In recent years, pseudo appeals for peace by Communists have been more than matched by intensified Communist espionage efforts in the United States. Using blackmail, bribery, and similar techniques, Communist agents, many with diplomatic immunity, are stepping up their efforts to obtain our military, scientific, and industrial know-how for use against us.

One tried and proven weapon the Communists have used in the past has been the ruthless smear. Congressional committees, patriotic organizations, including the American Legion, the FBI, and all those who attack subversion and defend American concepts are primary targets. The American Legion is proud to have earned from Communists and their fellow travelers the title of archenemy.

The best yardstick of the effectiveness of the fight against communism is the fury of the smear attacks against the fighter, launched and conducted by the Reds. The smear of the American Legion by the Communists is not a new thing. It has been a continuing part of Communist effort since the American Legion exposed it 40 years ago.

There was a time when American ideals of freedom and opportunity fired man's imagination throughout the globe. The United States was the light and hope of all mankind. It should become such a symbol again. It can, provided we have a plan of victory consistent with our American principles, provided we are willing to work and to sacrifice for our ideals—provided we take the offensive in the war for the minds of men.

I believe all real Americans will agree when I say that we want to live in a land which is strong enough and morally courageous enough so that, instead of receiving insolent Communist ultimatums, we will be issuing American ultimatums to Red tyrants.

We want to live in a nation which will not tolerate the spawning of communism on its own doorstep, Cuba, or in any other part of the free world that remains.

Action on these principles is the fundamental task of the American Legion. We must become a focal center for rallying the moral strength of democracy. No other organization can do this for us. Moral leadership in this time of crisis can be claimed only by an organization which is completely free of ulterior motive, an organization which is courageously representative of all that is good in our way of life. This is the American Legion.

Address by Dr. Louis M. Orr, President, American Medical Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address by Dr. Louis M. Orr, of Orlando, Fla., president of the American Medical Association:

ADDRESS TO THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES BY LOUIS M. ORR, M.D., OF ORLANDO, FLA., PRESIDENT-ELECT, AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, OPENING SESSION, HOUSE OF DELEGATES, AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 108TH ANNUAL MEETING, ATLANTIC CITY, JUNE 8, 1959

Mr. Speaker, members and guests of the house of delegates, I would like to express my warm, personal approval of the applause which you have given to Dr. Gunnar Gundersen. For the past 2 years, in his extensive travels throughout this country, and in Europe, Asia, and Australia, he has been an effective spokesman for American medicine. Dr. Gundersen has carried out his presidential duties not only with energy, but also with dignity and sincerity. I commend him for a job well done, and I hope that in the year ahead I can achieve the same high level of performance.

In my brief remarks this morning, I shall look at a few issues and challenges which I believe should have close attention from this house of delegates and the entire medical profession—not just for the next 12 months, but for years to come.

The policy actions taken at this meeting will be vitally important to American medicine. In addition, we must give constant attention to many other problems—old ones, new ones, and hardy perennials. Taking the long-range view, let me point out for particular problem areas which demand full recognition and advance planning to meet the needs of the future.

COSTS OF MEDICAL CARE

One of these is the cost of medical care. Numerous Federal agencies and State governments are conducting studies of hospital costs, health insurance programs, and other economic aspects of medical care. Everyone is writing or speaking on this subject—politicians, economists, magazine writers, newspaper columnists, and curbstone experts, who sometimes air their views through the press.

The American public—and rightfully so—has an intense interest in the costs of medical care. Those costs involve the people's lives, health and pocketbooks. But the mass of written and spoken words frequently produces confusion and misinterpretation of facts in the field of medical economics. Quick and easy information—sometimes misinformation—is coming from persons who may be adept at statistics, but who lack a thorough knowledge of all the medical and human elements that go into health care.

Therefore, I strongly urge that the American Medical Association take the lead in providing authoritative information gathered by qualified personnel with a real understanding of all the economic, medical and human factors involved in this complex subject.

As I see it, such a program should involve much more than the collection of dry statistics—it should include continuing, simplified interpretation, made understandable to the public. It should include studies of all possible ways to stabilize or reduce the costs of medical care, hospitalization, and health insurance. It should encourage the development and increased use of rest homes, nursing homes, rehabilitation centers, chronic illness facilities, home care programs, homemaker services, and other special facilities for patients who do not need complete hospital care.

Finally, in the field of hospital costs—and this perhaps is the major problem in the overall picture—the American Medical Association should draw atttention to all new ideas on the organization, design and construction of hospitals. One of these is the concept known as "progressive patient care"—which means the systematic classification of patients according to their medical needs.

Under such a program the hospital can concentrate expensive equipment and highly skilled personnel in an intensive care unit for patients who need close attention. Then, as a patient improves, he can be moved to an intermediate care unit and finally to a convalescent or self-help unit. This will represent the concept of automation in patient care. This concept improves patient care and produces economy both in construction and operating costs. In the field of atomedics we are going to see bricks and mortar, metal and plaster being replaced by plastics. Adhesives will be substituted for nails and bolts. We will also see the increasing usage of computing devices, all of which will assist in reducing costs. Moreover, because of the variation in room rates for the different units, the hotel aspects of hospitalization can be reduced.

In short, all fresh, imaginative approaches should be explored by the American Medical Association in a vigorous, continuing study of medical and hospital costs.

NEED FOR DEDICATED YOUNG PEOPLE

The second area which I have in mind is the recruitment of qualified, dedicated young people to enter the study of medicine.

For the past 30 years or more the production of new physicians by our medical schools has kept pace with the Nation's growth in population. However, we no longer can relax in the complacency of past or present accomplishments. We are entering a period when increasingly rapid population growth—plus the mounting number and complexity of medical services—will require a still greater increase in the annual number of medical school graduates.

Last December in Minneapolis this house of delegates approved a clear, positive statement urging the sound expansion of existing medical schools and the creation of new medical schools by universities which can provide the proper academic and clinical setting. This program of expansion would be based upon careful, continuing study of the changing needs in all categories of medical activity.

We accept the need for a greater quantity of medical service in the future. At the same time we are encouraging the medical schools to experiment in new programs to even further improve the quality and content of their curriculum.

There is one more very important consideration—the mental, moral and ethical caliber of tomorrow's doctors.

It will not be enough to have a larger number of well-trained physicians in the years ahead. They must also be dedicated men and women with a profound, sincere realization of their obligations to their patients and to all of humanity.

With these ideas in mind, I strongly urge the medical profession to consider the de-

velopment of a planned, organized program to recruit the best qualified young people into the study of medicine. Such a program, to be effective, must be carried out on all levels—national, State, local, and individual.

The American Medical Association already is engaged in a variety of efforts along these lines. It participates each year in the National Science Fair. It is producing a new career guidance film on medicine. It provides informational materials for interested young people. The American Medical Association, however, cannot do the job alone. It must be carried down to every local community.

Basically, this is a grassroots responsibility which should be assumed by every individual physician. He should take the time to talk medicine with promising young people of high school and college age. In particular, he should concentrate on those who have not only scientific aptitudes, but also the capacity for dedicated service.

MEDICAL RESEARCH

The third area to which I would call your attention is that of research. It has been estimated that by 1970 this country will be spending around $1 billion a year on medical research—with about one half of that total coming from private philanthropy and industry. We in the medical profession must exert influence and leadership in seeing that research funds are spent wisely, not just in the economic sense but also from the standpoint of scientific principles and the public interest.

Medical research in the years ahead will require more and more money and facilities. It will require increasingly intensive efforts to recruit and train medical scientists with an aptitude for research. It also will require constant vigilance to maintain a sound balance between practical, applied research and basic, long-range research. The American Medical Association should encourage, in all areas, the creation of "lifetime grants" in basic research. It is only in this way that we will be able to attract the dedicated minds to pursue basic research with complete freedom from worry and distractions, financial and otherwise.

Those of us in active practice are, quite naturally, interested in the practical results of medical research—the new drugs, treatments and techniques which we can apply in our everyday work. However, we must never forget that the vaccines, antibiotics, and hormones in use today are only the end results of basic discoveries made years ago in such fields as pathology, bacteriology, and biochemistry.

Everyone, in and out of medicine, hopes and prays that a cure will be found for cancer. However, if and when we achieve an ultimate, complete conquest of cancer, it probably will come through new, basic knowledge of body cells—how and why they behave as they do. This kind of research will then provide specific clues for the development of new methods of treatment and prevention.

The basic research of today produces the lifesaving drugs, preventive vaccines and dramatic surgical techniques of tomorrow. As Dr. Hans Selye has pointed out, the Nation's culture, health, and strength depend primarily upon its creative basic scientists—those whose main endeavor is to search for the kind of truth that can be verified by experience.

And so—whether we are promoting private research programs, or expressing our opinions on legislation involving medical research funds—let us fight always for proper recognition of those dedicated men whose basic research may have a profound effect on the future of mankind.

RESPONSIBILITIES IN AGING

The fourth and final subject I have in mind is aging and health care of the aged. As you know, this involves a complexity of problems with both immediate and long-range aspects. The American Medical Association on the national level, is working hard on an expanding program to bring about a sound, realistic approach to all phases of these problems.

But here again, the American Medical Association cannot do the job alone. I strongly appeal to every State medical society, every county medical society, every physician, to accept a share of the responsibility in carrying out the national program. I charge every member of this house of delegates to review the work in his State, and to help stimulate even greater activity.

This responsibility must be met through medical leadership. If it is not, the politicians will take over the field. Every individual doctor must recognize the problems that exist in the field of aging. The key to sound solutions lies in community planning to develop services and facilities attuned to the needs of older people. This will require close cooperation among physicians, hospitals, and all other interested groups.

Encouraging progress has been made during the past 6 months by medical societies, prepayment plans, and insurance companies to meet the health insurance needs of senior citizens. However, we probably have less than a year in which to demonstrate—dramatically and convincingly—that private health insurance can do this particular job. I appeal for an accelerated, snowballing program which will demonstrate medicine's leadership and wisdom in meeting the problems of an aging population.

This annual meeting here in Atlantic City promises to be an extremely interesting one. If I may call a spade a spade, we can expect some very spirited discussion during the next 3 days.

You will be acting upon the report of the Commission on Medical Care Plans, which was presented 6 months ago at the Minneapolis meeting and which, since then, I hope has been under study by the entire profession.

You will be receiving a report from the judicial council on our relations with osteopathy.

You will be considering some important recommendations from the Committee on Preparation for General Practice.

You will be wrestling with some proposals regarding social security coverage of self-employed physicians.

These and many other issues coming before you at this meeting contain the seeds of controversy. They involve subjects on which physician shave a wide range of opinions.

MEDICAL STATESMANSHIP

I urge every interested physician to express himself fully at the reference committee open hearings tomorrow. I urge every delegate to make full use of his privileges on the floor of this house. At the same time, I hope that all discussion will be based upon a maximum of reason and logic. Above all, I hope that medical statesmanship will prevail—keeping in mind not only the interests and standards of medicine but also the medical and economic welfare of the people whom we serve.

Thank you.

House Armed Services Subcommittee Investigation Into Activities of Retired Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last week the Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on Armed Services began its investigation into the activities of retired military, naval, and civilian personnel in connection with the awarding of defense contracts. Because this action grew out of action that first took place on the floor of the House in connection with the 1960 defense appropriation bill, and a suggested amendment to that bill which I opposed on the floor, I believe that some Members may be interested in the text of testimony which I was privileged to submit to the subcommittee on July 10. Under leave to extend my remarks the testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN SAMUEL S. STRATTON, DEMOCRAT, NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE FOR SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES REGARDING THE EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED MILITARY AND FEDERAL CIVILIAN PERSONNEL IN DEFENSE CONTRACTING, JULY 10, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this subcommittee today in connection with the broad question of the employment of retired governmental personnel, both military and civilian, in the field of defense contracting. I have no particular special interest in this field except that I happen to be a Reserve officer in the Navy and I do represent a district which includes two major defense manufacturing concerns, the General Electric Co. and the Alco Products Co., both of Schenectady. Since Schenectady is an area which has been most heavily hit by unemployment our people are naturally concerned about any action that might further impair the likelihood of a fair share of the employment connected with the defense industry from coming into our area.

This subject arose in the first instance, if my recollection is correct, in connection with the employment of retired military personnel, and it came to a head on the floor of the House on June 3 in an amendment offered by my friend and colleague from New York State, Congressman SANTANGELO, to the Defense Department appropriation bill for fiscal 1960 providing that no defense funds could be expended for the payment of any contract with any firm which employed retired military or naval officers of general or flag rank who had been retired for less than 5 years. Although the amendment came to the floor in the course of debate and was entirely unexpected, I believe the RECORD will show that I was the only Member of the House to rise and speak out against it specifically on the merits. The amendment failed by a single vote on a division of the House, but only after the chairman of the Defense Appropriations

Subcommittee, Mr. MAHON, had indicated that he felt the subject raised by Congressman SANTANGELO should be fully explored by this committee rather than be tacked on hastily to a major appropriation bill. Since the committee is now in the process of undertaking the inquiry to which the gentleman from Texas referred, my only purpose here is to restate most emphatically the opinions that I expressed on the House floor at the time the original suggestion was made, and to offer to this subcommittee, most respectfully, my own suggestions as to the proper course that this investigation should take.

In my judgment the amendment originally offered by Mr. SANTANGELO was unwise and unsound. It could only have had the result of damaging many entirely innocent retired officers, and it would have had a most disastrous effect on the conduct of our whole defense program. Certainly this committee would not, I am sure, desire to do anything either to impair the defense program or to cause injustice to be done to loyal officers of our armed services who have completed their service and retired pursuant to law.

The original amendment appears to have been offered on the assumption that retired officers who have gone to work in defense plants are, if not always at least in most cases, utilizing their knowledge of defense matters and their acquaintances among defense personnel to the detriment of the Government, the taxpayers, and the defense program as a whole. The suggestion has even been made that thousands and perhaps millions of dollars might be saved, without any impairment whatsoever in our national defense, if retired officers were barred from any position in a defense contracting organization.

I am not aware whether any evidence exists to support such a charge. It may well be that there are instances where retired officers have used their abilities improperly to the detriment of the country and at a waste of the taxpayers' money. That, of course, will be one of the things to which this committee will address itself in the course of this inquiry. But it would be my own feeling that such instances of a betrayal of trust will be very few and far between, and that as a general rule it may be assumed that the retired officers of this country, regardless of their rank, are loyal, honest and conscientious individuals who are no less anxious to serve the interests of their country after their retirement than when they were in uniform. Certainly those retired officers who now occupy positions of importance in the General Electric Co. and Alco Products in my home city—and there are a substantial number of them—most definitely meet this standard.

And so I believe it would be a grave mistake if this committee were to proceed on the assumption that there is something inherently wrong with a retired officer going to work for a defense contractor, and I do not believe that the committee intends to create any such impression. On the contrary, there would seem to be evidence to suggest that this kind of procedure is actually extremely helpful to the national defense. In the first place, the defense contractor greatly benefits from the advice and recommendations of individuals who have spent their lives in the defense field. How better could a civilian manufacturer understand the requirements of the defense program than with the help of someone in his own company who had been closely connected with that kind of program? In the second place, what more natural thing for a retired officer to do than to find retired employment in the field with which he is most directly familiar and in which he has spent his life? All of us, as members of the Armed Services Committee, are well aware that the retirement income for officers is not excessive. Most of our officers are retiring these days at comparatively young ages, many while their families are still in the process of completing their education, which is the period of heaviest demand on one's income. To expect that a retired officer should live and provide for his family entirely on his retirement pay is, of course, completely unrealistic. Only recently our committee approved the Navy hump legislation which would force senior officers out of the service earlier than they would normally except to retire, and we acknowledged the economic burden this would place on them by providing for the payment of a special separation bonus to such officers. Many of these officers, by the way, though in the rank of captain, will be promoted to flag rank upon their retirement, and therefore would fall within the terms of the original Santangelo amendment. Wouldn't we be causing them a grave injustice to force them out of uniform ahead of the normal period of time and then foreclose automatically to them the one civilian field where they would be most likely to find employment?

Actually, if our defense program is to succeed—and judging from the continuing behavior of the Soviet Union we will have a defense program of some magnitude with us for a long, long time to come—then there must be the closest possible liaison and understanding between those in the military service and those in the manufacturing field. How better can we hope to achieve this necessary liason than by means of a free and untrammeled interchange of personnel?

If there are abuses then of course these should be dealt with. But it would be my recommendation that any legislation designed to prevent any such abuses be directed toward the specific abuses the committee uncovers rather than toward retired officers and defense contractors generally. Surely we need not throw out the baby with the bath. This was the basic flaw in the Santangelo amendment; and had it been enacted the whole defense program would have ground to an abrupt stop.

Specifically, the implication that retired officers employed in Defense Establishments is a bad thing would seem to be based on the assumption that defense contracts are awarded by one or two individuals, in which case personal friendships and individual favoritism might be controlling. Frankly, my own limited experience has been that this is not the case, that before any contract can be awarded the decision must pass through many different hands and many different boards. Personal acquaintances might well enable an individual company to grasp more quickly Defense Department requirements and be able to locate more readily the first stage in the procurement process, but they would not be likely to have any decisive influence on the outcome.

I would respectfully suggest that the committee direct its attention to this particular field. If it develops that important contracts can be awarded by single individuals on the basis of nothing more substantial than favoritism, then in my judgment corrective legislation ought to address itself to the contract-awarding machinery, to insure a close check on the actions of any single individual.

These are only tentative suggestions, Mr. Chairman, and I make them with some hesitation in view of my status as a very junior member of this distinguished committee. I know that the subcommittee has very broad experience in the whole field of defense procurement which cannot be duplicated by any individual member. But what disturbs me most about this investigation, Mr. Chairman, is what I might describe as a cloud no bigger than a man's hand, suggesting that we in America may gradually be moving back toward the view of a bygone day that might best be expressed by the term "the devil theory of war." I had thought that as a result of our experiences in World War II and our experience during the cold war that has followed it, that we had at last grown out of the rather naive assumptions that were prevalent in the 1920's and 1930's that the military operations of World War I were not the result of broad political, economic, and social forces at work, but rather were the result of the schemings and machinations of one of two sinister and evil individuals.

I hope we are not today allowing ourselves to fall into the same trap by implying that the heavy financial and psychological burdens of continuing to stand up against the massive threat of Soviet communism are not the result of equally massive political and economic forces at work in the modern world, but rather have been caused by the evil machinations of just a few individuals and that when these individuals are removed we can live quietly and easily and cheaply once more. Can we honestly believe that there is some sort of "devil" explanation of this kind for the high cost of military budgets? Can we honestly believe that if we only push aside one or two retired generals or admirals we can provide for our military security on a painless and almost costless basis?

As a boy, I grew up in a day, Mr. Chairman, when the professional mililtary men of this country were not held in very high regard. It was quite fashionable when I was in college to sneer at anyone in uniform and to assume that no individual worth his salt would ever be so silly to consider a professional military career. I hope, Mr. Chairman, we never go back to that kind of thing again. Thank God that, in spite of that common view, we had able career officers ready when World War II came, to win the victory for America. And unless we can continue to attract and retain in our armed services the ablest and most competent men and women to solve some of the fantastically complex problems that confront us in maintaining our national security, we will be in desperate straits indeed in the years ahead.

Let this subcommittee certainly root out all evildoing that may exist. But let us not also lend ourselves, even unwittingly, to the support of any campaign that would suggest that those who have dedicated their lives to the defense of their country are actually men and women who are undermining it. Let us do nothing that will, even indirectly, discourage wise and intelligent men and women from going into the career service of our country. Let us instead recognize that this Nation has indeed a right to expect those who have served in uniform to continue to make their skills available to the defense of their country as long as life and breath permit.

New Park in Tri-State Area—Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the National Park Service has recently announced the opening, this summer, of the Cumberland Gap National Park in the area of three States, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia. This new park appropriately dedicated on July 4 last

will offer vast scenic beauties and recreational opportunities to those who visit the three-State area. Mr. Warner Ogden has written an interesting account of this historic and scenic wonderland park. His writing appeared in the New York Times on June 7, 1959, and under unanimous consent I include this report in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The report follows:

A NEW PARK IN THE APPALACHIANS—CUMBERLAND GAP TRACT SET ASIDE IN MEMORY OF THE PIONEERS

(By Warner Ogden)

MIDDLESBORO, KY.—Daniel Boone blazing the Wilderness Trail through Cumberland Gap in 1775, had a major role in bringing drama and romance to a famous pass.

Now the new Cumberland Gap National Historical Park is an American shrine to preserve the memory of the pioneers who passed through there for the conquest and settlement of the lower Ohio and Mississippi Valleys, and the Northwest.

Travelers today can follow in the footsteps of the Indians, the early settlers, the Civil War strategists with their "Long Tom" cannon on the Pinnacle, and the seekers of fortune who came here with English capital in the Gay Nineties for a short-lived industrial boom.

Now, however, travelers come by good roads over the path of the pioneers to the more than 20,000-acre midland Gibraltar of America in a scenic area where the corners of Kentucky, Virginia, and Tennessee meet. It is easily reached by U.S. 25–E and U.S. 58.

VISITOR CENTER

A new visitor center, with museum and theater, will be completed this month, just off U.S. 25–E, near the northern entrance to the new park. Various events have been arranged in the area in connection with the park dedication July 4.

The main program will be a 2-day celebration at Middlesboro July 3 and 4. On July 3 there will be judging of historic window displays; a golf match between professionals and amateurs on what is called the oldest golf course in the United States in continuous existence; arrival of a pioneer Thomas Walker wagon on the Wilderness Road; a parade; a barbecue, and a homecoming jamboree with variety shows.

Then on July 4 there will be North-South "skirmish" teams, an official luncheon, presentation of State flags of all the States and the dedication of the park at the Visitor Center, with fireworks at night.

President Eisenhower was invited by a three-State delegation which went to Washington. Members have been hopeful that he would accept. When they mentioned the "oldest golf course," the President laughed and quipped, "That would be an inducement."

OVERLOOK TERRACE

The park is being rapidly developed by the National Park Service. An overlook terrace has been completed on the Pinnacle, highest peak in the park, from which may be seen parts of several States, including the Great Smoky Mountains, 80 miles to the south, on clear days. Wide horseshoe parking grounds, an information center and a visitor shelter with displays have also been built near the crest of the Pinnacle. Paths through pine-scented woodlands lead to the overlook, to Civil War fortifications, to the old road up which "Long Tom" was hauled, and to other points of interest.

For a historic step into the past, tourists can stop at the new visitor center. The museum is in the exhibits room on the second floor of the center. Twenty-three exhibits cover a period of history beginning prior to the coming of the explorers and on into the 20th century, with emphasis on the pioneer period. In the museum are displays showing the background of the pioneers and their role in the Nation's history.

Of special interest is a diorama showing Daniel Boone and his axemen blazing the Wilderness Road. There are also small models of an early Kentucky fort and a Civil War supply wagon.

A small theater, open without charge, seats 150 persons. The audio-visual equipment includes an automatic slide-synchronized sound program unit, a 16-mm. movie projector and conventional slide projector.

"The automatic unit combines a narrated historical story and description of principal park features with slides showing historical events and scenic views of the park," Dean Guy, park superintendent explained. The movie is being presented at frequent intervals daily to aid the visitor in understanding and enjoying the park.

Two observation areas at the Visitor Center give panorama views of the gap.

A new road leads from U.S. 25–E to the parking area of the Visitor Center and a new road is being completed from the Visitor Center to the Skyland Road, which goes up to the pinnacle. There are 4 miles of park roads open to the public.

SCENIC WILDERNESS

Among the park's sights are Cudjo's Cave at Cumberland Gap, discovered by Dr. Thomas Walker in 1750, and a scenic wilderness known by the names of the Devil's Garden, Sand Cave, and White Rocks. This area encompasses a 20-mile segment of the Cumberland Mountains wall, which is split by the great pass through which the pioneers poured.

Among nearby attractions is Lincoln Memorial University, with its Lincoln room, at Harrogate, Tenn., which is also open to visitors.

Dr. Robert L. Kincaid, historian and former president of Lincoln Memorial University, had much to do with the creation of the new park. He and others in Kentucky, Virginia, and Tennessee began their efforts 35 years ago. Dr. Kincaid impressed Washington with the need to preserve the historic area.

"Cumberland Gap has been the scene for a vast pageant of American history," he reported. "Although deep in the interior of the early West, it spans nearly three centuries of white civilization in the continent. Gabriel Arthur first passed through it in 1673 over the well-worn Indian trail known as Athawominee or the Path of the Armed Ones. Dr. Thomas Walker, making a tour into the West in 1750 for the Loyal Land Co., chartered it officially for the first time. Nineteen years later Daniel Boone passed through with some companions on his first long hunt in the Kentucky land.

"However, it was not until 1775, when he and a band of 30 axmen cut the Wilderness Road to Kentucky, that the famous pass began its major role in the settlement of the Northwest. With this event Cumberland Gap leaped into national significance."

It was Henry Clay who, while riding to make a speech to mountaineers, paused in the historic pass and turned his ear to the silent forests which spread out before him. In reply to a query from someone who broke his revery, the great orator said, "I am listening to the tread of the coming millions?"

This three-State region today looks for millions through the years ahead to come to the new historical park. Any information desired on the area may be obtained free from the Middlesboro Chamber of Commerce office, which has a list of accommodations available, including hotels, motels, and restaurants.

Middlesboro, a town of 15,000, was originally named Middlesborough after a coal and iron center in England by that name. It has a main street over 100 feet wide. Parallel streets are named after English shires.

OUTDOOR DRAMA

At Pine Mountain State Park, near Pineville, Ky., 12 miles from Cumberland Gap, the outdoor drama, "The Book of Job," opens in Laurel Cove, a natural amphitheater, in June. The drama will run to July 25, Monday through Saturday nights at 8:30.

From the mountains, the first of the Tennessee Valley Authority lakes (Norris Lake) is reached by U.S. 25–E, just a few miles south of Cumberland Gap, on the way to Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

Cross Country With the On-to-Oregon Cavalcade—IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the On-to-Oregon Cavalcade has reached the State of Idaho, and is well on its way across that State. The cross-country trek has included one wedding—in Kemmerer, Wyo. The bride was Miss Judy Roudebaugh. The groom was Mr. Al Hollaman. Both are Oregonians. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the ninth on-the-trail report written by Robert (Rudy) Roudebaugh, father of the bride and driver of the Drain wagon. It covers the days June 20 through June 29, and appeared in the July 2, 1959, issue of the Drain, Oreg., Enterprise.

The report follows:

DAUGHTER'S WEDDING BIGGEST EVENT ON WAGON TRAIL FOR RUDY

(By Robert (Rudy) Roudebaugh, driver of Drain covered wagon in the 2,000-mile trek to Oregon from Independence, Mo., retracing the historical Oregon Trail)

June 20 and 21: Arrived at the Green River Camp at 11:30 for the weekend. Green River was high, but went down 2 or 3 feet this weekend. Janell helped a little lamb get back to its mother. It took her about an hour. It was the cutest thing she's done on the trip. Al Hollaman and Judy Roudebaugh arrived here at camp about midnight.

June 22, 5:56: All hooked up and ready to roll. 6:44: We sure had a tough pull to get out of our camp this morning. We are now entering Lincoln County. Al and Judy have been taken to Evanston for their blood test so we won't see them until this evening. The way things look they will be kept pretty busy. All that you see along here are sheepherder wagons on every point. We can still see a peak of Windy River Range, also snow peaks in Utah. The sun is shining but it is windy. 11:20: Arrived at Taylor grazing land.

June 23, 6:05: On Highway 128. It is the slickest oil we have ever been on for the mules. Ki and Janell have gone into Kemmerer to get ready for the wedding. 7:22: A logging truck is going by. It had about 60 or 70 logs. Stakes are about twice as high as the ones out there (Oregon). Looked like all 32-foot logs. There were no binders on.

9:58: Crossed Willow Creek. 10:03: Going by sawmill and planer. I understand the mill cuts about 70,000 board feet a day. 11:19: Arrived in Kemmerer, elevation is 6,924 feet, population 1,667. 11:24: Went over the Hams Fork River. 11:30: Arrived at the city triangle for Judy's wedding. There

was a large crowd, between 500 and 800 people.

WEDDING ON THE TRAIL

The wedding was held in front of the Oregon Trail marker across the street from the mother store of J. C. Penneys. It was the only wedding ever held in Triangle Park. I gave the bride away and Janell was maid of honor. Sheryl Carnine was bridesmaid with Don Work acting as best man. At the very, very last minute, my mother arrived from Lexington, Nebr. (Mrs. James Roudebaugh).

It was the most wonderful wedding two young people could ever had. Judy made the most beautiful bride, all in white. Many thanks to Mrs. Edna Erickson. She made Judy's wedding dress. By the way, Judy was about 20 minutes late getting to the wedding. 12:04: Judy and Al drove the wagon away from the triangle.

12:45: Arrived at camp at the Kemmerer sale ground. 2:00: A wedding reception was held at the Frontier dining room. All the wagon train personnel were present and many of my old friends of Kemmerer were also there. They had a beautiful wedding cake furnished by the Kemmerer Bakery. They received many lovely gifts.

I visited with an old boss of mine, Ralph Sutton, most of the afternoon. I worked for him 22 years ago. He also showed us the trail for tomorrow past his ranch. 7:30: The people of Kemmerer gave us a banquet in honor of the bride and groom. My mother and I were both asked to make a speech. Ralph Sutton's mother came from Salt Lake City to see me tonight. I was always treated like one of the family. It was one of the biggest days I've had on the trail.

June 24: People in Kemmerer had us for breakfast at the Frontier Cafe this morning. 5:52: All harnessed up and ready to roll. Judy and Al are riding with us today. 6:29: We are leaving Kemmerer. 6:37: We are crossing over Ham Fork River. 8:15: We are pulling a steep hill. All the people got off to walk. 8:28: Elevation 7,510 feet. 9:25: Elevation 7,663. The road branches off at the old Sutton ranch. We are also going by the lone pine tree which is an old landmark. The old tree hasn't grown in years. 11:11: Elevation 6,362 feet. 11:47: Elevation has gone up to 7,805 feet.

Last night we visited the grave of Nancy Hill, who died on July 4, 1847. We also saw three other graves of unknown men. 12:12: Arrived at camp. We are staying at a place called Immigrant Springs. John McDermott and the Cormier family have traveled the last few miles behind the wagons. Paul rode with the Carnines and Bobbie rode with me. Ki, Al, and Judy rode in the car with the rest of them. Five-year-old Bobbie calls me his wagonmaster. Janell has been down watching some sheep about a quarter of a mile away.

June 25, 5:30: Al and Judy have left for home. 6:02: We are headed northwest. The sun is out bright but it is still hazy. This camp we stayed at was an old watering hole for the pioneers on the Oregon Trail. It was so pretty and green with ice cold water. I wish we could have stayed longer. (It even had some trees.) There was snow pretty close to camp. Some of the wagon people went up and brought some snow back for our coolers. 6:22: Elevation 8,035. 7:31: Janell just got out of bed. 7:46: Elevation is now 8,400. A spring in the seat broke. 8:00: Going down a hill to Sublet Creek. 8:30: Just going down a hill. We had to lock the wheels to slow our speed. Ki walked and Janell said, "If I ride all the way down I wouldn't be chicken." 9:14: We are going to start down another hill, and will lock our wheels again. 10:24: Drove off of Rocky Hill into Rock Creek. 10:36: Ki's brother, Bob Weaver and family from Springfield, Oreg., showed up and we sure were surprised to see them. His two boys rode with me to Cokeville (Sam and Bob). 11:22: Hit the oil road. We have sure seen a lot of Hereford cattle along this road. 11:25: Crossed Spring Creek. 12:07: Arrived at camp along Spring Creek at the edge of Cokeville. Its population is 600 and the elevation is 6,192 feet.

June 26, 5:25: It has started to rain. Doc has a sore neck. 6:18: We are on our way, northwest on Highway 30. Ki is on cook shift. 6:28: Crossed Spring Creek. 6:36: Crossed Smith Fork River. Sagebrush is a little bigger along here. 9:21: Leaving Wyoming and entering Idaho and Bear Lake County. Idaho was admitted to the Union on July 3, 1890, and Wyoming was made a State July 10, 1890. Stopped to rest and had coffee at the State line. 9:46: Heading across Idaho. 10:15: Crossed Thomas Fork Creek. 10:30: Pulling up Webber Hill. We had to rest three times. The summit elevation is 6,395 feet. 12:15: Arrived at Mariner Jensen ranch on Bear River. We will make camp here. The Bear Lake Rangers and a riding club from Paris, Idaho, gave us a fried chicken dinner and we were entertained by the Montpelier Lions club trio who have entertained all over the United States. The Boy Scouts from Eugene and vicinity are going to stand guard for us tonight.

June 27, 5:55: Waiting for Roy this morning. 6:07: We are heading west. Bear Creek Rangers are riding on saddle horses with us. Vicki Jensen is riding with Janell and me. She is 11 years old and her father owns the ranch where we camped last night. Doc and Jan are up on the bit today. The weather now is rain. It is also chilly. 7:07: We are following Bear River foothills. Ki has gone on ahead to do the laundry. 8:05: We have dropped down into the valley which is about 2 miles wide. Janell and Vicki are in the seat driving and I'm here in the back writing to my faithful readers of the Drain Enterprise. So many people have admired the spreader rings Mel Ross of Drain has lent me for this trip. 8:36: The valley has widened out. We have added saddle horses and riders.

CAVALCADE REACHES IDAHO

9:02: Entering Montpelier, Idaho. It is the first town in Idaho, population 2,682. It has rained all morning. 9:11: We are now going by the hospital where "Pop" Weaver Clark is staying. He is our oldest member and needed a rest badly so he will be in the hospital for a few days. We went out of our way so he could see us go by. 9:27: Stopped by the post office for the mail pickup. Very few people were out to see us. 10:06: We made camp at Bear River County Fairgrounds and we will stay here for the weekend. The wagons traveled 16 miles today. Janell and Vicki brought the wagon into the circle. 2:00: We went to the high school where we took showers. Janell went to the show and Ki stood the 9 to 11 o'clock guard with me.

District Recreation Programs Showing Growth Each Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on more than one occasion in the past few months I have had an opportunity to call to the attention of the membership the great demand for a better understanding of the need for off-production-line activities and job opportunities.

The following article from one of the fine daily papers in my district, the Greensburg Tribune Review, clearly helps to point up this situation.

In our future planning we must give more emphasis to recreational employment opportunities. This basically will be one of the answers to automation and shorter workweeks.

I recommend the following to the membership of the House as required reading:

DISTRICT RECREATION PROGRAMS SHOWING GROWTH EACH YEAR

Recreation, the original do-it-yourself fad, is today a growing tribute to the leadership of the professional.

A soaring population, booming suburbs, and America's growing preoccupation with group activities have all but abolished the corner lot that once served as a combination playfield and meeting place for another generation.

As the farm became a shopping center and the small town a hub for building developments, the neighborhood recreation center, that corner lot, vanished, the victim of an ever-expanding and land-hungry economy.

What was first viewed simply as "growing pains" soon gave evidence of becoming a serious illness.

To cure this illness, government on all levels turned to the professional recreation director, the individual trained in youth work and capable of developing and putting into practice programs to provide a maximum number of people with the best possible facilities.

It hasn't been an easy job.

IN MANY DISTRICTS

Public apathy, unsuitable facilities, and low budgets have made a difficult task even harder.

Public apathy, unsuitable facilities and low budgets have made a difficult task even harder.

Fortunately not all communities have ignored the problem. Many are, in fact, providing excellent recreational facilities and programs bridging the gulf between the do-it-yourself venture of another age and the out-and-out commercial and resort establishments.

Central Westmoreland County residents have been particularly fortunate in this respect. Outstanding recreation programs are now in effect in most of our larger urban communities and in some of the more heavily populated rural areas.

ESTABLISHED PROGRAM

Greensburg, Jeanette, and Latrobe, for instance, have long-established organized recreation programs under full-time professional directors. Hempfield Township's program is rapidly approaching a similar status despite unusual geographical problems. And many other smaller communities are supporting a small amount of activity principally in the summer seasons on a part-time basis.

And an overall program is being conducted by the Westmoreland County Recreation Commission aimed chiefly at adult programs, coordination of local programs, long range planning and small community activities.

In communities maintaining an organized recreational program, policy is either established or approved by a recreation board or commission on which municipal government officials and school board members are represented. They in turn participate in the financing of the program usually on an equal basis.

The chief gap in the programs offered both on a year-around and seasonal basis is the adult program, ignored for the most part or limited to periodic lectures and craft classes. However, it is in this area that the county program—still more or less in the developing stage—is expected to enjoy its greatest success.

COVERS WIDE FIELD

In almost every instance the local recreation groups make an effort to cooperate with

churches, service clubs, YMCAs and youth groups in the formulation and conduct of their programs. This cooperation has proven to be of immeasurable assistance in promoting wider participation in recreation activities.

Thus Greensburg's widespread program covers playgrounds, playlots, football and baseball, arts and crafts, dancing, operettas, volley ball, basketball, tennis, ice skating and in cooperation with outside agencies, swimming, golf, gym and handball.

The Greensburg program is developing on a large scale every year and particularly since the partial development of Lynch Field, destined along with St. Clair Park and Mount Odin Park to provide the city with a well-rounded program for every age group.

Jeannette, and Latrobe have similar extensive programs, particularly Latrobe where the recent construction of a community swimming pool near the present athletic field offers a tremendous recreation potential.

Experts who have studied the problem of recreation in the central Westmoreland area have pinpointed the present programs—adult activities, recreation buildings, and swimming pools. Progress is being made toward a better rounded adult program, but the swimming pool and recreation buildings are largely hamstrung by a lack of funds.

WELL ORGANIZED

All recreation groups plead a lack of money. Thus, recreation leaders find themselves unable, because of insufficient facilities, to satisfy the public demand for participation in the program and, because of the insufficient facilities, unable to acquire the financial support necessary to expand the program.

But, despite the difficulties involved, there is every reason to believe that the immediate Greensburg-Jeannette-Latrobe area has as extensive and, within financial limitations, well-organized overall recreation programs as any similar area in western Pennsylvania.

Each of the three municipalities have organized full-time directors and employees, municipal parks, nearby State recreation areas, an outdoor swimming pool in Latrobe and one in the planning stage in Greensburg, indoor facilities in cooperation with church and school officials, and easy access to at least six outdoor commercial swimming pools.

The immediate area is also likely to enjoy added facilities when the county program which tentatively plans a system of parks as well as the arts and crafts programs fulfills its early promise.

Thus, at least for those living in the tricity area, the recreation future for both children and adults appears bright.

And there is every indication that government is at last recognizing its full responsibilities in the same field. One of the most effective fighters for additional recreation facilities has been Congressman JOHN H. DENT.

Congressman DENT sees the shorter workweek, the increased use of the automobile, and the resulting freedom of movement and the improved standard of living, as presenting a challenge to government, local, State, and Federal, to set aside lands and provide facilities for even greater recreation programs.

Effect of the Midwinter and Spring Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the address delivered by the Honorable Leo A. Hoegh, Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, on "Effect of the Midwinter and Spring Floods," at the 46th national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress on May 14, 1959, will prove of interest to my colleagues and it is with much pleasure that I am having it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS BY LEO A. HOEGH, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION, AT THE 46TH NATIONAL CONVENTION, NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Providing Federal assistance in natural disasters is a program of historical development. The first nationwide plan to help disaster victims was launched by the Red Cross. In 1881, this excellent organization widened its sphere of wartime activities to include assistance in natural disasters. The aid extended was so effective that in 1900, Congress chartered the American National Red Cross as a quasi-government organization, charged with the responsibility of providing natural disaster victims with food, clothing, medical care, and shelter. We owe a debt of great magnitude to the Red Cross for the assistance rendered to the people of our Nation.

The organization, concerned largely with relief of human suffering was not equipped to handle the highly technical problems—repair of bridges, streets, and dams, clearing of debris, repair of sanitation facilities—the almost inevitable results of natural disasters.

The Surplus Property Disaster Act of 1947 was the first positive action toward making available Federal assistance in natural disasters, but it became ineffective when wartime surplus goods were exhausted. In 1950, Public Law 875, now known as the Federal Disaster Act, was passed.

The history of disaster assistance was recognized in this legislation by the division of responsibility between the Red Cross and the Federal Government.

This division still applies—the Red Cross is geared to relieve human suffering and the Federal agencies are geared to repair public facilities and render other services essential for the preservation of life and property, when required to supplement State and local efforts.

The Disaster Act was administered originally by the Housing and Home Finance Administration. In January 1953, that responsibility was shifted to the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and—under the terms of the Reorganization Act of last year—to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

The similarity between natural disaster and over-all civil defense activities is apparent. We consider it basic that in any emergency, disaster needs are met first by the individuals and families and by the local government. Support action comes from the State and then from the Federal Government, if required. The first line of defense—whether it be in making ready for disaster or the havoc that follows—must be the individual.

At the State and Federal level the impact of natural disaster normally requires far less diversion of resources than would be required in an enemy attack. It is significant, however, that the procedures for meeting immediate disaster needs are virtually identical. The need for gathering information, the assessment of damage, the establishment of support requirements follow the same basic procedural patterns.

The challenge of a natural disaster gives the Federal agencies, as well as State and local governments, a chance to perfect their administrative organizations and to develop and refine techniques whereby the ability to meet and surmount the obstacles of the greater disaster of war is increased.

A request for Federal assistance must be made by the Governor of the affected State and must include certain specific information—an estimate of the severity and extent of the damage and the total funds and resources required to alleviate the damage; action which will be taken by the State and local authorities; an estimate of State and local funds, personnel, equipment, material, and other resources available; and an estimate as to what Federal assistance is required.

It is recognized that in many cases complete information on all four prerequisites cannot be obtained prior to making the request. For instance, the extent of the damage caused by hurricane Audrey in Louisiana in 1957, could not be immediately ascertained, but the need was obvious and the request for Federal aid had to be based on preliminary estimates, even though incomplete and fragmentary, and then later substantiated by specific information.

After July 1, this year, minimum requirement provisions become effective whereby the Governor of the State involved in requesting Federal assistance in a particular disaster must certify that total expenditures within the State for disaster relief purposes will exceed a specific minimum amount. Disaster relief expenditures or obligations for the 12 months preceding the Governor's request, over and above nominal expenditures, may be considered as part of the minimum expenditure required. The Joint Federal-State Action Committee recommended this change and suggested a schedule ranging from $250,000 in some States to $3 million in others. This was approved by the Governors' conference and the schedule was published in the Federal Register on April 9.

There are regular lines of action that are to be followed in the event of natural disaster. As stated earlier, recovery begins at the local level. The local chapter of the Red Cross looks after the welfare of individuals affected by the disaster. Local civil defense officials work with the Red Cross and in many cases become, in effect, Red Cross workers. In wartime, the role would be reversed.

If it appears that the disaster is beyond the local government's capability to handle, aid is sought from the Governor of the State. The Governor mobilizes the appropriate State agencies. His capability has been multiplied many times over through the establishment of his State civil defense office with its corps of trained personnel. If the disaster is of sufficient magnitude, an appeal is made to the President through our regional director and my office.

We also lend assistance through the civil defense program in emergencies not of sufficient scope to be considered major disasters, under Public Law 875. Here are some examples:

In the tragic fire at Our Lady of the Angels School in Chicago last December, OCDM was asked to help. We broke into our civil defense stockpile of medical supplies in Seneca, Ill., and furnished extra large burn-dressing bandages to treat the victims.

In Mansfield, Ga., the new city-owned pump fell 437 feet to the bottom of a new well during installation. The town had no water for 3 days. Civil defense emergency equipment was used to pump water from a nearby lake.

Mount Pulaski, Ill., suffered a damaging sleet and snow storm last winter. Phone and power lines failed. Local officials offered the grade school as a heated refuge but power failed over the entire city. Civil defense secured a generator and established a power hookup so lights and heat could be furnished.

Following the tornado which struck St. Louis in February of this year, and which was subsequently declared a major disaster by the President, the Associated Press reported the following: "The St. Louis Civil Defense unit went into full-scale operation for the

first time since it was organized in 1951." An editorial stated: "Such a disaster vindicates the civil defense organization, for in it are men and women trained and equipped for emergency tasks of many kinds. They are able to work with police and firemen of whom, at such a time, there are never enough. Trained hands can save many a life. Civil defense, when it is taken seriously by a community, supplies these trained hands. * * * When it went into action in St. Louis, the civil defense organization paid back every cent of money and every hour of work went into it."

In each of these instances, with the exception of the St. Louis tornado, there was no declaration by the President of a major disaster under the Disaster Act as the magnitude of the damage was not sufficiently great to warrant it. Nonetheless, people were suffering and they needed help. Civil defense, trained for service in the event of war, was able to render effective help in these disasters.

The work of OCDM in administering the disaster law is largely a task of direction and coordination. There are many Federal agencies whose specialized duties fit into the pattern of disaster relief. Some have emergency authorities under which they can take action without the invocation of Public Law 875, and others have emergency authorities which must be triggered by invoking this law. When the law is invoked, OCDM directs all Federal assistance provided by the various agencies, in addition to administering the financial assistance available from the President's emergency fund.

One of the most destructive disasters in recent years was Hurricane Audrey and its tragic visit to Cameron, La. This was just before I assumed the responsibility as Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Agency and I flew down there and met with Governor Peterson and General Gruenther, at the request of the President. Of course, I had come into contact with the Federal disaster assistance program while serving as Governor of Iowa. The official records of the Federal Civil Defense Administration indicate the way the civil defense organizations channeled the assistance of the various Federal departments and agencies into this disaster area to provide immediate and effective relief.

Disaster is ever present as evidenced by a Union Pacific accident in Olympia, Wash., on March 13. While we are prone to speak of natural disasters as a result of winds, earthquakes, flood and fire, when 15 railroad cars crashed through the depot in downtown Olympia, and buried themselves in buildings on the opposite side of the street, here was a different type of disaster.

But here, too, civil defense played an important role. A civil defense communications truck and civil defense personnel assisted in controlling the crowds which gathered. Floodlights and base communications were furnished.

Here is a quote from an Olympia paper: "Our civil defense unit demonstrated how efficiently it works in time of disaster. I am certain there is no doubt in the minds of the people as to their efficiency."

While tornadoes, hurricanes, fires, and other catastrophes cause considerable havoc and the damage runs into millions of dollars each year, I know I do not need to tell this group that floods continue to be the greatest source of destruction. The New England floods in the fall of 1955 cost the Federal Government over $30 million. This was over and above what the States and local governments spent. The west coast floods in the winter of 1955–56 cost another $11 million in Federal assistance alone. The tristate floods in Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky in January 1957 required $2,500,000 in Federal assistance.

So far this year, four major disasters have been declared and three of these were caused by floods, the other being the St. Louis tornado I mentioned earlier. Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Indiana suffered heavy damage because of severe weather, heavy rains, unseasonal thaws of heavy snows, and ice jams in rivers, which resulted in some of the worst floods of recent years. Eighty-six of Ohio's 88 counties were affected by the floods. In Pennsylvania, 24 counties received heavy damage and the situation became particularly tragic when a break in the flooded Susquehanna River overflowed into a mining area, causing the death of trapped miners and disrupting mining operations in many communities. Thirty-six counties in Indiana required Federal assistance.

Federal allocations under these three declarations amount so far to $5,500,000.

We sincerely hope that groups such as yours will have a measurable effect in developing and implementing policies that will help to prevent such widespread destruction which costs so much in human suffering and misery, and disrupts the economy of many communities.

The most important truths are these: (1) Individuals and families cannot avoid the personal responsibility of being prepared to meet disaster; and (2) the elected official of the local, State, and Federal Government is the responsible leader in his jurisdiction during an emergency.

These responsibilities are clearly set forth in the national plan for civil defense and defense mobilization. They are equally as appropriate to floods, tornadoes, hurricanes, and fires as they are to enemy attack. I want to emphasize, too, that every person in this room has a fundamental, inescapable responsibility for civil defense preparedness of this nation.

As individuals, you must know these five things:

1. The warning signals and what they mean. A steady blast of 3 to 5 minutes means take action as directed by your local government. You should know this local plan. If you do not, turn your AM radio to the conelrad frequency—640 or 1240—for official direction. A wailing tone or short blasts for 3 minutes means take cover immediately in the best available shelter.

2. Your community plan for emergency action. If you are in a target city, you will be asked to either move out or to take the best available shelter. The decision is a local one. If you are not in a target city, you should take cover.

3. How to protect yourself and your family from radioactive fallout. You should construct a fallout shelter and stock it with a 2-week supply of food and water, a battery radio, first-aid kit, and essential items for survival. Designs and plans are available.

4. First aid and home emergency preparedness. This is essential for everyday living, but crucial in case of a nuclear attack.

5. How to use conelrad—640 or 1240—for official directions and instruction. Other radio and television would be silent.

It will be the constant effort of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, through administration of the Federal Disaster Act and through our responsibilities in the nonmilitary defense field, to provide quick, effective, operative assistance when disasters strike our Nation. But every American must be prepared to do his share.

Private Power Almost Matches TVA for AEC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Knoxville, Tenn., Journal recently printed a series of articles by Mr. Dudley Brewer, on payment in lieu of taxes made by TVA and its power distributors. I believe Members of Congress will be particularly interested in the article of June 18, "Private Power Almost Matches TVA for AEC." Fifteen companies comprising the Ohio Valley Electric Corp.—OVEC—supply power to AEC. Among them are the Ohio Power Co., Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., Dayton Power & Light Co., Ohio Edison Co., Toledo Edison Co., and Monongahela Power Co.

Under leave to extend, I include the article mentioned:

PRIVATE POWER ALMOST MATCHES TVA FOR AEC

(The following report on costs of electricity furnished to Atomic Energy Commission by Tennessee Valley Authority and two privately owned suppliers is an outgrowth of a recent series of articles on payments in lieu of taxes made by TVA and its power distributors.—EDITOR'S NOTE.)

(By Dudley Brewer)

Although it is not generally known to the public, privately owned utility companies are doing almost as a big a job as Tennessee Valley Authority in supplying power to three major Atomic Energy Commission installations.

They are doing it at nearly the same rates as TVA but without the complete tax exemption which the Federal power agency enjoys on power sales to AEC. The private utilities are Ohio Valley Electric Corp., which has Indiana-Kentucky Electric Corp. as a subsidiary, and Electric Energy, Inc.

According to the Federal Power Commission, a total of about 51,361,203,000 kilowatt-hours of power went in 1958 to the AEC installations at Oak Ridge, Paducah, Ky., and Portsmouth, Ohio. Of this 27,885,737,000 kilowatt-hours was supplied by TVA at Oak Ridge and Paducah while 23,475,466,000 kilowatt-hours was furnished at Paducah and Portsmouth by OVEC and Electric Energy, Inc.

Thus nearly 46 percent of the supply came from the private companies.

The average rates per kilowatt-hour paid by AEC were as follows: To TVA at Oak Ridge 3.9 mills, to TVA at Paducah 3.69 mills, to OVEC at Portsmouth 4.03 mills, and to Electric Energy, Inc., at Paducah 3.86 mills.

In 1957 the comparative rates paid were: To TVA at Oak Ridge 3.97 mills, to TVA at Puducah 3.89 mills, to OVEC at Portsmouth 3.91 mills, and Electric Energy, Inc., at Paducah 3.86 mills.

So it is seen there is hardly any difference between the TVA and private utility rates to AEC.

TVA has two distinct advantages. Up to now it has not hard to pay interest on the millions of dollars invested in its power facilities out of the U.S. Treasury. Last year OVEC paid out $12,908,695 and Electric

Energy, Inc., $5,673,554 in interest on their funded debt.

And TVA is exempt from all taxes. It pays no Federal income tax whatsoever but does distribute to State and counties 5 percent of its gross power revenues as tax replacement. However, all power sold to AEC and other Federal agencies is excluded from the 5 percent.

Last year OVEC paid a total of $3,631,703 in local, State, and Federal taxes, and Electric Energy, Inc., paid $1,005,306.

TVA spokesmen were quick to point out that these tax payments were low in proportion to revenues when compared with taxes paid by private electric companies generally. Inquiry shows this is true although the two concerns apparently pay all taxes that are applicable to them. They enjoy no exemptions.

As a matter of fact, OVEC's taxes in 1958 figured at 5.12 percent of revenues and those of Electric Energy, Inc., were 3.36 percent. By contrast, total local, State, and Federal taxes of power companies generally averaged 23.2 percent of revenues.

The biggest difference is in Federal income taxes, which average about 13 percent of revenues for all power companies.

The reason for the difference is this:

OVEC and Electric Energy, Inc., were formed by groups of electric companies for the primary and almost exclusive purpose of supplying AEC. They were permitted by regulatory authorities to capitalize with an extremely high ratio of funded debt and a minimal ratio of equity investment. In other words, they were financed mostly with bonds and long-term loans, but little by issuance of stock.

The Federal tax laws allow interest paid on bonds to be deducted for income tax purposes. Consequently, the amount of income subject to Federal tax is relatively small.

Last year OVEC's Federal income tax was $383,348, while revenues were $70,885,342; and Electric Elergy, Inc., paid $355,398 in income taxes from operating revenues of $29,899,314.

Biggest item for these companies is their local real and personal property taxes. For OVEC these amounted in 1958 to $1,233,354 in Indiana, $1,249,169 in Ohio, and $125,000 in Kentucky. Electric Energy, Inc., paid real and personal property taxes of $418,900 in Massac County, Ill., and $37,573 in personalty tax in McCracken County, Ky.

West Virginia Welcomes a Giant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, my State of West Virginia rapidly is becoming a leader in efforts to attract new industries. We know that we have many of the features which industries are looking for, and we have been accelerating our programs for explaining these advantages. We look forward to the day when the State no longer will depend on the ebb and flow of the coal market, but will have a broadly based, diversified economy.

Now I am happy to report that another of the world's great corporations has recognized our immense potential, and may serve as a beacon to lure additional businesses to our area. And this is no raid on another section of the country—it will not take one dime from any other region's pockets.

The Montecatini Societa Generale per l'Industria Minerari e Chimica of Milan, Italy, has just announced plans to build a magnificent new $10 million chemical plant on the Big Sandy River near Neal Wayne County, about 8 miles from Huntington.

The benefits which will be derived from the Wayne County plant—located in an area sorely wounded by the still-current recession gripping our State—should be immense.

Montecatini is locating a plant in our district of the United States when many American industries are resituating their plants in foreign nations. This should be an object lesson to American corporations, who need only to look to Montecatini to reaffirm that American workers are the best labor supply in the world—and that they fully deserve to be the best fed, best housed, and best paid.

In fact, I had the pleasure recently of meeting with the company's senior American representative, Mr. Lucio Lucini, of New York. Mr. Lucini has had long experience dealing with industrial labor both in America and abroad, and he made a remark about the reasons for Montecatini's selection of the Wayne County site that I regard as exceptionally pertinent. Not only did the firm decide upon the Wayne site for the usual advantages such as coal, water, power, and accessibility to markets, Mr. Lucini said, but also because of the human element.

This factor, less tangible but no less important to an industry seeking sites to expand or relocate, was not inconsiderable in Montecatini's selection.

We liked the people—

Mr. Lucini told me.

The working people of West Virginia are good people. They are quick to learn complicated jobs, they are conscientious and they work hard. This was one of our big considerations.

I believe this clinches arguments in favor of West Virginia for new plant sites. West Virginia is an ideal location from a standpoint of abundant raw materials and other blessings, but it also has the kind of people with which industry likes to be associated.

And if the Montecatini company is happy to be working with our West Virginians, it is equally true that the people of West Virginia are happy to welcome Montecatini.

This company has become truly global in scope since its founding as a small copper mining concern in 1888. Today, it embraces an industrial empire of 174 plants in 25 different nations, employing 60,000 persons.

The firm has kept up with the tremendously rapid and complex changes taking place in the chemical world of today. Five percent of the company's gross income is poured back into fundamental or applied research, and another 1 percent for the education and added training of its workers on every level.

It is hardly surprising that Montecatini is one of two great Italian firms cooperating on the first application of atomic energy developed in Italy—and I should like to point out that this will be peaceful atomic energy, not war production.

The Wayne County plant will be producing another fabulous new product which Montecatini research has developed—the marvelous discovery Moplen, which may be as important to the plastics industry as the development of nylon a couple of decades ago.

Mople, described by chemical experts as a true breakthrough in the polyolefin chemical group, is going to be one of the real workhorse plastics of the future. It has broken the so-called 100° centigrade barrier which defied many earlier plastics compounds.

Moplen's high melting point, low density, excellent electrical characteristics, rigidity, toughness and tensile strength make it ideal for a galaxy of uses.

Moplen is a product evolved from a research miracle by Dr. Giulio Natta, who found a means of actually altering the molecular structure of the gaseous olefin chemical group—derived from petroleum—to meet given needs in the manufacured or finished form.

Thus, Moplen can be literally tailormade as it is being produced to provide specific qualities for the product into which it is to be fabricated.

This will make its application in the plastics field incredibly wide as production expands. And our plant in Wayne County will be one of the pioneers in manufacturing this miraculous new product for industries and consumers alike all over the world.

So keen was the interest in Montecatini's new venture that a bond issue of $10 million for construction of the new plant through an American subsidiary was oversubscribed almost as soon as it was announced.

Montecatini's Wayne works will provide needed jobs for our West Virginians, a vital new product for the world's future, and a closer bond between America and a stanch European ally.

With all these benefits in sight, it is no wonder that West Virginia extends a cordial welcome to Montecatini, and looks forward to many years of happy and fruitful association.

It is altogether possible that Montecatini will blaze a trial for many, many other industries to recognize the great potential of the Ohio Valley, "the American Ruhr," and other sections of West Virginia, and locate new industries there.

George E. Stringfellow's Remarks on the Shriners' Hospitals for Crippled Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, some years ago my attention was directed to the valiant effort Mr. George E. Stringfellow was making in the fight against

the spread of cancer. It was then I learned of this outstanding citizen's dedicated, unselfish work in behalf of his fellowman.

George Stringfellow who was busy enough as the vice president of the Thomas A. Edison Industries of the McGraw-Edison Co. and as director of a number of nationally known corporations was never too-busy to devote himself unselfishly to humanitarian activities.

Mr. Stringfellow who has been the recipient of honorary degrees from various colleges in recognition of his accomplishments is a doctor of humanities, doctor of fine arts, and a doctor of law. He was made an honorary member of the New Jersey Medical Society and was the recipient of the American Cancer Society award for his leadership and work in founding and supporting the New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society. Mr. Stringfellow was cited by the Brotherhood Committee of Christians and Jews for bringing about a better understanding among the three religious sects. In 1958 he received the 1958 Academy of Medicine of New Jersey Annual Citizens Award "for rendering extraordinary service for the health and welfare of the public."

It is therefore, a privilege, Mr. Speaker, to include in the RECORD the following brief history of Shriner's Hospital for Crippled Children prepared by Mr. Stringfellow:

BRIEF HISTORY OF SHRINERS' HOSPITALS FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN

(By George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, N.J., Imperial Potentate, A.A.O.N.M.S., 1958–59)

It was my privilege to witness the Shrine Oyster Bowl football game in October 1958 at Norfolk, Va. The game was played by the stalwart young men of the Naval Academy and the equally stalwart young men of Tulane University.

The game is one of more than 80 played each year in various sections of the country for the benefit of the Shriners' Hospitals for Crippled Children.

The Oyster Bowl game has been promoted since its inception by Khedive Temple, A.A.O.N.M.S., Norfolk, Va. Last year's game produced a net profit of more than $80,000.

Incident to that game was a huge parade of high school bands, the Shrine temple organizations of Virginia, and a number of beautiful floats from the territory surrounding Norfolk. The float of Khedive Temple was devoted to the Greenville Hospital unit. Riding on that float was a little 4-year-old boy, the son of a merchant seaman.

This little boy romped and played on the float, jumping, dancing, and even running. He was happy and so were the group of Shriners who watched and guarded over him. Eighteen months before the boy was admitted to a Shrine hospital. He could only crawl. He had never been able to walk, because he was born with club feet. His feet were so malformed that if he had been able to stand upright, he would have been walking on the tops of his feet instead of the soles.

This is not an unusual case. It happens all over North America and in Hawaii, where the Shriners have established 17 hospitals with more than a thousand beds to care for children with deformities they would carry with them throughout their lives, except for these hospitals. Instead, the little boy in Norfolk and thousands of others who have been patients in Shrine hospitals, today are leading normal lives, contributing their full share to our American way of life.

These hospitals have been called the world's greatest private philanthropy. The story of these hospitals is filled with romance. It is a story of men with reverend minds and merry hearts, a faith in God, and a desire to be of service to those who cannot help themselves.

In its 1919 session, the Imperial Council of the Ancient Arabic Order, Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, elected W. Freeland Kendrick as its imperial potentate. At that time, Noble Kendrick was the tax collector of Philadelphia, and was later to become that city's most distinguished mayor.

The Kendricks were childless and as a result devoted much of their time to entertaining friendless and orphaned children who were inmates of the various homes of the city. Among these institutions was one for incurables. On one occasion Noble and Mrs. Kendrick took four of these deformed youngsters on an automobile ride through the city's parks.

Noble Kendrick never forgot that visit to the home for incurables and he resolved that when he should become imperial potentate of the Shrine he would endeavor to have the organization care for as many of these crippled children as possible.

About that time, 1918, a new hospital was established in Atlanta, Ga., owned and operated by the Scottish Rite Masons of that city. This hospital was for crippled children of that area who could not pay for treatment or correct their deformities. This hospital was the fulfillment of a dream of Dr. Michael Hoke, an orthopedic surgeon of Atlanta, and Noble Forrest Adair, the head of the Scottish Rite bodies.

Noble Adair was also one of Atlanta's Yaarab Temple representatives to the Imperial Council which met in Portland, Oreg., in 1920, at the end of Noble Kendrick's term as imperial potentate.

It was at the Portland session that Noble Kendrick sponsored the movement within the Shrine to build a hospital for crippled children. His resolution would probably have failed had it not been for Noble Adair who delivered an inspiring message that has become known throughout shrinedom as the "bubbles" speech. Noble Adair spoke from firsthand knowledge. He had built such a hospital in Atlanta, as Noble Kendrick proposed to have the Shrine build for North America. Noble Adair had seen the twisted bodies enter the Atlanta institution and leave it straightened. He had been inspired by the happy smiles and the discarded crutches of the crippled kids. He knew what could be done and he knew Shriners needed in their lives an objective above and beyond fund and frolic.

And so it was that the imperial council approved in Portland the policy to establish hospitals. The authority to establish these hospitals was handed to a committee of seven men, headed by Noble Sam Cochran of Dallas, Tex., and I doubt that in all history there have ever been seven more dedicated.

The basic rules and regulations they established were so sound they have never been changed. For admission to the hospital, a child must be under 14 years of age, and in the opinion of the doctors, one who can be improved or cured by orthopedic help. The children must come from families unable financially to pay for their treatment. They may come from all races, be of any color, and have faith under any creed.

The first hospital was opened at Shreveport, La., on September 16, 1922, the second in Honolulu on January 1, 1923, and the third in St. Paul on March 12, 1923. The last to be opened was in Mexico City on March 10, 1945.

It cost close to $6 million a year to operate these hospitals. The money is provided by the 830,000 Shriners, each of whom contributes $5 per year, from the proceeds of football games and circuses conducted by the various temples, and from an endowment fund to which anyone may contribute either as gifts or bequests.

In addition to regular work of the hospitals, each hospital treats thousands of youngsters as outpatients—children who may need posthospital care, or whose difficulties may be corrected without surgery.

May I remind you again that no patient has ever paid a penny for the care received, although there are former patients without number who have contributed to the endowment fund, or who at special times contribute to the welfare of the patients, such as at Christmas.

The work of these hospitals has, for Shriners, been a labor of love, a labor which is above the call of duty. Shriners have enjoyed the privilege through the years and so have hundreds of others who are not members of our fraternity, for example, the players in many of the football games.

The first of these football games was the now famous East-West all-star game in San Francisco, which has been called football's finest hour, and which originated the slogan, "Strong legs run that weak legs may walk."

It is needless to go into statistics or to tell you of the many crooked bodies that have been straightened. Your own imagination can give you the picture. We invite you to visit any 1 of our 17 Shrine hospitals. What you see may shock you for a moment, but the shock is only momentary. Then you see the smiling faces. You will hear the laughter. Then you will know why we Shriners are so very proud to remember Nobles Kendrick, Cochran, Adair, and Dr. Hoke, and all the others who have done so much, including the present head of our 17 hospitals, past imperial potentate, the honorable Galloway Calhoun, a symbol of civic virtue and illustrious son of the Lone Star State.

H.R. 4700

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I have submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means in support of H.R. 4700:

STATEMENT OF HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN, OF NEW YORK, ON H.R. 4700

May I first congratulate this committee for holding hearings on H.R. 4700 which is of the utmost importance to our older men and women.

The miraculous advances of this century in the medical sciences have resulted in longer and healthier lives for the people of this Nation. The number of persons 65 years and older today is 15 million and is expected to reach almost 25 million by 1980. At that time this age group will constitute between 9.0 and 10.6 percent of the population.

I join the rest of you here today who are concerned with the plight of our older men and women. What will these aged look forward to after years of hard work? Most of them will be forced to live on low and limited incomes. Many of them will suffer from any one of the numerous long-lasting and expensive chronic diseases. These diseases continue each year to make up a larger total of the illnesses in this country. In

addition, chronic illnesses are more likely to affect the elder than any other age group. The dilemma of the older person is how to meet ever spiraling medical costs on fixed retirement incomes.

It is my sincere conviction that the best solution to this problem is embodied in H.R. 4700, introduced by the Honorable AIME J. FORAND. This practical and sensible measure proposes the inclusion of coverage for certain medical expenditures within the existing social security system. Beneficiaries of old age and survivors insurance would receive hospital, surgical and nursing home benefits.

In my opinion, this plan has two major advantages. In the first place there can be no hidden exclusions or cancellations in a publicly supported system. Secondly, the cost for the program would be shared by nearly the entire working population at a time when they are well able to afford the low increase in payroll deductions necessary to finance the program.

This problem has received the careful study and attention of a number of groups. Even those who cry out against the approach of H.R. 4700 cannot ignore the serious plight of the aged in meeting their medical costs. Most recently the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare submitted a very thorough report to this committee on this subject. I concur with Representative FORAND'S judgment that the report pointed clearly to the urgent need for passage of H.R. 4700. Among other very interesting facts, the report showed that in 1957 more than 80 percent of the hospitalized social security beneficiaries had medical bills of $1,000 or more.

I do not ask that we ignore the great advance in coverage of medical costs by nonprofit and commercial insurance companies. Nevertheless, I am astounded by a recent report in the New York Times which quoted the New York State Labor Department's monthly magazine as stating that an average of $2 out of every $3 spent by Americans on health were not covered by insurance policies.

For the aged the problem is especially serious because the cost of insuring the elderly is much higher than for the rest of the population. It is, therefore, not surprising that a recent study of the National Opinion Research Center shows that only three out of eight persons 65 years of age or older had some form of voluntary health insurance coverage in 1957. Nor is it astonishing that of this number an even smaller percentage were fully covered for hospital costs. The same study reports that more than half of these persons favor Government insurance.

Within recent months there has been a floor of publicity on plans especially designed for persons 65 and over offered by commercial and Blue Shield companies. Let us not be misled by the outward claims of these plans. Their shortcomings are evident upon careful examination. The premiums are high, the benefits low. Often no more than half the average cost of hospital room and board is covered for a time shorter than usually needed. Exclusions for preexisting conditions and limitations on services covered further limit the usefulness of these plans to the aged.

The failure of voluntary health insurance to meet the needs of persons 65 years and older is clear. It is equally evident that the most effective way of meeting their demands is through a fair broad-based, well-run system. Our Social Security System meets these criteria.

New York has been in the vanguard of attempts to improve health insurance coverage for her population. I am sure I speak for the people at home when I urge the passage of H.R. 4700 as another step in this direction.

Our increased national life expectancy is a precious gift, but it also offers a pressing challenge. We have the opportunity to lessen one of the heaviest burdens of our older citizens, their staggering health bills.

H.R. 4700 is a worthy national solution to a national problem.

Why TVA Self-Financing Bill Should Be Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as we know, the House has passed the TVA self-financing bill. It was passed by a vote of 245 to 170.

Last week the other body also acted favorably on this legislation. This bill was passed by a vote of 73 to 17. Two years ago the Senate also passed a similar bill by a vote of 61 to 20.

I express the hope and the belief that the President will be fair and approve this legislation when the bill comes to his attention.

First. The President himself first proposed this legislation to the Congress in his budget message on January 17, 1955. The President has repeated his request for self-financing legislation for TVA in his budget messages of 1956, 1957, 1958, and again in January of this year—on five separate occasions.

Second. Committees of the Congress have worked for 4 years to write a reasonable and workable bill.

Third. Extensive hearings have been held—five sets of hearings—on this legislation in both Houses of the Congress.

Fourth. Both the House and the Senate have acted favorably on this bill and there has been 5 years of debate on this measure, both inside and out of the Congress.

Fifth. The bill represents a reasonable compromise of many views. It is considered satisfactory in the main, not only to the TVA, but also to the private utility companies bordering on the TVA area.

Sixth. The Secretary of the Treasury has expressed his approval of desirable features of the financing phases of this bill—and indeed all approved the measure except a limited few who want TVA destroyed and dismembered.

Seventh. The bill puts a fence around TVA—a territorial limitation is prescribed—and not a kilowatt of power can be sold outside the area.

Eighth. The TVA will make a far greater return of payments into the Treasury that under the present law.

Ninth. TVA is a creature of Congress—will remain under the control of the Congress. The President can make recommendations for changes at any time and the Congress can enact changes at any time.

Tenth. All three members of the Board—Chairman Vogel, former Congressman Hays and former Deputy Director of the Budget Bureau, Jones, have all been appointed by the President, and surely they can be depended upon to carry out the provision of this legislation in a responsible manner.

With the territorial limitations, with Treasury Department control, and congressional control, and Presidential control through the naming of the Board members, no further control should be desired.

When we are appropriating millions for the development of water resources throughout the country—and billions throughout the world—surely it is just and fair that the citizens of a great area would be given the privilege of voting bonds for self-financing, bonds that are taxable and bonds that are not included, but outside, the national debt.

I express the hops again that the President will be objective and fair and not disapprove this needed and meritorious legislation. Such approval would permit the TVA to operate in a businesslike fashion, but without undue political and partisan influence and to a large degree eliminate the annual congressional fight over TVA's operations, and would be in line with statements and assurances of the President of his friendship and support for this great agency of the Government.

Resumption of Foreign Ministers' Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today in Geneva the Western Foreign Ministers resume negotiations with the Soviets on the future status of West Berlin and its more than two million inhabitants. As the conference reconvenes, it is well to recall just where responsibility for the present difficulty lies; with Nikita Khrushchev's ultimatum of last November. While the Kremlin representatives have endeavored to soften the harshness of its impact, this brutal threat remains the key to Soviet policy in Germany. Their goal is no less than complete withdrawal by the West, and the subsequent replacement of freedom with Communist tyranny.

Despite repeated threats from Moscow, President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Herter have made it abundantly clear that the United States will not retreat from its basic responsibilities in West Berlin. At the same time we have advanced a series of constructive proposals, looking forward to the reunification of Germany by democratic means. So far, the Communists have refused even to consider these proposals.

In yesterday's New York Times there appeared an excellent editorial on the resumption of the Geneva negotiations. Believing that this perceptive analysis of the issues involved merits wide consideration, I include the editorial with my remarks:

[From the New York Times, July 12, 1959]

GENEVA: ACT TWO

As the Foreign Ministers' Conference reopens in Geneva tomorrow there may be several diplomats on the allied side whose feelings are, as Secretary Herter suggested in his Thursday press conference, unprintable.

The Russians may or may not be trying to solve the Berlin problem that they themselves have created. They may have offered British Prime Minister Macmillan some sort of deal because they really want a settlement. Or they may just be playing the old game of trying to split the allies. They continue to hint at concessions that are not concessions. It means nothing at all, for example, for them to say they are willing to continue the present status of West Berlin until 1961. They already have said the same thing in different words.

As far as anybody can tell—or will tell—the situation adds up to what it was on June 19, when the conference recessed, or indeed, what it was on May 13, when it opened. The allies proposed nearly 2 months ago to unite the two parts of Berlin and the two parts of Germany by democratic process. They tied into this proposal a plan for an internationally supervised reduction of armaments. The Russians have never dealt seriously with these proposals. They have never budged from their basic position that all of Berlin ought to be left at the mercy of the East German Government, and that Germany should be reunited, if it is ever reunited, on terms that would leave it under Communist domination.

In plain language, Moscow proposed the retirement of the Western Powers from their legitimate position in West Berlin and the betrayal of more than 2 million of West Berlin's inhabitants to an alien tyrany. Nothing that Mr. Gromyko said in Berlin, nothing that Mr. Koslov has publicly said in his visit to this country, nothing that Mr. Khrushchev is known to have said to a former Governor of New York State and other callers, or has uttered more loudly in public speeches is any indication of a Russian willingness to allow the people of Berlin and all of Germany to determine their own fate.

Secretary Herter made it clear on Thursday, and again yesterday, that we would not budge from our basic position, which is simply government by the consent of the governed.

In lesser matters we will make concessions. The Macmillan government in Britain, or the De Gaulle government in France, will not break with us on matters of principle. We may have to confer with them again at the summit, or at some lesser altitude, to settle questions of procedure.

But the issue of the talks that are to be resumed tomorrow lies with Mr. Khrushchev and his agents. The question whether the Kremlin is to bestride the world like a colossus has to be settled sometime. It might as well be settled now before passions rise too high and fires are lighted that might consume the world. There can be peace, there must be peace, but there is no peace in slavery.

Time To Take the Long Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Editor Ralph E. McGill, of the Atlanta Constitution, is a highly respected member of his profession. His observations while in Havana, Cuba, recently appeared in his syndicated column for July 9, 1959, in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star. The column, "Cuba Needs Castro To Succeed," follows under the leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CUBA NEEDS CASTRO TO SUCCEED—POLITICAL REVOLUTIONIST VIEWED AS HOPE OF PEOPLE TO EASE THEIR INEQUITIES

(By Ralph McGill)

HAVANA, CUBA.—Here, seeing Fidel Castro's bearded soldiers strolling along the Prado, and on the streets of this ancient and beautiful city, one thinks of the Pageant of History.

Cuba has had her share—Columbus, Diego Velasquez, Cortez, De Soto, pirates, and British and Spanish rule.

Now, in the long pageant, appears Fidel Castro.

His story is too new to belabor. But, let us recall, in this attempt to find understanding, that this is his second appearance on the stage of Cuban history. His first was very brief. On July 26, 1953, he led a small group of 75 men in a desperate attack on the Moncado fortress near Santiago de Cuba. It failed. Castro was arrested. Plots to kill him were thwarted by friends, and the court, not yet dominated by the Batista forces, heard Castro's defense. This was more than 5 years ago. None of it was then permitted to be published.

In a long, eloquently written defense, Castro said—almost 6 years ago:

"We call on the people, the 700,000 Cubans who are without work * * * the 500,000 campworkers who dwell in miserable shacks, who work four months out of the year and are hungry the rest, sharing the misery with their sons, who do not have an inch of land to plant and whose existence should move more to compassion if there were not so many hearts of stone; the 400,000 industrial workers and stevedores whose retirement funds, all, have been embezzled * * * whose salaries pass from the hands of the boss to the usurer, whose future is a pay reduction and dismissal, whose life is perennial work, and whose rest is the tomb. We call on the 100,000 small farmers who live and die working a land that is not theirs * * * who die without possessing it; who cannot love it nor improve it, nor plant a cedar or an orange tree to beautify it because they do not know the day when a sheriff or rural guard will come and tell they have to go."

Castro was 27. He spoke for more than an hour. The judges heard him out. They then sentenced him to 15 years at hard labor. His first appearance in the pageant of history was ended.

A year later the story of the attack, the atrocities, undenied against some of the captives, became known. So did Castro's eloquent emotional words. On May 16, 1955, he and the survivors were released from prison after long agitation for an amnesty. In January of the next year he and 12 men reached the Sierra Maestra mountains. He was once more in the pageant. The pageant will continue through the centuries ahead.

Fidel Castro is an episode * * * a new type revolutionary, a political revolutionist, not a military. The odds tremendously are against him. But if he does not succeed, it is not comfortable to consider the next scenes in the pageant.

Americans, who are themselves heirs of revolution, fall into a commmon human error of comparing everything with their present situation, laws, customs, and comforts.

Here is why the odds are heavily against Castro. The labors of Hercules are less in comparison.

Most of his people are dependent on agriculture—perhaps 60 percent of them. Most of them are landless. The average yearly earnings of thousands of them is less than $100. This is true not merely in Cuba, but all Latin America. Cuba is but one of those in the spotlight. The long-term issue is not Castro—but the stability of Latin America. It is not now Communist. There is no head of a government who is Communist.

But even Castro cannot stem the tide of discontent if he cannot remove some of the inequities which have so long been smoldering in the minds of millions of Latin peoples.

Something like one-quarter of the world's population of more than 2.5 billion people today live in what can be called rich countries. These peoples average a per capita income of about $1,000 per year. These peoples are mostly the Europeans, the Americans, Canadians, Australians, New Zealanders, and so on.

From somewhere between a half and three quarters of all the people in the world are definitely and excessively poor with an average income of about $100. There are at least three with this income for each making $1,000. And the gap between "have" and "have not" nations widens fearfully—ominously.

This is the problem of Cuba—but it is also that of other Latin countries and of Asia.

It is against this backdrop we must see Castro—and the continuing pageant—if we are to understand.

Operation Bootstrap—Reservation Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, among others who have unequivocally endorsed "Operation Bootstrap — Reservation Style" is the Economic Development Commission of Bismarck, N. Dak.

In their letter of endorsement under date of July 7, they enclose a copy of their letter to the Honorable Don L. Short, Republican, of North Dakota, part of which is of particular interest to all Members of Congress and to the public generally. These figures illustrate what is meant by the Indian problem. They are proof of the statement I have made in many occasions to this body that the Indian problem is actually a white man's problem, that it has been created because of our failure to provide opportunity to the Indian people, or I should say, to make available the possibility for the Indian people to provide opportunity for themselves.

Operation Bootstrap, which is an Indian self-help bill (H.R. 7701), provides a means for the Indian people to provide opportunity for themselves. Further proof of the need will be found in the figures presented in the letter of Lawrence S. Schneider, director of the North Dakota Economic Development Commission, which is in part as follows:

You might be interested to know that in the Aberdeen area (in which North Dakota is included) 32 percent of the Indian family heads, ages 20 to 45, have attained this age living on unearned income. It will be quite difficult to change their attitude enabling

them to successfully compete in a business economy unless a long-range program is devised.

According to the 1956 census, there are 34,200 Indian people in our area (11,000 in North Dakota). Over 38 percent are in the fullblood Indian group, 22 percent in the three-fourths to fullblood Indian group, or 60 percent, have three-fourths degree or more Indian blood. Conversely, only 34 percent of the off-reservation population is in this three-fourths to fullblood group. This would appear to indicate that the group who will find it most difficult to relocate successfully is still on the reservation.

Another very important factor is that 44 percent of the resident reservation population is under 16 years of age. Unless the efforts of all concerned are combined toward establishing these 15,000 young people as self-sufficient members of society, our reservation problem will become greatly exaggerated in the years to come.

Any program of providing job opportunities for Indian people will benefit the Government financially, for it is estimated the cost of maintaining a reservation family is about $4,200 per year.

The Trinity River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen serving on the House Appropriations Committee, in marking up the public works appropriations bill, are certainly to be highly commended for refusing to spend needless funds for the construction of the Trinity River power facilities. However, an amount for this purpose was included in the nearly $80 million by which the Senate increased the House-approved bill.

This action by the other body seems particularly regrettable in view of the fact that the legislative committee had announced that hearings will be held on July 24 on the bills providing for joint development on the Trinity, whereby a private utility has offered to build and operate the powerplants itself. The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, having jurisdiction over the proposed legislation, has, in effect, been improperly circumvented by the decision on the other side to appropriate prior to the legislative committee's consideration and action on the merits of the pending bills. Considering the matter from the aspect of proper legislative procedure, I believe the criticism is well-taken that an appropriation for a project, with full knowledge that the legislative committee is about to hear the testimony on bills providing for an immediate saving to the Treasury of $60 million in construction costs, is certainly premature and highly questionable. Therefore, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the House conferees should stand by the sensible decision of this body and refuse to accede to the demands from the other side concerning amending H.R. 7509 to provide for Federal construction of the powerplants on California's Trinity River.

Turning now to the merits of the proposed Trinity bills, scheduled for consideration and action by the Legislative Committee next week, I would like to quote a few excerpts from some of the many editorials appearing in the California press, unqualifiedly endorsing the joint development proposal. The Chico Enterprise-Record, widely noted for its sensible, accurate, and thorough analyses, has recently published a number of excellent articles which give the background and whole story on Trinity. The editor, Mr. A. W. Bramwell, first tells us that—

The main purpose of the Trinity River project is to help solve California's water shortage by making use of water which currently is being wasted away into the Pacific Ocean. As authorized by Congress, the project will use a tunnel system (now under construction) to divert Trinity water through the mountains and into the Sacramento River. In that way, the Trinity River will be enabled to play a useful role by adding to the irrigation water supplies of the huge Central Valley project, which serves the rich agricultural lands of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys.

A secondary aspect of the Trinity project is the production of electrical power with turbines spun by the falling water of the diversion system. Under original legislation setting up the huge Central Valley project, Congress specifically stated that power revenues from Central Valley projects (such as Trinity) should be used as a means of "financially aiding and assisting" development of the Central Valley projects water features. In other words, Congress intended that profits from power production and sales should be used to help pay the costs of the Central Valley projects.

For that reason, Secretary of Interior Fred Seaton 2 years ago recommended use of President Eisenhower's partnership plan on the Trinity project. Under that recommendation—which was based upon exhaustive research and study by the Interior Department—the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. would finance construction and operation of the project's power facilities and would pay the Government for the use of the project's falling water.

Seaton explained that the partnership plan would save the Federal Government (taxpayers) more than $60 million in construction costs. The Government (taxpayers) also would receive $175 million from Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for the purchase of the falling water over the years, and the utility firm would pay another $145 million in taxes to Federal, State, county, and local governments over the life of the contract. Taken together, they add up to a saving of $380 million for the taxpayer.

In that way, Seaton explained, the power facilities of the Trinity project actually would help pay for the project, in keeping with the intent of Congress in its Central Valley project legislation. The partnership plan has been opposed, however, by advocates of socialistic public power, who, Mr. Bramwell points out, want the Government (taxpayers) to finance the power facilities so that the power can be earmarked for preference customers at cheap rates. But the preference customers (including mainly the Sacramento Municipal District) comprises only 7 percent of northern and central California's users of electric power. He calls our attention to the fact that under the all-Federal plan, preference customers would be able to buy the power at rates less than what it cost the Government to produce that power. In other words, 93 percent of the poeple (taxpayers) would be financing the plan so that 7 percent (the preference customers) could get electric power at rates cheaper than the rest of us pay.

From the June 16 issue, I again quote excerpts, one of which reads—

It might be said that the demands by public power advocates that the Government construct the Trinity power facilities is a graphic example of one reason why the Government debt keeps going up: the Government is inclined to waste too much money doing things that might better be done by private industry. As a matter of fact, the Trinity case becomes an even more graphic example when one considers that—under the plans set forth by the public power advocates—the Government actually would invest a huge sum in the power features and then turn around and sell the power for less than the cost of its production. Estimates accepted by both sides say that it would cost the Government around $60 million to build the power features. Then it would cost 8.9 mills per kilowatt-hour to produce the power. And then, under contracts already in effect, the Government would sell that power to preference customers for about 4.5 mills per kilowatt-hour, about one-half the cost of production.

As related in an earlier editorial from the same newspaper—

During recent sessions of Congress, those opponents have managed to stalemate the partnership issue and keep it from obtaining a floor vote, despite the fact that a majority of the House Interior Committee last year approved partnership and officially urged the Government not to appropriate funds for construction at Government (taxpayer) expense.

The editor draws the following conclusion in another statement, concerning the financial aspects of the matter at hand, when he speaks of "the relationship between the ever-growing national debt and such undertakings as the Trinity River project. If Congress insists upon forcing the Government into money-wasting ventures, then we can be sure that the national debt will keep going up. A reversal of those wasteful spending practices will be required to start a trend the other way for the good of the taxpaying citizens of the Nation. Adoption of the partnership plan for Trinity would be a good place to start."

The Trinity story has been accurately spelled out by the above excerpts, which I call to the attention of the House conferees on the Public Works Appropriations bill and urge them to uphold the House decision not to spend needlessly for the Trinity River powerplants prior to next week's consideration of the proposed joint development bills by the House Interior Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

The Unemployment Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am as elated as anyone else that unemployment, according to the most recent

statistics, has declined to 4.9 percent or about 3,389,000 unemployed.

I do not, however, let this general feeling of euphoria, so prevalent in the administration and in many business groups throughout the country, blind me to facts which are almost as distressing as those we faced during the days of the 1957–58 recession.

Today 179 areas are classed as distressed labor markets, and in these areas the rate of unemployment remains 10.8 percent.

While economic recovery has reduced the unemployment rate in nondepressed labor markets to 4.2 percent, the situation in the other areas is as grim as ever.

Thirty-two of the distressed labor markets are classed as major by the Department of Labor and 132 as smaller. There are some 15 others which are too small for inclusion in Federal figures.

The highest unemployment rate in the Nation is 23.1 percent in the Biddeford area of Maine. Uniontown and McConnellsville, Pa., and Pikeville, Ky., have 22.8 percent out of work. St. Helens, Oreg., has 20.6 percent and Astoria 20 percent unemployed. Some 20 other labor markets show more than 15 percent jobless and 66 range from 10 to 15 percent.

A statistic which should give us further pause is that in 70 of these areas substantial unemployment began as early as 1957, and that in one area the rate has exceeded 6 percent since 1951. There has been substantial unemployment in 17 areas since 1952, in 8 since 1953, and 15 since 1954, in 13 since 1955, and in 16 since 1956.

My own city of Detroit has been classified as an area of substantial labor surplus since 1956.

What we must face is the danger that these individual distressed labor markets may expand again into general nationwide unemployment. This will be very much with us and will continue to be a problem on the American scene until such time as vigorous action is taken to provide opportunity for the people in these areas, and to expand our force of workers to provide full employment to all our people everywhere.

It is fine to say that the unemployment situation is well in hand, but it should never be forgotten that our country still has a substantial number of unemployed who must live but who can in turn contribute nothing to the economy until they are able to work.

With new employees entering the market by the high school and college graduating classes setting forth on their search for work the problem will become magnified with each passing year.

The Misnamed Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Wade H. Wright, of Atlanta, wrote me recently to offer his appreciation for my support of H.R. 3. In his letter he also congratulated all of my colleagues who supported this bill. Mr. Wright enclosed a tear sheet from the June 29, 1959, issue of the Wall Street Journal entitled, "The Misnamed Measure." This editorial comment of the Wall Street Journal is very interesting and I commend it to my colleagues in Congress. This editorial in very appropriate language states that the Congress in passing this bill will only restate what the U.S. Constitution already provides for, namely, that it is the duty of the Congress and not the Court to write the law. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the editorial herewith:

THE MISNAMED MEASURE

The House of Representatives the other day passed and sent to the Senate a bill introduced by Representative HOWARD SMITH of Virginia that deserves careful and honest debate if the public is ever to weigh its value accurately.

We say that because opponents of Mr. SMITH'S measure have consistently identified the bill as a curb on the Supreme Court. The basis of the charge needs examination, just as the intent of the bill needs clarification.

The bill is not an involved measure, nor is it written in foggy language. It is composed of two sections, and the heart of the measure is found in section 1:

"No act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of State laws on the same subject matter, unless such act contains an express provision to that effect, or unless there is a direct and positive conflict between such act and a State law so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together."

Section 2 says, in short, that when Congress enacted laws aimed at subversion or sedition it did not mean that the States could not enact their own laws on the same subject. This section unquestionably arose from a belief by supporters of the bill that some Supreme Court decisions misinterpreted the intent of Congress, as in the Nelson case, when the Court seemed to say that the States could enact no laws against subversion. Since that time, however, the Supreme Court has clarified the Nelson decision. In the recent Uphaus case the majority made clear that the States did have the power to enact their own laws against subversion. Thus section 2 of Mr. SMITH'S bill is no more a curb on the Court than the Court's own latest decision.

Section 1 will not curb the Court, either, for it does not attempt to deny the Supreme Court any jurisdiction whatsoever. The Supreme Court will still have the power to say whether an act of Congress or an act of any State violates the U.S. Constitution.

What Representative SMITH'S measure does, and only does, is to make clear that when Congress passes a law it does not mean that the States cannot pass their own laws on the same subject, such as kidnaping or bank robbery. Mr. SMITH'S bill makes plain that when Congress does mean to supersede State laws in some field of legislation Congress will say so. But the bill also says that the Supreme Court has all the rights and power it ever had to overrule State law where it conflicts with or cannot "consistently stand together" with Federal law.

None of this seems, in our view, to be an attempt to curb either the Supreme Court's jurisdiction or its powers granted under the Constitution. It is a simple clarification of the intent of Congress that the Court should not read into a law something that is not there.

To read into a law something that is not there is the same as writing the law, and writing the law is the prerogative, not of the Court, but of Congress under our republican form of government. Only to the extent that it prevents the Court from misinterpreting the intent of Congress concerning the rights of the States to legislate could Mr. SMITH'S measure fairly be called a curb of any sort.

And if that is what the critics of the bill mean when they say it will "curb the Supreme Court," it seems to us that they are offering the best argument of all for its passage by the Congress.

A Warning on Mutual Security Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to go to conference on the mutual security legislation for this year, it would be well to weigh the possible consequences of reductions that have been made in the military assistance and defense support programs. President Eisenhower has carefully pointed out that these programs perform a vital role in the maintenance of free world security and cannot safely be cut below minimum levels. With increasingly dire threats emanating almost daily from the Kremlin, it would seem a poor time to decrease our effectiveness.

The New York Times of July 9 contained a very thoughtful editorial on the potentially dangerous reduction in the program. Believing that this article commends itself to our careful consideration, I include it with my remarks:

WARNINGS ON MUTUAL SECURITY

In the face of persistent congressional moves to slash the mutual security program at a time of impending showdown with the Communist bloc, responsible leaders of both parties have now joined forces to prevent a serious blow to the free world's defense structure.

Thus President Eisenhower, at his press conference yesterday, warned Congress that it will jeopardize the security of the Nation and the vital interests of the free world if it cuts the program below safety levels. He more than hinted that if this happens he will resort to the extraordinary step of calling a special session of Congress in an effort to rally more popular support behind the program.

In the same vein Senator JOHNSON, leader of the Democrats who have been mainly responsible for the cuts, has warned Congress to stop gambling with national security.

These warnings were sounded when two-score Senate Democrats combined with a dozen Republicans to rebuff both President Eisenhower and the Senate's own Foreign Relations Committee by cutting the authorization for the program to $3,543,320,000, or $383,500,000 below the President's request (aside from an extra authorization for the Development Loan Fund) and $633,500,000 below the even higher committee recommendation. Despite these warnings the Senate passed the authorization bill at that figure, which comes close to the House authorization, cut to $3,542,600,000.

Fortunately, the Senate did defeat further meat-ax proposals made by Senator ELLENDER

and Senator MORSE, though it is significant of congressional irresponsibility that 34 Democrats and 3 Republicans joined in support of what amounted to a move to scuttle the whole program, made, of all people, by Senator GRUENING from our newest and strategically most exposed State, Alaska.

Since Congress usually cuts the President's mutual security requests, the present reductions may, perhaps, be regarded as not too excessive. But they have been made almost exclusively in military and defense support aid, and that will scarcely impress either the Soviets or our allies and friends as testimony of our determination to help the free world resist the threats of war so freely scattered about by Premier Khrushchev. The bills of both Senate and House must still go to conference and this gives responsible congressional leaders a chance to rectify glaring mistakes.

Company-Owned Stores Hit in New Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a column from July 6 issue of the Cincinnati Enquirer which was written by Mr. Edward Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business. In view of the fact that my bill, H.R. 2729, will be considered in public hearings on July 21–22, I would like to call the attention of this body to Mr. Wimmer's remarks as to the need for this legislation:

COMPANY-OWNED STORES HIT IN NEW BILL: WOULD CURB BIG PACKERS; BENTLEY BILL IN PUBLIC INTEREST

(By Ed Wimmer)

The charge has been made to Congress and various Government agencies, over and over again, that big manufacturers are subsidizing their own retail stores to such an extent that independent dealers are being forced out of business by their own suppliers.

Tire dealers, for example, have had to face devastating competition from stores operated by the huge rubber companies, from which they buy their products, and records submitted by federation vice president, George J. Burger, show that tire makers have demoralized entire markets where they had strong independent dealerships, leaving them weakened or out of business.

According to Mr. Burger (who has pointed out these evils for more than a quarter century), the big tire makers about 2,000 stores, handling hundreds of products and pricing their own goods to these stores in any manner they see fit. In his appearance before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at which time he testified in favor of the Bentley equal pricing bill, H.R. 2729, Burger declared:

"If something is not done by this Congress to halt the discrimination being practiced by manufacturers in dealing with their own retail outlets, we will end up with certain major industries controlling all production and distribution of many commodities.

"Working closely with Congressman ALVIN BENTLEY, of Michigan, and his staff, our office helped to draft H.R. 2729, for the express purpose of forcing all manufacturers to charge their own stores exactly the same prices they charge their other customers; thereby ending a type of subsidy that is dooming countless thousands of small businesses. When we polled our more than 125,000 members on this legislation, 82 percent of the mandate ballots voted favored passage of the bill, and other organizations have reported similar approval."

Consider the statement of Mr. Sam Sullivan, prominent Laredo, Tex., shoe dealer and a leader in the fight to stop the giant shoe manufacturers from swamping the independent shoe dealers and their smaller suppliers. Said Mr. Sullivan:

"Most of our problems, monopoly-wise, stem from producers by one means or another, going into competition with their own customers, buying them up or knocking them out in other ways. With the ax they have, we don't stand a chance."

Gasoline dealers, faced with competition from giant suppliers who build huge station operations out of excess profits, have gone out of business by the countless thousands.

Congressman BENTLEY included a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from James Cassedy, general counsel of the National Auto and Flat Glass Dealers Association, which listed "82 dealers" who said they were being "forced out of business by store operations and policies of Pittsburgh Paint & Glass Co." The Michigan Congressman commented:

"A point that I would like to bring out, is that under present conditions there are no real incentives for younger men with ambition to take the plunge and become retailers on their own, and I believe that an increasing number of independent retailers of all kinds, is a healthy situation to have in all our communities in the United States."

CURBS BIG PACKERS

In 1920, the biggest meatpacking firms accepted a Government consent decree, terminating operation of packer owned retail meat stores. Now the packers are asking the courts to lift the decree on the grounds—that giant chainstore systems (many of which are operating packing plants), have become so powerful that the giant packers have lost their "bargaining power" at the retail counter. They want to open meat store chains of their own to compete with the big food chains saying it is necessary if they are to "protect nationally known brands now being used to lure customers into stores where they are sold other brands."

All in all the Bentley bill is in the public interest and ought to be supported as such.

Soviets Bit the Hands That Saved Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover pretty well carved up and laid out on the table Deputy Premier Kozlov's line of phony propaganda chatter during the latter's recent pilgrimage to the United States. The sharp-tongued, quick-witted admiral's remarks were well reported by the press. But so the Kremlin can know that ordinary U.S. citizens also are capable of drawing a bead on the Soviet's basic noncomprehension of the fundamentals of civilized conduct, I commend to their reading the following letter to the editor printed by the Long Beach Press Telegram newspaper on July 10th:

HOW UNGRATEFUL CAN RUSSIA GET?

EDITOR: Russia's First Deputy Premier Kozlov seems to be quite a charming visitor. But his call for coexistence and world peace in one breath and threats of war in another make it sound very insincere and hollow.

Who does he and Premier Khrushchev think they are to even question our rights in Berlin, Germany? When they should be grateful to us for making it possible for them to even be in Germany. The Germans would have wiped them out if it had not been for the English and Americans.

They would not even be in Germany had we not furnished them with materiels and ships to fight with. Outright gifts plus money they borrowed have never been paid back.

How ungrateful can the Russians get? They should be trying to show a little appreciation instead of demanding that we give up the things we fought and died for.

What do they think we should get out of World War II? A vast graveyard and hand all the rest over to them? If they want their peace talks to sound sincere they should be peaceful and quit stirring up trouble by demanding our rights.

Let us not fall for such insincere talks and charming personality.

MRS. B. HARDIN.

Special Munitions Lobby Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently Congress started to awaken to the great dangers in the high defense spending program. First, the situation was highlighted by Congressman SANTANGELO'S proposal concerning the employing of retired high ranking military officers by munition manufacturers.

One of the crops harvested out of the cold war, Russian scare, sputnik-missile race, is the high profits made by the munition manufacturers who get the bulk of the $41 billion—$41 billion—budgeted yearly for defense.

The most powerful vested interest skillfully manipulating its unparalleled influence on Capitol Hill is the military-munitions lobby.

In view of the tremendous amounts spent directly and indirectly—defense, veterans' payments, foreign military aid, and so forth—the Congress has named a special subcommittee under Congressman ED HÉBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana, to make an investigation of the whole picture and to come up with some answers and recommendations for the future. This, of course, only tells half the story. The amount of money spent for this and related expenditures such as the interest on the national debt and all of this can honestly be charged to defense because between foreign aid and national defense, direct spending in the last 11 years has amounted to well over $400 billion, or about 35 percent more than the total national debt. This represents 80 percent of the national budget.

When the president, National Manufacturers Association, and the National

Chamber of Commerce bombarded Congress and the press with demands for reduced spending, they failed to tell the people that after we take out farm subsidies, the people only get about 15 cents out of their tax dollars spent for health and welfare, social security legislation, education, public works, transportation, recreation, flood control, stream clearance, and any and all other personal and public services.

The day must come when the people of this country will awaken to the fact that while the President was vetoing a domestic housing bill, he was at the same time asking for more money for foreign economic aid to build schools, roads, bridges, factories, and, yes, even housing in foreign countries.

No matter how much a person wants to help his needy neighbors in foreign countries, it just doesn't make sense to say you cannot afford housing and education and highways here at home while spending $108 billion in foreign aid in 11 years in foreign countries.

One thing is sure and that is that all of the money advanced by the United States to build public and veteran's housing has been and is, being paid back by the citizens and veterans who bought the homes, but little or nothing, comes back except a lot of criticism about the money we spent in some foreign aided nations.

While the whole country has its attention focused on Beck, Hoffa, the Teamsters and juke boxes, 95 percent of all the contracts for defense spending are given out without competitive bids. The people ought to know a little more about this and the connections between the Defense Department, contracting corporations, and retired military personnel. The corporations have learned they get the best results when retired officers represent them in their negotiations for contracts.

This week, the U.S. Navy made a public announcement that in their preliminary examinations and investigations started as a result of the Hébert subcommittee, on the hiring of retired military personnel that at least 300 cases have been uncovered where there appears to be conflict of interest on the part of the retired naval officers employed by these corporations.

In line with the legislation dealing with conflict with interest of labor officials, it might be proper for Congress to consider legislation on this admitted conflict of interest, which reaches down into the pockets of every taxpayer in the United States.

Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, recently exposed the fact that 88 corporations doing business with the $41 billion defense allocation have lured 721 retired officers from the rank of colonel up. This does not count the hundreds below colonel grade doing small, but meaningful jobs for these large contract procuring corporations.

It is no secret that many of these retired generals, admirals, and so forth, derive salaries, bonuses, and special stock options that make Jimmy Hoffa look like a piker insofar as salaries and gratuities are concerned.

Note: This is no defense of any person accused of racketeering in labor; it is just to show that while someone is yelling "thief" at labor, his accomplices are walking out the front door with the family treasures.

Of the $41 billion spent directly for defense, about $10 billion goes for personnel wages, salaries, and so forth in the Department, both military and civil. The remaining $31 billion is up for grabs by the contract-hungry corporations whose profits are reflected in the greatest stock market boom in all history.

One cannot help but wonder here in the Capital how little the people really know about their budget, taxes, Congress, and especially their own Government.

Behind the scenes these retired officers know the intricate procedures and redtape of the Pentagon. Even more, they know the personnel of the Pentagon. It is hard to disregard the human factor in noncompetitive negotiations in which billions of dollars are spent for defense.

Some 94 percent of all defense procurement contracts are written on a cost-plus fee basis. No one even attempts to maintain that this is an efficient operation. Waste is extensive. Skilled manpower is stockpiled at cost to the Government. And the type of unchartered work that many of these contractors undertake frequently negates the possibility of a yardstick.

Nevertheless, the General Accounting Office has issued numerous reports in recent months on major cases of overcharging by defense contractors. Boeing Aircraft in Seattle, for example, submitted target costs for spare parts that were $5 million too high. The Georgia division of Lockheed negotiated target prices $4.1 million more than expenses incurred. A number of other companies have been named, too.

The problems which face the Congress to secure effective legislative control of the complex Military Establishment are almost overwhelming. The military, in fact, has become an independent colossus due to several factors. An important one is that the entire operation is so complex that few, if any, Members of Congress have sufficient time or background to develop a thorough grasp of the problems.

New light on the entire defense picture is urgently needed—pressures, influences, and other improper activities. Perhaps it could point the way in which we can learn to live with the all-powerful military in a democracy.

This report is an extra report to be followed by a report on the labor reform education, housing, veterans, and tax proposals, later this month or early in August.

One thing is sure, we cannot balance the budget without balancing all of our expenditures including defense and foreign aid.

Trinity River Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 26, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has announced the intention to consider on July 24 the administration's proposal for joint development of the Trinity River power project by the Federal Government and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

The Trinity River division of the Central Valley project in California, as authorized by the 84th Congress, directed the Secretary of the Interior to study and report back to Congress on proposals to sell the falling water to a non-Federal agency. He did so, and recommended that the company's offer be adopted by Congress because: First, the company, not the Federal Government, would put up the $60 million to construct the power facilities; second, through the sale of the falling water the Government would gain $175 million in CVP surplus; third, the Government would gain $83 million in Federal taxes; and fourth, Federal construction of the powerplants would result, the Secretary said, in a financial drag and a drain on water development.

More than 230 California organizations have actively supported joint development of the Trinity project power facilities; these include irrigation groups, the California and the American Farm Bureau Federation, business groups, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO, as well as some 80 daily and weekly newspapers and other publications.

The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee last year heard the testimony, but a vote was not permitted. The American Farm Bureau Federation spokesman, accompanied by the President of the California Farm Bureau Federation, testified, in part:

> It is clear that the interest of water users is to obtain from Trinity the maximum contribution to Central Valley project that the marketability of the power will warrant, and that this objective will be furthered by private development. * * * Why should the users of water and power on the various units of the Central Valley project be required to pay or help pay for the Federal Trinity powerplants? We believe this would defeat the purposes as declared by Congress in enacting the Central Valley Project Act of 1937. The net result is that, in order to comply with the intent of Congress in authorizing the Central Valley project, relating to revenues from electric energy "as a means of financially aiding and assisting" the project, it is necessary that joint development of the project be authorized by the enactment of the proposed partnership legislation.

He then went on to show that if the Federal Government were to construct

the facilities, it would not only be out the construction costs, the falling water payments, and the taxes which the company would pay, but the water users would be deprived of their just due.

I quote from the federation's statement again:

We see no reason for the entry of the Federal Government into the power business on the Trinity division of the Central Valley project when the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is ready, willing, and able to participate in joint development of the project.

After detailing the financial benefits to the taxpayers and water users which would be lost under Federal construction, California's ambitious plans for solving its water problems were cited:

A great deal of irrigation development remains to be accomplished in California. To make such developments a reality, the State will need maximum revenues from power to assist irrigation development. The recently published California water plan outlines for ultimate construction 270 reservoirs, with a total capacity of 60 million acre-feet and hundreds of miles of canals to transport water from surplus to areas of deficiency. This program will cost between $12 and $13 billion. In addition, water resource development projects have been authorized by the Federal Government, which will cost millions of dollars.

The senior Senator from California, on March 5, 1959, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of tables showing that there remains to be completed on active, authorized California projects about $850 million of Federal funds. Should the House also pass the San Luis bill—the Senate-passed version calls for $290 million—the California total would be well over a billion dollars.

The Friant Water Users Association, representing the majority of the Central Valley project water users, have recently declared that if Trinity is constructed federally, an increase in the rates for non-Federal customers should be demanded in order that power will financially aid and assist water development, as intended by the original act authorizing the Central Valley project.

The Washington Post and Times Herald, on June 30, 1959, carried a UPI report of a press conference at which Interior Department Secretary Seaton also said he has not dropped his position favoring partnership development of electric power by private industry in the Government's Trinity reclamation project in California. If Congress orders the Federal Government to spend $60 million for power facilities on the project, Seaton said the money would have to be taken from other western reclamation projects unless Congress votes extra money for the Trinity job. Seaton said chances of getting extra money would be very slim.

There is no more reason to deprive the Central Valley project water users of their intended benefits than to deprive other western projects of needed money; neither would be necessary, and the Federal Treasury would be far ahead, under joint development.

About the Housing Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 23, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the July 11, 1959, issue of the AFL–CIO News:

WHAT THE VETO MEANS

President Eisenhower's veto of the Housing Act of 1959 has exposed the essential phoniness of his antispending, anti-inflation campaign.

The bill he vetoed was a compromise measure passed by both Houses of Congress with bipartisan support. It was designed as a moderate proposal to help meet America's critical housing needs, to enable our cities and their people to take a long forward step toward a better way of life by eradicating slums and providing decent housing for all Americans.

The veto comes on the heels of the President's request for lifting the interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds, a move which would force up interest rates all through the economy. The price of money and its effect on general price stability apparently do not concern the President. But the slight cost of providing decent housing for Americans is inflationary.

The net effect of the President's economic policies as revealed in the housing bill veto and the no-ceiling-on-interest-rates proposal is to build fewer houses at higher prices.

This philosophy carried over into the other areas of American economic life spells economic stagnation and a new cycle of boom and recession in the year ahead.

The President's failure to understand the problem of economic growth and his obsession with inflation and spending can only lead to more vetoes of reasonable social welfare legislation and a slackening in America's dynamic economy. It will be to the detriment of the Nation and the free world.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Caylor to Kozlov—Memo on Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Arthur Caylor, a distinguished columnist of the San Francisco News, has spelled out with clarity and dramatic impact the salient ingredient of our most cherished national heritage—independence.

Mr. Caylor has done this in a notable memorandum, published in the July 3, 1959, San Francisco News, and addressed to Soviet Deputy Premier Frol Kozlov.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAYLOR TO KOZLOV—MEMO ON INDEPENDENCE—OPEN LETTER TO FROL KOZLOV, SOVIET FIRST DEPUTY PREMIER

SIR: They say you'll succeed Khrushchev. They say you're over here to learn about America because, pretty soon, you'll be making the big decisions as between this country and Moscow.

So I make bold to invite your attention to something on which you may not have been briefed before you left home.

The biggest thing there is for you to see in America, you can perhaps see best tomorrow.

Tomorrow is Independence Day.

As such it's the symbol of the something we've got that you people haven't got.

It's the something you can't compensate for with more factories, more automobiles, more missiles, more 5-year plans, more this-is-for-your-own-good oppression.

Independence is the difference between you and us, sir. And it's a difference we intend to keep until we die.

I hope you won't be fooled because you can't see independence, or measure it with a machine, or examine it in a test tube.

But I'd like to assure you, that while we don't celebrate the Fourth of July as our forefathers did, Americans hold their independence as dear as Patrick Henry held it. Don't think otherwise.

Now hear this. When you're Mr. Big you won't understand America unless you realize that, to Americans, independence means both a free state and a free people.

Universally, sir, freedom has only one form—freedom from government.

A man can be free only in the degree his government allows him to be free. He can be enslaved only in the degree his government decrees his enslavement.

And a nation can be free only by escaping the domination of other governments.

Sir, I beg you to do me one favor. Tomorrow, on Independence Day, read our Declaration of Independence. It will tell you how—while Catherine still reigned in Russia—we shook off the tyranny of England's George III not to found a new nation but to free a people.

It will explain how it happens that Americans enjoy an inalienable right which goes beyond the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It's the inalienable right to live in a state which can never push its people around—a state which lacks all powers except those granted it by the consent of the governed.

This concept, sir, is not always easy to grasp. When Mr. Mikoyan was here, someone threw an egg. His reaction was mildly bitter. In Russia, he said, you protect the people from the hoodlums—not vice versa.

It showed, sir, that Mr. Mikoyan did not understand America, will never understand America, and has no feel for the essential thing that will make America forever great.

Mr. Khrushchev, too, often sounds as if he so hopes Marx is right about the triumph of your system being inevitable that he's blind to the thing you can see if you really look for the meaning of Independence Day tomorrow. So, sir, it's up to you.

But please, one other thing. When you read the Declaration you'll be struck by the thought how different things would be in Hungary today—if that country had been allowed to shake off certain of the very tyrannies our Founding Fathers complained against in George III.

He quartered soldiers. He subverted judges. He combined with others to subject us to a foreign jurisdiction.

Please take, sir, no offense. My purpose is not the sly dig. Rather I wish you a fine Fourth, a glorious Fourth, a Fourth, indeed, that will somehow see to it that, even if Marx is wrong about America, and Mikoyan and Khrushchev too, Kozlov can still be right.

ARTHUR CAYLOR.

Constructive Action, Not Bluff and Reaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address which I delivered on June 13, 1959, at the Sixth Congressional District Democratic dinner in Fond du Lac, Wis., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTRUCTIVE ACTION, NOT BLUFF AND REACTION

My State of Minnesota, and our neighbor, Wisconsin, lie in the heart of one of the great farming areas of the world.

Now farmers tend, by and large, to be a frugal lot. They live close to the soil—and close to the knuckle as well.

So all this Republican talk about sound dollars and budget balancing is aimed right at the farmers of America.

Well, nobody should be fooled by this line of talk because it is strictly phony.

The truth is that this Republican administration that brags so much about economy has racked up a total deficit of $19 billion.

The truth is that on June 30, 1959, this country is going to end up with the largest peacetime deficit in our history.

The truth is that this Republican administration has been the biggest peacetime spender in history.

The trouble is, they spend on the wrong things. And then they turn around and use the economy argument as a phony excuse for inaction on the right things.

Let me give you a couple of examples.

As a result of the Republican tight money, high interest rate policy, the American taxpayers will pay $2½ billion more in interest on the debt this year than they did when the Democrats left office. And the outlook is for even higher interest costs, since the administration wants to lift the lid entirely on interest rates. The sky would be the limit.

The Republicans see no problem in saddling the taxpayers with an extra $2½ billion annually in interest payments. But when some of us propose a program to give surplus food to the jobless, the aged, and the needy, these same Republicans tell us the country cannot afford it.

The fact is that we could provide food, through a food stamp plan, to every unemployed family, every person under social security, every widow and orphan—for far less than the rise in interest costs under this Republican administration.

Yet this administration wants to lift the lid on interest rates while keeping the lid on food for the needy.

Another example: I have proposed the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps, patterned after the CCC of the 1930's, to put our young men to work preserving our precious natural resources. This is a program designed to add to America's natural wealth.

But the Republicans say we cannot afford it. It will cost only about one-tenth of the Republican rise in the interest rates—but still they say we cannot afford it.

There is another field in which spending has skyrocketed under the Republicans—and that is on our farm program.

Today the farm program costs four times as much as it did when the Democrats left office.

Now if the Republican farm program were doing its job keeping farm income and farm prices up—it would be well worth the cost.

But what do the Republicans have to show for spending four times as much on the farm program?

This is what they have to show:

Lower farm prices—down 20 percent since the Republicans took office.

Lower farm income—down $3 billion a year since the Republicans took office. Fewer farms and fewer farmers.

The people ought to know the truth about this Republican talk about economy.

It is poor propaganda—and it is the strictly Republican excuse for a do-nothing, caretaker administration.

By now, the bluff and reaction of the GOP should not be a surprise to anyone.

Ever since the day Republicans took over the administration in Washington, some of us have been repeatedly warning that they were going to wreck our farm programs—and ultimately wreck the farm economy in the process.

That is one thing in which they have succeeded.

Earlier today, it was my privilege to address a nonpartisan gathering of Wisconsin farmers at the annual meeting of a rural electric cooperative in Ellsworth. At that time, I outlined the alternatives we face in national farm policy—and offered some guidelines for action in building a new and better farm program.

We Democrats want to accentuate the positive. We want constructive action, as our answer to Republican bluff and reaction.

We refuse to rest our case on complaints about abundance or surpluses, as the Republicans prefer to say. We prefer to use our brains to develop ideas for using that abundance—and seeing that farmers are properly rewarded for producing it.

When the American public buys an automobile, they expect and know that the price they pay for it will cover all costs of production plus quite adequate profits.

The price of that car has been set by the huge corporations in the industry, by tailoring output to demand at a profitable price.

American citizens accept this as proper and just. We think the price of a car should be enough to provide an American standard of living to those who produce the car, and we know that managers and vice presidents are necessary. We honor and accept the profit system in the automobile industry.

But what about agriculture? Why do we have a double standard? Why, for example, shouldn't we honor that same system on Wisconsin's dairy farms?

We Democrats certainly aren't against auto manufacturers making a profit.

We would just like to see that same privilege extended to our farmers, who make up the bulk of the economy in the Midwest. And we are determined to do something about it, whether Ezra Benson and the GOP likes it or not.

As we are meeting here in the agricultural heart of America in these lush days of June, there is every prospect of a bumper crop of farm production.

In most parts of the world, this prospect would be rejoicing and thanksgiving that the Lord had endowed the earth with richness and had brought forth the fruits of the earth in such abundance.

But not in America, I am sorry to say—no, ashamed to say.

Here in America, the advent of summer and the prospect of abundant farm production is the occasion not of rejoicing, but of hand wringing by the leaders of Government, and of groaning complaints that this abundance should be inflicted upon us.

Now wouldn't it be far better for all of us to be concentrating on ways of seeing that everyone has an opportunity to share in that abundance?

We cannot talk unceasingly of prosperity, and turn our backs on those who, through no fault of their own, do not share in that prosperity.

In the past week, I have been conducting and participating in hearings on legislation of my own and of other Democratic Senators designed to assure more adequate diets for the Nation's unemployed, for the recipients of social security and old age and survivors insurance benefits, the people on welfare of various kinds, the blind, the indigent, the dependent children.

In all good conscience, we must expand the distribution of our surplus commodities to these unfortunate people. But I favor even more strongly a food stamp plan which would supplement the purchasing power of these low income groups and enable them to get a more balanced diet than any direct relief distribution of surplus commodities can provide. Such a food stamp plan could boost consumption of eggs, butter, cheese, poultry, milk, and similar perishables so necessary to build better health—and so important to our agricultural economy.

Just as we have still untapped opportunities for wiser use of our abundance at home, we have even greater potential in using this great blessing as a vital force for peace throughout the world.

It is difficult to believe that with over half of mankind hungry tonight, the leaders of the richest Nation on earth should regard its abundance of food and fiber as an affliction—a problem.

"Give us this day our daily bread" is still the prayer of human beings in the far corners of the earth.

It is the cry of hungry—the feeble plea of the old man begging on the streets of Cairo, the child whimpering for milk in Bombay, the weary African mother trying to convert a few scraps into an evening meal for her family.

For several years, some of us have been advocating a more imaginative use of our farm abundance. It has seemed to me that piling up vast quantities of food in a world of misery and hunger is morally wrong, economically wasteful, and politically dangerous.

Morally, we are losing sight of the Great Teacher's admonition to feed the hungry and clothe the naked.

Economically, we are paying hundreds of millions of dollars a year in storage costs for commodities which are already beginning to deteriorate.

Politically, we are creating an unfavorable image of Uncle Sam abroad when we wring our hands over our surplus food problem in full view of the world's hungry inhabitants.

I wonder if we fully realize the power of food in our relations with other countries. Is it possible that many of the underdeveloped nations now receiving expensive military shipments from the United States would be more impressed and better strengthened by less costly shipments of food?

Personally, I become more convinced each day that our most powerful material asset in building a world of peace and freedom is our food abundance. It seems probable to me that the remarkable productivity of the American farmer, if properly used, can be a more decisive factor in the struggle between freedom and communism than the sputnik. The hungry multitudes of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East are far more interested in bread, medical care, and schools than in any number of jets and sputniks. Does anyone wonder what the crafty Khrushchev would do if he had America's surplus food to use in his international operations?

The Senate will soon be considering the President's request of $3.9 billion for next year's foreign assistance program. Of the $3.9 billion the President has requested, $2.6 billion is for military aid, including defense support and the contingency fund; $1.3 billion is requested for economic and technical assistance.

Many of us in the Senate are becoming more concerned each month with the heavy emphasis of the foreign aid program on the side of military hardware. A sizable amount of such aid is going to undemocratic governments that rule over people suffering from poverty, hunger and disease. It seems doubtful such people would make very good fighters for freedom.

After pouring millions of dollars in military equipment into Iraq to bolster this country against communism, we saw our military aid used by Iraqi military leaders to destroy the loyal government and then engineer a working alliance with the Russians.

American military supplies, poured into Pakistan, have so frightened her neighbors that Afghanistan has made a deal with Russia for arms and India has taken a hundred million dollars out of her economic development program and placed it in orders for military equipment with the British and French.

In still other instances, guns and tanks sent by the United States of America have been used by unpopular dictators, not to fight communism, but to resist local reform movements demanded by the people.

For these reasons, I have supported amendments in the Foreign Relations Committee which will cut millions of dollars from our military shipments to underdeveloped nations. At the same time, I will continue to push legislation that I have introduced calling for an expanded use of our farm surpluses overseas as well as in the United States.

As you may know, I have introduced a comprehensive Food for Peace Act for that purpose.

Highlights of the Food for Peace Act are as follows:

1. The sale of surplus farm commodities for foreign currencies to the extent of $2 billion a year for the next 5 years.

2. Outright grants of food surpluses to countries experiencing famine or chronic hunger.

3. Continued encouragement to church groups and other voluntary private agencies that wish to distribute surplus commodities overseas on a direct people-to-people basis. This section of the bill also includes grants of surplus farm stocks to public and private agencies for use in the United States in the school lunch program, nonprofit summer children's camps, charitable institutions, including hospitals, and needy citizens.

4. Agreements with friendly countries to establish foundations to promote education, health, research, and other projects from foreign currencies accruing to the United States through the sale of farm surpluses. We could literally convert surplus farm commodities into education and health.

5. A Peace Food Administration under the President to direct the various operations provided for in the legislation.

Under Public Law 480 we have already made a start on moving surpluses to other countries. But much more needs to be done. Included in this program is a truly fine section which permits the churches and other private institutions to distribute surplus commodities overseas. The church world service groups have done a magnificent job with this most valuable program. In my view, this particular activity is the finest single example of the kind of people-to-people relationships that the world desperately needs. It needs to be encouraged, and expanded manyfold.

"Food for peace" is more than a slogan. It offers a partial solution to our agricultural problem, and will at the same time relieve much of the suffering of a world that looks to America for leadership in this crucial hour.

The Food for Peace Act, if put into operation, would offer us a dramatic way to show the world we care more about people living than about people dying.

And let us never forget that there are many more people in this world who want to live than want to die.

I have enlisted on the side of the living.

Let us not forget, too, that millions of people have lived under conditions of tyranny and terror for so long that there is nothing more that can be done to frighten them.

What they seek is help, guidance, friendship, understanding.

What this world needs today is not massive retaliation, but massive doses of health, education, and food.

We need some guided missiles to the hearts and minds of men—missiles of technology and science, missiles of schools and education; yes, missiles of medicine and medical care—of jobs and industry, of public works and public welfare.

It is to the creation of these missiles that we must dedicate our talents and our energies.

This world will not be saved or spared by missiles of war with thermonuclear warheads.

Important as they are for our national security and our defense against the aggressive, imperialist communism, it will take more than defense to build a peaceful world.

We must wage peace, while we defend ourselves against attack.

We must move on the offensive, and declare war against mankind's most ancient and terrible enemies of hunger, disease, poverty, and ignorance.

This declaration of war must be more than a war of words.

It must be a war of deeds—the kind of deeds that we Americans have demonstrated our ability to accomplish and perform.

We need our bold, new food for peace program, dedicating our God-given abundance to serving the needs of humanity—rather than complaining about it.

We need a dramatic, worldwide health for peace program, with vastly expanded international medical research—and perhaps a white fleet of mercy ships carrying our medical know-how and wonder drugs to the disease-ridden and suffering in the far corners of the earth.

We need to launch a broad program of world educational development—a plan of education for peace.

The first step would be for the Congress of the United States to declare to the free world that we share their beliefs in the values of education, and that we are ready to work with them in building up their own educational systems to train their own people.

We should declare our readiness to support a 10-year effort for worldwide development of democratic education—and I have just recently outlined a plan for financing it out of foreign currencies we receive from the sale of American farm commodities abroad.

These are truly the works of peace.

These are the kinds of deeds that made America what it is today.

They are the kind of deeds that helped bind up the wounds after World War II, through successful completion of the Marshall plan.

They are the kind of deeds by which our country's great voluntary, church, and nonsectarian groups have brought a message of kindness, compassion, and helpfulness to millions of people throughout the world.

They need to be multiplied manifold, to present the real image of America for all to see—a country truly dedicated to people, progress, and, above all else, peace.

This is our Democratic answer to Republican bluff and reaction—an answer of constructive action.

Rising Hospital Costs Point Toward Need for Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, despite the disturbing and cruel increases in the cost of living during recent years, medical care costs have risen even more. This is particularly true of hospital rates.

Measured by the consumer price index, the cost of living generally has risen 23 percent since 1947–49. Yet medical care has soared 44 percent, with hospital-room rates more than doubling.

These burdens are so excessive, particularly on elderly people who usually suffer the most costly and lingering illnesses, that some form of national health insurance seems imperative.

I ask unanimous consent that a thorough and documented column by the noted economic analyst, Sylvia Porter, as published in the Oregon Daily Statesman, of Salem, of January 10, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—MEDICAL CARE SKYROCKETS FAR BEYOND NORMAL COST OF LIVING

(By Sylvia Porter)

NEW YORK.—At least 1 out of 10 of us will become a bed patient needing medical care in 1959—and every one of us is a potential hospital case.

If you do become a hospital patient this year and if you don't have adequate insurance against the soaring costs, you'll find the psychic shock of the bill to your pocketbook nerve almost as great as the physical shock of an operation to your body.

For the cost of medical care has been skyrocketing in the past few years, has risen far more than the overall cost of living. Measured by the official consumer price index, the cost of living has increased about 23 percent 1947–49. Simultaneously, the cost of medical care has jumped 44 percent.

Hospital room rates have more than doubled. General practitioners' fees have climbed 39 percent. Dentists' fees have gone up 34 percent. Surgeons' fees have risen 26 percent.

Only the pace of the rise in transportation costs has topped the pace of the rise in medical care expenses. The cost of medical care has gone up much more than the cost of food, housing, apparel, etc.

If you have not been ill recently or had an enforced rest in the hospital, you may regard yourself, as the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia puts it in a superb study of medical costs and the value of health insurance, "a superman—perpetual strength in perpetual motion."

But even if you have escaped the misfortune of a hospital illness, you surely are aware of the zooming costs of one and, although you agree with the Philadelphia Reserve Bank that "health isn't free," you surely have grumbled a few "whys" about the bills.

Here, therefore, are a few of the "whys":

Hospital costs have been ballooning because salary and wage levels have been rising, and hospitals must compete with industrial and commercial concerns to get the employee skills and talents they need.

Hospital costs have been zooming because their own housekeeping expenses have been increasing. As improvements in diagnosis and treatments have shortened the average stay of a patient, the average per day cost of handling a patient has gone up. The higher turnover in patients increase a hospital's overhead, and the hospital's patients pay that overhead.

Hospital costs have been climbing because our rapidly growing population is using more hospital services than ever before. Today the annual admission rate to hospitals is 12 percent of our total population against 8 percent a generation ago.

Hospital costs have been rising because hospitals are offering more services than ever before—more diagnostic and treatment services, more private and semi-private accommodations, more out-patient service—and it costs money to perform all these new and expanded functions.

And actually, none of the statistics I've quoted tells the whole tale. For the official medical care index measures price changes only of the same quantity and quality of items brought by city families in 1947–49—and we're not buying the same quantity and quality of medical care as a decade ago. A patient may pay hundreds of dollars for the use of a life-saving machine that wasn't even in existence in 1949.

Again, to quote the Philadelphia bank, "you can't pay bills with index numbers"—and although I can't prove it, I'm positive the rise in the most of medical care averages out to a lot higher than 44 percent.

What's more, there are no signs whatsoever that the rising trend is ending. And even if it were ending—and all our hospitals were modernized, adequately staffed, completely efficient—the size of a typical hospital bill to a typical American family would be a shock.

The answer, then? The answer is, of course, health insurance.

Right now, about 70 million people own insurance policies protecting them against hospital expenses. Right now, about 55 million subscribe to more than 80 Blue Cross plans operating through the Nation and in 1957, Blue Cross paid about $1 billion in hospital bills.

But, while this represents great progress over the conditions of past decades, there still are immense gaps in the insurance, there still are millions utterly without protection, there still are few who can financially survive a catastrophic physical illness.

It is against this background that the demand is persisting that Congress help by developing what the Democratic Advisory Council called for only a month ago—a comprehensive health insurance program.

Impressions of the U.S.S.R.—University Students Favored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Impressions of the U.S.S.R.—University Students Favored," written by Dr. F. Cyril James, president and vice chancellor of McGill University, and published in the Montreal Star of July 2, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPRESSIONS OF THE U.S.S.R.—UNIVERSITY STUDENTS FAVORED

(By Dr. F. Cyril James)

The boy or girl who completes the program of the 10-year school, which is now the standard throughout the U.S.S.R. is under no compulsion to continue his, or her education at a university or at one of the many institutes that have already been mentioned. He, or she, will be 16 or 17 years of age, and able to seek a job in industry, in the civil service or on one of the collective farms.

But the U.S.S.R. is anxious to encourage all lads and lasses of outstanding ability to attain higher educational qualifications and the policy that is followed is similar, in its basic principles, to that by which outstanding scholars and scientists are encouraged to become professors. In the first place, university students are exempt from military service—both during their undergraduate years and after they have graduated. In the second place, a university student from a poor family is likely to receive a cash income (by way of scholarship) as good, or even better during the 2 final years, than he could earn in any job likely to be open to him. In the third place, he realizes that a degree or diploma is absolutely essential if he ever wants to attain any of the posts—in industry, Government, or university life—that carry the highest salaries. High incomes and high prestige blend to create strong inducement, and a very large proportion of the high school graduates in Russia want to go to college.

PROCEDURE

How does the ambitious high school graduate attain this goal? The first hurdle is the matriculation examination at the end of his 10th school year. This is a nationwide examination, identical for all schools in the U.S.S.R., which is set, and marked, by examiners appointed by the Ministry of Higher Education in Moscow; i.e., by the ministry responsible for the universities and not the Ministry of Education under which the schools are operated. It is not a school-leaving examination as we know it but is intended to measure the ability of the individual to enter upon a course of higher education, and heavy emphasis is placed upon the command of modern foreign languages, the Russian language, chemistry, mathematics, and physics.

The student who fails this exam is automatically excluded from the university. The student who passes must then consider what course he wants to take, and to which university he wishes to apply, for the standard nationwide examination is acceptable to all universities and institutions.

OPENINGS

This decision is an important one because the number of places in the freshman year is substantially less than the number of applicants. An average for the whole of the U.S.S.R. would seem to be above five applicants for each place, but the ratio varies in the institutions that we visited from a low of 3 to 1 to a high of 50 to 1, and it is perhaps worth mentioning that the highest ratios were in music and ballet dancing.

The reasons for the variation are two. In the first place, the Government of the U.S.S.R. guarantees a job in his chosen field to every student who satisfactorily completes the university course. To do this, the Government must now decide how many chemists, geologists, teachers of English and operatic tenors (to name but a few examples) will be needed in the summer of 1964. This estimate, which is carefully made on the basis of a great deal of data, determines the total number of places that will be available for freshmen next autumn at all the institutions of higher education in the U.S.S.R. In the second place, in determining the exact number of places at any one institution, the Government in Moscow is, generally speaking, trying to prevent any substantial increase in the size of the older universities like Moscow—now 22,000 students—and Leningrad—about 12,000 students—and to encourage the growth of newer institutions in the south and east. An applicant of good, but not outstanding, quality therefore has a better chance of admission at Irkutsk or Samarkand but, since all Russian universities (like their Canadian counterparts) want to have a student body of diverse geographical and cultural background, an outstanding applicant from Turkestan or Armenia will have a better chance of admission to the University of Leningrad than a boy whose home is in that city. The problems of the admissions office at a Russian university are strangely like those in Canada. Academic grades, geographical residence, health, aptitude, and sometimes—although we seldom admit it publicly—the position and aggressiveness of the parents must all be taken into account before deciding which out of the many applicants are to be admitted.

THE COURSES

Let us follow the lad who is one of the successful fifth of the applicants. He is admitted to the university of his choice, and embarked on the program of studies that leads to the diploma which is his goal. The details of the curriculum naturally vary from one subject to another, and it would be tiresome to attempt elaborate comparisons. The information, in great detail, is available in official publications of the U.S.S.R.

Some general comments, however, apply to all fields of study—medicine, engineering, music, or chemistry. The course covers 5 years, and leads to a diploma that is roughly equivalent to the master's degree in North American practice. During the first 3 years, the student will be expected to attend classes 6 hours a day for a 6-day week—and substantial work is required of him outside classes. The academic session is 10 months, with a short break between the two semesters, and the student is encouraged to take a real holiday during the two summer months rather than to seek gainful employment. During the last 2 years the number of classes is sharply reduced, so that the student has more time for individual study and the preparation of his thesis, but it is quite clear that the Russian student, when he graduates, has done two or three times as much work, much of it more intensively, than the man who graduates with a bachelor's degree at a Canadian university. Conversely, in the professional fields, the Russian student of law or medicine graduates in a shorter period than his Canadian counterpart, since these courses (like all the others) take no more than 5 years from matriculation.

PARTY STUDY

The required courses—required in all faculties at all institutions—must once again be mentioned. No mater what his specialty, our student must take a course in the History of the Party in each of the first 2 years, a course on political economy in the third year, on dialectical materialism in the fourth and on historical materialism in his final year. In order to graduate, at the end of the 5 years, the student must pass comprehensive examinations in his special subject (e.g. physics) which are set by the university, and a series of examinations, set by the Ministry of Higher Education for the whole country, on the required subjects mentioned above. He must also write a thesis in his special subject, and defend it publicly before the faculty and the senior students.

This is a stiff academic program, but if the student has to work hard he also enjoys several advantages over the youngsters who did not gain admission to university. First of all, there are no tuition fees whatever—no fees of any kind since education is completely free to those who have the ability and the strength of character to undertake it. Secondly, as I have said earlier, the student is exempt from the call-up for 3 years military service which comes to all other young men on their 19th birthday. In the third place, the Russian student is guaranteed such financial aid as he needs to carry on his studies.

STIPENDS

More than 80 percent of all the students at institutions of higher education in the U.S.S.R. receive "stipends"—the Russian term that covers both scholarships and bursaries. At the Lomonosov University in Moscow 85 percent of the students are in receipt of stipends this year, at Leningrad 82 percent, at Kiev 90 percent, at the Institute of Foreign Languages (where there are many young women students from well-to-do families) 60 percent. For the country as a whole approximately 25 percent of the total university budget is allocated for the payment of such stipends.

The precise amount of the individual stipend varies widely, being determined in each case (usually by a joint committee of students and faculty) on the basis of both financial need and academic performance. If the grades of the student fall to C he is apt to lose the stipend until his grades improve; if he maintains an A average the stipend is increased by 25 percent, and for the most brilliant students in the last 2 years there are a few princely awards of as much as R1,000 per month. The typical range of stipends would, however, be from R250 to R500 per month—subject to the 25 percent increase for A grades—and this compares favorably with the wages that the student would be likely to earn if he left college and went out to find a job. Good students in the last 2 years, when the load of academic courses is lighter, may also get appointments as part-time laboratory assistants at approximately R450 per month in addition to their stipends and—as a last point—these stipends are paid for all 12 months so that the student may have money for his summer holiday as well as for his living expenses during the academic session.

BOARD STUDENTS

For out of town students there are hostels at all Russian universities and student cafeterias where good meals can be purchased at comparatively low prices. The quality of the hostel accommodation varies enormously. In the magnificent new buildings of the Lomonosov University in Moscow—the show piece of Russian higher education—the best accommodation is as good as that at any Canadian university and better than some. At Kiev, which is still in the process of rebuilding after the devastation of the Second World War, many of the hostels are old private houses where five, six, or seven students share a room. But, in spite of the differences in quality, all of the hostels are amazingly cheap. In the places that we visited the rates ranged from R10 per month in Kiev to R30 per month in Moscow—which is low either in comparison to the student stipends or to the rates that students have to pay in North America.

FOREIGNERS PAID

It should be pointed out, moreover, that students from foreign countries are, at all Russian universities, eligible for stipends and for accommodation in the hostels on the same basis as students from the U.S.S.R. We met and talked with students from China, India, Indonesia, and other parts of southeast Asia, as well as exchange students from Great Britain and the United States. Most of them, as one might expect, are at Moscow or Leningrad, but each university in the U.S.S.R. is eager to attract students from foreign countries, recognizing that a significant part of the process of education is the impact of students upon each other. The foreign student, like the student from a distant part of the U.S.S.R., often has a better chance of a larger stipend than the student from the city in which the university is situated.

Quite clearly, students and professors constitute a privileged class in the U.S.S.R. More

educated men and women are needed by the country, and the Government is willing to offer the inducements that will attract the best brains in the country.

Where Is My America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address entitled "Where Is My America?" which was delivered by Prof. Yahya Armajani, of Macalester College, in St. Paul at that college's cap and gown day on May 12, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE IS MY AMERICA?

(By Yahya Armajani, Macalester College, Cap and Gown Day speech, May 12, 1959)

Thirteen is unlucky in most parts of the world. I remember my father in Persia used to count "11, 12, extra, 14, 15." However, for some curious reason, our son from an early age, has consireded 13 to be his lucky number. I see that by osmosis it has become my lucky number, also. For in this my 13th year of work at Macalester, I have been honored to speak on this occasion by the best senior class ever to graduate from Macalester. Indeed ever since they asked me to speak, I have remembered how I have always thought this to be an outstanding class ever since they entered as freshmen.

In choosing the subject "Where Is My America?" it is not my intention to teach you a lesson in geography. Although the good Lord knows that you need it—the good Lord that is and Dr. Hildegard Johnson. However, I will not take time for that. Neither am I going to deliver a Fourth of July oration.

Last year on my way to the Soviet Union, I visited a Persian friend in New York. Like me he had studied under American missionaries and had learned about America long before coming here. Like me, he had been disappointed in some things which he had seen here. We were discussing some of the problems of the day and our experiences in this country. He turned to me and said that someday he wanted to write an article entitled "Where Is My America?" He was in quest of the America introduced to him in the school in Persia and exemplified in the life of American missionaries. He will probably never write his article because he is a diplomat and diplomats are cautious about expressing such sentiments. Consequently I have borrowed his title and am taking this opportunity to speak on the subject.

Professor Boorstin of the department of history at the University of Chicago wrote an article a few weeks ago, entitled "We the People, in Quest of Ourselves." He has this to say: "We Americans are a people in quest of ourselves. Ever since our birth as a nation we have been trying to find a mirror in which we can see our true image. * * * Other people have had only to live up to a role assigned by their past, but we Americans have been trying to guess the role demanded by the future."

Now it is tragic that Americans believe that they do not have a past to live up to. It is indeed very sad to realize that a nation at the helm of the free world should have to guess the role demanded by the future. I don't know what the Europeans think of America, but I do know that the peoples of Asia and Africa believe that the professor's statement is as tragic as it is false. Americans do have a past to live up to, because the peoples of Asia and Africa are enthused and inspired by that past. They simply cannot believe that Americans have to guess at their future steps, when they themselves are guided in their future by America's past. Indeed the intensity of the resentment of the peoples of Asia toward America is directly proportional to the disappointment they feel that America is blind to her own past.

CONCEIVED IN LIBERTY

The peoples of Asia and Africa look upon the United States as a country conceived in liberty. Not only in our school in Persia, but in hundreds of other schools across the world and in countless gatherings, the Declaration of Independence of America and the Bill of Rights have been studied. People have been inspired by them and have come to believe that this country is conceived in liberty for which the soul of the world is yearning.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights. * * * That to secure these rights Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed * * *."

These words may ring dull in your indifferent ears, but I want you to know that they are stirring thousands of people in Asia and Africa to action. These are concepts novel and exciting to millions who had been led to beleive that they were endowed by their creator with nothing except misery and starvation. When the Persians wrote their constitution in 1905, they did it with the idea that all people are created equal. When the Turks started their Republic, they did it with the idea that government derived its just powers from the consent of the governed. In 1945 the people of Vietnam, just before they were pushed into the arms of the Communists, not only quoted the American Declaration of Independence but followed it by stating their grievances against the French as your forefathers had done against the British.

In the light of all this, it is said that the heirs of such a tradition should be groping in quest of something to live up to. However, it is unfortunately true that only a small minority in this country is enthused by these concepts and uses them for the advantage of all. It seems to me that it is also true that a minority, on the other hand, abuses these concepts for its own selfish purposes. But the vast majority of the people of this country, God forbid that you be among them, are indifferent—so much so that these concepts are held without honor, and indeed are suspect, in the country of their origin.

Justice Douglas (in his book, the "Almanac of Liberty") relates that he atended a lawyers meeting in the Far West, where a person was discussing the background of the Bill of Rights. After the meeting, the justice heard one lawyer say to another: "There goes a Communist if I ever saw one." Is this America?

No doubt the fact, that freedom was being ridiculed and individual integrity trampled under feet, prompted the General Council of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America to issue a manifesto which said, among other things: "Some congressional inquiries have revealed a distinct tendency to become inquisitions. * * * Treason and dissent are being confused. The shrine of conscience and private judgment which God alone has a right to enter, is being invaded." Is this America?

In our own State of Minnesota, there is a bill in the legislature to suppress a minority, called the Hutterites. A few weeks ago a Lutheran minister, no less, wrote these words to the Minneapolis Tribune: "Why must America be a haven for all oddballs? If they want to live, work, and worship like the rest of us, they have the opportunity. But until they do, I believe legislation is a must. Already it is two years too late." Where is the America which was conceived in liberty, and where are the Americans who wrote the Declaration of Independence?

BORN IN REVOLUTION

The people of Asia and Africa believe that America is not only a country conceived in liberty but also born in revolution. "That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it." I daresay there is not a person in Asia who doesn't believe that these words were written for his condition. If there is anything that the peoples of Asia and Africa want today, it is change, for they are living under governments which, on the whole, are destructive of these ends. They are aroused when they hear that they have the right to alter or abolish it. To whom shall they go except to the country which was born in revolution and gave them these concepts. And yet when they ask you for bread, you give them stone. They expect sympathy but you show resentment, for you have grown soft and contented, and you don't like change or revolution anymore. Your double standard is confusing and they cannot understand why you hail the Hungarians who rebelled against the tyranny of the Soviet Union as freedom fighters, while you denounce the Algerians who are fighting against the tyranny of the French as rebels.

Who do you think said this? "I hold it, that a little rebellion, now and then, is a good thing, and as necessary in the political world as storms in the physical. * * * It is a medicine necessary for the sound health of government." Lest you be tempted to say: There goes a Communist if I ever saw one," may I remind you that you have raised a monument to this man in Washington. His name is Thomas Jefferson, and he wrote this in a letter to Madison.

Or who do you think said this? "This country with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it." You may say, "Surely, there goes a Communist if I ever saw one." But before you even think it, let me say to you that you have raised a huge monument to this man also in Washington. His name is Abraham Lincoln and he uttered these immortal words in his first inaugural address.

If you place the concept that man has a constitutional right to amend and a revolutionary right to overthrow, in the minds of millions of people who have grown weary of existing conditions, then the result is revolution. The question is not whether there will be a revolution—indeed, revolution is upon us. The question is which way will it go? Will it go the way of Jefferson, Lincoln, and Wilson, or will it go the way of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin. The initiative is yours if you bestir yourselves and take it.

LIVING UNDER LAW

The image that the Asians have of America is not only of a country conceived in liberty and born in revolution, but also of a people who live under law. The idea that people must live under law rather than the whim of individuals is not so new, but what is very new is that it is possible for states

to live under law. Indeed there are many otherwise intelligent persons among us who believe that it is not possible for states to live under law. The relationship between states is not governed by law but by treaties, which may be turned into scraps of paper without notice, and by unstable balances of power. If I may be permitted to generalize, the history of Europe in the last five centuries has been the monotonous story of alliance, balance of power, disintegration of the balance, and war.

This country was in danger of going that way if it were not for revolutionary men who were not afraid to be different. They proposed laws governing the Thirteen States as they had laws for individuals. They proposed that each State exchange a part of its sovereignty for the rule of law, in the same way as an individual exchanges a part of his sovereignty for the same purpose. Many who were enamoured of the word "sovereignty," believed that the scheme would not work. Nevertheless it was carried out. Thirteen grew into twenty and still there were people who though it was impossible. Twenty became forty, and 40 increased to 48 and still people said it was impossible. In our own time the number became 50 in the face of the opposition of people who thought it impossible. Now there are 50 of them and each, by giving up a part of its sovereignty, has added unto itself the sovereignty of 49 other States. The strength of the State of Minnesota is the strength of 50 united States; and the weakness of Minnesota is the concern of 49 other States.

You have proved that it is not only desirable but also possible for States to unite under the law. It is beginning to catch the imagination of the world. The Arabs have taken steps to form a federal union. The Africans are talking about it. The Indonesians have formed one. Everyone believes that peace will come to war-torn Europe when they form a United States of Europe.

This you have accomplished. This you know and to this you must witness. What can be more 100 percent American than for you to work for a federal union of the world under law? What can be more natural than for the citizens of the United States of America to work for the united states of the world under law? Why shouldn't you take this light from your past endeavor to change the weak United Nations into a strong instrument of world government under law?

Where is America which was conceived in liberty? Where is the Nation that was born in revolution? Where are the people who believed it was possible for States as well as individuals to live under law?

Some time ago a discerning student from Persia, he had to be a Persian to be discerning, told me that America was like a giant that is tired: like a boxer who is in the ring in spite of himself. This reminds me of a story which I read in the Reader's Digest—where else? "When a sudden storm blew up at sea a young woman, leaning against the ship's rail, lost her balance and was thrown overboard. Immediately another figure plunged into the waves beside her and held her up until a lifeboat rescued them. To everyone's astonishment the hero was the oldest man on the voyage—an octogenarian. That evening he was given a party in honor of his bravery. 'Speech, speech,' the other passengers cried. The old gentleman rose slowly and looked around at the enthusiastic gathering. 'There's just one thing I'd like to know,' he said testily. 'Who pushed me?' "

It is said, isn't it, that a nation conceived in liberty, born in revolution, and living under law, should be groping as in darkness and not using the shining lights it has inherited. I am persuaded that all of you are intelligent enough to see the danger to your basic liberties and are dedicated enough to take up these causes as your own, no matter in what situation of life you find yourself. However, to spur you on, I want to offer a prayer as a parting gift and wish for you certain things.

I wish you sickness and hunger; not so much that it will sap all your energies, but enough that you realize that the majority of the people of the world do not have enough food and cannot even hope to have medical attention.

I wish for everyone of you anxiety for finding a job or for the security or health of your family; not so much that you will become hysterical and lose your balance, but enough that you may discover the inner resources which you have in you to meet the challenge of the hour.

I wish that all of you will become victims of injustice; not so much that you will be completely frustrated, but enough that you may realize that you cannot have justice without paying the price and making the cause of universal justice your own.

I wish you will become victims of tyranny; not so much that you will be completely broken, but enough that you may learn that no one can offer you liberty as a gift—you must attain unto it and safeguard it with constant vigilance.

I wish you will become victims of the rule of man when an individual tramples your personality under his feet because he doesn't like the color of your skin or the manner of your speech or just because he enjoys doing it; not so much that you may become bitter, but enough to make you appreciate the rule of law and hold it high and defend it with your will and intellect.

I wish for everyone of you an experience of disappointment in people and institutions from whom you have expected much; not so much that you may become cynical, but enough that you will realize what others feel about you when you let them down.

And in all good things and profitable endeavors, I wish you God's richest blessing.

Transportation in World Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following interesting and informative address titled "Transportation in World Civilization," which appeared in the July 9, 1959, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror and which was delivered by James M. Symes, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., at the recent convention of Lions International in New York.

The address follows:

TRANSPORTATION IN WORLD CIVILIZATION

I consider it a great honor to meet and address this distinguished gathering from all parts of this hemisphere and the rest of the civilized world. Your presence here under one roof is an example of one of the pleasant jobs that modern transport can do—bring people like yourselves together from all ends of the earth, and do it economically and comfortably.

I was asked to talk to you on "Transportation in World Civilyization." As a transport man all my life, I am happy to do so. But transport is a complex activity and can get mighty technical; so, with your permission, I will discuss it in a very informal way—the way you might talk to friends about your particular business over a cup of coffee. This will let me emphasize the human and more interesting side.

First I shall try to demonstrate that transport has had a lot to do with getting man civilized. In fact, it is a pretty good rule of thumb that, in countries where it is easy for people and goods to move about, the standard of education and of living is likely to be high. There are very sound economic and sociological reasons for that, and we'll go into them in a moment.

How did this come about? How did transport happen to pace the growth of man's knowledge, comfort, and well-being—which added together make our material civilization? Well—as Al Smith used to say here in Madison Square Garden—"Let's look at the record."

There seems to be little doubt that woman was the first beast of burden. She not only carried her child; she carried the things that man began to use. Primitive man spent a lot of time on the move, hunting for food and seeking out or avoiding his enemies. He needed his hands free for hunting and fighting—at least that was his story—and so it fell on his wife to carry the household gear, any provisions on hand, and any game he brought down.

Incidentally, our modern American wives—especially suburban wives—sometimes complain that they are still beasts of burden. I hope you foreign delegates understand that this is an exaggeration. All they do, actually, is spend the first 16 years or so of their children's lives transporting them to school, to the doctor for shots, to dancing class, to the shoe store about feet that change size and shape every year, to birthday parties that neighborhood children always seem to be having, and so on. A serviceable wife also fetches groceries, gets her husband's suit from the cleaners when she remembers to, meets him at the commuting station if reminded to, picks him up at an airport 40 miles away at 2 o'clock in the morning, and odds and ends like that. He helps out by letting her use the family car—when he doesn't need it—and by sturdily carrying his own briefcase.

But to get back to primitive woman as the first form of transport. Her first relief came when her husband began training animals to help with the heavier hauling. In various places these have included and still include the ox, the donkey, the reindeer, camel, elephant, llama—and the two you and I know best, the horse and the dog. The horse became so important that owning one made you a man of distinction and this provided various cultures with their names for "gentleman." A Spaniard on a nice looking caballo or horse was a caballero; a Frenchman on a suitable cheval or horse was a chevalier; a well-mounted Englishman was a cavalier. The dog has also provided a name or two—but we'd better not mention them here.

We might note to, in passing, that some of these animals that early man trained to transport provided valuable byproducts. A fellow who owns a herd of reindeer, for instance, is not just in the trucking business—he is also in the milk, meat, and hide business. A fellow with a herd of camels is also nicely fixed: aside from transport to sell, he is also in the milk, meat, skin, and hair business. Modern industry did not invent diversification.

Nor are operational difficulties anything new. A passenger camel can do a hundred miles a day; in freight service he can handle a thousand pounds. But his feet are tender as a baby's when he gets off sand, so his run has to stop wherever the sand stops. The

elephant can move mountains, but he is a professional invalid and always reporting sick. The only fuel suitable for a reindeer is reindeer moss—which grows only in certain places; the llama can operate only in high altitudes, and so on. Obviously, any civilization built on this hit-or-miss array of transport would be at best elementary and local.

Meanwhile, primitive man found that animals can drag more than they can carry. This basic discovery—which is the principle of the railroad train—led to sleds and then to the wheel. Someone has said that the wheel is the most important invention of man. Everything that moves—from our trucks and trains—is built around the wheel.

Probably man's first wheels were cross-sections of a tree trunk with a hole burned in the middle, and thousands of years before written history there were rough carts of one sort or another. Today civilized man spends at least some of each day on wheels. This is especially true in America, where there are probably more wheels than in the rest of the world put together. This makes it embarrassing that the American Indian is one of the few primitive peoples that never found the secret of the wheel. When the white men came he was still lugging his belongings around on the back of his wife or on two trailing sticks.

Meanwhile, helpful as the wheel was to our ancestors, it was not what gave civilization its first big push forward. That came—and as a land transport man I regret having to admit this—with the beginnings of water transport. Early man lived mostly in clusters in river valleys, and as far back as the stone age he had learned to get about on rafts and in small boats of skin, bark, or hollowed logs.

The first of our Western civilizations grew up along the banks of the Euphrates River. Then the Egyptian civilization grew up along the Nile—which not only provided a means of water transport, but fertilized the farms on its banks with regular spring floods. As to land transportation in that civilization, I am sure all of you remember the drawings of the slaves pulling stones on crude sleds to build the pyramids.

Then the Greeks, Phoenicians, and Romans began to build larger ships with sails and one to three banks of oars. The motive power for these boats was very dependable. They put a slave on each oar and used a whip for a sparkplug. If the slave didn't produce enough motive power, they got another slave. It was transportation, but hardly what we would call civilization. In these boats the traders ventured around the Mediterranean and as far north as Britain, looking for markets and for products to take home and sell. World trade of a rudimentary sort had begun, and with it the competition for raw material and markets that has been going on ever since.

This in turn brought on the wars such competition can cause. Eventually Rome won them all. She set up her empire, giving the Western World its first extensive taste of orderly and constructive existence under law—in short, of civilization. To hold this civilization together, and to encourage trade within it, she supplemented her ocean fleets by a system of roads fanning out over Europe. You, of course, know all this. I recall it to you only to remind you that it was water transport that got Roman civilization spread around the Mediterranean, and the addition of land transport that held the empire together and developed it. In short, the world's first large-scale transport system helped to produce and maintain the world's first large-scale civilization.

When that civilization fell, from corruption within and barbarian assaults from without, large-scale transportation almost disappeared from the earth for 1,000 years. The Roman fleet vanished and her system of roads disintegrated. Europe was not to know such extensive and unifying transport again until the railroad and the steamship came, almost 1,500 years later. Nor has Europe, up to this day, known for more than a few decades at a time the freedom from war that Roman transport encouraged and her legions enforced.

The first result of the disintegration of the Roman transport system was that economic, social, and political life became local. In time a feudal society developed that is remembered chiefly by some long-winded poetry about knights in armor and their wretched squabbles. For centuries neither people nor goods traveled freely; there were not the facilities and it wasn't safe. The economy was mostly agricultural, with some manufacturing and trading in the few towns. The rich—that is, the landowners—lived in drafty castles and the poor—which was almost everyone—lived in the fields and worked like animals. What sense of social responsibility and of civilization there was resided largely in the church.

It was a revival of transport that started Europe up out of this static mess. The kings and princes organized the crusades and sent thousands of men marching east to free Jerusalem from the Mohammedans. This was the first mass movement of people in Europe since Attila the Hun had swept in from Asia, and it reminded people they could move. It also brought Europe again in contact with the Middle East with its fine steels, dyes, perfumes, and medicines. Samples of these luxury products brought back by the crusaders stimulated a demand for them, but presently quite a few ships were busy in the trade. Shakespeare's Merchant of Venice was in this business. The vessels were small but the cargoes were valuable: they were what transportation people today call high-rated commodities.

Meanwhile this trade had cracked the shell in which Europe had been living. Voyages of discovery became the fashion, and Columbus sold Ferdinand and Isabella on putting up the money for a discovery voyage to find the Indies by going west. It is a sobering thought that he discovered America with a fleet of ships that weighed only 200 tons. You could load the *Nina*, the *Pinta*, and the *Santa Maria*, on three railroad flatcars, and one passenger car would hold the entire crew. A small tool of transport had done the job of opening half a world up to civilization.

It was ocean transportation also that started and developed the world empires of Great Britain, France, Holland, and other European states. Colonization has since become an ugly word to many of the colonized, but the fact does remain that it was by colonization that civilization spread out of Europe, including to what is now the United States, and that sea transport made it possible.

From the time of Columbus until pretty well into the 19th century, transport remained largely by water. This was true in both the Old World and the New. Rivers and lakes were the main highways of travel and commerce. Man widened their reach by connecting them up with canals, especially in Europe. Even after Mr. MacAdam, the Scotch engineer, developed his broken-stone road, overland traffic remained slow and cumbersome. The coach and four was the height of luxury and speed. As late as 1776, it took 14 days to travel the 393 miles between London and Edinburgh. You can do it now in an hour and a half by air or 6½ hours by rail.

In fact, the wheel did not begin to approach its potential until it found out how to do without the horse. The horse had always been man's most useful and flexible powerplant; we still measure work output in terms of horsepower. But with the industrial revolution leading the way to mass production, there was getting to be more heavy hauling than the horse could handle; with populations spreading out from the seacoasts and river valleys, there was getting to be more travel than he could accommodate. And then man was provided with the iron horse, the railroad.

As a railroadman all my life, I would be happy to talk on for hours about the contributions, past, present, and future, that railroads have made to man's economic progress. But you already know most of the story as it applies to your own country, and so I shall just mention the more significant highlights.

I think we should begin by reminding ourselves that our interest here is less in the technology of transport than in what transport can do for people. I believe, too, we should remind ourselves that we are thinking of people in terms of civilization, and that if the philosophers will excuse us we are discussing civilization in the form of tangible benefits to whole populations. I do not mean by this to belittle man's sense of intellectual and spiritual values, but I will leave them to the philosophers, and as a transportation man confine my remarks to the realities of daily life. China, for instance, was producing philosophers, poets, and spiritual leaders when my ancestors in northern Europe were half-naked savages. Today the shoe is on the other foot; it is we who have time for, and access to, the things of the mind and spirit, while they live by the hundreds and millions in hunger and squalor—and we will continue to do so until they have built economies like ours which benefit everyone in them. So we need feel no embarrassment here that we are seeing civilization as bountifully created benefits, bountifully shared.

As an example of how early railroads took up their share of this job of creating and distributing benefits, I might cite the origin of my own railroad. It was built to connect Philadelphia with the newly opened West and its branches tapped the great coalfields of Pennsylvania. Coal was at the time the Nation's almost only source of large-scale industrial energy. Much of this coal happened to be in Pennsylvania—but most of the ore that required its energy to make iron was farther West. So the railroads took on the job of getting the coal and the ore together in the steel plants at Pittsburgh and beyond, and then hauling the manufactured steel away.

This is, incidentally, still almost one-third of our business. I mention this fact because it illustrates something that does not catch the public eye—and yet is the very foundation of heavy industry. This is the ability of a mass carrier like a railroad to move bulk materials like ore and coal not by the cartload or the truckload or the bargeload—but in millions of tons. And not merely to move it, but to move it at costs that are a small fraction of the final price of the finished product. Can you imagine how little steel would be made, and how much it would cost, if all its coal, ore, coke, furnace stone and finished product had to move by individual truckload, instead of by whole trains that converge day and night on the plants? And the same is true of a great many other basic raw materials and products of a mass-production economy like ours.

Another thing about the railroads that is hard for us to realize today is how much the coming of the railroads drew people together. In Europe they overcome geographical and national boundaries, making travel and trade easy. In America, which is 3,000 miles across, they annihilated distances it had taken months to cover by horse and wagon. This new facility of movement tied thinly settled areas into the economy, and opened unsettled areas to settlement. The California gold rush of 1849 called attention to the west

coast; the transcontinental railroads made it part of the Nation. California, which once had a few thousand Spaniards, gold miners and barkeepers for its population, is now one of our most populous States—and its garden vegetables, citrus fruits, wines and so forth appear daily on tables thousands of miles away.

The freight train—especially after refrigerator cars came in during the 1870's—changed the Nation's pattern of eating. Fresh meats, fruits, vegetables, and seafoods came to be marketed hundreds and thousands of miles from where they are produced. A city no longer had to rely on a surrounding ring of garden farms and dairies, nor synchronize its eating habits with what was locally "in season." It could choose, at competitive prices, between California and Florida oranges, among potatoes from south New Jersey, northern New York, Maine, Michigan, and Idaho. That sort of thing is more than a superficial frill on the standard of living: it keeps prices in line—as alternative sources of supply always do. And fast and efficient transport makes this possible.

The railroads had freed man from pacing himself and his economy to the horse. Now the internal combustion engine came along and made it even easier for man and his goods to get about. The first important use of internal combustion was in the automobile. But even more important than the invention of the automobile was the development of mass production which made it widely available. Federal, State, and local governments moved quickly to build hard-surfaced roads—and the automobile population boomed. Soon there were also trucks and buses and airplanes. Modern diesel engines began to throb in the holds of tugboats and lake and river boats—and they cut the costs of hauling by water wherever there were good waterways. Again a generous Government, urged on by Congressmen from the river and harbor communities, spent hundreds of millions of dollars, deepening harbors and waterways.

Americans fell in love with the automobile and the airplane—as their grandfathers had with the railroads. Their development in size, number, and performance exceeded even the most optimistic predictions year by year. Today we have many more automobiles than families—57 million automobiles as against 51 million families. There is a truck of one sort or another for every five families. In addition to all the commercial airplanes, there are now 65,000 privately owned planes flying around the country. The Nation's total investment in transportation is around $365 billion, which is even bigger than our national debt. The major part of this investment is for the automobile and its facilities—only a tenth of it now is in railroads.

In other countries, as you know, the automobile has not grown in this proportion. In most countries the railroads still do a larger part of the overall transportation business than they do here—about in the proportions we knew a generation ago. This does not mean, however, that we are a generation ahead of the rest of the world, for the causes of our railroads' shrinking share of the business have been partly artificial.

I have mentioned the tax-free highways, airways, and waterways that have been built alongside thousands of miles of railroad. Government money—including taxes paid by the railroads—has given these other types of transport an artificial advantage in competing for the most profitable freight and passenger business. The result of this uneven treatment is that the basic workhorse of America's transport system—the railroad—is not growing as it naturally should, while the general economy and other forms of transport are booming.

As a railroadman, this situation worries me beyond the fears for the welfare of my own industry. It poses, I think, a real threat to America's prosperity—for it imperils the economical and self-supporting mass transportation of freight and people that our growing population and our growing industrial, economy require.

I should mention one other threatening aspect of the situation and that is the importance of mass transport to national defense. Twenty years ago when America set up shop to be the arsenal of democracy for World War II, the railroads hauled 90 percent of all military freight. Today our Federal, State, and local governments—in their enthusiasm for promoting the newer modes of transportation—often forget the workhorse job that railroads did before, and the unhappy possibility that such a job may have to be done again.

Meanwhile, Russia is relying primarily on railroad transportation. They are doing everything they can do to expand and modernize their railroads. Railroad construction is also a prime objective of the Chinese Government. Both countries are seeking the form of transportation which does each job best, at the lowest cost in resources and labor—and in most cases they are building railroads.

Curiously enough, this mention of the two big Communist countries gets us back to our subject of transport as a means of raising the standard of living and therefore of spreading civilization. Last year a friend of mine spent several weeks traveling on the Russian railroads. He was astonished at the great amount of building materials for homes and consumer goods factories they are hauling. Who knows?—it may be that for all the threatening noises their diplomats make, they may inadvertently do what the Western World has done: attain a high standard of living based on good transportation. If they do that they would then find that it is better to enjoy peace than to subjugate satellite nations.

If they were to succeed in this program—and convince China to adopt it—the Western World could stop worrying about almost a billion potential enemies. And that, I suggest, would be the biggest thing that transportation ever accomplished for civilization.

Award to Senator Thurmond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on June 13, 1959, the Military Government Association held its 12th annual conference at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D.C. I had the privilege of participating in the banquet which culminated the conference.

A main event of the evening was the presentation to Senator STROM THURMOND, immediate past national president of the association, of the highest award which the association can bestow—the 1959 annual award for outstanding contributions in the field of civil affairs and military government.

The annual award was presented to Senator THURMOND by Dr. Eli E. Nobleman, the national president of the association.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Dr. Nobleman in making the presentation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, members, and friends of the Military Government Association, every once in a while, in the lifetime of each of us, an opportunity arises to do that which one really wants to do. This is the opportunity which has come to me in my lifetime. For it is now my solemn task to officiate at one of the most important events of this 12th annual conference—the presentation of the annual award of the Military Government Association for 1959.

You may ask yourselves why this occasion is of such significance to me. If I may be permitted to digress for a moment, I will tell you the same thing I told the Vice President of the United States about 2 months ago, when Senator THURMOND and I had occasion to consult with him with respect to a matter concerning the association. He asked me how I, a gentleman from New York, came to be associated with Senator THURMOND, a gentleman from the Deep South. I replied then as I reply now—that it was my privilege, during part of World War II, to serve under the command of the recipient of the 1959 award.

My association with this outstanding officer, gentleman, and scholar since that time has been and continues to be one of the finest and most inspiring experiences of my life.

The task of selecting an individual for this award is usually very difficult, because many persons have made significant contributions in the field of civil affairs and military government. However, the association does have two ground rules—one, that the recipient must not be in the Active Army; and two, he must not hold an elective office in the association. The association presents its distinguished service citations to worthy persons who are connected with the Defense Establishment or who hold positions of leadership in the Government.

Our procedure in choosing the recipient begins with a determination which is made by our Standing Committee on the National Award. After this committee has made its choice, the names are circulated among the national board of directors who must signify their desires in writing.

The man whom we honor this evening is no stranger to this organization. However, a brief review of his life and accomplishments is in order.

STROM THURMOND was born in Edgefield, S.C., on December 5, 1902. He graduated from Clemson College in 1923, studied law at night, and was admitted to the South Carolina Bar in 1930.

It becomes apparent as we learn more about this unusual gentleman that whatever he does he does superlatively. For example, we find that between 1923 and 1929, STROM THURMOND was a teacher in a county school; from 1929 to 1933, he was county superintendent of education; between 1933 and 1938, he served as city attorney and county attorney and also State senator; between 1938 and 1946, he served as circuit judge.

Elected governor of South Carolina in 1947, he occupied that office until 1951, serving, in 1950, as chairman of the Southern Governors' Conference. He was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1932, 1936, 1948, 1952 and 1956, serving in 1948, as

chairman of the South Carolina delegation and national committeeman. He was elected to the U.S. Senate on November 2, 1954, for a term ending January 3, 1961, the first man in history ever to be elected to the U.S. Senate as a write-in candidate. On April 4, 1956, he resigned from the Senate in order to place the office in a primary election, pursuant to a promise made to the people during the 1954 campaign. He was renominated and reelected to the Senate in 1956, without opposition.

If his civilian career may be considered remarkable, his military career is equally outstanding.

Volunteering for service in World War II on the day war was declared, General Thurmond served with Headquarters, First U.S. Army, between 1942 and 1946, in both the European and Pacific theaters. He participated in the Normandy invasion with the 82d Airborne Division; and was awarded 5 battle stars and 16 decorations, medals and awards, including the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star medal with a "V," Army Commendation Ribbon, Purple Heart, Presidential Distinguished Unit Citation, Belgian Order of the Crown, and French Croix de Guerre.

He is a brigadier general in the U.S. Army Reserve and holds a mobilization designee assignment as Deputy Chief, Office of Civil Affairs, Department of the Army.

After distinguished service as national president of the Reserve Officers Association, General Thurmond was elected national president of the Military Government Association in 1957, for a term commencing January 1, 1958.

As one who has been a member of this association since its establishment in 1947, I can say without any hesitation that during the year 1958, the association's achievement, accomplishments, and gains were nothing short of phenomenal.

However, I would like to make it clear that General Thurmond's activities on behalf of civil affairs and military government and in support of the objectives of the association did not start in 1958. On the contrary, he has been working for many years to further our objectives, and his appearance before the Davis committee in 1953, and his continuous efforts through the years to obtain recognition of the importance of the CAMG function at all echelons of the Army have been most effective in the attainment of such objectives as a separate branch for reservists, a career pattern for Regulars, an office of Chief, Civil Affairs in the Department of the Army, and so forth.

He has worked continuously to increase the stature and the role of CAMG. He has by word and deed demonstrated its role as an integral part of the military forces.

Senator THURMOND has given of himself with complete selflessness and with a devotion to duty far above and beyond the call of duty.

His activities and his unselfish devotion to the needs of others bring to mind the story which is told of the man who was 80 years of age and who was planting a large orchard of peach trees.

"Why do you, at your advanced age," he was asked, "plant these trees? Surely you know you cannot hope to live to eat their fruit."

"I know," the old man replied, "I know I'll never live to pick a peach from any of these trees, but all my life I've been eating peaches from trees that someone else has planted. I want to plant some trees now to pay for the fruit I've eaten."

Such a man is Strom Thurmond. By hard work, brilliance and ingenuity he has reached high office in the Nation and in our Association. He has nothing to gain personally from additional labors in this association. Yet, he continues to work tirelessly and unceasingly so that those who come after him may benefit.

General THURMOND, it is my proud duty, on behalf of the Military Government Association to present to you the highest award which the Military Government Association can bestow—the 1959 annual award for outstanding contributions in the field of civil affairs and military government.

Governor Harriman's Talk With Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Gov. W. Averill Harriman has just had a most interesting visit in the Soviet Union, which he has been reporting from time to time through the press. At the end of his long trip in Russia, he had two extensive discussions with Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev. A report of these discussions is carried in an article which appeared in the New York Times on July 3, 1959.

Mr. Harriman confirms the impression I got of Premier Khrushchev when I talked with him last December. He emphasizes Khrushchev's great confidence in communism and in the Soviet Union. Khrushchev again pointed out how he expects the 7-year plan to succeed. Mr. Harriman says Khrushchev is convinced that the Communist system will prevail throughout the world and that we in the West are on the way out.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Governor Harriman's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARRIMAN GIVES ACCOUNT OF TALK WITH KHRUSHCHEV

(By W. Averell Harriman)

PARIS, June 29.—At the end of my long trip through the Soviet Union, covering about 17,000 miles, I have had two extensive discussions with Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev. He revealed with unmistakable clarity his complete confidence that the Soviet Union can within relatively few years gain supremacy over the United States.

"We will demonstrate the advantages of our system and set an example to other countries which they will follow," he said to me.

BASIS OF CONFIDENCE CITED

The grounds for Mr. Khrushchev's confidence, he made clear to me, are threefold.

First, he has supreme faith in Marxism. Communism, he believes, is a higher form of human organization and eventually capitalism must cede to it.

Second, he is certain that the Soviet economy will make long strides in catching up with us, especially in heavy industry, during the current 7-year plan.

Third, he is deeply ignorant of the facts of American life and its potentialities.

Stalin, he acknowledged, laid the foundations for the rapid progress now being made in the Soviet Union. However, not until his death was it possible to take the initiative and release the energies essential to that progress.

"In Stalin's later days," Khrushchev told me, "he became overbearing and distrustful of his colleagues. He would not let us do the work he was no longer capable of. He did not always use his great authority for proper purposes. It was very difficult for us."

I suggested that we had had similar difficulties with Stalin in foreign affairs and Khrushchev readily agreed. In fact, in international affairs, Khrushchev said repeatedly, "Stalin was not blameless."

I went on to point out that Khrushchev had recently stated publicly that I had made a number of anti-Soviet speeches and I suggested that he had made even more anti-American ones. To this he also agreed.

I ask whom Stalin had chosen to succeed him. Khrushchev replied a little sourly: "He never selected anyone. He thought he would live forever." Then he revealed, for what I understand is the first time, his story of Stalin's last days.

"One Saturday in March of 1953 we all went as usual to Stalin's dacha [villa] for dinner," he said. "He was in fine spirits and we had a good time. Then we went home. Next day we waited for the telephone call Stalin usually put through to us on Sundays, but it never came. On Monday evening the head of his bodyguard called us to say Stalin was unwell.

"Beria, Bulganin, Malenkov and myself hurried out to his dacha and found him unconscious. A blood clot had paralyzed an arm, a leg, and his tongue. We stayed with him for 3 days, but he remained unconscious. Then for a moment he came out of his coma and tried to joke with us. Pointing to a painting over his bed of a baby lamb being fed with a spoon by a little girl, he indicated by gestures that now he was as helpless as the lamb.

"A few minutes later he died," Khrushchev went on. "I wept. After all, we were all his pupils and deeply indebted to him. Like Peter the Great he fought barbarism with barbarism, but he was a great man."

PREMIER THE DRIVING FORCE

Khrushchev left no doubt in my mind that he is the driving power behind both the industrial and agricultural expansion which is taking place wherever I have been in the Soviet Union.

At the end of the war, Stalin had told me of his plans for industrial expansion including 60 million tons of steel a year. Then Soviet production had been reduced to 12 million tons and I thought this goal could not be reached for many decades.

But already, only 14 years later, it is 55 million tons, and in Karaganda alone I had seen another 3,200,000-ton plant coming into operation. In northern Kazakhstan I had watched Soviet engineers uncovering iron mines with a total annual capacity of 80 million tons. But Khrushchev told me the Soviet Union is presently exploiting only half its potential.

I asked whether he had the manpower to carry out his ambitious program. "We have plenty of labor," he replied, adding however, that much of it is at present tied down by unproductive practices in agriculture.

"Some of our collective farms are using two and even three times more workers than they should," he acknowledged. "We shall take them away when we need them to work in industry."

I had no doubt that he had the power to do so. Earlier he had admitted to me that his word is law in the Soviet Union.

He was equally confident that the Soviet food problem was being solved. I had myself seen the virgin lands which he is plowing up and sowing to grain. I pointed out that even some Soviet scientists were afraid that

plowing up the steppe would create another dust bowl.

"Despite two severe droughts," he replied, "the project has already paid for itself, and we have made a profit of nearly $2 billion." Besides, he continued, the area is producing the cheapest grain in the entire country. "The skeptics are already blushing for shame," he added.

POWER OUTPUT STRESSED

Nor is the power to electrify the farms and drive his industry worrying him. From the Volga River to deep in Siberia I had seen suge hydroelectric plants rising. New coal and gas deposits, he told me, had opened the possibility of much cheaper thermal power stations, which he now proposes to build. "By 1970," he said, "we shall be within 70 percent of America's 1957 power output."

With his great plans to "catch up with America," I asked him if he was not underestimating the United States capacity to expand. His economists had told me they calculated American economic growth at only 2 percent, which is hardly more than its population increase.

If this was the best information he was getting, I suggested he fire his economists and hire someone who knew the American economy better and could report more accurately what was taking place there free of dogmatic prejudices. Far from the stagnation which his economists predicted, I told him, the American system was in "its most creative period."

Anastas I. Mikoyan, First Deputy Premier, had now joined the discussion and together he and Khrushchev stubbornly supported their economists' findings. Though the American democratic system was still far from its end, Mr. Khrushchev said, it was inevitably heading in that direction. He charged that American prosperity was due largely to profits made during both World Wars.

But when I explained the absurity of such statements, it seemed to make little impression on him.

"You have become so rich that until now you have been able to bribe or buy off your workers with high pay and living standards," he said. But, he added, "one day they, too, will overthrow your capitalist system."

As he described the inevitable triumph of communism, Mr. Khrushchev talked forcefully, leaning forward and wagging his forefinger under my chin. His small, piercing eyes peered intently at me and his round cheeks were flushed with emotion. As he grew more intense, he spoke with a marked Ukrainian accent, just as Stalin had spoken with a Georgian one.

"In 5 to 7 years," we will be stronger than you," he said. "We developed the hydrogen bomb before you. We have intercontinental missiles and our rockets carry warheads many times larger than yours."

I interrupted to tell him that this sort of talk hardly allayed American fears of Soviet aggressive intentions. He replied that Americans had misunderstood Communist doctrine on the possibility of war.

Earlier doctrine, he explained, had defined imperialistic war as inevitable. However, he continued, the 20th Soviet Communist Party Congress had revised the dogma and declared such wars to be avoidable, though not impossible. Furthermore, he added, the 21st Party Congress had confirmed this view. Thus war is no longer necessary. He seemed to think that we should accept without question the decrees of party congresses as predetermining our future history.

Toward the end of our long discussions, Khrushchev brought up the Berlin problem and reiterated in the most forceful language the Soviet position as stated at Geneva. I told him with equal vigor that the American people and both political parties were solidly behind the President in his stand to protect the freedom of the 2 million people living in West Berlin.

Nevertheless, he appears to be so confident of his strength that he is determined to force a solution of the problem. Furthermore, in the long run, he is firmly convinced, the Communist system will prevail throughout the world and that we are on the way out.

This is the challenge we face.

Budgeting for Defense and for Health: The Contrast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Senate today resumes consideration of a gigantic appropriation bill dedicated to the maintenance of the defense of our country and its citizens. Three weeks ago we passed another bill—puny by comparison—which contains an item significant and urgent to the defense of our peoples. I refer to the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, which includes a small but significant $480 million item for the National Institutes of Health, center of our important Federal medical research activity. The NIH appropriation represents an increase of some $136 million over the House appropriation and $186 million over the administration's inadequate budget request.

In the June 1959 issue of the Bulletin, official publication of the National Tuberculosis Association, I have written, under the hearing "Budgeting for Defense Against Disease," of our urgent and desperate need for increased expenditures for medical research. Because this article points up the significance of our two types of defense and the differing budgetary emphasis which we have chosen to give each of them, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGETING FOR DEFENSE AGAINST DISEASE

(By RICHARD NEUBERGER)

When I returned to Washington and my Senate duties in February this year, following my successful treatment for cancer, one of the newspapers which commented editorially on my recovery was an Arizona paper circulated in a sunny locale to which tuberculosis sufferers have flocked. The editorial writer noted that in earlier days the tuberculosis patients had even formed clubs and had a camaraderie among themselves. But, the writer continued, thanks to medical research, great gains have been made in the conquest of the disease, and such groups have lost their fatalistic nature.

My doctors have just given me a clean bill of health after operation and treatment for a disease whose cured victims are organizing "victory" clubs. Like thousands of tuberculosis sufferers, we owe our lives to the advances of modern medicine; we are living symbols of the results of medical research.

The debts that all Americans owe to medical research are many. Human happiness and decreased suffering is one. The 5 years that have been added to the average lifespan in the last decade, resulting in added productive strength for our Nation, is another.

Indeed, were it not for the medical research of the last quarter century, about all our doctors would have in their familiar black bags would be bottles of aspirin and stethoscopes. The amazing vaccines and antibiotics that today we take for granted in the treatment of everything from the common cold to the most complex infectious disease are results of the research during this brief period.

Yet the investment which has purchased these benefits is trifling when compared with the amounts Americans spend on such items as chewing gum, permanent waves, and tobacco.

In fiscal year 1959, for example, a little more than $34.2 million was appropriated from Federal sources for heart disease research. Americans spend 11 times that amount each year on permanent waves.

Under the leadership of Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, I have worked in the Senate to increase the Federal appropriations to the National Institutes of Health for all medical research. We have succeeded in some measure. The appropriation for fiscal year 1956 was $98,458,000; the 1959 figure was $294,383,000. But compare either of those totals with the more than $300 million that we spend annually on chewing gum.

Cannot an economy that includes annual expenditures of $6 billion for research on missiles and armaments spare more than a pittance for research into the saving of human life?

MORE RESEARCH FUNDS JUSTIFIED

Fifty million Americans now living will die of cancer, but the Federal Government devotes 50 times as much to farm price supports as it does to cancer research. With a background of such staggering statistics, I believe greater Federal appropriations for medical research—such as my proposal for an additional $500 million for cancer research through the National Cancer Institute—are not only thoroughly justified but urgently needed.

The argument for increased funds follows the three principles which must guide all effective medical research. Larger research appropriations would:

1. Insure continuity and stability in medical research. Our able researchers would be assured that their salaries were no longer based on the uncertainties of annual congressional approval. Thus these people could avoid the inevitable temptation of abandoning laboratories for the greater financial rewards of private medical practice.

2. Permit expansion of basic as well as applied research. Military science and technology are not the only fields which have benefited greatly from basic research. Fundamental studies originally thought only distantly related to patient treatment have resulted in important forward steps in medicine.

3. Recognize that medical research cannot move forward by any arbitrary schedule, and that researchers must be free from financial limitations that cramp the ingenuity of the mind.

MEDICAL RESEARCHERS NEEDED

Research—be it basic or specialized—requires researchers. Provision of necessary funds for research programs is nothing without trained minds to utilize them. Yet the rigors of obtaining a medical education are

great, especially financially. The newly graduated M.D. and his family too often have heavy debt loads. Many of these students find their economic position so precarious that they feel forced to employ their skills in private practice, where monetary rewards are, of course, greatest.

I have introduced legislation in Congress which, if enacted, can assist in supplying the trained medical researchers we need. My bill would amend the loan fund program of the National Defense Education Act, which Congress passed last year, to give medical researchers benefits now enjoyed by elementary and secondary school teachers. That is, loan recipients who enter medical research would be permitted to write off up to 50 percent of their loan and interest under the Defense Education Act.

I recognize that my proposal is not a panacea for all the ills of our medical research personnel problem. We are still faced with inadequacies in the facilities and finances of our medical schools. And medical research itself does not possess the natural glamour or remunerative appeal of private medical practice.

There is no questioning its significance, however. Medical research has touched the very life of all of us. In little more than a decade, its products have cut the fatality rate of once dread diseases like influenza and rheumatic fever by as much as 83 percent. I write and speak and vote in the Senate today as a personal testimony to medical research.

Our Federal budget includes unquestioned billions for the defense of the American people against potential foreign enemies. We can and must afford more for the defense of our people against disease—through investment in medical research.

More Partisanship Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of July 9:

MORE PARTISANSHIP NEEDED

The row in the Democratic Party may be blamed on two false ideas of the purpose of political parties. The sooner we get rid of these ideas the better.

The first of them is that the principal job of a party is to elect its candidates. Without stopping to think, most people would agree with that idea. But consider what it implies.

It implies that any kind of public deception is justified in order to get votes. It is true that the public is often misled and betrayed by politicians, but the people demand some degree of honesty. Such cynicism about politics as exists today is largely traceable to the failure of successful candidates to redeem campaign promises. The theory that the party's first job is to get its candidates into office cannot be supported.

The principal job of the party is not to elect its candidates. It is to declare certain principles and to stand by them. A conservative party ought to be conservative even though defeat is certain. It was the failure of the GOP to do this that has reduced it to its present low standing. And it is the trend of Democratic liberals toward conservative policies that is now causing the quarrel in that party.

The second false idea is that there is something wrong in vigorous partisanship. According to this notion, the middle of the road is the proper place. It was this wrong concept that misled Ike through his first administration.

The truth is that good politics and good government require robust partisanship. Middle of the roadism is wishy-washy and leads to irresponsibility in partisan politics. It confuses voters and makes voter mandates impossible.

There are always opposites in political ideology and there should always be parties who accept the opposites and stand willing to champion them. The alternative is to have candidates who don't really stand for anything, but pretend to stand for what they believe the people want at the moment.

That is what certain cautious Democrats in Congress are doing now. And the forthright Democratic national chairman, Paul Butler, is right in scolding them for it.

The job of a political party is to declare principles and champion them with the most vigorous partisanship, not to elect candidates by parroting public opinion polls.

Report of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks a copy of the report of the committee on irrigation and reclamation to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress' 46th national convention which was held in Washington in May. This report was submitted to the convention and accepted on May 15. I had the honor to serve as chairman of the committee, but much of the credit belongs to Ival V. Goslin, engineer-secretary to the upper Colorado River Commission and to William Welsh, secretary-manager of the National Reclamation Association.

I call attention to the fact that more than half of the funds for reclamation comes from the sale of public lands, certain minerals, and the repayment on reclamation projects. Irrigation allocations are returned to the Treasury without interest in accordance with reclamation law first enacted in 1902.

Irrigtaion is a sound investment for the Nation. For instance, every 4 years the value of crops produced on reclamation farms equals the total appropriation for Federal reclamation which started 57 years ago. It has been estimated that the Federal Government has received more than $5 billion in Federal taxes from reclamation projects and adjacent trade territories. The land irrigated would be nonproductive without water and good people to work the land. Irrigation projects produce food for a growing, expanding population. Only about 2 percent of the products on irrigated farms add to our surplus agricultural products. It would not be possible to have an abundance of cheap vegetables without the irrigation of good land.

The report follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

INTRODUCTION

Two years ago at the 44th annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, President Overton Brooks announced the creation of the committee on irrigation and reclamation. The assembly approved the forming of this committee, adopted its report, and made the committee a permanent part of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Purposes of the irrigation and reclamation committee

This committee has been directed to deal only with matters of general policy.

At its inception the purposes of this committee were defined as the formulation of a policy and a program for the continued, orderly development by reclamation and irrigation of our water and land resources in the arid and semiarid regions of the West, and to suggest ways and means whereby the National Rivers and Harbors Congress may better cooperate and coordinate its efforts with the advocates of reclamation and irrigation.

Committee personnel

The personnel of the committee on irrigation and reclamation are listed on page 1 of this report. This committee is interested not only in irrigation and reclamation, but in flood control projects, rivers and harbors projects, and, in fact, all phases of water resource development.

PROGRESS

In this committee's report for 1957 to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, several policy and procedural recommendations were outlined. These were designed as guides and suggestions for implementing basic principles. The adoption of these recommendations by this organization has contributed greatly to a better understanding of water resource problems. It is gratifying to note that sponsors of projects are recognizing new possibilities for coordination of efforts and cooperation in developing water and land resources. This new spirit and its resultant accomplishments constitute progress—not because during the past year we feel that the program of project development has been accelerated to the point necessary or desirable—but because future results will prove the wisdom of united efforts.

As a result of cooperative efforts, Congress enacted a public works appropriation bill for fiscal 1959 that contained 65 unbudgeted water development projects of which 9 were reclamation new starts.

During the past year, several projects were started under the Small Reclamation Projects Act. Presently, there are four project loan applications pending before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of Congress. There are at least four additional projects under this act pending before the Department of the Interior. It is anticipated that these latter four projects will be submitted to Congress during its current session.

RECLAMATION IS MORE IMPORTANT TODAY THAN EVER BEFORE

Population increasing, productive land decreasing

The population of the United States continues to increase at a rate that provides

approximately 3 million more mouths to feed each year. At the same time, we are losing more than a million acres of good agricultural land every year to highways, airports, municipal and surburban developments, industrial and military establishments, and by other means. These two opposing but interrelated influences pertaining to our need and capacity to produce, speak for themselves.

Will agricultural production increase fast enough?

Our total farmland has remained about the same for the past 40 years. About the only means of increasing our farm acreage is through reclamation and drainage. It is doubtful whether production on our existing farmlands can be increased fast enough to meet the future demands of our growing population.

Another fact that has not been fully appreciated is that reclamation projects contribute only insignificant amounts to our crop surplus accumulations. As an example, wheat, upland cotton, corn, tobacco, and rice are the crops that have been giving the greatest headaches to our agricultural experts. Of these crops, only 2.2 percent of the wheat is raised on irrigated lands, and 5.3 percent of the upland cotton, 0.46 percent of the corn, 0.54 percent of the rice, and none of the tobacco come from reclamation projects.

Reclamation is for the future

Many years are required, often a quarter of a century or more, to bring a major authorized multiple-purpose development into agricultural production. For instance, the Colorado River storage project and participating projects will require about 30 years for completion; the Columbia River Basin project at least 40 years, the Missouri River Basin project about 75 years, etc. An average reclamation project requires at least 10 years for completion and often longer. In many instances, it takes equivalent amounts of time to bring projects to the authorization stage.

RECLAMATION'S NATIONAL VALUES

Economists and financial experts have found that the overall reclamation program has proved to be an economically sound and financially feasible enterprise for the Federal Government. Every 4 years the value of crops produced on reclamation farms equals the total money appropriated for Federal reclamation since its inception 57 years ago. The cash value of the crops produced in 1957 was more than $900 million. Since the reclamation program was initiated in 1902, $13,277,661,000 worth of crops have been produced. The Federal Government has received nearly $3,500 million in Federal taxes derived from reclamation projects and adjacent trade areas since 1940. Irrigation farmers have repaid the Federal Treasury more than $134,789,000.

As emphasized many times, from a financial standpoint, reclamation projects repay the investment in many ways besides repaying to the United States all of the costs allocated to irrigation features without interest and the costs allocated to power and municipal water supplies with interest. Reclamation portions of Federal multiple-purpose developments create economic returns in the form of stabilized downstream flows for industrial waters, pollution abatement, and other benefits that are not reflected in the financial feasibility of irrigation use of water. Western reclamation projects develop floodwater as the irrigation water supply; thereby, accomplishing flood control as an important byproduct. Flood control projects, as such, become less necessary because of irrigation water supply storage.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are believed to embody principles essential to a well-rounded, yet progressive, reclamation program that would be correlated with and complementary to a national program of development, utilization, and conservation of our Nation's water resources.

We are again confronted this year with a lack of budgetary recommendations for new starts. There are still prevalent in the land many irrational and misinformed influences that are waging relentless opposition against effective and progressive water resources development. Much of this opposition seems to be founded on the false premise that water resource development should be considered solely as an antirecession program to give the economy a boost when needed. This viewpoint fails to recognize the fundamental concept underlying the development of our natural resources which is to meet the demands of our growing population and expanding economy and at the same time, maintain our high standard of living. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress should support the position of the 10 Missouri River Basin States' Governors and the 4 Upper Colorado River Basin States' Governors in their efforts to modify the no-new-starts policy.

Reclamation, flood control, and other water resources developments create new wealth, a vital prerequisite to the maintenance of our national economy and our world leadership. We must stress the development of such new wealth within our country in order to continue investments in similar new wealth-producing projects in foreign lands.

It is recommended that:

1. Where opposition to water development programs exists, officer members of and delegates to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress should act without delay to neutralize or combat such opposing influences with any effective means available at local, State, and national levels.

2. Congress should appropriate funds for the construction of authorized projects for which advanced planning has been completed. Construction should not be subjected to a stop-and-go policy because that procedure is too costly and inefficient. Construction funds for reclamation portions of multiple-purpose developments should be accelerated to $300 million per year and maintained thereafter at a level that would be relatively consistent with the annual gross national product.

3. The Congress of the United States should maintain and exercise its right to determine the policy and criteria under which all Federal water development projects will be authorized and constructed. This constitutional principle should be emphasized in the appropriation of funds and the designation of their use.

4. On multiple-purpose projects, wherever practicable, the development of water resources should be preceded by basinwide planning.

5. Power revenues derived from Federal projects should be used on a basinwide or areawide basis to assist in repayment of irrigation costs on Federal reclamation projects beyond the ability of the water users to repay.

6. The principle of the interstate compact should be encouraged in order to avoid litigation between and among States and to preclude domination of the development and control of natural resources by Federal agencies.

7. Procedures under which Federal water resources projects are investigated and reported should be simplified. The creation of a Board of Review or the Office of Coordinator would mean another obstacle in water resource development and should be opposed.

8. Basic land and water inventories, soil and water research, snow surveys and stream forecasting should be continued, expanded and modernized in order to provide adequate data for current and future planning.

9. The use of conservancy-type districts capable of levying taxes on project beneficiaries as agencies to execute repayment contracts with the Federal Government should be encouraged in order to more equitably allocate costs of a project and meet the burden of expensive and complex project construction.

10. In planning and constructing water resource projects the principle of supplying supplemental water to lands presently inadequately irrigated should be given priority over bringing new lands into cultivation.

11. It is further recommended that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, through its executive offices and appropriate committees—

(a) Accelerate its campaign in support of a water-utilization program designed to fully develop our land and water resources placing special emphasis on starting new water development projects that are financially feasible and economically justified and are now ready for construction;

(b) Continue to bring to the attention of the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government the need for a continuous, progressive, planned program of project authorization;

(c) Urge and actively support adequate appropriations for investigating and planning water-use projects;

(d) Support legislation requiring compliance with and adherence to State water laws by Federal agencies.

SUMMARY

In summary, the purposes of the committee on irrigation and reclamation of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress shall be to promote the development, control, conservation and utilization of the Nation's water resources, to work for the continuation of the services and the coordination of activities of Federal agencies dealing with water resources, to cooperate with and assist in securing authorization and construction of Federal water-use projects which meet with the approval of States and local agencies, to assist water users of the Nation in the economic development of river basins, to preserve the rights and interests of the States in their water resources, to promote the enactment of legislation favorable to these principles, and to oppose legislation detrimental to the orderly and progressive development of the river basins of the United States of America.

The committee on irrigation and reclamation unanimously approved the foregoing statement and recommends that it be adopted by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

IVAL V. GOSLIN,
Secretary.

Citizens Foreign Aid Committee Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, while the House has passed the foreign aid authorizing legislation, it will be considering the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1960 within the next few weeks.

Dr. Melchior Palyi, of Chicago, an eminent economist of sound competence, as a representative of the Citizens Foreign

Aid Committee, testified before the House Appropriations Committee recently. Dr. Palyi's reasoning and conclusions are of such significance that I feel all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should have the benefit of his analysis of our foreign-aid program. There follows an excerpt from his testimony:

Our global boondoggling systematically and relentlessly erodes our currency.

In the 8 years to the end of 1958 our accounts with the outside world showed a cash deficit aggregating $13 billion. Accordingly, a $4.8 billion decrease of our gold reserve and a $9.2 billion increase in our short-term debt to foreign countries occurred, this despite the fact that our international trade balance produces every year a huge active surplus. But foreign aid and the lending activities of the Bretton Woods institutions, the Export-Import Bank, and so forth, totaling $5 billion or so annually—plus the $3 billion to $4 billion (net) spending of our troops abroad—permitted our trading partners to cover their balance of payments' deficits (caused by their self-made inflations). They also provided them, Western Europe in particular, with the means to draw gold from, and to accumulate dollar reserves in, this country, on top of lending money to other countries in huge volumes. Last year Britain's net capital exports amounted to $700 million; those of Germany to over $1 billion.

Nor is that the end of the story. The gold supply of the Western World is rising at the annual rate of nearly $1.3 billion; we receive not a "yellow cent" of the new gold. Again Europe's central banks and private hoards are the chief beneficiaries. As to private hoards, two examples may serve as illustrations. The official French stabilization committee estimated last November, that the French public's hidden holdings of gold, dollars, and other foreign values amounted to $10 billion—pretty close to the $11 billion post-World War II donations and "loans" France received. Or take India. Her balance of trade shows an $800 million deficit, and her official monetary reserves are declining; but privately, she has imported an estimated $400 million of gold.

Yet, Europe still receives aid from us, if mainly the military variety—about $1 billion worth in each, 1957 and 1958—which is just as dollar-earning, or dollar-saving, as is the so-called economic aid.

Briefly, we are left with a gold reserve of $20 billion and a short-term debt to foreigners amounting to—$20 billion, including an estimated $3 billion in dollar notes held abroad. But undermining the dollar's health and stability is only one of the effects of foreign aid. It was a prime force in promoting inflation in Europe, as it is now, and even more so, in the underdeveloped areas. Everywhere, it is a prime method to establish, and to solidify collectivist practices, pulling the rug from under the free enterprise system.

The erosion of the U.S. dollar proceeds unabated through several channels. We have donated, lent and spent money, and keep so doing, to 70 countries. Virtually every single one of them still maintains discriminatory import restrictions against our exports, notwithstanding the tremendous postwar increase of our commodity imports, our rapidly growing tourist expenditures, and private capital investments abroad. Foreign aid carries no small share of responsibility for the accelerating rise of our imports and the decline of our exports. Foreign aid was instrumental in equipping the low-wage foreign competitors to the detriment of our own businesses—providing them with a very strong, new argument in favor of higher American tariffs.

Western Water Projects Aid Entire Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the national dividends which accrue from western reclamation are, sooner or later, understood and apreciated by every national administration of whatever political party—even the present administration. Commissioner Floyd Dominy of the Bureau of Reclamation stated the case admirably in his testimony on the public works appropriations bill that was passed by the Senate last week. The Sacramento Bee commented on this in a significant editorial in its issue of June 30. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sacramento Bee, June 30, 1959]
WESTERN WATER PROJECTS AID THE ENTIRE NATION

Western reclamation projects, far from being the drain upon the taxpayers in other States they are claimed to be by critics of the program, are returning huge sums of money to the Federal Treasury.

This long has been recognized by westerners. But confirmation coming from the Federal commission of reclamation in an administration which has paid much homage to the eastern concept should be effective in stilling this unwarranted criticism.

Testifying before a Senate appropriations subcommittee, Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy said the returns to the Federal Treasury from these projects far exceed the outlay of Federal funds.

Dominy stated benefits from the projects since 1940 have exceeded $3,500 million Federal income taxes from projects areas, because of the higher earnings of the inhabitants, have increased by $340 million.

By transforming deserts into productive lands, the tax base is broadened enormously so that governments from the Federal level down to the school districts profit in huge measure from the projects.

Dominy pointed to the fantastic growth around Phoenix, Ariz., and the fact that taxes in the area of the Colorado Big Thompson project increased fourteen fold as proof of his statements.

Dominy was speaking of the benefits from irrigation and avoided mention of public power which is an integral part of almost all of the reclamation projects.

Were Dominy to apply the same yardstick to the benefits from public power developments the results would be even more striking. For while Federal funds advanced for irrigation are noninterest bearing, the power funds are repaid with interest and in addition provide large subsidies for water.

In areas supplied by water, the introduction of low cost public power has been a tremendous factor in attracting business, shoring up the economy and providing a better way of life for the people. Without the project "breadwinner" of electricity, many of the water projects would be of dubious feasibility.

To say the western reclamation program is costing taxpayers in other States is so much hogwash. As a matter of fact, unlike most governmental operations which represent only outgo, the reclamation projects are a sound business proposition, and even the critics must know it.

Communist Gains in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is all too often a demonstration of human frailty that when the alarm sounds, we are disturbed by it briefly and then switch it off to return to our repose. Unfortunately, this morning behavoir pattern has extended to our posture with regard to Latin American relations. Recent events in Guatemala, the Caribbean, Bolivia, and elsewhere have monetarily shocked us into lively interest in Latin American problems but too often as a people we have slipped back into a role of complacency, content with speeches about hemisphere solidarity, while the Communists are busy at burrowing and building. There appeared in the July 10 New York Post a thought-provoking editorial by Arnold Beichman on Communist infiltration south of the border which should interest every Member. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH OF THE BORDER
(By Arnold Beichman)

BRUSSELS.—It is one of the more sobering facts of American life that Latin America, even for those who consider themselves informed, comes under the heading of "dutiful" interest. Dramatic events spark a momentary flareup of curiosity—Bastista's overthrow, NIXON'S ill-fated tour, the Bolivia business—and a self-flagellating resolve by Americans that from now on they must really get acquainted with what's going on down below.

So for a few issues of Time or Newsweek, they stop skipping the Latin American sections and read the news stories datelined Bogota or Buenos Aires. But then the resolve evaporates.

This block about Latin America is particularly marked in those circles where the internationally minded intelligentsia roam. And it is no mark of lamentable ignorance for a careful newspaper reader, who can tell you at a shot where the Dalai Lama is living or discuss the latest unpleasantness in Iraq, to look blank when you ask him about a fellow in Brazil named Jango Goulart.

This passivity could be the subject of another essay. But all this is by way of preface to a report on the astounding increase in Communist influence throughout Latin America. The report, issued by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, whose world headquarters are located here, makes it quite clear that never before has

the danger of communism been so great in South America and never before have trade unions in South America been so Communist-infiltrated.

Country by country, the ICFTU cites the current record:

Argentina: The Socialist Party is divided into two factions. Although there is no formal agreement with the Communists, in practice the labor and political leaders of one of the factions support Communist maneuvers and fight those democratic labor unions which opposed "united fronts."

Brazil: The local newspapers have reported the signing of a pact with the Communist Party by the Vice President of Brazil—that's Jango Goulart, ranking leader of the Brazilian Labor Party. The Brazilian Communist Party, says the ICFTU, has infiltrated the army, the teaching profession, unions, political parties, and the Ministry of Labor.

Chile: Socialists and other political groups have joined the Communists in a united front called "FRAP," of which the Chilean labor movement is a major supporter.

Ecuador: The Communist Party dominates the trade union movement through the Ecuador Confederation of Labor, whose leaders for the most part are Socialists.

Uruguay: The Socialist Party is backing a Communist drive for a united labor organization. Leaders of the Confederacion Sindical del Uruguay who oppose this united front program are being or have already been expelled from the Socialist Party.

Venezuela: Communists have never been more active in trade union affairs. Next November, an organizing convention will be held to establish a national confederation of labor and avowed Communists will be given participation.

The ICFTU analysis points out that Latin American people "tend to expect immediate solutions to all their political and economic problems when they pass from dictatorship to democratically elected governments." Since South America is suffering from all the problems brought about by insufficient foreign capital investment and instability of markets for the primary commodities they must export to live, it is a made-to-order situation for the Communists.

"If the incipient democracies of Latin America," says the ICFTU report, "cannot solve their present economic crisis, they will inevitably be swept by another wave of dictatorships."

And they won't all be military rightist juntas. Remember Guatemala.

The National System of Interstate and Defense Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include House Resolution 143, of the 71st General Assembly, House of Representatives, State of Illinois:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 143

Whereas it was declared by the Congress in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, to be essential in the national interest to provide for the early completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, to meet the needs of local and interstate commerce, the national and the civil defense; and

Whereas the Congress has committed the Federal Government to the program of completing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways by setting forth the authorizations for appropriations for a 13-year period in the 1956 act and making subsequent appropriations therefor; and

Whereas the State of Illinois, along with the components of the highway construction industry, consisting of labor, contractors, material producers, and equipment manufacturers, have at great expense enlarged their facilities to accomplish the task within the time limit set by Congress; and

Whereas after 3 years of intense effort the State and the many components of the highway construction industry have reached a point where the program is being executed expeditiously and economically; and

Whereas it has come to the attention of the House of Representatives of the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois that no provision has been enacted by Congress for financing the apportionment of Federal interstate funds authorized for fiscal year 1961; and

Whereas if no apportionment of Federal interstate funds for the fiscal year 1961 is made within the next 2 months the award of contracts for interstate construction in Illinois will be suspended after September 14, 1959; and

Whereas the economic impact of the suspension of contract awards will be disastrous to the components of the highway construction industry consisting of labor, contractors, material producers, and equipment manufacturers, who have enlarged their facilities to accomplish the program; and

Whereas the interruption of the program will result in delaying the completion of this vitally necessary System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and will also result in widespread unemployment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That the 86th Congress of the United States be respectfully requested and urged to take the steps necessary to insure the continuation of the program for constructing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways without interruption and without stretchout; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is directed to send a copy of this preamble and resolution to each of the Members from Illinois in the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the house, June 24, 1959.

PAUL POWELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
CLARENCE BOYLE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Reverie in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reverie in Washington," published in the Washington Evening Star of July 10, 1959. The editorial contains excellent advice for the executive branch of the Government.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVERIE IN WASHINGTON

The Greeks used to consult oracles. Our traveling politicians consult Khrushchev. But the practice is becoming a sort of one-way street. Senator FULBRIGHT might be persuaded to set up a new exchange system, under which every interview between Mr. Khrushchev and a roving American politician would be balanced by an interview between some traveling Russian and Mr. Eisenhower. One benefit would be that instead of merely confusing American citizens, the Russian citizens would also be confused, and we could thus do away with unilateral confusion in favor of bilateral confusion.

At any rate, our thoughts along such lines took form in fantasy, and an imaginary article that Ojezn, the great Moscow magazine, recently printed about the exciting report of V. Averfrol Harrimanshikov on his conversation with President Eisenhower. Mr. Harrimanshikov once served as Russian Ambassador to the United States. Later he was Commissar of the Province of Omsk-Tomsk, and hoped to become Russian Premier. But he was thrown out by Nelsiviski Rockefellotoff, who also has his eye on being Premier. Traveling in the United States, Mr. Harrimanshikov had two long talks in early June with Mr. Eisenhower—one at the White House and the other at the President's retreat in Gettysburg. Well, Mr. Harrimanshikov now has written a long article about these talks for the Moscow magazine, and here are some of the things he says:

"The President proved to be a genial host, affable and friendly. He was gracious enough to talk with me for 3½ hours at the White House and for 4½ hours at his dacha—a total of 8 hours, which is quite a lot of time. * * * He served good Scotch in moderation and fine food in abundance. He seemed to be full of vim and vigor, though he was slightly cocky, I thought * * *. He expressed boundless admiration for the people of our country, and he repeatedly spoke of his burning desire for peace in the world, provided, of course, that we help him shape the sort of world he wanted, and for a cordial, warm, completely trustworthy, yet one-sided, spirit of togetherness in American-Soviet relations * * *. Nevertheless—and this startled and even alarmed me—there were moments when his ruddy, pleasant face would darken and he would use harsh and almost savage language.

"The President at one point (this was at his handsome dacha, which he modestly calls a farmhouse) banged the table with his fist, shook his finger at me, roared like a lion, and declared as follows, in what struck me, frighteningly, as a sinister tone: 'Your Nikita Khrushchev and your other bigwigs talk menacingly about places like Berlin and Formosa. Well, let me tell you something: That's no way to ease tension or promote peace, and if you start a war, you can be sure that we'll fight back. We'll fight back, and we'll finish it, with everything we've got, if necessary—everything, including our rockets, our Polaris submarines, our Strategic Air Force and all our other instruments of massive retaliation. Make no mistake about it, my friend. We can lick you with our hands tied behind our backs. If we don't wipe you off the earth with our missiles (with wild monkeys in them) we'll crush you by the superior strength of our economic development.'"

But then, according to the Harrimanshikov account, "Mr. Eisenhower relaxed, smiled, told several good American jokes, and insisted, with what seemed to be genuine fervor, that there was no reason why our two great countries could not become the dearest friends in the world." As for the "harsh and almost savage" language, Mr. Harrimanshikov warns the Russian people in his magazine article that it should not be shrugged off as mere bluff, and he urges Premier Khrushchev to do everything

possible to cultivate friendly relations with the President—or else.

What we find interesting in our dream about Mr. Harrimanshikov is the idea of the press of the U.S.S.R. opening up its pages to hot-off-the-griddle memoirs by Soviet dignitaries returning from chats at the White House. American readers are accustomed to this sort of thing, the other way around. Why not let the Russians in on it? The cause of peace would be served.

Maybe, just maybe. Nearly anything seems possible in a reverie.

Fiftieth Anniversary of NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, at its convention this week in New York City, is marking the 50th anniversary of its founding. The goal of the NAACP for the past half century has been the attainment of the full enjoyment of the personal liberty and individual rights and freedom of American citizens for that approximately one-tenth of our fellow citizens who are Negroes. In this effort, the NAACP has rendered a high order of further service and sees within the predictable future still greater gains for equal opportunity. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times of July 13, noting the 50th anniversary mark of NAACP progress in behalf of our Negro fellow citizens and in behalf of the Nation, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NAACP AT 50

The convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, meeting this week at the Coliseum, celebrates two important events: The organization's 50th anniversary and what it describes as "the beginning of the end" of massive resistance to desegregation in the South. Both its achievements and its goals for the future were scheduled to be reviewed during the 7 days of convention sessions in a program brightened by many stars—including Governor Rockefeller and Senators HUMPHREY and SCOTT—and ending with a huge rally at the Polo Grounds on Sunday afternoon.

The NAACP can be proud of its accomplishments and the Negroes of this country deeply thankful for its existence. So can Americans of every color and race who know—even though they may not openly admit the full implications of their knowledge—that "all men are created equal" and have equal rights to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." During the 50 years of its career the NAACP has built up an extraordinarily effective task force in the struggle for what it believes to be the Negro's rightful aspirations, "working always within the framework of the American constitutional system," through support of legislation, court actions, and public education.

The 1958 report, presented to the convention, maintains that the advocates of segregation lost ground on every front last year. It cites particularly the Supreme Court decision of September in the Little Rock case, which amplified and clarified the historic ruling of 1954 barring segregation in public education, the election to Congress of liberals of both parties who favor the strengthening of civil rights legislation, the alienation of public support for segregation which followed the closing of the schools in Little Rock and Virginia, and the revulsion of feeling aroused by the bombings of schools and churches. The target for the future is "the complete elimination of all vestiges of second-class citizenship under which Negro Americans still suffer"—in employment, housing, registration and voting, education, transportation, and public accommodations.

We congratulate the NAACP for its outstanding accomplishments under the distinguished leadership of its chairman, Channing H. Tobias, and its president, Arthur B. Springarn, and if its able and tireless executive secretary, Roy Wilkins. And we applaud their ambitions for the future. May they be amply fulfilled.

Strauss Footnote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Evening Star of June 25, 1959, entitled "Strauss Footnote."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 25, 1959]

STRAUSS FOOTNOTE

One of the Democrats who voted for confirmation of Lewis Strauss as Secretary of Commerce was Senator GORE, of Tennessee. And one of his reasons, he said, was that he feared rejection of the nomination would be damaging to the prestige of the President in a time of international crisis.

This week the Tennessee Senator inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following Associated Press dispatch from Vienna, Austria:

"The Senate's refusal to confirm Lewis Strauss as Secretary of Commerce was reported by Communist bloc broadcasters in Austria today as follows: 'This was a blow at Eisenhower's prestige, the like of which no President had suffered in three decades. But then Strauss was a big banker who got his admiral's rank for producing atom bombs, and he was also noted for advocating the most reactionary views in domestic and foreign policies of the United States.'"

Any resemblance between this Communist interpretation and some of the more extreme accusations lodged against Admiral Strauss in this country is, we assume, purely coincidental. Nor are we arguing that a Senator's vote in a matter of this kind should be dictated by Communist reaction. A Senator's vote, after all considerations have been weighed, should be a matter between the Senator and his conscience.

Certainly, however, the effect of an adverse vote on the President's prestige is one relevant consideration. We think that Senator GORE's point was well taken.

Implementation of World Refugee Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in the Washington Post and Times Herald for July 11, there appeared an editorial concerning the need for legislation to implement World Refugee Year. It calls attention to the obvious need for this legislation, pointing out that World Refugee Year was sponsored by the United States, but we have yet to demonstrate our support in some tangible way.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and a letter which appeared on the same page of the Washington Post and Times Herald, written by Hyman H. Bookbinder, legislative representative of the AFL–CIO, be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFUGEES IN LIMBO

Not so long ago, this country went to the United Nations and helped rouse the support of 52 nations for proclaiming July 1 the beginning of World Refugee Year. Well, the year has started now, but sad to report, the country which sponsored this humane project is lagging badly in doing its part. It would be a lamentable commentary if Congress does not soon take some action on the modest measures now seemingly lost in the legislative mill. The reproach from Hyman Bookbinder, published elsewhere on this page, could not be more to the point—indeed, it speaks especially well for labor that a representative of the AFL–CIO should appeal to Congress to open the door just a little.

Senator KENNEDY and Representative FRANCIS WALTER have introduced similar resolutions which would authorize the admission of more refugees on a parole basis. These proposals—which fall far short of a needed overhaul of the restrictive McCarran-Walter Immigration Act—seem an absolute minimum if any help is to be given to the displaced persons now languishing in Europe and North Africa. Additionally, Senator HUMPHREY has succeeded in tacking on a $10 million appropriation to the Senate version of the mutual security bill in order to help finance resettlement. The House-passed version contains no such provision, and hence it will be up to the Senate conferees to press for the addition of the badly needed funds. Surely it would be shameful if the United States should fail to honor the pledge implicit in its sponsorship of World Refugee Year.

A HAVEN FOR THE HOMELESS

July 1 marked the beginning of World Refugee Year. Fifty-two nations have already announced participation in this im-

portant United Nations project. President Eisenhower has called upon all Americans to join in efforts to find solutions for the tragic plight of millions of refugees.

The writer had the privilege recently of participating in the White House Conference on Refugees. The deep concern which Americans feel for the plight of refugees all over the world was reflected in a resolution adopted by the 200 delegates who represented a crosssection of America. That resolution called upon the administration and the Congress to "raise their program objectives both with regard to Federal appropriations and immigration to the United States in order to further the aims of World Refugee Year."

Unfortunately, the year has already begun and there has been no action by the Congress to implement our participation in it. The voluntary agencies, both religious and nonsectarian, who have over the years done so much good work on behalf of refugees have made plans for special activities during the year, but meaningful official action should be approved by the Congress as quickly as possible.

The U.S. Committee for Refugees, a committee of citizens representing every segment of American life, has proposed a modest program of $10 million in additional funds and 20,000 visas for refugees over and above regular quotas.

The AFL–CIO, in testimony presented to the Senate Judiciary Committee, has stated that, in addition to approving a special refugee program, the most appropriate thing the Congress could do during World Refugee Year is to liberalize and humanize our basic immigration policies. It was recommended that our national quota be increased from 155,000 to 250,000, and that the national origins quota system be abolished.

These basic immigration policies, contained in the Walter-McCarran Act, reflect neither the humanitarian, compassionate, democratic convictions of most of America nor the actual immigration practices of the United States in the years since the act was passed. As a consequence, it has been necessary to pass special legislation on numerous occasions.

There has been perhaps too much heat, and not enough light, in the public debate over the Walter-McCarran Act. If it is true that the act reflects discrited notions of racial superiority, as I believe it does, it does not follow that its authors or its supporters are "bigots" or "racists." And, on the other hand, if it is true that the act's critics desire to change the law in order to allow more people, with less difficulty, to get to the United States, as I do desire, it is not true that we advocate unlimited numbers of immigrants or that we don't care whether subversives or criminal elements come in.

In advocating a more liberal immigration policy, organized labor is fully conscious of its responsibility to its members. An immigrant might every now and then actually deprive an American of a job. But it must not be forgotten that many jobs are created by the influx of immigrants. Many immigrants have proved to be creative, imaginative industrialists who have built great businesses. Every immigrant, moreover, is a customer for the goods and services which all Americans produce. Our history shows that the great waves of immigration to this country were followed by great gains in our national prosperity.

It is to be hoped that before World Refugee Year ends, our statute books will contain a basic immigration law that will truly reflect the humanitarianism and liberalism of the American tradition.

HYMAN H. BOOKBINDER,
Legislative Representative, AFL–CIO.

University of Santa Clara Honors James K. Carr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I wish that my associates and others may have the opportunity to read a recent editorial by Paul Bodenhammer, editor of the Redding Searchlight in Redding, Calif.

Mr. Bodenhammer has singled out James K. Carr for noteworthy commendations on the memorable occasion of Mr. Carr being appointed to the board of regents, Santa Clara University. The thoughtful and worthy remarks reflect the esteem in which Jim, as he is fondly known, is held by everyone with whom he is acquainted. Many of our associates in the Congress of the United States came to know Jim when he served as consultant to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. From this worthy period in his career, his imagination, initiative, and judgment have been and will continue to be sought more and more in water and conservation policy matters throughout the great State of California.

Mr. President, I wish that my colleagues in the Congress of the United States may share with me a refreshing and comfortable feeling for a dynamic personality on the California scene. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Redding Searchlight, June 18, 1959]

UNIVERSITY HONORS BUSY JIM CARR

A local boy who keeps making good in the big city is James K. Carr, a Redding native now living in Sacramento.

Santa Clara University, his alma mater, has just made him a member of its board of regents, and he is helping develop the plans and financing for a $2 million engineering center on the campus.

Earlier this year he was appointed to the State water board, succeeding Clair A. Hill, of Redding. Carr's father, the late Francis Carr, was a member of the State's first water board and was one of the leaders in the movement to create the Central Valley project.

Jim Carr, too, has been deeply involved in the Central Valley project. As a young engineer just out of Santa Clara, he went to work on Shasta Dam during its construction phases. He later became assistant regional director and district manager of the Bureau of Reclamation. It was on his initiative that the Bureau built the road which gives a scenic approach to Shasta Dam. He was responsible, too, for planting 2 million young pine trees on the bare hillsides near Shasta Dam, where copper smelter fumes in mining days had killed off the vegetation.

Carr then went to Washington, D.C., to serve as consultant to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which deals with reclamation matters.

He is now assistant general manager of the Sacramento municipal utility district. Since he knows both politics and engineering, he frequently represents the district in its dealings with the State and National Governments.

He has a sense of humor and a great capacity for making friends. He also has phenomenal energy which allows him to do three jobs at once while cheerfully planning several others.

Is Dependable Service a Thing of the Past?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, a few days ago I received from Mack & Co. a letter written by Harry J. Mack, one of the partners of the company, addressed to clients and friends, entitled "Is Dependable Service a Thing of the Past?"

Mr. President, I think Mr. Mack emphasizes in the letter some of the qualities which are necessary for a young businessman to meet success in life. I am sure it will be of interest to all Members of the Senate. Perhaps it may find interest among many other people, so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS DEPENDABLE SERVICE A THING OF THE PAST?

MACK & CO.
Wilmington, Del.

To Our Clients and Friends:

Amidst the breakdown and flaunting of laws and the flagrant disregard for the rights of others, we also have another form of breakdown and defection, one that relates to promises of performance associated with the rendering of services of various sorts. In other words, the failure to keep one's word or promise for gain or profit as opposed to the nonperformance and breakdown of purely social obligations.

Who, at one time or another, has not been the victim of poor, or, perhaps, a failed service? A time honored business expression of a bygone generation was "his word is his bond" is, unfortunately, no more and is just a memory out of the past. It is the exception in today's world of business and professional organizations to find responsible services. Promises by the plumber, the contractor, the electrician, the carpenter, the roofer, the store clerk, the deliveryman, the tailor, the automobile mechanic, the handyman, the maid or cleaning woman, the prospective employee and many others, all give their solemn word that they can be depended upon to do as promised, or that a specific condition will be met. In many instances these promises are merely idle statements, implying at best a "maybe" or "perhaps", which fails to materialize as promised. All of which fits into a common pattern, the economic cost of which, in all probability, would make a sizable dent in the national debt, to say nothing of the

cost in frayed nerves, loss of tempers and even the loss of friendships.

The principles of doing business should not rest upon hyprocrisy or deception. On the contrary, such promises should be inviolate, a man's word should be his bond. This is especially true if the businessman hopes to grow and develop on the basis of reputable service and customer goodwill. Poor standards of service should not be rewarded, but should be encouraged to do better. The failure to keep promises is a major defect that permeates an entire organization and evinces itself in other respects, such as shoddy workmanship, poor quality of materials, dragging delays and similar uneconomic behaviorisms.

It is bad enough when one defaults in a social obligation, but when the defection of broken pledges becomes commonplace in the affairs of business, it is high time to pause, reflect and change for the better. Quality, truth and integrity should be the cornerstones of business dealings. Promises and commitments should not be given lightly, but thoughtfully and meaningfully. The businessman, whether he be tycoon, self-employed mechanic or a hopeful aspirant to professional or business status, should realize that in the long run he will be the principal loser if his word does not become his bond. Chicanery is the tool of the counterfeit.

Business establishments, whose functions necessitate services incidental to the transaction of business, would do well to investigate and assess such values in terms of sales, profit, customer goodwill, and the general benefits flowing out of these departments and functions. The complaint department, if one exists, tells only part of the story. What the businessman really should know is too often not told or revealed to him; these things he finds out the hard way, after the impact on his business finances and reputation. It would be most unusual if the employee squealed on himself or his pal regarding harmful acts or bad practices. It is not only what is apparent and in sight that should be of concern, but the enigma of it all concerns the unseen and the unknown. When a danger is known, protection can be timely given, but when the danger is hidden and not known, punishing damages in the form of loss of trade or business can result.

What can be said apropos the defections in the services of the general run of business establishments is doubly so as regards the purely service-type enterprises. Repair type services, in particular, appear to be in the forefront of all other service indictments. Contracting organizations also come in for heavy criticisms for making date-line promises never kept. The rising tide of criticisms having to do with faithless promises apparently are not restricted in scope to functional services as delivery, shop, contractual, but appears to be extending and reaching into all fields and touches upon every aspect of human need. There is no substitute for honesty, truthfulness and integrity of service, big or little, other than the putting of these self-same attributes into practice.

HARRY J. MACK.

Foreign Aid Wreckage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Foreign Aid Wreckage," published in the Washington Evening Star of July 11, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID WRECKAGE

President Eisenhower cannot escape some of the blame for the Senate's deep cuts in military assistance to our allies. Had he stuck by his original dedication to long-term economic aid, favored by the State Department, he would have enjoyed substantially greater Senate support for the military funds. As it was, the coalition of Republicans and conservative Democrats which the Treasury and the Budget Bureau rallied for the successful assault on economic aid ended up steam-rollering almost the entire mutual security program before disheartened supporters of the bill were able to stop them.

In the circumstances, the President's last-minute threat to call a special session on military aid was quite futile. He now has no effective means of dealing with the forces of reaction and despair which he helped to stir up and which combined to defeat him. The hopes of only a few weeks ago that a truly imaginative and bold new approach to foreign aid, embodying a sustained economic effort in the underdeveloped countries and a thoughtful reappraisal of military assistance burdens, have gone a-glimmering. By the time the Appropriations Committees finish the job, it is likely that the severest damage will have been done, and supplemental appropriations, if not a special session, almost surely will be required early next year.

While the Treasury and the Budget Bureau are busy congratulating themselves on having "saved" a few dollars, we hope the President will reflect on what he has lost. In our judgment he has been misled into sacrificing his last chance to launch the vigorous program of economic assistance which his own advisers in the State Department have so urgently pleaded for, and in the process has helped to bring about the weakening of our military position as well.

Significance of Imports in Rye

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement to the U.S. Tariff Commission, Monday, July 13, 1959:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN ODIN LANGEN, MINNESOTA'S NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, TO THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION; MONDAY, JULY 13, 1959

First, may I express my gratitude to the Commission for having taken the necessary steps to instigate a public hearing regarding a matter of real importance to the producers of rye throughout our Nation. I should, as well, express my gratitude to the Commission for having provided me with the opportunity of presenting this brief statement in this manner.

While rye is not one of the major farm commodities in my district, it is a commodity that does play a substantial part in the farm economy throughout my district and the State of Minnesota, because it is a crop that can be quite generally raised throughout the district and particularly in the marginal farming area. It is a crop which carries a great deal of significance to a number of our farm people. In my district it has a further significance, for it is one of the few winter crops that can be raised in this area. Being a very hardy crop, it has the ability to withstand the winters in northern Minnesota, making it valuable from the standpoint of weed control as well as its potential of increased farm income. Because of these facts, the investigation that is before the Commission this morning is of prime importance throughout my district and the State of Minnesota.

It is my understanding that the investigation has been instituted to determine whether rye might be imported in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, the price support program for rye presently carried out by the U.S. Department of Agriculture pursuant to section 301 and 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. In direct response to that question, in my humble opinion, importing of rye is surely very materially interfering with the price support program. Figures taken from statistical reports prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture indicate that we have about 12 million bushels of surplus rye on hand today. They further indicate that during the last ten years, from 1948 through 1958, our surpluses of rye have grown by something over 4¼ million bushels. This growth is not particularly alarming or cause for too great concern until we recognize that during that same ten year period, the total production of rye within the United States has not during a single year equaled our total disappearance of domestic use and exports.

During this ten year period from 1948 to 1958, we have produced a total of 46.5 million bushels less than our total disappearance, while during this period of time, we have imported 52.7 million bushels. This surely indicates substantially that our producers of rye have not by their doing created the present surplus, when we again note that during this period our surplus increased by only 4.5 million bushels.

The real significance of this to the producer of rye is that since 1950 the price support for rye has been reduced from $1.28 a bushel on the national average to 90 cents a bushel for 1959, a drop of 30 percent during a period when not a single bushel of surplus was produced. A further result has been the large investments by the Commodity Credit Corporation in the surplus bushels on hand plus large payments of storage each year, running well over a million dollars a year.

Surely these facts indicate very clearly that imports of rye do materially interfere with the price support program for rye presently undertaken by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in that first, they have substantially increased the amount of dollars invested by the Commodity Credit Corporation in the surplus bushels on hand; secondly, they have increased the cost of storage for these same surplus bushels over the years; and finally, they have substantially reduced the income to the producer of rye throughout our Nation. These facts alone should be sufficient evidence and reason for reducing the import quotas on rye. However, the effects are even farther reaching in that they also play a part in the overall agricultural surplus problem. Some additional acres might have been devoted to the production of rye, of which we have shown so clearly that the farmers have produced no overproduction. These acres would have been taken out of the production of other crops such as oats, barley, flax and others, of which we also have surplus stocks today which are costing the Commodity Credit Corpora-

tion large amounts of money in storage costs.

At this point, I should as well point out that the very same conditions exist as far as oats and barley are concerned. In fact, in both of these crops, the producers of oats and barley have not raised as much oats or barley during this same 10-year period as our domestic use and export program have consumed.

To substantiate the points that I have just made, I am submitting, together with this report, statistical data which will show the total production as well as total disappearance through domestic use and exports, the history of the surplus on hand, and the prices received by the producers of rye during the past 10 years. These facts surely indicate beyond any doubt that the import program has cost the American taxpayer substantial amounts of money. It doesn't seem fair or just to me that our farm program should be charged with this expense, inasmuch as the producer of rye has not during the last years produced a single bushel of surplus rye. Nor does it seem fair that the American producer of rye should have been caused to suffer the 30 percent loss in income.

As we look to the future and ponder a possible solution to the very difficult agricultural problem, it would surely seem that here is one instance in which action might be taken that would substantially alleviate the agricultural problem, and at the same time provide the real oportunity to increase the income to at least a segment of agriculture. Further consideration might be given to the imports of other crops which are causing the same kind of difficulties and the same kind of experience, both in cost to Government and reduced price to producers.

With these facts in mind, it is my hope that the Commission in its deliberations, and its wisdom, will give adequate concern to the significance of imports in rye to the point of where we can look forward to the elimination of these surpluses that have been created by imports. This will result in a reduction in the cost of our agricultural program and an increase in income to the producer. Such action, in my opinion, would be of significance and benefit, not only to agriculture, but to the taxpayer and the consumer as well.

I thank the Commission again for the opportunity of presenting these observations.

Resolution Adopted at Democratic Party Relations Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, this past weekend—the 1959 Democratic Party Relations Conference meeting in Washington—adopted a resolution calling on Congress to implement the Democratic Party platform and pledges.

Delegates to the conference endorsed Democratic National Committee Chairman Paul Butler—and said that a Democratic victory in 1960 requires action in Congress now.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY DELEGATES TO DEMOCRATIC PARTY RELATIONS CONFERENCE—JULY 11, 1959, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The 1959 Democratic Party Relations Conference, attended by representatives of 24 States, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia, hereby resolves:

1. The platform of the Democratic Party represents the great liberal policies and programs to which our party has historically been dedicated and upon which our Party won its overwhelming victory in 1958.

2. We call upon the Democratic leadership in Congress to bring about the enactment of legislation implementing the policies and programs of our party platform and the pledges made by the Democratic candidates during the successful 1958 campaigns.

3. In the field of civil rights, we call upon Congress to enact the Douglas-Celler bill which has been endorsed by all major civil rights groups in America. This bill provides an orderly procedure for the desegregation of our public schools and our public facilities and includes part III authorizing the Attorney General to bring suits to protect constitutional rights under the 14th amendment. Neither the bills proposed by the Republican administration nor those relying upon conciliation is remotely adequate to insure compliance with the Supreme Court's historic desegregation decisions. We call for the defeat of all legislation aimed directly or indirectly at weakening the Supreme Court or threatening its independence.

4. Looking to the 1960 Democratic Convention, we call for a vigorous and forthright civil rights plank in the party platform which will make crystal clear the determination of our party to eradicate every vestige of second class citizenship in America. Adequate and meaningful protection of the right to vote and prevention of all forms of segregation and discrimination must be included in that plank.

5. We wholeheartedly endorse and commend the action of Chairman Paul Butler in calling upon the Democratic leadership in Congress to support the policies and programs of our party platform and to use their positions to enact the liberal legislation promised by Democratic candidates during the 1958 election. A Democratic victory in 1960 requires action in Congress now. Chairman Butler has sounded the call to colors for that victory. We urge all our fellow Democrats, inside and outside Congress, to respond to that call and to rally behind the chairman's inspiring leadership.

Guilt by Association Is Un-American and Its Practice Should Stop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, daily complaints have been pouring in to the effect that the newspapers, magazine writers, and media of expression are defaming and maligning directly and by innuendo Americans of Italian origin. Some purveyors of news do it under the pretext of news reporting, some for ulterior motives, some for profit, and others for political purposes and advancement. Whatever the motives or reasons might be, the effect is that a group of people, who have contributed much to the American way of life, has been adversely affected in many fields of endeavor. Pride and reputation have been hurt and feelings aroused.

It is high time that the defamation of a proud ethnic group for the sake of profit be discontinued. Let the criminals of every race be prosecuted where evidence warrants prosecution—and no ethnic group has a monopoly of virtue—but let not a race whose blood courses through the stream of American life and whose offspring have shed their blood in defense of these United States be pilloried and condemned by the practice of guilt by association.

An editorial from Il Progresso, one of the great New York newspapers bespeaks the sentiments of Americans of Italian origin, details the growing complaints about unfair publicity, and calls for corrective action. This appeared as an editorial in the issue of Il Progresso on Sunday, July 12, 1959. I submit this editorial for the readers' consideration.

HIGH TIME FOR ACTION

For more than a year and a half there has been an ever increasing torrent of abuse and vilification directed against Americans of Italian origin, who comprise one of the most important segments of American life. A systematic campaign of defamation has been given wide circulation through slanted articles in nationwide newspaper chains and magazines, and books, which become best-sellers through the artful drum beating of modern press-agentry. But the most frequent offenders are television and motion pictures through ganster portrayals on their screens, using Italian names for the evil characters or what are easily recognized as Italian types.

One need only turn his TV dial and lo and behold, there is one of those bloodcurdling sagas in which the unsavory villain is pictured as a hoodlum with Italian features.

Many years ago Il Progresso spearheaded a drive to eliminate the racial identification, in news items and stories, of elements caught in the toils of the law. That campaign was widely commended by public officials, editors, and publishers who agreed that the sins of the few should not be visted on the many; and for years no accused or convicted person was identified, in the public prints, as to race or color.

What has happened to change all this? In November of 1957 a group of Americans of Italian descent met in a small New York State village called Apalachin. Some of them had criminal records. The purpose of their meeting has never been explained. But if they were meeting for some nefarious undertaking, we not only do not condone them, but we denounce them and their ilk, for this tiny group of 60 furnished the pretext for bringing discredit and contempt on more than 12 million loyal, law-abiding, decent Americans of Italian origin who daily make their valuable contribution to the enrichment of our country in every field of human endeavor.

Since that day, sensation-seeking organs spawned the specter of a sinister international organization of criminals, presumably composed exclusively of men of Italian or Sicilian extraction, which they call the maffia. And they have been making a roman holiday of the terroristic activities of these men

and their henchmen, attributing to them infiltration into and control of many legitimate businesses and undertakings, including labor unions. And in passing they mention Italian products and Italian communities which defer to the maffia.

If this crime syndicate exists in fact, the conclusion is inescapable that all law-enforcement authorities, city, State, and Federal, have broken down. We cannot conceive of the distintegration of the FBI, the Treasury and Immigration Departments, and we resent this inference, as much as we deplore the insinuations against our people.

Like ourselves, many social, civic, and fraternal organizations, as well as many individuals prominent in industry, in commerce, in civil service, and in the judiciary, have openly decried the patently unjust association of all Americans of Italian heritage with the criminal acts of the few.

In this connection we are happy to note that two U.S. Senators, HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, and KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, have taken up the cudgels against the defamation of our ethnic group and have urged a national investigation. In letters to Attorney General William P. Rogers and Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson, the two Senators ask a full report on the alleged existence of a nationwide organization of criminals; what is being done to eliminate such a conspiracy if it exists; and, if no conspiracy exists, a that two U.S. Senators, HUGH SCOTT, of statement to that effect. They also ask for a statement of policy of both Departments of Government to protect the civil rights of people mistakenly identified with criminal acts, and instruction to Federal agents to beware of defamatory public statements about any minority group.

The letters go even further, when they point out that "the most serious of all have been the statements issued by some law enforcement officers and Senate investigating teams" which tend to associate all Americans of Italian lineage with the unholy delegates of crime and vice. The letters also state: "This is as heartless as it is untrue."

We most heartily endorse the position of Senators SCOTT and KEATING. It is high time for action. We have been patient too long. We are aroused as never before and we want an end to the ill-founded, vague condemnation of a fine, loyal, and industrious people who—since the discovery of America by one of their forbears—have given it their full measure of devotion.

American Red Cross Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, 1959, the first American Red Cross memorial was dedicated in honor and memory of the men and women of the American Red Cross who have given their lives in the service of mankind in peace and in war. This memorial stands in Red Cross Square here in Washington, D.C. The memorial consists of four bronze figures, each about 7 feet tall, on a 5-foot marble base. I had the rare privilege of being present at the dedication of this memorial. It was a touching ceremony, participated in by Red Cross men and women from all over the land.

E. Roland Harriman, chairman of the American National Red Cross, was chairman of the meeting. Dr. Felix deWeldon, the sculptor and builder of the memorial, gave a memorable interpretation of the meaning of the statue. Gen. Mark W. Clark was the principal speaker and had previously headed the National Memorial Committee.

This dedication was on the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Solferino, Italy. The founder of the idea of Red Cross was present at that battle and saw the terrible suffering of those on both sides, which drove him on to take up active part in relieving suffering by those in battle, as well as innocent citizens who took no part.

On the same day that the memorial was dedicated in Washington, another memorial was dedicated in Solferino, Italy. The Italian memorial, made of stones from all the countries having Red Cross societies, marks the spot where, during the Battle of Solferina, the Red Cross idea was born. It bears the inscription, "Tutti Fratelli," meaning, "All are brothers."

I was particularly interested in the dedication of this memorial in Washington because Alf R. Thompson, of Mattoon, Ill., in my congressional district, served as chairman of the American Overseas Association Committee and was general finance chairman of that committee and also of the National Memorial Committee, which were instrumental in the construction and erection of the memorial which is located in the garden of the American Red Cross here in Washington. This memorial was the brainchild of Alf Thompson and he is given the greatest credit for the accomplishment of this worthy project. He was the founder of the American Overseas Association and that association on this occasion presented him with the presidential citation of that organization.

The citation reads:

Alf R. Thompson, founder, president, adviser, and loyal friend to the American Overseas Association, he has lent his strength and stature unstintingly to the accomplishment of its aims. No friend in need has ever found his hand withheld and many have found help without seeking it. For many years he has served the Red Cross as a volunteer. In peacetme he has been a leader in his community, State, and Nation and guided efforts which established the world's first memorial to Red Cross heroic dead. In the First World War, he was an Army officer in Siberia; in the Second World War, he supervised Red Cross services to combat troops in North Africa, Italy, and France.

A man of integrity, he has earned the affection of hosts of friends who see in him the wisdom of the words, "Live truly and thy life shall be a great and noble creed."

It might be said that Alf Thompson has earned his life of dedication to the cause of helping others. In addition to his fine work in Red Cross, he has been a civic leader in Mattoon and the State of Illinois. There has not been an activity in Red Cross in that great State that he has not had his hand in. This is but small recognition of the excellent work which he has done throughout the years. It is wonderful to know that at least he has been recognized for what he really is—a good man who has practiced the rule of doing for others as he would have them do unto him. In the words of St. Matthew, chapter 25, 21st verse: "* * * thou has been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Xavier University Fills Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, recently Xavier University marked a significant milestone when it graduated its first class composed of career Federal administrators from a course in business management. Those of us here on Capitol Hill who are daily wrestling with problems which are becoming increasingly difficult and complex can more than appreciate the value of such a course to the Government. Xavier University is to be congratulated on its farsightedness.

Mr. Albert W. Highsmith, one of the fine executives of General Electric was the speaker at the graduating exercises. His remarks are highly significant, and I know will be of great interest to all of us in Government:

I certainly appreciate this opportunity of being with you tonight and having a part in this event marking a most desirable step forward for self-government.

I must confess, however, that after I had accepted Mr. Martin's invitation to meet with you, I had certain very pronounced misgivings. Most of the speaking that I have been doing of late has emphasized the need for my audience to take an active interest in the affairs of government. This hardly seems a necessary topic for discussion with a group of men who have already accepted this need and are devoting their lives to serving their country through careers in Government.

In fact, as I usually develop the matter, I point out to my audience that those of them who cannot serve in Government can still have a voice in Government by taking an active part in politics. This, I fear, is an even more inappropriate subject for a group covered by the Hatch Act.

So, after much tossing and turning at night and the gnawing away of several hangnails, I decided it would be appropriate to discuss some of the history and principles of business management with this group of Government officials who have been studying the matter.

At this point, however, let me say that I hope the fact that my message is directed primarily to those graduating from this course will not be interpreted by the others present as license to sleep through the remainder of the meeting. Some of you may have a disturbing tendency to snore. This might be distracting for any who are not asleep. I assure you it would be most disconcerting to the speaker.

It is also possible that since it is your Government, too, and since the basic principles of business management can be applied to any organization, there may be something of interest in my remarks for all of you. At any rate, I request that you not sleep and I beg that you not snore.

I bring you my remarks from the viewpoint of an outsider looking in as far as

Government is concerned. (And, this circumstance, I have found, leaves a speaker a great deal of freedom of expression that is not possible when he must practice as well as preach.) However, I have not always been an outsider in the matter of Government.

For 2 exciting years I had the privilege of serving in the ranks of Government as a member of the staff of the Postmaster General. And, for an equal time, I had the magnificent experience of standing in the shadow of the mightiest oak of American statesmanship, Herbert Hoover, helping in some small way as he painted a detailed picture of Government for the people of our Nation.

Too, I share something in common with members of your families. My own revered father has served with pride and dedication in the ranks of the Federal Government for almost four decades.

So, you see, I am not an outsider after all, but one of you by legacy and previous condition of servitude.

You have just completed a course designed to help you more efficiently manage those operations of the Federal Government with which you are charged. This is a most encouraging and seriously needed step. I congratulate Xavier University for offering the course and I commend each of you for giving your time and energy beyond the call of duty to take advantage of it. I hope that many others will emulate your examples.

It is interesting to note that the very first instance recorded of man's efforts to apply principles of business organization to his activity was directed toward Government.

If we turn the pages of history back some 3,300 years, we find recorded in the Book of Exodus a moving account of the efforts of Moses to lead the Israelites out of the wilderness. In the 18th chapter of this ancient record, we find Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, pointing out to Moses that he shouldn't try to carry all the burden of government himself but should share the job of management.

Thus Jethro emerged more than 3,000 years ago as the first management consultant in recorded history. He brought to Moses sound business advice that is being advanced today as modern scientific management and is still applicable to business and government.

First and foremost, Jethro called on Moses to stop and look at his problems from a long-range point of view and stop trying to meet each problem as it arose—stop letting the morning mail determine the day's work—but rather to plan and organize for the long pull.

Now, Moses was no slouch as a manager. He was one of the most magnificently equipped men in all history by training and wisdom and he worked hard and with significant success. But he had the same blind spot that many managers have even today: he tried to carry the whole load by himself. Jethro pointed out that this was not only hard on Moses, the manager, but that it made the people soft and did not offer any opportunity for them to develop so competent successors would be ready to take over when Moses was no longer there to guide them.

After he had identified the problem, Jethro, the consultant, submitted a plan to meet it.

He recommended that the people be taught the laws and ordinances that were to govern them. These were to be Moses' policy statements and operating instructions designed to help people act on their own initiative on most matters without having to go to higher levels for decisions. Such policy statements and operating instructions are the basis of operation in modern business today, and, if my memory serves me, I believe that there are a few written rules and regulations for similar purposes in government.

Then Jethro submitted the idea of a position guide or job description to further guide the people in their individual responsibilities—as he said "in the work they must do." This is certainly still a sound principle of management used in both business and government management.

And, finally, Jethro recommended that Moses delegate authority to line management by appointing men to manage thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens. He even gave Moses criteria for selecting managers when he said that they should be "able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness." These are still valid specifications for good managers.

In the 33 centuries since Jethro advised Moses, there has been some expansion of his basic theories of business management. General Electric's professional business management course, which is offered to members of our management, breaks down the work of a manager into four basic elements: planning, organizing, integrating, and measuring. The only one of these that Jethro did not spell out was measuring and that was certainly implied.

Perhaps we would do well at this point to quickly review these four elements of management and to note how they apply to management in government equally as well as in business.

The first step in planning is to determine the objectives of the manager and his group. This necessitates a look at both the past and the present to determine trends that may affect the future. And, incidentally, here is one of the basic differences between management where one is dealing with people and, say, engineering where one deals with things. Before an engineer starts to construct a bridge, he draws a blueprint and follows it closely at every step. A manager, on the other hand, must stop and examine the impact of each step in his program on the shifting foundation of human reactions and compensate for any changes that result. His plans must remain flexible if he is to attain his objective and planning must be a never-ending process closely tied to measured results.

Incidentally, let me emphasize that a good manager must never be afraid to admit that he has made an error. If he is to earn the respect and support of his people necessary to success, it is much more important to convince them that he is honest than that he is infallible. They will never believe he is infallible anyway. This applies to the business of government as well as to management.

In determining objectives as part of his work in planning, a good manager must anticipate future situations and be bold and forthright in choosing the best from the many alternatives that inevitably present themselves in any given situation involving people.

A second step in planning is the establishment of policies. These policies will serve as his long-range guidelines. In formulating them, the manager must reflect a broad understanding of human values and keep a realistic balance between the requirements of the moment and long-range objectives. And, then like Moses, he must communicate these policies so they can serve to guide all in the organization.

The third step in planning is that of actually formulating specific plans and schedules and spelling out realistic standards of performance to be used in implementing those plans. He must consider manpower—both managerial and otherwise; facilities and equipment; and financing—among others.

He is then ready for the manager's next big job—organizing. This was Jethro's long suit.

The first step in organizing is to determine and classify required work into manageable components and jobs. Then he must segregrate that work into an orderly structure, grouping like work together into organizational components and individual jobs. He must clearly define the responsibility of each individual and unit and to whom each is accountable for performance. Then, of course, the manager faces the job of designating specific individuals to fill stated positions, making sure that he has the best man for each job.

The manager must also spell out the methods and procedures to be followed in performing the work. Of course, I do not mean that you as a manager must spell out in detail every operation for each level of your organization. Rather you must give broad direction and let the lower level managers expand upon that direction and apply it to their specific tasks.

The next major element of management is that of integrating the various components of the organization. It is in this area that communication plays its most important role. Integrating is simply having the right hand and left hand know what the other is doing and why, so that their combined efforts will have maximum combined impact. This requires two-way communication. It is at least as important to listen as it is to talk. We must never assume that we already know how people feel or are reacting.

It is in integration that some of our most serious management failures are found. It is not unusual to find a man who is an excellent manager when it comes to planning and organizing but when it comes to integrating and building a work climate in which people accept their assignments voluntarily and perform them in a friendly, cooperative, dynamic, and productive manner, he fails because he does not understand people. I think that the basic and most necessary ingredient of a good manager is the ability to understand and appreciate what makes people tick.

The fourth element of business management is that of measuring results. A carpenter does not measure a board only to see how long it is but rather to see what adjustments will have to be made if it is to perform the job he has designated for it. Similarly, a manager never measures results just for his information. His objective in measuring is to get direction for making improvements in the overall mechanism and make it ever more effective.

We in business have a basic measure that is not so readily applicable in government and that is the measure of profit. If we do not make a profit, we have failed. You do not have so clear cut—or final—a measure of your result. This, perhaps underlines the need for constant review of organization in government.

Jethro's consideration of the management of Moses' government of the Israelites was not the only look that has been taken at management in government. They have been many and most have found similar problems. A more recent study, and one of which I have a bit more intimate knowledge, was made by the Hoover Commission.

Its report on personnel and civil service is probably of great interest to you. Submitted to Congress in February 1955, in this report the Commission said: "Our task force has found, and we agree, that the Government's personnel on the whole is competent, faithful, and in numerous specialties, distinguished. The greatest weaknesses is in expert managerial direction. Management needs to be improved at all levels, from the noncareer political appointees and the career administrators, down to the firstline supervisors."

The Commission submitted 19 recommendations for action to meet this need.

It found that a severe contribution to the problem resulted from the failure to clearly delineate between the proper roles in government of career and noncareer officials.

The Commissioners felt that the establishment of broad policy and political defense of that policy, when defense is necessary, is a proper function of noncareer elected and appointed officials. After all, the people delegate to the party in power the duty to establish policies and programs and they hold that party accountable at the polls for action in these regards.

At the same time the Commissioners recognized the indisputable need for competent, nonpolitical administrators or managers to give stability and continuity to government in the implementation of the policies and programs of the Government.

The problem arose from the fact that too often noncareer appointees were, out of necessity of the workload, handing over parts of their responsibility for setting and defending policy to career employees. The Commission recognized that it could seriously impair the usefulness of a career employee to a future administration if he had been placed in the position of defending contrary policies of another administration.

They recommended, therefore, that there be a clear delineation of the proper role of both career and noncareer government officials to eliminate undesirable overlap.

The Commission also recognized a need to introduce a higher degree of professionalism into government management—a problem revealed regularly since the days of Moses and Jethro.

In the instance of career employees, it recommended creation of a senior civil service, composed of a few thousand politically neutral persons of proven competence and ability in their fields given sufficient incentive in pay and status to attract and keep men and women of the highest caliber in management position in government.

This was but one step.

I believe that courses like the one in which you have been engaged can contribute a great deal toward this same end—professionalism in government management. They can provide government managers like you with the know-how to give their service the highest tone of professionalism in their dealings both with the people within their jurisdiction in government and in dealing with the public at large as government. Many of the principles are the same.

The unfortunate fact is, however, that very few managers in our government have had the opportunity that you have to participate in a course like this. This fact underlines for you one of the most important responsibilities of a professional manager: that of helping his associates develop their full capacity. I urge you to ever be attentive to opportunity to impart to your associates the knowledge that you have gained here at Xavier during this course. In that way you can multiply your contribution to bringing professionalism and maximum efficiency into the management of our Federal Government.

Today the vast majority of Americans would immediately identify international communism as the greatest threat to our American way of life. The brief parting of the Iron Curtain 2 years ago revealing in all its horror the blood bath of Hungary, the more recent heartless crushing of the independence and religious fervor of Tibet, the whole host of promises solemnly made by the Kremlin and ground under heel when they no longer served its purpose, the seething cancer of the Berlin situation—all of these and others have served to dramatize the threat of godless communism.

But history has shown us that the most obvious threat is not always the most dangerous. Sometimes the very lack of drama of a threat compounds its danger because it does not shock citizens into alertness and action.

Arnold Toynbee, the eminent historian, has reported that of the 21 great civilizations of world history, 19 have fallen, not at the hand of maurauding invaders, but rather from internal collapse.

In our own instance, such collapse could come from a government that destroys the ambition of men by trying to be all things to all men, a government that drains away the vitality of the nation in excessive taxes and feds the devouring monster of inflation, a government grown so large and cumbersome that it becomes unmanageable and topples of its own weight.

As professional administrators in government, it is not your role to determine the policies of government. Yet at the same time you can, through effective administration, contribute to keeping our Government sound by holding the costs of operation down and keeping it well organized and well managed. This is your challenge, and it is a challenge that is more overwhelming than any that ever faced management in business. Every American—indeed, every man, woman, and child, present and future, in the free world and even those behind the pall of communism who would dare to dream of being free—has a stake in your success. Your tool is good management.

With that tool it is you who is truly the first line of defense for our way of life.

Indianapolis Star Continues Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, in the next few weeks the House will vote on the foreign-aid appropriation bill. I am sure that not only those of us who oppose this program but also everyone else will want to scan each of the items more carefully than ever before. Two excellent editorials by Jameson G. Campaigne, editor, which appeared in the Indianapolis Star on June 7 and 17, indicate why we must do so:

WHY HELP COMMUNISTS?

Last December the Star had an editorial titled, "Foreign Aid for Communists," pointing out that since 1946 millions of dollars of U.S. aid has been sent to Communist countries. We also noted that as late as 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958, U.S. tax money was still going to some Communist countries.

Recently the International Cooperation Administration privately circulated in Congress a 9-page memorandum refuting our editorial which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The burden of this refutation is that most of the money sent to captive countries was sent before they had Communist governments. It says, "98 percent of the grant aid to Czechoslovakia was supplied before the Communist coup d'etat in 1948." This is, of course, true. But what is ignored is this important fact: Czechoslovakia was occupied by Soviet troops, as was Poland, and American aid was distributed only by sufferance and often by order of Communist Russian officials. Many of the UNRRA funds supplied by the U.S. taxpayer were actually used, particularly in Poland, to advance the cause of communism and to hide from the people the fact that it came from the United States.

Whether Czechoslovakia, Albania, or Poland had Communist governments when they received U.S. aid is not the point. They were Communist controlled because Red troops were controlling them. Witness the fact that Czechoslovakia wanted to accept Marshall plan aid in 1948 and the Soviet Union said no, so the Czechs obeyed.

The ICA does not dispute the fact that American aid has been going to Communist countries in more recent years. They say, howveer, that it was given to the people and not to the government, except in the case of Communist Yugoslavia. What difference does that make? Money we supply for relief of people in Communist states is money the Soviet Government does not have to supply. By that much U.S. tax money strengthens each Soviet regime.

It is our contention that any sort of taxpayers' aid to any country controlled by the Soviet Union, directly or indirectly, helps the Soviet Union. Back in 1946, 1947, and 1948 we opposed sending American aid to countries controlled by Communists. We opposed the sending of around $500 million to the Soviet Union right after the war. We knew, which too many in our State Department apparently did not, that it is the Communists' intention to bury us and to seize control of as much of Europe as it could. Whatever aid we gave them helped them in this aim.

It is the contention of our foreign aid enthusiasts that foreign aid helps keep other nations independent of communism. Well, we gave foreign aid to Albania before it became Communist. Did our aid prevent the Communists from taking over there or in the Balkans or in Poland and Czechoslovakia? It helped the Soviets take over.

We are giving money to Communist Poland. What for? Have we helped the Polish people throw off the chains of communism by doing so No, we have helped Communist boss Gomulka solve some of his economic problems and he now has tighter control of Poland than ever—with our help.

The same is true of Tito in Yugoslavia. No doubt Tito would have been thrown out on his ear by the Yugoslavs if we had not supported him with money and goods.

We believe all U.S. aid of any kind to Communist nations merely helps them stay strong and prepare for their eventual attack upon us. Our cultural exchange programs, disaster relief, food shipments, and trade with the Soviet bloc do not help us at all. They help only the Communist dictators.

The ICA memorandum also refutes the Star editorial which claimed that neither the press nor the Congress knows how foreign aid money is spent. They reply that Congressmen can see how much military aid goes to each country—but that the press and the people cannot be told. They say that all other aid is a matter of open record.

Why, then, did the General Accounting Office, an arm of Congress, last March accuse the ICA of refusing to let them see the evaluation reports on aid to China, Laos, Pakistan, India, Bolivia, Brazil, and Guatemala? Why was it necessary for the Comptroller General's office to send auditors to Pakistan to discover that 271 American officials needed 229 cars, 529 refrigerators, 650 stoves, and 666 air conditioners, all paid for by U.S. taxpayers? Why didn't ICA inform Congress that 15 percent of the rice sent to Pakistani flood victims was sold to them on the black market?

The ICA has recently investigated itself to prove that the book, "The Ugly American," is a distortion based on untruth. Not surprisingly ICA thinks ICA is doing very well and

errors are minor and few. But after they investigated, did they report to Congress that ICA helped build a big citrus packing plant in Lebanon which has never been used? Did they let Congress know that U.S. taxpayers' money was spent to help build a $20 million housing project in Lebanon that nobody has ever lived in?

No. These facts about foreign aid are not open to Congress or the public—unless the press or some other governmental body finds them out.

THE UGLY AMERICAN

The International Cooperation Administration just investigated itself as a result of charges against American foreign aid and foreign policy operations in southeast Asia in the novel "The Ugly American." ICA says "The Ugly American" was grossly exaggerated.

Yesterday we received the House Committee on Government Operations report, "U.S. Aid Operations in Laos." This report is truth, not fiction. But a careful reading of it makes it clear that "The Ugly American" didn't exaggerate half enough to catch up with the truth. Listen to this:

U.S. dollars were given to the Laos Government which deposited a like amount in a special account. The Lao Government borrowed local currency from the National Bank of Laos for its projects. Dollars thus served as currency backing until converted into Laos currency by sale to importers. "It was apparently the intention," says the report, "to limit inflation. So unsuccessful has this system been that the cost of living in Laos has doubled between 1953 and 1958." Strike one for "The Ugly American."

Because U.S. officials imposed an unrealistic official rate of exchange and poured more money into Laos than the economy could absorb, "Excessive use of cash grants and relaxed laxity in import controls have, in effect, led to the financing of capital flight by the U.S. aid program, in a country where one of the primary needs is for local investment." Strike two for "The Ugly American."

"The technical cooperation program has been quite small. * * * Aid activities having a direct impact on the rural villagers have been slight. * * * Benefits from commodity imports * * * were limited to relatively few Laotians." But in 1958 special elections were held in Laos. Ambassador J. Graham Parsons decided to combat possible Communist gains by Operation Booster Shot, a program of more than 90 work projects including well digging, irrigation and flood control, repair of schools and temples, roads, airfields and construction of hospitals was begun. This village aid program produced the following results in the elections: "The election was a Communist victory * * * of 21 contested seats the Communists won 9 and their sympathizers 4." Strike three for "The Ugly American."

A contract was let for roadbuilding. "The total amount of this contract was 37,400,000 kip (Lao currency) or, at the free market rate of 100 to 1, $374,000. * * * However, 10 days after the contract was signed, the contract was amended to provide for the conversion of the 'contractor's earnings' into U.S. dollars at the official rate of 35 to 1. This increased the value of the contract from $374,000 to $854,000, increasing the cost of our aid program by $500,000." Strike four for "The Ugly American."

"Edward T. McNamara was public works and industry officer for the USOM/Laos. * * * He was in a position of initiating and supervising numerous USOM construction contracts (and to) exercise, and did exercise, considerable influence upon both USOM and the Laos Government to secure award of contracts to Universal (construction company).

"In return for these favors, he received from Universal money, stocks, and airline tickets totaling at least $13,000. This he admitted under oath." McNamara then left ICA, apparently scot free. He then turned up as vice president of Transportation Consultants, Inc., which was under an engineering contract with USOM/Laos. Strike five for "The Ugly American."

"Haynes Miller was an ICA end-use auditor assigned to Laos. * * * Miller's compiled material and leads he provided could have led ICA to uncover such matters as McNamara's corruption, and to remedy deficiencies in the contracts and performance of the Universal Construction Co."

But as soon as Miller made his reports available to ICA officials and the Ambassador, he was removed from the Laos mission charged with being unable to adjust, of having obvious signs of nervous disorder, and associating with low French, some of whom were opium addicts and scorned by other French.

According to the committee, "Miller was one of the few qualified French linguists in the mission, probably the most linguistically competent of the American employees." He was also the one most sought out on a social basis, in a real wish to adjust Laos and French nationals.

The Ambassador's charge of nervous disorders against Miller was rendered without benefit of medical advice. This is contrary to State Department regulations. Yet after Miller informed Parsons of the messy situation in Laos he was removed on Parsons' recommendation and Parsons informed Washington that in Laos our credit is high. Strike six.

A Robert Manley disapproved a housing project for ICA personnel to build 25 houses. He estimated that contractors would get a windfall of $50,000 in exchange profits. The project was started, but never finished. USOM Director Carter dePaul tried to persuade his successor, Carl B. Robbins, to sign a contract for repair and construction of the houses. Robbins refused, for he hadn't seen the project. When he did see it, he "found them in very bad condition. To complete them would have been an economic nightmare."

"Another group of 12 houses occupied by mission personnel was located in a saucerlike area without any natural drainage. * * * In the wet season * * * accumulation of water was so serious that the residents were reduced to wearing boots and using boats. * * * Each house had been costing the Government over $300 a month for maintenance alone. These houses had originally cost the Government $30,000 each." Strike 7.

That same Carter dePaul sold his 10-year-old Cadillac and a record player to Universal Construction Co. for local currency which "our Embassy in Laos converted * * * into $3,038, representing payment to dePaul of about three times the amount he could obtain on the open market." Strike 8.

The committee report sums up. The decision to support a 25,000-man army "to promote stability" has had effects which "detract from that stability."

Too much U.S. cash put into Laos resulted in "speculation in commodities and foreign exchange, inflation * * * corruption, and destruction of any stability, political or economic."

"The aid program has not prevented the spread of communism in Laos. In fact, the Communist victory in last year's election, based on slogans of 'Government corruption' and "Government indifference' might lead one to conclude that the U.S. aid program has contributed to an atmosphere in which the ordinary people of Laos question the value of the friendship of the United States."

Here we see truth is indeed stranger than fiction. Sometimes, however, truth and fiction coincide. Is it a coincidence that "U.S. Aid Operations in Laos" and "The Ugly American" tell the same story?

Should Colleges Make "Loyalty" Dirty Word?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that some persons have lost sight of the real purpose of the National Defense Education Act, which is to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States.

Under the circumstances, it is difficult for me to understand the logic of persons who contend that the act's loyalty oath requirement is an invasion of academic freedom. While I question the necessity of a special oath, I do believe that loan recipients under the act should be required to take an oath of allegience to the Constitution of the United States.

In my opinion, the stand taken by the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier on this issue is sound, and as part of my remarks I desire to include the following editorial which appeared in the Courier's June 24 edition:

The Grinnell College Board of Trustees has voted to decline participation in the Federal student loan program until the so-called loyalty oath requirement is repealed.

This, we believe, shows emotional thinking by people who should, above others, be able to think clearly. To prevent its students from obtaining Federal student loans for a trivial reason such as this represents an obsession with a doctrinaire fear that academic freedom will be invaded.

The purpose of the so-called loyalty oath is to prevent Communists or others who advocate the use of force in settling political issues from receiving Federal aid in obtaining an education. Does the Grinnell College Board of Trustees believe that Federal student loans should go to such students? The question ought to be answered; and it ought to be answered by a simple "Yes" or "No."

We would be inclined to agree that the loyalty oath is a nuisance and probably ineffective. Indoctrinated Communists will take a perjured oath and their number is so small that an attempt to prevent them from participating in the loan program may be more effort than it is worth. And it may reasonably be argued that a negative, I-don't-believe, type of oath is a poor way to teach loyalty. As Representative H. R. Gross suggests, perhaps an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States would be a better way to promote affirmative loyalty.

Everyone agrees, of course, that a college has a right to refuse participation in the Federal program. And we do not believe that the people on one side of the loyalty oath controversy are any less patriotic—in the broadest sense—than those on the other side.

But the Grinnell action seems to say: We don't believe a government has a right to distribute governmental aid only to those who are loyal to it. Yet there is an absolute contradiction between democracy and those systems which advocate the use of force to settle political issues; and both concepts cannot for long survive side by side in the same society. Just as the right of free speech is limited by penalties for slander, so academic freedom is limited by the necessity of keeping society on a path in which reason

replaces hate and majority rule replaces killing of the opposition.

We believe academic circles need to do some rethinking of the loyalty issue. The McCarthy era conditioned many people, like an old prizefighter, to come out punching at the sound of a bell. Do these people really believe that the welfare of America is served by teaching that "loyalty" is a dirty word?

Operation Bootstrap, Reservation Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have again asked permission to make comment regarding the Indian industrial self-help bill, patterned after the Operation Bootstrap program of Puerto Rico.

In the past few days I have received letters from three reservation superintendents, men who live with this Indian problem, men who work with this Indian problem and men who have dedicated their lives to the task of helping to provide opportunity to the Indian people.

Through the years I have not only worked with these men but have the greatest respect for their efforts and their ability. The first letter under date of June 29 reads in part as follows:

I was very pleased to receive your Operation Bootstrap for the Indian people. I think it has a great deal of possibilities and I assure you that I will do all I can to help develop thinking concerning the contents of the material you sent me.

I wholeheartedly agree that what our people need is opportunities on the reservation as well as opportunities off the reservation.

The next letter under date of July 1 reads in part as follows:

I have read with interest the comments under "Operation Bootstrap For the Indian People" and the other material in connection with this subject. We have also discussed this matter with our joint advisory committee which is composed of our top department heads and tribal administrators and representatives of the tribal council.

It is the opinion of our advisory committee that your idea has considerable merit and that it would receive the support of people at the reservation level. As you probably know, the tribal council at this jurisdiction has gone on record supporting industrial development and has indicated that they would give serious consideration to providing financial assistance if a workable plan is developed. With the completion of the Oahe Dam and its related benefits, we can visualize conditions favorable to industrial development in central South Dakota. We have made preliminary inquiries and studies in this field and feel that there is a good potential for interesting industry in locating in this area.

As you have pointed out, natural resources of the reservation cannot possibly support the resident population in a satisfactory manner and if some other source of income can be developed, our people would be able to raise their standard of living.

The third letter was received this morning and is dated July 10. It reads in part as follows:

Receipt is acknowledged of your letter and a copy of your proposed bill for the industrial development of Indian reservations. We, of course, feel that this is a step in the right direction and is the only way that economic security can be established in this area.

Obviously, agriculture is not the only answer and until something to bring jobs to the Indian country is established, the low economic standards of this area will continue.

We have tried, unsuccessfully, to bring industry here, working with the tribal council. * * * While there may be differences of opinion on the exact provisions to be placed in such a bill, we feel sure that no one will take exception to the general idea.

We do not have any particular comment concerning any of the provisions of the bill and although, as we say, there may be individuals objecting to one or more of the various provisions, we feel that the bill generally is good and we do not at this time recommend any change.

Mr. Speaker, action on an industrial program is long past due. The Indian people are entitled to greater opportunity. They are entitled to a program that will provide opportunity and economic security, both on and off their reservation areas. Operation Bootstrap, reservation style, is tailored to do that job.

No Fairy Tale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has, in a very unusual and intriguing manner, stated a fact of life.

This was in connection with a conference that he held at the White House with Mrs. David G. Fernald of Upper Montclair, N.J., a valued constituent of mine, who was recently elected cochairman and Ned Cushing of Downs, Kans., who is the new chairman of the Young Republican National Federation.

This editorial appeared in the Newark (N.J.) News on July 13, 1959, and makes good reading:

NO FAIRY TALE

President Eisenhower thinks we might begin telling our children and grandchildren a new kind of bedtime story. It would explain to them how the future of all American youngsters is mortgaged because of heavy Federal spending and the big national debt. One of these tales of prudence, the President suggested, could start: "I am not supporting you—you are supporting me."

The President passed the idea along to Ned Cushing of Downs, Kans., and Mrs. David G. Fernald of Upper Montclair, the new cochairmen of the Young Republican National Federation. He was discussing with them the need for wisdom and restraint in public spending.

The President has good reason for wanting to get the message across to the young.

For two decades Federal policy was influenced by an economic philosophy which found virtue in debt and deficit spending. Regard for the taxpayer's dollar was identified with reaction.

The effects of this thinking penetrated down to the family level. Many came to assume that debt is a normal condition of domestic finance and installment buying an inevitable method of household procurement.

Now spendthrift economics are under growing attack. Public debt is coming to be recognized for what it is, a liability that must be paid off and that meanwhile imposes heavy interest charges. Fewer now believe that by spending money it doesn't have the Government can create prosperity.

But as we can learn by listening to congressional debates, such truths percolate slowly. President Eisenhower was suggesting, masking his seriousness in a whimsicality, that sound financial ideas must be planted early in young minds, before they can be led astray by easy-money trickery.

How To Solve a Metropolitan Sewage Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the final story on Metropolitan Denver's sewage problems written by Bill Miller for the Rocky Mountain News, and published June 29.

It was my privilege on July 6 to sit with the Joint Sanitation Commission in the Colorado Governor's office to discuss with metropolitan political and sanitation leaders the steps to solution such as here proposed.

Also, I was proud to report to them how the House of Representatives had passed the bill of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], and how H.R. 3610 would encourage municipalities to join in constructing and operating more economical and effective sewage treatment plants.

People will not forever tolerate filthy water for cooking and bathing. Government at all levels may as well take the action necessary and do it with sensible management and less cost. The time is now.

I was pleased to hear Dr. Roy L. Cleere of Colorado's Department of Public Health say he was prepared to enforce Colorado's new law requiring secondary sewage treatment. He will be lenient, he said, only if good intent and prompt, satisfactory progress is made in the next few months.

The Denver metropolitan area will be helped to solve its problem by prompt enactment of H.R. 3610.

The article follows:

NO QUICK SOLUTION TO SEWER PROBLEM

(Last of a series, "Metropolitan Dilemma")

(By Bill Miller)

There is no quick, inexpensive panacea available to cure the sanitation ills of the Denver metropolitan area.

But, unless specific remedies are taken, the sewer problems will increase, as will the cost of solving them.

If there is a long-range solution to the problem—and many believe there is—it can be summed up in two words:

Metropolitan authority.

Such an authority would not necessarily be limited to the one problem of sewage collection and disposal. It would cope with water, health, parks, air pollution, police and fire protection.

STARTING POINT

But sewage disposal and prevention of stream pollution offer a starting point from which metropolitan citizens can try working together for the good of all.

In discussing sewage, two basic facts must be kept in mind. Sewage disposal cannot be separated from water supply and the Platte River drains the entire area.

Here, then, are steps to be taken to alleviate sewage and pollution problems now and eventually solve them.

1. Establish a metropolitan sewage authority.

2. Halt construction of small, inadequate sewage plants.

3. Stop creation of small political sanitation districts.

4. Update available studies and surveys in population, future land use, stream flow, water supply and water rights, and similar data.

5. Using this data, form a long-term plan for the entire area and adhere to it.

6. Adopt State laws, to bring consolidation of overlapping districts.

7. Enforce existing sanitation standards if they are realistic and amend them if they are not.

There are many reasons why a metropolitan sewage authority is recommended as the most feasible solution of sewage problems in the Denver area.

ALL LEAD TO PLATTE

All drainage ditches and creeks eventually lead to the Platte River. An authority with control of all area sewage could build and operate three or four basic, complete plants at strategic points along the Platte.

Then, instead of having 21 haphazardly run plants, the area could have 3 or 4 efficiently operated disposal units that would handle all sewage.

Existing plants would not be abandoned immediately. It would take several years to plan, engineer, and build the bigger plants and connecting lines.

Existing plants, even after construction of new ones, would continue in service until their life span is exhausted. The new plants, however, could immediately pick up and process the overloads. As the other plants wear out, the new ones gradually would pick up the entire load.

Using per capita cost as a basis, it has been proven that a large number of small sewage treatment plants are more costly than a well-designed plant serving the same population.

EFFECTIVENESS

Black & Veatch, Kansas City consulting engineers, say:

"Of the Denver area data, operating costs for the 3 complete treatment plants show per capita operating costs for 1 of them, serving 26,000 people, to be approximately $0.92 per year as compared to $1.68 for 1 of the smaller plants serving 7,000 people. Annual per capita operating costs for Denver, serving 550,000 people with primary treatment, were $0.62 in 1956."

In addition, plants are only as effective as the operation staff. It is virtually impossible, Black & Veatch say, to staff small plants with highly trained, competent personnel.

By concentrating sewage treatment at three or four major plants, more competent personnel, attracted by an adequate wage scale, would be hired.

Black & Veatch maintain that most plants in the Denver area are not satisfactorily operated and produce poor effluents.

"The result has caused nuisances and imposed a public health hazard on municipal water supplies," the firm said. "Consolidation of sewerage facilities will provide important benefits."

Consolidation and creation of major plants are not easy goals.

One of the biggest obstacles is water law and the rights of downstream users.

Take Denver, for instance.

Its main plant processes an average of 54 million gallons of sewage a day. The effluent is dumped into the Platte.

Irrigation users siphon off Platte River water, through the Burlington ditch, directly below the sewage plant, and others.

With a giant consolidated plant below the confluence of the Platte and Clear Creek, Denver could pipe its primary effluent the short distance to the new plant for secondary treatment.

COURT DECISION

Glenn Saunders, Denver Water Board attorney, points to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Pulaski* v. *Trinidad*. The Court held that running sewage water through a plant doesn't change the character of the water.

The user, Denver in this example, must return the flow to the stream for the benefit of downstream diverters. If Denver's 54-million-plus gallons bypassed the Burlington ditch, it could cut streamflow from these users.

The same is true in Clear Creek.

A proposal now under study by the joint sanitation commission calls for a giant pipeline from a point somewhere below Golden to the site of the proposed new plant.

All sewage effluent from all areas along the creek would be dumped into the pipeline. This certainly would prevent pollution of the creek. But if there were no effluent, waterflow in the creek would be reduced and downstream users would have far less water.

When Blue River water, a fresh supply, comes to Denver through the Roberts Tunnel the question of reuse will arise.

Saunders says the Denver Water Department wishes to work with all citizens in the area to make his water available for reuse. He points out that engineers have estimated that 97 percent of all water used for domestic purposes eventually finds its way back to streams, one way or another.

BASIC QUESTION

The reuse question is a basic one. But it can be answered.

The foundation of Colorado water law is found in section 6, article 16 of the consitution. This section protects the right of diverting unappropriated waters of any natural stream for beneficial use and stipulates further:

"When the waters of any natural stream are not sufficient for the service of all those desiring the use of the same, those using the water for domestic purposes shall have the preference over those claiming for any other purpose, and those using the water for agricultural purposes shall have preference over those using the same for manufacturing purposes.

"When a lower referred use such as agriculture has the prior appropriation, its water can be taken for the higher domestic use only by condemnation, that is, payment must be made as for any other property right."

If the area is to build major plants, then construction of additional small ones should be halted immediately.

Colorado's Legislative Council, in a 1955 report on special districts, came to these conclusions:

Financial procedures of many such districts are lax; many do not follow acceptable budgeting or accounting practices; there are conflicts with general property tax laws; there are innumerable laws on the same subject; there is no uniform method of forming special districts.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Among the council's recommendations:

"A more flexible method of consolidating existing districts, coupled with statutory permission for several districts to finance and operate joint facilities would be helpful."

All sanitation districts have elective boards and the power of taxation.

The Colorado Tax Commission report of 1957 shows, for example, that 25 water-sanitation districts in Jefferson County collected almost $500,000 in revenue in a 1-year period.

Abolishing special districts, however, challenges the right of citizens to govern themselves.

However, most people are unaware of the many districts in which their homes are located.

CITIZENS' RIGHTS

For instance, in January of this year the Clear Creek Valley Water and Sanitation District asked voter approval to spend $140,000 for a secondary sewage treatment plant.

The district, which takes in the area between Clear Creek and Arvada, serves approximately 1,000 homes and a population of 4,000.

Only 32 votes were cast. Twenty-five voters gave their approval for the expenditure. Seven voted against it.

Adoption of the State laws forcing consolidation of districts would not take away the rights of citizens to govern themselves.

Under such consolidation provisions could be made for voters on a metropolitan basis to accept or reject the idea of a metropolitan sewerage authority.

But the State health department or some State agency should have the power to protect the health and welfare of the general population.

The State already has the right, under the Dr. Wells bill passed by the last legislature, to tell districts what standards have to be met. It also has the duty to approve or reject any sewage plant any district plans to build.

The Federal Government helps bear sewage plant costs. It pays up to 30 percent but not more than $250,000 for a plant.

Under Public Law 660, Colorado was allotted a total of $635,700 for such projects in 1959. The money has been allocated and additional Federal aid will not be available until 1960.

Several amendments to this law are being considered by the present Congress. One would raise the per project maximum to $500,000. Another would permit each district in a consolidation program to obtain a full grant, rather than, as now, only one grant for the entire consolidation project.

No. 5 is another basic recommendation.

LONG-TERM PLAN

A long-term plan must be formulated and carried out.

Otherwise, small districts will continue to form; small plants will continue to be built to take care of pressing needs; sewage treatment needs will never catch up with the population; streams will continue to be contaminated.

We have taken the step in highway building. Communities recognize that master

highways, crisscrossing political boundaries, have to be planned years in advance. The same must be done in treating metropolitan sewage.

The joint sanitation commission has taken the first step.

Composed of representatives of most districts and towns along Clear Creek as well as Denver, the commission has agreed to study building a major plant near the confluence of the Platte and Clear Creek. It would provide complete treatment from Golden to the Platte as well as taking care of Denver's secondary treatment needs.

The commission hopes to finance the study (cost $10,000 to $15,000) through voluntary contributions of existing districts. The study would update Black & Veatch and other reports and the commission also plans to:

Outline adequacy of treatment of each plant in the basin; study effects of effluent on irrigation and domestic water intakes, approximate costs of developing the treatment plant and lines; estimate time of construction and suggest formulas for sharing costs.

FOR THE FUTURE

The Black & Veatch basic plan calls for eventual metropolitan plants at Englewood, by enlarging the existing plant; continued use and expansion of Denver's northside plant; expansion of the North Washington plant at the confluence of the Platte and Clear Creek; and a South Adams County plant, also on the Platte, north of Thornton.

Estimated cost of such facilities, in 1957, was $23.5 million.

That's a lot of money. But it will cost even more for individual districts and towns to solve the problem independently. And the problem will have to be solved.

Why Send Our Money Elsewhere?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Titusville (Pa.) Herald of July 11, 1959:

WHY SEND OUR MONEY ELSEWHERE?

The National Education Association last week voted overwhelmingly to start a grassroots campaign to flood Congress with telegrams urging support for a massive program of Federal aid to education.

However, one of the very few persons to vote against the resolution at the association's annual convention was a delegate from Virginia who expressed some very sound wisdom. "To me it seems incongrous to send $1 to Washington just to get 60 cents back," he said.

This sentiment applies to many other States, including our own. Pennsylvania is a "have" State. The Federal Government will tax its residents to raise money for any aid to education. After using up some of this tax money in bureaucratic administration in Washington, the aid will be distributed throughout the Nation in the form of outright grants. With Pennsylvania suffering its own financial woes, why should the money of its citizens be given to the "have not" States, the very States which are luring away our industry with ruthless competition?

The responsibility for the financial problems of education rest not with the Federal Government but with the State and local governments, preferably the latter.

Life of Accomplishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article I wrote for a nationally circulated magazine more than 3 years ago on the life of a splendid West Virginian, Mr. Raymond M. Davis of Morgantown, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. Davis, whose forebears were among the pioneers of our native hills, has remained true to the tradition of the hardy folk who settled West Virginia. Although the physical frontier has long since been conquered, men like "R. M." have carried their imagination, their industry, and their capacity for doing good to new frontiers.

Thus, I am reminded of Mr. Davis as an early advocate in the superhighway concept. And, for the past 18 years, he has devoted much of his energies and talent to the cause of world peace. Indeed, Mr. Davis was the original stimulus for the Department of Peace proposal I introduced as a Member of the House of Representatives in 1945, and again befor this body in the present session.

Although Mr. Davis recently retired from the active management of the coal mining operations in which he had substantial interest and ownership, he continues a creative life by contributing to many worthwhile causes and by his constant helpfulness in matters affecting the youth of his community, the State, and the Nation.

I commend this article to my colleagues as an illustration of the strengths and virtues of one of America's earnest exponents of a free economy whose horizons were and remain broad and objective.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

(By Jennings Randolph)

If Raymond M. Davis, of Morgantown, W. Va., had not been born, Horatio Alger would have had to invent him.

For in R. M. Davis, multimillionaire coal magnate, we have a robust symbol of success on Main Street—success achieved in the Alger tradition of "Struggling Upward."

Davis' success has been made possible because early in life he set a goal from which he has never deviated. Like Diogenes and his lamp, R. M.'s goal served to keep him on course when the going was particularly rough. Faith in the worthiness of his goal plus a personal philosophy which allies action to the ideal enabled R. M. Davis to move forward in the face of adversity that would have probably broken a less dedicated man.

Davis was born and grew up on a farm in the hills of West Virginia. Recalling his early days, he says:

"I have worked on a farm, plowed with a root-cutter plow, suffered the hardships and enjoyed the pleasures of hard physical work. On cold mornings, I have driven the cows from their places that I might warm my bare feet where they had lain. My education has been chiefly in the school of hard knocks."

His formal schooling ended at the age of 15 when he went to work in the West Virginia oil fields—turning over all his earnings to his father until the age of 21. He spent his spare time at nights learning telegraphy, hoping that he could use it to build a better future.

In 1905, Davis married Fannie Wilson. He and his young bride followed Greeley's advice and left for Los Angeles on their wedding day. However, the only opportunity—in fact the only job—Davis could find there was as a streetcar conductor. He traveled the trolley route for 2 years before he and his wife returned to West Virginia.

Davis stayed in the transportation field for the next few years—only he switched from trolleys to trains. Starting out as a $30-a-month telegrapher he went from yardmaster to train dispatcher to car distributor on the Morgantown and Kingswood Railroad.

By this time Davis and his wife had two young daughters—Alice and Mary.

The mining and selling of coal is the major industry of the Morgantown area, and around it young Davis set his goal. He believed he could have a wonderful future in the coal business. Each month he and his wife managed to save a little from his $50 dispatcher's salary and in 1915 he quit his railroad job and leased 10 country mines. He hauled coal by horsedrawn wagon to the railroad siding, loading it in cars for shipment to market. The next year he and a friend purchased some acreage along Scott's Run of the Monongahela Railroad, opened a new mine, and launched themselves full scale in the coal industry.

Everything that happened in the next several years seemed to indicate that R. M. Davis did have a wonderful future in the coal business. By 1924 his position of modest yet solid prosperity enabled him to build the home of his dreams.

The depression of the thirties dealt him a blow which didn't cost him everything—only his worldly possessions. As he puts it, "I lost every cent—including our home and furniture."

When the smoke had cleared, Davis discovered that he had only $2.85 left in the bank, with judgment for endorsements on former company notes of approximately $150,000.

His partner immediately went into bankruptcy but Davis refused to follow.

"I believed that I could work my way out of the situation."

And so R. M. Davis tightened his belt, flexed his muscles, both physical and spiritual, and proceeded to turn his adversity into an advantage.

People in Cleveland owned and operated a Morgantown mine—Bunker mine—along with several others throughout the country. Davis knew that they cared little about Bunker even though its potential was tremendous. He decided to lease it.

Only 6 weeks elapsed between the time Davis was out of the coal business and the time he was back in.

"For the next 3 years—grim depression years," Davis says, "I had to forgo the lunch habit, as I didn't have enough money to include that meal in my daily diet." But his shirt was starched, his suit was pressed, and he kept a smile on his face.

Sales were made over the telephone at night—when long-distance rates were cheap-

er—because phone calls cost less than travel fare.

Thus disciplined and guided by a scale of values which refused to temporize with honesty and personal integrity—which would not countenance hurting others in the solution of his own problems—R. M. Davis began to move forward again. His only collateral was his reputation.

Within 7 years, Davis had paid off all his outstanding debts and satisfied his judgment creditors. He bought Bunker Mine in 1935.

Today the mine has no indebtedness. Its daily capacity is 5,000 tons, with reserves estimated at more than 40 million tons. Davis, at 74, is still active in the sale of all of the coal produced there—maintaining 8 to 4:30 office hours 6 days a week as president of the Davis-Wilson Coal Co.

The house which he had built in 1924 and lost in 1930, he purchased and moved into once more in 1944. The homecoming of Davis and his wife was the occasion for thousands of congratulatory expressions from friends and admirers throughout the Nation.

Repossession of his roots and comparative security did not mean that R. M. Davis was going to retire into a life centered only about coal and coupon clipping. His eyes were set unflinchingly on world peace with youth education at the base.

At his request, I had already (in 1942) introduced a measure into the U.S. House of Representatives, recommending that the President invite foreign governments to send representatives to attend an international constitutional convention for the purpose of drafting a constitution in the interest of world peace.

At a hearing, members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee listened with rapt attention as Davis, the star witness in the testimony, read his 16-page statement recommending that the United States should take the lead in spreading the gospel of peace throughout the world. After he had finished the late Representative Charles Eaton, of New Jersey declared:

"Mr. Davis, you may be unschooled, as you tell the committee, but you are certainly not uneducated. That is one of the finest documents I have ever listened to."

This measure was reintroduced in 1943 and twice during 1945. In the latter year the creation of a Department of Peace was urged, with a Secretary of Peace at its head. The argument behind this proposal which I introduced in June 1945, was as reasonable as it was timely. Why spend billions preparing for war, but nothing trying to prevent war? If a Defense Department is needed to keep abreast of the best implements of war, why not a Peace Department to maintain, at all times, the best implements of peace?

Even prior to this, late in 1942, hundreds of copies of Davis' booklet, "Proposed New International Order," were distributed to every Member of Congress and to the leaders of nations all over the world. In January of 1945, he published his "Constitution for a United Nations Government" which received widespread approval at the San Francisco United Nations Conference. Davis was selected by the State Department to act as observer at that Conference and was cited by Dean Acheson for his active part in stimulating interest in the establishment of an international organization for world peace.

As already pointed out, at the base of R. M. Davis' blueprint for peace lies education.

In June of 1945 he wrote President Truman urging the creation of a Department of Peace. He stressed that one of the chief functions of such a department should be to encourage our colleges, universities, high schools, churches, and religious organizations to offer programs designed to develop a better understanding of the fundamental relationships of all peoples of the world.

"Every encouragement should be offered to scholars to study and write in the field of world problems," he declared. Toward this end he published in 1946 another book, "The World Begins To Live."

As usual, Davis not only proposed but acted in terms of his proposal. In 1947, he sponsored an essay contest for high school students throughout West Virginia on the subject, "Creating a Department of Peace Within Our National Government."

Shortly after the essay contest, he established a $5,000 scholarship at the University of West Virginia to encourage study in the field of international relations.

The momentum generated by one educational enterprise led to another. In 1949, Davis and his wife gave $265,000 to the Wesley Methodist Church in Morgantown for constructing and furnishing the Wesley Youth Center. Last April they provided $70,000 for enlarging the present plant. About 100,000 high school and college students and other groups use this youth center annually.

R. M. Davis is alive to the value to our international relationships of a spiritually fit youth population here at home.

While his vision of a Department of Peace has not yet materialized, a most significant step in that direction was taken on March 19 of this year. On that day, President Eisenhower created an unprecedented Cabinet-level post of Special Assistant to the President for Disarmament Problems. The post, popularly referred to as the "Secretary of Peace," was created with a view to easing world tensions in the atomic age and was given to Harold E. Stassen.

There can be no doubt that this development in "facing up" to our current world responsibilities was due in large part to the unflagging efforts of R. M. Davis. And while it does not precisely hit his target, it brings that target into the clearest focus to date.

On December 19, 1954—just about 3 months before our new Peace post was established—Davis wrote a letter to President Eisenhower. He began by referring to recent remarks made by the President.

"It is time for all of us to renew our faith in ourselves and in our fellow man. The whole world has been far too occupied with fears. It is time for people throughout the world to think again of hopes, of the progress that is within reach."

Davis then took up in his own words:

"A Department of Peace, Mr. President, can and should be established within the framework of the Government of the United States to achieve the objective which you seek. We are a creative and peaceful people. This is our opportunity to prove to men and women throughout the world that America means business in building a dynamic approach to the coordinated effort for peace in the positive rather than in the negative."

In the positive rather than in the negative. Probably no words could describe more aptly the way R. M. Davis has seen life—and the way he has lived it.

And the life of R. M. Davis is a testimonial to the fact that it is not as important into what circumstances a man is born as where and how he goes from there.

Born into poverty, Davis became a multimillionaire. Without benefit of extensive formal schooling, he influenced the thinking of eminent statesmen and encouraged education for youth. He did not accomplish this by passively sitting on the sidelines of life.

He was allocated a certain number of years—his lifetime—on the face of the earth just as is every other human being. What he did with that lifetime was up to him—just as it is with every other human being. R. M. Davis chose to cram each one of his days full of constructive action to back up his beliefs. Result—a life of accomplishment.

Senator Johnson of Texas Stands Firm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Monday, July 13, the Washington Evening Star published an article entitled "JOHNSON Hews to Own Line," written by Cecil Holland, a very able staff writer for the Evening Star. In Mr. Holland's article, the philosophy of the majority leader is set forth in great detail. The Senator from Texas explained his position to Mr. Holland understandably and reasonably.

I am in full accord with the views expressed by the majority leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON HEWS TO OWN LINE—SENATOR WON'T LET ATTACKS BUDGE HIM

(By Cecil Holland)

Senator Democratic Leader JOHNSON intends to pursue his own legislative way, unswayed by Republican attacks and criticism from liberals within his own party.

He made this clear in an interview in which he also emphasized that he will not undertake to pass legislation which has little chance of White House approval simply to create party issues for the 1960 Presidential and congressional elections.

The overwhelmingly Democratic Congress, in Senator JOHNSON'S view, can best serve the party by enacting as constructive legislation as possible in the national interest.

Nor does he admit for a minute, as critics within his own party contend, that the 86th Congress has been laggard so far in the 1st session. Despite what National Democratic Chairman Paul M. Butler thinks, Senator JOHNSON believes the Congress already has made a good record and will make a better one before the session ends.

With regard to the complaint of Mr. Butler and other Democratic liberals that the Democratic leadership has adapted itself too much to the administration's thinking on certain legislation, Senator JOHNSON said:

"In this world, none of us ever gets everything that he wants. I think the real test is whether we take what we have and do the best we can with it."

Senator JOHNSON said the Republican attacks on the 86th Congress as a spender was an effort to tear down its record in view of national polls showing it was held in the highest favor of any Congress in its history. The June Gallup poll, the Senator said, showed 61 percent of the people approved the Democratic Congress as compared to 58 percent in the Roosevelt landslide in 1936.

SEES GOP DESPERATION

"The Republicans are desperate because they are continuing to drop in the national polls," the Senator commented. "You can see how desperate they are every Tuesday morning as they leave the White House after meeting with the President.

"No longer is this a meeting where programs for the best interest of the country are worked out. It has turned into a partisan meeting where the White House steps are used to propagandize and smear the Congress.

"They have become so desperate now that their political committees and political man-

agers and their political newspapers are trying to create division in the Democratic Party. The only way they can defeat us is to divide us."

Senator JOHNSON said that a year ago they were "hollering socialism" at Democratic proposals for combating the recession. Their new line, he added was to divide the Democrats.

"Some Democrats are getting sucked in and will continue to contribute to the comfort of the Republicans. But the voters are not going to be misled."

BACK-DOOR "RAIDS" DENIED

Senator JOHNSON said part of the Republican propaganda was the charge that the Democratic Congress has resorted to backdoor raids on the Treasury by authorizing programs that would be financed by Treasury borrowing rather than direct appropriations.

He said administration officials concede that the only socalled backdoor financing to become law was requested by the administration—and represents a total of $4.5 billion for the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

"We won't have any backdoor financing that isn't recommended and approved by the administration," the Senator said.

Junior Legion Baseball Great Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, while the sports world attention is focused on the recent all-star baseball game—one of the great attractions of the year—and the remaining months of the Major League season, throughout the land tomorrow's big league ball players are reaching an important point in their season.

I speak now of the junior baseball program sponsored by the American Legion, and originated in my home State of South Dakota at Milbank. More than 18,000 Junior Legion baseball teams are competing this year in this wonderful sports program sponsored by one of our outstanding veterans organizations.

As the weeks pass, these teams will participate in elimination tournaments, starting with local district tournament contests, leading eventually to the State tournament. The final goal, of course, is to enter the American Legion's national finals—the world series for our youngsters—and become the champions.

However, the importance of the Junior Legion program does not rest in the national finals, but as it is carried out in each community. Legion posts which sponsor a local baseball team are providing the youngsters of their community with an excellent competitive summer activity as well as taking a firm step in combatting juvenile delinquency.

In citing this fine program, Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial which appeared in a recent edition of the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEAMWORK, FAIRPLAY ARE WHAT COUNT

From 29 teams in 1926 to more than 18,000 in 1959 is only a part of the American Legion's record accomplishment in junior baseball. During those years it has graduated more than 15 million boys from its ranks. Of these, more than 2,000 have become major league stars. This in itself is a record not equaled by any other activity.

Of the thousands of games played, teams have won and lost but every boy who has participated has graduated a winner regardless of the outcome of the game. The American Legion believes that a boy on the ball field benefits in many ways. He learns the lessons that aid in the development of a citizen of responsibility. Legionnaires do not suggest that the boy who is concentrating on the next pitch or the double play is aware of the lesson of life he is learning while playing ball.

But in later years he will realize that in learning to work with his teammates, play cleanly and fairly and to accept his responsibility, he was learning to respect the rights and dignity of his fellowman. He was learning how to be a responsible citizen. In addition he was developing his coordination and physical stamina.

When that citizen of tomorrow takes his position in the affairs of our Nation he will have the moral and physical strength needed to meet the challenge America will face. American Legion junior baseball could ask for no finer tribute nor could it serve any greater cause.

Two factors have been instrumental in the building of this fine activity. First, the unselfish devotion of those adults guiding the program and second, the support, interest and encouragement of the many fans. The community would do well to offer more opportunity to our young people through activities of this type, and only through support can we expect to give every boy the chance to be a "winner" through this worthwhile activity.

Charting a New Middle East Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the June-July issue of Land Reborn, written by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. In connection with our thinking to chart a new course toward the Middle East, Senator HUMPHREY presents three sound basic principles of American foreign policy which should serve as a guide to all of us who are concerned about one of the world's most troubled areas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARTING A NEW MIDDLE EAST POLICY
(By HUBERT HUMPHREY)

The topic that I am to speak on should be looked upon as a challenge rather than a promise. As a U.S. Senator, I have attempted to interest myself in the broad areas of the political, economic and social life of our Nation and the world. This by itself limits one's knowledge. But there is an interdependence among major public issues.

You cannot, for example, be a liberal abroad and a reactionary at home. You cannot believe in the dignity of man, his right for equal protection under the law, the fullest participation in all the activities of communal life abroad, and then deny these same rights back in the United States. The trouble is that too frequently our foreign policy objectives are distorted, weakened, limited and, at times, made totally ineffective by the sins of omission and commission in the body politic of the United States of America.

One of the first things we need as we chart a new course, not only toward the Middle East, but anywhere, is to recognize that when we practice racial or religious discrimination we decisively limit the effectiveness of our foreign policy. I would suggest to my Christian and Jewish brethren that we are not a majority in the world. But, fortunately, the principles that inspire our faith, the principles of one God and the brotherhood of mankind, are principles that are rather universally accepted by the great mass of mankind.

Let me put it into current terms. There is no doubt but that the incident at Little Rock has cost this Nation dearly on the international scene. This is not just a domestic tragedy, not merely a challenge to law abiding citizens within the United States. We have to understand that. If we reject people because of their color, their national origin or their station in life, our foreign aid money will be wasted.

FIRST, THE PEOPLE

I happen to believe there are three principles in American foreign policy that ought to guide us at this stage of our history—people, progress, and peace. Every policy ought to be directed toward the well-being of people, identifying everything we do—whether medical care, food, technical assistance, economic loans, educational programs, or whatever may be the case—with people, not just rulers, not just the institution, but people. We understand this in America. We politicians understand this at home, so why can't we understand it abroad? I regret to say that our foreign policy has been derelict in its duty toward people. In the Middle East we have it identified with kings and oil rather than with people and water.

I am not one of those who believe that Middle Eastern oil is unimportant. It is very important. The Soviet Union would like it right now. It is very important to the economies of the Western nations. Our identification, however, has been with powerful forces in the area, forces which support the status quo or seek to direct economic development of these resources primarily for their own selfish purposes. We ought to have more identification with people and water for the obvious reason that the water is needed on the land and it means hope for the people.

Progress is the second principle. We Americans are the apostles of progress. We constantly condemn people in business, in politics, in education, and all other pursuits, if they are dragging their feet, refusing to take advantage of modern technology and other improvements. In America progress has almost become a religion. Progress has been our theme, but we can't get the people of

the world to understand it and I will tell you why. Too often we have people who are in charge of things who are afraid. They are afraid of the people with whom they are working, failing to understand the social and economic forces that are at work in the area. They tend to look upon progress as a kind of revolutionary or radical adventure.

Peace is the third principle. We have allowed ourselves to be pictured in the minds of too many people throughout the world as warmongers, rather than as the children of peace.

The truth is that we are a nation of peace, we are a nation of good Samaritans—a nation of generosity, of compassion. This is our history, this is our tradition. But if you pick up any newspaper, any journal, or you listen to any TV broadcast, any radio broadcast, a high percentage of the news and information will be about war, threats of war, new weapons, or other military matters.

It is mighty hard to get the message of peace across. In the 2 days that I was in the Soviet Union, I heard it dinned into my ears day and night. The propaganda that emanated from the Kremlin occasionally mentioned their great weapons as a reminder to the West. But to the people in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, day after day they beam in with radio propaganda the words—peace, peace, peace. The atheists are taking on the mantle of peacemaker. What a paradox, what irony!

Why do we let them get by with it? If we are going to insist on whispering the message of peace, then I am afraid that we will have trouble getting our message across.

I ask all Americans to get busy on a little evangelism! We must outline a program of works of peace. We must wage peace. We must believe in peace. We dare not forget the terrible cost and catastrophe of war in this age of technology and science.

What do these things mean in terms of the Middle East?

First of all there is no area of the world, I suppose, which has a more constructive basis of history than the Middle East. The Middle East has been the crossroads of the world and of every invasion, every struggle between the different societies, religions, and forces that make up the area. It has been literally fertilized with the blood and bodies of millions of victims of war. Today much of this area suffers from malnutrition, illiteracy, poverty, frustration, disease, and hopelessness. I don't believe you can build any peace in an area until you start feeding the conditions that are conducive to peace.

There are dictators, large ones, and small ones there are demagogs, effective ones, and less effective ones. Both grow out of a particular kind of social, political, and economic climate. Before we are going to get a peace that is worthy of that beautiful name in the Middle East, we are going to have to strike some mighty blows against man's ancient enemies—poverty, disease, and illiteracy.

Much of this will have to be done, not by government, but by voluntary organizations. The truth is that some of our voluntary organizations, sectarian and nonsectarian, can do more good in the Middle East right now than some of our governmental activities, even if these activities were properly directed.

There is a suspicion on the part of the Middle East toward the West. We have inherited, regrettably, many of the liabilities of yesterday. We have inherited the mantle of colonialism even though we are an anticolonial society. But we have great allies, whom we ought to cherish and not scold, but allies who, regrettably, have had a history of colonialism. Happily they are now shedding it.

I don't believe we can construct an effective foreign policy for the 20th century unless we recognize that the same science and technology which offer the hope of progress, offer the threat of utter destruction.

ACCENT ON THE U.N.

I have long advocated that through the United Nations we seek the establishment of a regional economic development agency for the Middle East. The Soviets are engaging in a very unorthodox and unfair economic offensive in the area. We should say to them as the President did say last August, but has not yet implemented, that we are prepared to place into a fund for the economic development of the Middle East a sum of money equal to that required to implement the so-called Eisenhower doctrine and to be administered by the Middle Eastern countries themselves.

How do we know it will work? We don't know, but I know the present policy isn't working either. At least it isn't working very well. I don't even know whether anybody would accept my proposal, but I know we ought to make the advance. Instead of wondering whether or not the Soviets are going to boycott it, why don't we suggest it. Both the technical and financial aspects will have to be studied carefully. Financial assistance may be available from agencies such as the World Bank, our Development Loan Fund, and certain regional agencies.

We must learn to take the initiative on such matters. We let the last Assembly of the United Nations go by, for example, without vigorously pursuing the statement of policy which our President laid before the United Nations when we were in trouble in the Middle East over Lebanon. Apparently the only time we have real ideas is when we get into such a jam that we don't quite know how to get out. At that time the jam was very significant and the trouble was dangerous and the President of the United States gave one of his best messages.

I am going to suggest here most respectfully that I think it is your duty, and that of everyone else, to remind everyone—Republicans, Democrats, the executive and legislative branchs of the Government—that Middle East regional economic development is something that ought to be implemented.

What else ought to be implemented? There are many bilateral arrangements which can surely be undertaken. We have our programs with the countries of the Middle East and we ought to continue these. We also ought to have arrangements in the Middle East relating to, as I have felt for a long time, the internationalization of certain waterways.

Fortunately, fellow Americans, the sign "United Nations" is acceptable in the Middle East. There are some who do not like it, some who abuse it, and yet it has more acceptance than any other outside force. We ought to maximize its effectiveness with the utmost cooperation. We should not try to run the agencies. We should be willing to put in more of our financing and let the agencies be operated as they ought to be operated on a fair and objective basis under United Nations control.

I also feel that we ought to recognize that certain rivers, like the River Jordan, could be better developed regionally, but if they are not going to develop it regionally, then we sould help some country develop its share of it.

Furthermore, I think we as Americans had better recognize for once and for all that one of the great assets that we have in the Middle East, and which has brought with it obviously some problems, is that living testimonial of democratic institutions, the State of Israel.

I think that one of the most encouraging signs in the last 2 or 3 years is the self-restraint and the self-discipline of the Government and of the people of the State of Israel in the recent Middle East crisis. That kind of political maturity is to be commended.

With her technical know-how and skilled manpower, Israel can make a real contribution to the economic advancement of the Middle East—if the political situation permits this kind of cooperation.

I have heard all about the limitations of this. I am fully cognizant of the animosity which exists because of this state. I am not a Zionist, but I tell you this—looking at it strictly from the point of view of an American, a U.S. Senator, and one interested in peace and security—I say that we would be a great deal better off if we focused upon the positive example of a modern democratic state in this part of the world. Instead of apologizing for what has transpired over there in the last 10 or 11 years, we should point to Israel and say: "If you will bend your efforts the same way, with the same vigor, you will have the same kind of cooperation and assistance from the American people and the American Government and, therefore, we want less antagonism and more cooperation."

I would also caution you to remember that other states in the area can do much to help the nation of Israel. You have listed on the program here the subject, "Israel Looks to Asia and Africa." Let me say: Asia and Africa should also look to Israel.

There are the programs, the technical assistance, the development of trade and commerce—possibly not enough yet—but it helps. The seeds are there for multilateral cooperation. We Americans do not have any mandate to save the world alone. When we get that kind of feeling, we get a little self-righteous. I would suggest that we attempt to get other nations to join with us in carrying the heavy responsibilities of economic development. This goes for our NATO partners and any of the other nations with whom we work.

Then, in our own policies, we ought to have, not only for the Middle East, but for the whole area of the world of the rising new nations, an economic assistance program that is up to the requirements, and not one that just barely scratches the surface.

What I am attempting to say to you is that an international development loan fund program that is on a year-by-year basis, permitting little or no advance planning, is not only inadequate, but wasteful. It never brings into its mechanism the kind of people that can really dramatize through imaginative, constructive projects, the good works that ought to be accomplished.

We need a development loan program for the next 5 years of not less than a billion and a half to $2 billion a year. I am going to develop some proposals along this line in the Senate.

Of course, somebody will say that you cannot pledge each Congress in advance for what it will do. Well, no, you can't pledge it, but with leadership it is as good as a pledge.

One Hundred and Twenty-five Years of Church Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

an editorial tribute to the First AME Zion Church of Paterson, N.J., on its 125th anniversary.

The following editorial appeared in the July 11, 1959, issue of the Paterson News, of Paterson, N.J.:

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF CHURCH SERVICE

Over the span of 125 years, the United States emerged from a virtual cocoon stage to become the most powerful Nation in the world. All the inventions which created a veritable new world were conceived in the same period, we moved from horse and carriage to the high-speed autos and the jet planes. The world became as one. We have fought numerous wars in the interim, the Civil War, Spanish American, two world wars, and the Korean conflict.

So the pride of members of the First AME Zion Church of Paterson is understandable as they mark the 125th anniversary of the founding of their first church in Paterson. Though the early records are obscured in the dust of time, it is known that the Paterson church is an off-shoot of the breakaway of a number of Negro clergymen from the white Methodist Episcopal Church of New York City some years before. The first three ministers of First AME Zion were believed to have been part of the seceding group.

Down through the years, First AME Zion Church has ministered to the spiritual wants of Negro residents of Paterson, many of whom became honored citizens in Paterson community life. One of them, Mrs. Jennie Amelia Graham Dry, has been a member for 70 years, and so it is appropriate that special honors are being accorded to her, along with a number of 50-year members who have dedicated themselves to the church.

It is a pleasure to record their respected role in Paterson church life, just as they are being singularly honored by their congregation, augmented as it is by newcomers to the city.

They include Mrs. Viola Adams, daughter of the late Reverend J. Harvey Anderson, former pastor; Miss Bessie Brown, one of the original members of the old Godwin Street AME Zion Junior Choir; Mrs. Carrie Dunn, daughter of the late Dr. John Henry White, former pastor, and the compiler of the church's original history; Mrs. Virginia Dunn, stewardess and the wife of William H. Dunn, trustee, who helped purchase the present site in 1915 along with James H. Dempsey, trustee, who has served as sexton of the church for decades and was on the land purchasing committee; Mrs. Grace Forting, who presented the present organ to the church in January, 1938, in memory of her grandmother, Mrs. Hannah Sisco; and Mrs. Virginia Satchwell, who lent the second Old Godwin Street AME Zion Church $1,000 for the purchase of the organ destroyed by fire in 1923.

The News salutes this sturdy symbol of Negro religious life in Paterson and bespeaks for its pastor, the Reverend Clifford Kirkpatrick, its members, and for the church itself continued fulfillment of a noble heritage.

Progress on Flood Control and Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in the public works appropriation bill for 1960 the Senate included funds for a start on the Wilson Dam. The importance of this project is portrayed in an editorial published in the Kansas City Star on Saturday, July 11, a copy of which is included in my remarks by unanimous consent.

The orderly progress on water conservation and flood control projects in Kansas is necessary for industrial progress and economic growth. The costs of these projects, once all of them in the Kansas river basins are completed, will be more than repaid to the Federal Treasury through the payment of additional taxes and through the revenue that would otherwise be lost due to devastating floods and lack of water.

THE WILSON DAM IS A TEST FOR THE KAW VALLEY

Eight years after the great flood you can see a fair prospect for the Kaw Valley river control program. At least the Senate has proposed a modest start on the small Wilson Dam. For this purpose the Senate proposes to spend $500,000 in the next year. The total cost of the dam, spread over several years, is estimated at around $16 million.

Compared with the big river control projects, the Wilson Dam is a small item. It is hardly a threat to the budget. On the Saline River it is in the upper reaches of the Kaw Basin near Russell. It could have such little effect on floods in this area that some people might wonder why Kansas Cityans are concerned over it.

The Wilson Dam is important in its own right, but it is now particularly significant as a part of the overall Kaw Valley program. With Tuttle Creek well advanced in construction it is time to bring along another dam to keep the program moving ahead. If Wilson can be started next year, the Kaw Valley interests can then concentrate their efforts on the Milford Dam on the Republican River. This is a step-by-step program.

In addition, Kansas City has a very substantial interest in the part of Kansas that will be protected and irrigated by the Wilson project. The possibilities for irrigation in that part of the State are very substantial. In fact, the dam was first authorized as a project of the Bureau of Reclamation that is primarily interested in irrigation.

We can see no reason for the House to refuse to go along with this Senate addition to the appropriation bill. Any delay would delay the whole Kaw Valley program. A delay of a year would increase by one more year the exposure to floods and droughts. And it would save nothing.

We realize that the Government is operating on a tight budget this year. There is no reason to assume that the financial problem will be eased next year or the year after. If Congress intends to go through with the Kaw Valley program, it had better push it at a steady pace. That is what the Senate is trying to do with the proposed start on the Wilson Dam.

Castro Having Troubles of His Own

SPEECH

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

(Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include an editorial.)

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose an editorial concerning one Ralph McGill. Everybody in my neck of the woods knows McGill and his left-wing tendencies. McGill, unfortunately, has finagled Washington's best newspaper to subscribe to his daily column. I think this is because the Washington Star had never been accused of being one-sided. Despite McGill, the Star possesses some of the best correspondents in the Nation.

McGill is now in the process of trying to sell to America Fidel Castro. Castro hates this Government like the Devil hates holy water. Castro is up to his neck with fellow travelers and may not be a Communist, but his brother positively is. At the Communist Congress in Moscow early this year Cuba was cited as one country that carried out the program of the Communist Party in its revolution against Batista. This was no accident. Castro's brother Raul was trained in Russia, and he still has Russians assisting him in Cuba.

Back to Ralph McGill. McGill is trying his best to embellish Castro. This is one job that McGill will find difficult. Castro is giving this country the very devil because his defecting chief of air force is here telling the security committee of the other body something about Castro and that Communists had riddled the Castro setup. Well, you do not have to know anything about Castro. Castro is what he is. Either a Communist or just about 99.44 percent Communist. I suggest McGill direct his talents to explaining to the American people why the American Society of Newspaper Editors invited Castro to this country and how much it cost the taxpayers of this Nation to provide Castro with security.

[From the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., July 11, 1959]

ATLANTA EDITOR MCGILL WHITEWASHES RED ELEMENTS IN CASTRO'S CUBA

Ralph McGill, liberal editor of the Atlanta Constitution, is visiting Cuba. His dispatches from Fidel Castro's country show that Mr. McGill didn't forget his whitewash equipment when he packed his traveling kit.

Mr. McGill has written articles that apply several coats of whitewash to the Castro regime. In the face of strong evidence to the contrary, Mr. McGill says the Communist element in the Castro government "is not large." The junior officer group in the army, Mr. McGill says, "includes a few Communists and others who have made the old error of thinking the Communist party safely can be included in a popular front."

Though more than 500 Cubans have been shot by firing squads after trials before kangaroo courts, Mr. McGill says: "This is by no means a police state."

He also excuses Castro's unwillingness to hold elections.

"Until there is more stability and the emergence of an opposition," Mr. McGill asserts, "it is more honest not to have a free election."

We wonder whether Ralph McGill has considered the question of how there can be an opposition when Castro opponents are shot or chased from the country.

In giving a clean bill of health to the Castro government, Mr. McGill runs counter

to facts in the public record and to reports of able anti-Communist observers. U.S. News & World Report recently documented widespread Communist influence in Cuba's new regime.

We hope that Mr. McGill will stop in Miami before returning to Atlanta. He might talk with Maj. Pedro Luis Diaz Lanz, former head of the Cuban Air Force under Castro, who was forced to flee July 1 after charging Red infiltration in his country's armed forces. For bringing this matter to the attention of Fidel Castro, Major Diaz was charged with treason.

Speaking in Miami, Major Diaz said:

"I consider all these actions against me due exclusively to the fact that I have always opposed acts that would permit Communists to take prominent positions within the rebel army and within dependencies of the Government."

We cite the McGill whitewash because U.S. citizens must not misunderstand what is taking place in Cuba. The events in that island republic could be more meaningful to the United States than the much-publicized talks at Geneva. If the Communists gain control of Cuba, the Caribbean might become a Red lake and the United States would have a Red satellite 200 miles from its shores.

Address of George Cochran Doub, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division, U.S. Department of Justice, on Presidential Inability: The Constitutional Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of George Cochran Doub, Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice on Presidential Inability, at the dinner of the Federal Bar Association in honor of the Federal judges of the seventh circuit, Chicago Ill., June 11, 1959:

ADDRESS OF GEORGE COCHRAN DOUB, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, CIVIL DIVISION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, ON PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY: THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROBLEM

On March 4, 1881, James A. Garfield, who as a boy drove the mule team of a canal boat on the Ohio Canal, became President of the United States. Only four months later, Garfield drove in his carriage from the White House down Pennsylvania Avenue to the Baltimore & Potomac Railroad depot on Sixth Street intending to take a train to New England. As he walked through the station arm in arm with Secretary of State James G. Blaine, an assassin stepped forward with a cocked revolver and fired two shots at Garfield, striking him in the arm and side. When the lunatic, Charles J. Guiteau, was seized and dragged through the crowd, he cried, "Arthur is President of of the United States now."

Garfield lay in a coma for 80 days completely unable to perform the duties of President. During that period, he performed only one official act—the signing of an extradition paper. The total incapacity of the President during this period, we are told, had a harmful effect on the country. Considerable Government business could not be conducted nor could important officials be appointed. It has been said that the Nation's foreign relations, lacking the direction of the Chief Executive, seriously deteriorated. Only routine business was handled by department heads.

Yet, nothing was done. There was criticism that Secretary of State Blaine was attempting to usurp the President's duties and there were insistent demands that Vice President Chester A. Arthur act. After 60 days, a Cabinet meeting was held in which it was unanimously voted that Vice President Arthur should assume the powers of the presidential office. But would he become President and thus preclude Garfield from returning to office? Opinions were divided. The members of the Cabinet voted 4–3, with Attorney General Wayne MacVeagh among the majority, that Arthur would become President and would thus permanently oust Garfield from office. The majority relied upon the fact that upon the three prior occasions of the death of the Chief Executive, the Vice President had become President and the language of the Constitution concerning death and inability were exactly the same.

The Cabinet resolved that, before Arthur should take this momentous step, Garfield should be consulted about the serious consequence to him which might attend Arthur's assumption of the powers of President. However, this could not be done by reason of Garfield's desperate condition. Arthur himself emphatically declined to take any steps to assume the powers of the President on the ground that he would not be a party to ousting Garfield from office. If Vice President Arthur had believed that he would exercise the powers of the presidency only for the duration of the President's disability, there would have been no reason for his failure to exercise those powers. Considerable sentiment developed at the time for clarification of the law, but after Garfield's death Arthur took office as President and the matter dropped.

If such uncertainty could occur during the peaceful days of 1881, how frightening would be the prospect of similar uncertainty at a time when it is essential that the Nation have such continuity of official leadership as to enable critical decisions to be met and made.

In periods of peace and quiet of the past, this issue may not have been of vital importance but in the dangerous critical days of world leadership, of nuclear weapons, of the touch of the ICBM on the nerve of danger, of a powerful threatening enemy, the problem becomes one of paramount consequence. In times of almost continuous international crisis requiring immediate decisions by the Executive to safeguard the Nation's interests, our future safety could possibly depend upon our ability to have provided clear definitive answers to this constitutional question.

In the event of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office, does the Vice President succeed permanently to the Presidency? Or does he act as a temporary pinchhitter during the disability period? Who is authorized to say a President is unable to discharge his duties?

You will recall that paragraph 6 of section 1 of article II of the Constitution provides that "in case of the removal, death, resignation and inability to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, the same shall devolve on the Vice President." You will notice that the language is mandatory. "The same shall," not "may," devolve on the Vice President. "Devolve" means to pass down, descend, to transfer, and the mandatory transfer to the Vice President occurs in the same way in each of the four situations: removal, death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President. No distinction is made as to what happens in case of presidential inability and the President's removal, death, or resignation.

The Constitution states, "the same shall devolve on the Vice President * * *." To what do the words "the same" refer? What is it that shall "devolve" upon the Vice President? Is it the office of the President? In that case, the President would thenceforth be permanently excluded from his office; or do only the powers and duties devolve upon the Vice President and in that case, his tenure as the Acting Chief Executive would end upon the recovery of the President.

It appears that there was a constitutional question, when the issue first arose, whether the Vice President, in the case of the death of the President, became President or Acting President for the balance of the term, but this doubt has now been settled by established practice.

The question first was presented when President William Henry Harrison died of pneumonia in office in 1841, 1 month after his inauguration, "worn away and destroyed by the hordes of applicants for public office." Did Vice President John Tyler become President or Acting President? Many objected at the time to Tyler becoming President because it was believed that the precedent would establish that the same result must occur when the President became disabled. It was argued that the records of the Constitutional Convention indicated that the Convention had not intended that the Vice President become President under the succession clause but merely that he should exercise the powers and duties of the disabled President until his inability was removed. Daniel Webster, then Secretary of State, was the only Whig who was not greatly alarmed over what the Democrat, Tyler, would do in opposition to Whig policies and interests. Webster took the position that Vice President Tyler actually became President. It was Tyler's initial belief that he would act as President during Harrison's unexpired term, but reflection changed his attitude and in his inaugural address he boldly proclaimed that he had been called to "the high office of this Confederacy."

The first paper submitted to Tyler for his signature had below the space for his signature the words "Acting President." Tyler was incensed and by a stroke of his pen eliminated the word "Acting" and signed as President, and President he became. After him, six other Vice Presidents, Fillmore, Johnson, Arthur, Theodore Roosevelt, Coolidge, and Truman, did likewise upon the death of the President in office. From these precedents, it is now assumed that, in the case of the death of a President, the Vice President becomes President for the unexpired term. Yet, the very way the original doubt was resolved by these precedents has contributed to the problem in the case of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

When we examine the original articles agreed upon in substance by the Constitutional Convention before their revision by the Committee of Style, we find that they made clear that upon the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President should exercise those powers and duties "until the inability of the President be removed."

In other words, the framers of the Constitution intended that the Vice President would be acting as President, but would not become the President. Although acting as President, he would remain in the office of Vice President.

The obscurity developed by reason of the revision made by the Committee of Style, which boiled the provision down to the simplified statement that in case of removal,

death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the office, "the same shall devolve on the Vice President."

This interpretation is borne out by the debates in the Convention indicating that the Vice Presidency was originally created to provide for an alternate Chief Executive who might function from time to time should the President be unable to exercise the powers and duties of his office. Indeed, only after the Convention decided upon this standby position did the Convention consider giving the Vice President something to do while he waited in the wings. The idea of assigning him the duty of presiding over the Senate seems to have been an afterthought.

In 1919, President Woodrow Wilson suffered a stroke while leading his great fight for the adoption of the covenant of the League of Nations. At that time the position of the United States had developed into one of world leadership. After our spectacular military and economic exertions in World War I, and at the moment that the leader of democracy was stricken, in the midst of the postwar effort to establish a lasting peace, a dramatic Senate battle over ratification of the Versailles Treaty and the covenant of the League of Nations was being waged.

The illness of Wilson continued from his collapse on September 25, 1919, until the end of his presidential term on March 4, 1921. During this period of 1 year and 5 months, the President was unable to attend any Cabinet meetings or to perform most of his duties. The exact extent of his inability is not clear because his condition was carefully shielded from the public by Mrs. Wilson, his personal physician, and his entourage in the White House. Indeed, even the Vice President and the Cabinet were kept in the dark about Wilson's condition. It is said that for a considerable period of time—although the precise time is subject to speculation—he was completely unable to perform any of the duties of his high office. It has been believed that Mrs. Wilson and the President's physician played a major role in making and deciding matters of large public policy. In any event, the administration of the Government almost was at a standstill for 1½ years.

Without the direction of the President or Vice President, Secretary of State Lansing called 21 Cabinet meetings in an attempt to prevent the affairs of the Government from becoming paralyzed. When Wilson heard of these meetings he accused Lansing of usurping Presidential power and forced this outstanding Secretary of State to resign. Upon Lansing's suggestion that the Cabinet request Vice President Marshall to act as President, Joseph P. Tumulty, Wilson's secretary, replied: "You may rest assured that while Wilson is lying in the White House on the broad of his back I will not be a party to ousting him." At that time widespread discussion again ensued for clarification of the law, but when Wilson's term expired the matter died down again.

Now why did Wilson's personal advisers fear knowledge of his disability becoming known? I believe that there can be no doubt that a primary reason was because of their fear that public opinion would demand that Vice President Marshall take over the powers of the Presidency and, if Wilson should recover, he might face a constitutional fight to regain his office. In other words, the dangerous uncertainty of this constitutional provision was responsible for this deplorable situation. Attempts made to induce Vice President Marshall to act as President failed. The major reason Marshall was unwilling to act was because of the fear that once he did so, Wilson would be ousted permanently from the Presidency.

The pernicious consequences of the belief that a Vice President actually succeeds to the Presidency for the balance of the presidential term, when called upon to exercise the powers and duties of a disabled president, have been in both the Garfield and the Wilson case to frustrate the intent of the drafters of the Constitution that the Nation should have an alternate Chief Executive ready to provide continuous Executive leadership. If it had been perfectly clear that constitutionally the President could resume his powers at any time his disability ended and he was relinquishing the reins only temporarily, this dangerous problem should not have arisen in either the Garfield or Wilson administrations.

Immediately upon President Eisenhower's recovery from his heart attack in Colorado in September 1955 he directed the Department of Justice to institute a full legal study of the constitutional problem with respect to Presidential inability. His purpose was the preparation of a plan for the protection of the Nation in the event any President in the future were to become disabled. After an extensive study of the problem by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, the President reviewed alternative plans and authorized the Attorney General to consult persons outside the Government for their views and criticisms. The President also sought the opinions of the members of the Cabinet at a Cabinet meeting. Finally a definitive plan proposing a constitutional amendment was prepared by Attorney General Brownell, approved by the President, orally presented by the President at a meeting of congressional leaders of both parties and publicly announced in the testimony of the Attorney General before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee in the House of Representatives.

President Eisenhower was the first President of the United States who had the courage, the interest and the appreciation of the problem to attempt to correct this serious deficiency of the Constitution. Every prior President shrank from attempting to deal with this delicate matter or manifested no realization of the difficulty.

On March 3, 1958, the President and the Vice President took an historic step in consultation with Attorney General William P. Rogers when they reduced to memorandum form, and published, their own understanding of the constitutional role of the Vice President as Acting President during the disability of the President. The Eisenhower-Nixon understanding was stated in these terms:

"The President and the Vice President have agreed that the following procedures are in accord with the purposes and provisions of article 2, section 1, of the Constitution, dealing with Presidential inability. They believe that these procedures, which are intended to apply to themselves only, are in no sense outside or contrary to the Constitution but are consistent with its present provisions and implement its clear intent.

"1. In the event of inability the President would—if possible—so inform the Vice President, and the Vice President would serve as Acting President, exercising the powers and duties of the office until the inability had ended.

"2. In the event of an inability which would prevent the President from communicating with the Vice President, the Vice President, after such consultation as seems to him appropriate under the circumstances, would decide upon the devolution of the powers and duties of the Office and would serve as Acting President until the inability had ended.

"3. The President, in either event, would determine when the inability had ended and at that time would resume the full exercise of the powers and duties of the Office."

I have no doubt that this unprecedented document although not binding upon future Presidents and Vice Presidents, will become recognized as a notable state paper of our constitutional history.

On the day following the Eisenhower-Nixon announcement a bipartisan majority of the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, including Senators KEFAUVER, DIRKSEN, HRUSKA, HENNINGS, JOHNSTON, LANGER, WATKINS, JENNER, and BUTLER, joined in sponsoring a proposed constitutional amendment on presidential inability which adopted the administration's proposal with certain changes in section 4 acceptable to the Executive. This proposed bipartisan amendment was promptly introduced in the Congress.

Section 1 restates existing law in case of the removal, death, or resignation of the President.

Section 2 provides that, if a President declares in writing that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, those powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as acting President. This section assures a President in announcing his own inability that his powers and duties will be restored to him upon his recovery.

Section 3 deals with a situation in which the President is unable or unwilling to declare his own disability. In that case, the Vice President with the approval of the majority of the heads of the executive departments in office—that is to say, the President's Cabinet—shall make this decision. Many scholars agree that the Vice President alone now has the authority under the Constitution to make this determination. Section 3 requires the written concurrence of a majority of the members of the Cabinet.

Section 4 provides that, whenever the President declares in writing that his disability is terminated, he shall resume the exercise of the powers and duties of his office. This provision affords a constitutional guarantee to a President that he will regain the powers of his office when his disability has been removed.

The realities of the situation suggest that it is unlikely a Vice President would attempt to assume the duties of the Presidency unless it were clear beyond challenge that the President was, in fact, unable to exercise the responsibilities of the office. The proposed constitutional provision proclaiming plainly that the Vice President will merely discharge the powers and duties of the Presidential office for the temporary period of disability should negative any motive of usurpation. At the same time, the Vice President should not in the future under the amendment refuse—as Vice President Arthur and Vice President Marshall—to perform his constitutional duty of serving as the alternate executive temporarily when the circumstances require that he do so.

Section 4 will allow the President to resume the functions of his office although there might be a difference of opinion between the President and the Vice President whether the disability has ended. However, in the event of a dispute between them as to this, provision is made for immediate action by the Congress, whether then in session or not, to resolve the issue if raised in writing by the Vice President with the support of the majority of the Cabinet. A two-thirds vote of the Members present in both Houses would be required to establish the continued existence of the President's inability. Thereafter, the announcement by the Acting President that the President's inability has ended or a resolution adopted by a majority of both Houses will restore the powers of the Office to the President upon his recovery.

Historically this problem has never been one of a too aggressive Vice President but rather of a reluctant Vice President, who hesitated to exercise the powers of the President under the present succession clause of the Constitution because of the uncertainty that his action might result in the permanent elimination of the President from his Office.

The essential solution is a clarifying amendment establishing that the Vice President's tenure of the Presidential powers is only temporary. This provision is the foundation of the administration's proposal submitted in 1957, resubmitted in 1958, and the bipartisan amendment proposed in the same year. The proposal implements the original understanding of the members of the Constitutional Convention as indicated in the debates and in the original articles.

There is now presented the best opportunity in our history for the solution of this problem. The time required for the ratification of a constitutional amendment will undoubtedly extend beyond the term of this administration and accordingly will be inapplicable to it. We do not know the person or the party that will occupy the White House in 1961, but we do know that under the Constitution, it will not be President Eisenhower. At this moment in history, the proposed measure can be considered entirely upon its merits without any consideration of personalities or parties.

At the time of each illness of President Eisenhower, as in the case of President Garfield and President Wilson, there was a general recognition of the seriousness of this constitutional problem of succession and clamor by political leaders of both parties and the press that constructive measures be taken for its resolution. Although the problem arises from a permanent inherent defect in our constitutional system, proposals for its resolution now lie dormant in the Congress under the press of far less significant matters. The bipartisan constitutional amendment was proposed over a year ago yet the Senate Judiciary Committee and the House Judiciary Committee have taken no action of any kind.

An informed and responsible public opinion appears needed to secure the action which the interests of the Nation plainly requires.

World's Only Albino Colony Owes Life to "Father" Tippit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, Olney, Ill., among other things is noted for its unique colony of white squirrels. Olney is my hometown and everyone in the area is proud to have these beautiful animals in our midst. I would like to take this means of letting my colleagues know more about these squirrels by submitting for the RECORD a very excellent article recently published in the Olney Daily Mail:

WORLD'S ONLY ALBINO COLONY OWES LIFE TO "FATHER" TIPPIT

OLNEY, ILL.—When Tom Tippit frantically fired a shotgun at a fierce fox squirrel 56 years ago he became the father of Olney's famous white squirrels.

It is the only known place in the world where there is a colony of these snow-white animals, numbering between 600 and 700.

Started here in 1902, they multiplied and stayed right here in Olney not caring to roam outside the city limits. And no wonder. The children love them, the people feed them, the Chamber of Commerce advertises them, and the law protects them.

"Heaven protects them," said Tom Tippit the other day. "At least it was an act of providence, my firing that shotgun way back in 1902."

It happened in Tippit's woods, when Tom was 15, a mere broth of a boy. Today he is 71. In his attractive little stucco house—still in Tippit's woods—on Olney's pretty residential North Silver Street, he sits on his wide screened porch or looks out his windows at the adorable little white animals. He watches them scamper across the spacious grounds and climb the old, old trees on this same land his grandfather, Matthew L. Tippit, obtained from the Government in 1821. Tom's father, Thomas Tippit, Sr., was circuit clerk 13 years, served in the legislature 12 years, was mayor of Olney and editor of the Olney Times.

Before Tom Tippit entered the plot, Ezra Stroup was out hunting one day in 1902 on his father's farm in Bonpas Township, 4 miles southeast of Olney. According to Bert Michels, Olney's historian, Stroup fired into a bundle in a tree and the bundle fell to the ground with two albino squirrels.

ORDERED FREED

"One," said Michels, "was cream colored and the other was pure white."

Stroup was delighted with his find and he took the squirrels home and after a while, he brought them to Olney in a cage and placed them in a window of Jasper Banks' saloon.

"I don't know about that part of the story," said Tippit. He crossed his legs, leaned back in his chair, and got set to talk.

"I don't know," he repeated, "where they came from originally, but I'll tell you what happened after those squirrels left the saloon. One day my father came home and he said to me and my brother Bert, "You boys go down to Jap Banks' saloon and pick up those two white squirrels. Bring them out here and release them in the woods."

Tom said he and Bert hitched their horse to a cart and headed for downtown Olney. Bert was a little older, so he went into the saloon and brought out the caged animals.

"When we arrived home," said Tom, "We got a ladder and took the cage up in a tree and nailed it there. When we opened the door, the male squirrel started climbing higher. When he neared the top, out of the foliage appeared a large fox squirrel. He attacked the white one, ripping it to shreds. It dropped to the ground like a rag."

CERTAIN DEATH

Tom and Bert were both scared and mad. They saw the female white squirrel leaving the cage and starting to climb higher in the tree.

"I knew," said Tom, "That it was certain death for that white squirrel. Now here's where Providence stepped in. Just the day before I had been given permission to fire the family shotgun, and I did. I thought of that gun, and I ran into the house and grabbed it, I loaded the gun on the run."

When Tom looked up the tree he saw the fox squirrel ready to pounce on the white one. He aimed the gun and fired. The fox squirrel fell to the ground, dead.

"That white female," said Tom, "went up into the tree, and in a few weeks we noticed some baby white squirrels about the place."

As months and years passed, the white squirrels increased in numbers out there in Tippit's Woods. The population grew and grew, and the squirrels spread out all over Olney. They became a common sight in trees and on lawns all over town.

"They were welcomed," said Editor Allen Yount of the Daily Mail, "by residents with such gentle treatment that they became and still remain almost tame."

Yount tells how the pretty white animals received widespread attention back in the 1920's. A newspaperman from Toronto, Canada, was visiting Ernie Hendershott in Olney. He was entranced by the squirrels and wrote a full page article about them for the Toronto paper.

WIDELY PUBLICIZED

"Shortly," said Yount, "newspapers and magazines throughout the country started printing articles about Olney and its white squirrels. The Governor of Arizona, and many others, wrote here seeking a pair of them. He hoped that colonies of them could be started in other places. Although many were caught and shipped away, it is understood that they never develop into a colony in any other place."

Olney became so proud of her white squirrels, the City Council in 1925 passed an ordinance to protect them. There's a $25 fine awaiting anyone caught destroying one or transporting any out of town. In 1943, State Representatives Clyde Lee and Homer Kasserman put through the legislature a bill which placed the Olney squirrels under State protection.

"You can see them almost anywhere in town," said Mrs. Edith Newton, city clerk. She was looking out of the city hall window across busy Whittle Avenue, where cars were streaming by. "I just saw a couple a few minutes ago over there in that tree across the street."

Olney goes all out in glorifying the white squirrels. Every policeman and fireman has an outline of the bushy-tailed animal as shoulder patches on their uniforms.

"They're so tame," exclaimed Mrs. William G. Smight, Jr., 929 East Main Street. "They come up on our front porch and sit on the railing. One day we had guests from Kentucky, and the squirrels just sat there while the guests took pictures of them."

"They're prettiest after a rain," Mrs. Smith said.

"Roaming around town," she explained, "their fur gets soiled and they don't look so white. Right after a rain or snowfall, the lovable little creatures are as white as snow."

BEWARE TRAFFIC

Millard Davis sees scores of the pets every day in the city's 54-acre park, where he lives as custodian, but you needn't go to the park to find them. They're all over town, living close to the people who put out nuts and cornbread for them.

"If we crack the nuts," said Mr. Tippit, "the squirrels eat them at once. If we don't, they usually bury them for a short time. They like hickory nuts best, I believe, but they are hard to find. The squirrels get a lot of pecans."

It probably isn't necessary, but the Daily Mail comes out every few months with an appeal to the people to feed the squirrels.

Tom Tippit and many others are worried now. They are afraid the whole squirrel population is decreasing because of traffic hazards. The squirrels have legal protection and love, but cars are killing them too fast. Every day or so one is found on a street where it was run over by an auto.

"They're smart, though," said Tippit, "I hope they are smart enough to lick the traffic problem. I've actually seen this happen many times in the past year or two—I've seen these little white scamps crossing the streets by walking the telephone and electric wires, high up over the passing cars."

The St. Lawrence Seaway Is Only a Foretaste of What Is Possible in the Future for Americans of Faith and Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, there are few things that can happen only once in all of history. One of them is the St. Lawrence Seaway. There was no other place on this planet where a whole new ocean could be created by man. Completion of the seaway will prove to be an event of greater significance than we probably can realize at this time.

The seaway begins at Duluth, Minn., 2,300 miles inland. On July 11 there was an enthusiastic celebration at Duluth of the seaway's dedication. Governors attended from four States, Montana, South Dakota, and Nebraska—which for the first time in their history are given a seaport.

The main address at the Governors dinner on Saturday night, July 11, 1959, was given by the Honorable Fred A Seaton, Secretary of the Interior. Because of the unusual scope and perspective of the address—and its vision of the future possible to Americans of faith and courage—I am including it here:

ADDRESS BY FRED A. SEATON, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, AT THE GOVERNORS' DINNER, HOTEL DULUTH, DULUTH, MINN., JULY 11, 1959

It is of course an honor to participate in the dedication of the seaway Port of Duluth, here at the extremity of the fourth seacoast of the United States on what has now become the fifth ocean of the world.

On such an occasion it seems only fitting to remind ourselves of the fact that the newly opened St. Lawrence Seaway is many things.

First of all, it is a magnificent physical symbol of the friendship between the United States and Canada, and of nearly a century of peaceful cooperation between our two countries.

It is a major source of hydroelectric energy, with a power dam as Massena, N.Y., surpassed on this continent only by Grand Coulee and Niagara—a power dam which will serve consumers on both sides of the international boundry.

It is a pathway for ships—big ships, flying the flags of countries on six continents, exporting from and importing to the infant seaports of Buffalo and Erie and Cleveland and Chicago and Duluth-Superior. In less than 2 months after its opening on April 25, more than 1,500 vessels traveled this waterway. And long after the parades and pageantry of the formal dedications of the seaway end, such deep sea vessels will go on year in and year out, weaving their pattern of peaceful international trade.

Eight American States border the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway. They presently have 25 percent of the total number of American farms, 40 percent of the American population, and 46 percent of America's gross income. The port of Duluth-Superior directly serves two—Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Stretching out beyond them is America's heartland, including Canada and western sections of the United States rich in natural resources. To all these areas and to the lake ports which serve them, the new seaway offsets tremendous opportunities for economic expansion.

Opportunities, however, are not gifts. Rather are they circumstances to be seized upon by the bold, the intelligent, and the energetic. So it is that the cities which reap the major rewards to be offered by the seaway will be those which look ahead, plan ahead, and build ahead. It is perfectly evident to me that you in Duluth are well aware of that fact. You deserve congratulations on your Arthur M. Clure Public Marine Terminal, dedicated today, and on the private facilities which will join it in the years to come. I honor you for your initiative and foresight.

As you well know, the total tonnage of cargo through Duluth-Superior has historically ranked second only to that through the port of New York. With the gradual exhaustion of Minnesota's high-grade iron ore reserves, some people have feared that your port would sink in the national scale. The new seaway puts such doubts to flight and brings Duluth new hope for the future.

There is ample evidence to support such a conclusion.

Since 1915 the tonnage through the Panama Canal has increased 10 times. In the past 10 years traffic on the U.S. inland waterways, excluding the Great Lakes, has nearly doubled. Recognizing the leaping growth of our population and economy, we may well expect a repetition of these historic waterway patterns here.

Before the seaway was widened and deepened, the volume of cargo that moved through it every year totaled about 13 million tons. In this first year of the improved seaway, the volume is expected to be nearly twice as great—25 million tons. And in another decade, it should double again, going to 50 million tons, as our population grows past 200 million and the gross national product of our economy leaves the one-half trillion dollar mark behind it.

Tonight is indeed a night for rejoicing over the fulfillment of a dream nearly 3 centuries old. In 1680 Francois Dollier de Casson worked out a plan for a route around the Lachine Rapids at Montreal—a plan, incidentally, which never went into effect. One hundred years later, George Washington caught a glimpse of what might happen to the economy of his new Nation if it could but "open the road" between the Great Lakes and the sea. More than another century later the United States and Canada undertook joint studies of the St. Lawrence, and from 1903 forward vessels with a draft of less than 14 feet could travel up the little seaway.

The big seaway, however, was still a big dream when the United States and Canada signed the Seaway Treaty of July 18, 1932, during the Presidency of Herbert Hoover. It remained but a big dream for nearly another quarter of a century, perennially supported by leaders of both major political parties, never enacted; always a bill, never a law—a permanent portrait, many thought, in the gallery of noble and futile causes.

To those doubters, the seaway was in a class with statehood for Alaska and Hawaii—the class of good things that just couldn't be accomplished.

Today all those doubts have been resolved—affirmatively. The St. Lawrence Seaway is a fact. Alaska and Hawaii have become States. And, I submit to you, it is no accident that all three things happened at long last during the Presidency of one man, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Largely because of his strong leadership the promises have become realities, and inaction has been translated into action. Having voted for the seaway as a Member of the United States Senate, in 1952, I take pride—I hope pardonably—in the fact that after 25 years of frustrating talk and delay, the necessary legislation was passed by a Congress made up of a majority of members of the same political persuasion as the President. Valuable bipartisan support was given, of course, and for that we should all be grateful.

Just 1 week ago today it was my privilege, at the tri-State border of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia, to dedicate the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park. Through that hallowed historic area in the year 1775, Daniel Boone and 30 axmen drove through the 200-mile Wilder Road making possible settlement beyond the Alleghenies in the fertile grasslands of Kentucky.

Just 2 weeks ago the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, with bipartisan support, approved legislation establishing the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park—a park preserving for posterity a canal built in the first half of the 19th century, which once carried freight over the 180 miles between Washington, D.C. and Cumberland, Md.

Just 1 month ago it was my honor to dedicate the Glendo Dam in Wyoming—a major new reclamation dam authorized in 1954, and now completed—at a site on the historic Oregon Trail, over which a century ago pioneers pushed westward to the Pacific.

The men who hacked out the Wilderness Road, dug the C. & O. Canal, and trudged westward to California and Oregon were the kind of people who neither accept horizons as impassable barriers nor walk backward into the future with their eyes forever fixed on the past. They were men who seized the future, and the road, the canal, and the trail all remain today as monuments both to their daring and their determination and ability to gaze far ahead.

Among such monuments in our own time, the St. Lawrence Seaway is a towering colossus.

It is, however, only a single symbol of the Eisenhower administration's leadership and the foresight of the Congress of the United States in the fields of commerce and transportation. There are many others.

Going vigorously about the job of meeting the 20th century needs of the American people, the administration in 1956 launched a $38 billion Federal highway program, which in 13 years will have provided the most modern Federal roadways all over America to meet our growing needs for roads, both for defense and economic purposes.

Last year there was established for the first time in our history a Federal Aviation Agency, designed to discharge increasing responsibilities of the Federal Government in the field of commercial aviation.

The view from my office window in the Department of the Interior Building in Washington looks out over the Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln Memorials. Further out on the horizon is the National Airport. Screaming airliners rise up from behind the trees to pass almost directly over the temple which we have built to honor Lincoln. And as they do, I can't help thinking of horse-drawn carriages of Washington and Lincoln's time plowing up the mud on a rainy day on Constitution Avenue. The airplane is a symbol of a technological advance to a present which would stagger the imagination of our ancestors and of a future which surely would stagger ours.

In your lifetime and mine, one of the most important Federal agencies may well be the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, set up last year to carry out aeronautical and space research and development.

Satellites have been placed in orbit around the earth and the sun and have sent back

their radio messages. The monkeys Able and Baker have made the trip into space and returned to the Pentagon to be the guests of honor at one of the most hilarious and memorable press conferences in the history of Washington. Soon the X–15 rocket plane will attempt to take a human pilot into space and return him safely to earth.

Seven fine, courageous young Americans now stand ready, after the most rigorous kind of training and conditioning, to make the first manned flight in a satellite into outer space.

Moreover, at the urging of the administration, in the past few years the Congress has approved other Federal activities which could well revolutionize transportation right here on our own planet—particularly transportation under, on, and over the water.

Last August 3 the atomic submarine *Nautilus* made the first undersea voyage in history beneath the polar icecap. A week later the submarine *Skate* did the same thing. Currently, the Department of Commerce is working to develop the undersea merchant ship, nuclear powered, as a freight boat of the future, capable of speeds of 30 knots or more.

In just 10 days, the first lady of the United States, Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, will launch at Camden, N.J., the U.S.S. *Savannah*, the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, capable of carrying, at a speed of 20 knots, 60 passengers, 130 crew members, and 10,000 tons of cargo. Visiting ports of call all over the world, it will ride the waves as a symbol of the American people's determination to put nuclear power to peaceful application.

Next year the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce plans to begin building an 80-ton hydrofoil test craft—a ship that in effect would ride on a wing-like structure, skimming the surface of the water without leaving any wake, reaching the almost incredible speed of 80 knots. If such a ship of commercial size proves feasible—and we shall soon know—it could make the trip from New York to Southampton in England overnight.

In addition, the Maritime Administration has begun investigating the feasibility of the levitation ship—one that wouldn't even touch the water, once underway, that would have its weight lifted above the surface by a jet of air forced downward, and that could speed along carrying tons of cargo and hundreds of passengers at 100 or more knots an hour.

All these accomplishments and plans of the Federal Government, under the leadership of a great President, to me reflect the dreams and hopes and wishes of a people—the American people—who, like the pioneers of the 18th and 19th centuries, have their eyes fixed with hope on the future.

History, I am sure, will vindicate that hope. Probably in our lifetime—certainly in the lifetime of our children—citizens of Duluth and Chicago and Toledo and Buffalo will grow familiar with sights which would be strange indeed to our eyes: Such sights, possibly as atomic-powered freight-carrying submarines, atomic merchant ships, hydrofoil ships, levitation ships, speeding along this great 2,300-mile international seaway and other waterways of the globe, bringing the products of the world to our docks and carrying American products of farm and factory to the ends of the earth.

Faint-hearted despair is frequently a product manufactured by a salesman with a purpose, peddled with such noise, and all too often bought by the gullible. A free country, of course, will not and must not outlaw even the demagogue and the fool. But a free people, while permitting such individuals to talk, can also refuse to listen to them and certainly refuse to follow them.

On such a night as this we can with reason rejoice in great achievements and yet see them only as forerunners of even greater ones to come. Yes; this is a night for being true to our forebears, and in a large sense it is also a night for resolving to do in our time what they did in theirs: Look to the future with intelligence and confidence and courage.

Our Chickens Have Come Home To Roost on the Eaves of the Federal Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government began its 1960 fiscal year on July 1 by the forced borrowing of $3 billion in new cash. The money was borrowed by auctioning 258-day Treasury bills on a best-offer basis. The securities were sold at prices which gave purchasers an average interest rate of 4.075 percent. This rate compares with 4.56 percent on an issue of 221-day bills auctioned early in May. Then, a few days later, Uncle Sam borrowed another $2 billion at increased rates.

Why was this new borrowing necessary? It became a must because the Federal Government, already deeply in debt through the spending of funds not covered by tax and revenue income, needed money to meet a host of current obligations. Congress was obliged to again increase the debt ceiling on June 19 for the third time in less than 18 months. Just where this headlong plunge into Federal indebtedness will stop, I do not know. Each year that Congress fails to balance the budget prescribed on the basis of the anticipated income of the Treasury, Federal indebtedness will continue to mount. The President has pleaded for Congress to authorize and appropriate only those funds which the budget income can sustain. Time and time again, Congress has failed to heed this urgent request.

Some folks—particularly that breed of political economist who scoffs at deficit spending and its inflationary byproducts—continue to cling to the baffling theory that "it just doesn't make any difference." Other folks are indifferent—some are resentful of those who believe in legislating with the prudence demanded by the fiscal condition of the Treasury—particularly if this prudence is applied to the curtailment of any program which makes a special interest group the beneficiary of new Federal obligations. Fortunately, there are still many millions of Americans who realize the pitfalls of a loose fiscal policy. But whether those in each of these three categories agree or not, it certainly affects each and every one of us. And it will mean, too, that part of the great American heritage which will befall our children and grandchildren will be a thoroughly mortgaged government.

And here's how our chickens have come home to roost on the Federal Treasury:

The $5 billion which the Treasury Department was obliged to borrow this month to meet Uncle Sam's accrued bills between now and the middle of August will have to be paid back next March out of income taxes when the Treasury starts collecting again from all of us. When Secretary of Treasury Anderson went to the Nation's bankers on two occasions this month to borrow this money to tide Uncle Sam over temporarily, he was obliged to pay the highest rate of interest in the history of the Nation's fiscal transactions.

Moneylenders know that Uncle Sam is already up to his ears in debt. They also know that they can be choosy about the length of their loans and the interest which they must get to make it worthwhile to make these loans. There are still Members of Congress and other self-styled experts out of Congress who feel that they can maintain the 4.5 percent interest rate ceiling on Treasury loans for more than 5 years. But regardless of what anyone thinks, Congress just doesn't set the level of interest rates today. Instead, it is the "market" which sets the level. This market is made up of those who must loan the money—and they have simply told Congress that there will be no loans available to Uncle Sam at any figure less than that which they might derive from private investments. Frankly, you just can't blame them, either.

It does seem almost ironical that the Treasury of the United States, traditionally the soundest and most riskproof agency in the world, is being obliged to pay approximately twice the amount in interest on its borrowing than it did for a similar loan just a year ago.

How does this situation develop?

It it relatively a simple thing to understand. The fact of the matter is that the demand for money is exceeding the supply available. Private investments with sound securities and an apparent ability to repay its creditors on each due date have created a demand which now exceeds the supply of money on the market. Necessarily, the Federal Reserve System is refusing to swell the pool of easy money to meet all of these demands. Hence, the cost of borrowing money is becoming more expensive in the form of higher interest rates charged to anyone seeking loans—whether it is you, I, or Uncle Sam himself.

President Eisenhower and the fiscal experts of the administration are facing the reality of this situation. They know that, if we are going into debt and incurring obligations for which we must borrow money, that any ceiling on interest rates is unrealistic. Uncle Sam will either have to pay the market price for money he borrows when the demand faces him or will just not get it. It is just as simple as that.

It seems to me that Congress is beginning to realize that deficit spending can be a costly and dangerous business—that is, more Members of Congress than apparently understood it in the years and

months past. But, as I have said so many times before, there is just no way this Nation can continue on this deficit-spending spree without suffering the fiscal hangover which invariably follows.

The only remedy to our present fiscal ills which have accumulated over these many years is self-discipline, which must start in the Congress of the United States. Voting for various types of bills which are in excess of the amounts we can afford, predicated upon our Federal revenues, is not always politically expedient. We are learning, I hope, that the expediency of voting funds that create deficits beyond our ability to pay is both costly and dangerous. The biggest job facing the lawmakers today and in the future is simply a matter of facing the facts of life and, in doing so, conveying to many people, seeking more and more Government subsidies and assistance, that the funds are just not available. The only alternative for those who wish to satisfy every constituent's desire is to publicly stand for the tax increases necessary to pay the tab. The day had better soon come when those elected to Congress can no longer run on a platform of more spending and tax reductions, too. It is just a case of the public learning that no one can ride the same horse in two directions at the same time.

It is for this reason, among others, that I introduced House bill 8083 to require rollcall votes on all appropriation bills.

This is an oft-repeated story. But I predicted a year ago that we would be faced with another increase in the national debt unless we began living within our budgetary means. And, since it has come to pass, we can only hope that we may profit from yesterday's mistake.

A Leading Southern Newspaper Exposes Another Case of Yellow Journalism Directed Against the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from a recent issue of the Shreveport (La.) Journal, subsequently reprinted in the June 24 issue of the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News. I think this editorial particularly significant as it points out very clearly the grossly unfair policies of much of the northern press in reporting racial incidents which occur in the South, as contrasted with their reporting similar incidents which occur in their areas.

The editorial follows:

IT'S TAKEN A LOT OF NUDGING BUT WIRE SERVICE COMING AWAKE

Last Friday the Associated Press teletype machines in the Journal's editorial rooms ticked out eight tiny paragraphs which related that a 14-year-old white schoolgirl in New York had been raped by a Negro.

After reading down to the sixth paragraph we learned that there were six Negroes involved—not just one. And, reading on to the seventh paragraph, we found out that the girl had also been beaten and dragged across the schoolyard—not merely raped.

In the meantime, not a line had been received from the AP's rival, United Press International. A few lines showed up later.

The lack of attention which the New York case was receiving as compared to that which was given the rape of a 19-year-old Negro coed by four young white men in Florida was all too typical. When a crime against a Negro is committed in the South, the northern press turns out en masse for a field day. Newspaper reporters, biased magazine writers, television cameramen with eyes trained for the seamy side of life, and motion picture photographers descend upon the scene and stage a little carnival of their own. When they're finished with their chores, the South is smeared again.

But let a crime against a white person be committed by a Negro in the North and the silence is deafening. Seemingly, the wire services' prize-winning reporters suddenly become blind and paralyzed and are unable to write a single line about the horror which has occurred. Cameramen are away on distant assignments and the ones left behind can't get their equipment into focus. News magazines, which Gov. Orval Faubus of Arkansas says are printed for people who can't think, and picture magazines which he says are printed for people who can't read, are completely disinterested. We're used to this sort of treatment by now.

Still the slighting of the New York rape case by the wire services Friday caused us to make one more protest. We ignored the United Press International but—with tongue in cheek—we sent the following telegram to New Orleans' Bureau of the Associated Press and to the AP's general offices in New York:

"Appreciate 2,000 words on gang rape of 14-year-old white girl in New York. Want comparisons between New York case, in which girl raped by one Negro while five others looked on, and Florida case in which Negro coed raped by four whites. Point out no brutality in Florida, while white girl in New York beaten and dragged to her fate. Appreciate dispatching Relman Morin (the AP's reporter who won the Pultizer prize for smearing Little Rock) to scene. Interview parents. Get editorial reaction North, East, South, and West. Want full picture coverage. Contact president of the American Association of Citizens' Councils in Greenwood, Miss., for statement. Ask NAACP if any 'prayer groups' organized to seek 'justice' for Negroes. Anything from Eisenhower? Please keep story running daily till settled. Please expedite."

Ridiculous requests? Not at all. Every one of these steps would have been taken by the AP and UPI at the urgings of northern newspapers if a 14-year-old southern Negro schoolgirl had been raped by a southern white man on her school grounds in the South while five other southern whites looked on.

Our protests could not have been given better timing. Whether it had anything to do with subsequent developments we do not know, but by Saturday morning it was apparent the Associated Press was giving greatly increased attention to the New York rape case.

For one thing, the AP's reporters had discovered by Saturday that the 14-year-old white girl had been raped by three of the Negroes instead of one, as originally reported. In addition, the AP had discovered that one of the six Negro gangsters involved in the attack had actually held the 14-year-old white girl while the three Negroes criminally assaulted her. And it had reaffirmed the fact that the girl was beaten and dragged across the schoolyard—adding the new information that she was also gagged.

But best of all was this additional Associated Press story which bares the hypocrisy of the Northern press:

"NEW YORK.—New York newspapers, which gave considerable attention to last week's Tallahassee, Fla., race trial, Friday did not front-page the New York rape of a white teenager by six Negro youths. * * *

"The Post gave the New York story a column on page 4. * * *

"The New York rape made page 10 of the Journal-American, page 21 of the World-Telegram, page 5 of the morning Daily News, page 3 of the morning Mirror, page 3 of the morning Herald Tribune, and page 11 of the Times."

We congratulate the Associated Press, the world's largest newsgathering organization, on its awakening to the gravity of the New York rape case.

We still have no details from United Press International, but we are forwarding to UPI a copy of our telegram to the AP.

Laws Against Filth Should Be Explicit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 13, 1959:

LAWS AGAINST FILTH SHOULD BE EXPLICIT

Philadelphia over the weekend was the focal point for a double-barreled attack against obscenity. If the constructive suggestions that were made are adopted by lawmakers in Washington and Harrisburg, real progress can be achieved in the campaign to curb purveyors of filth.

U.S. Representative KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN of Philadelphia presided at hearings held in this city by the House Subcommittee on Postal Operations, which is studying ways to combat filth in the mails more effectively. Mrs. GRANAHAN well may have found the key to the problem when she said laws against obscenity must use clearer and more specific language even though it might "be embarrassing in its frankness."

Veterans of Foreign Wars, assembled here in 40th annual State convention, approved unanimously a resolution calling for a new Pennsylvania statute against obscenity that would include "a legally specific and widely-accepted, clear-cut definition of the meaning of the words used to describe violations."

The proposed law would replace the one recently declared unconstitutional by the State supreme court because it dealt in broad generalizations and did not adequately define "obscene" and other words.

A serious obstacle to the writing of sound legislation against obscenity at both the State and national levels has been the reluctance of Congressmen and legislators to use words that are explicit. As a result laws against filth have been handed one setback after another in decisions of Federal and State courts.

The time has come to put aside inhibitions and enact laws that deal with the obscenity problem in realistic language. Representative GRANAHAN and her committee, and delegates to the State VFW convention, deserve active public support in their efforts to stamp out filth in the mails, on the newsstands and anywhere else that it appears.

Laws with teeth—and straightforward definitions—are needed to do an effective job.

Hold the Line on Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, probably never before have any labor-management negotiations been followed with as much interest and apprehension on the part of the general public as in the current steel crisis. Americans everywhere have come to realize that another round of wage-price increases only means they must run that much faster in their relentless race with the cost of living.

The July 13 issue of Life magazine contains an editorial which, I think, merits careful reflection. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial, which follows:

HOLD THE LINE ON STEEL

Our Nation this week faces a showdown on a domestic issue of crucial importance to the battle against inflation. The showdown is in steel. The issue is whether the vicious spiral of wage-and-price inflation is to be checked or whether a new wave is to be set in action.

The United Steelworkers Union, which deferred a strike for 2 weeks at the President's request, seems nevertheless determined to strike unless the industry makes some wage concessions. Industry spokesmen say they are equally as determined to resist any increase in their costs. Furthermore, they say no wage increase can be made without a further price increase.

As we see it, there are four possible outcomes to this struggle in steel:

A small wage increase without a rise in prices. Such a raise, if held within the limits of productivity gains, would not be inflationary.

A wage increase with a price increase. This would be inflationary and would set off a shock wave of price rises, all over the economy, with further shrinking of the dollar's value.

A cut in steel prices to justify holding the wage line entirely. We have urged this in the past. We still think it would be a mark of statesmanship and would win wide public support to the industry's position. The British industry has just cut prices 2 percent. The U.S. industry is complaining loudly about the inroads of foreign competition. Why not meet it with more competition? The industry, however, seems determined not to cut prices.

No wage increase and no price increase either. The union says it won't stand for the first.

Of these four possibilities the likeliest, unfortunately, is a wage raise larger than is justified, accompanied by another hike in prices. This would repeat the dreary pattern of big business-big labor collusion which has already contributed so much to inflation. The most likely outcome of a strike, if past patterns are repeated, is the sham of a vacation at the consumers' expense—a quick strike, with a quick yielding of a raise, with a quick sequence of jacked-up prices to keep the profit level rising.

A steel strike could even have a medicinal effect on the economy if the industry really were determined to hold both the price and wage line. Despite current wildcat strikes by a few, most steelworkers do not have their hearts in this battle, since poll after poll has shown their main concern is a stable income rather than higher houly rates; they too have grown fed up with illusory raises which are canceled out by price rises. The time is indeed ripe for some important changes in union philosophy, away from wage battles whose gains are self-defeating and toward stabler production and employment.

Of the possible solutions we have outlined, the least harmful of the more feasible ones would be a small raise without a price rise. Great technological advances and new processes in the industry have been yielding rapid gains in productivity. U.S. Steel's profits, which have risen from $3 a share to an estimated more than $7 since 1953, indicate there is room to pass on some of these productivity gains, if not to the consumer, then to labor, without price increases. Since other industries have already raised wages slightly for 1959, the steelworkers can scarcely be expected to settle for nothing. But the big need is for both the industry and the union to consider the public interest as well as their selfish ones. For as steel goes, so goes inflation—and inflation has got to be checked. Let the steel companies and the unions know how you feel. After all, it's your dollar—your pension, savings, insurance and the security of your old age—which are at stake.

Tax Recommendation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Sylvia Porter, published in the New York Post. In the article Miss Porter discusses the merits and the beneficial results of the Keogh-Jenkins bill. I hope this measure will be brought up for consideration at this session of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX BREAK FOR MILLIONS

(By Sylvia F. Porter)

Tucked into six short paragraphs of the British Government's revolutionary 1956-57 budget is a provision of deepest bread-and-butter importance to all of our Nation's self-employed—small businessmen and professionals, shopkeepers and farmers, accountants and artists.

If you are among the 11 million Americans in this category, send a mental "thank you" to Britain—and read on.

For Britain has become the first major nation in the world to accept the principle that under today's tax laws, a corporation employee covered by a pension plan gets a great tax break not available to the self-employed wanting to build his own retirement program. Britain formally has admitted a glaring injustice exists.

And so Britain soon will allow a self-employed person tax exemption on a limited amount of earnings he puts aside every year in a retirement program.

In our country at least 20,000 corporations have pension plans. Probably 20 million employees pay no taxes on funds placed in the pension pools for them; they pay taxes only when they retire and start drawing their pensions.

But the self-employed gets no similar tax-exemption. Earnings he puts aside in a retirement plan are taxed at today's high rates. The discrimination is clear, undeniable.

For almost 10 years a group of dedicated citizens has been fighting for a law which would establish some tax equality between the self-employed and the corporation executive or employee covered by a pension plan.

Bill after bill has been introduced into Congress with the sponsorship of both Republicans and Democrats—only to be killed because of protests that the move would cost the Treasury too much in revenue.

Right now, there are bills in the House sponsored by New York Democrat KEOGH and Ohio Republican Jenkins which, in brief, would permit a self-employed person to get a tax deduction on an annual contribution to an approved pension plan up to 10 percent of his earned income or $5,000; raise the limit a bit for taxpayers over the age of 55; hold the maximum deduction during a lifetime to $100,000; tax the funds only when the individual starts drawing on the pension at the age of 65.

In his 1952 campaign, President Eisenhower stated flatly that the self-employed had been forgotten in legislation giving tax-exemption to pension plans for corporation employees and he added:

"I think something ought to be done to help these people help themselves by allowing a reasonable tax deduction for money put aside by them for their own savings. * * * If I am elected I will favor legislation along these lines."

During congressional hearings on the Keogh-Jenkins bills last June, Treasury Secretary Humphrey said he would be sympathetic to the proposal when general tax relief is possible.

If, when Humphrey announces the revised budget estimates around May 21, he reveals a substantial budget surplus, a tax-cutting drive will get underway in earnest and, said KEOGH when I interviewed him on this, "the latest official estimates by Congress' own tax experts indicate the annual cost would be only $320 million a year. It is more likely the cost would be only $100 million a year because not everybody eligible to take advantage of the law will start putting money in a retirement fund."

KEOGH is confident that if the bill reaches the floor it will pass. He has over 150 written promises of support and many more verbal assurances. "My firm conviction," he told me, "is that sooner or later—and much better sooner—such legislation will be enacted."

Britain's pioneering move is bound to stimulate action here. When what she has done becomes known in our land, it is certain to rally new support for the legislation.

Now if you—the millions to whom this would mean so much—will wake up and speak up, the moment for translation of theoretical justice into actual justice could be directly ahead.

Legislate for Safer Cars?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 29, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. Robert Ingalls, published in the Corvallis, Oreg., Gazette-Times:

LEGISLATE FOR SAFER CARS?

Beginning July 7, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Health and Safety Subcommittee is slated to hold hearings on a bill designed to force the auto industry to build safer cars. It would require the Secretary of Commerce to determine what safety measures should be built into cars purchased by the Federal Government and, since the Government buys so many cars, it is believed the bill would prompt manufacturers to put the prescribed safety devices on all their cars.

It was hoped by committee members that the auto manufacturers would place more emphasis on safety in designing cars without Federal prodding, but so far little has happened in this regard so the Congressmen think they should step in.

Although the bill leaves it up to the Secretary of Commerce to decide just what safety features should be included, here are some of the devices which are considered by many people to be desirable:

1. Safety belt attachments: It would be relatively easy to put on belt attachments at the factory. As it is, the absence of such attachments necessitates considerable labor in putting bolts through the floor of the car.

2. Deep dish steering wheel: This is a wheel standing out from the steering column. In a collision, the wheel is designed to bend and yet keep the driver from being speared by the steering column.

3. Roll-over bars: Bars atop the roof designed to keep it from collapsing if the car rolls over.

4. Crash paneling: Soft materials on dashboards and other places passengers are likely to hit in case of a collision.

5. Better packaging: This involves the science of placing passengers in the car so as to afford them maximum protection from injury. Suggestions made by various experts include making seats with neck supports to prevent whiplash and placing instruments so they cannot puncture the passengers.

The automobile industry as a whole will oppose the bill under consideration. They contend that the industry is doing all it can to develop safer cars. They claim that not enough is yet known about accidents to warrant dictating what type of safety equipment is best.

It is difficult to guess how the bill will come out in the Congress. If the American Medical Association gets into the act, it will certainly aid its favorable chances because much testimony in prehearings has been given by medical experts who unanimously blame the construction of the automobile itself for many injuries which could be avoided.

While none of the devices suggested may be a panacea for accident prevention because too much depends on the driver, the roads and such other factors, it seems to us the safety devices suggested by the Congress are at least worth a try, and they shouldn't add too much to the cost of the car.

Walters: He Sells America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, each year since the days of World War II, Walter M. Walters, of Coral Gables, Fla., head of the Miami Reception Center of the U.S. Department of State, has been constantly at hand with his friendly smile and amiable personality to welcome visitors from foreign nations the world over.

His job—one of the Nation's most important: sell America.

Specifically he had to greet, arrange transportation and living accommodations, entertain, and generally assist visiting dignitaries and citizens from other countries with many complex matters. In addition to his own salary and small staff, the Government surprisingly furnished only about $100 a year in entertainment funds. To many, the job would be impossible—to Walter Walters, a job cheerfully accomplished.

He has so many friends, he is so well-liked and so effective, he was able to mobilize community support and effort to assist him and the United States.

Now, June 30, 1959, after 16 years service, Walter Walters has retired. He takes with him into retirement the best wishes for happiness and good health from thousands of friends. To Americans he leaves a heritage of accomplishment and encouragement.

The appreciation of our community is expressed in the following editorials from the Miami News and the Miami Herald:

[From the Miami News, June 30, 1958]

WALTERS: HE SELLS AMERICA

Today is Walter M. Walters' last day in a very important public relations job.

His product is America, Miami brand; his approach is a soft-sell invitation to take a look at the product. And in the past few months his customers have included some Buddha monks from Burma, a professor from the University of Salonika in Greece and the governor-general of Casablanca, Morocco.

Walters is head of the Miami Reception Center of the U.S. Department of State. He retires from Government service today.

For 16 years he has been the U.S. official host in Miami to foreign visitors—diplomats, ambassadors, exchange students, teachers and journalists. He averages 2,800 visitors a year, and he frequently greets them at the airport (sometimes before dawn), finds a place for them to stay, introduces them to their professional counterparts in Miami and arranges for them to see whatever interests them most.

As host, he wants them to be happy with America and to remember her with kind words when they return home.

Officially, he heads a staff of four, and unofficially his staff numbers approximately 60, because many of Walters' friends and Dade public officials open their homes and hours to these foreign visitors.

Walters, who speaks Spanish, French, German, and Portuguese in addition to English, was born in Manhattan, earned a bachelor of arts degree at William College and was a first lieutenant in the Army in World War I.

Educational and military demands out of the way, he decided to fulfill a childhood ambition—to go to Spain. He was working for an American banking firm; requested and got a transfer to Barcelona. His second year there, he and a Spaniard opened their own banking business. It thrived for 17 years, until the Spanish civil war prompted Walters to return home.

Back in New York, he took some postgraduate courses at New York University and Columbia and for a while ran a placement bureau for art history teachers and museum directors.

It was a job offer as cultural relations officer with the State Department in Miami that brought him here in April 1943. He was promoted to his present position in 1946.

Walters, who is tall, thin, affable, and punctual, lives with his wife and four children in Coral Gables. His plans for the future are indefinite, but he does intend to enter private business.

[From the Miami Herald, June 25, 1959]

OUR GREETER AT THE DOOR

The retirement of Walter M. Walters as head of the Miami office of the State Department removes a warm and colorful figure from the local official scene.

Miami's position as Latin American gateway contributed to the importance of Mr. Walter's mission. He was often the first official to greet visiting dignitaries on U.S. soil.

Suave, gracious and a skilled linguist, Mr. Walters eased the way for many a traveler from ordinary citizen to those of highest rank. He was, to draw a parallel, the Grover Whalen of this hemispheric crossroad.

Mr. Walter plans to enter business here and so has a new career ahead. But in the role which he filled so well for the past 16 years he will be sorely missed.

Marketing Data From New Censuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the important and interesting work of the Bureau of the Census was ably described in a recent speech by A. Ross Eckler, Deputy Director of the Bureau, to the American Marketing Association. I include excerpts from his talk, as follows:

MARKETING DATA FROM THE NEW CENSUSES

In the course of a decade, about two-thirds of the resources of the Census Bureau are devoted to taking the major censuses, as prescribed each 5 or 10 years. The remaining one-third is used for carrying out the Bureau's program of annual, quarterly, and monthly reports in various fields, including foreign trade and shipping. The percentage required for the censuses varies widely from year to year. In the current fiscal year, the percentage is close to its 10-year average, but next year it will be above 90. The very high percentage during the 1960 fiscal year reflects the fact that we will be at that phase of our 10-year cycle when active work is taking place on almost all our major censuses.

We are now completing the tabulation and publication of our 1957 Census of Governments, we are in the active collection phase of our 1958 series of censuses, covering business, manufacturers, and mining, and we are in the final stages of preparation for the decennial series including population, housing, and agriculture.

A gratifying corollary of this concentration of effort is that we are approaching the period in our 10-year cycle when the supply of statistics from major censuses is most nearly current and, therefore, most useful for marketing research and related activities. The results of the Censuses of Business and Manufactures will still be comparatively current when the figures from population, agriculture, and housing begin to appear in 1960. I do not mean to imply, of course, that

census figures more than 2 or 3 years old are no longer useful for many marketing purposes, but I think we all would agree that the dynamic changes in population and in business structure in many areas are great enough to place a premium upon up-to-date information.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF CURRENT SERIES OF CENSUSES

* * * * *

I should like first of all to tell you something about the general characteristics of our recent and current program of censuses. These elements, involving emphasis upon timeliness, quality, economy, and reduction of burden on the public, will be of interest to many of you here either because you use our statistics or because your companies have been called upon to supply data for censuses and surveys.

We expect to make important breakthroughs in speeding up census reports. Modern electronic equipment, which has been especially designed for our requirements, is the basis for much of our optimism. In addition, our expanded use of sampling contributes effectively to improvement in the timing of our current and 1960 census reports. We hope to realize the full benefits of the new equipment and programs in our series of censuses for 1958. It is our objective to issue during the present calendar year advance reports on these censuses which will furnish many of the statistics by industry and locality which are most used by marketers.

* * * * *

We believe that our current series of censuses will, in all cases, be better than their predecessors. One feature which we believe contributes to improvement is the extension of the principle of giving business officials, farmers, and individual householders a chance to fill out their own questionnaires, consulting as needed available records, other employees, and other household members. We continue direct enumeration by interviewers or office assistants, when required or appropriate. The advance mailing of questionnaires to each household is one of the important new features of the 1960 Census of Population and Housing. We have learned that the public can be counted upon for very high degree of cooperation.

* * * * *

Another feature contributing to improvement in quality of the new series of censuses is the broadening use of quality control methods in all phases of census taking, including enumeration as well as processing.

* * * * *

A third factor contributing to higher quality is the use of electronic equipment for more detailed editing of returns, particularly those for business establishments.

* * * * *

Improvements of timing and quality usually involve increased costs but this is definitely not true of our present series of censuses. For example, changes which we introduced in the taking of our 1954 Business Census made it possible for us to save one-third the cost of the previous Census of Business with allowances for price changes over the period 1948–54. In our 1960 series of censuses, we found that major opportunities for savings were provided by the wider use of sampling, by the use of modern electronic equipment, and by the more extensive application of production standards in our clerical operations. The savings from these three features are substantial enough to account for a cost reduction of over 10 percent in comparison with what it would cost to collect and publish the same items as in 1950, allowing for increase in the number of people to be enumerated, higher rates of pay, and increases in other costs.

* * * * *

THE CENSUSES FROM 1957 TO 1960

We now turn to consideration of some of the individual features of the new censuses. * * * These are presented in chronological order and thus reflect approximately the order in which the various results will become available.

The 1957 Census of Governments

Those of you who know that State and local governments account for the employment of 6 million persons and for the expenditure of $50 billion per year realize the importance of these governments as providers of personal income and as purchasers for many classes of goods. The detailed information from the governments census on employment and payrolls, on revenues and expenditures by type, and on capital outlays and indebtedness is the only comprehensive source of facts on a uniform basis on the size and characteristics of this important segment of our economy.

A majority of the reports of the 1957 Census of Governments have already been issued and the remainder will become available in the next several months. One major feature of the 1957 Census of Governments was a special survey to determine the relationship between the sales value of property and its assessed value. The results of this study furnish a measure of inter-area differences in property tax burdens as well as of the value of various classes of property (residential, agricultural, commercial, and industrial) shown on local assessment rolls.

The 1958 Censuses of Retail and Wholesale Trade, and of the Service Trades

These censuses, often described under the general heading of "Census of Business," constitute our most comprehensive source of information on the Nation's systems for the distribution of goods and services. These censuses as well as the 1958 Census of Manufacturers and Mineral Industries are now well along in the collection phase, with about 90 percent of the returns already received at our headquarters office.

The first data from these censuses and the figures which are the most important for business use, are the total sales and receipts for States, counties, and cities which will be shown in our preliminary area reports the latter part of this year. These figures represent our most comprehensive measure of the flow of consumer funds to various kind-of-business groups and to various areas.

* * * * *

A new feature of the 1958 census will be the publication of statistics for major business centers located outside the central business districts (the latter were first used in the 1954 census and will be continued for 1958). The statistics for the outlying business centers are planned for inclusion in the appropriate central business district bulletins, scheduled for issuance during the last half of 1960.

Another feature of the 1958 Census of Business will be the presentation of more data for towns and townships. We plan to include in our preliminary and final area bulletins statistics for New England towns with 2,500 or more urban population and statistics for New Jersey and Pennsylvania towns and townships with 10,000 or more inhabitants.

* * * * *

The 1958 Censuses of Manufactures and Mineral Industries

In the last 2 months of this year we expect to issue a series of preliminary summary reports on manufacturing to include (a) general statistics such as employment, payrolls, man-hours, value added by manufacture, cost of materials, value of shipments, and capital expenditures for all important individual industries and for industry groups; (b) general statistics for each State by two-digit major industrial groups; (c) general statistics for the 60 largest standard metropolitan areas by major industry group; and (d) general statistics for the total of manufacturing for most counties.

One of the most important classes of information to become available from the census of manufacturers, and certainly the most important for industrial marketers, will be the advance series of releases for some 300 of the most important manufacturing industries, which will be issued late in 1959 and in the early months of 1960, about 10 months on the average earlier than the corresponding reports for the 1954 census. In these preliminary reports, we will have a product table for the primary products of the industry. The industrial classification in all preliminary reports will be in terms of the unrevised standard industrial classification codes.

In the summer of 1960, approximately 85 industrial bulletins will be issued as they become available, at dates averaging about 9 months ahead of those for the last census. These bulletins will contain data for all manufacturing industries, based on the new standard industrial classification, but it will include transition tables to tie together the results under the old and new systems. The 1958 census reports will provide the first 1958 production statistics to be published on the basis of the new classification. Since our statistics will be available on both bases, companies which have classified their customer lists and other records either way will be able to compare their statistics with our industry totals.

The subject matter content of the new series of bulletins will include several types of information not collected in the 1954 census or collected in less detail. The first of these is the data on distribution of sales by class of customer for groups of products. The second is the supplementary data collected for 1957 as part of our 1958 census program, including supplements to wages and salaries, maintenance and repair expenditures, value of fixed assets and depreciation accounts, and selected additional expense items, such as insurance and taxes. Third, there will be an expanded coverage of materials consumed. In this connection, especially noteworthy is the addition of an inquiry on the consumption of containers and packaging supplies in those industries where such materials represent an important element of cost.

The program of preliminary reports and final industry bulletins for the census of mineral industries is similar to that for manufacturers. In the case of both censuses, the 51 area bulletins (one for each State, including Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia) will be issued from July through September 1960, about 12 months earlier than for 1954. The area data in these reports will give a great deal of information useful for evaluating regional shifts of particular industries, and the kinds of markets offered by different States for various types of industrial goods and raw materials.

Approximately 12 subject bulletins will be issued in the late summer of 1960. For the most part, these will represent an assembly of selected materials from the industry and area bulletins on such subjects as inventories, capital expenditures, size establishments, and so forth.

* * * * *

The 1959 Census of Agriculture

We believe that the results of the census of agriculture will once again be a mine of information for at least three important classes of business organizations: (1) those marketing specialized products for farm use, such as feed, fertilizer, farm equipment, etc.; (2) those firms for which the farm

market is an important part of the total market for consumer goods; and (3) manufacturers and other organizations which obtain some or all of their raw materials from farms.

Those of you who are interested in the agricultural market will find in the results of the census of agriculture a number of important measures of the size of the farm market by counties. One such measure is the number of farms classified by size and gross income. Another measure is the quantity of production resources on farms and a classification of farms by those resources. For example, a classification of farms by the acreage of particular crops or by the number of different kinds of livestock can be very important in suggesting the market for specialized farm equipment and supplies. A third measure of the size of the farm market in each county will be the figures on gross income by source. The reports of the census of agriculture will furnish other important county data for marketers, such as measures of expenditures for petroleum products, fertilizer, lime, seed, etc., and the kinds of equipment on farms. Most of the data chiefly used by marketers will be available in the county reports for the 1959 Census of Agriculture, which will be published during the calendar year 1960.

The 1960 Census of Population

The Census of Population, to be taken as of April 1, 1960, is the largest of our censuses in terms of the number of reporting units, size of staff required, and publication pages. The results of the Population Census are probably more widely used by business and Government than those of any of the other censuses. This is not surprising, since this census is the only source of much highly detailed information on the number and distribution of the population, extensively classified by social and economic characteristics. Many of the statistics are widely used in sales forecasting, analysis of market potentials, analysis of distribution, layouts of sales territories, location of plants and business outlets, and the determination of samples for research studies.

The 1960 Population Census will include a total of about 25 inquiries, two-thirds of which pertain to what might be called social characteristics and the remainder to economic characteristics, such as work status, occupation, industry and income. Most of the questions will be asked of only one household of four.

The 1960 census will include more new features than any population census in recent history, but many of the innovations are methodological and hence of limited interest to most users of statistics. It is particularly pertinent to note that, thanks to the greater use of sampling and of modern electronic equipment including some especially designed for our own needs, the speed-up of population reports will be especially great. We expect an improvement of more than a year in the publication time of the final population count for each local area. It may be possible to achieve somewhat greater gains in the timing of statistics on age, sex, race, marital status, and other parts of the census.

One of the major extensions of the 1960 Population Census program is the increase in the amount to be published for small areas, census tracts within cities, small urban places, other minor civil divisions, and counties. The number of census tracts has almost doubled over the past 10 years, rising from about 12,000 to about 22,000. Tracts will have been set up for almost every city over 50,000 and for nearly every standard metropolitan area over 100,000. It may be of particular interest to members of this association that we shall provide for counties information on the distribution of individual income as well as on the distribution by family income.

Many of you may be interested in the fact that we are including for the first time a question on place of work and means of transportation to work for persons who were at work at the time of the census. There will be provided a count of intercounty commuters together with data on the means of transportation to work.

Many of you will welcome our plans for a larger amount of family statistics from this census. We recognize that many of the goods sold by business organizations are marketed in terms of families rather than of individuals, and hence information on the characteristics of families is very useful as an indication of market potentials for such goods.

The 1960 Census of Housing

The 1960 Census of Housing will include about 35 inquiries concerning the basic characteristics of the housing unit, the plumbing and water supply, and kinds of equipment and facilities associated with the unit.

The 1960 Census of Housing will include a number of equipment items which are important for evaluation of changes in living standards as well as for analysis of market potentials. Among the new topics to be covered are home food freezers, clothes washing machines, clothes dryers, air-conditioning units, water heating fuel, and number of passenger automobiles available for regular use Other new items of considerable marketing interest are number of bathrooms, source of water supply, and method of sewage disposal, the latter two inquiries being omitted in places of over 50,000.

Another new feature in 1960 will be information on the duration of occupancy of the present housing unit. Information will be provided on the characteristics of housing involved in recent changes in occupancy, thereby making it possible to identify areas of stable occupancy and those in which there is a high turnover.

We shall again include questions on radio and television, identifying in each case the number of housing units with more than one set.

One feature of the 1960 Census of Housing represents essentially a continuation of the 1956 National Housing Inventory, which provided information on types of change in the housing inventory and on the financing of residential properties. We will collect for 17 large metropolitan areas, as well as for the United States subdivided by regions, information on units changed by conversion and merger, units added by new construction or in other ways, and units lost through demolition, fire, or other means.

* * * * *

SUMMARY

I believe that the results of the current series of censuses will prove to be the most valuable ever issued, not only because of their new features, but also because of our emphasis on quality, and on timeliness of publication. We are confident that they will make a real contribution to helping business maintain the pace of economic recovery from the recession levels of last year.

Speech by Lt. Gen. J. L. Huang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

SPEECH BY LT. GEN. J. L. HUANG

Mr. Fisher, honorable Members of the U.S. Congress, and my distinguished friends, I am deeply honored by this luncheon and feel this honor is not for me as an individual, but rather a tribute to my government and my people, and especially to the valiant defenders of Quemoy and Matsu. May I convey to you on behalf of Free China—our heartfelt thanks for your moral and material support.

During the past 12 years I have been connected with the Combined Service Forces, serving for the last 5 years as the commander in chief. One of the vital activities of this Chinese logistic service was the receiving and dispatching of U.S. military aid materials on their arrival at Taiwan. I am proud to report to you and, through you, to your worthy constituents, that every dollar of your taxpayers' money has been carefully handled and effectively spent by my government. The Receiving of the Aid Material Department (RAMD) under the Combined Service Forces, has dispersed literally millions of tons of military cargo and unloaded more than 3,000 shipments during the last 8 years. There is not a single instance of penalty for overtime demurrages.

The recently retired commander of the Military Sea Transportation Service, Adm. John M. Will, in commenting on the speed and efficiency with which military cargo was dispatched, said: "Your record for handling military cargo is remarkable. You have saved the U.S. Government a lot of money. Incidentally, you have also earned for your country that much more aid."

You know how grateful the Chinese are to your people—and we want to translate this gratitude in terms of the careful handling of your aid program.

And now I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to outline our thinking of these other vital problems of the day—which affect us all.

Firstely, your firm stand on Berlin in face of Soviet threats has won profound respect and endless admiration from the freedom loving peoples all over the world. Your Secretary of State, Mr. Herter, stated the Kremlin rules should realize the depth of the Berlin commitment on the part of the West. He hoped they would refrain from putting to trial, by force, the present right and obligations of the western powers to preserve the freedom of the people of West Berlin. From this statement it appears that it can be taken for granted that the United Staes is not going to be threatened, cajoled or pushed out of Berlin.

Now let us turn to Tibet. The Chinese Communists took over Tibet in 1950. From the beginning of the Red occupation, many Tibetans have resisted courageously. When they resisted, the Communists bombed and burned their monasteries, killed their abbots and priests, and turned their tommyguns on statues of Buddha, an act of blasphemy deeply resented by the Tibetans. They marched in more and more troops. They built airfields for their bombers; and they moved in tens of thousands of Chinese as colonizers. Many children were carried away to the China mainland to be trained as Communists. All of this cruelty and ruthlessness aroused the Tibetan guerrillas. And recently, when the Tibetans thought their Dalai Lama, their God-king was in danger, it even sparked a battle within the capital city of Lhasa itself.

Does not this ruthless, calculated aggression recall the Hungarian crisis? The people who rose against their oppressors in Hungary fought for freedom. So did the Tibetans. Great casualties resulted in suppressing Hungarian freedom-fighters. The same was true in Tibet. In Hungary, however, the

free world did not intervene. In Tibet, it appears next to impossible for military aid to reach the Tibetans. The outcome for both peoples is disastrous.

Of course, there is still some hope for Tibet. The neutralists of Asia are beginning to be aware of and are openly criticizing Peiping for breaking its pledge of autonomy to the Tibetans. Public opinion and the press have been vocal in protest all over Asia. Moreover, all through Asia, Buddhists are united in condemning the Chinese Communists for the suppression of their freedom of religion.

Now, lastly, here is a problem which I think affects all of us—but which is of especial interest to me as a citizen of free China, that is Quemoy. Let us review the Quemoy situation, and consider its implications. In October, 1949, 17,000 Reds attempted an outright invasion with motorboats, junks and bamboo rafts. The Nationalist defenders of the island fought them off as quickly as they could land, either killing them on the beaches or taking them prisoners. None escaped and none returned.

Again, in September 1954, tension gripped the Taiwan Straits. By this time, the High Command of the U.S. Army, Navy and Air Force, who had visited Quemoy and Matsu, realized the extreme importance of defending the offshore islands, both from a military and psychological point of view. But as we are all aware, their views were not universally shared. There was even talk that the island of Quemoy and Matsu were unimportant.

With strong persuasion from the U.S. Government, we reluctantly agreed, in 1955, to make a strategic retreat of Tachen and Nanchi Islands. Implicit in all these was the belief that this was the last concession, and was the end of giving in to the threats of the Communists. Were the Communists satisfied then? Did this stop further aggression? Of course not. The aggressive grabbing of the Communists can never be satisfied and our retreats fanned the flame of aggression, rather than banked it.

Suddenly without warning, on the 23d of August, 1958, the Chinese Reds let loose their big guns in a savage bombardment. That first day, 50,000 shells were lobbed from the mainland into Quemoy. Within 6 weeks, a total of half a million shells had pounded the four islands in the Quemoy group. There was no question at any time as to the courage and morale of the Nationalist defenders. Our greatest problem was to supply and to resupply the offshore islands. The 7th Fleet was said to have the biggest striking power of the U.S. Navy. They convoyed the Chinese supply ships to the internationally recognized territorial waters. From there, the Chinese supply ships had to go it alone. Many heroic sacrifices were made. Yet, in barely 2 months, the Chinese soldiers learned new landing tactics and broke the Communist blockade.

From this we can perhaps draw a conclusion. Appeasement never bought peace anywhere, anytime. In Berlin, you do not intend to give in, you do not intend to sacrifice the freedom of the people of West Berlin to buy off the Russians. We feel the same way about our offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. You understood the problems of Hungary. Your hearts ached when the free world found no way to help the freedom fighters resist the Russian tanks. We feel the same way about Tibet.

Therefore, we must remember that Berlin, Tibet, and Quemoy are all one problem. The free world cannot afford to concede another inch to the threat and bluff of the Communist aggression. We must not sacrifice the freedom of other people, as it is not the way to save our own.

In closing, I want to reiterate how grateful we are—and we want to translate this gratitude in terms of the careful processing of your aid program. And, although I do not presume to fully comprehend all the ramifications of your appropriations program, as a recipient of aid—and with the understanding of the tremendous importance throughout the rest of the world, we respectfully urge that you consider most carefully the appropriations program now before you and the attendant difficulties which might ensue.

Thank you so much.

As Talks Resume at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following appraisal by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

WEST RESUMES EFFORTS FOR PEACE AT ANY PRICE

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Once more Western representatives are back at Geneva negotiating Soviet demands for their own eventual evacuation of West Berlin. Presumably the talks will resume on the basis of one-sided Western concessions first arranged by Macmillan and Khrushchev during the Briton's visit to Moscow and then somewhat grudgingly accepted by our Secretary of State, Christian Herter, against the advice of de Gaulle and Adenauer.

Once more the West has resumed a diplomatic poker game in which we have nothing to win except a reprieve and the Soviets have nothing to lose.

Surely, the citizens of the free countries insofar as they have not been panicked by Soviet war threats, are justified in asking why.

The coziest answer, particularly from Britons, is that the Western position in West Berlin cannot be defended without war and that nobody has any interest in dying for Germany.

This is true but shortsighted. For if West Berlin cannot be defended without war, neither can London, Paris or Washington. Failure to stand at West Berlin will make ultimate war more likely as surely as Britain and France's surrender to Hitler at Munich brought on World War II.

OTHER REASONS

British statesmen, however, have other reasons for the present resumption of negotiations at Geneva. Prime Minister Macmillan hopes to reduce the questions in dispute to manageable compass and settle them at a future summit meeting.

Actually, the only question in dispute at Berlin is how far the West will yield to Khrushchev's threats. There is absolutely no chance—repeat, no chance—of reaching any agreement on the vast problems raised by Soviet imperialism, such as the reunification of a truly free Germany, the liberation of the satellites, etc. To imply that there is is either to deceive oneself or others.

Britain's Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd gives another reason for resuming talks. He believes that it is possible to reach an agreement on West Berlin. This belief is vociferously seconded by such British Labor Party leaders as Hugh Gaitskell and Nye Bevan. Bevan can no longer see "any substantial differences" between the two sides regarding a "provisional agreement" on Berlin, something that Gaitskell calls a "modest understanding" which will "lead to a summit conference without delay."

To which the rejoinder is that if Gaitskell and Bevan can no longer see substantial differences between the side that has a right to stay in West Berlin as long as it pleases and the side that wishes to throw the West out, then indeed the West must secretly have gone very far toward surrender.

The argument in favor of a "temporary agreement" has been further illuminated by Chalmers Roberts of the Washington Post. Studying a recent Soviet statement, he found that Russia had agreed to tolerate (how generous) a "temporary stay" of Western military garrisons in Berlin and a "temporary maintenance of communications with West Berlin as they now exist" in order to permit a coming "all-German committee to discuss the German question."

Aside from the fact that there is literally no chance of all-German negotiations reaching anything but a stalemate or a fight, one simply fails to understand what the West has to gain by transforming today's unlimited de facto rights in West Berlin into any sort of a "temporary status."

Yet Roberts suggests an answer: Having been maneuvered by the Soviets into accepting negotiations over Berlin on Soviet terms, the U.S. administration does not know how to break them off. Nor is it certain that the President desires to break them off so long as there is anybody opposite to talk to. In his recent press conference, he outlined his view.

"We are ready to talk and discuss anything because we certainly do want to find some way of reaching a solution that will not keep the whole world on edge * * * We must do it * * * if we are going to do a real service for the citizens of the world."

ASTONISHING SOLUTION

The President's motive is, as always, commendable. He would presumably be astonished if somebody were to insist that the best method of getting the world off the edge would be to accept a political showdown with the Kremlin and compel it to back down.

But Khrushchev and his traveling stooge, Frol Kozlov, have repeated their threats of war unless they have their way over Berlin. If these threats succeed, they will doubtless be periodically repeated until the West, including Uncle Sam, is stripped naked.

In consequence, our diplomats are back in Geneva engaged in what a bolder generation of Englishmen would have dubbed a "mug's game."

All because British conservatives need an election boost, because the U.S. Administration stubbornly insists on trying to call off the cold war instead of winning it and because the Western peoples are being slowly conditioned to desire peace at almost any price.

The Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include, from

the July issue of The American Mercury, an article entitled "The Summit." The author of this article, which is the first of a series, is Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, U.S. Army—retired. General Willoughby was closely associated with General of the Army Douglas MacArthur from 1939 until 1951.

THE SUMMIT

(By Gen. Charles A. Willoughby)

PART I: A DEMILITARIZED MID-EUROPEAN BUFFER ZONE

Khrushchev's drive for a summit meeting has succeeded, with Macmillan acting as the honest broker. Russian declarations, however, show no palpable concessions—indeed, they were more conciliatory in 1952.

The intrinsic value of summit meetings can be ascertained by simple, historical recollections. In the last 25 years, the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Communists, including Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom, and Geneva. The negotiators spoke 106 million words (about 700 volumes in print). These talkfests led to 52 major agreements—and Soviet Russia has broken 50 of them. It is almost boring to quote Lenin: "Promises are like piecrusts—made to be broken."

The Communist philosophy of diplomatic negotiations was stated in 1931 by Dmitri Manuilski who, at one time, presided over the U.N. Security Council—telltale index of the quality of that overrated body. Manuilski's time table is interesting: "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, we are not strong enough. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years (i.e., in 1951 or in 1961). The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we will launch the most spectacular peace movement on record. The capitalists, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends." We suppose this coldblooded forecast has escaped men like Cyrus Eaton and his Pugwash coterie of tax-exempt brainwashers.

The Russians precipitated the Berlin crisis for well-known, well-defined objectives in the framework of their ruthless but brilliant strategy; conversely, a study of cause and effect will place responsibility for a critical situation almost entirely on the West: (1) Panicky demobilization in 1945 while Russia armed to the teeth; (2) fatuous reliance on a supposedly exclusive deterrent; (3) failure of Western Europe to maintain even peacetime armaments; (4) silence of NATO commanders on a visibly weakening shield.

Against this background of military fumbling, the Russians seek to retain the loot acquired with the help of Hitler, plus the loot handed over to them at Yalta and Potsdam. They want acceptance of the status quo at the highest level—the summit. Behind this acquiescence, the Russians anticipate even more important gains: the resulting collapse of resistance by captive millions whose only hope has been the West.

The smiling farce of hobnobbing with the Kremlin as at Geneva, reverberates from Warsaw to Sinkiang, England, which precipitated World War II over the Polish corridor (loot of Versailles), acquiesced in the Russian seizure of eastern Poland. Russia, in turn, assuaged the Poles by throwing them the consolation of East Germany from the Oder-Neisse line.

The Czechs went unchallenged in the brutal expulsion of 3 million Sudeten Germans in 1948 and the confiscation of every stick and stone of Sudeten properties. Poles and Czechs are proposed as members of the meetings. The division of Germany (and of Korea) is expected to be legalized and become permanent.

The summit is expected to devise some sort of face-saving formula. Fantastic as the cynical conditions of the Kremlin appear, there is plenty of support for them by the habitual appeasers in New York, Washington, London, and even in Bonn; viz: Germany: Carlo Schmidt, Debates in the Bundestag; "Disengagement"; England: Denis Healey, Labor Party, "European Neutral Belt"; United States: Professor Brecht in American Political Science Review, "Cordon Sanitaire."

There were other proposals by the Belgian Van Zeeland, the British Eden and Liddell Hart, the American Kennan, the Hungarian refugee Auer, and others. Their proposals are variations of the same theme—the formation of a mid-European buffer zone, a neutralized central Europe. Macmillan has carried this scheme (among other proposals) to Washington. These proposals are based on the naive theory that current international tensions can be relaxed by reciprocal disarmament (disengagement) along a mid-European corridor of buffer zone. The fallacy lies in ignoring the fact that these tensions have been largely generated by the Russians, themselves.

These proposals, dating back to the 1950's, are a repetition of the cordon sanitaire which the ebulient victors of Versailles attempted to build around Bolshevik Russia * * * except that the Russians have developed this time a sort of satellite cordon in reverse.

The Kremlin often picks up gems of Western thought and improves upon them. The Russian variant involves the neutralization of Germany, i.e., Germany's eventual withdrawal from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the perpetuation of a divided Germany (and a divided Korea). We expect some sort of package "deal," along similar lines, in the forthcoming summit deliberations.

Over recent years, there have been four or five proposals for a demilitarized mid-European zone, viz, the Pfleiderer Plan 1952. Map 1; the First Eden Plan 1955. Map 2; the Second Eden Plan 1955. Map 3, the Bulganin Plan 1956. Map 4, the Rapacki Plan 1957. Maps 4 and 5.

At first glance these plans appear deceptively alike, which normally would afford a promising start for diplomatic action. However, there are critical differences—in the "line of departure" or "basis" and in the width of the zone. Eden and Pfleiderer (maps 1 and 2) initially fixed the "basis" along the current provisional Potsdam division between West and East Germany.

Eden and General Heusinger (speaking for Adenauer) then proposed a modified "basis" (map 3), the prewar German-Polish border, on the assumption that the eventual reunification of Germany would be within the old German borders. Somehow the "Oder-Neisse line" crept into this scheme and raised a specter that has haunted the West ever since—and may become the single, crucial issue of the summit meeting. That line spells the occupation and retention, under Polish control, of a substantial area of East Germany, territory in German hands for centuries.

The width of the proposed zones became a factor of immediate tactical significance; it varied from 150 to 300 miles initially, which was a concession to conventional, obsolescent infantry but rather pointless with jet-propelled aviation or midrange ballistic missiles. Then Bulganin came up with something rather startling. He enlarged the disengagement zone to 1,000 miles.

The buffer zone proposals were initially intramural and intergovernmental, but they were tossed around violently by the tides of public opinion. The fellow-traveling scientists moved in to flash the specter of nuclear fallout, carefully masking the fact that Russia was exploding the dirtiest bombs in the world. It was inescapable that the West would come to grips with the problem since they are directly under the Russian guns.

More exposed than any other nation, German authorities were quoted: "* * * it is possible that a demilitarized zone in Central Europe will again be presented to the interested powers. Indeed, it has been under study (by Germany) since 1953 * * *." This was a reference to General Heusinger's views.

The German studies were predicted uniformly on the prewar frontiers of a reunited Germany. The zone ran from the North Sea to the Adriatic. It was linked to a favorite theme of Adenauer, the European Defense Community (EDC), a fairly practical inter-European security system. EDC was promptly torpedoed by Mendes-France with the assistance of the solid voting bloc of the French Communist Party. Europe lost valuable years of potential preparedness through that maneuver.

Rapacki, the Polish Foreign Minister (under instructions from Moscow) expanded on Bulganin with a neutralization plan of his own that would pull interior countries from both the Warsaw and NATO Pacts, suggesting vaguely a neutral third force wedged between Russia and the West, atom free and with a progressive thinning out of conventional forces.

PART II: NATO AND A MID-EUROPEAN BUFFER ZONE

We have traced certain proposals for a mid-European buffer zone from Pfleiderer (1952) to Bulganin-Rapacki (1956–57); hence, the Berlin crisis did not precipitate an unknown dilemma. It has been in the making or a long time; it is covered by a phony label, "disengagement"; and it runs through the evasive verbiage of the current Washington conferences.

The tongue-in-cheek quality of the Bulganin proposals would disengage (i.e., demilitarize) all of Germany, the Benelux countries, and almost half of France. It would push (disengage) the present American garrisons in Germany to a line roughly west of Paris (where they are probably not wanted) while leaving the bulk of Russian troops in the eastern half of pre-Stalin Poland with normal Russian border garrisons stationed in the Minsk-Pinsk-Kiev triangle ready to march, with 50 to 60 divisions.

It could be argued that the displaced divisions of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are free to countermarch from new garrisons in Western Europe or wherever ultimate buffer zones are permitted by the Russians. The catch is that we will have to accept abandonment of the enormously costly American installations in Germany—airfields, barracks, depots, and warehouses—that have been built since 1945 at a cost running into billions of dollars.

The real purpose in all Russian proposals—indeed the essence of their calculated foreign policy—is the ultimate retention of their war loot since 1939, the Baltic countries, a mutilated Poland, a divided Germany, and so forth. They demand the acceptance of the status quo. They seek the legalization of the Potsdam territorial crimes (equally chargeable to the Allies) in a form of political genocide that drove millions from their homes and properties, which had been in their possession for centuries. This is the cancer of Europe, from which it has ailed since Versailles (1918), and American intervention in Europe created the conditions for the bacteria to flourish.

Disengagement and demilitarized buffer zones are no remedy. They are a psychological hoax, a military-political sham. They would separate the contending forces by a few hundred miles—a matter of 3 or 4 truck-days for motorized and armored

units, a matter of minutes for midrange ballistic missiles from present Russian and Czech bases (the threat of which urged Macmillan on his road to appeasement), a matter of hours for a thorough raking-over of jet-propelled aircraft. General de Gaulle has commented wryly on schemes of disengagement in the era of intercontinental missiles, that he "would not be satisfied until the Russians disengaged as far eastward as the Urals."

We accept, of course, the fact that retaliatory action is still possible for the West through the highly efficient SAC and that a "balance of nuclear terror" is still within our hands—and will be for some time to come. But what an index of "statesmanship," after expenditures of $50 billion on "mutual security" and an annual budget of around $70 billion! The cynical, hardheaded Russians naturally count on the humanitarian feelings of America to prevent or delay the nuclear destruction of French, British, or German areas, though the Russian satellites in Warsaw, Prague, and Budapest will be equally vulnerable.

While it is too late to cry over spilled milk, as regards the immediacy of the Berlin ultimatum, the weakness of NATO in conventional armies ought to be exposed relentlessly and something done about it, instead of the "one-shot" gamble on nuclear deterrents. We have said before that the balance of nuclear terror must be paralleled by an appropriate balance of conventional forces with special emphasis on the crucial front: Denmark-Switzerland. The weakness of the NATO "shield" is a constant bait for the Russians to get tough. The story is plain to see in a comparison of military performance, over the years, viz:

The weakening shield of NATO

	1928	1950	1956	1959	Remarks
Benelux	18	3	4	4	(1).
United States of America	12	6	5	5	(2).
Great Britain	23	4.5	4	3	(3).
France	30	6	2	2	(4).
Germany	10	------	3	7	(5).
Aggregates	93	18.5	18	21	(6).
Russia-central Europe	105	65	65	65	(7).
Russia-overall	105	195	175	175	(8).

The column, 1928, is significant as a yardstick of normal military capacity, the product of European annual conscription operating without American foreign aid. Emphasis is on the countries immediately adjacent to the crucial NATO front: Denmark-Berlin-Switzerland, the front where basic issues may force actual fighting—not the spurious fronts of an evasive neutralism, as in India, Yugoslavia, or Indonesia. There are certain collateral factors that have a bearing on this historical tabulation, listed under "remarks" viz:

1. The heart of Benelux is the Netherlands. This faithful wartime ally has been dispossessed from Indonesia (1948) and is still plagued with wholesale confiscation of private properties (1959). The instrument of expropriation was developed by the United Nations, the United States collaborating (1947). The Communist parallel is found in the barbarous expulsion of 3 million Sudetan Germans from Czechoslovakia (1948).

2. Since 1945, the American contingents have been the mainstay of NATO conventional defenses along the decisive front: Denmark-Berlin-Switzerland. Casual mention should be made of the presence of 100,000 women and children dependents of these Armed Forces. They ought to be withdrawn from a dangerous trap.

3. Great Britain is reducing progressively, as the welfare state cannot support the armed services. Incidentally, the present precarious situation is the result of World Wars I and II, largely brought about by British diplomatic maneuvers and intrigues; they triggered World War I through the creation of the entente cordiale; they precipitated World War II by backing the Poles on the corridor, a creation of Versailles, 1918.

(4) France has been compelled to withdraw her best divisions for employment in Algiers—a war largely engineered by Russia, utilizing Mediterranean stooges like Nasser of Egypt.

(5) Germany has increased her NATO contributions from "zero" to currently seven divisions and will increase to 12 divisions. (Currently the New York brainwashers are distributing anti-German literary and theatrical material dating back to the Hitler period.)

(6) NATO commanders Ridgeway, Eisenhower, Gruenther and Norstad have made successive estimates of required strength to balance the visibly growing Russian forces. They considered 90 divisions necessary in 1950, about what the Europeans turned out in 1928; thereafter, they scaled down their estimates to 65, 45—and now 30—divisions, though the Russian threat is no less in 1959 than it was in 1949. Until recently, largely due to increased German contributions, NATO never produced more than 18 conventional divisions in Central Europe at a cumulative aggregate cost (foreign aid-mutual security) of approximately $14 billion, or $770 million annually; this amounts to a "unit cost" per division of $77 million each year. In the Mediterranean sector, "mutual security" is less expensive: Greece, Turkey, Italy and Spain have turned out a division for $12.8 million of annual foreign aid; Korea and Formosa have cut this to $8.7 million per division.

(7) Russia, the archenemy, the scourge of the West, uniformly maintains superior conventional strength. On the crucial NATO front, the Russians maintain 22 divisions. (East Germany); 8 divisions (Poland); 25 divisions in the Minsk-Pinsk-Kiev triangle. Satellite divisions like the Czechs (12 armor divisions) are considered reliable; indeed, this showpiece of Wilsonian diplomacy (1918) has turned into the most rabid Communist (sic) of them all. The East German "Vo-Pos" (10 divisions) are probably uncertain. Nevetheless, Russia has the potential of 55 to 75 ready divisions, challenging 21 NATO units in a ratio of 3 to 1, a ratio considered technically sufficient for a blitz offensive. These facts have induced Eisenhower finally to admit (1959) that ground forces are inadequate. He must have known the obvious as early as 1950 while he was still NATO commander; it was an inescapable development coincidental with the Russians' obtaining our nuclear secrets through a British-American-Canadian spy ring.

(8) The Russian standing army, on the conscript pattern, is reported at 175 divisions; it could be stronger. Annual reserves are available to double the current figure within 30 to 60 days. In a central geographical setting, Russia can reinforce any specific front, from Turkey to North Korea, from the Baltic to the Persian Gulf. It should be remembered that Mongolian units appeared in the Hungarian crisis. In the wake of that crisis, Russian reinforcements came in via Czechoslovakia; five Soviet divisions remained there for some time: one armored division, in Moravia, two armed divisions, and two in Slovakia.

These valid considerations have been brushed aside for years in a myopic reliance on the exclusive deterrent, the nuclear bomb, airborne or missile-carried. Today, the Russians are at least equivalent (if not superior) in nuclear armament, deterrent or retaliatory. Where do we go from here?

In the NATO palaver in Washington it is blandly assumed that the Russians will not use their deterrent. Are we to credit Krushchev with a greater moral or humanitarian sense than Truman who did not hesitate in his day, to launch this satanic weapon—and tipped his hand prematurely.

Can NATO afford to fight?

Trinity River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 26, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on July 7 the Senate Appropriations Committee approved a $39,593,939,000 Defense Department appropriation bill, $746 million higher than the amount approved by the House and $346,139,000 more than the President recommended. The measure included $380 million for a second nuclear-powered aircraft carrier.

No one denies that $380 million is quite a bit of money to spend on anything, anytime. Few will infer that the committee, in its wisdom, having pondered the necessity of the aircraft carrier versus the expenditure of $380 million, at great length and with voluminous testimony, should have concluded otherwise.

I believe it is worth noting, however, that another item entailing this same sum—$380 million—is now going to conference. The House refused to appropriate for Federal construction of the Trinity River power facilities in California because pending bills, providing for joint development with a private utility, were to be considered shortly by the House Interior Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation. The Senate Appropriations Committee, however, chose to ignore the fact that the House Legislative Committee had jurisdiction over the subject matter properly before it for some time, since the Trinity Authorization Act directed the Secretary of the Interior to study and report back to Congress on proposals by non-Federal agencies to construct and operate the powerplants. His recommendations are incorporated in the bills pending in the House Interior Committee. It certainly does not seem to constitute proper legislative procedure for one congressional committee to bypass another by an appropriation before there has been consideration and action by the Legislative Committee. It is to be hoped that the House conferees will firmly maintain their stand, and thereby uphold the dignity, integrity and status of their colleagues on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee who have scheduled hearings on the Trinity joint development proposal for July 24.

But how is $380 million involved in the Trinity River division? Under the

proposed legislation providing for joint development, or partnership, as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. would build and operate the Trinity power facilities. There would be an immediate saving to the taxpayers of $60 million, for the company, not the Federal Government, would put up this amount to construct the power features. Contrasted with all-Federal development, there would be $175 million more net surplus revenue in the Central Valley project from the sums the company would pay for the temporary use of the falling water and operating savings over the 50-year project repayment period. And there would be $145 million new tax revenues from the company's facilities, about $83 million of which would be Federal taxes and $62 million for State, county, and local governments.

Three hundred and eighty million dollars—one nuclear-powered aircraft carrier—could be totaled up by the company's outlays in building and operating the Trinity River powerplants: $60 million construction costs, $175 million additional Central Valley project surplus, and $145 million in tax payments. And who would benefit under the joint development proposal? The water users and the taxpayers, the same people who would lose these benefits should the Federal Government itself, build the generators to sell subsidized power at half its production cost to so-called preference customers, who, incidentally, had ample opportunity to come forward with offers to build the plants, but did not do so, preferring to buy half-cost power from the Government.

Over 230 representative and responsible California organizations have actively supported joint development of Trinity, including irrigation districts, farmer groups, city councils and boards of supervisors, labor unions and civic groups. On June 19, 1959, Ronald T. Weakley, business manager of Local 1245 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO, told the Senate Appropriations Public Works Subcommittee, in opposing any appropriation for all-Federal construction, that "we believe it is time to reappraise the whole concept of public power. It is understandable," he said, "that when private capital is unable to undertake a given power project, that the Government should do so. We fail, however, to understand why an unfair tax policy should be adopted just because some would like to nationalize the power industry. I make no brief here for the power companies," he continued. "They are regulated on a State and Federal basis and can stand on the record so far as providing the capital and developing the power to meet the needs of California's tremendous post-war expansion. Why they should be singled out for extinction, and all-Federal power development on the Trinity is just another major step toward that goal, is beyond us. We still believe that Congress should act on the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s offer to provide private capital and get on with the job, rather than tack on millions of dollars to the project cost out of our already tremendous tax load."

Mr. Weakley also pointed out that "I.B.E.W. members in the private utilities work under collective bargaining agreements covering wages, working conditions, and other benefits," while "legislation to provide for collective bargaining in" municipal utility districts and local agencies "is bitterly opposed by the representatives of these California public power preference agencies."

As business manager of an I.B.E.W. local, Mr. Weakley's prime interest is the economic welfare of the members who have authorized him to speak for them. His concern, and their concern, resolves itself down to the basic question: Are we, as union members in the electric power field, better off regarding working conditions and purchasing power under this private company than we would be under a public power agency? There appears to be no doubt that this union feels strongly that it will profit if the Trinity River power facilities are constructed and operated by the company, not the Federal Government.

To consider the issue in its simplest terms, Federal subsidized power is a great boon to the minority who are receiving it, because the great majority are paying for it through their taxes; but the members of the paying majority are going to have to get along with less food, less comfort, less entertainment, less savings, less schooling for our children, a lower standard of living, and increased taxes so that preference customers can get cheaper power than we receive.

Mr. Weakley has struck at the heart of the issue—the pocketbook—and concludes forcefully:

> Further, underwriting tax-free public power agency bonds as against private tax-paying investment is, we believe, a bad bargain for all of us. After these agencies are set up, we find that instead of Federal power being used to pay for water development, these agencies get power at below cost to the extent that all of the taxpayers are paying for subsidies to a favored few consumers. * * * To sum up, our members, by resolution, have directed me to support the principle of joint development of Trinity for their protection both as free workers and as taxpayers.

The majority of the people surely prefer to see their tax dollars spent on a necessary nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, rather than subsidize the minority's power bills; and no one can deny that this would be the result of needless Government spending for all-Federal construction of the Trinity River powerplants.

Freedom From Bigotry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have frequently voiced my disagreement with President Eisenhower and his policies. There is one very important matter of political principle on which I heartly concur with him and that is that religion has no place in politics. The sooner we root that out of the Amercan scene even a discussion of it, the stronger our country will be.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of July 9, 1959:

FREEDOM FROM BIGOTRY

President Eisenhower responded to the question as to whether a Catholic could properly be elected to the Presidency with a salutary swing at religious prejudice. His words may well be emphasized and reemphasized as the country moves into another nominating season for presidential candidates. He said:

"As far as I am concerned, it's a perfectly extraneous question * * * it's like asking a man whether he is a Methodist or a Presbyterian or something of that kind. I do not agree at all with the theory that prejudice, religious prejudice should rule our choice of candidates and officials of this Nation.

"If I saw any man that I thought was really a qualified responsible individual running for office, my vote would never be changed on the basis of his religion."

This is a straightforward statement of a basic principle underlying the American philosophy of government. It is an essential corollary to the separation of church and state required by the Constitution. Every citizen ought to realize that he cannot drag religious bigotry into the political arena without trampling upon rights that all free men ought to respect.

Geneva Outlook: Gloomy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, "forewarned is forearmed," and it is my hope that we are sufficiently forearmed on the question of West Berlin which is now the subject of deliberations in Geneva. As far as I am concerned, there is no question of the firmness we must have in our dealings with the representatives of the Kremlin.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by David M. Nicol which appeared in the Long Island Sunday Press of July 12, 1959, and which I hope each and every Member of Congress will take the time to read.

The article follows:

GENEVA OUTLOOK: GLOOMY

(By David M. Nicol)

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.—The four-power East-West Foreign Ministers are reassembling in Geneva this weekend in an atmosphere considerably gloomier than that in which they left last month.

It seems clearer than ever that the Soviets are in no mood to make any concession about Berlin or the larger question of German unification. Publicly and privately, Premier Nikita Khrushchev has affirmed beyond any doubt, and in threatening fashion, that he is sticking to the core of his original demands.

In essence, these require that the West weaken its position in West Berlin to the point where the city will fall political and economic prey to the Communist East German Government that has its seat in East Berlin and controls the surrounding territory.

About the only question to be decided in Geneva's new exercise in conference diplomacy is whether the sessions will be followed by a summit meeting.

Even in this the Soviets seemed to have turned the tables until most pressures for such a summit meeting come from members of the Western alliance. The British are keenest for such a conference but among the other delegations there are thoughful men who wonder whether it isn't a last hope.

The Soviets themselves either are playing hard to get or genuinely have lost some of their earlier interest in such a proceeding.

Recent visitors to Khrushchev say he seemed more anxious for bilateral talks with President Eisenhower. The junketing American governors were given this impression, among others.

It appears also to be true that Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko never once mentioned a possible summit meeting during all of his public and private utterances during the earlier round of Geneva talks.

The end result may well be a situation in which the West almost begs the Soviets to meet them at the summit without even superficial concessions from Moscow.

The argument of those who urged a summit gathering whether the present Geneva talks succeed or fail, is simple. Khrushchev, they insist, is the only man who makes the decisions in Moscow and it therefore is essential to state the Western case directly to him.

As an added incentive, in the eyes of these people, is the fact that Khrushchev seems abysmally ignorant of the strengths and ideas of the West. His closest advisers apparently don't give him an honest count about their own contacts with the West and the impressions they gather.

Khrushchev is portrayed as much more impetuous and much less coldblooded and calculating than his predecessor, Joe Stalin. But even Old Joe went wrong on some notable occasions, including the blockade of Berlin and the Communist attack on South Korea.

How much easier, it is argued, for a war to begin by accident when the decision lies in the hands of a volatile, cocky and hypersensitive man like Khrushchev?

Exponents of this view feel Khrushchev might be impressed by some blunt, straight, private conversation with Ike and a summit meeting might be the backdrop for such a session.

Pessimists fear that it already may be too late for such an effort and that Khrushchev has ceased to be influenced by talk.

The Soviet Premier's own plans seem to be incredibly ambitious; far more sweeping even than the dreams of most of his followers. He is convinced he is right and can succeed; and talk may only increase his impatience.

Bastille Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Man's struggle for his freedom, for liberty and independence, forms the most glorious and praiseworthy part of his long history. Human history is full of glorious deeds, innumerable landmarks. But none of them in the last 170 years is more glorious than the history made in France in the capture of the Bastille by revolutionary forces on July 14, 1789.

For years this historic fortress in Paris had served as the principal prison for French National Governments. All those suspected and charged with some alleged crime were herded there indiscriminately, and detained for a long time, often without trial. This in itself was bad enough, but in the 18th century the Government made the Bastille a political prison house. All those conscientious, freedom-loving, and daring souls who spoke or wrote critically of the Government were imprisoned in the Bastille. Thus, toward the end of the century the name "Bastille" had become synonymous with such odious words as despotism, cruelty, and oppression, while its innocent inmates were looked upon as gallant fighters and martyrs dying for the cause of freedom. It is not, therefore, surprising that when the French Revolution broke out, and long before France and all Europe were clamoring for freedom, one of the first acts of the revolutionary leaders was to attack the Bastille and free the prisoners there.

This was done on July 14, and since that day, that event has become a symbol of freedom. July 14 has also become the national holiday of France. Just as we in this country annually celebrate July 4 as our Independence Day, all Frenchmen celebrate July 14 as Bastille Day, as their liberation and independence day.

In its broader aspect, Bastille Day symbolizes something more. It marks the beginning of a revolutionary era in Europe which has extended far and wide to all parts of the world. Its influence has been tremendous. In one respect, the ideas engendered by the French Revolution differed from those embodied in the American Revolution. Our Founding Fathers established modern democracy, and an orderly process of government under law, while the French revolution made democratic principles, as understood by the revolutionary leaders in this country, into a militant creed, a universal gospel, to be preached and propagated everywhere.

Even with all its excesses and all the setbacks and reverses suffered by the attackers and destroyers of the Bastille, the event of its destruction as man's physical and spiritual prison, and the freeing of its suffering inmates, marks an unforgettable day for all lovers of freedom and independence.

New Life for Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a result of my long-time interest in civil defense I have come to realize that it is a field where sincere interest and constructive ideas are at a premium.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present for my colleagues' consideration an address by a constituent of mine, Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director of the National Association of County Officials, entitled "New Life for Civil Defense." The address was recently delivered to the Ohio civil defense directors in Columbus, Ohio.

The address follows:

NEW LIFE FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

(Address by Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director, National Association of County Officials, before the Ohio Civil Defense Directors, Columbus, Ohio, June 13, 1959)

One of the most able and conscientious county commissioners we know was recently invited to attend a demonstration of modern weapons at a nearby airbase. He saw rockets that were guided by sensitivity to heat that were so delicate that they could find their way to a man's lighted pipe. He saw jets flash by at 700 miles an hour and was advised that in time of war they could be equipped with nuclear rockets. He and his fellow public officials were also briefed on intercontinental ballistics missile development and were treated to horror stories about the possibility of germ warfare. Most important he was advised by military authorities that to the best of our knowledge the potential enemies of the United States also had similar weapons and capabilities.

The impact of this demonstration upon this public official was not unlike the impact upon the general citizenry. He came back to his home county with a feeling of futility at the very enormity of the defense problem and he resolved in his own mind to vote against further appropriation of funds for civil defense purposes. He reasoned that the problem is so enormous and our efforts to solve it so pitiful, that it seems better to do nothing and at least save taxpayer funds.

IS DEFENSE OF CIVILIANS NECESSARY?

The logical question to ask is, "Civil defense—is it necesary?" Now, at the offset I would like to make it crystal clear to everyone that I know very little about civil defense. With some reservations which I will mention later, I approached this subject with no more factual information than is available to the average citizen. Were you to find yourself in my position I feel sure that you would do what I have done. I have consulted the experts.

Our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, says that civil defense is most necessary and that it is a vital part of the Nation's total defense. Every impartial study of the problem has concluded that civil defense is vital to national survival.

In going through tons of material on this subject, I have found what seems to me to be a very significant thing. Everyone, with no exceptions at all, is of the opinion that we must defend our civilians, but there is wide disagreement as to whether or not we need civil defense in the ordinary concept of people running around with armbands. The key question seems to be who is to protect the civilian? The regularly constituted civil authorities? A semiautonomous civil defense? Or, the military?

On the latter point there is considerable agreement that the U.S. Military Establishment is not the agency to protect our civil population other than its broad mission of minimizing enemy damage to us and retaliating with destructive force. Let the military speak for itself. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chief of Staff, on March 1, 1956, testifying before the Holifield com-

mittee of the House of Representatives, noted: "The Department of the Army endorses strongly the necessity for effective civil defense organizations at the local, State and Federal level, equipped and trained to meet the particular requirements of civil defense in the atomic era." And later in the same testimony he said: "You cannot depend upon the Army to perform civil defense of the United States. It is neither organized, trained, nor equipped, nor directed to do that sort of thing."

Thus, it would seem that the question of who is to minimize loss of civil life; care for the wounded; restore vital public and private enterprise and strengthen the total national strength, resolves itself between whether this should be done by the normal units of Government as already established, or if we should have a completely separate civil defense operation. Our county officials in the National Association of County Officials have expressed their overwhelming opinion that civil defense should be integrated within the regular operations of the Federal, State and local governments, and that it should not be to itself. Our American County Platform, which many people have been kind enough to say is one of the most enlightened of our national documents on civil defense, seems to revolve around the following four vitally important concepts.

First, civil defense must be considered a normal function of each unit of government and unfortunately, in view of the international situation, it must be considered a normal permanent part of American life. Federal, State and local governments have the same responsibility for supporting civil defense as they have for other public health and welfare functions. We must understand that it is impossible to keep 175 million Americans at fever pitch on the subject of civil defense over a long period of years. Steps must be taken immediately to make civil defense a part of everyday government operations, just as fire drills are a permanent part of the operation of our educational system.

Second, civil defense leadership must be the responsibility of the popularly elected public officials. If you stop to consider the matter, if any emergency or unusual occurrence takes place in a city the very first person that the citizen contacts would be the mayor. If it happens outside the city the citizen immediately calls his county commissioner. Governors, mayors, and county commissioners are the duly elected leaders of the people and they hold their positions by virtue of being the natural leaders of their respective areas. Any plan, organization chart or concept of civil defense which fails to take into consideration this basic fact is doomed to complete failure.

Thirdly, we cannot provide maximum protection and security for our civil population unless there is complete understanding, cooperation and deep mutual respect between the Federal, State and local governments which must share equally and completely in this responsibility. Frankly, up until very recently, there has been utter confusion as to what level of government should be responsible for the various aspects of civil defense. Until the passage of Public Law 606, defining the teamwork concept of civil defense, we have had the ridiculous idea that civil defense was essentially a State and local responsibility. We had no national direction from the Federal Government, and indeed, during most of the early period we began to wonder if the National Government was even on our side. State and local officials were asked to assume responsibility for adjusting local preparedness to the facts of international tension and radical new concepts of warfare when indeed, they had no access at all to the information upon which they could base sound decisions. The earlier concepts of exclusive State and local responsibility for civil defense were about as sound as a concept that national defense was purely a State and local responsibility and that the National Government had nothing to do with it except act as sort of a chairman of the board to keep order.

We feel strongly that if there is to be real teamwork between the levels of Government, all of us must enter that relationship with sincerity. If the U.S. Congress, by passage of Public Law 606, declares it to be national policy that the Federal Government is to provide the national leadership based upon the facts that are available only to the National Government, then the demand for honest dealing would surely dictate that the U.S. Government should implement this declaration of policy, by providing the organization, finances and real leadership which they have determined to be their share in the total picture.

Again, if this is to be a true partnership then it must be just that. The Federal Government, in developing overall national policy that does effect State and local governments, must make adequate provision to consult with State and local government people. Speaking now for county officials we have no stomach whatsoever for having either Federal or State people come and present us with an accomplished fact in the form of policies in which we had no hand in formulating or were not asked to contribute. More specifically, I would point out that our 3,047 counties employ 668,000 Americans and spend annually $5.5 billion, and yet the Advisory Council on Civil Defense which is meant to help formulate national civil defense policy does not have a single county official represented.

We do not profess to know very much about civil defense but we do pride ourselves on knowing something about elected officials. In all our experience we have found that if we approach elected officials sincerely, with a sound program and ask their help, in no instance has that help ever been denied.

The fourth concept that seems to run through most county officials thinking on the subject of civil defense is perhaps the most difficult to identify. You might say that our officials like the county commissioner I mentioned previously, feel that in many respects this problem is so overwhelming that it is difficult to identify specific steps that can be decisive in a national emergency. There is a tendency to feel that a national emergency in the future would be of such a magnitude that it would be difficult to determine the relative merits of a combat ready soldier and a little old lady in Pocatello, Idaho, who is a welder at a local defense industry. In other words, future wars will be waged with the total resources of the Nation, both public and private.

This line of reasoning leads logically to the idea that anything that public officials do at the local level to increase community facilities such as roads, schools, water systems, and public buildings, all contribute significantly to the Nation's total defense. These facilities and services, of course, are urgently needed above and beyond any civil defense application so perhaps it is slightly in the nature of a rationalization that local officials would rather put public funds into ventures of this nature rather than buying sirens and emergency medical supplies, etc.

For you who are actively engaged in the new profession of civil defense I would think that you should keep this in mind and try to build your program around existing local government needs. Examples: An emergency police and fire street corner telephone alarm system is a necessity in most urban places. Its value to a total civil defense program is obvious. It is only sound public policy to make sure that vital local government records are adequately protected from fire and other damage. Again, the records preservation program of the continuity of local government undertaking therefore makes a great deal of sense to local government officials. You will find that they will support it. Everybody wins.

CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRESS

We have heard it said that the criticism of civil defense has never been more intense than it is right now and that the morale of civil defense people is at the lowest in the history of the program. Let us not let this obscure the fact that we have made some real progress in civil defense under the most capable leadership of Gov. Leo A. Hoegh, Director of the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization. We in county government think that in Governor Hoegh we have a man who has a very sound philosophical base and a deep understanding of the operations of State and local government. In his term of office we have made very great strides to shape civil defense along the lines of some of the concepts we have just mentioned. We now have a reorganization of the program that merges civil defense administration with the office of defense mobilization. We have built a very sound working relationship between the Federal, State, and local governments on the continuity of State and local government program and for the first time, we think that the State and local people are being taken into the councils of the National Government in the formulation of policy. For the first time we do have a national plan for civil defense and defense mobilization and in general, despite criticism, we feel that we are evolving a program of civil preparedness which seems sensible and sound and somewhat in proportion to the urgency of the situation and the resources of the Nation.

ROLE OF PROFESSIONAL CIVIL DEFENSE WORKER

If we are making progress then why are we having so much criticism and lack of action on the part of the U.S. Congress? Frankly, our county officials believe that the major problem is just plain lack of interest of the people at the local level. The Members of the Congress are aware of this and civil defense becomes a good whipping boy for anyone who desires to make a speech on economy or wants to be critical. Civil defense people of course should be criticized. Nobody should have to do his job without the benefit of criticism, but, we maintain that the criticism should be constructive and it should suggest alternatives. It is in this spirit that in preparation for this speech we polled some of our key NACO people and asked for their frank appraisal of what we might do to improve our civil defense program. I repeat these suggestions to you in the same spirit. They are suggestions and ideas which have been gathered from people like yourself who are actually deeply enmeshed in the civil defense program, and we pass them along to you for your critical review.

1. It does not now, nor has it ever, made sense to organize civil defense on a city basis. From the very beginning civil defense should have been organized locally on a county-wide or multi-county basis. City officials have no jurisdiction outside of the city limits but county officials do. If we did receive a nuclear attack, presumably the city would be wiped out and your problems would be out in the rural areas where you would have to find ways of taking care of the injured and taking care of the evacuees from the central city.

In a great number of cases it does not make sense to organize even on a single

county basis, but rather we should look to a multi-county concept, perhaps along the lines of the Fulton County-Atlanta metropolitan area.

2. All civil defense planning should revolve around elected policymaking local government officials. We have said this several times, now, and you will perhaps get the impression that we think it is important. We say it again because restating it brings up the question then, what is the role of the professional full-time civil defense person?

If the elected official is to be the boss man then it follows logically that the civil defense person is an assistant to the elected official and issues orders, etc., only in the name of the Chief Executive. While varying local conditions will require different setups, it would appear that most generally the civil person will act in a staff or advisory capacity to the elected officials. His duties would probably include drawing up emergency plans which fully utilize local employees and all local government facilities; coordinate with the various local government departments; prepare overall plans; establish training programs, and keep the entire civil defense effort in constant review; develop plans that fully utilize privately owned facilities; serve as a liaison with other local civil defense directors, State directors, Governor's office, and other public and private agencies; coordinate publicity, public information, and citizen education programs; maintain current inventories of equipment for emergency use, and in cooperation with the other members of the local government family discharge the other numerous responsibilities of civil defense.

3. In all too many cases civil defense offices seem to be operating as independent units with a great number of volunteers attached directly to them. This gives the elected political official the impression of an independent bureau and perhaps may give rise to the erroneous impression that civil defense is out to build an independent structure of its own. Civil defense offices must be a part of the total local government picture as are other departments, and the volunteers assigned to the appropriate regular department as indicated in our own Policy Statement. This lack of understanding of the role of civil defense often leads to conflict and confusion. For instance, auxiliary police trained by the civil defense office will get ambitious for activity and will appear on the scene of an auto accident, much to the consternation of the local police force. A civil defense office should not get into action until a CD emergency is declared by the Chief Executive. Normal local government department work should be left to the regular personnel. This type of conflict at the local level gets back to the Congress and produces negative thinking on the matter of providing Federal funds to assist in the bearing of the cost of local administration.

4. There should be more emphasis on the role of civil defense in natural disaster. It is my understanding that right here in Ohio that the 1927 floods left nearly 600,000 homeless. I understand that more recently, in January of this year, you also had the most widespread and intense floods you have experienced since 1913. It would be senseless therefore, for me to continue emphasizing the natural preparedness aspects of civil defense. Many of our county officials are of the opinion that even if the international situation changed and we became internationally nations of lambs, we would still need civil defense programs to protect against natural disaster.

5. Too many civil defense offices are operated as merchandising offices. This type of office is merely established to comply with the requirements to secure Federal contributions such as matching funds for radios and surplus property for civil defense use. Usually this type of office has no plan or program and not too much activity. This particular type of operation was pointed out during one of our civil defense panel sessions at our NACO Urban County Congress held in Washington last spring. As a matter of fact, it was an Ohio county commissioner who identified this type of problem. Several of our county officials also believe that the abuse of surplus property regulations has harmed civil defense. The regulations state that property acquired from surplus shall not be used for normal governmental activity. It appears, however, that much road-building machinery and other heavy equipment has been acquired for no apparent civil defense use. This is not to suggest that bulldozers and other civil defense equipment should be allowed to rust and not be used for governmental purposes. The equipment, however, should be incorporated in the overall civil defense plan of the community.

6. The problem of getting adequate participation and understanding on the part of the public is a continuing one. It has been suggested that about once every quarter civil defense must stage some sort of public exercise to focus attention on civil defense. Such items as rescue demonstrations, feeding exercises, evacuation of some segments of the population, are all essential if the people are to know that the civil defense in their community is in business. It has also been suggested that every civil defense office should issue a bulletin to its key people at regular intervals and let them know what is going on. Periodic meetings should also be held. It is a bad situation to have individuals assigned to a task or responsibility in civil defense and never receive any contact or information on the subject. It has been suggested that cvil defense committees be appointed by the PTA, Lions, and other community groups.

7. Finally, this might be the most important suggestion of all. When someone criticizes you, or worse still, completely ignores your existence, perhaps the best course of action is to meet the problem head on and invite the critics and those who are indifferent to sit down with you and review your entire program. We have in mind a Hoover Commission type thing on the civil defense program. You might consider inviting newspaper editors, members of the bar, members of the service clubs, clergy, representatives of business and labor, local public officials, State officials and other key community leaders. This type of operation takes courage and imagination and absolutely should not be undertaken unless you are completely sincere in trying to accomplish a job.

Our county officials out in the State of Washington tried this approach to the general problems of county government and were spectactularly successful. On one hand their critics had a chance to air their grievances against county government and came up with a lot of very valuable suggestions to help the counties get their houses in order. By the same token, and of equal importance, these very same critics came to understand some of the problems facing the county officials and went away with a far more understanding and cooperative attitude.

This is democracy in action. It is a healthy approach to our problems and if all parties undertake it with good will it could be a tremendous force for good.

The Rivers Are Our Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, one of the greatest programs of development that has ever occurred in this country, is now in progress along the Mississippi Valley River system, which includes the Missouri River running through my home State of South Dakota.

Never before in American history has the dynamic effort and enterprise of our citizens been devoted to such a monumental task—that of taming not one river, or one stream, but bringing under control the great inland waterway that is the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

Part of the job has been accomplished. In the Upper Valley States of the Missouri River—South Dakota and North Dakota—huge dams and reservoirs are completed or nearing the completion stage. Already electric power is being generated at these flood-control dams. And manmade lakes have been created from the once "Muddy Mo," developing new recreation opportunities never envisaged by our pioneer forefathers.

However, much remains to be done. An excellent address on the new challenges and responsibilities to utilize the basin program wisely has been given by Mr. Donald O'Toole, president of the Mississippi Valley Association. One of Mr. O'Toole's most constructive points is his recommendation for a special research and development program, which, as he states, can be a positive, dynamic program working for the good of all.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the excellent address by Mr. O'Toole.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY RIVER SYSTEM AND THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

(By Donald O'Toole at 40th annual North Central Electric Association Executive Council, Breezy Point Lodge, Pequot Lakes, Minn., June 14–17, 1959)

The Mississippi Valley River system is the greatest inland waterway system in the world. It is one of the most magnificant resources possessed by any nation, yet it is scarcely known by Americans beyond its geographical location.

This system is a network of navigable streams made up of a main stem or aorta—the mighty Mississippi River itself—and its many arteries—the Illinois, the Ohio, the Missouri, the Arkansas, the Ouachita, the Gulf Intracoastral Waterway, the Tennessee, the Cumberland, the Monongahela Rivers, and others.

All of these streams flow toward the center of our country—from the east and the west and the north—thence into the Mississippi River and down to the Gulf of Mexico. The system contacts two deepwater ports—the port of Chicago at the north end, just opened up, through which barge cargoes are trans-

shipped to ocean steamers headed for north European, Mediterranean and South American ports via the St. Lawrence Seaway; and the port of New Orleans at the southern end, through which cargoes pass to Mediterranean, South American, and Pacific ports.

Our economic future, particularly the future of the Middle West, rests in a large measure upon what we do to conserve and develop this great water system. For in an industrial economy, water holds the control on industrial expansion. And water is getting shorter in supply every day.

Industry, agriculture, and cities—the hallmarks of our great Middle Western economy—all have ravenous appetites for water. They must have it constantly, every day of every month of every year, to cool hot industrial coils, to carry off industrial and municipal wastes, to transport fuels and raw materials and finished products, to provide water for irrigation when nature denies water and to slake the thirsts of men and animals. The Mississippi River system does all of these things for the Middle West, our area, and it does them well when it is controlled and disciplined.

The conservation and control of the Mississippi River system began to be undertaken by the Federal Government at the turn of the century. An enterprise of truly staggering proportions, it has, in the short space of some 50 years, provided protection from ravaging floods to thousands of river cities and towns and millions of acres of farmlands. It has given us 7,500 miles of commercially navigable streams.

This development has also given us billions of kilowatt-hours of electric power. Some comes from harnessing the flows of the rivers themselves as they descend downstream but most has been derived from low-cost transportation of fuels found throughout the system to huge thermoelectric generating plans. River control also means pollution abatement.

What about the mighty Missouri in all these river developments? Greatest of all the rivers in the system except the Mississippi itself, the Missouri in 1957 handled one-fourth million tons and in 1958, six-tenths million tons. These figures compare very poorly with the 81½ million tons of the Ohio and the 20¼ million tons of the Illinois. Why should this be?

The Missouri River, rising at Three Forks, Mont., flows 2,475 miles to its mouth on the Mississippi, 17 miles above St. Louis. It drains a basin constituting one-sixth of the United States, rich in agricultural and mineral resources and low in population. Its basin contains 13 billion kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power in the fall of the river and a very great many more kilowatt-hours in the thermoelectric potentials in its lignite resources in the Dakotas and its petroleum resources in the Williston Basin.

Here is a huge river—one of the longest and widest in the whole world—carrying millions of gallons of water through or past seven great States.

The development of each section of the Mississippi River system has come about through the vigorous efforts of its own group of determined men. Seeing the possibilities in their valleys and tasting the profits and other benefits to be realized, they have set upon carefully organized and reinforced programs to get improvements needed to bring their river valley to full fruitation. Their efforts have been coordinated and supported, since 1919, by the Mississippi Valley Association.

During the initial construction period of the Missouri Basin program, businessmen, farmers, and public servants marshaled their strength and coordinated their efforts to secure construction of the physical features of the Pick-Sloan plan. The valley association has tried, and I think successfully, to be a major vehicle through which the citizens of the States in the valley could foster the control of the region's magnificent water resources.

Now that some of the benefits of that construction program are becoming available, a new responsibility must begin to supplant the task of getting the program built. The task now is to utilize the basin program wisely to improve and expand the area's economy. The region must secure new industry and the agricultural economy must be stabilized. Without proper exploitation, the magnificent structures now under construction cannot serve their full purpose.

It is to do this job that the Missouri Basin, particularly the upper and middle valley, seems to lack a sponsoring group. There appears to be a tendency on the part of business leaders in the area to "let George do it."

The tremendous floods, which as recently as 1951 and 1952 caused billions of dollars in flood damage, cannot happen again. Dams to hold back these floodwaters have been built from Gavins Point, near Yankton, S. Dak., upstream to Fort Peck, Mont. Big Bend Dam, last of the six major structures, is finally under construction.

Above five of the dams lies a huge and beautiful lake of sparkling blue water such as you would never expect to see on the muddy Missouri. The lake above the Oahe Dam, for example, will be longer than Lake Erie.

A tremendous interest in water sports has developed. Big fish are being caught, boat and motor sales exceed automobiles sold locally. Beaches and vacation cottages are being constructed. Hydroelectric power is being generated at the dams and is being sold mainly to cooperatives.

Where are the sponsors of industrial development of this unreplaceable resource? What will happen if they don't appear, organize, and make themselves heard?

What will happen is best demonstrated by what is already happening. This basin is being cut into huge lakes, each separated from the other by a high dam wall which no barge can cross or get around. There are no provisions for locks, or otherwise lifting barges over the dams, which are absolute essentials to free movement of traffic on the river.

True, it is said that locks or marine railways can be installed later. But later may mean after a whole new philosophy has taken over this basin, a philosophy dedicated solely to the use of the river for recreation and for Government-owned, Government-babied, untaxed hydroelectric power.

We must not let this happen. I speak for all Americans in saying that you who live and operate in this area have a serious responsibility to develop and conserve this enormous resource for us, according to the American tradition of development by private enterprise. You hold within the earth here billions of dollars of minérals and agricultural products, and it is up to you to develop them and the facilities needed to get them to markets at proper costs and prices.

River transportation has provided the answers to the other valleys and river transportation is a major part of the answer to the future of the Missouri Basin. Here are some of the truly great possibilities inherent in the development of the Missouri for barge transportation as far upstream as economically feasible:

1. The outshipment of your great lignite deposits, 350 billion tons of them in the Dakotas, to other points along the Missouri or elsewhere in the Mississippi Valley.

2. The inshipments of ores to the mills to be constructed at the lignite fields. Is there any reason why Venezuelan or Texan alumina cannot be processed on the Missouri as well as on the Ohio River?

3. The construction of huge thermoelectric plants, to provide the additional electric energy that will be needed when the Missouri Basin is fully developed. These plants can utilize the basin's own lignite and oil.

4. The outshipment of the petroleum resources at Williston. Petroleum products constitute principal cargoes on the Mississippi River system.

5. The outshipment of other minerals in the area, such as manganese, which may not be worth mining now because of total costs of delivery to points of usage. These costs now need to be resurveyed in relation to their shipment via a canalized river system and modern barges and towboats.

6. The outshipment of grain and other agricultural products via cheap transportation to the great ports of New Orleans and Chicago.

7. The inshipment of grain to range areas, for complete cattle and hog raising, feeding, and slaughtering there. This is now underway in Texas and substitutes for the older and clumsier method of shipping live cattle from place to place to be fed and slaughtered. Following the construction of local slaughtering houses, there will be the outshipment of meat products.

Overriding all of the foregoing is the enormous growth of population being felt in the United States. The Missouri Basin contains land—good land and lots of it—and land is what we'll need for our millions of additional citizens.

Growth will come to the basin, whether it is ready or not. That growth will be orderly and profitable only if business and industrial leaders take steps now to plan programs of development and then fight for their programs.

The electric utility industry of the upper Middle West has an especially great opportunity in the industrial development of the Missouri Basin. With this opportunity, there is the usual correlative responsibility—responsibility for the proper initiation of that development, to insure that it will be organized and carried out properly.

The Mississippi Valley Association would be pleased to incorporate a sound development program for the Missouri into its general program.

We believe that the proper industrial and agricultural expansion of the Missouri Basin must be accomplished primarily through the resources of privately capitalized industry.

What is needed is a program of special research and development for the Missouri with the following objectives:

1. To coordinate current research now being done on piecemeal bases by other agencies and to procure additional economic research as needed.

2. To analyze and compare the economic and industrial and development factors at work in other river valleys and relate those findings to the economic and industrial advantages of the Missouri Basin.

3. To create task forces of leading businessmen, farmers, educators, and professional persons to explore and create ideas for economic and industrial development of the basin.

4. To organize a program of education and publicity on a nationwide basis to inform business and industry of the commercial and industrial advantages of the basin.

5. To cooperate with the existing organizations, public and private, which are engaged in similar activities on more restricted bases.

Here is a positive dynamic program, which will make use of enormous and energetic forces now at work. It is in direct contrast with the negative program of simply complaining about the tax and other advantages of others who are moving into a void left by inactive business and industry.

The Missouri River Basin—one-sixth of the United States—is our greatest undevel-

oped resource area. It has within itself the water supply, minerals, fuels, and potential for low-cost transportation which can enable it to produce products at lower costs than elsewhere in the world. It connects directly to the great Mississippi Valley River system, and can thus take in its raw materials and ship out its products over the greatest inland waterway system in the world and out through the great ports of Chicago and New Orleans to all of the nations of the world.

The development of the Missouri River Basin awaits the initiative, the imagination, and the vigorous action of its industrial leaders. It will repay them—and their children—far beyond their fondest dreams. This is what has happened in every other river basin on the Mississippi system which has been developed to date.

Freedom of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in view of the widespread interest and concern over secrecy in Government, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I presented last month to the Special House Subcommittee on Government Information in which I related experiences of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Disarmament, of which I am chairman, on the declassification of information by the executive branch of the Government.

In this statement I called attention to six specific instances in which Government agencies mistakenly classified information and denied it to the public.

Under our system of government, the withholding of information from the public should be permitted only in the interest of the Nation's security, not to cover up for errors which may have been committed or legitimate criticism of governmental actions.

Congress has an obligation to see to it that the right to classify information is not abused by the executive branch of the Government.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPERIENCE OF THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT ON THE DECLASSIFICATION OF GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

(Statement of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, chairman, to the Special House Subcommittee on Government Information)

Achieving a balance between informing the public and preventing the dissemination of information which would be injurious to the Nation's security is one of the great problems that confronts our Government at the present time. In this effort both the executive and legislative branches have a responsibility.

The Congress has been wise to establish special committees to study this problem and to take or recommend action when agencies of the executive branch appear to be restricting unduly the availability of information to the public. In addition to these special committees the other committees of the Congress must also be alert constantly to guard against the deliberate or inadvertent suppression of important data when national security is not involved.

The purpose of this testimony is to share with the Special Government Information Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations the experience of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Disarmament with the declassification of information by the executive branch. I am presenting this statement in response to a request from the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, JOHN E. MOSS.

It is not my intention to suggest that the specific cases I cite be investigated further. Rather, it is to show that information is withheld for reasons that cannot be justified in the name of national security and to stress the need for vigilance on this matter by all congressional committees.

Over the past year the Subcommittee on Disarmament held a number of hearings, many of them in executive session. In all cases the executive session was held because the witness requested it. Usually, after such a session the transcript of the hearing was submitted to the executive agency or agencies involved for review. The executive agency then marked those parts of the testimony that, in its opinion, should remain classified. In order to determine whether this classification was justified, the subcommittee and its staff reviewed carefully the testimony after it was returned by the executive officials. When the reason for the classification was not self-evident, the executive officials were questioned about it. Frequently a reason other than security was given for restricting the information. When these erroneous reasons were pointed out the executive officials often lifted the classification label.

The experience of the Subcommittee on Disarmament suggests that in a great many cases the executive branch censors testimony for insufficient reason. In order to correct this practice the committees of the Congress and their staffs ought to review carefully all testimony which executive departments ask to have classified. The review should seek to determine the reasons for continued classification and whether they are valid. Such a procedure would redound to the benefit of the electorate by providing our citizens with an opportunity to become better informed. Members of Congress would also be in a much better position to perform their constitutional responsibilities.

The cases which follow illustrate the various points I wish to bring out.

1. The Central Intelligence Agency, in reviewing testimony given by a noted scientist, had classified a passage of testimony. When questioned as to why, the CIA official indicated he did not agree with the conclusion of the scientist and incorrect information should not be given out. When challenged further on the point, the CIA representative agreed to let the scientist's conclusion stand.[1]

2. The Atomic Energy Commission at first classified portions of testimony given by one of its chiefs of division that there was no evidence the Soviet Union was developing, testing, or producing so-called clean nuclear weapons; that is, weapons with reduced radioactive fallout. The Commission was asked whether it was not in the interest of the United States to have this information brought out. The Commission reviewed the matter and decided that the information was of interest and agreed to leave in that portion of the testimony.[2]

3. The Department of State had struck out of testimony questions by the chairman and answers by a witness regarding a study being made by the Government on U.S. oversea bases. When it was pointed out by the subcommittee that this information was contained in a news conference of the Secretary of State, the Department officials then said the testimony had been deleted because it seemed irrelevant. It was suggested that it was not the function of the Deparment in reviewing testimony for publication to rule on the relevancy of the discussion, particularly questions the chairman considered sufficiently relevant to raise in the first place. The Department then agreed to leave in the discussion on the overseas base problem.[3]

4. The Department of the Army and the Department of Defense classified testimony relating to the results of Operation Sagebrush, simulated war maneuvers of the Armed Forces using tactical nuclear weapons. The Army refused to remove the classification even after it was pointed out that at the time of the maneuvers in October 1955, a reporter wrote extensive stories about them and that these news accounts could only have been written as a result of considerable background briefing on the part of military officers. Part of the reason why the Army wished to continue to classify the information, according to one officer, was that the results indicated the Army didn't know quite what it was doing in the maneuvers. Even if this were true, said the officer, the information should not be released.[4]

5. The Department of the Army requested the elimination from the record to be published several portions of testimony submitted by Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Maxwell Taylor. When challenged on the classification, over 90 percent of what had been taken out was restored. Among the passages finally declassified were those containing general discussions of new nuclear weapons development and the tactical uses of these weapons. They also put back statements the General had made on the necessity of improving our nonatomic or conventional weapons capabilities if a nuclear weapons test ban should go into effect, general information on the fabrication of nuclear weapons, expressions of opinion regarding the reliability of agreements with the U.S.S.R., views on the psychological impact of a nuclear test suspension on people around the world, and the effects of nuclear fallout.[5]

6. The Government continues to classify significant information dealing with seismology, the study of earthquakes and movements in the interior of the earth. This includes testimony given before the Disarmament Subcommittee and documents submitted to the subcommittee by executive agencies. The subcommittee has never received a satisfactory explanation as to why such studies should be kept secret.[6]

The reason that such studies should be made available is that advances in the science of seismology are needed and necessary to improve our knowledge about the detection and identification of underground nuclear explosions. It is to the interest of the United States to speed up our work in this field so that we may have a better conception of the capabilities of a control system for the cessation of nuclear weapons tests. An expanded research program in seismology is essential and a number of well-qualified and prominent seismologists and geophysicists have recommended specific projects; yet, the detailed description of these projects and the estimates given for the workability of certain theories for the detection and identification of nuclear weapons tests remain closed to the public and to scientists throughout the country. What is particularly of concern

Footnotes at end of speech.

is that some of our scientists who have visited the Soviet Union within the past year report that in some fields in seismology the Soviet Union is much more advanced than the United States and that in many respects more money is being spent on fundamental research in seismology in the Soviet Union than is being spent in the United States.

This suggests to me that the Department of Defense should not be the primary agency responsible for developing programs in the field of seismology and related scientific fields. Perhaps if this work were lodged in the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the Department of Commerce or the National Academy of Science, the scientists of the country would have access to the results of studies made and experiments conducted.

The six cases discussed briefly illustrate that Government agencies mistakenly classify information and deny it to the public. These are not the only cases that could be cited, but I believe the ones I have submitted amply demonstrate the need for vigilance on the part of congressional committees to review carefully all transcripts which contain classified information. If this is done then perhaps executive agencies, too, will exhibit greater awareness of the public's need to know and will exercise greater care in the future in the classification of testimony.

I would not want to end this statement without emphasizing that in most cases overclassification of information is not a deliberate effort to deceive the people or to protect the Government from criticism. Generally I think it is due to a habit of being overcautious, in other words to follow the rule to classify when in doubt.

---

[1] Hearings of the Subcommittee on Disarmament, "Control and Reduction of Armaments," pt. 17, testimony of Dr. Hans Bethe, p. 1539, discussion of the number of earthquakes occurring each year in the U.S.S.R. and China equal to a given yield of nuclear explosive.

[2] Hearings of the Subcommittee on Disarmament, "Control and Reduction of Armaments," pt. 16, testimony of Brig. Gen. Alfred D. Starbird, p. 1394.

[3] Hearings of the Subcommittee on Disarmament, "Disarmament and Foreign Policy," pt. I, testimony of William C. Foster, pp. 73–74.

[4] Hearings of the Subcommittee on Disarmament, "Disarmament and Foreign Policy," pt. I, testimony of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, p. 140.

[5] Ibid., pp. 116, 117, 118, 119, 133, and 136.

[6] Since preparing this statement I am pleased to report that some of this information has been released. Some material contained in the Berkner Report on Seismic Improvement was released on June 12. There is the possibility that more of such information will be forthcoming.

Address of Hon. Hugh G. Grant, Former U.S. Minister to Albania and Thailand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of an address delivered by Hon. Hugh G. Grant, of Augusta, Ga., before the Citizens' Council of Lowndes County, at Valdosta, Ga., on June 27, 1959.

Mr. Grant is a former member of the State Department, and has served as U.S. Minister to Albania and Thailand, and I commend his address to the attention of all who believe in the preservation of constitutional Government:

ADDRESS BY HUGH G. GRANT, OF AUGUSTA, GA., FORMER MEMBER OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND U.S. MINISTER TO ALBANIA AND THAILAND, BEFORE THE CITIZENS' COUNCIL OF LOWNDES COUNTY, GA., INC., AT VALDOSTA, GA., SATURDAY EVENING, JUNE 27, 1959

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, in an address before the law students of the University of Georgia at Athens in February 1956, I stated that "a war is on in the United States of America—a racial revolution involving our whole social structure." I said this racial revolution was spearheaded by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, whose Negro leaders have as their goal the mongrelization of the white and Negro people in the United States. I pointed out further that the goal of the racial revolutionists is a leveling off of our American society into a common racial mold, eliminating all racial distinctions on the false theory that this constitutes democracy. I said also that never in all the history of these United States has there been such a widespread and insidious propaganda campaign. I made these statements publicly more than 3 years ago.

Triggered by the black Monday decision of the U.S. Supreme Court on May 17, 1954, declaring segregation in the public schools unconstitutional, this racial revolution has resulted in mounting racial conflicts and violence, not restricted to the South, and grave disunity among the people of the United States at a time of international crisis when unity is imperative for the safety and security of the Nation. The clock has been turned back to the evil days of reconstruction following the tragic War Between the States.

One of the major battlefronts in the cold war with Russia is right here at home. From the 1958 report of the House Un-American Activities Committee come shocking revelations of Communist activities through the enlistment of more than a million American citizens in some 200 organizations in a nationwide campaign of political subversion. "Many of these Americans," according to the committee, "would be aghast if they understood the full import of their activities and the extent to which they benefit the Communist conspiracy. * * * The Communist operation today presents a menace more serious than ever before. * * * The objectives of the campaign for political subversion is the destruction of the entire security system of the United States.

In a hearing in Atlanta, Ga., last July on Communist infiltration and activities in the South, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, declared that "most of the Communist Party operations in the United States today consists of underground-behind-the-scene manipulations * * * that there is a "pattern of (Communist) operation * * * operations in the United States of worldwide conspiracy which is determined to destroy us."

Let us take a brief look at the NAACP. It was founded in New York City, 50 years ago, by four white persons, including a Russian-trained revolutionary, William E. Walling, and one Negro, W. E. B. DuBois, honorary chairman of the NAACP. DuBois has a long list of citations of Communist, Communist-front and subversive activities, according to the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee. The files of the committee show further, according to an investigation by the staffs of Senator James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Representative James C. Davis, of Georgia; and Attorney General Eugene Cook, of Georgia, that as of 1955 the president of the NAACP, the chairman of the board, the honorary chairman, 11 vice presidents and 39 other top officials have records of affiliation or participation in Communist, Communist-front, fellow traveling or subversive organizations or activities.

Among those listed in the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee, according to the investigation, were Roy Wilkins, present executive secretary of the NAACP; Thurgood Marshall, chief counsel for the NAACP court attack on segregation in the public schools; and Henry Lee Moon, director of public relations.

Only 3 weeks ago, on June 6, 1959, a Florida legislative investigating committee declared that whether the NAACP has been infiltrated and influenced by Communists on the national level or in the State of Florida is not open to question. It definitely has been.

The whole story of the background of the decision of the Supreme Court of May 17, 1954, outlawing segregation in the public schools, has not yet been revealed. One Supreme Court Justice, Felix Frankfurter, who participated in the segregation decision, has admitted that he was a legal adviser to the NAACP before he became a member of the Court. Certainly this infamous decree played right into the hands of the Communist conspirators in the plot designed to create racial tension, strife, and violence in the United States. The Court overturned numerous Federal and State court decisions covering a period of three-quarters of a century and in effect actually amended the Constitution. Here was a major victory for the Communist plotters in the United States.

William Z. Foster, longtime head of American communism, pointed out in his book, "The Negro People in American History," that Lenin, leader of the Bolshevik revolution of 1917, advocated racial warfare as a means to revolution. Like Karl Marx, Lenin seized upon the idea of using the Negro as a dupe for revolutionary purposes for the destruction of capitalistic power.

Henry Lee Moon, mentioned above, high Negro official in the NAACP, back in 1948 in his book, "The Balance of Power, the Negro Vote," echoed this Marx-Lenin philosophy. Moon, who during New Deal days was assistant to the late Sidney Hillman, in the Political Action Committee of the CIO, wrote that "The Communist Party sees in the Negro an important ally in the struggle for the revolutionary upheaval and redistribution of wealth and power—there is every reason why Negroes should oppose any attempt to purge Communists from American life."

Having rung up a big victory through the Supreme Court segregation decision, the Communist plotters, seeking to stir up race tension, strife, and discord in the United States, scored again through the civil rights legislation enacted by the Congress in August 1957. A month later, in September 1957, there was another important Communist gain through President Eisenhower's unprecedented troop invasion of Little Rock.

It is significant that immediately following the Eisenhower troop invasion of Little Rock, the Communist Daily Worker, on September 30, 1957, commented as follows: "The action of the Government at Little Rock must not become a single-shot expedient. Little Rock cannot be half-way house for Government to rest its case against the insurrectionary southern segregationists. As Faubus' infamy was no isolated stunt of a wild man, so Eisenhower's counteraction at

Little Rock must not be an isolated deed, but the first of a series of measures that the Government must be compelled to undertake to put down the southern racists' revolt and secure the rights of the millions of Negroes to exercise their full rights as citizens."

Now this comment by the Communist Daily Worker is indicative of Soviet global pressure tactics, designed to create the impression throughout the country and the world that the South is a center of public disorder and mob violence by Negro-hating white citizens. Nothing is further from the truth. I am of the opinion that if and when the truth ever comes out, it will be revealed that certain acts of mob violence in the South, such as the bombing of synagogues and schools, were actually designed and carried out by Communist-front agents from outside the South.

The battle for more far-reaching so-called civil rights legislation, aimed at the South, is now underway in the present 86th Congress. As Senator STROM THURMOND declared recently before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, this legislation "would in effect treat the South as a conqured province to be ruled over, insofar as race relations are concerned, by a czar in the person of the Attorney General of the United States."

The Attorney General's czarism would not be restricted to the South. If you analyze this trend of Federal authority in the United States, there is only one conclusion—unless the movement is checked, we are headed for an all-out Federal police state (which is a Communist state) centralized in Washington, with the power to control the individual acts and thoughts of all the citizens of all the States, North, South, East and West.

History repeats itself. As in the Reconstruction era, following the War Between the States, a vicious struggle for political power through public office, inimical to the welfare of the Nation, is going on today in this country. As I read the civil rights bills which are now pending in the Congress, in preparation for testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, my thoughts went back to the political activities of Thad Stevens and Charles Sumner, the radical political leaders of the Reconstruction era. Surely if Stevens and Sumner could rise up out of their graves and see what is going on today they would freely admit they were pikers. These men and their followers, in the quest for political power, were oblivious to the welfare of their country. They instigated and forced the adoption of the 14th amendment to the Constitution through fraud and corruption and at the point of Federal bayonets directed at the people of the prostrate South.

Let us not overlook the fact today that it is this 14th amendment that is cited as the only legal basis for the Supreme Court decision ordering race mixing in the public schools and elsewhere. This 14th amendment is a colossal fraud since it was illegally incorporated in the Constitution of the United States.

Today some of our topflight political leaders in both major parties are following in the footsteps of Stevens and Sumner. They appear to be utterly oblivious to the fundamental facts in this race mixing campaign in the United States, as well as blind to the Communist global strategy to use this movement as one effective means of destroying the American Republic from within.

At the height of the civil rights battle in the Congress in the fall of 1957, which was featured by Senator THURMOND'S historic filibuster, David Lawrence's U.S. News & World Report, a national magazine which prints facts, published this significant headline:

"Outside the South, It's 4 Million Negro Votes That the Fight's All About—4 Million Negro Votes in 14 States—These Votes Can Decide Elections."

And today the knockdown, drag-out political battle between the national Democratic and Republican Parties for the Negro bloc vote in strategic States, with large electoral votes, where the Negroes hold the balance of power, is underway as the 1960 presidential sweepstakes approach. And so we witness the continuation of the strange and sorry spectacle of white political leaders of the Nation, which was founded and developed by sturdy white pioneers with a racial heritage of thousands of years, groveling for political control through a minority group of primitive Negro people only 95 years removed from slavery.

In this connection, a brief glance at the history of the origin of this American Republic is pertinent. Early America was colonized and developed by white people of northern European stock. These white pioneers, lovers of individual liberty and fearful of central bureaucratic control, wrote the Declaration of Independence; fought and won the American Revolution against great odds; formed a Union of States for mutual protection from outside enemies; and adopted a Constitution with a Bill of Rights to provide a minimum of central control. These white pioneers and their descendants, trekking across the vast North American Continent, expanded the little American Republic into a great Nation.

Now such achievements in a brief period of less than 300 years is no accident. Back of the sturdy determination and physical courage of the American white pioneers, as I have pointed out, was a racial heritage developed through thousands of years of struggle, sacrifice, and war.

And what of the racial heritage of the American Negroes, who under the leadership of the NAACP and its misguided white allies, are now trying to force their way into our white institutions on the basis of full racial equality? The answer is obvious. Their forebears were primitive savages in the dark jungles of Africa. The black chieftains of their ancestors actually aided the avaricious white traders in capturing the slaves for the overseas slave markets. There are today approximately 160 million Negroes still living in a primitive state in Africa. A few native Africans, trained in foreign universities and followng the Communist line, are today the agitators for so-called independent movements in Africa.

In the United States the descendants of the Negro slaves, copying the customs, manners and religion of the white Americans, have made steady progress under the friendly tutelage of the southern white people and through the system of segregation. If these American Negroes, who have many fine qualities, are let alone by the revolutionary leaders of the NAACP and its allies they will continue to make more progress, individually and collectively, as a race of people. It does not follow, however, that the American Negroes as a race can attain equality with the white people as a race through integration. There is a wide gulf between the two races of people, physically, mentally and morally. Race is a fact. That there are superior and inferior races is also a fact. The Negro race has never made the slightest contribution to civilization.

The desegregation of the Washington public schools, following the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, by order of President Eisenhower, to establish a model for the Nation, revealed the gulf existing between the two races. This was made crystal clear in the exhaustive investigation of the Washington schools by a special House committee headed by Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia. There was chaos. There was also deterioration in standards, which no special educational devices, such as the so-called four track system, adopted by the Washington school authorities, can eliminate as long as race mixing continues.

Five years have elapsed since the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, declaring segregation in the public schools unconstitutional, and 4 years have passed since the second Court decision of May 31, 1955, ordering desegregation of the public schools "with all deliberate speed."

Well, what is the situation today in the desegregation of the public schools in the 17 States and the District of Columbia, involved in the Court decisions? Is the so-called law of the land to desegregate being carried out with all deliberate speed? What is the outlook?

Southern School News, which is published monthly in Nashville, Tenn., in its June 1959 survey, states that out of a total of 2,875 biracial school districts in the region comprising the 17 States and the District of Columbia, 742 districts are known to have begun or completed the process of desegregation.

Although these statistics indicate that the Supreme Court order to desegregate with all deliberate speed does not appear to be very speedy, I am of the opinion that we should face up to the realities of the situation relating to public school integration, especially since race mixing in the schools stands at the very top of the list of plans formulated by the race mixing conspirators for the complete integration of every phase of American life. As I have pointed out, amalgamation—mongrelization—of the races is the ultimate goal of the master minds directing the conspiracy. In the final analysis, success depends upon the success of school integration.

Make no mistake about it, my friends, we are faced with a sort of creeping paralysis in public school integration. Of the 17 States and the District of Columbia, which prior to the Supreme Court decisions, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States and their own constitutions and laws, exercised complete control of their public schools, operating them on a segregated basis, only six Deep South States remain in this category. These States are Alabama, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi. In several of these States suits are pending or are in process, designed to break the segregation barricades.

Desegregation of the public schools is proceeding slowly but surely in all of the border States. In Arkansas it looks as though Governor Faubus, backed by the legislature and popular support, may have lost his dramatic fight to prevent the desegregation of the Little Rock high schools unless the Governor can find a way to circumvent recent Federal court edicts.

In the Deep South States of Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee there is so far only limited or token integration. The spotlight is on the Old Dominion State where a sharp struggle is underway by segregation leaders to counteract the surrender policy of Governor Almond who in January agreed to the collapse of Virginia's massive resistance program in the face of Federal court edicts.

There is drama in Prince Edward County, Va., where one of the original suits for school desegregation was brought before the Supreme Court. Now ordered to desegregate in September 1959 by the U.S. circuit court of appeals, which reversed a U.S. district court decision granting a 6-year grace period in desegregating, Prince Edward County will abandon its public school system and operate

private schools for white children in churches and other buildings.

Again, my fellow citizens, make no mistake about it—once the bars to race mixing in the public schools come down, through token integration or local option in any community of the State, the stage is set for the pattern to spread throughout the State. In areas heavily populated with Negroes a tiny break in the segregation dykes can easily result in a flood. It is significant that today in Atlanta, the capital city of Georgia, there is much talk of token integration and local option, arising from the recent U.S. district court order to the Atlanta public school officials to end racial segregation.

I was a spectator at the trial in Federal court in Atlanta on June 5, when the injunction suit against the Atlanta Board of Education, brought by 10 Negro parents at the instigation of the NAACP, was heard and acted upon.

This trial, it seemed to me, was a distinct triumph, a sort of Roman holiday, for those seeking racial integration, not only in the public schools of Atlanta, but throughout the State of Georgia. Before the trial ever got underway the die was cast against segregation in a preliminary order, previously agreed upon by U.S. District Judge Frank A. Hooper, and his associate, Federal Judge Boyd Sloan. This preliminary order was announced by Judge Hooper before any arguments were presented. Everything that followed was anticlimax.

This Federal courtroom scene in Atlanta on June 5 seemed unrealistic, but at the same time brutally realistic in its implications to the white people of the sovereign State of Georgia. Here was a large crowd of Negroes, the majority of whom were no doubt members of the NAACP. These people lined the walls and jammed the aisles of the courtroom. The white spectators were a small minority. Here was the chief counsel for the plaintiffs, a Negro woman of New York City, representing the NAACP.

Nearby in the Federal courtroom was an observer of the trial, Georgia's Attorney General Eugene Cook, who had made a speech to the Peace Officers Association of Georgia in Atlanta in 1955, entitled "The Ugly Truth About the NAACP." In this speech, the attorney general said he referred to the subversive design behind the current crusade of the misnamed National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and its fellow-traveling fronts to force upon the South the Communist-inspired doctrine of racial integration and amalgamation.

Appearing on behalf of the defendants, the Atlanta School Board, was Chief Counsel B. D. Murphy, who has been a special assistant attorney general representing the State in the college segregation cases. Murphy's line of argument seemed to me to be wholly unrealistic, in that it sought to make it appear that there was no intent to segregate the races in the Atlantic public schools. The testimony as a witness, of Miss Ida Jarrell, superintendent of the Atlanta schools, followed the same general trend.

Late in the afternoon of June 5, Judge Hooper indicated the general outline of his final order. In this final order, announced on June 16, Judge Hooper held, in effect, that the Supreme Court decision, in the Brown integration case ruling out racial segregation in the public schools is the law of the land and that he (the U.S. district judge) was bound by it; that the Atlanta public school officials must present to him for approval a plan of desegregation; and finally, that he (the U.S. district judge) would give the Georgia General Assembly time to act on the desegregation plan. There was as an indication that Judge Hooper would look with favor upon some sort of pupil placement plan to provide for screening of school pupils on other than racial lines. In effect, Judge Hooper granted a grace period—a breathing spell—which should allow the schools to continue operating on a segregated basis for at least another year.

In the wake of the U.S. district court ruling in Atlanta there has been widespread discussion of the issue throughout the State and some indications of panic. In some quarters, particularly in the Atlanta newspapers, there were statements to the effect that Judge Hooper had exhibited magnanimity toward the defendants. Said the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, editorially, on June 21, "He (Judge Hooper) showed proper concern for the social welfare of the State and the future of public education * * *. The court has granted Georgia both time and latitude to seek its own solution within the law."

Well, everyone to his own opinion, but I cannot follow this line of reasoning. Judge Hooper's order in effect strikes down the system of segregation of the races in Georgia's public schools whose constitution of 1877, amended in 1945, provides that separate schools shall be provided for the white and colored races. Judge Hooper's order upholds a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court which is regarded by many eminent legal authorities, as well as leading Federal and State public officials, as sociological, illegal and unconstitutional, a direct invasion of certain rights of the sovereign States pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, as set forth particularly in the 10th amendment of the Bill of Rights: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

I pose the question: Are Federal judges, including Judge Hooper and Judge Sloan and other judges in other States involved in this school situation, bound by the Supreme Court decisions? Is there no latitude whatsoever, especially in cases involving a dubious Supreme Court decree which, as indicated above, is under strong attack on a wide front? Where these Federal judges took their oaths of office, did they swear to uphold the Supreme Court or the Constitution of the United States?

What if these Federal judges, in the event they upheld the right of the State to separate the races in the public schools, were reversed by the next highest Federal court or by the Supreme Court? Would this constitute a stigma on the record of these judges? I cannot visualize such a course of events.

I pose the further question: Does a Federal judge, called upon to deliver a momentous decision, affecting the welfare of the people of his own native State, have any obligations to uphold the constitution, laws and customs of that State?

When Judge Hooper's final order, banning segregation of the races in the Atlanta public schools was announced, I sent a telegram to Governor Vandiver to the effect that the U.S. district court order constituted a direct challenge to him as the chief executive of Georgia and to the members of the general assembly. I urged the Governor to call a special session of the general assembly at the earliest possible date with a view to asserting the full sovereignty of the State of Georgia in the field of public education, through the adoption of whatever legislation may be necessary to implement the bill to invoke the doctrine of interposition.

This bill of interposition, a copy of which I hold in my hand, was approved by the General Assembly of Georgia on March 9, 1956, by a vote of 218 to 1. The bill provides:

"That said decisions and orders of the Supreme Court of the United States relating to separation of the races in public institutions of a State, as announced and promulgated by said Court on May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, are null, void and of no force or effect."

All of the resisting Southern States, except North Carolina, according to my information, 3 years ago adopted resolutions of interposition with a view to maintaining their sovereign right to operate their own school systems without Federal interference. There are numerous historic precedents for the application of the law of interposition and the cases have not been restricted to the South. Georgia has been a leader. Listen to what James Jackson Kilpatrick, editor of the Richmond, Va., News-Leader and author of "The Sovereign States," has to say:

"No State in the Union has more clearly perceived the dangers of judicial encroachment than Georgia, and no State—into our own time—has been more resolute in resisting them."

Citing two famous cases, Editor Kilpatrick referred to Georgia's remarkably successful interposition in the Chisholm case, in which Georgia flatly refused to abide by a decree of the Supreme Court, and the Yazoo Land case, in which Georgia wrathfully denounced the Supreme Court, and her representatives in Congress succeeded, over a period of several years, in frustrating the claims of the Yazoo purchasers.

The Supreme Court has spoken. The U.S. district judge in Atlanta has spoken. The time has come for the State of Georgia to speak.

The paramount issue before the people of Georgia is—who is to control the operation of the public schools, not only in Atlanta, but throughout the State—the legally constituted officials of Georgia or the Federal authorities? This grave question should be resolved without delay. The people of Georgia are entitled to know what lies ahead in the education of their children.

The strategy of defense, which has characterized resistance to the race-mixers in the Southern States, including Georgia, should be abandoned for the strategy of offense. Holding-the-line tactics and delaying-action devices should give way to bold and forthright action. The State of Georgia, through its chief executive and its general assembly, should proclaim that under the Constitution of the United States and pursuant to its own constitution, laws, and customs, it has the right to maintain and operate its public educational institutions as it sees fit, that it intends to keep its schools and colleges open—and on a racially segregated basis. This is interposition.

I am of the opinion that there is a good possibility that several other Southern States would follow Georgia's lead. Such concerted action could not only turn the tide in the battle for race mixing, but it would also go a long way toward forestalling the creation of that powerful, centralized Federal police state in Washington.

My fellow citizens of Georgia, we must meet the crisis that confronts us without delay, for the hour is late. The white people of Georgia, who believe in constitutional government and the right of a sovereign State to control its own internal affairs, must mobilize their forces for positive action. Individual citizens must be willing to stand up publicly and be counted, dedicating themselves to the cause which we believe to be right and just. Individual sacrifices in time and money are required. The race-mixing conspirators are heavily financed. Thorough organization for collective action, in an orderly and lawful manner, at the local level is imperative. Organization should be on a strictly nonpartisan basis, devoid of political tieups. There should be full freedom for independent action on the problem with which we must deal. Each of Georgia's 159 counties should

be organized, functioning through regular meetings. A plan for effective coordinated effort at the State level should be formulated by the people at the local level through their county organizations.

The decisions on this momentous issue will be made at the State capitol in Atlanta by the chief executive and members of the General Assembly of Georgia. I am of the opinion that it is the desire of the great majority of Georgia citizens to retain their public schools and colleges as presently operated on a racially segregated basis, which is not possible through such foot-in-the-door devices as token integration, pupil screening, grade-by-grade gradualism, or local option. As so well expressed recently by Georgia's Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, "We will ultimately have mass integration or no integration. There is no such thing as a middle ground in this problem."

The desire of the great majority of Georgia's citizens to retain their racially segregated public schools and colleges must be crystalized and forcibly expressed by the white citizens of Georgia mobilized for positive action, as indicated above. Let's go into action, fellow citizens.

It's the People's Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a great deal recently about government by veto which, in my opinion, is a little ridiculous. If President Eisenhower, or any President, does not reflect the wishes of a majority of the people when he vetoes a bill, the Congress can certainly override it.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the July 20, 1959, edition of the U.S. News & World Report which gets to the heart of this matter and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

IT'S THE PEOPLE'S VETO

(By David Lawrence)

Political discussion lately has centered on the presidential veto. The Democratic National Chairman has urged members of his party in Congress to exercise their power to force vetoes on the theory that it is politically advantageous to do so. President Eisenhower, on the other hand, has been accused of using his authority to negate the will of Congress, and there have been denunciations of this as "government by veto."

What we are witnessing today is the strange phenomenon of irresponsible government because there exists in both houses of Congress a two-thirds majority which is opposite to the party in control of the executive branch of the Government. There have been instances where, even when the same party controlled the White House and two thirds of both houses of Congress, a presidential veto has been overridden. This is a reflection of public opinion—it is, in a sense, the people's veto of a presidential action.

In the 1937 battle between President Roosevelt and Congress on legislation to increase the membership of the Supreme Court from nine to fifteen Justices, he could not muster even a 51 percent majority, though the Democrats actually had elected in 1936 more than two thirds of both houses. The people said, "No."

The truth is, as Woodrow Wilson wrote in his book on "Constitutional Government" 5 years before he became President, the Chief Executive alone is in a position to represent the national interest, and he can derive substantial power and prestige from his hold on public opinion. This is why there is a fallacy in the oft-repeated comment that a President in his second term is a "lame duck" and that the Constitution should not have been amended to prohibit more than two terms in the Presidency.

This amendment was adopted in 1947 to some extent on the theory that a President leads by reason of the patronage or favors he can dispense and that, if eligible continually for reelection, he could win votes in Congress by virtually bribing members with promises of presidential beneficence. But this assumes that an unpopular President could thwart the public will. It ignores the fact that every two years all Members of the House, along with a third of the Senate, must go before the electorate.

A President is as strong as the public opinion that he is able to mobilize. Mr. Eisenhower is in a powerful position today precisely because he is not a candidate for another term. The country feels he is not politically ambitious, and he has announced that he will not attempt to dictate the nominee of the 1960 Republican National Convention.

Whatever influence Mr. Eisenhower has over his own party or over the members of the Democratic Party in Congress comes from his accurate sensing of the national will. He himself, in discussing this point at last week's press conference, said:

"I am trying to do what will, I believe, be good for the country, and I don't enjoy vetoing bills. I don't believe that there is any validity in such expressions as 'government by veto.'

"I am part of the process of legislation and when I am the only official, along with the Vice President, who is voted into office by all the people, I think I have got a special responsibility to all the people. So, I try to tell them and explain to them what I am doing. If they approve, that ought to have some effect."

The argument is sometimes made that a majority of the people are in favor of the Democratic Party because in the 1958 election Democrats carried both the House and the Senate overwhelmingly. It is pointed out that even in 1956, when President Eisenhower was re-elected, the Democrats actually polled more votes for Congress than did the Republicans. The figures, however, present a statistical paradox. For, actually, the votes for Congress are cast in individual districts or States, and, where one congressional candidate is acknowledged to have preponderant support, many citizens do not take the trouble to vote.

Recently another paradox has been noted in the Gallup polls. They show Mr. Eisenhower to have made a gain in popularity from 52 to 62 percent since last year's congressional elections. But the pollsters still find that more people label themselves as Democrats than as Republicans.

This has little bearing on what the nation wants at any particular moment by way of legislation or action by the Executive. Each proposal or national policy has to be judged on its merits. If the President vetoes a bill and public opinion generally is on his side, it would not be good politics for members of the opposite party or of his own party to override the veto.

The President is elected by all the people. He is not supposed to bow to sectional or pressure groups.

Mr. Eisenhower is singularly free from political entanglements. He has no political ambition. He has only a little more than 18 months to serve. If he refuses to sign a bill, it's because he thinks that it what the people want. This is indeed a people's veto.

Statistics Submitted by American Committee on Italian Migration Concerning Petitions for Immigrant Visas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter I received from Rev. Caesar Donanzan, executive national secretary of the American Committee on Italian Migration, 5 East 35th Street, New York, N.Y.

The letter follows:

AMERICAN COMMITTEE
ON ITALIAN MIGRATION,
New York, N.Y., July 13, 1959.

The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: Permit me to acknowledge receipt of and to thank you for copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated June 16, 1959, volume 105, containing your speech on "The Immigration Laws of the United States."

Permit to refer further to my correspondence with you regarding our interest in the solution of the fourth preference quota problem and to draw your attention to the statistics submitted by the U.S. Department of State on June 10, 1959, concerning the number of petitions filed by American citizens and classified under this category of the Immigration and Nationality Act. They are as follows:

Italy	64,453
Greece	4,500
Poland	3,200
Portugal	2,500
Yugoslavia	1,700
Turkey	490
Spain	595
Hungary	785
China	257
Other countries	6,472
Total	84,952

There is no doubt that some of these 84,952 applicants (adult sons and daughters, brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens) are married and have children. We have advocated, you will recall, that, in order not to create a future problem of separated families, they be permitted to bring spouses and children with them.

The index used officially to determine the family unit size is 1.7 which, multiplied by the total number of 84,952, equals 144,418.

Since many of the petitions have been on file for several years, it must be assumed that some of the applicants or their petitioners have either passed away or—the former—have lost the desire to emigrate because they have been absorbed in the economy of their native country or for other reasons. These factors would somewhat reduce the toal number of fourth preference immigrants.

We further recommend that the immigrants be admitted within the next 4- or

5-year period, during which time no additional petitions be accepted.

We believe that it is in the American national interest that these people be admitted and, furthermore, we believe that our Government has a moral responsibility to act favorably upon the petitions since it has accepted and approved them.

Appreciative of your continued interest and support of this vital objective, I am, with kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

CAESAR DONANZAN

Rev. Caesar Donanzan, P.S.S.C.

P.S.—You will be interested to know that, according to the Department of State, less than 1,500 Italians would receive nonquota visas and thereby benefit by H.R. 5896 out of the 64,453 presently wait listed.

Geneva: Round 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, the free world watches closely the conferences now going on in Geneva. Upon the outcome of these conferences may well rest the future of free nations everywhere.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the York Daily News of July 13, 1959, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

GENEVA: ROUND 2

Following a recess of 3 weeks, the Foreign Ministers' Conference takes up again today at Geneva.

As in round 1, so in round 2 the United States will be represented by Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, Britain by Selwyn Lloyd, France by Maurice Couve de Murville, and Soviet Russia by Andrei Gromyko. Sitting by as observers permitted to talk now and then will be representatives of West Germany and Red-enslaved East Germany.

The conversation, as before, will have to do mainly with West Berlin and Khrushchev's November 27, 1958, bawl that the Western allies had to pull their troops out of there within 6 months, or else.

Khrushchev's May 27 deadline is long past. He modified his ultimatum in advance of that date, when it dawned on him that his bluff was a bust. Now, he is merely saying we've got to get out of West Berlin some time.

Well, what happens in the second round? In our opinion, the Western Foreign Ministers have made all the concessions to Khrushchev that they can make without actually selling West Berlin down the river.

They have offered to reduce the Western garrison, now amounting to about 11,000 men. They have shown a willingness to let East German Communists, instead of Russians, check trucks into and out of West Berlin, as agents of the Russians. And they have offered to cut out what Khrushchev calls subversive activities in West Berlin.

WE'VE ALREADY GONE TOO FAR

In view of Communists' notorious skill at grabbing a mile when given an inch, these concessions would make the Western Allied occupation of West Berlin a good deal more difficult than it has been, and would encourage the Kremlin to step up its efforts to blast us out of there.

We think the Western foreign ministers erred in offering any of these compromise steps, and we are convinced that Khrushchev took them merely as signs of Western allied weakness.

Now, however, it is advance-doped that British Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd will try in the second Geneva round to sell still more concessions to the United States and France for the appeasement of Moscow.

One of these, it is said, will be an offer to set up a four-power commission, including a Soviet representative, for running West Berlin or perhaps all of Berlin.

A moron could see how dangerous it would be to let the Kremlin stick a foot into West Berlin in that way. This commission from the start would be bedeviled and disrupted by the Russian member.

STAND PAT, MR. HERTER

We hope Messrs. Herter and De Murville will stand pat, from first to last.

Khrushchev hasn't offered a single concession to our side, and won't as long as he thinks we're weak willed.

If the West lets West Berlin slide into Khrushchev's Marxist hell, the West will hand the Kremlin its biggest single victory to date in the cold war. The Western alliance will start coming apart, nation after nation will hurry to appease the Red slave empire, and communism will be in sight of its long-planned enslavement of the entire human race.

This conference, then, is, among other things, a test for Herter, which will show whether he has the cold courage and unshakable resolution of the late John Foster Dulles, or whether he is just a nice, high-minded fellow with a fat percentage of rubber in his backbone.

A lot of Mr. Dulles' longtime supporters fear Herter is the latter, while devoutly hoping they will be proved mistaken.

WILL HE PASS IT?

Certainly he delivered a firm, bluntly worded TV and radio report to the Nation on round one at Geneva. But that didn't finish this job.

Herter's next job is to hold out against any further concessions to Moscow on West Berlin, regardless of pressures brought to bear on him by chicken allies, homegrown Russia lovers, Gromyko, or anybody else.

We hope with all our hearts that Herter will pass this test. On his passing it may depend the life or death of Western civilization.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses cleared D.C. appropriations for White House.

Senate passed defense appropriations and took up D.C. home rule bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 12069–12105, 12165

Bills Introduced: 7 bills and 3 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2378–2384; S.J. Res. 120; and S. Con. Res. 61–62. Pages 12074, 12165–12166

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

Report of Joint Committee on Atomic Energy entitled "Proposed Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation With the United Kingdom, and Proposed Agreements for Cooperation With the Republic of France, Canada, Turkey, the Netherlands, the Federal Republic of Germany, and Greece on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes" (S. Rept. 513); and

S. 1138, to provide for a readjustment of benefits for post-Korean veterans, with amendments (S. Rept. 514). Page 12074

Bills Referred: Five House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. Page 12105

D.C. Appropriations: H.R. 5676, fiscal 1960 appropriations for the D.C., was cleared for President's signature when Senate adopted conference report thereon. Motion to reconsider this action was tabled. Pages 12130–12132

Defense Appropriations: By unanimous vote of 90 yeas (motion to reconsider tabled), Senate passed with amendments H.R. 7454, fiscal 1960 appropriations for the Department of Defense, after taking the following actions on additional amendments thereto:

Adopted: Engle amendment providing that the commercial air transport service authorized shall be from licensed air carriers not holding certificates as supplemental air carriers that have available equipment for the Civil Reserve Air Fleet; and

Rejected: By a tie vote of 46 yeas to 46 nays, modified Thurmond amendment to reduce from $100 million to $80 million funds available for procurement of commercial air transport service from carriers certified by CAB as scheduled or supplemental air carriers; and Proxmire amendment to eliminate $380 million, Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (cost of a nuclear-propelled attack aircraft carrier).

Also, the Chair sustained Chavez point of order against Humphrey amendment to add proviso that $500,000 shall be available to Departments of State and Defense, jointly, for special foreign policy studies relating to disarmament and weapons control, and possible technical means of enforcing any reduction-of-arms agreement.

Senate insisted on its amendments, asked for conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Chavez, Hayden, Russell, Hill, Ellender, Robertson, Byrd (Virginia), Saltonstall, Bridges, and Young (North Dakota). Pages 12105–12130, 12132–12151

Policy on Communism: Senate adopted (motion to reconsider tabled) S. Res. 115, to authorize studies respecting national policy in contest with world communism ($60,000). Pages 12152–12153

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced that during balance of week Senate will consider S. 1681, D.C. home rule, to be followed by S. 1928, participation of U.S. in Inter-American Development Bank, and probably a call of the calendar. Page 12153

Tariff—Gift Imports: H.R. 7567, to extend for 2 years the privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the U.S. on duty abroad, was passed without amendment and cleared for White House. Pages 12153–12154

D.C. Home Rule: Senate made its unfinished business S. 1681, to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the D.C. Page 12157

Veterans' Benefits: Authority was granted for filing of individual and minority views on S. 1138, to provide for a readjustment of benefits for post-Korean veterans (reported today). Page 12074

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken during Senate proceedings today, which appear on pages 12130 and 12151.

Treaty Reported: International Wheat Agreement, 1959 (Ex. E, 86th Cong., 1st sess.), was reported (Ex. Rept. 5). Page 12074

Appendix

I Kept Right on Going

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Thursday, July 16, Michael L. Benedum will sit quietly in his living room reading congratulatory letters on his 90th birthday anniversary.

M. L. Benedum, an outstanding native West Virginian, has enjoyed a fabulous career as the most successful oil wildcatter in history and is the possessor of that outstanding quality—concern and compassion for the well-being of his fellowman.

Tomorrow's birthday anniversary of the stalwart mountaineer will be the occasion for him to receive greetings and congratulations from the President and the Vice President of the United States, as well as from those of us in the Congress, and, indeed, from just plain folk.

Each year and each decade have been marked by Mr. Benedum testifying, by his good living and genuine serving, to the Longfellow dictum that "Age is opportunity no less than youth itself."

Mike Benedum's responsiveness to the needs of his home community and his country—their recreational, educational, and religious activities and institutions—has been the hallmark of the respect and esteem his deeds have engendered in people of all walks of life.

His countless admirers and coworkers, and those hosts of men and women who call him "blessed," join in the wish that Michael Late Benedum will enjoy more fruitful years to further inspire them, as he has done for so long.

His 90th birthday anniversary recalls an article which I wrote 5 years earlier for a national magazine, Success Unlimited. In the preparation of that article, I ask Mr. Benedum what he did when he met adversity and defeat on his road to success. He replied: "I kept right on going."

Mr. President, that is the title of the story published by Success Unlimited in April 1955, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I KEPT RIGHT ON GOING

(By JENINNGS RANDOLPH)

Henry George, social theorist of the second half of the 19th century, once said that he was disturbed by the spectacle of men whose incomes were derived not from the services they rendered the community, but merely from the fact that they had the good fortune to hold advantageously situated soil.

If George had had the privilege of knowing Michael L. Benedum, probably the world's most celebrated oil wildcatter, he would not have been so disturbed. On the contrary, he would have marveled, even as we who know him today marvel, at M. L. Benedum's talent for deriving his income from making advantageously situated soil render service to the community. For with Benedum's lifetime objective of puncturing the earth's crust in search of the precious, black, flowing liquid which has made him rich, have gone other objectives which have made him great.

On a sultry July day in 1890, a tall hard-muscled young man of 21 boarded a train at the little town of Bridgeport, W. Va. He was headed for Parkersburg, W. Va., and an uncertain future. There was only one empty seat in the crowded car. The young man sat down in it. At the next stop a middle-aged man, laboring with a heavy suitcase got aboard. The young man jumped to his feet. "Won't you take this seat, sir?" he asked.

"Oh, no. Keep your seat, son," the man said.

But the young man insisted. The stranger smiled, "All right, I'll sit down—but only if you sit on the arm and talk to me."

The man, impressed with the youth's going out of his way to help a stranger, asked some questions. He soon learned something of the history of the young man at his side. "So you want a job?" he asked. "Well, I'm John Worthington, general superintendent of the South Penn Oil Co. How about working for me?"

Thus began the fabulous career of Michael Late Benedum—a career founded on perhaps his most outstanding quality—concern for the well-being of his fellowmen.

Today—at 85—Mike Benedum, erect and almost wrinkle-free, with a youthful appearance to match his frame of mind, ranks as the most successful oil wildcatter in history, as the discoverer of more oil than any other single individual who ever lived. In the past 35 years, his discoveries have added more oil to the world's known reserves than the world has consumed. They have included every State in the Union where rigs have gone to work. Royalties from his discoveries have made the University of Texas a wealthy institution. The wells he drilled in Rumania proved both a blessing and, during World War II, a curse to that nation. His discovery and development of Colombia's vast oil wealth has raised the standard of living of the entire country. He played an important role in discovering Mexico's seemingly inexhaustible reserves. And as recently as 1950, Mike Benedum, at 81, sent geophysicists by helicopter over a million acres of leased wasteland in Canada to make recordings of the terrain. Subsequent discoveries there show notable promise of developments in both gas and oil. It is more than likely that if you asked Mike what was the best oilfield (he never thought merely in terms of wells) he ever brought in, he would probably exclaim, "The next one."

Today, Mike Benedum's fortune ranges upward of about $100 million, probably putting him among the Nation's dozen richest men. It also places him in the ranks of one of the largest payers of income tax in the United States.

What qualities go to make up such a man? What did Mike Benedum do that you can do in your life—perhaps not to create a $100 million fortune—but to make living a richer, more regarding experience for you?

If you will but appropriate only two of the many principles followed by Benedum in his achievements, you will go a long way toward achieving success.

Benedum has based his life on giving—always doing more than was expected of him without expecting return. This habit of going the extra mile got him started. How was he to know that the stranger to whom he offered his train seat was in a position to give him a job? By always doing more than was expected, by always giving with no thought of immediate getting, Benedum simply put the law of increasing returns to work for him, and as it always will, the law repaid him handsomely.

Think thoughts of giving instead of getting and you, too, can reap the effects of this law.

Mike Benedum has had reverses in fortune which might have broken another man. Shortly after making his first fortune, he lost it—as a result of a tip from his brother to get out of the oil business and play it conservative.

What did Mike do when he lost his fortune—when everything was at its blackest? He kept right on going. He returned to his first love—oil—and soon his faith in what he knew he could do best was paying off in yet a greater fortune. Through believing by doing he turned yesterday's losses into today's fortune. As he says:

"I've had no ulcers because I've had confidence, faith, and patience to carry me through. If halfway up an obstacle I'd meet a streak of bad luck, I kept right on going 'til I was over the top."

In 1920 his attempt to tap oil in the Philippines in productive quantities failed; again adversity hit. Did Mike abandon all hope? Did his econversation reveal that he was defeated by this setback? No. His optimism rang through his every word as he said, "That is part of the game. You can't expect to find deposits of oil everywhere you look. If you did, there wouldn't be any fun wildcatting."

If you, like Benedum, can stand tall when misfortune strikes, if you can learn to look for the seed of an equivalent benefit in every adversity, you will have put into effect another priceless principle of successful living.

Mike Benedum's recipe for success is compellingly put: The first step to success, he explains, is to be doing what you like. Then work. He says:

"Work yourself, drive yourself, make sacrifices, or you'll never achieve anything worthwhile."

Mike Benedum's philosophy about money goes something like this: "I'm just a trustee for it—and will be held accountable for the good I can accomplish with it—both in the community as a whole and in behalf of opportunities for people coming up—even as I was given an opportunity, back when."

Opportunities for investment within the vast complex of his numerous enterprises have always been made available to his associates.

His fortune will play many great parts. He built a million dollar Methodist church in Bridgeport, W. Va. Smaller colleges in West Virginia and Pennsylvania share his interest and the public will benefit from his Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation (in

memory of his son who was lost in World War I and also the name of the man who gave Mike his start).

How does Mike stay young?

On his 85th birthday, he said, "I have been asked how I keep going at my age. My formula is to keep busy so that the years go by unnoticed. To despise nothing except selfishness, meanness, and corruption; fear nothing except cowardice, disloyalty, and indifference; covet nothing that is my neighbor's except his kindness of heart and his gentleness of spirit; think many, many times of my friends and, if possible, seldom of my enemies. As I see it, age is not a question of years. It is a state of mind. You are as young as your faith, and today I think I have more faith in my fellow man, in my country, and in my God than I have ever had."

And while he sees vast opportunities for the future, he is realistic in appraising them:

"It takes a combination of character and assets to get started—and you don't come upon either easily. It takes lots of sacrifice, curtailment of first impulses, and patience to succeed."

Speaking of patience, Mike is most impatient with those who intone the old saw about opportunity being a thing of the past, that it was all parceled out to our grandfathers.

"Sheer nonsense," says Mike Benedum. "They told me that too, when I was a kid. All the good farmland is gone—there's no more opportunity. What they didn't realize was that the times were to unfold new opportunities for pioneering. Oil, steel, and other fields were waiting for explorers to discover and develop them.

"The same is true today—if a person looks hard enough and has sufficient drive, those with pioneering blood in their veins will find an outlet for their energy."

Because he is still such a person, today, as he approaches the age of 86—and who knows what new venture in a life of endless possibilities—Mike Benedum, still standing tall, is keeping right on going.

Adequate Representation Allowance One Key To Insuring That Qualified Persons Head U.S. Embassies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on June 24, 1959, I submitted a resolution which would put the Senate on record as favoring the selection to head our embassies and legations overseas of career diplomats with a useful knowledge of the language and culture of the countries involved.

At that time I pointed out that establishment of such a standard must be accompanied by congressional support for adequate representation allowances. Otherwise, experienced American diplomats would be eliminated from consideration for posts for which they are well qualified merely because they lack a personal private income sufficient to cover the costs of social responsibilities inherent in the positions.

In the July 5, 1959, issue of the Oregonian of Portland, Oreg., there appeared an excellent editorial commenting on this relationship between wealth and diplomacy in American foreign relations. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, July 5, 1959]

SHORT RATIONS

After a promising start, Congress has decided against making it possible for other than wealthy persons to serve as ambassadors to the world's major nations. Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, Arkansas, who, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has been promoting appointment of trained diplomats to important ambassadorial posts, has, at the same time, urged an increase in allowances to prevent out-of-pocket costs to those representing the United States abroad. But House delegates in conference committee have refused to accept this idea.

This means that appropriations will not, in some cases, cover the official expenditures required of ambassadors in such posts as Paris and London, and that the state of a man's pocketbook must still be among the considerations in selecting such envoys.

Oregon Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER recently inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table showing that, of the two of of three U.S. ambassadorial and ministerial posts filled by foreign service personnel, virtually all are qualified in the language of the country to which they are assigned. But when he asked for the language qualifications of ambasadors and ministers outside the professional corps, the State Department responded that it did not have that information.

Ridiculous. The State Department surely knows what languages its envoys speak. It must be assumed that it is embarrassed to make the information public. Circumstances are likely to remain embarrassing so long as wealth and politics are retained as major criteria in the selection of our representatives abroad.

A Challenge to All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by Preston J. Moore, national commander of the American Legion.

It was my pleasure and privilege, on June 26, 1959, to attend the department of Idaho convention at Twin Falls and to hear Commander Moore deliver this dynamic message.

I call the attention of Senators to the pertinent points which the national commander makes concerning current legislation, an accelerated program of Americanism, renewed activity on behalf of veterans, and national security.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You active Idaho Legionnaires who are attending this convention—any many of your hard working comrades back home—are doing your part to help build a new spirit of progress and achievement.

At the beginning of this year I said that "community service is the answer to the future of the American Legion." In community after community where you have put effort and initiative into fine community service programs, you have proved the accuracy of that statement.

Rehabilitation, Americanism, national security, child welfare, these are the foundation stones of the American Legion. You have been building the American Legion of the future through your renewed emphasis on these four basic programs.

I have no doubt that the solid progress made during the past year will be reflected into Idaho's membership strength. My congratulations to you for a job well done.

I am indebted to each of you individually. I also want to pay my respects to your department leaders—the Legionnaires with whom I have been permitted to work very closely during these past months.

To Department Commander Pete Wilson, to your national executive committeeman Hawley Atkinson, to Adjutant Lou Babb, and to all of the Idaho Legionnaires who ably filled positions on our national committees, my sincere thanks.

However, neither they, nor you, nor I serve the American Legion with the hope of personal credit. We work for and in the Legion because we believe in it—because it is our way of meeting an obligation to our Nation and to our fellow veteran.

According to a book that made the rounds a few years ago, life begins at 40. The record I will review briefly today indicates that in its 40th anniversary year, the American Legion has definitely taken on new vigor. It is virtually certain that this year, for the first time in 6 years, we will score a membership gain.

Membership as you know, is our powerplant. It provides the push and prestige that make all our programs go. The increase at this particular time has a deeper significance. It means that the American Legion creed of service is attracting new believers. And it means that we shall have new hands to carry on the work of the many devoted Legionnaires who have answered their last rollcall.

As national commander, I share your sense of achievement over this reversal of the membership trend. I also recognize that the credit belongs primarily to you—to the blue-capped Legionnaire who gives his time and effort to his post and asks only the satisfaction of serving.

Heading the list of 36 departments which already have topped their membership totals of 1958 are North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska. The entire American Legion will benefit from their pace-setting performances. My own department of Oklahoma is near the top—and while there's nothing unusual about Oklahoma turning in a championship job in any kind of competition, the records show that very seldom has a department increased its enrollment while one of its members occupied this office.

So the accent once again is on growth—on a renewal of strength not only in members but in purpose.

The current year has seen that strength of purpose tested and affirmed on every major front of American Legion activity.

In rehabilitation, we have long advocated a realistic revision of the veterans' pension program. I am happy to report that the Congress is well on the way to providing one.

The object of our concern here is a large group of war veterans and their survivors who are prevented by age or other circumstances beyond their control from caring adequately for themselves. A generous Government long ago recognized their plight in the form of a limited program of modest disability and death pension awards. The cost has been small—the return in human dignity enormous. And yet, antiveteran forces have chosen to subject this program and its beneficiaries to an almost constant rain of pressure and abuse.

The administration recently proposed legislation that would have sharply reduce the rates and numbers of those on the disability pension rolls. We found it to be a "bill of wrongs"—and said so. We urged the Congress instead to enact changes to meet these fundamental goals: (1) Higher pension awards, particularly at the lowest income level; (2) the same eligiblity requirements for death pension to the widows and orphans of World War II and Korea as are now applied to World War I cases; (3) reasonable increases in the income limitations that determine pension eligibility; and (4) assurance that the awards will continue to go only to beneficiaries actually in financial need.

Under the leadership of Chairman TEAGUE, the Veterans' Affairs Committee approved a bill that is consistent with all four of these recommendations.

On June 15, the House passed the bill and Senate approval is expected without substantial change.

Here, in practical terms, is what enactment of H.R. 7650 will mean:

As of July 1, 1960, 7 out of every 10 veterans, widows, and orphans now on the rolls will receive increased awards. In addition, more than 275,000 not eligible under existing law will go on the rolls. A total of approximately 1,132,00 veterans and survivors will gain either increases in their present rates or a place on the rolls for the first time.

Now I want to make it clear that the bill does not contain everything we recommended. Some features fall short of our estimate of the need; some will require careful evaluation in practice. In my judgment, it is a good bill; compared with the plan submitted by the administration, it's a great bill. It guarantees that the Congress will continue to recognize the Nation's obligation and the veteran's need.

I only hope that the people who tried to destroy the program will take this latest defeat to heart, and will turn their attention to something more constructive than the harassment of war veterans and their families for whom life itself has become a battle.

The child welfare and youth training activities of our combined American Legion posts and units add up, I believe, to the greatest investment made by any organization in the future of America. This year we've upped the ante.

By year's end we will have spent roughly $7 million on child welfare and related services.

An additional 100 Boy Scout units have been organized under American Legion sponsorship, bringing the total to 4,333.

Forty-nine departments this summer are training 18,000 high school juniors to know and respect good government at 49 American Legion Boys States.

When it first became a national program in 1926, American Legion junior baseball was played by 26 teams. The competition now getting underway will feature 18,000 teams—with about 1 million boys participating in some phase of the program.

This is the type of work we were organized to do. We are doing more of it for the benefit of more young Americans than ever before, and still there's plenty of room for expansion.

Again, the important thing is that we're on the move. At the post level where all our achievements begin, both the spirit and the flesh are willing.

Building for the future has also claimed our best efforts in another area of traditional concern—national security.

In this 13th year of the cold war, we face a far greater challenge abroad and at home than ever before. The Soviets hold the initiative militarily and psychologically. Their drive for world domination has registered vital new gains in the Middle and Far East, and there's a definite possibility that in Cuba they will capture a vital stronghold at our very doorstep.

We believe that strong military forces, armed and organized according to modern standards, represent a minimum answer to this threat. That is why we have emphasized the importance of balanced forces, of strength in being as against strength on paper, and of reserve forces adequate to assure defense in depth. With one ominous exception, the defense appropriation bill now pending in the Congress recognizes these needs.

The exception relates to missile power—the new first line of our defense. A year ago, there were official denials that a missile gap really existed. Now the gap is acknowledged, but we're told it's nothing to worry about—that the Soviet lead is only a year or two long, and perhaps we can keep it from growing.

The disturbing thing to us is that most of the arguments supporting a limited missile program fall back sooner or later on the element of cost and the desirability of balancing the budget. We're concerned about the budget, too. But we're more concerned—and I think most Americans share our concern—about building the kind of military preparedness that will enable us to uphold America's honor and advance America's cause in the world struggle with communism.

Frankly, a second place finish in the nuclear arms race doesn't impress us as a national objective. The Communists have not lowered their sights; they mean to conquer us. We ought to rely more on our readiness to win a fight than on their reluctance to start one.

The Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, recently stated: "If we looked into the books of the Soviet leaders where they list our national assets and liabilities, I am sure we would find that they count heavily upon American unwillingness to bear for long the discomforts and hardships which are the price of world leadership."

Have we reached that point already? Do we value our freedom and sovereignty so little that we will do only what can be done conveniently and with comfort?

The real issue is more than survival. We can survive, if that is all we want, by quitting the fight—and coexisting the way hundreds of millions of people are coexisting today in Russia and China and in all the captive lands behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Americans, historically, have aspired to something more. Our richest and greatest resources are to be found not in military or industrial might but in our tradition of faith in America—of dedication to the sanctity of human freedom and of confidence in the destiny of our country. This is the spirit—the positive purpose—that should motivate and control our national policy.

Love of soft living is not among the ideals for which we fought. Perhaps the time has come when we must choose between luxury and liberty.

Winston Churchill, in the dark summer of 1941, reminded us that "the destiny of mankind is not decided by material computation. When great causes are on the move," he said, "we learn that we are spirits, not animals; and that something is going on in space and time which, whether we like it or not, spells duty."

Our great cause is human freedom. Our plain duty, I believe, is to launch a freedom offensive that will utilize the full potential of our power—economic, psychological, and moral. The patriots who fathered our cause deemed it worthy of their fortunes, their lives, and their sacred honor. Let us act in their image. Let us demonstrate by deed as well as word that we are resolute and united—that our single purpose is peace with justice—and that neither favor nor fear will persuade us to take less.

If we do this, we will command the respect and confidence of peoples the world over who are waiting to see on which side the real power lies. We will put an end to doubts about our capacity to lead. And we will finally be in a position where we can make the moves and leave the checkmating to the Kremlin.

I have reviewed here today just a few of the ways in which we, the American Legion, are serving—and can serve—our common heritage. To help the veteran who needs help, to encourage youngsters to grow straight and our country strong are obligations that we cherish as Legionnaires. May God grant us the will and the way to continue to meet them.

Independence Day for Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on May 28, 1959, the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, under the distinguished chairmanship of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER held an opening hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 57, introduced by myself and Senators CLARK, HENNINGS, HUMPHREY, LANGER, MORSE, NEUBERGER, and PROXMIRE. This resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution to protect the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court as final authority in all cases involving constitutional issues. The proposed amendment was introduced because, although the Supreme Court has by tradition, historical acceptance and continuity of court decisions exercised authority to declare any Act of Congress or law of a State unconstitutional, nowhere has that authority been expressly stated in the Federal Constitution.

In view of the interpretation given a number of resolutions adopted by the American Bar Association in February, 1959, dealing with specific issues in the internal security field on which the Supreme Court had handed down decisions, I am most gratified that the president of the American Bar Association, Mr. Ross Malone has, on a number of recent occasions, reiterated the special responsibility of the bar in maintaining the independence of the courts and the judiciary. He pointed out, in addressing the Judicial Conferences of the Fourth Judicial Circuit in Asheville, N.C., on June 30, and of the 10th Judicial Circuit on July 3, that when the

independence of the Courts is endangered by attacks arising from decisions in controversial cases, this special responsibility of the bar assumes vital importance. In doing so, Mr. Malone endorsed and urged adoption of the constitutional amendment which I had proposed.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Malone's remarks before the Judicial Conference of the 10th Circuit.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDEPENDENCE DAY FOR COURTS

(Address by Ross L. Malone, president, American Bar Association, before the Annual Judicial Conference of the 10th Judicial Circuit of the United States, Santa Fe, N. Mex., July 3, 1959)

The indictment returned against George III by the Continental Congress at Philadelphia on July 4, 186 years ago, contained as two of its specifications:

"He has obstructed the administration of justice by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers.

"He has made judges dependent on his will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries."

That this aspect of the tyranny of the English monarch had so outraged the Colonists, that it was included in the Declaration of Independence, is of special significance as a backdrop for the subsequent history of the courts of this country.

The original concept of justice having been that it was the beneficence of the sovereign, and the judges who administered it having been the agents of the Crown, it is understandable that the concept of independent courts was slow to develop.

In 1776, the concept of an independent judiciary was of comparatively recent origin. It had received its first formal recognition in England in the Act of Settlement of 1701, which for the first time provided that judges should be appointed for the period of their good behavior and prevented the removal of judges except on an address from Parliament to the Crown. Throughout the early stages of English history, judges had combined the performance of administrative duties for the Crown with the administration of justice and frequently had confused the two functions.

In the 14th century, some steps had been taken to bring about a gradual separation of the administrative functions of courts from their judicial functions, but progress was intermittent and retrogression was not unusual. Throughout this period, and even until the Act of Settlement various English kings thought nothing of polling and manipulating the judiciary to insure a favorable outcome in any matter in which the Crown had an interest, whether direct or incidental.

A typical example was the attempt of James II to secure judicial recognition of the power of dispensation. This resulted in his discharge of a number of judges who would not bend to his will and give judicial sanction to the doctrine that this was within the royal prerogative. It was this purge which led one of the ousted judges to warn the king, "Your Majesty may find 12 judges of your mind, but hardly 12 lawyers."

James and his successors were not deterred, however, and judges continued to occupy the bench at the king's pleasure, until the Act of Settlement in 1701. It was inevitable that history during this period should provide frequent examples of the monarch coercing favorable rulings from judges dependent upon him for their tenure.

The Act of Settlement was of no assistance to the American Colonists, however, in spite of the fact that they also had been the victims of the system which subjected judges to the whim of the Crown. Its provisions did not extend to the colonial judges. Some of the colonists and colonial assemblies had sought to obtain this protection, but the Tory argument prevailed that to create an independent colonial judiciary might "lessen the joint dependence which the colonies ought to have upon the government of the Mother Country."

The lack of this protection and the resulting dependence of the judiciary upon the pleasure of the sovereign was frequently brought to the attention of the colonists. The historic trial of John Peter Zenger in 1735 for seditious libel was upon charges among others, that he had published articles critical of the removal of a colonial judge by the Royal Governor as the result of the failure of the judge to decide a case in accordance with the interest of the Governor.

The second specification of the Declaration of Independence with reference to judicial abuses referred to making the judges dependent upon his will alone, not only for their tenure, but also for "the amount and payment of their salaries." This specification no doubt resulted, at least in part, from the royal plan announced in 1772 under which judicial salaries in the Colonies would be paid by the Crown, rather than by the Colonial Assembly or other local source. This proposed change, at a time when the Colonies were becoming increasingly restive, was a rather obvious attempt to insure control of the courts by the Crown, and was, of course, in direct opposition to the growing demand that justice be administered in the Colonies by judges who were independent of the influence of the Crown.

It is interesting to speculate whether the recognition of the importance of independent courts which was included in the Declaration of Independence is primarily attributable to Thomas Jefferson, whom we recognize as its principal author. There were two signers of the Declaration of Independence who, in all probability, had personally experienced the attempted imposition of the sovereign's will upon a dependent court. They were Sam Huntington, a judge of the Superior Court of Connecticut by appointment of George III, and Richard Stockton, a judge of the Supreme Court of New Jersey.

Regardless of the immediate occasion for including these provisions in the Declaration of Independence, however, it is apparent that concern as to the lack of independence of the courts extended throughout the Colonies. Thus the Declarations of Rights adopted in 1776 by Maryland and Delaware, in almost identical language, provided:

"That the independence and uprightness of judges are essential to the impartial administration of justice, and a great security to the rights and liberties of the people."

Having experienced the vices inherent in subservient courts, it would seem that the colonists would make independence of the courts a major objective of their new regime, but surprisingly, they failed to achieve such independence in establishing their own government.

Probably as a result of distrust, engendered by the fact that the courts had been considered instrumentalities of the King, and also because the legislative branch of the Government was the branch considered most responsive to the popular will, the first courts established in the States of the new Republic were also denied independence. They were made subservient, not to the executive, but to the legislative branch of the Government. The legislatures were empowered to make rules governing the courts, vacate and annul judgments, grant new trials and otherwise completely dominate the administration of justice.

Whether it can be said that the situation of the courts had been improved by this change in the dominant branch to which the courts were the subservient estate is debatable. If it can be said that in a democracy the will of the majority is the will of the sovereign, then actually little change had occurred since the will of the majority of the members of the legislative body had merely been substituted for the will of the Crown.

The courts had gained in one respect, however. In effect, they now had the benefit of an act of settlement which made them secure in their tenure, at least for the terms for which they were appointed.

There seems to be little doubt, however, that the weaknesses in this system were soon apparent. Thus, Madison discussing the proposed Constitution in the "Federalist," No. 22, said:

"Complaints are everywhere heard from our most considerate and virtuous citizens, equally the friends of public and private faith, and of public and personal liberty * * * that the public good is disregarded in the conflicts of rival parties, and that measures are too often decided, not according to the rules of justice and the rights of the minor party, but by the superior force of an interested and overbearing majority. However anxiously we may wish that these complaints had no foundation, the evidence of known facts will not permit us to deny that they are in some degree true."

It thus becomes apparent that while July 4, 1776, was Independence Day for the country, it was far less than that for the courts. Perhaps it was an emancipation day that was needed. In any event, the substitution of the legislative branch for the executive as the "dominant estate" merely substituted one evil for another. With the passage of time, however, it did serve to demonstrate the absolute necessity that courts in a democracy such as ours must be independent equally of the executive and the legislative branches, if they are to perform their vital function.

The recognition of that necessity, as the product of sad experience, resulted in the independent judiciary created by our Constitution, as a third, equal, and coordinate branch of Government. To help preserve that independence, "good behavior" was established as the tenure of their offices, and an express provision was included in the Constitution that the judges of the United States "shall at stated times receive for their services a compensation which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office."

No thinking citizen of our democracy today would knowingly destroy the independence of our courts which has been gained through such travail. Whether or not he has ever had recourse to them he must realize that the law, and the courts which administer it, are his final hope for the vindication of his individual rights as a citizen. He may have the utmost confidence in the President and the executive branch of the Government. He may feel that the legislative branch should be paramount because it reflects the views and wishes of the majority of our citizens and is responsive to them through the elective process. Nonetheless, if he thinks, he realizes that it is to the judicial branch of the Government that he will turn in the final analysis for the protection of his rights, regardless of who may threaten them. He must realize also that the enforcement and protection of his rights provided by the courts is not going to be dependent upon whether he is in the majority or in the minority in the assertion of his rights. Whether the opposing party be the Govern-

ment of the United States, a tremendous corporation, or all of his neighbors he knows that his opponent or opponents must meet him on equal terms at the courthouse.

I wish that any citizen who entertains doubts as to the importance of the independence of the courts could see the legal system and courts of the U.S.S.R. in operation as a group of American Bar Association officials did last summer.

We were particularly interested in the system of justice of the U.S.S.R., the functioning of their courts, and in the status of lawyers in the Russian society. We found to our surprise that there are in Russia today some 16,000 lawyers who make their living in the private practice of law. Two thousand of them are located in Moscow, a city of 5 million people. These private practitioners are not working for the government, as is everyone else in Russia, but are still employed by their clients and dependent upon the fees paid by their clients for their livelihood. The system of peoples courts which exists, with appellate courts leading finally to the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R., was a more complete judicial system than we had anticipated finding. The trials which we observed were conducted reasonably well, and the judges to whom we talked appeared to be conscientious in their desire to administer justice fairly.

While in Russia I purchased a copy of the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. Interestingly enough, it is for sale in all of the cities in Russia, not only in the Russian language, but in English and every other language that can be found in that country. A person reading that constitution, who had no knowledge of life in the U.S.S.R. today, might well conclude that the rights of Russian citizens are recognized and protected to a greater extent than anywhere else in the world. The Russian Constitution so provides. It spells out in detail the rights of their citizens and the protection to be afforded to them. It reads beautifully. Yet the world knows today that no one has fewer rights or less protection against the government of its country than the citizens of the U.S.S.R.

Why is this true? What makes the difference between a country where citizens' rights guaranteed by their constitution are protected and a country where citizens' rights guaranteed by their constitution are nonexistent? It is not just the existence of courts. Courts exist in Russia. Courts function in Russia. Lawyers represent clients in Russia. Cases are decided by courts in Russia. But in the U.S.S.R. the courts and judges are under the complete domination of the Communist Party, which means the Government of Russia, just as is every other facet of Russian life. The army is controlled by the political commissar assigned to its units. Industry is controlled by the plant representative of the Communist Party who sits at the elbow of the plant manager (both employees of the Government) and second-guesses him in the operation of the plant. Agriculture is controlled in the same manner. This same domination extends to every aspect of Russian life, and it is true of the courts as well. True, we did not find a political commissar assigned to the staff of the court, although I should not be surprised if some exist. We did find adequate proof that if the party, or the Government, is interested in a particular result in a certain case, the party chairman contacts the judge before whom the case is pending and instructs him as to what the outcome of the case shall be. When such an instruction is received, there is no question but that it will be followed by the court, just as the direction of the Communist Party is followed in everything that occurs in Russian life today. This is so-called "socialist legality." A citizen seeking to protect himself, his family, or his property in the courts of the U.S.S.R. receives only the protection which the Government, by sufferance, elects to grant him. In this respect, Russia today is where England was in the 15th century. Both are graphic illustrations of the necessity for complete independence of the courts.

The bar of the United States has a special responsibility for the maintenance of the independence of our courts. The bar more readily than the public, appreciates this necessity for independent courts if the Constitution and the Bill of Rights are to be more than exercises in rhetoric. When the independence of our courts is imperiled by public clamor resulting from decisions in controversial areas, this special responsibility of the bar assumes vital importance. I am glad to be able to say that its discharge of this responsibility has reflected credit upon the profession.

The two principal attacks which have been made upon the independence of the Supreme Court of the United States within our day, have resulted from decisions which are in areas of intense controversy. Any decision inevitably would have incurred the dissatisfaction of a large segment of our population. The first attack occurred in 1937 in the form of the Court packing plan. It came from the Executive and from the left. The second occurred in 1958 in the form of the Jenner bill and came from the legislative branch and from the right. In both instances, the legal profession of the United States led by the American Bar Association opposed the attacks upon the Court, and assisted in preserving its independence.

Because the decisions involved in both attacks were quite controversial, there was no unanimity of opinion within the legal profession—or even within the Court itself—as to the correctness of the decisions. It is to the credit of the bar that its position was not predicated upon agreement or disagreement with the decisions. Recognizing its overriding responsibility for the maintenance of the independence of the judiciary, the bar, through the American Bar Association, rallied to the defense of the Court, and was a major factor in the defeat of the measures which threatened its independence.

The attack of 1958, which would have deprived the Court of appellate jurisdiction in certain areas, pointed up the importance of insuring the continued independence of the Court by establishing its appellate jurisdiction in the Constitution of the United States. The house of delegates of the American Bar Association considered this question prior to the controversial decisions which resulted in introduction of the Jenner bill in the 85th Congress. After extensive debates on the subject, which included an appearance of retired Justice Owen Roberts before the house of delegates, the house, in 1950, adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the American Bar Association approves the submission to the Congress of the United States of an amendment to article III, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States of America establishing in the Supreme Court of the United States appellate jurisdiction in all cases arising under the Constitution of the United States, both as to law and fact."

Several implementing resolutions proposing such an amendment have been introduced in Congress and supported by the association but have not been adopted. Senator JAVITS of New York and other Senators have introduced in the 86th Congress, Senate Joint Resolution 57, which would amend the Constitution to establish therein the Court's appellate jurisdiction. Hearings upon the proposed resolution have begun, and consideration of the resolution by the present session of the Congress seems likely. Its adoption by the Congress and ratification by the States would constitute effective action to insure the independence of courts. In urging such adoption the bar is acting once more in the highest tradition of the profession, and in support of the independence of the judiciary.

In each instance which I have mentioned, as in the case of almost all problems facing the legal profession, the questions presented affect both the bench and the bar. Their cooperation with each other in meeting these problems is dictated by their mutual interest and their common responsibility to the public for the functioning of our system of justice. In the final analysis, every threat to the independence of the courts is a threat to the existence of the courts, for only so long as their independence is retained can our legal system survive.

The celebration of the Fourth of July annually reminds us of the sources of our liberty, and invites our rededication to the principles enunciated by the Declaration of Independence. It should also remind the legal profession, bench and bar alike, of the vital importance of the independence of the courts of this country, as well as of our joint responsibility that this independence be exercised in such a manner as to merit the respect and confidence of our citizens, without which no judicial system can long endure.

Water Resource Development and National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the last major address by Brig. Gen. John L. Person, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, prior to his retirement was delivered on May 14, 1959, before the 46th national convention of the Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington, D.C. This address, entitled "Water Resource Development and National Security," is well worth reading by everyone who has an interest in our vast but endangered water resources, and in order that Senators may have an opportunity to read the address, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. Chairman and members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, I feel greatly honored in having been asked to address this 46th national convention of the Rivers and Harbors Congress. Your consideration is especially important to me as this will probably be my last appearance before you as a representative of the Corps of Engineers.

I am quite aware of the important role which for 57 years this Congress has played in the development of the water resources of our country. I also recognize your interest in the specific works which have been authorized as Federal improvements. Since I know that you will consider these projects

in detail during your deliberations I feel that I can be of greatest assistance by speaking very frankly about the nature of our civil works program for water resources development, its value to our country, and its future.

My experience with water resource development is not as long as that of your organization, but I have had the good fortune to be involved in the planning and construction of civil works improvements for the major part of my 30 years service with the Army. The span of my service, therefore, has covered the period of the greatest expansion of Federal activity in this field, since by far the greatest progress on a nationwide basis has taken place since 1936 when the first general flood control legislation was enacted by Congress.

First I'm going to talk today for a little while about my pet hate—the term "pork barrel" which so many people, including some sincere and honest individuals, are so fond of applying to river and harbor and flood control projects. The term implies just what it is used to imply—that projects for water resource development are wasteful, boondoggling, political raids on the Treasury. This is simply not true, as I intend to demonstrate by citing a few facts.

The corps has been in the so-called pork barrel business since 1824, when Congress appropriated $75,000 for the removal of snags in the Ohio River. Since that time we have spent a total of about $11 billion in planning, constructing and operating river and harbor improvements. What have the American people bought with this $11 billion?

The list is a long one, and I will try not to bore you with too many details. But we have, on the navigation side, produced 22,600 miles of improved inland waterways, over 400 improved commercial harbors, and of course the Great Lakes navigation system. In 1957 the total waterborne commerce of the United States reached a record high of over 1.1 billion tons. The inland waterway commerce amounted to about 232 billion ton-miles, made up by 117 billion ton-miles in the Great Lakes and 115 billion ton-miles on the rest of the inland system. This latter segment has shown a remarkable rate of growth, from about 8 billion ton-miles in 1929 to 115 billion in 1957, an increase of over 1,300 percent in less than 30 years. The ratio of the annual benefits to the annual costs of our overall navigation system is estimated at about 3 to 1—in other words, we are getting $3 in benefits for every dollar we are spending. Of even greater importance—incalculable importance—is the effect of navigation on our national economy. For example, without our pork barrel program our great seaports could not handle our vast world trade, our steel industry would starve for lack of the ore that comes through the Soo locks, and the Ohio Valley would not have earned its nicknames of Atom Valley and the Ruhr of America without its adequate water supply and its free water transportation.

In 1950 President Truman appointed a Water Resources Policy Commission to study the entire field of water resource development. In its report of December 11, 1950, that Commission gave exhaustive consideration to navigation improvements, including their military and defense value, and quoted the following statement of the Office of Defense Transportation:

"If our waterways rendered no service beyond that of transporting petroleum and its products during the war they would have amply justified their improved existence."

In flood control, the first major activity of the Federal Government began in 1928 when Congress authorized the project for flood control in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi. Flood control on a nationwide basis had its beginning some 8 years later when, in 1936, Congress passed the first general flood control act. During the intervening period about 500 projects have been completed or placed in partial operation for flood control purposes. On the average this group of projects has been in operation for a period of less than 15 years, yet they have already prevented flood damages totaling about $9 billion, which is almost three times the Federal cost of flood control from those improvements.

This is a part of the story the public hears too little about. Maybe it is not as spectacular for a reporter to tell of the damage that is prevented, the many lives that are saved, and the human suffering that is avoided because projects operate effectively, as it is to tell of the ravages and havoc caused by major floods such as those that occurred in the Northeast and on the west coast in 1955, in the Southwest in 1957, and in the Ohio Basin this year.

The fact that such disasters still occur is not an indictment of the effectiveness of projects that are in operation. On the other hand, they emphasize the fact that we are not progressing fast enough with our flood control plans. The results obtained through operation of flood control projects have proven that most of the flood damage now experienced can be prevented by comprehensive river basin development of our water resources. Gentlemen, if that is "pork barrel," I say let us have more pork.

Navigation and flood control alone do not represent the total benefits realized from the civil works program. Significant additional values also accrue through conservation and the use of our water resources through multiple-purpose development. These include development of hydroelectric power, storage of water for industrial, municipal, and agricultural uses, and the numerous benefits which result from improvement of low river flows. In many cases the projects also provide large public recreational values and opportunities for the preservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources. To mention but a few figures showing the impact of these important collateral functions:

Hydroelectric power: 27 billion kilowatthours were generated at Corps of Engineers installations during fiscal year 1958, representing 20 percent of the hydroelectric power produced and 4.3 percent of the total production by all sources of the Nation's utility systems. This hydropower has been of vital importance to industry and development generally in many parts of our country. This is particularly true in the Pacific Northwest which is almost wholly dependent upon water power.

Water supply: The Corps of Engineers is providing about 1.2 million acre-feet of storage space in the interest of domestic and industrial water supply, and almost 4 million acre-feet is being operated either exclusively or jointly for irrigation and other uses. In addition, conservation and power Corps of Engineers have in many cases releases from reservoirs operated by the proved the quantity and quality of water available for downstream supplies. These releases in fiscal year 1958 amounted to about 33 million acre-feet (about 11 trillion gallons).

Public recreation: Land and water areas at Corps of Engineers projects provide abundant recreational opportunities to the general public for such activities as boating, swimming, camping, fishing, and hunting. In 1958 about 95 million visitor-days of recreational use was counted at Corps of Engineers reservoirs. The importance of this use can be seen when it is realized that it is in the same order of magnitude as the attendance at all of our national parks. This public recreational resource, nationwide in scope, has been provided at a Federal cost of only $10 million for basic access and public use facilities; while States and other non-Federal agencies have spent more than 10 times as much in developing the recreational potential.

I have tried in brief to give you some concept of what the civil works program has accomplished. The solid facts of the record speak for themselves. They are the main reason why I detest this term "pork-barrel" which is tossed around by critics who are uninformed or who willfully choose to ignore that record.

So much for what has been accomplished. Next, I would like to pay a sincere tribute to the committees of the Congress of the United States which over the years have developed and guided the legislation that is the legal basis of this great program.

All too often we hear the term "pork barrel" applied to river and harbor and flood control legislation. The fact is overlooked or ignored that over the past half century this legislation, in addition to authorizing specific projects, has provided most of the important authorities under which the Federal Government participates in water resources development. We still use the terminology river and harbor and flood control law, whereas I believe it would be much more accurate to characterize these acts as Federal water resources law.

I believe that this country owes a real debt of gratitude to the legislators who have developed this body of law in an evolutionary and practical way to meet the needs that have arisen.

Now I would like to say a few words about the Corps of Engineers—which it has been my privilege to serve for 30 years. We are as you know, a rather unique outfit as we have both military and civil functions. The latter are my concern here, as they are the administration of this program of water resource development.

A major reason why the term "pork barrel" irritates me is that I know how carefully the Corps of Engineers studies the plans which are presented to Congress for authorization. Before any of these are recommended by the Chief of Engineers they must meet severe tests of engineering feasibility and economic justification. They must also run the gantlet of reviews within our own service, by other Federal agencies, and the Bureau of the Budget, and by the affected States. I do not believe that any other plans and projects—Federal or non-Federal—are subjected to such exhaustive study and scrutiny.

Moreover, the Corps of Engineers has played a leading role in the development of Federal procedures for the planning and evaluation of water resources projects. In particular we have supported and fostered the concept of multiple purpose planning. As our country has grown and developed during the past half century it has become apparent that our rivers must be developed to serve as fully as possible all needs of the present and foreseeable future. This has been one of the most significant changes in the field of water resource development—the shift in emphasis from single-purpose to multiple-purpose planning.

We welcome healthy and constructive criticism. I know that any agency which handles a large public works program and which deals with a controversial resource like water must expect criticism. But I do strongly object to attacks which mislead the public as to the value of a large Federal program and reflect upon the ability and integrity of the Corps of Engineers. On this latter point I can refer you to the findings of the second Hoover Commission (an agency certainly not biased in favor of the corps and not benefiting from "pork") which stated:

"The Corps of Engineers has an enviable record for safe and adequate engineering

design, that it has demonstrated its ability to carry out very large engineering projects, and that it has been signally free of any taint of fraud or dishonesty in the administration of the vast construction program with which it has been entrusted. And this applies to 131 years during which it has had those great responsibilities.

"The Commission wishes no sentence in the report to be construed as a reflection upon the Corps."

Now let's look for a minute at the Russian version of pork barrel activities. Theirs is not a pork barrel, it's a caviar jar. We have invested a total of $11 billion over a period of 135 years. Just one of their bond issues, about 6 years ago, was for $7 billion for increasing their water resource development program. Let us consider briefly what they have accomplished in this program. Comprehensive development on the Volga, which has pushed forward largely since World War II, already has provided the 3,000-mile main stem of an integrated inland waterway system extending from the Black and the Caspian Seas, now interconnected by a canal, on the south, to the Baltic and the Arctic White Sea on the north. East to west it stretches from the foothills of the Urals far across the European Russian plains. Construction is well advanced, and vessels of 11.5-foot draft regularly travel the approximately 1,000 miles between Moscow and the Black and Caspian Seas. Each of the 17 dams has or will have good-sized navigation locks which we estimate to be possibly as large as 100 by 1,000 feet with minimum depth of 18 feet over the sills.

Impressive hydroelectric plants are being built at the Russian dams. The largest on the Volga, at Stalingrad, scheduled for operation next year, will have 2.3 million kilowatts capacity, about 18 percent greater than that of our largest hydro plant, Grand Coulee. Project development is underway or planned in other river basins, including three mammoth hydroelectric plants in Siberia with capacities in the order of 3 million to 5 million kilowatts each.

If development of water resources is a wasteful, pork barrel or caviar jar program, why are our Russian friends proceeding with this program at a rate far ahead of ours?

In 1939, Sir Winston Churchill said that "Soviet policy is a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma, but perhaps there is a key. That key is Russian national interest." I am sure that you have seen popular magazine articles, and comments in the press, which join the chorus of many who combine the term "pork barrel" with "logrolling" and "political backscratching." Gentlemen, Mr. Khrushchev does not need to roll any logs. Mr. Khrushchev does not need to scratch any political backs. And Mr. Khrushchev has repeatedly said that Russia does not need to defeat us in a war—she will defeat us on the economic front.

I don't mean that Russia would not defeat us in a war if we dropped our guard, and I certainly don't mean to belittle the vital urgency of maintaining and improving our armed strength. But I do not believe that we can afford to neglect our economic strength and our economic growth. Certainly, in these days of tremendous demands on the Federal Treasury we must look ever more critically at the economics of all projects, and must concentrate on those which are most urgently needed. Certainly we must continue to encourage the increasing assumption of responsibility by local and State governments. But if we neglect the development of our water resources we jeopardize the development of our national economy. This we cannot afford if we mean to maintain our position of strength, on which rests the future of the free world.

In closing, I should like to express my very real appreciation of the friendly relations I have had in the past with the membership of this Congress, and my belief that organizations such as yours can and will exert a powerful and beneficial influence on the course of water resource development over the years to come.

Last Speech by a Great Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the late Mrs. Ruth Moon, the State treasurer of Idaho, who for many years was an outstanding public figure in the State—and, indeed, one of the remarkable women of our country.

Ruth Moon was reelected last November to her third term, with the most decisive majority in her long and brilliant political career. At one time she was the only Democratic office holder in an all-Republican State government.

Although defeated, she first ran for this particular office in 1938. Born in Colorado, she moved to Idaho as a small child, and lived in many towns throughout the State—a background that became invaluable as she campaigned for public office.

Ruth Moon was generous of herself and her great talents, both to her friends—and I considered myself fortunate in being one—and to her constituents. Idaho appreciated her as that political rarity, a gifted woman in politics who asked no quarter from her counterparts of the opposite sex, and spoke out on important issues with a courage and honesty that even her most rigorous political foes could not belittle or impugn.

At McCall, Idaho, only a few hours before her death last month, Mrs. Moon addressed the Ladies Auxiliary of the Idaho Municipal League. The address was printed in the Idaho Democrat for July. It was an informal, friendly discussion of her political experiences and what it means to be a woman in politics.

Because I consider it a true memorial to this great and wonderful lady, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Idaho Democrat, July 1959]

LAST SPEECH BY A GREAT LADY

It is indeed an honor to be asked to talk with the Ladies Auxiliary of the Idaho Municipal League, but when Mr. Smith wrote me, the subject he assigned was, to say the least, an ambitious one. To quote him, "I was to tell you of some of my experiences and your ability and responsibility in taking an active interest in local and State government." * * * Now I am sure he didn't mean that exactly as it sounds. * * *

I have lived up to now a long and hectic life and some of my experiences * * * well, I simply will plead the fifth amendment, I refuse to let down my hair to that extent * * * however, if he meant for me to tell you how I got into politics and government, that is quite a different story, and I will be glad to hand out the lurid details, for I agree with Mr. Smith, that all of you women should be actively interested in local and State government, and going a step further, in politics in its broadest sense.

So * * * starting with how I got this way, I have to look a long way back * * * isn't it fortunate I am farsighted so I can manage that * * * back to the time when I was finishing high school and getting ready to start out on my own. You see, in those prehistoric days, women were not so active in governmental affairs, nor for that matter, in business generally, as they are today. For instance, my mother insisted that there was no work suitable for a lady to engage in except teaching.

Since I had to make a living, teaching was what I had to do, whether I wanted to or not. I was a young woman from a refined home, my mother had taught school, my sisters had taught school and therefore I taught school. Naturally I attended a normal school and prepared myself first. * * * I even hold a life certificate—at least that's what it says. I can teach forever if I just keep on breathing, but my heart wasn't in schoolteaching Oh, I got by all right, and I have always hoped that I gave those poor children something worth while.

Now it is my theory that when all you look forward to is Friday and payday, there is something wrong about the job you are doing. But I was still a lady and there wasn't a thing I could do about it until fate stepped in and took a hand. I was teaching up in north Idaho, a one-room rural deal not far from St. Maries * * * a beautiful place to be, all pine trees and gorgeous scenery.

At that time politics and Government to me were things you read about; you knew they existed but they didn't come close to your daily living. Well, I was hearing a class in reading * * * Jane, see Jane * * * see Jane run * * * you know the line, when suddenly Jane's activities were interrupted by a knock at the door. It was the mail carrier and my landlord who breathlessly announced "You have got to go down to St. Maries, you've just been appointed the county superintendent of schools for the new county.

Now I hate to tell you this, but up to then I didn't know a new county was expected * * * and knowing as I do now how such things are done now, I can't imagine how it happened that I was handed a job I didn't know even existed. * * * But I went to St. Maries after school was out Friday * * * end of week, end of school teaching * * * yes, it was true, I was it.

So I took the oath of office, got somebody to take over my school and I plunged right in as the first county school superintendent of Benewah County and I loved it. Not just being an executive, that was nice of course, but the office work, which I had to do myself, it was heaven, especially the bookkeeping. Then politics became real, too, and Government was the most interesting thing in the whole world.

I read everything I could find on taxes, budgets, government, the works, and I studied office procedure and bookkeeping, never did get typing mastered, but I'm about the fastest hunt-and-peck artist you ever saw. It was all so fascinating. No longer were the days just something to get through and each morning was the beginning of a new adventure and people became

the most interesting of all—I loved working with them.

Then fate again took a hand. I married a public accountant who specialized in audits of cities, counties, school districts—all types of taxing units. Naturally this work took him all over the State and I tagged along working for the pure fun of it, I didn't know I was even on the payroll at first and my first paycheck almost floored me. I was being paid for having fun, wasn't that something?

My husband became recognized as an expert on the legal phases of government and governmental procedure. Together we worked all over Idaho, getting to know and understand people, helping them with their tax problems and pioneering in making the accounting systems more or less uniform throughout the State. Then after the sudden death of my husband, I continued auditing, getting so I could take a county or city to pieces and put it together again so it ticked.

Also, shortly after my husband's death, came my plunge into real honest-to-goodness politics. I was tossed into the primary race for State treasurer by a very able Governor who was trying to do something or other, and of course I lost out to a most efficient incumbent officer. Now wouldn't you think that would finish me on politics? Well, it didn't. I ran again and this time was lucky enough to be elected and served as your State treasurer in 1945 and 1946, the last 2-year term, now it is 4, you know.

That was a most worthwhile experience, and when I lost out in the 1946 elections, I didn't give up, I had things started I felt imoprtant to State government, and wanted a chance to finish them, so I ran again, and again I lost out * * * my party was in sort of an eclipse, shall we say * * * anyhow, my head was bloody but unbowed. I ran once more and this time I made it, only by a 351-vote majority, but I was in * * * and the 56,000 majority I received last fall leads me to hope that I've been doing my work to the satisfaction of most of the people of Idaho.

I could go on and on telling you experiences, but I won't, I couldn't be that mean to you * * * however, at the risk of boring you I do want to get to the second part of my subject—women in politics and government.

Before I go any further, let me assure you I am not making a political or campaign talk * * * but since government and politics are closely related, I must deal with both, if I want to help you realize the part you can play in governmental affairs.

There was a time, and you don't have to be done up in lavender and old lace to remember it, when women used to say, "I don't know anything about politics or business. I leave all that to my husband."

I am happy to say that this attitude pretty much went out of style with the bustle and beaded lampshade. Like most other pursuits today, politics is definitely coeducational * * * and is becoming more so all the time. American women are well equipped to face this new political age, for life has taught them not to give up. You see, politics is not a game like golf or bridge and you cannot turn it on or off like television. You cannot take it or leave it.

Politics, as Mr. Webster put it, is the business of government—and the quality, ability, perception and integrity of its management affect every facet of our life. Take a minute to think this through.

Let us look at a typical day, you "gals." Of course, my days are on a somewhat different schedule. You mothers drive your children to school in the morning. That trip is safe only if the traffic laws are conscientiously enforced by your city government.

The school you take your youngsters to may be a good structure or it may be a firetrap long ago condemned but never replaced * * * thanks to a chain of indifference or inability to cope that starts with the White House in Washington and reaches down to your own school district. The education available to the schoolroom is going to affect your children, for better or worse, all their lives. And whether there are enough teachers, whether these teachers are qualified, whether your courses of study are adequate, depends on politics and politicians.

Moving on in that typical day * * * you do your marketing on the way home from taking the "kids" to school. You have been told that inflation has been or is being controlled. The administration puts out what it calls a "cost of living" index. That probably doesn't mean a thing to you but there is something that every woman does know about the cost of living and that is, the amount you have to pay for things like bread and milk keeps going up and up, and the increase in your income, if there is one, still doesn't keep up with the prices marked on the shelves.

Now we are taking the groceries home. Once there and unpacking the grocery bags, no need to stop and think whether the cans of food are pure and contain exactly what the labels say they do. You don't have to worry because you know that the Government's Food and Drug Administration sees to it that this is so.

Yet not too long ago, in Washington, as an economy measure it was proposed to cut funds for that agency to a point where a citizens' committee reported that it didn't have staff enough to inspect our food processing plants more than once in 60 years. Fortunately, the Democratic Congress woke up people and they appropriated more rather than less for this vital service. * * *

These are only samples of the many, many ways that politics is woven into the fabric of our lives. But they are enough, for this occasion, to prove to you that politics is your own personal business.

Women in politics are nothing new in Idaho history. We have Gracie Pfost, the first woman to go to Congress from Idaho, and we've had Myrtle Enking, first woman to become State treasurer, and now since 1933, over a quarter of a century, we have kept women in that position. We have had women, many of them, at county and State levels for years, and there are also the mothers of the PTA who are working for better schools, the League of Women Voters striving to bring government and its problems closer home and give women an understanding of their part in this great Government of ours.

The women in our State legislature have been most effective too, and here is a place where mothers of grown children could be most helpful in getting legislation that would meet the current needs. Men are very like children and it wouldn't be a new thing for a mother to see through the shenanigans of some of the legislative procedure * * * a well informed woman would be a tremendous power and influence in getting the right things done at the right time.

But you needn't run for office to make yourselves felt in government. As I said before, you can help through your PTA, your League of Women Voters, your political party organization, or even by becoming more aware of the issues and problems of State and local government so that you can make your vote effective. Women are people, not rubber stamps of their husbands or of each other.

The average woman today is in business whether she is one of the 21 million who hold down jobs or not. She knows what the interest on the mortgage is, how much the payments on the car are, what the doctor bill for Johnnie's broken leg was, and whether or not the family has enough to enable them to snatch a little vacation somewhere. She reads with horror the fate of the little girl selling Girl Scout cookies in Spokane and is therefore competent to help make things right in her community.

She can help clean up the news stands * * * ridding them of the reading material detrimental to our young people * * * there is so much that can be done to make this a better place to live in. How to go about it? You can find books, magazine articles, any amount of information on what is going on in the world and what is bothering your lawmakers and elective officials. You can help by keeping these people informed of your ideas and wishes on vital questions. I know, that I for one, am always grateful for letters of the folks all over the State.

Those of us in our offices are sometimes out of touch with you all by the very fact that we are sitting under the capitol domes and quite often we hear only that which people think we want to hear, so write your Congressman, write your State officials, write your legislators, and if you wish, write your editor.

There is only one thing, however; get your facts before you yell about something * * * it is important that you know what you are talking about, so read, listen, and, above all, think for yourselves. You see, the first step in solving any problem is to get the facts, organize and analyze them, and then use one's experience and judgment to work out as intelligent an answer as possible.

Perhaps the thing that is worrying you is the matter of taxes. Well, what about taxes? There are two things to remember: First, all taxes are paid by the people, and, second, all governmental expenditures are ultimately met by taxes. The subject of taxation is so broad, so complicated, and so technical that the average person has little idea of the impact of the various methods of raising money through taxation. * * * There is no quick and easy solution to the tax problem other than the old story * * * that anything you ask for has to be paid for, so the simple thing to do would be to cut your pattern to fit your cloth. However, that isn't the way things are done, although that is what you do at home. I know I do. If I can't pay for a thing, desirable as it might be to have it, I go without it. * * *

In government, the thinking is different, but how far one should go along that way of planning is up to you people to decide, and you should make your wishes known. Read and study all you can about proposed tax plans and see if you really want some of the items proposed.

There are so many things confronting us, we need more and better roads, we need more and better schools, we have had a bad situation in some parts of our State as a result of unemployment. Women can help by getting into the game, either as a participant in government through holding office, or indirectly by talking things over with your husbands, and others interested in good government; for an informed citizen is the first step toward good government.

So, summing all this up, I repeat, women everywhere are accepting new responsibilities, meeting new challenges. I am sure politics would be a far sorrier affair if it were not for women who work for good government at the grassroots with no thought of personal or political gain. There are many such women now, for I know women who, either through their political party or service club affiliations, are stirring apathetic communities to action on improvements of school boards, bond issues for civic improvement, or much needed reforms.

These women are motivated by a sense of idealism, and they are endowed with a

special sense of patience, perseverance and courage which enables them to overcome almost any obstacle. For women are uniquely qualified to fuse their idealism into the serious business of government. For that reason, I am glad that Mr. Smith asked me to give you all a pep talk on this subject and I hope you'll all jump in, the water's fine.

Beauty and Grandeur of the U.S. National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the July 20 issue of Time magazine pays deserved tribute to the beauties of our U.S. national forests and to the dedicated men and women of the career ranks of the Forest Service who supervise and operate them. They are outstanding Government employees.

These magnificent reserves of timber, mountains, lakes, rivers, uplands, shoreline and meadow owe their protection to the foresight of two great Americans—President Theodore Roosevelt and his forester, Glifford Pinchot. They dedicated the national forests to the enduring maxim of "the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run."

I wish it were possible to reproduce in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the series of magnificent colored photographs with which Time magazine has heralded the scenic workers and rich fecundity of the national forests. In the absence of such a possibility, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the accompanying article, entitled, "U.S. National Forests," from Time magazine of July 20, 1959.

These forests contain some of the grandest scenry in the Western States, including lordly mountains such as Mount Hood and Mount Jefferson in Oregon, Mount St. Helens and Mount Adams in Washington State and many other great peaks. The National forests also encompass majestic areas like the Lochsa Fork of the Clearwater River in Idaho, where Lewis and Clark at last accomplished the first crossing of the Rocky Mountain region.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Time magazine, July 20, 1959]

THE U.S. NATIONAL FORESTS: THE GREATEST GOOD OF THE GREATEST NUMBER IN THE LONG RUN

In the cool green depths of upper Michigan's 800,000-acre Hiawatha National Forest, amid the fragrance of sweet fern and venerable hemlock, U.S. Forest Ranger Edwin Youngblood, 38, eased his pickup truck along a sand-soft logging road one day last week. He sang out a warning to a gang of pulp cutters to take only the jack pine that rangers had paint-striped for cutting, told them to heave dead branches 50 feet back from the roadway, out of cigarette-throw range.

In the quiet blue haze of North Carolina's high Pisgah National Forest, Ranger Ted Seely, 51, brier pipe in mouth, tramped through tree-darkened groves where waterfalls trickled down slopes and an occasional deer or groundhog darted into a clearing. His top worry of the day was checking the waters of the Pigeon, Hominy, Davidson, and other rivers to be sure that they were flowing silt free; miles below three North Carolina communities and some of the State's biggest paper, cellophane, rayon, and nylon plants were depending on a steady 100 million gallons daily.

In New Mexico's rugged Taos County, Ranger George E. Engstrom, 47, prowled through one of Carson National Forest's 22 picnic and campgrounds. The campsite was spotless. One reason was that Ranger Engstrom has a reputation for taking litterbugs to court.

In Colorado's jagged San Juan Mountains, Ranger Steve Yurich, 34, flew off in a Cessna for a quick fire-spotting swing around his Piedra district, switched to a pickup truck to check the campsites and flag down a logging truck, then saddled up his horse, "Buck," to inspect the grassy uplands where ranchers will graze 2,800 head of cattle and 7,000 sheep this summer under permit from the Forest Service.

Across the United States last week, thousands of green-uniformed forest rangers and staffers (12,000 permanent, 10,000 temporary) were patrolling and supervising the 181 million acres of national forests that add up to one of the U.S. taxpayers greatest assets. The 148 national forests, ranging in size and style from Alaska's 16-million-acre Tongass to California's 367-acre Calaveras Big Trees National Forest (sequoias), stretch across 39 States, occupy a massive one-twelfth of the continental U.S. land space, one-fifth of the land area of the Western States. Last year they drew 68.5 million campers and tourists, but few tourists realized that the amiable, green-clad rangers probably also had responsibility for controlled lumbering, watershed protection, grazing, wildlife control, mining, fighting forest fires (firefighting mascot: Smokey the Bear), and possibly dealing with friendly Indians.

The national forests, administered by Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, are also one of the few Government operations to turn a profit. In fiscal 1960 the Forest Service will spend $116,575,800 on its forests—including $38 million for roads and trails—but the forests will take in $129 million from timber sales, grazing fees, and other items ranging down to rentals of 18,000 private summer homes on national forest land. The national forests land, timber, and forage alone are appraised at $7 billion.

The U.S. national forests grew, along with the Interior Department's national parks, out of the U.S. late 19th century realization that its clear-the-wilderness drive was depleting the Nation's basic resources. The National Park Service (now running 23 million acres) was set up in 1916 to conserve recreation grounds and scenic splendors. The national forests were intended for controlled development and use.

Conservation got rolling in 1891 under President Benjamin Harrison, who got broad powers from Congress to close off forest reserves from exploitation by timber barons, set up the first reserve in Wyoming (now Shoshone National Forest in the soaring Absaroka and Wind River Mountains); in all, set aside 13 million acres under the Interior Department. Theodore Roosevelt gave conservation an evangelist's fire: "Conservation is a great moral issue, for it involves the patriotic duty of insuring the safety and continuance of the Nation." Roosevelt, in 1905, transferred the forest reserves to the Agriculture Department, created the Forest Service under his brilliant conservationist friend, Gifford Pinchot of Pennsylvania. Controlled cutting and sale of timber, and systematic reforestation of the national forests were authorized. Roosevelt's Agriculture Secretary James Wilson gave the U.S. Forest Rangers the enduring directive to run the forests for "the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run."

The greatest fear of U.S. fervent conservationists is that too much multiple use of the national forests might threaten the natural splendors. On the urgings of conservationists, the Forest Service, by administrative order, has set aside 82 Wilderness, Primitive, Roadless and Wild Areas, where roads and resorts are prohibited and a man can come and go only on horseback, on foot or by boat. Now Illinois' Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Oregon's DICK NEUBERGER and Minnesota's HUBERT HUMPHREY are trying to get these wilderness areas made by law into a new and inviolable National Wilderness Preservation System. Says Chief Forester (since 1952) Richard E. McArdle, a rugged (6 feet 1 inch, 206 pounds) Forest Service pro since 1924: "I am taking no sides. This country needs to maintain and preserve some of primitive America, and this we intend to do. Ninety-nine percent of the people who hunt, fish, camp, picnic, or just ride around enjoying the scenery in the national forests don't use our wilderness areas. Many of them don't have the time or money to get there. There is a steadily growing demand to make more recreational areas accessible to motor transportation."

Thus, in a direct way that pioneer conservationists would have wondered at—and some might have shuddered at—millions of Americans in whose name the forests were saved from the timber barons are now pouring into the national forests. The millions of U.S. citizens today want not only to coown and coprofit from the forests, but to harvest the personal dividends of their heritage by browsing through the ferns of upper Michigan or drowsing to the trickle of waterfalls in North Carolina or pitching the tent far from crowded camp sits and far, far from the urban world.

Letter by Representative Albert on the Farm Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Letters to the Times columns of the July 10 New York Times included a letter by the Honorable CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, in response to a Times editorial of June 27 on the President's veto of the wheat bill.

This is one of the clearest and most concise comments I have seen on the present farm situation and on the farm bill which the Congress recently passed and the President vetoed. Representative ALBERT is an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives, the Democratic whip, a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, and a leading spokesman for a sensible and progressive farm program.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the RECORD, for the information of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 10, 1959]

LETTERS TO THE TIMES—WHEAT LEGISLATION UPHELD—VETOED BILL SAID TO REDUCE COSTS, REVERSE SURPLUS BUILDUP

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Bernard Baruch once said, "Every man has a right to his opinion but no man has a right to be wrong in his facts." That sums up my reaction to your June 27 editorial on the President's veto of the wheat bill.

Leaders of wheat legislation accepted compromise after compromise in an effort to get acceptable legislation that would reverse the recent buildup in Government surpluses in wheat, reduce the Government's skyrocketing costs for the program, and prevent a sharp decline in wheat producers' income.

The bill passed by Congress would have achieved these objectives. If allowed to become law, wheat program costs would have been reduced an estimated $260 million a year. Present surpluses would have been drawn down at the rate of 100 million bushels or more a year. These are not my conclusions, but are opinions expressed by competent, impartial, agricultural economists.

CORRECTING EXCESSES

Let no one blame Congress further for the excessive Government cost and excessive stocks of wheat. Congress passed legislation which, if signed by the President, would have corrected these excesses. And Congress would have passed wheat legislation even more satisfactory to the administration if the Secretary of Agriculture had not been more interested in abolishing farm price support programs than in correcting their weaknesses.

I respectfully urge you to consider that we have today the Benson program—not the farm program which was in effect prior to 1953.

At the beginning of 1953 we had a farm program under which for 11 consecutive years farm prices generally had averaged 100 percent of parity or higher. The Commodity Credit Corporation price support program for 20 years had cost only $1.064 billion and this included subsidies during the war years. Programs for the 90 percent of parity supported basic crops actually showed a 20-year profit to the Government of $13 million.

In contrast, during the last 6 years net farm income has been almost $20 billion less than in the previous 6 years. CCC losses on price supports in these 6 years have been five times the total of the previous 20 years. CCC commodities in inventory and on loan have increased from $2,452 billion on January 1, 1953, to $8,716 billion on January 1, 1959. Expenditures of the Department of Agriculture have skyrocketed from $1.8 billion in 1952 to around $7 billion for fiscal 1959.

PER CAPITA INCOME

People on farms now have per capita incomes of only one-half the incomes of nonfarm people. Farm workers receive hourly one-third the average wage of factory workers. Average farm prices in 1958 were down 13 percent from 1952. In contrast, the hourly earnings of industrial workers in 1958 were up 28 percent from 1952 and corporation dividend payments in 1958 were up 37 percent since 1952.

Your editorial is eminently right in condemning the farm program as now being operated. No one can defend it.

But we must have a farm program. We cannot tell the farmer to find his solutions only in the raw competition of the market places, usually in auction markets, while other areas of our economy rely upon Government protections, or upon concentrations of economic power, to assure reasonable levels of wages or profits.

The Government has given labor the minimum wage and the collective bargaining law. It has given industry the corporate structure, the tariff and the many statutes that soften the perils of unregulated, unrestrained competitive enterprise. How, then, can the modern, highly mechanized farmer survive, ever selling in a free market and buying in a protected market?

We must have a farm program, and it must be fair to consumers as well as to farmers. The Times would merit the gratitude of consumers and taxpayers, as well as farmers, if it would encourage sound policies.

CARL ALBERT,
Member of Congress, Third District, Oklahoma.
WASHINGTON, *July 2, 1959.*

Reserve Unit Participation in CAMG Training Objectives and Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extremely able address delivered by Col. Charles H. Kraus, USAR, before the 12th Annual Conference of the Military Government Association, in Washington, D.C., on June 13, 1959.

Colonel Kraus, who is commanding officer of the 352d CAMG, Area Headquarters A, has prepared an excellent analysis of the vital role to be played by civil affairs units in the event of total war.

The observations of Colonel Kraus as to the economic and political aspects of waging war merit the careful attention of the general public, as well as Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the addresss was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESERVE UNIT PARTICIPATION IN CAMG TRAINING OBJECTIVES AND MEANS

(Address by Charles H. Kraus, colonel, USAR, delivered at the 12th Annual Conference of the Military Government Association, Washington, D.C., June 13, 1959)

The objective of unit training, whether it is a Regular or a Reserve unit, is the same. That objective is to make the unit ready to do its job wherever it is and whenever it comes.

It used to be that the Reserve unit could go slower in its training than the Regular unit. But the facts of today's world show clearly that the traditional period to get ready after M-Day, if it has not disappeared altogether at least has been drastically curtailed. Reserve training, therefore, like Regular training in today's tension-filled and atomic world must be directed to the objective not only of being ready, but, also, of being ready now.

This means that time is at a greater premium than ever before. Those of us who have military careers as an avocation have to cover virtually the same ground as the regulars to whom the military career is a full time matter.

One of the first jobs of the Reserve unit commander is to make sure that the members of his unit have this avocation of military service and are dedicated to it. The day of the reservist who attends training sessions with everything but his head is over.

I suspect that most members of Reserve units will agree that the day is also over when an adequate job can be done merely by working hard during the regular training meetings.

The atomic age, however, has done much more than to contract the time in which the training mission may be accomplished. It also has had major effects on the kind of training we must undergo. We may not agree with the famous British military writer, General Fuller, who has said that the atomic weapon has made the old rules of war obsolete, but at least we will have to concede that the training which was adequate to make us ready for World War II or the Korean action will not be adequate for the war of tomorrow.

If we know what the job is that we must be ready to do, what we need to learn in order to do it should be apparent.

The Minister of Defense of Great Britain, Duncan Sandys, speaking of disarmament said: "We must aim at nothing less than total peace. For only in that way shall we ultimately remove the danger of total war."

As yet, the goal of peace, total or otherwise, is a long way off and the danger of total war remains ever present. Obviously, therefore, the job we must be ready to do is to perform our missions, CAMG or otherwise, in the conditions of total war.

Larger and larger military forces and the increased fire power of conventional weapons, so enlarged the battlefield and expanded the war demands upon the civilian economy that war in the first half of our century became a conflict between nations rather than sovereigns or armies.

But the total war of the second half of the 20th Century has two new aspects, each of which radically changes the situation.

One is the atomic weapon. On the tactical side it has resulted in the drastic revisions of tactics involved in the pentomic concept. Clearly it requires equally drastic changes in civil affairs operations.

The other new aspect is the introduction of the ideological issue. The effect of this issue on the civil affairs task is, I believe, obvious. But it cannot be overlooked that it can be as important as atomic and CBR weapons in adding new problems on the tactical side.

The introduction of these issues broadens the hostilities to include a struggle over the very fundamentals of life. We see the basic nature of this struggle if we visualize a war between us and a Marxist enemy. The American idea, as the Declaration of Independence told us long ago, is that man is a creature of God, to whom man owes both reverence and adoration, and that as a creature of God man is endowed with dignity and rights, among them the right to be free. With the right to be free there is also the right to private property, the latter being both a natural and necessary support of individual freedom. These are things which in our view governments do not give. Further, they are things which governments cannot take away.

Each of these three fundamentals the Marxist rejects. He is atheistic, as indeed he must be with his claim of all power in the state. Dignity, freedom, and the other rights, under Marxism come only from the state, and, as we know, usually do not come at all, with the result that the Marxist man is not free. Because under Marxism,

it is not intended that man be free, naturally enough, the right to private property which supports individual freedom, is denied.

Marxism, moreover, claims that it is a universal and exclusive doctrine which explains history and provides the technique of historical changes. It is therefore inherently aggressive and considers itself to be the ultimate and sole survivor in a struggle for world control which it insists must come.

Because it denies morality and rests solely on force, such matters as honor, honesty, regard for the rules, including the rule of law, have no place unless it is advantageous. All and any means may be used to gain the end.

Vicious and erroneous as Marxism is, we must nevertheless accept the fact that it has skilled, dedicated, and effective leadership and devoted followers. We must also accept the fact that it creates an illusion which appeals to altogether too many of the men on the street over the world.

In war with such an enemy his obvious objective would be to establish the Marxist all-powerful state in any area he conquers with the inevitable enslavement of the people. Necessarily, therefore, his objective is to destroy freedom and our types of limited government. If our own objective is less than the destruction of the enemy government, it will mean that we will be content to stop his immediate aggression, but that we will permit him to fall back and reorganize for another try, which we know will come because of his policy of aggression.

In such a war actually the ultimate issue is over a way of life—the alternatives are freedom or slavery. It seems that our objectives in such a war must involve the destruction of the enemy government rather than to impose our will on a government which will continue to exist.

In our civil affairs training we must prepare ourselves to do the civil affairs job in such a war. It is the maximum situation. There may be limited wars in which only conventional weapons are used and there may be a variety of brush fires. If, however, we are prepared for total war we will be ready for such lesser jobs.

If we visualize a total war situation involving the ideological issue and the employment of atomic and CBR weapons in a densely populated, heavily industrial region, we perhaps can most graphically illustrate the problems we must meet.

1. The battlefield is no longer on a front a few miles in depth. The front may extend backwards 200 miles or more.

2. If this expanded battlefield is in a densely populated area the battlefield spectators will outnumber the troops from 30 to 1 upward.

3. The normal desire of the civilian to get away from the fighting will cause civilians to move. But the battlefield areas are all over so we must expect refugees in the hundreds of thousands, and even millions.

4. Mass numbers of people in movement immediately cause problems of order and of shelter and feeding. Even if native supplies are adequate the inevitable dislocations will create immediate and drastic local shortages.

5. Atomic strikes, particularly in urban areas, will create enormous problems of sanitation and medical care, as well as of food and shelter.

6. Radiation may increase substantially the casualty problem and in addition may seriously affect food and water supplies and the use of evacuation routes.

These are the battlefield conditions. If this battlefield is on the land of an ally we will, of course, call on the allied government for all the help it can give. But we must expect that its resources will be overtaxed and that it will require assistance. We must also expect that while it will be cooperative it will insist on the maintenance of its sovereignty and status. Perhaps more so because of its peril. Persuasion, rather than command, will be our means of working with it.

If the battlefield is on the territory of the enemy, whether or not we can use the governmental machinery or personnel depends upon whether or not our needs are so critical that we must take the chance of using officials of governments which are dedicated to our destruction.

The full picture also requires consideration of what the enemy will try to do and his means of doing it.

We must first assume that he will have a complete disregard for human life and suffering. We can not expect him to do more for other people than he does for his own. Thus if the sacrifice of people will achieve his aim, we must expect it just as we would expect the enemy to use any other material if it is advantageous to him.

If his attack is on our own or allied territory, we must expect him to make every effort to disrupt governmental operations and to impair the confidence of the people in the government. If the government is an enemy government, on the other hand, we must expect that it will be used in every way to impede our efforts.

Finally, we must expect that the enemy will make every effort to disrupt economic activity, not only to deny our forces the support of local resources, but also to throw upon our commander the burden of providing for the native people.

Infiltration, subversion, sabotage, terrorism, and propaganda, are among the means that the enemy will employ.

The net result is that our commander in modern total war besides being faced with all the new tactical problems, is also confronted with political and economic battles taking place on the same battlefield.

Unfortunately the evidence is strong that if he loses any one of these battles he may therefore lose the other two.

Certainly a major reason for the German defeat in Russia was the political decision of the Nazis to treat the Russian people as subhuman. This brought on the guerrilla and supply line problems which the Germans actually never were able to overcome. (Cf. Dallin, "German Occupation of Russia.")

If the enemy succeeds in totally disrupting the economy in the situation I have described, it could mean that our commander would be confronted with feeding and caring for millions of civilians in order to prevent disease and unrest. It is not necessary to describe the effect of such a burden upon combat operations.

I believe we must conclude that in the total war of the future, the commanding general's civil affairs responsibility has been greatly increased because of the changes in tactical operations resulting from the new weapons, and also that he has acquired great new civil affairs burdens because of the political and economic phases of modern total war.

It is our job as civil affairs people to advise and assist our commander in the discharge of this responsibility. Our Reserve training program is directed to preparing us for this job.

There are some parts of this training program that can well be emphasized.

1. It is true that whether or not a CAMG unit is worthwhile primarily depends on whether it can do its CAMG job. On the other hand, it is quite clear that in the future not even a high headquarters will be immune from combat problems. Hence our CAMG training should include sufficient tactical training so that as the need arises we can take care of ourselves in any situation.

2. In CAMG company training I think the tactical requirements may have so increased that some reorganization of the company structure may be desirable. In pentomic operations the mobility of the combat units is such that in a period of a few days there may be three different sets of civil affairs problems for the mobile unit, namely those in the place it was, those in the place it is, and those in the place it is about to go. It seems to me that civil affairs platoons, and perhaps companies, will have to be able to operate independently and if this is so, they will have to have some combat capabilities.

In the area of functional training of the CAMG unit, modern total war I think requires emphasis of the following subjects:

1. Ideological: Much as the average American dislikes the subject, a dislike which is perhaps greatest in the American soldier, there seems to be no alternative but to acquire a knowledge of political philosophy. We must know what we stand for, what we mean when we talk about limited government, and the dignity and rights of man, the rule of law, etc.

We must also know the ideology of the enemy, what it is and why it is diametrically opposed to our beliefs. We must also know the enemy's aims and how they operate.

The reason is the simple one, in CAMG, as in tactics, we must know our enemy.

2. Government: There are two phases in our study of government. First we should know our own so that we can at least appreciate our system for protecting the rights and dignity of man.

Second, we should know other governments. First in order to realize that there are different systems based on the experience and traditions of other peoples. We must understand that because they are different does not mean necessarily that they are wrong, and above all we must uproot the common American impression that all we need to do is to translate our Constitution into a native language in order to have solved the governmental problems of any area anywhere.

We also must know other governments because it is through governments that so much of our civil affairs work will have to be done. Necessarily, therefore, we must know how these governments operate, their powers and the limitations of those powers.

3. International organizations: In the wars of the future we will have allies and inevitably there will be international organizations involved. These will range all the way from the United Nations to the International Red Cross. We will have to work with these organizations. It is common sense that we should understand them and know how they operate.

4. International law: Here I refer to the international law of war. We, of course, have the manuals and our lawyers will have the treaties. It is important, however, that we know the principles of international law of war, not only those that have been codified but also those which are found only in the unconventional or common law of war. With a full knowledge of this subject we will be better able to come to the right decisions on the application of these principles to new situations.

It is a matter of national honor that we observe these principles, even in war against an enemy who disregards them. If we do not do so we can hardly claim the enemy to be worse than we are. There is, however, a practical advantage in observing principles. In the long run it is the best means of obtaining the support of world opinion and of local people. If we need an illustration we need only to cite the Nazi experiences in Russia in which unprincipled and harsh treatment of a native population turned the people against the invader.

I wish to conclude by mentioning our special training program in the Second United States Army—the Trapline exer-

cises. These have served as a means of bringing out the problems of modern total war operations and pointing to the specific knowledge that we should have if we are to do the job we want to do. The Trapline exercises as played by the 2d U.S. Army, in my opinion, have been the finest CAMG training that I have experienced since I first became acquainted with this field in 1942. Members of every CAMG unit in the 2d U.S. Army area participate.

In these exercises we work with the tactical people and they work with us. We each learn from the other.

The tactical people have assisted us greatly in developing staff and operation procedures to coordinate CAMG with tactical operations. Through our tactical teachers we have come to a better understanding of the tactical situation and the limitations which tactical operations necessarily impose on civil affairs operations. We have also learned how best the civil affairs operation can support the tactical mission, both in the sense of what kind of support is most desirable and of how it can most effectively be provided.

On the CAMG side we have not lost the opportunity to stress that the civil affairs responsibility is a command responsibility, that the civil affairs sections and units are only one of the means of discharging it, and that every member of the command from the commanding general to the latest rifleman replacement also has duties in connection with the civil affairs responsibility. The result has been increased agreement on the importance of proper troop instructions on the CAMG mission. We also have emphasized that the civil affairs obligation can be more than a burden. The burden exists, but we have tried to demonstrate that civilian resources also can lawfully be a means of affirmative assistance to tactical operations. The reaction of our tactical opposite numbers leads us to believe that we can claim some success in our own teaching efforts.

We have both found that with a better understanding of each others problems, the necessity of a cooperative attack on these problems becomes apparent. As is to be expected, understanding, recognition of the need for cooperation, and working together benefit the execution of both tactical and CAMG plans.

In Trapline, we began with a careful and intensive CAMG survey of the situation involved in the exercise, a typical total war situation, and we have come up with an analysis which in our considered judgment presents the CAMG problems of the war of the future not as we would like them to be but as they will be.

In the 3 years that we have been working on these exercises we have developed some practices and procedures which we believe will help us to do the job if the job is required to be done.

There are three lessons of the many we have learned in Trapline which should be mentioned here.

1. The first is the vital importance of planning. Improvisation is at best a poor substitute and it may be entirely inadequate when the problems are immense. In preparation for a total war situation, and probably any other except those involving uninhabited areas, tactical operations conceived without regard to the civil affairs aspects are as ill founded as those which ignore the terrain. Civil affairs operations in future war are a necessary part of tactical operations, or to put it another way, a tactical plan which lacks its civil affairs annex is incomplete.

2. There is a need for political and economic intelligence which the normal intelligence sections are not yet in a position to give. This need, in particular, concerns current intelligence. Either the capabilities of the existing intelligence sections have to be expanded or a separate political and economic intelligence section seems to be required.

3. We perhaps think too much of the civil affairs job as a necessary evil. We only recently have begun to realize the full extent of the support, as for example, through the supply of labor and other resources, which the civil affairs section can provide for tactical operations. It may be that this support can be expanded far beyond anything now contemplated. The battlefield we have described earlier is the battlefield on our side of the line. This battlefield can be extended as deeply on the enemy side if we are prepared to extend it. It seems that we should explore the possibilities, particularly in the political and economic phases of total war, to utilize civil affairs activities as an offensive operation on the other side of that battleline.

It would seem to be a mistake to limit the civil affairs weapon to defense. In modern total war we may find it gives us many opportunities to exploit the enemy's weaknesses in the territory it controls. These opportunities must not be lost. It is significant that in all the pictures we see of refugees in flight none show a flight from the free world. A well organized program, based on the American fundamentals, which after all only express the aspirations of free men everywhere, if that program is executed with resolution and sincerity, I believe could have a major impact on the citizens of a slave state, and quite possibly on many of such citizens who are in uniform.

Senate Action Properly Rejects Trinity Partnership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Senate's action last week in voting funds for Federal construction of the power features of the Trinity River project is being widely acclaimed in California. I have received many letters of commendation. A good editorial on the subject appeared in the July 11 issues of the Sacramento Bee, the Modesto Bee, and the Fresno Bee.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD; and I especially commend it to the Senate and House conferees on the public works appropriations bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sacramento Bee, the Modesto Bee, and the Fresno Bee, July 11, 1959]

SENATE ACTION PROPERLY REJECTS PARTNERSHIP

The 5-year fight by the Eisenhower administration to turn over the valuable power resources of the Trinity River project to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for private exploitation on a so-called partnership plan appears doomed at long last.

And if doomed, the public will have won a vital and fundamental victory.

The U.S. Senate has voted against the partnership plan by appropriating money for exclusive Government construction and operation of the dam's power facilities.

The legislation, a many-sided public works appropriation bill, now goes to a House-Senate conference committee which will seek to adjust differences between the Senate and House versions.

Public power advocates express hope the House conferees will go along with the Senate and approve the $2,415,000 appropriation voted by the upper House for the public development of Trinity's power resources.

The power to be generated at the Trinity project is intended largely to operate the pumps to lift water into the San Luis Reservoir. It makes no sense, however viewed, for the Federal Government to farm out the power facilities to a private corporation, then to buy that power back at the utility company's rates.

Yet for 5 years the Eisenhower administration has been trying to force the partnership idea on Congress.

It is to be hoped, with favorable action now taken by the Senate and with expectation the House will go along, that Federal construction can be got underway quickly. Too much time already has been lost.

U.S. Senators CLAIR ENGLE and THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, who spearheaded the drive of the Senate public power advocates in this matter, deserve the congratulations of every person who embraces the truth that public development of natural resources for public use is only commonsense.

Their victory is particularly significant because the partnership plan offered by Pacific Gas & Electric represents an effort by a new tactic to put into private hands the control of power from publicly built dams, a proposal by the company that it buy the falling water, build the hydro plants, and generate the power.

Adoption of this plan would overturn, to the public harm, the whole procedure employed in Federal water and power projects. The Government now sells power it develops at its dams and that revenue helps defray the costs of the projects. Under the proposed Pacific Gas & Electric-Trinity partnership, this arrangement would be wrecked. The Government, instead of realizing revenue from the hydro output, would have to buy back the power made possible by its own development of the river's potential.

Failure of this falling-water tactic in the present instance will mean no precedent will be set to impede public production and distribution of hydroelectric energy elsewhere.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we are well aware that the vociferous demands for Federal aid to education originate primarily with the National Education Association. In leading this drive, the NEA is doing a substantial disservice to the country. The newspapers of South Carolina recognize the source of this propaganda as well as the fallacies on which it is based. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Worn Record," which was published in the State, a newspaper published in Columbia, S.C., on July 12, 1959; an editorial entitled "Education

Is Cheaper This Way," published in the Greenville News, a newspaper published in Greenville, S.C., on July 7, 1959; and an editorial entitled "Welfare Staters Still Control NEA," appearing in the Greenville News on July 6, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., July 12, 1959]

WORN RECORD

A branch of the National Education Association has again called for a vast program of Federal aid to education as the only way possible to give schools the needed financial support.

There is no question but that expenditures for education will soon have to be increased rather sharply. First of all, there is the rising tide of youngsters ready for schools, and even if per capita expenditures remained constant, the total would go up substantially each year in the foreseeable future. However, schools are afflicted with inflation, just as the individual household, and this will also mean an increase in gross spending.

Federal aid programs, however, are not the answer. These programs would merely remove responsibility for operation of schools to Washington. The Federal Government would create a vast bureaucracy, and more and more tax money would stay in the National Capital.

It was interesting to note that the educational policies commission of the NEA, at the same meeting, also discussed the need for a national curriculum. Reduced to simple terminology, this means that everyone would get precisely the kind of education that a few Washington bureaucrats deemed advisable. Local needs and considerations would receive only passing attention.

It would be one of the greatest tragedies in the history of America if this country should, in an attempt to avoid responsibility at the local level, turn to federalized education. Basically, education fosters and encourages individual thinking and investigation. It is not an assembly line process in which the same models should be turned out.

Education is a local responsibility, and must be tailored to fit the needs of the community and the individual student. Federalized education would only complicate these needs.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, July 7, 1959]

EDUCATION IS CHEAPER THIS WAY

The advocates of Federal aid for education just won't give up, despite the many contradictions in their position. The bureaucrats in the Federal Government and the National Education Association are determined to entrench themselves and expand their power.

The theory on which Federal aid is based is that it would tax the wealthier States to assist in educating the children in the poorer States.

But comes now a University of Chicago professor who has made a study of the situation and finds that the wealthier States are the ones whose education facilities are farthest behind.

As has been said so many times before by so many persons, if a relatively poor State like South Carolina can lift its public school system to the level it is beginning to reach, then all of the other States can do likewise.

The self-styled liberals have come to look on Federal aid as a cure-all for any deficiency or any evil. It is not. Quite the contrary.

It has become trite through repetition, but it seems that it has to be repeated again and again. The Federal Government has to go to the same source for tax dollars that the State and local governments must tap to meet their needs. And Federal aid dollars are the most expensive kind. By the time a tax dollar is extracted from the pocket of the taxpayer and is returned in the form of Federal aid, it is sadly depleted.

For instance, a year or so ago the Congress enacted a law establishing a form of Federal aid to higher education, mainly to stimulate study in the sciences. It was a relatively small program, but, immediately, the agency in charge hired over 600 persons to administer the program.

And that is only a sample of what would happen if the Federal Government adopted a program calling for billions instead of millions.

If the advocates of Federal aid had worked as hard to increase State and local support of the schools as they have to put over their program, the need would already have been met in the best way that it can be met.

The true friends of public education are those who are working at the State and local level to increase State and local funds for the support of public schools and State institutions of higher learning.

As for the private colleges, individuals and corporations will find it far cheaper to make voluntary contributions for the support of higher learning than to submit to the taxation that will result from a large-scale Federal program for the same purpose.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, July 6, 1959]

WELFARE STATERS STILL CONTROL NEA

The results of the annual convention of the National Education Association clearly indicate that the group is still controlled by a professional clique dedicated to a powerful Central Government and the welfare state.

Even the rejection of a statement flatly endorsing racial integration—an important byproduct of the welfare state—seemed to be an act of expediency rather than conviction.

The association voted overwhelmingly to increase its lobbying activities in behalf of Federal aid to education. It called for a letter writing campaign supporting the Murray-Metcalf bill to provide Federal grants for school construction and teachers' salaries.

The professionals who run NEA have apparently succeeded in persuading a majority of its members (certainly a majority of those who are able to attend its conventions) that only a vast outpouring of dollars from the Federal Government can save education in the United States.

But to save it in this manner is really to destroy it. No matter how often the NEA's leadership proclaims the theory that it is possible to have Federal aid without Federal control, they have yet to point to one major field in which this miracle has been performed.

The professionals in the NEA hierarchy are not concerned with the threat of Federal controls. What they want is power. Under a system of local control and local supervision, this is denied them. But if authority is moved to Washington, these petty tyrants will have vastly increased their strength locally.

One commonsense note in the proceedings was sounded by a delegate from Virginia. Said Harold Bell of Harrisonburg:

"To me it seems incongruous to send $1 to Washington to get 60 cents back."

Unfortunately, Mr. Bell's warning went unheeded. The NEA is still convinced that, somehow, Federal money is unlike any other kind; that because it comes from everywhere it really comes from nowhere, and thoughts of ultimate cost need not disturb anyone.

The fact, of course, is that Federal money is just like any other and that, if the lack of money is really the root of America's educational troubles, it can be raised more easily at the local level than at the national.

But, because the NEA's leaders are more concerned with building their own empires than with solving the problems of education, this fact is ignored. They have tied their fate in with the centralized state and they are not yet ready to give up.

Their kinship with the liberal school of politics is again demonstrated by their action on the question of racial integration in public schools. The delegates did not reject the idea of endorsing integration outright. Instead they readopted last year's statement which called on the people to approach the problem in a "spirit of fair play, good will, and respect for law."

On its face, this seems innocuous enough. But to many of the Northern NEA "law" is defined as the decrees of the Supreme Court. Where that leaves the southern delegates is difficult to say.

More revealing than this, however, is the behind-the-scenes maneuvering as reported by the Associated Press. Said the AP:

"Ever since the convention opened last Sunday, officials of the 635,000-member organization have been pleading with the delegates not to take a stand on integration which might be resented in the South and hamper the effectiveness of the organization."

The AP report is evidence that the sentiments of the officials are not with the South. Instead the southern members are being catered to momentarily, like bad children with rich parents.

Behind this mask of friendliness lies the true sentiments of the officialdom of NEA. If their goal of massive Federal aid is attained, it may be expected that the mask will be dropped. With the tool of Federal control in their hands, they will then be able to put into practice their real convictions on the question of racial separation.

Kenosha, Wis.: Boom Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the economic problems still confronting the Nation deserve our serious consideration.

Unfortunately, there are still pockets of unemployment, business lags, and other problems.

Today, however, I would like to call attention to a great city—Kenosha, Wis.—that, in the midst of our national problems, is experiencing a kind of boom.

How did this happen?

The bright economic outlook for Kenosha is largely the result of foresighted planning in the best tradition of our free enterprise system.

Particularly, the American Motors Corp. has been the main wellspring of new economic health for Kenosha and the surrounding community.

We recall that in recent years, the general trend has been toward production of bigger and bigger cars—at higher

and higher prices to the consumers. However, the budget of the American family—as we all know—has its limits.

By an accurate reading of the "handwriting on the wall," American Motors Corp. has created a smaller, economy car to meet the needs of the auto-driving public.

The result has been improved prospects for industry and the community; and the availability of a car that serves the transportation, as well as the budget needs, of the American family. Significantly, the economic upturn in Kenosha includes: an increase of 5,000 jobs in the last 12 months; stepped up business activity throughout the community; and generally better living for the citizens of Kenosha.

I want to make it clear that—even though I have real respect for the ingenuity of the officials and workers of American Motors—I am not here plugging a car; rather, I am commending a principle of "free enterprise in action" that is serving consumers in Wisconsin and the country.

Recently, the New York Times carried a detailed article on the boom in Kenosha. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECORD OUTPUT RATE FOR RAMBLER CARS SPARKS UPTURN

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

KENOSHA, WIS., July 4.—This middle-size Wisconsin lake port city is riding the crest of a small—or, as they insist here the compact—car craze.

The only unhappy voices are those of some merchants who complain tongue-in-cheek, hand-on-the-cash-register:

The auto workers don't get enough time off to spend their money.

To help the workers solve this problem the stores stay open now on Mondays as well as on Friday nights. But time is indeed scarcer than money.

THREE SHIFTS COMMON

The American Motors Corp., the city's largest employer and the cause of it all, is running assembly lines 6 days a week, double shift. Other departments go 'round the clock to keep production lines supplied, so that 65 percent of the work force is in three-shift, 6-day-a-week departments.

But it's not all work. The Tyson brothers, Robert and Eugene, are doing a thriving business at their sporting goods store in all lines, from bar bells to boats.

"It's surprising," Eugene Tyson said, "how many men walk in here in work clothes and buy golf clubs."

A union official said: "Everybody seems happy."

American Motors is making 1,635 Rambler cars a day, a record high. Its present schedule calls for a model-year output of 376,087, or 210,704 more than in the first schedule set up a year ago.

This compared with a low of 250 a day in June 1954, and 73,393 in all of 1954.

Employment in the last 12 months has risen by 5,000 jobs to more than 12,000, also a new high—higher than in World War II. The company recently invested $5 million to increase capacity.

Only a year ago, Kenosha was still classed as a place with critical unemployment, with 7½ percent of its working force out of work.

Today the unemployment compensation office is deserted, and other businesses find it almost impossible to get extra help. Even maids are scarce.

The 1950 Federal census found 54,800 people in Kenosha. The population is now estimated at 62,000, not counting heavy growth in environs.

The influx of new people has created a housing shortage, too. But the city's new Rambler prosperity has created fresh optimism.

"We're thinking bigger," Mayor Eugene R. Hammond said. "We're planning for the future on the basis that we're going to grow. We're moving away from conservative type of thinking."

George Epstein, owner of Bell Clothing, a leading store, summed it up this way:

"A few years ago there was fear that American Motors was dying. But they have gone from the bottom of the bottom to the top of the top. It's wonderful to be on a winning team."

BUSINESS UP 20 TO 30 PERCENT

Mr. Epstein said that business was up 20 to 30 percent from year ago levels, and added: "People are buying in a lighthearted vein."

In line with this, the Tyson Bros. noted a marked increase in quality bicycle sales. Parents, it seemed, were doing something for their children, too. Two other signs of Rambler prosperity: more foreign sports cars and a booming market for power lawn mowers.

Spot interviews with men and women on the line and with the officers of United Auto Workers Local 72 indicated there was a fierce pride in the product.

"We are definitely trying to get as much production as possible," Leo Downing, local 72 president, said. "We're going to make the big three (Ford Motor Co., General Motors Corp., Chrysler Corp.) compete. We're going to make them hustle."

The union, at its own expense, has set up a committee to urge the United Automobile Workers, State and local governmental units to buy American Motors' cars.

And it tell its members: "You earn your bread and butter here—buy the product.

"Any car produced off the end of the production line could be our own—the cars we make could be our own," George Nordstrom, local 72 vice president, declared. Heads nodded in agreement around the conference table at union headquarters.

With all the fervor of a sales manager, the union men said that the American Motors' cars were the best on the market.

In a separate interview, a former local president, Jack Beni, declared that the morale is the plant was at its highest point.

To beef up its payroll the company didn't go far afield to recruit help. And its careful screening of applicants has, according to the Mayor, enabled the city to absorb the thousands of workers arriving here without any increase in crime or other social problems.

Most of the new people come from Wisconsin, some commuting long distances.

There is a romantic sidelight resulting from the employment of small-town lads from Northern Wisconsin. They get lonesome for their girls, and on the old principle that absence makes the heart grow fonder, have sharply increased for engagement and wedding-ring business at local jewelry stores.

While the bulk of the new people come from Wisconsin, some 400 have migrated from the Michigan auto centers. Jack R. Bell, 29, a native of West Virginia, used to work in the Flint Buick plant. After being out of work for 6 months in 1957, for 9 months last year, and 4 months this year, he came here and found work in the body plant. His take-home pay is $109 a week.

Michael Morris, 22, worked in a Detroit filling station after he got out of the Marines. Then when it went out of business, he was out of a job a year. Now he makes nearly $100 a week take-home pay.

A woman production line worker, Mrs. Florence Koessl, the mother of five children and whose husband is a fireman, said the family's extra cash above savings was going into a new garage. Lyle Krahn, a 29-year-old inspector, who was laid off in 1953 and 1954, but who now has take-home pay of $112 a week, said he had confidence in the company's future and was building a home.

William Thurn, president of the First National Bank, also reported savings deposits up—about 10 percent above last year's.

R. F. Kingsley, editor and publisher of the Kenosha Evening News and president of the Kenosha Savings and Loan Association, reported a better than three-fold increase in applications for home loans.

Milton Wittenberg, secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, noted that in May 1958, Kenosha had 24,000 wage and salaried workers. This May there were 31,000.

Factory production payrolls in May 1958 covered 14,300 jobs, a figure that rose in a year to 20,200.

He reported smaller but similar gains in wholesale and retail and transportation jobs.

The St. Lawrence Seaway is bringing in new business. Perhaps ironically the Ford Motor Co. has selected Kenosha as its Midwest port of entry for its imported small English cars.

World Refugee Year Represents Challenge to Our Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the price of war and violent political change is human suffering. Many pay who were only bystanders to the actual conflict.

Today 15 million persons are homeless and without economic security as a result of war or force during the last two decades. The current World Refugee Year was proclaimed to draw attention to the plight of these people and help to find new homes for them. The United States is a participant in this worthy endeavor. The Oregon Journal, a daily newspaper in Portland, Oreg., has correctly described the effort as a challenge to our humanity. I endorse the view of the Journal and ask unanimous consent that the paper's able editorial of July 10, 1959, expressing this belief be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal, July 10, 1959]

CHALLENGE TO OUR HUMANITY

Governments and private agencies, both religious and sectarian, have been working at the refugee problem ever since the end of World War II, but there are still some 15 million persons who have been cut loose from their homes and who need some kind of resettlement.

By far the greater part of these, an estimated 13,400,000 have fled from behind the Iron Curtain, most of them from East to West Germany. New groups of refugees include 180,000 Algerians driven into Tunisia by the French Army and some 15,000 Tibetans who fled from the Chinese Reds.

In refugee camps in several Arab countries nearly 1 million persons are living on United Nations relief. They are the Palestinians, or their children, who were displaced as a result of the Arab-Israeli war in 1948. Their number has increased rapidly through births.

The enormity of this total problem, a challenge to mankind's better instincts, has caused 52 nations to band together, under auspices of the United Nations, in observance of a World Refugee Year, just started.

It has been endorsed by major religious groups. The World Council of Churches, which includes 173 Protestant, Anglican, and Orthodox churches in the 52 countries, has declared that "the refugee and his family have, for more than a decade, been a challenge to our compassion, and must be a first call on the ministry of those whose Lord had nowhere to lay His head."

Pope John XXIII has broadcast an appeal to all Roman Catholics to aid those unfortunate brothers uprooted by war or political change and appealed to governments to open up their frontiers "more generously and speedily" to help resettle these distressed people.

Dag Hammarskjold, U.N. Secretary-General, recently proposed a plan to encourage the absorption of Arab refugees into Middle Eastern life, but this runs counter to Arab insistence that they be returned to Israel, a course which appears to any objective observer not to be feasible. It seems obvious, at least, that aid from the United Nations relief and works agency, which is keeping these people alive, will have to be renewed when it runs out in June 1960.

Throughout World Refugee Year there will be an attempt to coordinate government and private efforts to find new homes for displaced peoples. Many governments are taking a really serious look at this problem. In Britain, Queen Elizabeth II heads the special Refugee Year committee. President Eisenhower has proclaimed the observance in this country.

It is hard for the rank-and-file American, beset by problems much closer home, to work up sympathy for these faceless masses in other countries. But they are people, too, and their plight is a reproach to our civilization. One may pray that the extra effort being put forth this year will mean the rekindling of hope and the rebuilding of lives among a substantial number of these homeless millions.

A Tribute to President Ngo Dinh Diem of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of July 7, 1959, contained a noteworthy editorial which paid personal tribute to President Ngo Dinh Diem of Vietnam. I fully concur with the views so aptly and emphatically expressed in the editorial, and I would like to include it in the RECORD.

I feel that this is an appropriate occasion to record in the RECORD the part which a number of Members of Congress played in helping President Diem to achieve what he has done in his country.

It was during the critical moments when the Republic of Vietnam was beginning to make headway in face of Communist aggression and considerable dissension within, that a word reached us indicating that some people in the administration were advocating the withdrawal of our country's support of President Diem.

A number of members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, including the Honorable Edna F. Kelly, Hon. Wayne L. Hays, Hon. John Vorys, Hon. Walter Judd, Hon. Marguerite Stitt Church, and myself, met immediately in Congresswoman KELLY'S office to review the situation in Vietnam and the information which was made available to us.

On the basis of that information, we took prompt steps in emphatically urging the administration to continue to support President Ngo Dinh Diem. Fortunately that policy was carried out, and today Vietnam remains within the free world. President Diem consolidated the democratic forces in his country, established sound government, and advanced the cause of freedom in that vital area of the world.

I am certain that other individuals took a position similar to ours, and share in the satisfaction that their efforts aided a just and honorable cause.

I believe that special tribute is due to Walter Robertson, the then Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, and to the late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, who felt as we did and who carried out our viewpoint.

There is no doubt in my mind that all who understood the early trials and difficulties of the Government of Vietnam join in extending sincere congratulations to President Ngo Dinh Diem on the fifth anniversary of his leadership and, through him, to his nation.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, July 7, 1959]

ANNIVERSARY IN VIETNAM

Five years ago today Ngo Dinh Diem took over as chief of state of the Republic of Vietnam. He seemed to be a shy, retiring sort of person, nonpolitical in his background and deeply religious by conviction. He took over the reins in a country that had been divided and all but lost by the disastrous compromises at Geneva, that was beset with internal warfare, poverty stricken, threatened by strong Communist forces to the immediate north and honeycombed by the Communist network within.

Not many observers, even the sympathetic ones, gave him even an outside chance of survival. And almost immediately his shaky new free regime was inundated by the flood of almost a million refugees from the Communist north. One problem was piled upon another.

Now 5 years have passed. The dissident sects have been brought under control. There is unity and public order. The refugees have been put on the land with increasing success and there is real, not Communist-style, land reform. With American help the country has been made less vulnerable from a military point of view and the Communists have obviously thought it better to think twice before attacking. It is worth while noting, also, that this has been done within the framework of a real constitutional democracy.

The road ahead is still long and hard. The little Asian country is still in the very front line in the defense against the Communist onslaught. There are still a thousand things that need to be done for its good people before they can have the full measure of happiness that should be theirs. But a 5-year miracle, not a plan, has been carried out. Vietnam is free and is becoming stronger in defense of its freedom and of ours. There is reason, today, to salute President Ngo Dinh Diem.

Printing Press Money and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in these days when our Nation is enjoying the benefits of the greatest national prosperity era known to mankind, it is perhaps an easy thing for some to believe that we can "reap only good fruits, regardless of the seeds we sow."

Unfortunately, those who follow such a philosophy refuse or ignore the economic realities entailed in achieving prosperity.

In fact, there are two kinds of prosperity. One is the false prosperity developed upon the dreams of wishful thinking that all we have to do to achieve success is to spend our way there, and in particular, by spending the taxpayers money to reach this pot of gold at the end of some far-off rainbow.

The other prosperity is realistic. It is attained—perhaps the hard way, no fancy theories or grandiose schemes—through sound programs in which the integrity of the dollar and our financial institutions builds a firm foundation for the future.

The false prosperity is false because it can never be attained. It is false because it makes people believe that government does not have to account for its financial affairs. And it is false because as it fills one pocket it empties the other just as quickly through the cruel tax of inflation.

On the other hand, our real prosperity is something tangible, something which can be achieved, because it is developed on initiative, effort, and enterprise. It, simply stated, is following the old truism of "a dollar's value for a dollar earned."

Part of the scheme of the advocates of spend our way to prosperity includes so-called cheap money, or printing press money, perhaps the greatest force there is to inflate the currency of a nation.

An excellent article on this subject has been written by Mr. Thurman Sensing, who brings to attention a fine analysis of this problem. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by Mr. Sensing, which appeared in the July issue of the Southern States Industrial Council Bulletin.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINT THE STUFF

(By Thurman Sensing)

It is to be wondered if the advocates of cheap money policies know that they are in effect saying, "Print the stuff." That is exactly what they are doing. And by doing so, they are rushing our economy—and therefore our whole way of life—straight down the road to destruction.

Neither the Government nor anyone else can dodge basic economic laws. One of these laws is that something for sale must meet competitive prices.

In other words, when the Government has bonds to sell, it cannot sell them to the general public unless the bonds yield a competitive rate. The public just won't buy them; and there is no reason why they should. We are witnessing that situation right now.

The Government can do this: it can sell them to banks—or force the banks to buy them—but when that happens, they are simply "printing the stuff," because the banks use them as basis for issuing more currency.

What the proponents of cheap money are afraid of—if they care at all what happens to our economy—is the greatly increased cost of carrying our national debt if the Government had to meet competitive money rates.

They should be afraid of it. The annual interest charge now on our national debt is approximately $8 billion—the second largest item in the budget. Meeting competitive rates—in order to avoid "printing the stuff"—would mean a great deal higher annual interest cost.

But that is no reason for advocating cheap money. That is reason for reducing the national debt—now amounting to more than the combined debts of all the other nations of the world. That is reason for cutting the national budget—now the highest we have ever known in time of peace. That is reason for reducing the inordinate load of taxation in this country—where the personal income tax is the highest known in the world.

If we would do these things, we would not have to worry about our ability to sell Government bonds. These bonds would once more be the "safest buy in the world"—and they could be sold without adding in any way to the inflationary pressure upon our economy.

As it is now, the way our Government handles its affairs simply feeds the inflation which lies like a damp blanket over our whole economy. No nation living under constant inflation has ever been able to retain indefinitely any value in its currency. One of the current notable examples is France, the value of whose franc has practically disappeared during the past 40 years. More than half the value of our own dollar has disappeared over the last 25 years.

The first two things our Government should do are, start (1) living within its income, and (2) paying off its national debt. That is commonsense. But just as important is the need for cutting unessential expenditures (welfare state expenditures) out of the national budget so that taxes can be reduced. This in itself would add the impetus to our economy that more than anything else would enable the Government to do the first two things. As important as it is to pay your way, the worst thing we could do right now would be to raise taxes to pay the unnecessary items that the national budget now includes.

This is important for all the people—but it is especially important to the wage earner, the clerk, the schoolteacher, the rank and file of the people, the "little man"—because of necessity they must carry the major share of an excessive national budget. The taxes cannot be collected from corporations; in fact, it is fallacious to believe that corporations actually pay taxes. They are taxed all right, but they add this to the cost of doing business and pass it on to the consumers. That is the only way they can do it and stay in business. The taxes cannot be collected from those with larger incomes; in fact, to raise the extra $12 billion to $13 billion necessary to balance the current budget would require the confiscation of everyone's taxable income in excess of $4,000. To attempt any such thing is foolish on the face of it. No, the taxes must come from the so-called masses of the people—there is no other source.

That is why the "little man," more than anyone else, should be interested in stopping the Government from "printing the stuff." His future welfare and his whole standard of living are at stake.

How U.S. Worker's Life Has Changed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that today there are still a great many improvements that we can, and must, make in the standards of living of our people. Particularly, there are specific problems that need to be resolved. These include: "hangovers" of unemployment from the economic setback; slum areas in a great many American cities; inadequate income for too many small family farmers; and a variety of other challenges that demand a constructive approach to bettering life for all Americans—especially those who now share inadequately in the overall development and progress of the Nation.

As we take a look at these challenges, however, it is important, I believe, that we keep the picture in perspective. The years gone by have not been without their marks of progress. Today, the majority of American families enjoy higher standards of living than have ever been achieved in the history of the world. A study of living patterns over a 50-year period reveals that so-called class lines are fading. More and more people live in their own homes; also, a higher percentage own cars, dress better, and in many other ways share in the good things of life that have been created through our free enterprise system. As specific examples of progress, I cite the following changes in the life of the U.S. worker: In 1901 only 19 percent of these workers owned their own homes; by contrast, about 51 percent now are homeowners; the 55-hour or more workweek in 1900—without vacation—has now been reduced to about 40 hours—with paid vacation; according to a Labor Department study there were about 8,000 automobiles in the Nation in 1900; recently, the 175 millionth motor vehicle rolled off the assembly lines. This output has enabled 97 percent of the workers in many urban areas to benefit from automobile ownership; today, too, U.S. workers benefit from a great many home conveniences that are still luxuries reserved only for the wealthy in most other countries of the world.

In view of the fact, that all too often, a great many folks have difficulty in seeing the "forest for the trees"—that is, they become so immersed in the problems yet to be resolved that they tend to discredit the progress already made—I am particularly delighted to find, from time to time, illustrations of the kind of progress we are making, thus keeping the picture in perspective.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal printed an article entitled "How U.S. Worker's Life Has Changed." The article portrays significant marks of progress that, I believe, we should bear in mind as we grapple with the challenges ahead.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, July 12, 1959]

HOW U.S. WORKER'S LIFE HAS CHANGED

There is nothing startling to Americans about an ever higher material level of living. As a nation, we accept without wonder what in other parts of the world would be considered extraordinary.

Even so, the evidence of the economic progress of the typical American adds up to an impressive story. The U.S. Department of Labor has told it in a new 267-page book called "How American Buying Habits Change." The report, made last week, gathers into one volume data from six major studies of prices and the family budgets of urban factory wage earners and office clerical workers.

WORKING CLASS LESS DISTINCT

The social implications of the report are more remarkable than the obvious economic facts. What is shown is a revolution in class relations. There has been a rapid fading of a distinctive working class and a widespread adoption of middle class attitudes.

In the new, motorized suburbs, it is no longer possible to tell who people are by what they own, how much leisure they have, or how they use it.

Consider, for example, the automobile.

In 1900, according to the Labor Department's study, there were 8,000 of them in the Nation, some powered by steam or electricity, bumping along on crude, unpaved roads. They cost about $1,000 each. Since the average family made $650 a year, not many of them owned cars.

And, even if they had, they would not have had much time to drive around in them, because the average Joe's workweek ran 55 or more hours, and the 2-day weekend and paid vacation were virtually unknown.

ONE-EIGHTH SPENT ON CARS

By midcentury, automobile ownership was commonplace. It ranged from a high among urban wage earner and clerical worker families of 97 percent of the skilled workers in the suburbs in Western States to a low of 22 percent of the unskilled workers in the larger cities of the South.

The car had become a priority item in the family budget. Families spent $1 of every $8 income on their cars—more than they spent for clothing or any other item save food and shelter.

What had happened?

Real family incomes were up. They rose enough between 1901 and 1950, despite a rise in prices that cut the purchasing power of each dollar by two-thirds, to support the purchase of 2¼ times as many goods and services.

The proportion of total income needed for food, shelter, and clothing—subsistence, in other words—had decreased, leaving an ever widening margin available for conveniences and luxuries. The amount spent on sundries rose from 20.1 cents out of every dollar in 1901 to 43 cents in 1950.

CREDIT USE UP SHARPLY

Credit was increasingly available and relied on. In 1948, more than a third of car purchases involved the use of credit; by 1955, it was closer to two-thirds.

Back in 1901, unprotected by social security, workmen's compensation, private health insurance plans and unemployment compensation, workers' families put larger portions of their earnings into direct cash savings than they do today. At the turn of the century, only one in six families reported a deficit.

In 1957, two of three workers' families had some personal debts, excluding charge accounts and mortgages, and liquid assets were less than debts for about half.

If the worker was a good risk for the auto dealer, he was equally so when it came to buying a house.

At the turn of the century, his low income, the difficulty of borrowing money, and the high cost of financing presented almost insurmountable obstacles to the would-be worker homeowner. The maximum loan offered was typically about half of the appraised value on a 1- to 5-year note payable in full at maturity and bearing interest at from 6 to 10 percent. Renewal of the note involved heavy refinancing charges.

FIFTY-ONE PERCENT OWN HOMES

It was surprising, under the circumstances, that 19 percent of the workers owned their own homes in 1901. By 1917–19 some 27 percent of the city workers occupied dwellings they owned. The 1934 survey showed the proportion at 30 percent. By 1950 the cumulative effect of veterans' guarantee programs, Federal Housing Authority insurance, higher incomes, and improved building techniques had pushed the percentage of home ownership among urban workers to 51.

City workers' families in 1950, with more than twice the purchasing power that their counterparts had in 1901, were able to devote a substantially smaller share of their expenditure to housing, fuel, and light—15 percent instead of 24 percent.

That the workers' families participated in the migration to the suburbs is indicated by the fact that in recent years about 70 percent of the new housing in metropolitan areas has been built outside of the central cities.

As indicative of the climb in the level of living as home ownership itself was what was in the homes by the mid-1950's. Typically there was electricity, hot and cold water, a fully equipped bathroom, central heating, a vacuum cleaner, a washing machine, perhaps a dryer, a telephone, one or more radios, a television set, a gas or electric stove, a refrigerator and completely furnished rooms. In many cases, the heat was automatic and the kitchen would contain a dishwasher, a garbage disposal unit and an exhaust fan. Electric air conditioners, electric blankets, fans, mixers, power lawnmowers and a multitude of other equipment were within the range of the worker's family budget.

WORKER FAMILIES BETTER DRESSED

In the first half of the 20th century, the dress of American city workers and their families underwent a greater transformation than in any other 50-year period in the Nation's history, according to the Labor Department study.

Not only did styles change, but there were major improvements in the number, design and quality of garments owned and in the variety of clothing, fabrics and colors available. Improvements in dress went far toward eliminating differences in appearance between the Nation's factory workers and their families and other economic groups.

And workers and their families were better dressed for a smaller relative outlay. With higher earnings, they allocated a smaller share of expenditures to clothing than they did in 1901.

The same was true of food. Urban workers' families obviously are better fed now than in 1901, yet the proportion of expenditure for food and beverages has dropped from 43 percent to 32 percent. That is particularly noteworthy since food prices have risen more since 1901 than prices for all other items commonly bought by city families.

As the proportion of income absorbed by food, clothing and shelter declined, money was freed for other things. One of those was health care.

HEALTH CARE COST UP

The urban worker's family spent roughly four times as much for medical care in 1950 as in 1900 in dollars of equivalent purchasing power and received better care.

Perhaps no single feature of the urban worker's level of living better illustrates its spectacular improvement in the last half century, according to the Labor Department study, than the expansion and use of his leisure time.

A workweek of five 8-hour days became widespread with the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, requiring the payment of premium rates for work exceeding 40 hours a week. By 1957, 86 percent of the collective bargaining agreements negotiated by labor unions called for 2 or more weeks' vacation with pay and 20 percent provided for 4 weeks. So the workers have time for leisure.

They also have the money. In 1901, families allotted 2.7 percent of their expenditures to recreation, education, and reading. By 1950, it was 5.8 percent.

By 1950, the expenditure patterns for leisure time activity of American workers and their families did not differ significantly from national norms. In 1901 they were distinctly working class.

OUTPUT TRIPLED, WORKWEEK CUT

The main factor in the increase in leisure—indeed, in the whole dramatic hike in the level of living in the last half century—the Labor Department calls the golden trace of productivity.

The individual American worker's output today in a 40-hour week is three times that of his grandfather working 70 hours weekly.

In the process, the average American city wage earner and clerical worker family traded a drab, working class existence for a more secure, more relaxed, and more comfortable middle class life.

Holloran Calls Upon Butler To Resign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. The story deals with the views and comments of the Honorable Mark R. Holloran who, as Democratic National Committeeman from Missouri, has long served the Democratic Party with honor and integrity.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLLORAN CALLS UPON BUTLER TO RESIGN

(By Carl E. Major)

Mark R. Holloran, Democratic national committeeman of Missouri, told the Globe-Democrat Sunday he believes Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler should resign in the interests of the party.

Mr. Butler has sharply criticized the Democratic leadership in Congress. He said the Democratic-controlled Congress is moving too slowly toward enactment of "positive and aggressive legislation."

"We can't win the elections of 1960 if we are to ape the Republican Party," said Mr. Butler, whose criticism has caused a furor within the party.

"I think Mr. Butler is wrong and is stirring up a lot of unnecessary trouble," said Mr. Holloran, a St. Louisan.

QUESTIONS MOTIVE

He said Senate Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON and House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, both of Texas, have made a "commendable record and are working in the best interests of the whole country."

"I think they are getting through the best program they can under a Republican President and Republican Vice President," he added.

"There is something behind Mr. Butler's action. Maybe he is working with some candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination to take some control away from the southerners.

"I can't see what the purpose is in stirring up trouble now so far ahead of the 1960 election."

There have been reports that a resolution may be introduced in the Democratic National Committee at its mid-September meting asking Mr. Butler to resign.

HE'S "PRETTY FOXY"

Asked if he would vote for such a motion, Mr. Holloran said, "On the basis of the statements he has made up to now, I would if the motion were not tied in with something else."

He said Mr. Butler is "pretty foxy and might try to tie in such a motion with civil rights or some other project."

"He has a few cronies who would work for him," Mr. Holloran added.

Tribute to the Late Thomas L. Stokes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most courageous and able crusading journalists of our era was the late Thomas L. Stokes. All of us are the poorer, now that his trenchant and effective pen is no longer at the disposal of the causes he fought for so strenuously. On May 5, 1959, eloquent tribute was paid to the memory of Tom Stokes in an address made at the National

Press Club by Richard L. Strout, of the staff of the Christian Science Monitor. Mr. Strout and the late Mr. Stokes were close personal friends, and the glow of friendship gleams throughout Mr. Strout's tribute. I ask unanimous consent that the address, entitled "Tom Stokes: What He Was Like," as published in the July 1959 issue of Nieman Reports at Harvard University, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There beifig no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOM STOKES: WHAT HE WAS LIKE

(By Richard L. Strout)

Every now and then some exceptional new reporter joins the Washington press corps, some crusader, some hell-raiser, and it's funny how after the years the experienced newspaperman can generally spot him. He may be aggressive, like the late Paul Y. Anderson, or Bob Allen, or he may start out relatively young and shy and mild as Tom Stokes did.

These men are a little different from their fellows. Journalism to them isn't just a business. They would shudder at the word but it's a kind of lifetime crusade. It's a way of tilting at the smug and mighty, and of somehow yanking out the truth against obstacles. That kind of reporter when he hits Washington is likely to stay, and die, in harness: You can't somehow imagine a Nate Robertson or an Ed Lahey or a Ray Clapper or a Clark Mollenhoff ending up in a fat-cat public relations job for General Motors or United States Steel. They don't necessarily have to be radicals though a lot of them are; Joe Alsop is a good Republican but it's hard trying to imagine him toeing some chamber of commerce line or passing out handouts for some corporation.

These men have a purpose in life, a goal, a fire in their bellies; they are not using journalism as a stepladder to something else; they are generally here to stay. That's what Tom Stokes was when he came to Washington way back in 1921, 38 years ago.

He was 23 years old. Outwardly, I am told, he looked mild and shy and amiable. He was bright, he had got a Phi Beta Kappa key at the dreamy old Confederate university at Athens, Ga. I arrived in Washington 3 or 4 years later and ultimately came to know Tom. He liked to tell how he was in the SATC camp at college and one day was told to report to the 6-foot Regular Army officer. Tom presented himself with a snappy salute. "What's your name?" demanded the officer crisply.

For the life of him, Tom couldn't remember. It was part of Tom's personality both that this incident actually happened and that later he could look back on it without mortification. The officer dismissed Tom kindly and told him to come back some time when he could remember his name.

Once as a youngster Tom volunteered in church to go as a missionary to China and though he didn't go he remained a bit of a missionary all his life. His mother died when he was 13 and his world seemed to crash about his ears. He came to Washington from a small town newspaper in Georgia where a hideous lynching has occurred. He was a sensitive, imaginative person and I think the sickening affairs haunted him. There was that element in Tom under his gaiety. I guess that most of us, whether we admit it or not, feel some degree of guilt over the state of the world and some go their quiet way, as well as they can, trying to expiate it.

I asked some of Tom's old friends what was the single characteristic that they thought differentiated him from anybody else.

He was a liberal, of course; not a namby-pamby liberal but rather a fierce liberal when he discovered what he considered to be injustice. But there are a lot of liberals. He was also cheerful, and intelligent, and good company. Granted all that, there are other people like that, too (not enough, but some).

It got to be funny, the way I constantly got the same answer to my question, expressed in different ways but meaning the same thing.

"It was the way he managed to hold his own strong views and yet managed to retain the affection of people whose views were harshly antagonistic to his." In my lifetime I have never seen anyone who had this attribute to a stronger degree than Tom Stokes. He liked people and he was gay and companionable.

I don't mean that Tom didn't have critics—or perhaps even enemies. But consider the fact that Tom never hesitated to lecture the South on civil rights and that he yet remained one of the few columnists the South would listen to on that subject. It was the same with most people of all shades of opinion. I have seen it many and many a time. When he sat down at the press table in the Senate restaurant, or at his favorite place in the National Press Club, others would always crowd in. They would sit down and not go away.

People who weren't on speaking terms with one another would drop down if Tom were there, chat amiably and then go off and perhaps not be on speaking terms again. It was really something to analyze. He was a warm, comfortable stove; he was a walking truce, and yet he would not yield his liberalism an inch in the festive atmosphere. I really can't explain it: I suppose part of it was that he had no malice at all, and no arrogance at all.

Tom richly deserved the Pulitzer Prize which he won. But it is ironic that he got the award not for exposing reaction (as he did all his life), but for his equally fair and determined crusade against the political use of WPA relief funds in Kentucky in behalf of the New Deal Democrats, in the 1938 midterm election. Tom was right in his exposé, and it represented a splendid bit of reporting though it made some of the "liberals" mad at the time. But it is a chance which the progressive reported must take. Stay on your own side of the fence and things will tend to remain quiet and you probably won't get many prizes. But stray out briefly and attack fellow liberals and you run the risk of being tagged with a Pulitzer.

Like every old-time newsman I have a metal file cabinet of clippings by my desk. How often when I turn to it I still find some first-rate clipped item from the Stokes' column. These columns remind me that Tom was one of the few who kept his balance of objectivity in the otherwise all-but-universal paeans from the press after the 1953 inauguration.

I have always felt that the American press—or a good part of it—deprived the administration for several years of something to which it was legitimately entitled, a virile opposition. Every President needs this unending, critical press scrutiny. The administration and the country loses them at their peril.

Tom's normal style in these columns was simply direct and unpretentious. He had a grim concern with many matters which other columnists found too humdrum to explore. I think he was the one who first brought to my attention the role of the regulatory agencies in Washington—the "fourth branch" of the American Government. It was something that back in 1953–55 hardly any other writer seemed interested in.

I think that more than any other man Tom was responsible for Sherman Adams' departure. In a column as early as 1955 Tom charged flatly that Adams was "directing the fight against power development." In later columns he spoke out on the drearily complicated Dixon-Yates giveaway. Sherman Adams, he charged, "meddles constantly in the business of these regulatory commissions, which is really none of his business."

In the last column I have of Tom's, November 20, 1957 (6 weeks before he stopped writing for good), he came back to this same subject and Sherman Adams. "Anybody," he declared, "who is constantly around Congress during this administration finds his tracks all over the place."

Well, that's where Tom signed off. But a man named SAM RAYBURN took notice of these and similar columns and got the House to appropriate $300,000 for the first investigation of regulatory agencies in history. The inquiry followed. You know how it unexpectedly snagged Sherman Adams. I am interested in this because in a piece I wrote last summer for the New Republic entitled, "Tom Stokes and Sherman Adams," I argued that Tom had sparked the inquiry. I added sadly, "I suppose a posthumous prize is out of the question."

Well, I seem to be wrong.

Lethargy in the Face of Madness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in Canada's national weekly of business, investment, and public affairs, known as the Financial Post. It is an editorial which calls the attention of both Russia and the United States to the course of action which both countries are following in connection with preparation for a possible nuclear war. It is not particularly commendatory of either country, and I think with just cause, so I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETHARGY IN THE FACE OF MADNESS

The absolute folly, the utter madness, of nuclear warfare has been presented for the first time in all its full, calm, terrifying detail.

It is the most appalling story of death and destruction ever imagined.

Its possibility is invited by the unhappy lethargy of the public and by the attitudes of the military strategists who, it appears, don't want their big war plans interfered with.

A subcommittee of the U.S. Atomic Energy Committee heard that a limited attack on the United States—and by consequence on Canada—would mean death for some 50 million people, ghastly injury for another 20 million, destruction for all cities of any size; fire storms that would require nature 1,000 years to recover from; defective people for 30 generations.

Despite this appalling report, more headlines at the time of its publication were

devoted to the doings of union racketeers and movie actresses.

The fact that any one person can do so little in the face of international imponderables and horrendous weapons, helps account for public lethargy.

But the disinterest shown by some military people about the fate of our population and the country itself is a stark reminder that violence is their business. The generals and admirals are reluctant to speak out clearly, say reports from the United States, about the effects of nuclear warfare in case it would arouse public opinion against the present nature of U.S. defense policy.

If the military are reluctant to look at the realities of nuclear war, the U.S. administration appears no more concerned with reappraisal. Apparently to calm any public unrest over what could happen here, Neil H. McElroy, U.S. Secretary of Defense, stated a day or so ago that both the United States and the U.S.S.R. are behind schedule in perfecting a combat-ready, intercontinental ballistic missile.

But Mr. McElroy, what's important is not when an effective nuclear war could be fought, it's what is involved in one.

If anything more were needed to show why war is no longer a practicable or tolerable way of settling international disputes, this is it.

Discouraging as it may be when dealing with a foe such as Russia, the United States as a leader of the West has simply got to develop more patience and skill in its attempts to negotiate diplomatically with the Communist world.

It is no longer possible for the United States to remain happily indifferent to the arts and skills of diplomacy. Our peoples cannot afford the mistakes the present course breeds.

Dr. Charles H. Miner of Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Wilkes-Barre Record and Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Monday, July 13, 1959, and news story from the Wilkes-Barre Record of July 13 upon the passing of Dr. Charles H. Miner, distinguished doctor of medicine and humanitarian.

[From the Wilkes-Barre Record, July 13, 1959]

DR. CHARLES H. MINER

Professionally, Dr. Charles H. Miner, who passed away yesterday at the age of 91, had a distinguished career going back to the Spanish-American War. It was one of continuing recognition for one achievement after another. He gave a wealth of service to his State and his community.

As a pioneer in the fight against tuberculosis, he was outstanding for the high degree of success he experienced. It brought him into prominence and established him as an enduring authority in that field. Wyoming Valley Tuberculosis Society came into being 53 years ago because of his efforts. For a long term he served as its president and at retirement was named president emeritus.

Numerous other honors related to his profession—the outstanding part he took in the battle against tuberculosis and his outstanding role as a citizen came to him. He could have been mayor of the city by appointment had he chosen. After he had served as the first secretary of the board of health, he was elected president and subsequently president emeritus.

In the list of the distinctions that came to him was his appointment by Governor Pinchot as State secretary of health, a post he filled for 4 years earnestly and capably.

To list all his connections would require a long enumeration.

An unusual measure of eloquence would be required to surpass the tribute that was paid to Dr. Miner by a colleague in 1957 when the March issue of the Luzerne County Medical Society Bulletin bore the title "Dr. Charles H. Miner Number." The colleague, after saying that Dr. Miner's first thought had been for others, added: "In all matters Dr. Miner has displayed a genuine concern for his fellow man, and in the many difficult decisions of his public service I have never found him other than patient, kindly, unassuming, and thoroughly unselfish. Truly he is a gentleman."

The foregoing accords with the thought that Dr. Miner was a humanitarian. His labors were a blessing to untold thousands while he lived and, because of the progress he made in dealing with a disease now robbed of much of its dread, will continue to be a blessing to untold numbers in the years to come.

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, July 13, 1959]

DR. CHARLES H. MINER

When a man lives to be 91 and has served his country, his State, his community, and humanity so long and faithfully, when he has been honored by his profession and the public as a physician, humanitarian, and citizen so frequently as Dr. Charles Howard Miner has been, death, of necessity, must come as an anticlimax, although it be accompanied by pangs of sorrow for kin and intimates.

Dr. Miner lived a full and complete life. He had run his race and he had won. For him, there were no new worlds to conquer, no tasks left undone, no distinctions to be conferred, for his career had been rich in achievement and he had received recognition, reserved for few of his neighbors or fellow Pennsylvanians. Under the circumstances, he had only to look forward to the eternal reward that awaits those who have kept faith on earth.

It must be a comforting thought to loved ones to know that a husband and father had attained such eminence in life that death might be faced with calm resignation and with no regrets. It has been the privilege of few to have hewn so closely to the line of perfection in unselfish service with attendant rewards.

Member of a distinguished family, Dr. Miner was not content to rest on the laurels of his forebears or to lead a cidcumscribed life, dividing his time between his profession and social activities. This he might have done without any qualms of conscience.

Dr. Miner, who was made of sterner stuff, had higher aspirations. An outstanding practitioner, he took on the greatest challenge of his day—tuberculosis—and while he did not live to see it completely eradicated, he had the satisfaction of noting amazing progress in this field, thanks to his own contribution as a dedicated man of science.

As State secretary of health, medical inspector for Luzerne County, and one of the principal architects of the Kirby Health Center, to mention just a few of his activities outside of the field of tuberculosis, Dr. Miner gave unsparingly of his time and talents to the welfare of the public.

It is impossible to measure by the usual yardstick such a life. About the only thing left to a grateful community is to thank a kind providence for bringing into the world this man who combined greatness and humility and, above all, to single out Wilkes-Barre for the distinction of being his birthplace.

[From the Wilkes-Barre Record, July 13, 1959]

DR. CHARLES MINER DIES AT AGE 91—STATE HOSPITAL AT HAMBURG IS NAMED FOR HEALTH LEADER

Dr. Charles H. Miner, 91, of 264 South Franklin Street, former secretary of health for Pennsylvania, top leader in the fight against tuberculosis in the State, and civic leader in Wilkes-Barre, died at his home yesterday morning at 9:40.

Surviving besides his wife are a son, Attorney Charles H. Miner, Jr., Kingston, member of the law firm of James, McLean, Silverblatt, & Miner; daughter, Miss Stella M. S. Miner, at home; granddaughters, Amy B. and Margaret Lea Miner; nieces and nephew, Mrs. Edward W. Bixby, Mrs. Neil Chrisman, and Robert C. Miner, all of Wilkes-Barre; and Mrs. Marcus Morton and Mrs. Jesse Whitten.

Funeral will be held Tuesday morning at 11:30 from St. Stephen's Episcopal Church, South Franklin Street, with Rev. Thomas C. Davis, associate rector, officiating. Interment will be private in Hollenback Cemetery. There will be no viewing. Arrangements by Homer E. Graham.

Dr. Miner was instrumental in founding Wyoming Valley Tuberculosis Society 53 years ago, and served as its president from that time until 1948, when he retired and was named president emeritus. On the occasion of his retirement, he was honored at a luncheon at the annual meeting of the organization.

Summing up Dr. Miner's valuable contribution in alleviating some of the ills of suffering humanity, Miss Mary H. McKernan, executive secretary of the society, in submitting her report declared, "Through the interest and untiring efforts of such men as Dr. Miner, the diagnosis of tuberculosis is not the thing of horror it was to the family and patient 40 years ago, for if made in its incipiency today, thousands by proper care and treatment are cured and live normal and useful lives."

In recognition of Dr. Miner's long and active career in the health field and leadership in the fight against tuberculosis, Hamburg Tuberculosis Sanitorium, Berks County, was renamed the Charles H. Miner State Hospital in 1956.

In 1933, Dr. Miner declined an honor which many men strive to gain. At a conference of the five judges of Luzerne County Dr. Miner was unanimously chosen for the appointment of mayor of Wilkes-Barre to succeed the late Daniel L. Hart. Dr. Miner declined the honor in a letter to President Judge W. S. McLean.

As 13th president of the Pennsylvania Tuberculsis and Health Association, Dr. Miner was among six former presidents to receive testimonials on April 21, 1955, at the 63rd annual meeting of the association in Pittsburgh. He was cited for his work in combatting tuberculosis.

Dr. Miner and Dr. John J. Shaw, State secretary of health, were presented with scrolls in recognition of their achievements in the field of public health at the 16th annual dinner meeting of Pennsylvania Public Health Association on May 28, 1941.

Dr. Miner helped the late Fred M. Kirby in the planning to establish Angeline Elizabeth Memorial Health Center on North Franklin

Street in memory of Mr. Kirby's mother. With Mr. Kirby he visited various cities where similar institutions were functioning and helped draft plans for the type of building desired in this city.

Dr. Miner became first secretary of board of the health center and was elected president of the board in 1943. When he retired as active head of the board he was named president emeritus, first man to receive the designation since the center was founded.

Dr. Miner was born in Wilkes-Barre July 5, 1868, the son of Charles Abbott Miner and Eliza Ross Atherton. He was graduated from Wilkes-Barre Academy, received his bachelor of science degree from Princeton in 1890 and his doctor of medicine degree from University of Pennsylvania in 1893. For 18 months he was interne in the Presbyterian and Children's Hospitals in Philadelphia.

In 1895 Dr. Miner went to Europe and studied medicine at Heidelberg and Vienna. Returning to Wilkes-Barre in 1896, he has since been a practicing physician.

The system of tuberculosis clinics which have been of untold value to the thousands of residents in every community of the State was outlined by Dr. Miner in 1907 for the late commissioner of health, Dr. Samuel G. Dixon.

In 1906 a committee of local men formed the Wyoming Valley Society for the Prevention and Treatment of Tuberculosis and established the State's first clinic in a small building on South Main Street, Wilkes-Barre.

The clinic met with such success that in 1907 the late Dr. Dixon adopted the plan for establishment in every county of the State and selected Dr. Miner to outline plans and establish these clinics. The local headquarters were taken over by the State and became known as State Clinic No. 1. In 1907, Dr. Miner, through his activities at the local clinic, was appointed State medical director for Luzerne County and retained this position until 1923 when he was appointed State secretary of health.

During the influenza epidemic of the late 1918 and early 1919, Dr. Miner had charge of hospitals in Luzerne and Columbia Counties. Among these hospitals were the armory emergency and emergency institutions at Hazleton, Glen Lyon, Plains, Wanamie, Exeter, and Columbia County institutions.

In January 1923 when Governor Pinchot first assumed office. Dr. Miner was named State secretary of health. In announcing the appointment, Governor Pinchot said he felt the State was fortunate in obtaining Dr. Miner. Dr. Miner served as State secretary of health until January 1927, when Gov. John S. Fisher reappointed him as Luzerne County medical director.

During the Spanish-American War, Dr. Miner served as assistant surgeon in the 9th Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteers. He entered the United States Volunteer service on May 5, 1898, and was mustered out with the 9th Regiment on October 29, 1898. While at Chickamauga he was attached to the 3d Division Ambulance Corps and later to the division hospital. After the mustering out of the regiment, Major Mears, acting division surgeon, offered Dr. Miner a position of surgeon major of the 3d Regiment, Volunteers, but owing to his professional duties, he was unable to accept the position. The regiment served in Cuba for some time. At the reorganization of the regiment Dr. Miner was reappointed an assistant surgeon by the then Col. C. B. Dougherty.

On June 1, 1904, Dr. Miner and Grace Lea Shoemaker were married.

Dr. Miner also was cited May 26, 1943, by Luzerne County Medical Society, of which he was past president, in honor of his having practiced medicine 50 years. Pennsylvania Tuberculosis and Health Society paid him tribute at its annual meeting in April 1952 for his outstanding work and a ward at White Haven Sanitarium was named in his honor. He also received an award from the Pennsylvania Public Health Association on October 22, 1948.

Dr. Miner was a member of St. Stephen's Episcopal Church and senior warden for many years. Also a member of Westmoreland Club. He was on the consultation staff of Mercy Hospital and on the visiting staff of General Hospital and at one time was attending physician at White Haven Sanitarium.

He was a member of the Military Order of Foreign Wars; a corresponding member of the College of Physicians of Philadelphia; and a member of American Public Health Association, National Tuberculosis Society, American, State and county medical societies and American College of Physicians.

He also was a member of the American and Pennsylvania Heart Associations; American Clinical and Climatological Association; and Pennsylvania Tuberculosis and Health Society, of which he served as a member of the board of directors and executive committee and as president in 1917.

The late Gen. Asher Miner, famed soldier, who was wounded while leading the 109th Field Artillery Regiment during World War I, was a brother of Dr. Miner.

Dr. Miner was not only one of the most prominent physicians in Pennsylvania but was a decendant of a number of men prominent in the early days of Wyoming Valley, including Asher Miner, who moved to Wilkes-Barre from Norwich, Conn., in 1799; Gen. William Ross, his great grandfather, Robert Miner, his grandfather, and Charles Abbott Miner, his father.

The Interstate Commerce Income Tax Cases—Is There a Case for Action by Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of the Senate, to the finest summary I have seen on the perplexing problem of State taxation of interstate commerce.

This is a matter of compelling interest to the Senate and to the country. Our Small Business Committee has completed a report on it, and our Judiciary and Finance Committees are now at work on it.

I call the attention of the Senate to an address by John Dane, Jr., former tax commissioner in Massachusetts, to the 27th annual meeting of the National Association of Tax Administrators in Buffalo, N.Y., on July 10, 1959.

Mr. Dane speaks from experience as the tax commissioner in the State of New Hampshire, and from a fund of knowledge accumulated as an able tax attorney.

The information contained in his address will be of value to all Senators who wish a clear and complete analysis of this problem, so I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE INCOME TAX CASES—IS THERE A CASE FOR ACTION BY CONGRESS?

(Remarks by John Dane, Jr., before 27th annual meeting of National Association of Tax Administrators, Buffalo, N.Y., July 10, 1959)

Regardless of whether the recent Supreme Court decisions in the Stockham Valves and Fittings and Northwestern States Portland Cement cases represent the blazing of new judicial trails, as the minority of the Court felt, or whether they are merely a reiteration of previously well-established principles, as was stated by the majority, small- and medium-sized businesses now find themselves faced with new and pressing problems. Basically these problems arise from the fact that such concerns will be required to file tax returns in many more States than heretofore; and everyone knows that the more States there are in which you are required to file a return, the more likely it is that lack of uniformity in State apportionment and allocation formulas will work substantial injustices.

The Pandora's box of uncertainties which has been opened by these decisions must be closed soon if serious damage is not to be done. As it is, corporate treasures are receiving tax bills from States which had previously been nothing more than names on salesmen's expense accounts. Auditors are burning the midnight oil in an effort to decide on the form of their certificates and to arrive at a proper answer to the question of what reserves should be made for previously unsuspected State tax liabilities. Bankers are worried as to whether tax liabilities for prior years are going to render meaningless the balance sheets they had relied on in making loans.

Fortunately for all concerned, the Senate Select Committee on Small Business moved swiftly into the field, holding hearings in Washington on April 8, and in Boston on May 1. As a result of the testimony offered at these hearings, the committee has published a comprehensive and well-reasoned report and a number of bills have been placed in the legislative hopper.* * *

HISTORY OF STATE TAXATION OF CORPORATE INCOME

Two very important issues arise when a State seeks to tax a corporation which has been incorporated in another State. First, has the State jurisdiction to tax the particular corporation; and second, assuming that it has jurisdiction to tax, how do you determine what proportion of the corporation's income is subject to tax.

When corporate income taxes were originally imposed by the States—the first significant one being in Wisconsin in 1911—the tax was justified on the basis of the benefits which the corporation was presumed to receive from the taxing State.

Such benefits consist of the various protective and economic services which the State furnishes to the corporation and which assist it in operating and earning an income. The amount of the State-furnished benefits was supposed to be measured in terms of the income which the corporation earned in the State.

Two corollaries flowed logically from this benefit theory.

First, jurisdiction to tax existed only in the case of corporations which operated property or maintained permanent business establishments in the taxing State.

Second, a tax could properly be imposed only with respect to that portion of the corporation's income which was reasonably

attributable to its productive activities in the taxing State.

As can readily be seen, these original concepts of jurisdiction and allocation were strongly oriented in favor of the States where manufacturing activity took place or where stocks of goods and branch offices with authority to accept orders were located. States in which the sole corporate activity was confined to solicitation of orders by traveling salesmen or drummers had no jurisdiction to tax.

There were some earlier attempts to deviate from this pattern, but it was not until World War II that the voice of the market States, as distinguished from the producing States, began to be heard in earnest. Generally speaking, no States attempted to collect income taxes from companies engaged solely in sales activities until the early 1940's. California was the first State to construe its corporate income tax to apply to sales activities, its lead being followed by Georgia, Louisiana, Minnesota, Oregon, and Mississippi.

Paralleling this trend to extend tax jurisdiction to reach corporations which enter a State solely for the purpose of soliciting orders and have no manufacturing facilities, stock of goods, or permanent establishment within the State, attempts were made by market States to allocate to themselves a greater proportion of corporate income in cases where admittedly there was jurisdiction to tax. The earlier practice was to attribute a sale to a State only if it was accepted at an office in the State or if the goods were shipped from a warehouse in the State, thus adhering to the theory that the State where the firm had property or a permanent establishment of some kind supplied more benefits and therefore had a greater claim on the firm's tax dollar. More recently States have sought to allocate sales to themselves where solicitation has been made or where goods were shipped to purchasers within their borders.

DIFFERENTIAL EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESS

It seems quite clear that the impact of the new Supreme Court decisions will fall most heavily upon medium and small businesses by making it more difficult for them to compete with countrywide concerns which are already paying taxes in all or almost all 50 States. For such concerns the new extension of State tax jurisdiction will mean little if any increase in overhead expense. But take the case of a typical small business which has, for example, its manufacturing plant in one of the Middle Atlantic States. Salesmen from the main office cover the Atlantic seaboard. It also has a warehouse and sales office in St. Louis to cover the Midwest.

Under the former theory of jurisdiction to impose an income tax, only its home State and Missouri, where the warehouse and sales office were located, could have imposed taxes on this company.

Now it would appear that this concern may be liable to taxation in every State which its salesmen enter to solicit orders even though such salesmen may not live or have an office in the taxing State.

This is no fanciful case. Out of 139 replies received in a recent National Association of Manufacturers questionnaire, 65 companies paid income taxes in 5 States or less. Yet out of this same sample, 102 companies had salesmen who traveled with some degree of regularity in 21 or more States. For 65 reporting companies with gross annual sales under $25 million, only 21 paid income taxes in more than 5 States. Forty-one companies paid taxes in one State or less. Yet of these same companies, 37 had salesmen who traveled regularly in more than 21 States.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS OF RECENT DECISIONS

The pyramiding of the overhead expenses of taxpayers arising from an increase in the number of States in which returns must be filed is paralleled by a comparable increase in the administrative costs of the States. Auditing a $10 return is often as complicated as auditing a $500 return. It takes up just as much filing space. Just as many accounting entries must be made in order properly to cashier the tax payment.

But even more important is the problem of enforcement. So long as liability for taxation is confined to companies having manufacturing facilities, warehouses or sales offices in a State, efficient and effective enforcement is possible at reasonable cost. However, the mere identification of out-of-State firms which do business in the State only through traveling salesmen is a tremendously time-consuming task, nor is identification the end of the problem. It is one thing for a State tax official to know that a particular out-of-State firm has been sending salesmen into his State. It is quite another to secure a tax return from such a firm, check the correctness of its preparation and after all that has been done, enforce the payment of the tax against an absent and perhaps recalcitrant taxpayer.

To make matters worse, in many cases the tax liability of an out-of-State firm may well be less than the cost of collection. This will leave the State tax administrator faced with an unhappy choice—should he try for complete coverage of all taxpayers even if some of them do not pay their way, or should he confine his collection activities to just those larger taxpayers where the game is worth the candle, and wink at widespread tax avoidance on the part of smaller firms?

Recent reports from a number of States indicate that many State tax administrators are moving into this area with great caution. New York has taken the position that it does not wish to discourage foreign corporations from entering the local market and has made the announcement that it will make no attempt at present to impose its tax on corporations with no regular place of business in the State. Arkansas and New Mexico will continue to enforce their preexisting rules. In the former, liability attaches to corporations which engage in organized sales activity and own tangible property within the State. In the latter, solicitation of orders by nonresident salaried representatives which are filled outside the State will not result in tax liability even in the case of a foreign corporation authorized to do business.

EFFECT OF DECISION ON FEDERAL REVENUE

If any substantial number of States follow the footsteps of Georgia and Minnesota, and with the blessings of the Supreme Court already secured, tax out-of-State firms which merely solicit sales within their borders, the economic implications for the economy of the entire country may be both very substantial and very unfortunate. This country has outpaced even such highly developed industrial areas as Western Europe because it has presented a single market. Business firms have been able to spread their operations widely with a minimum of governmental interference.

If mere solicitation of orders in a State is now going to subject a firm to that State's tax requirements, the small businessman will think twice before extending his operations into areas where profit potentialities, even leaving out the danger of additional tax liabilities, may be conjectural at best. This will invariably tend to leave the market to larger firms whose activities are already widespread and which can better absorb the overhead expense both of securing the best tax advice and of keeping adequate tax accounting records segregated on a State-by-State basis.

It should not be assumed that this additional overhead expense of keeping accounting records, preparing tax returns, and securing legal advice is a concern solely of the particular businesses involved. All these nonoperating expenses, all these costs of complying with diverse State requirements and nonuniform apportionment formulas, represent deductions in the computation of net income subject to Federal tax. Thus 52 percent of the burden—the amount of the Federal tax on corporate income—is borne, not by the individual firms involved but by the Federal Treasury—which is another way of saying that it is borne by the general body of taxpayers.

POSSIBLE METHODS OF PREVENTING DISCRIMINATIONS AGAINST SMALL- AND MEDIUM-SIZED INTERSTATE BUSINESS RESULTING FROM RECENT SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

Small- and medium-sized businesses operating across State lines should pay their fair share of the overall State tax burden. On the other hand, they should not be saddled with discriminatory tax and compliance costs in comparison with businesses operating in only one State. However, the new Supreme Court decisions open up two possible areas where such discrimination may develop. First, due to the divergent apportionment formulas which are to be found in the various State tax statutes, any interstate business may be forced to pay a tax on more than 100 percent of its income. Second, even though a particular interstate business is not taxed on more than 100 percent of its income, it may be required to file returns in such a large number of States, in some of which the tax due is less than the cost of preparing the return, that its cost of complying with the various State tax laws is vastly greater than the corresponding costs of a firm doing business in but a single State.

Several solutions to these two possibilities of discrimination against interstate businesses suggest themselves. The solution that has had the most publicity over the years is the proposal that all the States adopt by statute a uniform allocation and apportionment formula. The enactment of a uniform formula would remove one of the possible sources of discrimination against interstate business in that it would eliminate the risk that a corporation would be taxable on more than 100 percent of its income. It would not, however, in any way reduce the risk of discrimination arising from inordinately high compliance costs. On the contrary, if it required the computation of the sales fraction on a state of destination basis, it would guarantee that interstate business would be required to file in the maximum possible number of States.

To these theoretical objections to a uniform apportionment formula as a solution to the problem of discrimination against interstate business is to be added a basic practical objection. Tax practitioners and administrators have been debating a uniform apportionment statute for years, but there would seem to be little more chance of the adoption of such a statute now than there was 25 years ago. The type of formula that would be acceptable to the manufacturing States is unacceptable to the market States and vice versa.

It would seem, therefore, that if a solution is to be found, it must be at the Federal level. At this point, the objection may well be raised that Congress has no power to regulate State taxation of income from interstate commerce. However, a reading of the conclusions reached by the Small Business Committee on this issue, as set out in its report (2), will satisfy all but the most doubting of Thomases.

The second possible solution is the one suggested in Mr. Justice Frankfurter's dissenting opinion in the Stockham Valves and Northwestern States Portland Cement cases, namely that Congress enter the field by enacting a statute which would permit the various States to tax income from inter-

state commerce on condition that they adopt a congressionally devised uniform apportionment formula. This solution seems little better than the first. If the various State legislatures cannot get together on an apportionment formula, what reason is there to believe that their elected representatives in the Congress, representing as they do various conflicting points of view, would have any more success?

There is, however, one solution which has the dual advantage of providing very substantial relief to interstate business with not inconsiderable potentialities of congressional approval. This solution would follow the pattern already adopted by the Congress in enacting a corporation tax statute for the District of Columbia and would prohibit a State from taxing the income of a person doing solely interstate commerce within its borders where such person does not have or maintain an office, warehouse, or other place of business in the taxing State, and has no officer, agent or representative having an office or other place of business in such State. "Agent" or "representative," for these purposes, would not include an independent broker engaged in regularly soliciting orders in the State for sellers and who holds himself out as such.

S. 2281, filed by Senator SALTONSTALL on June 25 and H.R. 8019 filed by Representative CONTE on the same day impose these limitations on State taxing power. They also provide further that States may not, after the enactment of the bill, assess or collect any income tax, or make any levy with respect to such a tax, if the imposition of such a tax would have been prohibited under the bill because the requisite minimum activities were absent.

Senator SPARKMAN, for himself and other members of the Small Business Committee, has filed Senate Joint Resolution 113, which contains a somewhat similar minimum activity limitation but restricted to taxable years ending after December 31, 1958, and beginning before January 1, 1961. This bill also provides for the creation of a five-man commission, to study the question of State taxation of income from interstate commerce for the purpose of enabling the commission to recommend legislation "providing for the establishment of uniform standards which the States will be required to observe in imposing income taxes upon businesses engaged in interstate commerce."

A large number of other bills have been filed adopting the minimum activity approach, and the House Judiciary Committee has appointed a special subcommittee under the chairmanship of Representative WILLIS, or Arkansas, to study the problems of State taxation of income derived solely from interstate commerce.

While the minimum activities type of Federal statute would not, in and of itself, prevent a corporation from being taxed on more than 100 percent of its income, it would restrict jurisdiction to tax to those States where the corporation had some sort of permanent establishment. With taxing jurisdiction so restricted, the risks of taxation on more than 100 percent of income would be greatly reduced. Such a statute would also go a long way toward solving the compliance problem for small- and medium-sized businesses which have permanent establishments in only a relatively few States but send salesmen into a majority, if not all of the 50.

The final and by no means the least persuasive argument in favor of such legislation is that it would not put the Congress in the position of overruling the recent decisions of the Supreme Court. If such a statute had been in force during the taxable years involved, the right of Georgia to tax Stockham Valves and of Minnesota to tax Northwestern States Portland Cement would in no way have been affected.

The crying need at the moment would seem to be to bring the greatest possible measure of certainty into this area. So long as every corporation selling outside of its own State is in doubt as to its tax liabilities, a serious restraint is being imposed on the development of the Amercan economy. Corporate management, being confused as to its tax obligations, will in many cases resist all new tax claims until the smoke has settled. Tax administrators, quite understandably, will, on their part, be engaged in staking out the widest possible claims for themselves. All that this can add up to is greatly increased administrative costs, both direct and indirect, for everyone concerned.

Few people will contend that the minimum activities approach represents the only solution to the problem in the long run. It may quite possibly offer too great an opportunity for artificial sales procedures designed primarily to reduce tax liability. On the other hand, it is, in the judgment of many who have given it very considerable thought, the best solution that has been offered to date. If adopted, it will provide a period of certainty during which the issue can be studied, both in and out of Congress, from all angles. It may well be that the States will get together on a uniform allocation and apportionment formula which will effectively reconcile the various conflicting interests or that such a formula will be devised by the Congress. But until this time comes, it seems essential that the management of industry devote its full energies to building up a stronger and more vigorous economy and that tax administrators direct their unimpeded efforts to the collection of taxes unquestionably due. Neither group can fulfill their allotted function in the present atmosphere of doubt and uncertainty.

Address by Brig. Gen. William W. Stickney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a splendid address delivered to the International Convention of the Sertoma Club at Memphis, Tenn., on June 24, last, by Brig. Gen. William W. Stickney, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, Deputy Director, Marine Corps Reserve.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM W. STICKNEY, U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, MARINE CORPS RESERVE, DELIVERED TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE SERTOMA CLUB AT PEABODY HOTEL, MEMPHIS, TENN.

I have been looking forward with great pleasure to address this outstanding organization. Your contracted name "Service to Mankind," is somewhat akin to the Marine Corps "Semper Fidelis"—"Always Faithful", and your youth employment service "Yes", is a "can do" objective just as the Marine Corps is a "can do" outfit. So it appears that your club and the Marine Corps have much in common. We build men—you build citizens. You teach the American way of life—the Marine Corps has fought and won hundreds of battles during the last 184 years to protect and defend that way of life, and, we will always be ready and faithful to that cause.

My inspector-instructor in Memphis, Capt. Ray Hicks, in writing about your club and what I should talk about today, ended his somewhat lengthy letter with this statement, "It's a big job to make a half hour address on the Marine Corps Reserve, National defense, service to youth, service to mankind, and patriotism. However, these are the subjects in which Sertomans are interested."

This is my challenge, which I accept in the hope that when I am finished, I will have stayed within my time limitations and yet covered all phases of your interest. I will not speak of the Marine Corps Reserve alone, but rather the whole "ball of wax"—all Reserve components—your Reserve and mine.

We too often think in terms of our own service alone. We sometimes feel that our own particular service is the best, or the only service to be considered. We sometimes speak of our particular service to the detriment of other services. This may be all well and good for competitive purposes or loyalty to one's particular service, but we must all remember that the hand is no stronger than the strength of all its fingers. Likewise, our Reserve is no stronger than the strength of each service. Insofar as we do harm to any finger of the strong hand of the Reserve, we destroy its strength to that extent. It is vital to the future of this Nation that we have a strong and virile Reserve in all components, a well-balanced force in readiness.

As you well know, many hours, days, weeks, and months of devoted effort have been expended during the past few years by many outstanding citizens, military and otherwise, in a concerted effort to find ways and means of improving our Reserve components so that they in turn may better serve the Nation. In this effort many committees, boards, surveys, and reevaluation symposia have been convened, desolved, and reconvened. What has been the cumulative result of all this monumental effort?

To be sure, gains have been made. Some improvements have been notable. Some rights have been established, and, many privileges have been sought. Frustration has been rampant.

In my opinion, never have so many eminent citizens and outstanding military leaders worked so diligently to obtain so little. Why?

Today, I would like to discuss with you a few basic concepts. A lawyer would call it "horn book law"; a military man would call it "an estimate of the situation"; a Navy man would call it "rocks and shoals"; a marine would call it "customs and traditions of the service."

Generally speaking, the resultant of all of our efforts has been the 1955 amendments to the Reserve Forces Act of 1952. Whether you agree with those amendments is irrelevant. The fate of that act may be academic, at least it is debatable.

Regardless of that, and whatever the results may be, we do know that in a democracy such as ours, the Regular forces can only be a shield, can only man the outer ramparts, can only ward off the initial thrust. By this, I mean no offense to our Regular forces—within them we have many great leaders and thousands of valiant hearts. Nevertheless it is the very nature of our form of government and economic structure to maintain a relatively small protective shield and to create and build a large Reserve to fight and win our wars. This is, and always will be, our tradition.

I believe it to be manifest that this Nation cannot survive without a strong, virile, and flexible Reserve. I also believe that it is the duty, not only of the Reserves themselves, but of every citizen as well, in and out of uniform, to build that Reserve and to give

it every nourishment necessary to its health. There are those who have said we have failed, but they say not why. If this be so, idle criticism is not what we need—nor are bodies and weapons our only requirements. What we need first and foremost is good old American pride and patriotism. And, what is more, we know that pride and patriotism cannot be subsidized, it cannot be bought and paid for in the marketplace. Dollars will help, but we cannot build a Reserve on drill pay alone nor lip service at a bargain. Let us look at the record of events during the past decade and see where we find ourselves today. Let us face our problems, good or bad, fairly and forthrightly.

First, let us look at our needs and requirements.

Never has the need for real preparedness, real thinking, and self analysis been so urgent. Now, as never before real and rapid preparedness is of the first priority. This Nation must organize its manpower and its production so that it can transfer easily and quickly from a peacetime economy to a war production effort, take any emergency in its stride, and ride out the storm. If this is done, and done now, it will gain for us the initial advantage of any struggle that may be in the offing.

In addition, we must make a very serious study of what future wars will mean and how we will fight them. It is of little use to superimpose new weapons on World War II organizations, and then try to work out the tactical changes involved—we have tried this before and know it will not work.

Any suggestion that the introduction of atomic and thermonuclear weapons is not going to affect the organization of our forces and the tactics of warfare is nonsense. We must examine our organizations and reevaluate our equipment, in order to keep pace with constant changes required in this atomic age.

This reevaluation is also required in our Reserve components and our present system of procuring and training our Reserve forces. The old method has proven itself to be out of date.

To successfully fight any war, we need the following essential requirements.

First, we must have outstanding regular peacetime forces, up to strength and ready at all times to act as our shield without any mobilization procedure.

These forces must be trained and equipped in the highest degree. They must be mobile, hardhitting, offensive troops with an esprit de corps and very highly disciplined. I say "very highly disciplined" advisedly. Somehow in our effort to be equitable we have lost track of the highly important subject of discipline. We just cannot wage a successful war without instinctively disciplined troops. These are the troops and the commanders who must stand firm in the face of the horrors and the terrors of the opening clashes of an atomic war. They will stand firm only if they are highly trained and highly disciplined.

Secondly, we need reserve forces, well organized, capable of being mobilized in echelons in depth, each echelon receiving sufficient training in time of peace to insure that it is ready in fact, and fit to fight offensively or defensively as and when needed.

Thirdly, these forces, regular and reserve, must be backed by a sound logistic and movement organization which must exist in peacetime to the degree necessary to insure success in the opening days of war.

Lastly, we must have a sound civil defense organization in each State, territory, and large metropolitan area.

For these reasons, I strongly contend that it is our solemn duty to do everything humanly possible to help affirmatively in the building of a strong, flexible and sturdy reserve with the will to fight anywhere, and everywhere that need may arise.

These things being true, how do we best obtain the desired results? First, it is my considered opinion that what we need most is a strong and forthright educational program for our citizens, as to the present position of this great Nation; that it is the greatest and strongest Nation in the world and that as such it is incumbent upon us to lead the free nations in our struggle for peace and the preservation of all freedom loving peoples. This preservation of freedom will largely depend upon our efforts in this direction. In our success may well depend the success of the world, and government as we understand it. In our failure may well depend the failure of world democracy. These are not idle words but fundamental truths for which our forefathers have fought and given their life blood to preserve. So let it be known that these ideals and our very existence are in peril. To maintain them, we need the full loyalty and wholehearted support of every American citizen. If America is worth living for, it's worth fighting, if not dying for as well. I cannot express too strongly the great need of new and powerful concepts in the thinking of the American people if this Nation is to survive. The concept is plain and the need is great.

There is rampant in the world today a sinister force of unbelievers—a gigantic force backed and sponsored by a nation whose rulers live in constant fear of the truth—in constant fear that the Russian people will learn the truth about the world without or that foreigners will learn the truth about their world within. A nation whose rulers constantly seek security only in patient but deadly struggle for the total destruction of rival power—never in compacts and compromises with it. With this constant fear of the truth—with this clinging dogma that the outside world is evil and that their inside world shall never be exposed to the clarifying rays of truth and justice—the implications are self-evident. With such a government, whose rulers dare not be guided by the everlasting truth, we will have an uneasy Rusian nationalism in which the conceptions of offense and defense are inextricably confused—and—armed and equipped with the apparatus of international communism they become more dangerous and more insidious than could ever be imagined by the ordinary man.

We have here before us a political force which appears to be committed to the belief that with the United States there can be no permanent modus vivendi—that it is desirable and necessary that the internal harmony of our society be disrupted, our traditional way of life be destroyed, and that the international authority of our State be broken, if Soviet power is to be secure. This political force has complete power of disposition over the energies of one of the world's greatest peoples and the resources of the world's richest national territory. Finally, it is seemingly inaccessible to considerations of reality and truth in its basic reactions. For it, the vast fund of objective fact and truth about human society and history is not, as with us, the measure against which outlook is constantly being tested and reformed, but a great grab bag from which individual items are selected arbitrarily and tendentiously to bolster an outlook already preconceived. The problem of how to cope with this force is undoubtedly the greatest task our diplomacy has ever faced and probably the greatest it will ever have to face. But cope with it we must. And to do this, I sincerely believe that we must see to it that our people are educated to the realities and truths of the Russian situation. I cannot overemphasize the importance of this great truth. I am convinced that there would be far less hysterical anti-Sovietism in our country today if the realities of this situation were better understood by our people. There is nothing as dangerous or as terrifying as the unknown. We must instill in all our people the truth, courage, and self-confidence necessary for the greatest posible improvement in the health and vigor of our own society, and, we must put before the peoples of the world a much more positive and constructive picture of the sort of world we would like to see than we have put forward in the past.

Ancient Carthage, with its luxury standard of living, refused to make minimum sacrifices to support Hannibal and did not survive. Cato's relentless chant "Carthage must be destroyed" did not awaken the indolent Africans from their preoccupation of life, liberty and the pursit of happiness. They did not believe that Cato, like Khrushchev, meant what he threatened. Similarly, Rome itself, entertained with bread, wine, and circuses—and, arrogant in its splendor, did not survive the onslaught of the Vandals and Visigoths. The technical skill that built her roads and aqueducts, the "know-how" of her administrators, the glory of her law—none of these assets saved an effete and overcivilized Rome.

The gross national product of Rome did not protect her. The visigoths had no gross national product—only weapons and the will for power. These dismal comments on Carthage and Rome could be repeated for other proud civilizations. Many times in the past, nations with high standards of living have been pushed to the grave by nations with low standards of dying. There is no reason to suppose that history, or providence, will accord any special dispensation to America.

We must admit, as a government and as a people, that we are locked in a struggle with a conspiratorial elite who seem to have perverted every form of human activity to the cause of conflict. This struggle continues today just as surely as it did on the afternoon of December 6, 1941. Even though we didn't know it, the carriers of the imperial Japanese Navy were converging on Hawaii. The bombs had been loaded, the pilots briefed, the mission assigned, the die cast for our people by war lords on the far side of the earth. We learned then that war starts—not at the moment of the surprise attack—but when the enemy completes his final plans and commits his resources to conflict.

Permit me to read to you a small portion of a paper read before the American geographical and statistical society by Admiral Perry in the year 1856, 103 years ago. I quote, "it seems to me that the people of America will, in some form or other, extend their dominion and their power, until they shall have * * * placed the Saxon race upon the eastern shores of Asia. And I think too that eastward and southward will her great rival in future aggrandizement (Russia) stretch forth her power to the coasts of China and Siam: and thus the Saxon and the Cossack will meet * * * will it be in friendship? I fear not! The antagonistic exponents of freedom and absolutism must thus meet at last, and then will be fought the mighty battle on which the world will look with breathless interest, for on its issue will depend the freedom or the slavery of the world. * * * I think I see in the distance the giants that are growing up for that fierce and final encounter; in the progress of events that battle must sooner or later be fought."

As sure as this prophecy has proven itself to date, there now stands on our frontier an Asiatic conqueror. Owing to science, the Atlantic Ocean is no wider than the Dela-

ware. Owing to technology, the Pacific is no broader than Lake Michigan, and, the wastelands of the North can be bridged in a few hours flight. And don't think for one moment that we will have time to organize the militia as we did at Lexington and Concord or the Federal Reserve as we did in World War I and World War II. We will be lucky if we have time to get our loved ones into air raid shelters.

Now, with this in mind, let us look squarely at the facts, particularly at the facts of our weakness—from them we may gain strength.

Never have we, as a people, talked so much about equity and privileges and so little about responsibilities, obligations and duties. In fact, the words "equity" and "privilege" have to many become synonymous. Let us remember that the building up in peacetime of a strong national character is of supreme importance.

This Nation has never accustomed itself to a professional military force. Indeed, we boast of the fact as if it were a cornerstone of democracy.

We still like to think about arousing a military force after the danger is upon us, and, about sending the boys back home even before the danger is over—as we did in World War II.

Our fetish for springing to arms in an emergency has prevented us from clearly thinking out our national defense problem, and, if the springing has each time proved costly, in life and treasure, we have been thus far willing to pay the price. It has seemed preferable to a large standing force.

Now the new weapons of war have eliminated our choice in the matter. We will barely have time to spring to our air raid shelters in this age of atomic destruction.

Whether we like it or not, security under arms is the order of the day, and as our leaders have told us, may continue for decades or even a century.

It is high time we became more mature about the needs and requirements of our Military Establishment. It is also high time that we started to think about our Reserve as a quasi-professional force instead of a quasi-amateur force. A force which must have the full support of business and industry if it is to succeed.

An adequate and flexible Reserve cannot spring up over night. It requires professional attitude, aptitude, organization, equipment, and training—much training. The history of German military success against the French in World War II clearly reveals the overwhelming superiority of the quasi-professional force when arrayed against the quasi-amateur force. Germany did not conquer France with superiority of manpower, in numbers. Germany conquered by virtue of the superior capability of its military force, even when outnumbered.

We Americans take pride in having the best of everything, but we have not demonstrated our pride in achieving, and maintaining the world's best Military Establishment or, the world's best trained Reserve.

The test is not in wartime, when patriotism runs high, when our people actually shake with patriotism. The real test is before us today, when we are called upon to support a large professional military force and, an even larger quasi-professional military reserve, all within our peacetime social structure.

Our support has been shabby, at best; as a nation we have not let our military people feel, Reserve or otherwise, that their efforts are appreciated. We go through the motions, but true respect is lacking. We look down upon the military service as a career, and upon the military reservist as a quasi-professional military man.

We cannot expect men of the necessary caliber to enter the military or its Reserve on a voluntary basis until their neighbors, all of us, look upon the bearing of arms as an honorable occupation, with the prestige which it deserves. We cannot expect to retain men of the required caliber in the military services unless the bearing of arms becomes, in fact, an honorable profession.

We must get away from the trend of thinking that Reserve units are quasi-amateur and insist that they are, and must be quasi-professional units. We must depart from the public conception of weekend warriors, Thursday night soldiers and citizen marines. We must go forward and prove, beyond doubt, that these men are expending their time, energy, and devotion to become quasi-professional men in an honorable and respected profession.

It must be made crystal clear, as it is in fact, that all major wars and struggles are Reserve wars and struggles and that the Reserves have done their part to quell past wars, contained the flame in Korea, and will do so elsewhere. The public must know that they train at home and in the field and are ever ready for immediate employment should the flame of greed or hate touch off a general conflagation.

If this be done, then, the community will see the error of its ways and will be compelled to honor and respect such efforts.

If this be done, then, it is merely basic economics to realize that the best military capability can be procured for the least money by a Reserve military establishment which, at least, has a backbone of professional character. It can be shown that the best way and the cheapest way to defend our country is with a professional force and a quasi-professional military Reserve. This, of course, goes against the present public concept. It runs headlong into the old theory that each must do his bit and, in the end, must do it whether he likes it or not, and, whether or not he can be made into a capable military man. If the Armed Forces Reserve were actually attractive, if there were some competition to get into it, this situation would not prevail.

A respectable military force, be it Regular or Reserve, can be obtained only if it is believed that the military worker is worthy of his hire.

The one way to get men without regard for their market worth is to draft them, and they will leave military employment at the first opportunity. The one way to keep them in military service is to give them a package which adds up to reasonable incentive and reasonable security. The package may not parallel civilian life in monetary gain, but the total should compare with civilian experience. The package may consist of direct pay, fringe benefits, and security for the long pull. It must include the respect, honor and prestige of the civilian community.

As a Nation, we will be in the military business for a long time to come. In the tradition of America, we deserve the best military force in the world, with the complexity of new weapons, we can no longer get the best with a quasi-amateur force, especially short-term enlistees nor with a quasi-amateur Reserve attitude. And in the long run, a highly professional force with a quasi-professional military Reserve is the most economical of all security forces, and an asset to business and industry rather than a deficit. Business and industry must realize that it has a great equity in our Reserve structure. It must also be remembered that the members of our Reserve are of, and from, business and industry and that their very membership is for the purpose of protecting that equity and all that it represents.

Civilian understanding and support of the military man is an essential ingredient of our military posture. Such support is, in the last analysis, our finest military asset—part and parcel of our national security.

Clean Corn Will Pay Dividends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, a booklet entitled "Clean Corn Will Pay Dividends" recently has been published by the Government Printing Office. It is an excellent factual presentation of the benefits which will derive to farmers from keeping stored corn clean, and free from rodents and insects. It was prepared by three governmental agencies working together—the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of the Interior. Also cooperating in preparation of the pamphlet was the Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., a private organization.

Because of the worth of this publication to farmers and to all consumers of corn, I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the booklet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNSEEN CATASTROPHE

A million-dollar fire wipes out a grain elevator in your area and the story is sure to make the headlines.

Almost unnoticed, however, is damage to grain and other farm property which, in outright dollar losses, is hundreds of times greater. This damage—so huge that it is a national catastrophe—is taking place every day, but is usually unseen and gradual. A little here and there, but it adds up to a loss so great that it demands urgent action by all of us.

Pests destroy or spoil hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of stored grain each year.

Increasing in severity

Despite effective work in the past and current efforts to keep pests under control, these losses continue, and may increase, due to the bumper crops of recent years and the need for storing grain over longer periods.

Right now there is more corn in farm storage than ever in history. Much of it is stored in cribs of open-type construction or in temporary structures which increase the chances of damage.

Attacks by insects, rats, mice, and birds may seem to cause insignificant loss on your farm or in your elevator. However, the small individual losses total up to an enormous yearly waste.

A COOPERATIVE PROGRAM

Safeguarding the food supply

Signs of pest damage mean something far more than money loss. They are firsthand evidence of contamination of the grains which are a big part of the Nation's food supply.

The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act requires that foods shipped in interstate commerce be wholesome and clean, and handled at all times under sanitary conditions to prevent contamination.

Due to the law's broad coverage, enforcement is a continuing, evolving process. Enforcement with regard to foods derived from grains began with the inspection of process-

ing plants. As sanitation improved at the manufacturing level, enforcement attention could be given to grain storage conditions, and to the sanitary quality of the grain itself. Inspection of wheat elevators was begun in 1952.

Your help needed

Through cooperation, the wheat phase of the Grain Sanitation Program is proving effective. You can do much, by your efforts and cooperation, to make the corn sanitation program succeed.

Since our pure food law applies to grains and to food products prepared from them, food corn comes within its scope just as wheat does. Each producer and seller of corn destined for food use has a real obligation to consumers to keep corn clean. The same holds true, of course, for those who later handle and process corn.

BENEFITS FROM CORN SANITATION

Worth the effort

Corn stored under sanitary conditions will pay dividends in at least three ways:

(1) Higher returns if you are a farmer, because quality holds up and waste is reduced.

(2) Less trouble, less risk, and less loss to handlers.

(3) Better food for consumers, since clean grain meets high standards required by our pure food laws.

Money in the bank

Experts in pest control contend that rats, mice, birds, and insects destroy nearly 10 percent of the entire crop of grains. Even if your vermin protection is better than average, assume the amount lost to pests on your farm is 3 percent. Say you store 8,000 bushels of corn in structures that do not keep the thieves out. That would mean 240 bushels, or around $260, lost.

You can carry on a year-round poisoning program to control rodents for an average cost of about $10 a year for bait and bait stations. For another $10 you can spray storage areas for insects. The grain itself may have to be sprayed or fumigated when held for long periods.

To pay for your labor, you would be left $240 of the $260 it might have cost you to feed the pests, as good as an extra $240 in the bank.

Rodents cost you money

If you have rats and mice on your farm they are probably costing you much more than you realize; it could very easily amount to several hundred dollars a year. Here's why:

The rat population is estimated to average 25 per farm in Corn Belt States. During 1 year, a single rat eats $2 worth of food, grain or feed—which means $50 out the window in straight destruction from eating. In addition these 25 rats contaminate 10 times as much—$500 worth—as they actually eat. In just 1 year, according to a leading authority, a single rat will shed about a million hairs, void 10,000 droppings, and a gallon of urine, and harbor as much as 10,000 lice.

Never conclude that you have only a few rats just because you seldom see one. According to studies of rat populations and breeding rates, if you see a few rats now and then at night, you may have a hundred or more on your premises. Seeing them every night and a few occasionally by day means you are probably boarding many more.

In addition to their destruction of grain, rats damage buildings by gnawing and undermining. They are blood-lust killers of chicks. They cause fires. So many different kinds of damage can be charged to rats that it is good business sense to stop feeding them.

Protect livestock health

Rodents spread disease. Germs are transmitted by their bites, their excreta, and the bites of the fleas and lice rats and mice carry. When disease breaks out among cattle, hogs, or poultry, rodents almost invariably are found in the corn and their filth in the feed.

Contagious abortion, distemper, mastitis, paratyphoid, swine erysipelas, atrophic rhinitis, and trchinosis are among diseases that have been traced to rats. Leptospirosis, which affects the kidneys of hogs and is often fatal to young pigs, may be transmitted through feeding corn contaminated by rat urine.

The menact of animal disease is another strong reason why it pays to keep corn clean.

Corn as a food source

A substantial amount of corn which is marketed is processed into human food. The average farmer or elevator operator cannot be certain where or how his corn will eventually be used. There is always the possibility that some part of the corn you sell or handle will be processed for food—perhaps as a form of food for your own table.

As an important part of the effort to protect the cleanliness of foods that people eat, you are urged to keep your corn clean and take what steps you can to market clean corn. An increasing number of grain farmers are finding that it pays to establish a reputation for delivering clean grain.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

On the farm

Rodentproof corn-storage buildings. A modest investment in hardware cloth, metal stripping, and metal door flashing will soon pay for itself in money saved.

Don't give food and shelter to rodents and birds. Clean up junk, trash, rags, and all else that affords hiding and nesting places.

Kill rats and mice systematically by poisoning, trapping, or gassing. The use of permanent, enclosed bait stations—well supplied with suitable poison baits—is one of the best ways to get rid of rodents. Be careful to protect stored grains from contamination with rodent poisons.

If you store shelled corn, examine the surface of the grain frequently for signs of rodent or bird droppings. When contamination is found, carefully shovel off the top twelve inches and more if necessary, before marketing it. Surface contamination should likewise be removed before turning the grain or adding grain to the corn already in the bin.

Also inspect your grain regularly for insect infestation, and fumigate or apply a protective treatment where necessary.

Consult your county agents, State extension services, local ASC officers, or area officials of the Branch of Predator and Rodent Control, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, for detailed information on rodent control. Write for printed matter—see list at end of this bulletin.

Use care in marketing corn. Where rats and mice have had free range over the ears in a crib, that corn is not satisfactory as a potential source of human food.

At the elevator

Keep your elevator free from rodents, birds, and insects, and clean out refuse and hiding places where these pests may live and multiply.

Inspect grain regularly for insect infestation. Fumigate whenever necessary.

Make one man responsible for sanitation. Authorize him to do a thorough job, including a continuous poison-bait program inside and outdoors.

Don't take chances on contamination spreading from infested grain to your bins of quality grain.

Where possible, it is desirable for the elevator operator to segregate the worst grain he receives, keeping it in a separate bin until he has a carload and then directing such a car into feed channels rather than shipping it indiscriminately into commerce.

An elevator operator who enjoys a reputation for clean grain on the market will think twice before putting contaminated grain of any kind through his facilities, even as stock feed.

CURB INSECT PESTS

Insects cost you money

Sanitary storing of shelled corn, in farm granaries and county elevators, requires as persistent a war against insects as you wage on rodents. Insect pests reduce the weight of grain. Their activity causes heating and excess moisture, resulting in caking and spoilage. Insect excreta and body remains contaminate grain.

If unchecked the numbers and destructiveness of insects increase during the journey of grain from farms to terminal elevators and processors. Insects breed and multiply in stored grain.

How to control insects

Follow good agricultural practices.

Provide storage that will permit protecting corn from insects.

Clean up and destroy waste grains, trash, and other insect harbors, to prevent migration to other grains.

Spray the cleaned bin thoroughly with a residual spray to prevent carryover of insect infestation.

Use protective treatments on grain when recommended.

Examine grain regularly for live insects, or other forms of insect attack. Weevils or moths are sure signs of trouble. They lay their eggs in and on the kernels and the larvae of some kinds bore in and live inside the kernels.

Fumigate if you find weevils or moths, or their exit holes in the kernels.

Use insecticides according to directions on the labels, and protect grains from residues of nonpermitted chemicals.

IN SUMMARY

Clean corn—corn protected from pest contamination, stored safely, and handled under sanitary conditions—means:

(1) Cleaner food for consumers;

(2) Less risk of loss to handlers;

(3) Less waste, hence more profit, to the farmer.

The law can and will be brought into use, as necessary, to safeguard the high standards of cleanliness for human food. However, voluntary compliance with the law is in the best tradition of our system of government.

Keep informed on the clean corn program. See your county extension agent, county ASC officer, or official of the Branch of Predator and Rodent Control, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, in your area. These officials will supply the latest information on the control of rodents and insect pests.

The best and most economical answer to corn contamination is to prevent contamination at the source.

Act now. Corn is food. Do what you can to keep corn clean.

Hungary, Tibet, and the Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a number of addresses to the House on the current crisis in the Caribbean, I have em-

phasized the security of that strategic area as an imperative necessity for the peace and safety of the Western Hemisphere and urged the recognition of the Monroe Doctrine as covering the infiltration and subversion of American governments.

The importance of the Caribbean regions to the United States and free nations of the Western World is analagous to that of Hungary and Tibet to the Communist empire, and should be so recognized.

This comparison is ably summarized in an article in the July 18, 1959, issue of National Review by Mr. James Burnham, one of the editors of that well-known journal of fact and opinion.

In order that this informative article may be permanently recorded in the annals of the Congress, I include it as part of these remarks:

HUNGARY, TIBET, AND THE CARIBBEAN

(By James Burnham)

In our policy toward the Communist enterprises there is a basic unbalance that must in the long run, if it is not corrected, prove fatal. It may be illustrated, once more, by contrasting the Communist relation to current events in the Caribbean with our relation to the late crises in Tibet and Hungary.

The Caribbean lies inside the boundaries of "our world"—the free world, as we usually call it. For the United States, main base of the free world, the Caribbean is a region of prime import—our "strategic threshhold." Any sort of trouble in the Caribbean is bad trouble for us.

Hungary and Tibet lie inside "their world"—within the Communist empire, or "camp of peace and socialism," as they usually call it. For Russia, main base of the Communist world, Hungary is a region of prime import. It guards a major pass between east and west, and is a fulcrum point on the north-south axis. Any trouble in Hungary is bad trouble for Moscow. For Communist China, Tibet is not quite so immediately crucial; but Tibet is a strategic key to the uneasy southwestern and western Chinese provinces, and the advance base for expansion in the Pakistan-India-Burma directions.

COMMUNIST INTERVENTION

Now it would not be accurate to say that the Communists caused the current troubles in the Caribbean. The trouble potential was there, with or without the presence of Communists. But what the Soviet agents and local Communists have done and are doing is to maximize that trouble potential, to exacerbate conflicts beyond solution, to guide the turmoil into those channels that do greatest injury to U.S. strategic and economic interests; and meanwhile to enlarge their own forces while planting them in positions of decisive social power.

Moscow long ago made its preparations for these Caribbean days. The first agents founded the Latin American parties in the 1920's. At the end of the Spanish civil war, thousands of militants trained and hardened under MVD control in Spain were dispatched to South and Central America, to become the core of the activist cadres in all Latin America.

Though Fidel Castro is probably not a Communist, Communists trained his guerrillas, taught him Mao Tsetung's tactical doctrine, formulated his slogans and his socio-economic program. While he was in the Sierra Maestre, a large portion of his arms and money came, by one or another staging, from Czech and Soviet sources, and much of the remainder from Communists or those duped by Communists in the United States. Communist pressure has determined the anti-Yankee, anticapitalist, self-destroying course of the Castro revolution.

With the Cuban lid blown off, the Communist cadres provoke and stiffen the bands of exiles, adventurers, idealists and bandits that harass Panama, Nicaragua, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Haiti and the land, sea and air of the entire basin.

The Communists process the political energy of the Caribbean events to their ends. In Africa, Asia, and Europe as well as the Americas, the Castro revolution is turned into a magic political bludgeon with which to batter the economic, political, and moral foundations of the West.

WESTERN NONINTERVENTION

The contrast between these operations and the Western behavior toward the Hungarian and Tibetan revolts is too complete and too obvious to need detailed statement. We did just next to nothing. We had made no preparations, and had no share in the preliminaries. We did not intervene, directly or indirectly, in midcrisis. For Hungary the Western leaders made a few platonic speeches; for Tibet, not even that.

How are we to explain this total contrast?

We do nothing because we are afraid to risk nuclear war. But that cuts both ways. They do not hesitate to take the risk—if it really is a risk—and they get away with it. Why should we suppose that the result would be any different if we were intervening in their sphere?

It is impossible to operate inside a totalitarian boundary? That excuse is shamefaced nonsense. There would have been no insuperable difficulties in getting arms, medicines, radios, money to the Hungarian and Tibetan freedom fighters. Air drops and smuggling are arts highly developed in our day. We could have offered asylum to defecting Soviet soldiers. And much that we could do to exploit their troubles does not require direct physical intervention. We too could use the U.N. as forum. We too could make diplomacy and trade into effective political and economic weapons. We could make our voice heard by all of the enemy's subjects. Instead we bow to the enemy's hands off. We grant him his privileged sanctuary.

In their excellent recent book, "Protracted Conflict," the associates of the Foreign Policy Research Institute summarize the peculiar rules of this strange game and the inevitable result if they are not changed:

"We are not 'containing' the Communists: they are containing us—behind a constantly shrinking perimeter of free world defenses. Behind the Iron Curtain, the Communist 'peace zone' is closed to our 'interference'; the free world is the 'war zone' in which the Communists can, with impunity, bring all of their implements of conflict to bear.

"In this 'war zone' we hold, if we are lucky, the ground which the Communists have not yet captured—or we give way. * * * The Communists, even were they much less adroit than they have proved to be, cannot help but win."

In relation to the present Caribbean crisis, we seem to be carrying the hands-off rule a half-world further. We forbear even that use of our power that is required to sweep the drunks—and the rats—off our own doorstep.

Why Hospitals Exploit Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Nation:

WHY HOSPITALS EXPLOIT LABOR

(By George Kirstein)

On the surface, the issues in New York's 46-day hospital strike which ended last week were simple. The predominantly Puerto Rican and Negro nonprofessional workers were doing battle in the only way they could to improve their admittedly miserable standards of pay. Opposing them, in the public's mind, were the wealthy and socially prominent trustees who guided the policies of the embattled institutions. The strike was a skirmish in class warfare, the very poor arrayed against the very rich. Citizens chose sides in accordance with their own socio-economic orientation; there was a convenient hero and a clear villain, and which was which depended upon one's point of view. No one, of course, dreamed of suggesting that the real villains were the helpless patients, bedridden inside the hospitals. Yet in sober fact it is the patient who has been exploiting—albeit unwittingly and by force of circumstance—the hospital workers and the hospital treasuries alike.

For the truth is that the hospitals are not receiving sufficient fees for the services they are giving. As a result, they are operating at staggering deficits; and the one controllable item of cost that can be kept at minimal levels is wages. It was not the trustees who profited from the sweatshop conditions under which the exploited workers toiled; it was the patients—and the taxpayers. Nearly every patient—semiprivate or ward—lying uncomfortably on his sickbed was being subsidized by the underpaid workers, as well as by the philanthropies (including the trustees') which maintained the hospital.

And the most curious paradox of this whole paradoxical situation was that the semiprivate patients who were insured by Blue Cross against hospital costs were virtuously convinced that they were no burden to anyone; indeed, many felt that if anybody had the right to complain, it was they themselves—about the high cost of Blue Cross.

To see how this anomalous situation arose, we must look back in time. Originally, the voluntary hospitals were built for the poor by men of great wealth. The rich were taken care of at home; they had their babies, and recovered or died from their illnesses, in their own darkened bedrooms. But the poor, almost as a punishment, went to hospitals where, because of inadequate care, the fatality rates were shocking. No one who could afford to pay for doctors and nurses would allow himself to be incarcerated in the pest houses that were the 19th century hospital. Most of the nonprofessional work in those early institutions was done by volunteers—Lady Bountifuls who devoted themselves to easing the suffering of the poor. As medical science advanced, the hospitals became more efficient centers where therapeutic equipment was centralized and recovery rates improved. The volunteer workers gave way, in

part, to the paid employee; and the municipality established the practice of augmenting private charity by compensating hospitals for indigent ward patients.

Today this compensation is not nearly enough. New York City pays $20 per day for each ward patient; the cost of ward care in one typical hospital is pennies under $30 per day. (In the city's own hospitals, such as Bellevue, the per diem upkeep of a patient is $28.) And these voluntary-hospital costs, it should be emphasized, are based on wage rates to nonprofessional help which everyone admits are inadequate.

Moreover, doctors who supervise ward cases receive no compensation; as members of the visiting staff, they contribute their valuable time. And the interns and residents who carry out the doctors' orders in the wards as part of their educational program are paid so little that their paychecks amount to little more than a recurrent monthly insult. In the average New York hospital, interns receive a stipend of around $50 per month in addition to room and board, and residents receive twice that amount. These men already have their M.D. degrees and the great majority are married and have children. Is it any wonder that, upon hanging out their shingles after their formal training is over, they feel that society owes them a great debt which they are tempted to recover by demanding high fees?

Turning now from the indigent patients whose care must be subsidized by the municipality or charity, let us consider the patients who can afford to pay for their own care. Historically, as hospitals improved to the point where they had become centers for treating the sick rather than merely pest houses, people who could afford to pay requested accommodations. They were given curtained-off sections of the wards, which were termed "semipublic" accommodations. These, of course, were the forerunners of the semiprivate rooms with which we are familiar today, and to which all who are insured under a Blue Cross plan are entitled.

Blue Cross was instituted in 1935 as a nonprofit plan under which people could arrange for an insurance company to pay their hospital bills. It has always been Blue Cross' objective to compensate the hospitals in full, and for the first 10 years, the objective was fulfilled. But in recent years, costs in some instances have advanced faster than Blue Cross payments. Thus, in some New York hospitals, even Blue Cross patients have caused deficits which philanthropy has had to meet. And it must not be forgotten that Blue Cross payments to hospitals, based as they are on actual costs, are predicated on substandard wages which are standard for unskilled help in most voluntary hospitals. If all labor exploitation were to cease, Blue Cross would have to pay at least double its current rates to hospitals, which means premium payments would also be doubled.

What factors have forced hospital expenses to such staggering levels as compared to a decade or two ago, when the Blue Cross system worked fairly well? Obviously, there is the purely hotel cost of running a hospital: bed, board and recreational facilities. Even New York's Waldorf-Astoria charges only about $14 a day for a bed, and perhaps another $10 would cover food. Why must the payment for a ward patient, who isn't exactly occupying a Waldorf room or eating Waldorf food, be nearly $30 a day? The problem here is that modern science has outpaced our socio-economic thinking. Only a few years ago, a patient with a certain heart ailment might be admitted to a hospital (if the disease were discovered in time) and there, within a few days, he would die. Not much could be done for him except, perhaps to ease his pain—a relatively inexpensive procedure. Today the same patient, after an 8-hour operation involving the use of an operating room, a recovery room, X-ray and other diagnostic devices, as well as a team of doctors and nurses, will spend a month or two in a hospital. He will not only live; he will recover completely. Similarly, a baby may have a tumor removed from the brain which would have been fatal a few years ago; he may be months in the hospital, with around-the-clock nursing, special foods and all kinds of expensive care.

True, other types of cases require briefer hospitalization periods than formerly, but even here the savings are less than one would imagine. The rule of thumb on hospital expenses is that one-third goes for nurses' salaries, one-third for other labor, and one-third for supplies (including food). Nurses' salaries have risen sharply in the last few years as a nursing shortage developed (their pay is still too low, in my opinion, to attract a sufficient number of recruits to this indispensable profession). But the costs that have really skyrocketed are supply costs. Science discovers a new drug—penicillin, for example. When first introduced, it is extremely expensive for many reasons; mass production has not yet been established, for one. Yet, if a doctor believes the drug will cure a patient, he rightly orders its use without regard to expense. And new and effective drugs come into use with unprecedented rapidity.

Another financial drain on a hospital is the outpatient department. In the cancer, heart, and other clinics which these hospitals offer to ambulatory cases, thousands of medical services are performed annually. Patients who can afford to pay do so, of course. But the patients are treated regardless of whether they can pay or not, and neither Blue Cross nor the city compensates the hospitals for these vital services.

The table gives at a glance the financial picture of one of New York's great voluntary hospitals. Not all hospitals have such a pressing problem; some, however, are in an even more desperate plight.

Let us turn now to the organizational structure of the voluntary hospital which bears the responsibility of coping with the institution's almost insoluble financial problems.

Historically, the committee of rich men who financed the individual hospital deficits became the institution's governing body, or board of trustees. But as deficits mounted to their present level of approximately $2,000 per bed per year, the burden became too great for any small body of men. Community fund-raising along sectarian lines replaced or augmented the trustees' donations.

Although funds for the voluntary hospitals are now raised in this manner, the archaic trustee structure persists. True, hospital trustees seek no material gain for themselves; indeed, they contribute generoulsy of their own time and money. But generally speaking they bring a point of view to bear on the economic problems of health administration which is limited in scope and preconditioned by upper-class orientation. Moreover, they are self-selecting, self-perpetuating bodies which represent no numerically significant section of the community they are serving. Trustees represent wealth and power, not people. No labor leaders, no representatives of the municipality or other segment of the community sit among them. Hospital boards are undemocratic in principle, unrepresentative in practice, and are apt to be unimaginative and retrogressive in the results they achieve. Dramatic confirmation of this can be found in the antedeluvian position the trustees took vis-a-vis the hospital workers' demands for union recognition during the recent 46-day New York strike.

The foregoing analysis of the economic problems which create the dilemma of the voluntary hospitals suggests at least some solutions.

1. The costs of patient care in hospitals should be met by public moneys—Federal, State, and municipal. To those who object to Government expenditures in this field, it should be pointed out that the Federal Government already contributes heavily to hospital costs through income tax deductions for charitable donations. The present-day philanthropist deducts his hospital donations from income, and it is a rare donor who gives more than the 30 percent of income permitted as a tax deduction. State tax laws, too, encourage donations; and as for municipalities, they have been in the hospital business for years.

As has already been demonstrated, hospital care should cost even more than it does today. In order to give each patient the utmost benefits of modern science, while at the same time terminating the current exploitation of many segments of the hospital staff, more money is needed. A society that is unprepared to spend money for the improvement of its own health deserves the fate indolence brings. I believe that our society would enthusiastically support a solution to its health problem—a far worthier objective than the armament race, upon which we are spending more and more billions each year.

2. Philanthropy, which is rewarding both to the donor and to the beneficiary, need not and should not be eliminated, although its purpose and direction should be newly defined. Philanthropic moneys should no longer be spent to offset ever-mounting deficits; rather, they should be devoted to the exploration of new methods of hospital administration, to research in the endless struggle against disease, and to other activities which go beyond the day-to-day administration of the hospital. The philanthropist would still receive his reward in the knowledge that he is helping to improve the whole health complex of society. Indeed, he would be much better off; no longer would he have to give more and more—not to see his hospital grow, but merely to save it from collapse. The endless race to stay in the same place would end, and the philanthropist could resume his classic role of financing the push on to new frontiers.

3. The governing bodies of the voluntary hospitals should be reconstituted along broader lines in order to cope with modern problems. The new boards might well include some of the present personnel who, by virtue of community leadership, or of special qualifications in the area of medical economics, still have a great contribution to make. But the boards should also include chosen representatives of organized labor as well as trained sociologists, economists, and scholars in other disciplines bearing on public-health administration. The possession of wealth should cease being the criterion for membership. Representatives of the Federal, State, and municipal governments should also sit, but should not constitute a majority. With such a governing body to formulate policy, professional administrators would no longer need to devote their efforts to shoring up an obsolete economic structure, but could concentrate on creating a new structure better suited to society's needs.

4. Finally, by intelligent replanning of hospital facilities, more efficiency could easily be introduced. Hospitals which cost over $30,000 per bed to construct and $30 per bed daily to operate should not be occupied by patients well on their way to recovery, or by aged people who are victims of chronic diseases. Each voluntary hospital should have attached to it a modern nursing home for convalescents, for which the medical supervision would be furnished by the hospital staff. In addition, each major hospital should have a special unit for the care of the aging sick and chronically ill, whose needs—in terms of hospital facilities—are

much less than those of an acutely ill patient being prepared for, or just recovering from, a major operation. Here again the hospital would furnish the necessary medical supervision.

As part of the care for the aged, there should be a home-care program for bedridden patients who have no immediate need for expensive hospital equipment. A visiting team of doctor, nurse, and social worker could supervise the medical care of these patients while their own relatives furnish the love and affection which means so much as life nears its end.

If hospitals were underwriten by tax funds, there would be no further need for the distinction between public (municipally operated) hospitals for indigents and voluntary hospitals serving the same kind of patient. All cases could be taken care of in the modern hospital complex I have described. In such a medical center, teaching and research would blossom, and doctors would be able to teach their students every aspect of medical science in one location. Indeed, eventually the logical place for medical schools would be approximate to these great medical centers.

That any such development will not happen immediately is obvious. But this is the direction in which we must go if we are to solve the complex problems of patient care in the fast-changing world of ever-expanding scientific knowledge.

Income and expenses; 650-bed voluntary hospital

Type of bed	Income (daily)	Costs (daily)	Profit or loss per patient (daily)	Number of beds (average)	Annual profit or loss
Private	Patient pays $40	$32	$8	20	$58,400
Semiprivate	Blue Cross pays $30	32	−2	330	−240,900
Ward	City pays $20	30	−10	300	−1,095,000
Outpatient department					[1] −280,000
Total annual deficit					1,557,500

[1] This hospital treats an average of 40,000 outpatients annually at a cost of $9 per visit. Average payment by the outpatient is $2 per visit, netting a $7 loss to the hospital.

Woman To Behold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following feature story from the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of July 12, 1959, written by the Society Editor, Libby Brennan, in which she interestingly sets forth some of the highlights in the fine career of Miss Esther Tinsley, Administrator of the Pittston (Pa.) hospital.

[From the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent, July 12, 1959]

ESTHER TINSLEY, R.N., IS A WOMAN TO BEHOLD—FINE CAREER IS UNEQUALED IN PROFESSION

(By Libby Brennan)

On a crisp clear October day in 1913, a young nurse recently graduated from the University of Pennsylvania School of Nursing walked into a small wooden frame building known as the Pittston Hospital.

It was really her first job and she had been selected to head the hospital as administrator, a position which Miss Esther Josephine Tinsley, daughter of the late Albert and Rosina Tinsley, of Wilkes-Barre, has held for 46 years.

From the very first moment that Miss Tinsley entered the hospital she gave her heart, mind, and body to it. It is a rare instance in the Book of Life that one person can actually see what her life's work has meant to a community. For Esther Tinsley, the wonderful privilege surrounds her every moment.

Her decision to go to the small hospital with its limited resources came after she decided against heading the Nesbitt School of Nursing, a position which she had held for a few weeks.

In the small wooden structure located on a knoll with its panoramic view of the Susquehanna Valley, she had found her challenge—a challenge that she has met with dignity and grace.

MANY THINGS TO DO

When she first started, there were many things to be done. First, she dreamed of having a modern brick structure, sparkling clean, modern as possible—a place where the ill could find relief.

"I never dared permit myself to think of a nursing school with all the equipment necessary to train young women; that would be asking too much from the fates," she said.

But strangely enough this amazing woman with her tremendous willpower and brilliant mind lived to see all her dreams come true.

It was a miracle, but a miracle that was realized through endless hours of unselfish sacrifice.

Excitement has peppered Esther Tinsley's life from the beginning. She became a heroine in the Laurel Line wreck which took place 30 years ago.

WAS IN TRAIN WRECK

"I was on the train that became sandwiched in between two others; I was on my way to a picnic," the grey-haired stately woman recalled.

"I remember the terrific crash and I know I was stunned and the man next to me was dead.

"Somehow, I escaped the wreckage and in my capacity as a nurse I helped out as best I could.

"One thing I do remember was having everyone I met give me spirits of ammonia—it is funny I didn't succumb from too much of that," she laughed.

It was not so simple as she described it. Records proved that she labored tirelessly with the injured.

Another instance that Miss Tinsley remembers well is the disastrous 1918 flu epidemic. "We went out in horse-drawn buggies to minister to the sick. Many families were wiped out and those who were able to be moved were sent to the hospital.

FOUND TWO DEAD

"I remember one instance when we found a family with the two older members dead. We not only had to remove the other members to the hospital, but we had to go out and find people to milk the cows, gather the crops and care for the farm," she recalled.

The flu finally reached the nurse who worked hour after hour ministering to others. "How I survived I will never know, but I did," she said.

Last year saw Esther Tinsley manning her staff to care for the men involved in the Knox Mine disaster. The teamwork under her charge was something to behold.

"I just did my job; a job that I am paid to do," she quietly explained.

If one asked the men involved, their answers would be that Miss Tinsley "did everything possible above and beyond the call of duty."

WORKS ALL HOLIDAYS

In the almost half-century that she has been associated with the Pittston Hospital, this wonderful woman has never been out of the hospital on one holiday, Christmas included.

"That is the time that patients need more cheering up than ever," she explained.

Once a year, Esther Tinsley takes a vacation from the hospital where she works and lives. She has covered all of the United States with the exception of Texas and Louisiana and has even been to Alaska.

Under Miss Tinsley's charge, Pittston Hospital is the only one in the area that is in the black. She make use of every item; she knows intimately every member of the staff and every student nurse.

Her day begins about 6:15 a.m. when the reports are brought to her. She knows the condition of every patient and even though she is an administrator, she still holds on to her teaching habits.

She works 7 days a week, an untold number of hours each day.

HELPS OTHER CAUSES

Besides her hospital work, she is a board member of the Visiting Nurses Association, the Pittston Family Welfare Agency, the Red Cross and the Business and Professional Women's Club.

She attends conferences that she feels will help her with her work.

With it all, she has a wonderful sense of humor and has commanded the greatest respect not only of those in her immediate circle but from all over Pennsylvania.

"When I look out of my window and see the hospital as it stands today, it is the most wonderful experience one could know," she said quietly.

Little does she realize that the Pittston Hospital is what it is because of a certain lovely, wonderful person—Miss Esther Tinsley.

Section 315 of the Communications Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a North Dakota television broadcaster requesting the outright repeal of section 315 of the Communications Act. The abuses which have been piling up under section 315 demand the immediate attention of this Congress:

The Honorable QUENTIN BURDICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR QUENTIN: I will surely appreciate it if you will give favorable consideration to the necessary legislation that is required to repeal section 315 of the Communications Act. This will result in giving radio and television stations a greater liberty in scheduling special broadcasts of our Senators and Congressmen, whether it be during a campaign or any other time or occasion that presents itself.

The Supreme Court decision is not the solution to the broadcasters' problem. Only the repeal of section 315 of the communications law is the solution.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. BOLER,
President,
North Dakota Broadcasting Co., Inc.

The Highway Fund Ultimatum—Gasoline Tax Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 22, 1959, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives will commence public hearings on the subject of the highway trust fund and the problems incident to the financing of the Federal highway program. Efforts to solve the highway financing problem through an increase of 1½ cents in the Federal gasoline tax, as recommended by the President earlier this year, have attracted the concern of many people on both sides of this issue. In recent days, editorials have appeared in the newspapers of Alabama in opposition to any Federal gasoline tax increase at this time.

Under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Tuscaloosa (Ala.) News on June 26, 1959. This editorial is earnestly commended to the Members of the House of Representatives for their careful study.

The editorial follows:

THE HIGHWAY FUND ULTIMATUM

Congress, which has not gone along with President Eisenhower's proposals too readily this session, is not likely to look with favor on the ultimatum that has been handed down from the White House on financing the interstate highway program.

President Eisenhower has again asked Congress to raise the Federal gasoline tax by 1½ cents per gallon to produce sufficient revenue to keep the road program on a pay-as-you-go basis. The President said if the additional revenue is not forthcoming, and quickly, it will be necessary to cut off Federal allocations for the road program in 36 States within a year.

In 10 States the Federal funds would run out within 3 months.

"We are on the verge of a stalemate in the orderly development of our vital interstate road network. This is a critical situation * * * and one which should give great concern to every motorist," the President told Congress.

We agree. Every motorist should be vitally concerned about the progress of construction and the financing of the Interstate Highway System. Each motorist is contributing regularly to this program through the special taxes that were levied to finance it.

But we are not convinced—and Congress seems to be of the same opinion—that an increase in the Federal gas tax is absolutely necessary at this time to keep the program moving ahead. It is agreed generally that the pay-as-you-go system is to be preferred for this huge construction effort. But there is no agreement that all funds which should be going to the highway trust fund now are being received or that the General Treasury should not reimburse the fund for some of the work that was done before the special taxes began coming in. The highway fund inherited a $1.9 billion carryover at the outset which previously had been placed in road funds from the General Treasury. Reimbursement of that amount would go a long way toward solving the present financial pinch.

A short-range solution to the current problem should be found. Why short range? Because in 1961 Congress will receive two reports on the interstate program. One will be a new estimate of the cost and the other will be a cost allocation study which is intended to cover the equitable distribution of taxes among highway users and the benefits which accrue to other beneficiaries.

Action on increasing taxes at this time can, at best, be only a stopgap measure until the 1961 reports are made. Efforts to plug any leaks in the present highway user tax allocations and for reimbursement of the $1.9 billion the trust fund inherited when the Government quit making annual payments from the Treasury for road projects now seem the more logical, and palatable to the public, course.

Loans, Not Gifts: A Logical Foreign Policy Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that the mutual security bill, which passed the House, placed more emphasis on loans than had prior measures, it is my firm conviction that if our prestige abroad is to be maintained and the honor of foreign countries is to be preserved, more of our foreign aid should be advanced through the loan program.

We are told that in areas where America has given substantial aid, little additional is received from the Communists and the latter get the credit. For example: A hospital could be erected and equipped with American dollars, then the Communists provide the window shades and the entire project becomes one supplied by the enemy of our philosophy of government.

Often I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if it would not be wise for America to withdraw completely from the foreign-aid picture as it now exists, thereby leaving the field to Communist Russia. If this were done, Russia would have to spread her resources so thin that she could accomplish little in any one country. Our aid could then be given upon application by the various countries, and they would most certainly be cognizant of the source of that assistance. Our personnel abroad could be considerably reduced by all forms of foreign aid being given through one division of the State Department, most of which should be on a long-term loan basis. No military aid should be granted unless approved by both the Department of Defense and the State Department.

In the Kansas City Star of Tuesday, June 16, Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared which I am convinced expresses the viewpoint of the great majority of Americans, and in order that each Member may have an opportunity to read it, I include it in my remarks:

LOANS, NOT GIFTS: A LOGICAL FOREIGN POLICY STEP

To suggest that the United States should eventually halt all outright foreign aid gifts does not imply that this country intends to duck its future international responsibilities. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee had good reason for asking the President to provide a cutoff date for grants. The committee simply seeks a reasonable transition from gifts to repayable loans that would be more effective.

Indeed, as C. Douglas Dillon pointed out last week, aid to the underdeveloped countries will have to continue for many years to come. The Communist economic challenge is by no means a mere overnight matter. India, for example, will be a cold war battleground for decades. To vacate the field would in a sense be surrender to the Reds.

But it is not contrary to the principles which have motivated mutual security to expect the underdeveloped nations, in time, to get their economic houses in order. In their initial years many of them obviously have been unable to provide a sound credit basis.

In addition, it seems very likely that many of the American dollars have been wasted by the receiving governments. A continuation of the giveaway system is not likely to provide the incentive for the development of both national self-respect and national efficiency. Loans, with a definite payoff date and a reasonable rate of interest, would supply the incentive. A man who leaves the dole for a paying job becomes a better citizen. The same, we believe, applies to the nations who abandon their dependence on charity for sound credit assistance.

It is quite obvious that the giveaway program has become increasingly unpalatable to American taxpayers. In its early years a full-scale lending program would still be a drain on the Treasury. But as repayments were made, the burden would gradually be eased. The public resentment stirred by the tax load of mutual security could be expected to diminish.

Gasoline Tax—Public Not Receptive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 22, 1959, the Ways and

Means Committee of the House of Representatives will commence public hearings on the subject of the highway trust fund and the problems incident to the financing of the Federal highway program. Efforts to solve the highway financing problem through an increase of 1½ cents in the Federal gasoline tax, as recommended by the President earlier this year, have attracted the concern of many people on both sides of this issue. In recent days, editorials have appeared in the newspapers of Alabama in opposition to any Federal gasoline tax increase at this time.

Under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Mobile (Ala.) Press on June 27, 1959. This editorial is earnestly commended to the Members of the House of Representatives for their careful study.

The editorial follows:

GASOLINE TAX

A warning from President Eisenhower that the national roadbuilding program is in a critical, $4 billion jam, apparently had little effect on the U.S. Senate.

The Senate not only rejected the President's proposed 1½ cents per gallon Federal tax hike for gasoline, but also passed the $3 billion corporation and excise tax extension bill after refusing to use it as the vehicle to solve the highway program crisis.

A majority of the Senators apparently have been listening to some of the people back home.

The proposed 1½ cents a gallon increase in gasoline tax was anything but popular with the motorist despite the promise of a superhighway system.

Many citizens of the United States are still not convinced that the roadbuilding program on the scale projected by Mr. Eisenhower's administration is wise.

And when it came to putting another 1½-cents Federal tax on a commodity that already bore a 3-cent Federal tax in addition to State and local taxes, there were concerted mutterings back home which apparently reached the senatorial level.

When the administration takes some concrete steps to curb inflation and curtail Federal waste, then the public will be in a more receptive mood toward projects such as the Federal highway program.

Welcome by Brig. Gen. A. C. Welling, Engineer Commissioner, District of Columbia, to National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the growing importance of the Potomac River to the expanding Metropolitan Washington area is more and more becoming generally recognized. Recently, Brig. Gen. A. C. Welling, Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, addressed the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington. Because General Welling's remarks underscore the importance of the Potomac River, now and in the future, I am privileged to insert them in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WELCOME BY BRIG. GEN. A. C. WELLING, ENGINEER COMMISSIONER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 14, 1959

On behalf of the Board of Commissioners, I am delighted to welcome to the District of Columbia you members of this all important congress.

This is your National Capital and we hope you enjoy it to the full extent of its beauty and historic charm.

In mentioning the city's beauty and charm, we should think of the No. 1 physical asset of this entire metropolitan region, the Potomac River.

The Potomac is also an old love of mine. I was interested and involved in it for years before I became Engineer Commissioner. I shall remain interested and involved in the Potomac even after the completion of my tour in the District government.

Historically the Potomac, in the Capital region, has been a boundary between Maryland and Virginia and between Virginia and the District of Columbia. It was our great divide, a chasm that alienated, isolated, and separated us.

But those days are gone.

Today the Potomac is playing a new role in the affairs of the National Capital region. For my colleagues in Maryland, in Virginia, and in the District of Columbia, the Washington metropolitan reach of the Potomac River is no longer the great divide. On the contrary, it has become the most powerful unifying force in the area. Its waters and our determination to improve their quality and our determination to sustain their quantity have taken on the aspects of a cementing substance binding us, one to another.

We local officials, working with the Corps of Engineers, have arrived at a harmonious determination to get on with the job of protecting and improving the flow of Potomac River waters—a harmonious determination to get on with the job.

We have learned that basically the Potomac is not a boundary and not a divide. Rather, it is a source of water, a thing of beauty and a heaven provided playing field.

More than that, we realize that the indispensable purpose of the Potomac has to do with the consumptive uses of water.

We realize that the quantity of water is sufficient to meet all our needs if the supply is adequately handled and properly cared for.

The active group of local officials having to do with the Washington metropolitan reach of the river is a Committee on Water Supply and Pollution Abatement. It consists of official representatives from those cities and counties bordering on the Potomac—that is, from Alexandria, from the District, and from Montgomery, Prince Georges, Fairfax, and Arlington Counties. It includes representatives from the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and the Washington aqueduct.

In essence, for our region, the committee serves as a sort of watchdog on the Potomac.

What have we been able to accomplish during the past year?

We have had adopted as an item of regional policy the prohibition against discharging effluent from sewage treatment plants into that part of the Potomac River between our water supply intake at Little Falls and the mouth of the Monocacy River, some 25 miles upstream.

Congress at our request has passed legislation permitting the District to arrange for the transfer of Virginia sewage across the Potomac and downstream to the District's sewage disposal plant for treatment. For years we have had such an arrangement with the adjoining Maryland jurisdiction. By way of implementing the congressional authorization in regard to Virginia, the District, and Fairfax County have executed a financial agreement for the immediate handling of certain sewage from that county through the District treatment facilities.

Working closely with the joint congressional committee studying Washington metropolitan problems, we have arranged for the establishment of a regional sanitary board which would coordinate the planning, construction and operation of regional sanitary engineer works. The board is being established and staff work has already started on the first planning item, the development of a regional sewer plan, mainly involving the construction of interceptors along both banks of the Potomac River above the city.

We have energetically and constantly—and I hope successfully—sought funds from the Congress so that the Corps of Engineers can complete its currently assigned comprehensive study of the Potomac River basin. Our main interest was that the corps should develop a water supply plan. Unless such a plan be developed and brought into being during the next 15 years, the region is going to be without adequate water supply during period of low river flow.

We are in the business of putting finishing touches on water quality objectives for the metropolitan reach of the Potomac. Our committee will take its final action at its June meeting and thereafter looks forward to acceptance of its proposals by the entire region.

We are seeing this very month the operation of new secondary sewage treatment facilities within the District of Columbia. The new plant will reduce by 80 percent the amount of pollution load being contributed by the District of Columbia and the adjacent portions of Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland. The total metropolitan loading on the Potomac will then be comfortably within the river's capacity for assimilation. The resulting organic demand of metropolitan wastes then exerted on the river will be less than those experienced in 1920, and 1920 was almost 40 years ago.

We Potomac River people of this region believe that we are making real strides in the development of the basin and we wanted you, our guests, to know about it.

We hope that we have more progress to report when you return here next year.

Elimination of Charge to Civil Service Retirement Fund of Salary Costs for Certain Reemployed Annuitants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to improve the situation with respect to the effect of the civil service retirement fund in certain cases where civil service retirement annuitants are reemployed in the executive branch. My bill also makes certain other revisions in the retirement law relating to reemployed service by certain annuitants.

Section 13 of the Civil Service Retirement Act prescribes general rules relating to the payment of retirement annuities in the cases of annuitants who are reemployed in the Federal Government after retirement. In the case of a retired Member of Congress who is reemployed after retirement, the annuity is discontinued during the period of reemployment and then resumed in the same amount after separation from the reemployment position. This provision is directed to the usual situation wherein a retired Member is appointed to a regular, full time Federal position or is reelected to Congress or another Federal elective office.

Several instances have come to light in which this provision has had an effect contrary to its intent. These instances involve requests from the Chief Executive or department or agency heads that retired Members of Congress accept positions on boards or commissions to serve on an intermittent basis, either without compensation or with compensation only for the comparatively few days each year on which services actually are rendered. In such cases, under the existing Retirement Act, the Member will lose his retirement annuity, even though there may be no compensation at all, or only an occasional day's pay, in the reemployment position.

My bill provides that in such cases the annuity of the Member shall continue during the period of reemployment without any increase based on the reemployment service and that there shall be deducted from any compensation payable in the reemployment position an amount equal to the annuity paid to the Member for the reemployment service, with the amount so deducted being paid into the Treasury to the credit of the civil service retirement fund.

This provision is necessary to prevent loss of the reemployed Member's earned retirement annuity, and, at the same time, insure that the full amount of any compensation paid to him for his reemployment service will be charged as a payroll cost of the department or agency involved and will not come out of the civil service retirement fund.

Another provision of my bill in effect authorizes the crediting, for civil service retirement purposes, of full-time service rendered by a retired Member in an appointive position with the Federal Government where he is subject to the Retirement Act. Any Member who performs such service after retirement will have his Member annuity discontinued during his reemployment service and may elect, upon separation from the reemployment service, to have his Member annuity recomputed to include credit for the reemployment service rendered after the original annuity was granted.

The foregoing provisions of my bill apply to any Member appointed by the President of the United States to a position which requires confirmation by the Senate.

The bill also makes necessary conforming amendments in section 9(c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act—relating to computation of annuities—in order to carry out the full purpose of the provision for crediting service rendered by a retired Member in an appointive position in which he is subject to the Retirement Act, as pointed out above.

Alabama Motorists Association Opposes Gasoline Tax Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 22, 1959, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives will commence public hearings on the subject of the highway trust fund and the problems incident to the financing of the Federal highway program. Efforts to solve the highway financing problem through an increase of 1½ cents in the Federal gasoline tax, as recommended by the President earlier this year, have attracted the concern of many people on both sides of this issue. A few days ago, Mr. Bancroft Timmons, secretary-manager, Alabama Motorists Association, gave his comments in opposition to an increase in the Federal gasoline tax at this time. Mr. Timmons' statement was covered in a news article which appeared in the June 28, 1959, issue of the Tri-Cities Daily, Sheffield, Tuscumbia, Ala. With the thought that Mr. Timmons' remarks would be of interest to the Members of the House of Representatives, I am pleased to insert this newspaper article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under leave heretofore granted:

CRITICIZES IKE—MOTORIST LEADER BOOSTS ROAD BUILDING PROGRAM

MONTGOMERY.—Interstate highway program construction need not come to a screaming halt, Bancroft Timmons, secretary-manager, Alabama Motorists Association, said Saturday in answer to President Eisenhower's urgent call for a 1½-cent gasoline tax increase. This would be an increase from the present 3 cents to 4½ cents.

In Alabama total gasoline taxes would range from 11½ cents to 14½ cents per gallon with the increase, Timmons reported.

"We must not let ourselves or Members of Congress be stampeded into accepting a 50-percent gas tax boost just because someone pushes the panic button," Timmons declared.

"This whole interstate highway program, as was pointed out by AAA at the time, was conceived in an atmosphere of haste that was bound to create problems. The time has come for cool thinking and not more gasoline taxes. Since when did a crisis-inspired tax increase help anyone?" he asked.

President Eisenhower told Congress Wednesday that it must enact a 1½-cent increase or see the Interstate Highway program come to a halt in some States, including Alabama, for lack of adequate funds. The program presently is on a pay-as-you-go basis which forbids deficit spending.

In a resounding vote Thursday night, the Senate rejected a tax increase and also refused to earmark more automotive taxes to alleviate the highway program deficit. The public should understand that $1.15 billion a year in U.S. automotive taxes are being diverted to the general fund, Timmons said.

"The problem really is twofold. First, we are told, more money is needed very shortly to meet obligations so that the program can keep moving. We suggest that Congress should definitely earmark enough automotive taxes to meet this immediate need; perhaps, on a temporary basis. Tax income is expected to equal need in later years of the program.

"Secondly, Congress should calmly reappraise the whole Interstate Highway program. Building, now on a 13-year basis, should be stretched out to fit income. After all, $2.1 billion a year already is dedicated to the highway program. Of this, $1.6 billion comes from the U.S. gasoline tax. These are fantastic sums, especially considering that States and local governments collect added billions from their gasoline taxes."

Bringing it closer to home, Timmons said Alabamians have more than the ordinary stake in the problem, because gasoline taxes in this State are already among the Nation's highest. Besides the 3-cent Federal tax, Alabama levies a 7-cent tax and more than 200 cities and counties add 1- to 2-cent gas taxes. Alabama gasoline taxes presently range from 10 to 13 cents per gallon.

"If the Federal gas tax is increased 1½ cents, it means $14 million more a year will be siphoned from Alabama. Add this to $28 million collected during 1958 in Alabama from the 3-cent U.S. tax. It means some $42 million will drop into Federal coffers from just the gasoline tax, not to mention other automotive taxes," Timmons pointed out.

"It is the feeling of my motorists association that we should not pay any more taxes for this interstate highway program. Let's keep interstate highway building in proper perspective. Washington officials heading other programs are screaming for our money, too," he concluded.

DAV Services in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Arkansas citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Arkansas, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

DAV SETUP

Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have very substantially

benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger, its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan, and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters at 1701, 18th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV National Headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff, of any veteran organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C.

They there have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

DAV SERVICES IN ARKANSAS

The DAV maintains two national service officers in Arkansas as follows: William S. Hoshal and George N. Richardson with their office being located at the VA regional office, 555 Building, 211 Broadway, Little Rock. The DAV department commander this year is Mr. Reeder Dildy, route 5, Nashville, and Mr. Hoshal serves as department adjutant. The national second junior vice commander is Mr. Billie Rocky Dunn, Box 694, Conway, and the alternate national executive committeeman for the 14th district is Mr. Hosea Gipson, 1304 Walnut Street, Jonesboro.

There are three Veterans' Administration hospitals in Arkansas in which the DAV has a Veterans' Administration voluntary service representative as follows: Mr. Forrest B. Nail, Route 3, Fayetteville, is located at the 254-bed GM hospital at Fayetteville; Mr. Marshall Crabtree, 1616 West 14th Street, Little Rock, is located at both the 591-bed GM hospital at Little Rock and the 2,062-bed NP and GM hospital at North Little Rock.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $70,955,000 for its veteran program in Arkansas, including $19,619,876 disability compensation to its 21,827 service-disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Arkansas furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Only about 8 percent are members of the 29 DAV chapters in Arkansas.

This 8 percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officers in behalf of Arkansas veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted, estimated	48,862
Claim Folders reviewed	40,719
Appearances before Rating boards	3,119
Compensation increases obtained	2,752
Service connections obtained	711
Nonservice pensions	828
Death benefits obtained	64
Total monetary benefits obtained	$1,068,558.07

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other National Service Officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Arkansas veterans, their dependents, and their survivors.

SERVICES BEYOND STATISTICS

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV national service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms, and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible.

A VA Claims and Rating Board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations, and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

LOSSES BY REVIEWS

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About one-tenth of 1 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Arkansas with a consequent loss of about $296,400 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Arkansas to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

COSTS OF DAV SERVICES

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary

benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

METHODS OF PROVIDING SERVICES

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project is thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag department, 1,859 of whom, during the last 8 years, were Arkansas residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

MEMORIAL HONOR ROLL

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000 exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members, and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds, and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first Perpetual Rehabilitation Fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation to which it recently added another $100. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100, equavilent to about $4 per DAV member—an excellent objective for all other States. Benefactors from 26 States have, up to this time, become enrolled on the memorial honor role.

Inasmuch as only the interest earning from special donations will be available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in maintaining its national service officer program in the State of residence of each such benefactor, this is an excellent objective also for Arkansas. Each such special benefactor is enrolled on a permanent memorial honor roll which, up dated, is then included in the annual report of the DAV and of its incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, to the U.S. Congress.

Each claimant who has received any such free rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue this excellent rehabilitation service for other distressed disabled veterans and their dependents in Arkansas by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington 4, D.C. Every such "serviced" claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100—$50 to those born before January 1, 1902 or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations and various religious, fraternal and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV.

Youths Give a Helping Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I wish to include in the RECORD an article by Mary Ellen Wolfe in the July 8 edition of the Dayton (Ohio) Journal Herald. The article is typical of the encouragement shown by the Journal Herald to worthwhile community projects. The fact that it features our teenagers in their volunteer work at the Dayton Veterans' Administration Center is particularly noteworthy, and I wish to commend these young people and Mr. Ray Q. Bumgarner, manager of the Veterans' Administration Center:

YOUTHS GIVE A HELPING HAND
(By Mary Ellen Wolfe)

Teenagers are taking over at Dayton Veterans' Administration Center. And the vets love it.

A junior volunteer program is gaining momentum here and across the Nation as young helpers roll up their sleeves or don pinafores to perform tasks like these:

1. Push wheelchairs for hospital patients unable to do it themselves.

2. Work in central service to prepare medical and surgical supplies for use on the wards.

3. Feed men four times their age and too helpless to lift a knife or fork.

Now that the new theater-recreation building is open, the teenagers are taking on other assignments—as ushers in the theater and pinsetters for the veterans bowling.

None get paid—except in smiles from appreciative veterans.

Donald Deis of 613 St. Paul Avenue, a Wilbur Wright High School senior, and John Becker, a Centerville High School senior, already are veteran volunteer pinsetters.

They have been spending three afternoons a week that way since vacation started.

Why, when they could be earning money for themselves the same way?

Becker shrugs and says, "It's fun, and I like to do anything I can to help them out."

Yesterday was X-ray day at the VA for Don and John and a group of their friends who plan to devote part of their vacations to volunteer work.

"All junior volunteers are given chest X-rays for their protection and ours," said C. L. Nordstrom, chief of special services for the Dayton center.

Those signing up for service yesterday included volunteers recruited by Junior Red Cross and Camp Fire Girls and members of Phi Epsilon fraternity, a boys' philanthropic group formed by Fairview and Colonel White high school students.

Jay Meiselman, of 230 Hornwood Drive, president of the fraternity, reported 12 to 15 members are going to spend the summer helping the veterans.

On weekends four junior volunteers feed selected patients in ward 1 in Brown Hospital. These are patients too helpless to do it themselves.

Three others wheel wheelchair patients each Sunday from Brown Hospital to chapel services in the auditorium and assist chaplains with preparations for the services.

For Saturday afternoon picture shows three other junior volunteers usher and help handicapped veterans find places in the auditorium.

"The program is growing and expanding, but we are doing it rather slowly. It's new to us," Nordstrom says. "We feel junior volunteers have to be appropriately placed and given more orientation, more instruction and individual attention."

He reports patients accept the junior volunteers enthusiastically.

"They bring something youth has which adults can't bring. They really add new spirit," says Nordstrom.

Ray Q. Bumgarner, station manager, added that it is planned to make the junior volunteer program here a year-round one rather than a summertime replacement program as the project originally started out nationally.

Lana Schumacher, of 5316 Markey Road, a senior at Julienne, helps at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and at the VAC. She has folded bandages, prepared supplies, served food at a picnic for veterans and now is scheduled to usher.

Lana says, "It makes us feel good to be helping someone else. The veterans seem to appreciate it, too."

The Growing Threat to Reciprocal Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, because the reciprocal trade program has accomplished so much in cementing our

friendship with other nations, despite the fact that some of our foreign aid has tended to destroy some of these friendships, I wish to include as part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Times—morning Kansas City Star—of Monday, May 18, 1959:

THE GROWING THREAT TO RECIPROCAL TRADE

The opponents of reciprocal trade were pretty well hushed up by the renewal of the Trade Act last year. Now they seem to have found their voices again.

They form an articulate minority pressure group that has found some sincere reinforcement among American manufacturers who are having trouble with foreign competition. As usual, most believers in a liberal trade policy are sitting out the debate. We hope they don't wait until it is too late.

The present Reciprocal Trade Act runs for 3 more years and it is unlikely that even a Congress susceptible to the blandishments of the protectionism could do an abrupt about-face. But little omens of the day are disturbing. Recently, for example, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce retreated a step from its traditional liberal trade policy. The protectionists were at work during the annual meeting in Washington.

A casual observer might get the impression that the United States is, in fact, being fleeced every time it entered the world market prices. Nothing could be further from the truth. Since 1953, imports have increased at a faster rate than exports. That was to be expected as the other trading nations of the free world got on their industrial feet. But exports have shown a greater dollar increase. Last year exports totaled $9.4 billion compared with imports of $3.9 billion. That strikes us as a pretty good business arrangement.

Trade is a two-way street, and there is the great weakness of the argument for high tariffs. Other nations must have dollars to buy American goods. A retreat behind higher tariffs and rigid quotas would certainly cut down their sales in this country. The chain reaction would reduce our sales abroad and hurt American business. From the foreign policy point of view, it would certainly weaken U.S. world leadership.

Foreign competition, in the atmosphere of postwar recovery, has been inevitable. But the recovery of the free world is vital to American interests. Obviously some industries are hurt by imports, and their problems cannot be ignored. The reciprocal trade law, through the escape clause, provides the channels for reasonable relief. Thus recently a Presidential proclamation reduced the wool import quota 700,000 pounds.

Of course, the escape clause could be abused and the principle of reciprocity destroyed. That has not happened so far. But, apparently, the ground is being prepared for a full-scale assault on the trade law when it expires again in 1962. Those who believe that reciprocal trade best serves the interests of the Nation had better begin to fight back.

Platform Adopted at Young Republican National Convention, Denver, Colo., June 17–21, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Young Republican National Convention which was held in Denver, Colo., June 17-21, was marked by a great display of vigor and enthusiasm and a rededication to high moral principles in political thinking by the Young Republican delegates assembled there from all sections of the country.

As an active Young Republican, I wish to pay tribute to the sincerity and strength of convictions of these dedicated young men and women. I, therefore, place in the RECORD as a statement worthy of serious attention and thought the platform adopted at this recent Young Republican National Convention:

PLATFORM ADOPTED AT YOUNG REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION, DENVER, COLO., JUNE 17–21, 1959

PREAMBLE

We believe that the United States of America is a great and prosperous Nation because its citizens are given the maximum opportunity to develop themselves spiritually, intellectually and materially.

As young people we are determined to play an active role in the formation of policies that will insure the advancement of these great American traditions as a force for progress through individual freedom.

We believe that our Nation has, in this era of atomic and nuclear advancement, the greatest opportunities for growth and expansion in its history. To fully realize this great potential for the future, present governmental actions must be based on the concept of individual freedom allowing our free enterprise system to operate with the minimum of interference from government.

As young people concerned with the future of our economy we believe that as a Nation, we must live within our means. We commend the Republican administration for defense of the sound American dollar despite the persistent actions of the Democrat Congress to undermine this vital program.

In the field of health, welfare, and education we believe in the concept of local governmental assumption of responsibility wherever practical.

We firmly believe that the long range interest of labor and management in our society is identical.

We further believe that mature management and mature labor are capable of reconciling their differences without interference of government.

We believe that the business climate created by the present Republican administration has encouraged and supported business growth and expansion, permitting each individual to create for himself and his family a solid basis for financial security and spiritual development.

We believe in a continuing and determined fight against the powers of atheistic communism and the freeing of the enslaved Nations behind the Iron Curtain.

We recognize that accelerated demands for water and power by both urban and agricultural areas must be met. We believe that government should encourage private interests to fulfill these needs wherever possible. We vigorously support the Republican administration's efforts to give private industry the basic responsibility in this field.

As Young Republicans we pledge ourselves to working for a total governmental climate which will enable our Nation to enjoy continued progress in all areas.

Sound Republican principles of government will provide the best means to achieve these goals.

AGRICULTURE

Mechanization and technological developments have advanced American agriculture to a point of efficiency and per capita production never before attained by man. This agricultural revolution, just as the industrial revolution which preceded it, has brought into being many altogether new and different problems. Perhaps the greatest of these problems, both in its effect on national economy and difficulty of satisfactory solution, is, and has, in turn, been aggravated by other national problems such as inflation and the decreasing value of the American dollar, which has adversely effected the export of our agricultural products.

In the past, the solution of these problems besetting the agricultural segment of our economy has been sought through increased governmental control and regulation coupled with subsidies.

Recognizing that our agricultural industry must remain strong, we are constantly seeking the best means to that end. Just as the Romans 2,000 years ago learned, we have found governmental controls have not satisfactorily solved our problems.

Therefore we recommend the following policies as a means of keeping our agricultural economy free and strong:

1. Adequate farm credit available to help the independent farmers obtain and utilize the advantages of our industrial progress.

2. The reduction and elimination of governmental subsidies to inefficiencies in agriculture, and the subsequent reduction of rigid governmental controls thereon.

3. The encouragement of free and independent farmers who can combat rising production costs with greater per capita productivity, lower unit cost, and greater individual income.

4. The encouragement of agricultural production geared to the domestic and export market rather than to the false market created by governmental control purchases.

BUSINESS

We are proud of the economic principles underlying our system of democratic capitalism, within the framework of which our Nation has traditionally derived its greatness and its strength from the vitality of free enterprise. We further believe that the economic and political freedom of the individual in our society can best be guaranteed and the dynamic growth of our Nation can best be maintained if more and more citizens are encouraged to become individual capitalists themselves; i.e., owners of the private means of creating wealth, by buying an interest or share in our country's business enterprises, farms, and financial institutions.

We applaud the success of the present Republican administration in halting the 20-year growth of the Socialist octopus of Federal interference and urge the continued orderly withdrawal of the Federal Government from involvement in areas of our Nation's productive economy which are more naturally and properly the province of private enterprise.

We favor an economic climate which encourages the growth and prosperity by both large and small business with the greatest possible freedom from governmental regulation—for both large and small business play vital roles in maintaining our economic health—but in the largest public interest we recognize the threat to true free enterprise from a system of unbridled monopoly and we feel it is essential to continue the sound vigorous and impartial execution of our national antitrust statutes.

Finally and specifically, we recognize the pressing need for the Republican-instituted Small Business Administration and commend its operations to date; but we also believe, ideally, that we should encourage additional sources of independent private venture capital, and urge that the requirements for loans made by such private agencies to new and small businesses should be liberalized to the utmost degree consistent with the principles of sound fiscal management.

FISCAL POLICY

We enthusiastically support the Republican demand for a sound American dollar.

Inflation is the cruelest thief of all, it has been fostered by the free-spending Democrat administrations and Congresses of the recent past and wage raises, fostered by union power, unrelated to increases in productivity. Under these short-sighted policies, elderly and retired persons and others living on fixed incomes who have no great pressure groups to support them, have had their small incomes and savings cut, often below the subsistence level. We believe our Nation must live within its means, the only road to sound growth is through savings.

We believe that to foster, in the framework of a free choice economy, high employment, stability of the economy, and to eradicate the corrosion of inflation the following policies are essential:

1. All Government expenditures must meet the test of a true contribution either to national security or national economic progress—not to special interests.

2. A budget surplus—this traditional Republican policy to be accomplished by drastic curtailment of Democrat pump-priming spending sprees, and further adoption of the substantive provisions of the Hoover Commission report, and decentralizing ideals of the Federal-State Action Committee. This necessary in order to accomplish the following policies:

3. Gradual reduction, rather than raising of the national debt in these prosperous times. We must pay for Federal expenditures out of tax revenues.

4. A general reduction of the present onerous level of taxation, and the according to everyone the privilege of building up a tax free savings reserve as proposed by Republicans in current legislation before Congress.

5. We must improve our tax system to provide more incentives for economic progress to make it fairer and widen acceptance by taxpayers. We, therefore believe in a thoroughgoing reform of the entire individual and corporate taxation system especially in the following areas: (1) We believe that dividend credit should be raised; (2) these provisions, promulgated by the discredited New Deal, of our graduated income tax, which are only punitive and makes it hard for individuals to accumulate enough capital to start new businesses and create new jobs and provide little revenue.

6. Democrats have tried to make the Federal Reserve a political plum, and force it to foster the equivalent of printing press money; we deplore this policy and favor a strict credit policy by an independent Federal Reserve, mindful of the classical restraints of free interest rate trends and gold movements. This is most needful for the furthurence of international trade as inflation pushes up our prices and make it difficult for us to compete with the rest of the world.

FOREIGN POLICY

Recognizing that the challenge of the future will be the leadership of the United States in world affairs, we the young people of our country accept that challenge and propose:

1. That economic and military aid to our allies, properly administered, be continued.

2. That we make the peoples of the world aware of, and actively promote our principles of democracy, freedom, and the dignity of each individual human being; we also encourage the continuation of the educational student exchange program with non-communist countries.

3. That all Americans recognize the importance of world trade and material development to the United States and the free world through international economic cooperation, and

a. gradual and mutual lowering of trade barriers.

b. long term loans to other nations or a sound economic basis rather than direct aid where possible.

c. encouraging expanded private capital investment in other nations of the world.

4. That we lead the cause of a free world through the support of the United Nations, NATO, regional pacts, and other means of international cooperation.

5. We morally condemn the rape of Tibet and Hungary and the Communist colonial tyranny over other free people of the world.

6. That we espouse the policies formulated by John Foster Dulles to maintain and build our strength against the most serious threat to man and civilization—International communism—to condemn and prevent aggression wherever it may occur, and to infuse in our international relations the benefits of personal contact with leaders of other nations and the necessity of standards of international morality.

We advocate the maintenance of our firm stand against Communist aggression by refusing to recognize the private governments of Red China and East Germany; by continuing to oppose the admission of Red China and East Germany to the United Nations.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Health statistics reflect the remarkably high level of health of the American people. In order to further improve the general health of our people voluntary health insurance of many different kinds have been made available through competitive enterprise that is cushioning the shock of the cost of illness to the majority of our people.

To maintain these advances and promote continuing progress we pledge our support to the healing professions in their enterprising efforts to promote better health for all Americans.

We support the free-enterprise system in health because of its ability to achieve its objectives. We oppose all efforts to impose Government control over the medical profession and other healing arts through compulsory health insurance or other proposals that seek that end—and commend the efforts of voluntary health insurance groups together with the medical profession in finding adequate methods of providing care for our aged population and lower income families without Federal intervention and control.

We endorse Federal financial support of research in health as long as such funds can be used with maximum efficiency when private financing is not available. We therefore urge continued cooperation in the program of research fellowships, grants and information pooling and dissemination among the National Institutes of Health and the public and private health institutions and foundations.

We support continued progress in vocational training.

We believe that basic protection against loss of income should be provided by private means and that the old-age and survivors program should be a supplementary source.

We commend the Republican administration for taking the initiative in the promoting of a broader study of the problems of aging and encouraging the interchange of information on the subject to private agencies so that they can better serve their local communities.

We reaffirm our faith in the American tradition to insure freedom of education by removing our schools and colleges as far as possible from politics and relying upon control by the Federal Government.

Mindful of the inevitable connection between subsidization and control, we are opposed to Federal financial aid for general public education and school construction.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The Young Republican National Federation reaffirms its historic position in the fundamental truth that all men are created equal before the law without regard to race, creed, or national origin.

We encourage all loyal Americans to manifest a continuing interest publicly and privately in sound programs designed to protect the civil rights of all persons.

Recognizing the inherent worth and dignity of each individual, Young Republicans realize that this Nation will reach its total strength only when there is an opportunity for each individual to employ his talents to the full extent of his ability free from discrimination and prejudice.

The young Republicans are aware that conformity to recently developed concepts of equal protection of the laws will require major social, economic, and cultural adjustments in some situations. In this regard, the Young Republicans commit themselves to the all important task of providing community leadership to assure the necessary conformity.

We favor a program of positive policies in civil rights.

LABOR

The Republican Party is for the working men and women of America. We are determined that these people shall prosper and share in the fruits of our free enterprise economy.

The Republican Party seeks to achieve:

1. A high level of employment and low unemployment.

2. Better job opportunities for all, and reduction of the causes of unemployment.

3. Higher living standards based upon increased productivity.

4. Better balances between labor and management in the area of free collective bargaining, with only the minimum of Government intervention that is needed to protect the public interest and prevent the abuse of power.

5. Scrupulous protection of the rights and freedom of individual union members.

We propose the following measures to check existing abuses by labor unions:

1. The prohibition of the secondary boycott, refusal to handle goods, and other means by which pressure is brought on labor or business organizations not involved in a labor dispute.

2. The prohibition of unjustified organization, or "blackmail" picketing.

3. The assurance that union elections will be conducted by secret ballot in a truly free and fair manner.

4. The full disclosure of union finances for the benefit of dues-paying members.

5. A thorough investigation of the feasible application of antitrust laws to the big, industrywide union organizations.

6. Rigid enforcement of the ban on political contributions by labor unions.

7. Protection of union members from involuntary political assessment by their officers.

We believe that the active cooperation of labor, management, and Government is essential to the full realization of America's fabulous potential. We must demonstrate that the long-range interests of these three groups are the same, and we must strive to arrive at the point where labor and business recognize their mutual needs to work harmoniously together to build a stronger, more prosperous Nation.

INTERIOR AFFAIRS

We recognize the need for the continuation and expansion of production, transmission, and distribution of power to the people of the United States for their benefit and economic progress:

1. The production, transmission, and distribution of power, including the commercial

production of electric power from atomic materials, should be primarily a function of private enterprise either cooperative or noncooperative. The entry of the Federal Government into the power business should be restricted to those instances where adequate development absolutely cannot be obtained from private enterprise.

2. Present public power projects should not be expanded but restricted in their present scope. We believe that public power projects should be gradually returned to private enterprise wherever feasible.

3. We believe that private enterprise is capable of providing for our basic needs. The Government should do for the people only those things which are beyond the resources and capabilities of private enterprise to perform.

We recognize the future of our Nation depends vitally on how well we develop and conserve our natural resources.

1. We favor the maximum participation of individuals, local agencies, and local government in the development of water projects. Federal participation in water development projects should only be in cooperation with State and local interests.

2. The Federal Government should refrain from encroaching upon the individual State's jurisdictions of water rights, mineral rights, and conservation, due to the fact that these matters are inherently the responsibility of the States and local government.

SUPREME COURT

We endorse the time-honored American principle of the separation of governmental powers—executive, judicial, and legislative. With regard to the continuing controversy over the Supreme Court of the United States, we urge that this key principle be observed by all branches of our National Government.

We do not believe that other branches of the Government should try to place the Court in a subordinate role, or alter its status in our tripartite system because certain decisions of the Court proved unpopular.

But by the same token we do not believe that the Court should usurp the functions rightfully belonging to other branches of our Government. We realize that the Court is but one of many subdivisions in our constitutional structure, and that the effect of its decisions may legitimately be open to criticism and legislative alteration.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

I. We actively support the President's militant stand against Communist tyranny, and his efforts to improve our missile defense and retaliatory power with greater efficiency, to be obtained through concentrating efforts into fewer, more capable channels with greater economies and better results; rather than the gargantuan program of indiscriminate spending as proposed by the current Democrat leadership. We urge that the administration move to speed up and complete the implementation of the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958 in order to effect economies to strengthen our entire defense effort. We also favor the President's strategy which further allows for an adequate standing conventional Military Establishment to be a safeguard against so-called brush wars.

II. We recommend that the country reward in a tangible manner those veterans who have made unusual sacrifices in the armed services of this country.

III. We favor an aggressive assault on all forms of subversion, both from criminal acts and ideological warfare, to be carried on by the Un-American Activities Committee, the FBI, and arms of both State and Federal Governments. This to be effectuated by comprehensive legislation which will enable the judiciary to enforce vigorously the clearly stated will of the people with regard to the course for individual rights and due process of law.

An Observant Survey of the Status of Military Forces in East Germany by NBC Berlin Correspondent John Rich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the question of the status of the Communist puppet government in East Germany is one that has recently figured prominently in the news, as the Geneva deliberations over the future of Berlin continue. Also important in these considerations is the military status of this country, and the potential threat which their armed forces might represent to our safety in Western Europe in the event that the Soviet government should decide to employ them. In that connection, I was very much interested in a report on some of the military developments that have taken place in this Soviet-dominated zone of Germany which appeared in the Reporter magazine for June 11. The author of this article, Mr. John Rich, is presently the NBC correspondent in Berlin and has had a distinguished record which qualifies him to be a keen observer of these matters. I had the pleasure of serving in the Navy during the war with Mr. Rich and I know of his experience not only in Europe but in the Far East. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his article, and commend it to the consideration of my colleagues:

II—THE RELUCTANT WARRIORS

(By John Rich)

BERLIN.—During the recent international trade fair in Leipzig, when East Germany suspended for a few days many of its police-state regulations, a unit of the Volksarmee, celebrating the third anniversary of its founding—or rather its "coming out"—held open house at its barracks. Families wandered about, soldiers on their best behavior tried to be helpful, and shouting children climbed over trucks and jeeps and squinted through the barrels of the big Soviet-made guns lined up on the parade ground. This was a field-artillery regiment.

A bright-faced Oberleutnant who cordially offered to show me around explained that all the heavy equipment was Russian-made. "We don't manufacture arms in the German Democratic Republic," he confided proudly. He was correct as far as heavy arms are concerned, but East Germany now does turn out some small arms and small-caliber ammunition.

East Germany doesn't get the very latest in Soviet equipment, but its weapons are not all merely castoffs either. Tank crews now drive T-54 medium tanks and Stalin heavies, as well as the more plentiful T-34's. In addition to the big field guns I saw, East German troops have a modern Soviet twin-barreled 57 millimeter antiaircraft gun and a new auxiliary-propelled 85 millimeter field gun. As far as is known in the West they have no rockets or nuclear weapons, and the chances of the Soviets' ever giving the Volksarmee nuclear weapons appear slight, although its troops undergo field training simulating conditions of nuclear warfare.

My guide explained proudly that his is a strictly volunteer army, in contrast to that of West Germany, which depends on the draft. Morale is high, he said, because of good relations between officers and enlisted men. He showed me in pantomime how he himself puts in a month every year serving as a soldier, mopping floors and lugging trash. "Even our generals do it," he added.

Although the Volksarmee doesn't depend on outright conscription, it has equally effective pressures to meet recruiting needs. Higher education is denied a youth until he can show that he has put in his time either in the army or in production. Young men are constantly under tremendous pressures from all sides. The Freie Deutsche Jugend, the East German counterpart of the Komsomol, offers up its regular quota of volunteers, as do most plants and factories. Half of the refugees fleeing to West Germany are under 25, and one of the main reasons they leave is to escape service in the Volksarmee.

NEW DISGUISES FOR OLD

The building of the East German army really started at Stalingrad with the surrender of Field Marshal von Paulus. Officers from this group of prisoners of war formed the nucleus of the so-called barracks police, set up in 1948 by order of the Soviet occupying forces. The barracks police was a crude camouflage for rearmament, begun long before rearming was undertaken in West Germany.

By 1952 the barracks police numbered 110,000, the strength of the present East German army. There are many theories why the size hasn't been increased in the past 7 years. One plausible explanation is that the Soviets just don't trust it and don't want to too large. There is also the expense of equipping it. But whatever the reason, the end result is that by keeping its size static the army can be purged of undesirable elements and maintained as a tough, hard-hitting corps. It is estimated that it now has enough well-trained officers to double its present size. Only in 1956 did this oversize East German police force shed its disguise and emerge publicly as an army.

Soviet supervision has been close. At one time the Russian "Sovietniks" are said to have even worn East German uniforms. But now there is a report that Russian advisers have been withdrawn from the lower levels, an indication of the army's progress. Many of the influential German officers in the Volksarmee have lived long periods in Russia and some even have Soviet citizenship. At Leipzig I asked if there weren't any old Nazis in the army. After pressing my point I got an admission that there were a few, "just a tiny fraction, and anyway those we have reformed."

East German soldiers are being treated with more respect by the Soviets these days. There were times when Russian officers refused to shake hands with their counterparts. That has changed. The two armies now have a program for exchange of folk dancers and other cultural attractions, and they conduct some joint exercise. Last year the East Germans maneuvered with the four-hundred-thousand-man Soviet garrison force on the division level. They also conducted joint operations with the Poles and Czechs.

The Volksarmee helmet is entirely new. I've heard it described variously as German-Russian and as a cross between the Swiss and Czech helmets. The uniform and other personal equipment, however, are strictly old German. While researching this article I was sorting through some pictures with a former German Wehrmacht officer who is now in West Berlin specializing in information about the East. "Look at those packs," he said, pointing to a picture of East German soldiers outfitted with canteen, mess kit, and poncho. "That," he said, too nostalgically I thought, "is the very same pack with which we conquered France."

The Volksarmee has, or had, seven divisions, two of them tank divisions and the others motorized rifle divisions. Western intelligence sources believe one rifle division has been broken up and cannibalized to build the others up to strength. Like their Russian counterparts, the divisions are self-contained units with high speed and heavy firepower, carrying with them their armor, supply, intelligence, and artillery units. The greatest shortcoming seems to be in transportation and supply. The army also has its women's auxiliary corps, which fills jobs in intelligence, medicine, administration, and meteorology.

Western experts have described Communist Party supervision over the East German Army as "almost perfect." Party boss Walter Ulbricht seems to be doing a better job in this respect than Stalin did. The party controls education completely and promotions of officers must have party sanction.

Willi Stoph, East German Defense Minister, is a member of the central committee, which directs the army and assigns political officers to it. But in the same way that the central committee of the party itself has its own party organization, so in the army there are unit party cells operating independently of the political officers assigned from above. There is a third type of party contact. In towns and cities where army units are stationed, civilians from the local parties contact the army, join in social life, conduct propaganda work, and generally keep an eye on things.

Backing up the regular army, and considered equally reliable, is the border police. This force comprises some 40,000 men equipped with tanks and antitank guns. They can be counted on as equal to a couple of extra divisions in case of trouble. Like Volksarmee recruits, they take the military oath.

Most of the border police are stationed along the West German border, but there's a special unit whose title is "Ring Around Berlin." Its job is to guard the 150 miles of barbed-wire barricade around Berlin, East and West. East Germans going to their capital of East Berlin must also be screened carefully because once there they can easily slip into West Berlin as defectors.

Going down the line in military effectiveness, next come the alert police, stationed mainly in state and county seats to protect strategic utilities. There are about 20,000 of them. Then there are the 8,000 railway police, who have their own antiaircraft guns.

Following the 1953 uprising, the Kampfgruppe were organized. These are factory workers who train as a paramilitary group. They have small arms, which are kept locked up in their plants except for training and on ceremonial occasions. At first the Kampfgruppe wore plain overalls with red armbands, but now they're blossoming forth in military-looking gray uniforms. They train on weekends, and Ulbricht plans eventually to get 10 to 15 percent of plant membership in the groups. Many discharged soldiers enter the Kampfgruppe.

Refugees coming through West Berlin say that hundred-man Kampfgruppe units are being trained as parachutists north of Berlin at what is purportedly a glider school. According to the refugees, factory foremen and the technical intelligentsia, are being trained much as the Soviets developed their own partisans.

The East German Navy and Air Force are much smaller than the Army. The air force has from 8,000 to 10,000 men and about a hundred tactical planes, including Mig 15's and and 17's. The Soviets themselves handle the air defense of East Germany, and its radar stations are tied in directly with the Russian warning system.

WILL IT FIGHT?

The East German Army is the elite of this extensive military system. The decisive question is: Will the army fight?

Undoubtedly the Soviets would like to know the answer to that question as much as the West would. It relates directly to whether they will ever be able to pull their own troops out, leaving the Volksarmee to defend the country and especially to put down any internal uprising.

Much depends on the circumstances of how trouble breaks out, who the oponent it, and how the battle is going. At Leipzig I asked East German soldiers whether, if West Germany gets nuclear arms, they will want them too. The answer came back: "No, we wouldn't. We wouldn't want to use them against other Germans." As of today East German soldiers would evidently find it difficult to open fire on their brothers in the West, or in the East. But they are under constant pressure to overcome this hesitation.

In this respect, time seems to favor the Communist cause. For one thing, the longer German reunification is postponed, the more chance East German government leaders have of developing a popular feeling and support for their regime. If West Berlin can be eliminated and East Germany cut off completely from the West, then their programs will be all the more effective, especially if Germans in the Soviet zone lose hope and become indifferent.

If the Soviets and the East German Communist leaders can convince the troops that there's no future for them in the West, if they can develop in them a collective pride and persuade them that their new goals are valid, then East Germany will have a very effective little army.

Gasoline Tax—Wrong Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 22, 1959, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives will commence public hearings on the subject of the highway trust fund and the problems incident to the financing of the Federal highway program. Efforts to solve the highway financing problem through an increase of 1½ cents in the Federal gasoline tax, as recommended by the President earlier this year, have attracted the concern of many people on both sides of this issue. In recent days editorials have appeared in the newspapers of Alabama in opposition to any Federal gasoline-tax increase at this time.

Under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Hartford (Ala.) News on June 25, 1959. This editorial is earnestly commended to the Members of the House of Representatives for their careful study.

The editorial follows:

WRONG ANSWER

Gasoline is certainly an absolute necessity in this mechanical age. About 90 percent of all gas sold goes into motor vehicles traveling the highways. And this essential commodity carries a tax far higher than that levied on even extreme luxuries.

Last year we consumed just under 60 billion gallons of gas. The excise taxes levied on it by the Federal, State, and local governments are estimated at $4⅔ billion. On the average, each gallon is taxed 9 cents—6 cents by the State and 3 cents by the Federal Government. This is the equivalent of slightly more than 42 percent of the retail price.

That is bad enough. But current programs, if they go through, will make matters much worse. For instance, a bill now in Congress would increase the Federal tax by exactly 50 percent, boosting it from 3 cents to 4½ cents.

The reason behind this proposal is that the fund which finances the multi-billion-dollar Federal highway program is in the red. But it need not be. A large share of the highway-user taxes the Government collects are diverted from highway purposes into the general funds. If all of those taxes were allocated to highways, there'd be sufficient money to meet the commitments.

If Congress doesn't want to make that allocation, it should stretch out the highway program over a longer period of time so that tax revenues at existing rates can carry the load. Further upping of an already excessive tax on a necessity of modern life certainly isn't the right answer.

"Rosy" Story on Braceros Blurs Real Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of this House to a feature article that was distributed to the Nation's newspapers by the Associated Press, and which was widely published in the issues of Sunday, July 5, 1959.

This article deals with the braceros, who, as you know, are Mexican farm laborers, brought into this country under contract to work on our farms, especially during the harvest season.

Many of my distinguished colleagues in this House share my concern for the wages, working conditions, housing, and health standards of farm labor in our country, especially the laborers who are hired for seasonal work on the large farms—the so-called factories in the field. The braceros are an important part of that work force, with some 400,000 of them being brought into the country for seasonal work each year.

No informed person can deny the fact that many of the braceros, and many of our native migrant workers, live and toil under conditions that are an affront to human dignity and a disgrace in a free, democratic society. This fact has been recognized by the Secretary of Labor, by church leaders, by organized labor, by many responsible farmers, and by everyone else who has taken the trouble to in-

vestigate. The evidence is overwhelming and indisputable.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, in the Associated Press article to which I have referred, quite a different picture is drawn.

To be sure, the article recognizes that charges have been made against the wages and working conditions of braceros. But it then does its best to show that the charges are groundless.

According to this article, the braceros are simple children of nature, delighted to discover the modern miracles of railroad trains and indoor plumbing—and rich beyond their fondest dreams of avarice on wages that begin at 50 cents an hour.

I might insert parenthetically, Mr. Speaker, that indoor plumbing is not by any means a universal "miracle" in migrant labor camps.

What this Associated Press article says, in effect, is this:

The braceros are better off than they were in Mexico. They are happy with their wages. They don't know any better. Why spoil them with money they wouldn't know how to spend and comforts they have never enjoyed?

I am sure this sort of argument is familiar to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all the Members of this House who are old enough to remember the depression of the thirties and the beginnings of the New Deal.

I remember the testimony of those who opposed the Federal minimum wage, who opposed social security legislation, who opposed the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively.

I remember the southern textile manufacturers, for example, who argued—and apparently they were serious about it—that wages of 25 cents and 30 cents an hour would simply lead their workers into temptation, and that this much money, coupled with a 40-hour week, would corrupt them into sloth, drunkenness and riotous living.

We as a people have long ago rejected that philosophy; and I am sure the Members of this House reject it today, with respect to farm workers—including the braceros—as well as industrial workers.

We do not accept the notion that a man is a pig because he has been forced to live in a sty. But that is what this whole concept of the "simple children of nature," presented by the Associated Press article, would have us believe.

The fact that such a concept has been given serious presentation by one of our greatest national news networks is, to me, a sad documentary on the blunting of our national conscience and the decay of our capacity for moral indignation.

The bracero system has been properly called a "none too subtle substitute for slavery." I am not suggesting that we do away with the use of Mexican labor; but I do say that farm laborers, domestic or imported, are entitled to fair, decent, civilized treatment as human beings.

I think the RECORD should show that the Associated Press has done a disservice to this objective—and on Independence Day weekend, at that. I would suggest to the Associated Press that it make amends by a full and impartial story, not on a model or idealized migrant labor camp such as the one it describes in this article, but on the plight of migrant workers as a whole.

Meanwhile, I hope the other matters which are now preoccupying the Education and Labor Committee can be disposed of in time for hearings, during this session, on the bills I have introduced to deal with the farm labor problem.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD, the AP story which has prompted me to make the foregoing comments:

SEND MONEY HOME—BRACEROS HAPPY WITH U.S. JOBS

EDINBURG, TEX.—People point their finger at Adolfo Duran Gomez and say, "You're a slave."

Others say, "You're poorly housed, underprivileged."

And a third group angrily charges, "You're taking jobs from U.S. workers."

Adolfo Duran Gomez grins a little and shrugs the powerful shoulders under his cotton shirt.

You can't convince him he's a slave, not at 30 U.S. dollars a week.

Privileges? He has discovered indoor plumbing. That to Adolfo is a mark of privilege he never had before.

Taking jobs from U.S. workers? He knows that few citizens north of the border want the jobs he gets.

In the labor camp here, Adolfo tells how it was in his village of Aquitzio, southwest of Mexico City, where he faced the hard facts of survival for his wife, his son, and himself.

He worked in the fields when he could find a job. The pay ranged from 45 to 85 cents a day. It was hardly a living.

But back to Aquitzio from the north came other villagers. They told of a country where Gomez could earn as much in an hour as he earned all day in Mexico.

Gomez is an unsophisticated countryman. He can't read or write. He believes he's 26, though he isn't certain. But wages like $30 a week he understands.

He and his wife scrimped for a little grubstake. Then he boarded a bus for Mexico City.

In Mexico City he saw that marvelous invention, a railroad train. He also viewed for the first time that accomplishment of science, indoor plumbing. He paid for a train ride to Monterrey, where he received a permit to work and transportation to a labor processing center nearer the border.

For months now he has worked in Texas fields and even as far up as Arkansas. In the slack season he makes $30 a week. When he isn't working, he receives a subsistence allowance. In cotton picking time he easily can make $60 a week.

"Someday I will have enough money to buy my own home," he says. "I send all my money home."

Gomez is known throughout the United States as a bracero. And it doesn't worry the countryman a bit that he and 400,000 like him are extremely controversial figures. He just likes to work and send money home.

Adolfo is legal. His opposite, the wetback—called that because he sneaked across the Rio Grande to work—is a vanishing breed.

At one time an estimated million wetbacks bid against each other for jobs in the United States.

Adolfo doesn't bid against anyone. He is protected by minimum wages. These range from 50 cents to $1.10 an hour.

Adolfo's employer must provide proper shelter. He has hospital and accident insurance.

Last year, Adolfo and braceros like him sent home $30 million. That gives a big boost to Mexico's economy.

Farmers contract for braceros through their own labor association. They tell the association how many workers they need, pay a head fee of $12 per worker, and the association handles the redtape. If a farmer contracts for workers already within the United States, the fee is only $6.

When Adolfo isn't working, he remains at the labor camp at Hidalgo, Tex., near here. He has a bunk, locker, and cooking facilities. A commissary gives him credit.

Labor organizations and some church groups argue that the bracero is mistreated. He should have more pay and better working conditions, they say. Occasionally labor groups have charged that Adolfo and those like him take jobs away from U.S. citizens. Some protest that the housing offered the bracero is inadequate.

"By what standards?" asks Joe Davis, who farms and operates an Edinburg cotton gin.

"The housing furnished braceros is far better than the housing of workers in several classes of industry, not just the farmer," Davis claims.

The Reverend James L. Vizzard, representing the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, told a congressional committee last year the bracero program is "a none too subtle substitute for slavery."

At the same hearing, the Very Reverend Monsignor George S. Higgins of the National Catholic Welfare Conference said a leading Catholic moral theologian, he did not name, concluded that Catholic farmers are obliged in conscience to refuse to take part in the program.

Davis denies farmers abuse braceros. A member of a citizens group advising the Labor Department on braceros, Davis told the committee:

"I have seen these men all but break down and cry when their contract is up and they have to leave. A man who has been abused wouldn't do that.

"As for wages, he gets the prevailing wage for his work, the same as the domestic laborer."

The farmer-ginner said most farmers would prefer domestic farm help but that "it is just not available when needed." Farmers say U.S. workers don't like the "stoop" jobs, like picking cotton and gathering vegetables.

Braceros interviewed in this area say they are happy with U.S. employers' treatment. But they express a preference for California and northern States jobs, because wages there are better.

Importation of workers began during World War II. Regulations were few and the small border patrol could do little more than keep out the criminal element.

In 1950, the immigration service cracked down on wetbacks. By 1954 the campaign was in full cry.

During 1954, authorities sent 1,022,267 wetbacks across the border to Mexico.

In 1958, only 22,856 wetbacks were deported.

Incomparably the Best Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, much praise has been given Earl Mazo for his new study of the Vice

President, which is considered one of the best books on Mr. NIXON ever written. Mr. Max Freedman, the well-known Washington correspondent of the Manchester Guardian, for instance, declares that Mr. Mazo has written incomparably the best book on Mr. NIXON. In his review of Earl Mazo's book, Mr. Freedman says that—

Mr. Mazo, a distinguished reporter, has not tried to emulate the arts of the missionary. He is not seeking to convert anyone. But in this book, published by Harper's, he has set down the facts with courage and honor, separated myth from reality, and given us a portrait of the actual man. * * * It is an admirable achievement.

Mr. Mazo is a personal friend of mine of many years standing, and I am happy to see him receiving the recognition at last which he so richly deserves. Mr. Freedman is quite right; Earl Mazo has, indeed, set down the facts with courage and honor, and anyone who knows this brilliant writer would expect nothing less.

I am pleased to include here the review of Mr. Mazo's book by Max Freedman from the June 25, 1959, issue of the Manchester Guardian.

[From the Manchester Guardian Weekly, June 25, 1959]

(By Max Freedman)

A NEW STUDY OF MR. NIXON

WASHINGTON, June 23.—Mr. Earl Mazo is a brave man. He has written a biography of Vice President NIXON without once suggesting that he is a devil or a saint. The result is easy to predict. For the next few months his mail will quiver with abusive letters, friends will ask him if he really meant what he wrote, and his more sensitive colleagues will allow the whole episode to rest in a chivalrous silence. Most people look at Mr. NIXON not with their eyes but with their prejudices. The usual comment moves between the extremes of generous praise and calculated abuse. Balanced judgment is regarded as a kind of inexcusable neutrality in a conflict between right and wrong.

Mr. Mazo, the national political correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune knew all about these hazards before he began his task. He was resolved to write an honest, penetrating, measured study of one of the most memorable political careers of our time. This certainly is no campaign biography written to glorify its hero as a leader without blemish or fault. Nor is it the ultimate account, based upon the private papers of Mr. NIXON and expressing the final verdict on his story. Mr. Mazo has admitted the faults and pointed to many of the mistakes. But out of a knowledge of Mr. NIXON's career that surpasses the work of all previous biographers or critics who have touched this controversial theme, he has written incomparably the best book on Mr. NIXON and crowded it with insights invaluable to the understanding of today's political debate.

The figure that emerges from Mr. Mazo's analysis must be treated with respect by anyone who values the arts of leadership. Curiously enough, the final estimate is not very different from the private assessment of the most important Democrats in Washington. They may think they could defeat him next year in the presidential race. But they have no illusions about Mr. NIXON's robust and resourceful campaign if he should be their opponent. Mr. NIXON often wonders if the Democrats are wise in saying that Governor Rockefeller would be harder to beat. Suppose the Republicans come to believe them. What happens then? The Democrats might find themselves opposed by the new star of the Republican party instead of by the battle-stained veteran. This would be a strange sequel to the "hate NIXON" campaign.

Except for an occasional frigid episode, relations between Mr. NIXON and Mr. Rockefeller have been cordial and generous. The book is sprinkled with tributes to the Vice President from Mr. Rockefeller. On foreign policy the two men have the same outlook and philosophy. They are not divided by the differences which separated Senator Taft from Mr. Eisenhower. Nor does Mr. NIXON conceive it to be his duty to speak for one political group or one economic philosophy in the Republican Party. He sees himself as a unifying force in his party, eager to organize its fighting faith for every national campaign. This loyalty to the party's cause is known and respected by Republicans in all parts of the country. It helps to explain his popularity with the men who control the Republican organization. Mr. NIXON believes that the Republican candidate for President in 1960, no matter who he may be, will have to run on the record of the Eisenhower administration. That partly explains the zeal, sometimes the excessive zeal, with which he threw himself into election campaigns. The rest of the explanation can be found in the amazing and unprecedented fact that he had to do most of this campaigning by himself. Never in American history has any Vice President carried so vast and so controversial a burden.

In 1950 Mr. NIXON entered the Senate by defeating Mrs. Helen Gahagan Douglas by a majority of 680,000 votes in California. It was a dirty campaign—dirty on both sides. Mr. Mazo shows in a masterly political analysis that Mrs. Douglas's supporters started many of the rough and shameful practices which later were developed with dexterous ruthlessness by Mr. NIXON. This section of the biography will bring a sense of justice to an impartial minority; but Mr. Mazo had better brace himself for an avalanche of protests from California.

In pitiless detail Mr. Mazo exposes the blunders of Mr. Harold Stassen's campaign in 1956 to remove Mr. NIXON from the vice-presidential nomination. This tale has never been told with such exact and punishing accuracy. Every mistake made by Mr. Stassen is recorded with icy precision, down to the last incredible demand that the Republican National Convention postpone its nominations for the Vice-Presidency for 24 hours to give his faltering campaign another chance. Perhaps the most valuable new material in the whole book is contained in the chapters describing Mr. NIXON'S ordeal in his most recent trip to Latin America. Mr. Mazo produces unanswerable evidence to prove that Mr. NIXON was the victim of a Communist campaign of violence and intimidation. It must be added that several of the governments were shamefully negligent or cravenly neutral in the face of this Communist conspiracy. It is impossible to deny, when confronted with Mr. Mazo's impressive evidence that Mr. NIXON was in alarming danger of assassination. Knowing these risks, Mr. NIXON might have shown greater restraint in arranging the details of his tour. That remains an open question. What is beyond all dispute is the mixture of courage and composure displayed by Mr. NIXON during every phase of this tragic experience.

Mr. Mazo, a distinguished reporter, has not tried to emulate the arts of the missionary. He is not seeking to convert anyone. But in this book, published by Harpers, he has set down the facts with courage and honor, separated myth from reality, and given us a portrait of the actual man instead of feverish glimpses of a hobgoblin. It is an admirable achievement.

Georgia's Thigpen Stirs Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago a young but outstanding Georgian, Dr. Corbett H. Thigpen, addressed an overflow audience of medical students attending the annual convention of the Student American Medical Association.

This address so moved the audience and Dr. Walter C. Alvarez, emeritus consultant, Mayo Clinic, that Dr. Alvarez wrote a column thereon, reading as follows:

DR. ALVAREZ SAYS: GEORGIA'S THIGPEN STIRS STUDENTS

(By Dr. Walter C. Alvarez)

One of the most moving experiences of my medical career came to me a few weeks ago as I sat in a huge, jam-packed audience made up of medical students from all over the United States. They were attending the annual convention of the Student American Medical Association.

As one of their guests, I listened to a brief talk from the heart of a remarkably fine psychiatrist—Dr. Corbett Thigpen, the Georgian who recently wrote up the case of the Georgia woman whose problem he described in "The Three Faces of Eve." He is a handsome, fortyish, sensitive-looking man with fine eyes and a very moving voice.

Time and again, during his talk, when he would say that perhaps many of the ideas of modern psychiatry are just theories for which no one can adduce any scientific proof, the audience—much stirred—applauded. At those moments, I wished all dynamically inclined psychiatrists could have been present just to sense the relief that seemed to come over these students when told that, if they were reluctant to swallow a lot of weird theories, they were perfectly justified.

They registered their approval only as people do when, at last, they hear an authority say something that they have long felt to be true and much in need of being said. The students chuckled with delight when they heard Dr. Thigpen say that he had never heard his patients complaining of "penis envy" or "castration fear"; two ideas which are foundation stones of modern "dynamic psychiatry."

As Dr. Thigpen emphasized, he was not attacking anyone; all he wanted was to find ways in which to cure his patients. After years of experience, he knows—to his sorrow—that modern psychiatry does not give all the answers; in fact, in many cases of mental aberration, even good psychotherapy does not help.

Dr. Thigpen told me that he and his eminent chief, Dr. Hervey Cleckley, had started in practice with analytic indoctrination, but later had turned away from it. In their practice, they have come to behave like any good scientific physician does who will use any form of treatment that he finds useful—psychotherapy, rest, tranquilizers, brain stimulators, electroshocks, or hypnosis.

Dr. Thigpen was sorry to have to admit what all of us physicians know: That, for the last 30 years or more, under the dominating influence of theories of early sex trauma, psychiatry has largely stagnated, so that there has been little advance in it.

Many psychiatrists have cultivated the habit of writing in such an almost-unintelligible jargon that few people can guess what

they are trying to say. In doing this, they have fooled themselves—and some of their readers—into thinking they know something. As Dr. Thipgen, Dr. Freyhan, and others have pointed out, much of psychiatry has changed from a science into a religion with Freud as its prophet. Whenever one of Freud's old friends came to differ with him, he was promptly excommunicated, and after that his name was never mentioned, and his papers were never quoted. This, of course, is not science. In science, one may differ strongly with a man, and yet love him as a friend, revere him as a teacher, and continue to quote from his work.

As Dr. Thigpen went on to say to the students, what he prays for is that psychiatry may soon come out of the doldrums to become again a field for scientific research. Perhaps the changeover is now being effected by the brain physiologists, pharmacologists, surgeons, and geneticists who are getting interested in the problems of mental disease. We will hope so.

Naturally, there is little hope of changing the mental processes of the older psychiatrists, they are too firmly set in their ways, and so our hope must be in the young men of the present generation. If they will accept only ideas for which there is scientific proof, we will get somewhere. Movingly, Dr. Thigpen told of the similar frank talk which he gave at a recent meeting of a great psychiatric association. There, also, he pleaded for scientific honesty.

When, after the talk, a physician came to the podium and asked, "Would you have us give up our practice and starve?" Dr. Thigpen said, "I have no desire to rob anybody of his livelihood, but I feel that if patients are paying us for our services they deserve to receive scientific knowledge—not beliefs."

At the close of his talk in Chicago the students were so moved that they stood up and applauded for several minutes. I will never forget that experience so long as I live. It is a wonderful thing to hear an able and honest man confessing—from the heart—that there is something terribly wrong with the work of the group with which he has long been associated. It takes tremendous courage and dedication to do such a thing.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Thigpen and his partner, Dr. Hervey Cleckley, down at Augusta, Ga., are performing miracles in the psychiatric field. There is no psychiatrist more eminently qualified to challenge certain accepted theories in mental ills than is Dr. Thigpen. Dr. Thigpen has the ability and the knowledge to inspire young students to go on and up in the field of mental health and to discover truths that could not be discovered in a stagnant field. I sincerely believe that this courageous speech by Dr. Thigpen will be the means of releasing men's minds from fiction and false conceptions, so that they might work impartially, as scientists should, to discover that which is right.

Hosmer Has Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 4273, to eliminate farm price supports, still languishes in the Agriculture Committee. Sooner or later we're going to have to face up to this most acute problem. The question is when are we going to get nerve enough to do it?

L.A.C. of the Long Beach Independent put the matter most effectively in his column of July 9, 1959, headed "HOSMER Has Program," which I am happy to submit for the RECORD.

L.A.C. SAYS: HOSMER HAS PROGRAM

It is doubtful that Congressman HOSMER would get many votes from the Midwest farm States because of his approach to the farm subsidy program. But it is as realistic a program as any that has been offered to overcome the farm mess to which he refers. It should be of interest to all consumers and in the long run it would probably save farmers from becoming vassals of big government.

HOSMER's plan is simple: He would stop all subsidies. Now, hold a fire sale to get rid of the $9 billion in surpluses, costing $1 billion a year to store—then use the proceeds to relocate small farmers put out of business, to reduce national debt and to start tax reduction. He says unless action like this is taken soon subsidies will cost another $5.4 billion this year, and hit taxpayers twice—once for the direct cost in taxes and again for higher food and clothing costs.

This may seem a drastic and even radical approach to the problem. But could anything be more radical than the continued payments to farmers which encourage them to raise more crops which are already in such surplus that enough of some crops are now in storage to take care of our needs for from 1 to 2 years? The new crops soon to be harvested will produce even greater surpluses.

Before us is a long list of wheat, corn, and cotton growers who have received from $40,000 to a million a year each for growing more of their crops than the market could absorb. The total cost of the crazy program is a fifth of the total personal income taxes paid to the Federal Government each year. The surpluses being built up can only mean at some point they must be destroyed—or they will be dumped on the market as HOSMER has suggested. He is taking a realistic view of a situation which it is evident must be solved by some such method.

It takes clear thinking and courage to suggest such a program. There is little hope it will be adopted this year—or in the next election year. But unless some Congressmen and Senators have the courage to speak out with some such plans—radical as they may seem—there is little hope of solving the problem. We are rapidly approaching a time when farmers will be placed on a virtual dole. Until it is solved, as HOSMER points out, the taxpayers will be paying a fifth of their income taxes for subsidies plus higher prices for the food and clothing they buy.—L.A.C.

In Memory of Madison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the suggestion was made that a memorial be erected in honor of James Madison, the fourth President, father of the Constitution, and author of the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Irving Brant, in an article appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald, urged that the 24 discarded columns from the East Front of the Capitol we used for the memorial.

The Washington Post and Times Herald and the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times immediately seconded the suggestion. Now a third distinguished newspaper, the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, in its issue of July 9, 1959, has added its voice to the demand for a suitable memorial for our fourth President.

The Post-Dispatch editorial follows:

IN MEMORY OF MADISON

Irving Brant, former St. Louis editor now engaged in historical and biographical writing in Washington, makes an excellent suggestion. It is that a memorial be established in the National Capital to James Madison, fourth President, father of the Constitution, and chief architect of the Bill of Rights. But Mr. Brant, five of whose volumes in his definitive Madison series have appeared, is not content with a generality. He has a practical suggestion for the memorial. This is that the discarded 24 columns from the East Front of the Capital in Washington be set up elsewhere in the parkways of the Capital City so as to harmonize with existing memorials to Presidents Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. The Washington Post has begun a campaign to put Mr. Brant's suggestion into effect. We are glad to be among the seconders. As the biographer of the brilliantly creative statesman so well puts it: "We should erect a memorial to Madison not because he needs it but because we do."

Auto Makers Lag in Pollution Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of June 28 by Gladwin Hill, concerning the failure of the automobile industry to assume its fair share of the task of preventing air pollution.

As a member of a Government Operations Subcommittee, I participated actively in a 1957 study of the Federal Air Pollution Research and Technical Assistance Program. Our study included hearings in Los Angeles at which the subcommittee took testimony from some of the country's leading authorities in the field of air-pollution control. The evidence presented to the subcommittee clearly indicated, as have many other studies, that motor vehicle exhaust fumes are the greatest single source of air pollution. The subcommittee also placed in its record a series of correspondence between Kenneth Hahn, a member of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, and various automobile manufacturing companies dating from 1953 to 1957 which graphically illustrates the

failure of these companies to shoulder their proper responsibility for helping to control air pollution caused by their products.

Mr. Speaker, the automobile manufacturing companies spend many millions of dollars annually for unwanted style changes and unneeded horsepower. I suggest it is high time they begin using some of this presently misdirected effort to help control air pollution from exhaust fumes.

SMOG FOES ACCUSE AUTO MAKERS OF LAGGING IN POLLUTION BATTLE

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, June 27.—The automobile industry was roundly censored by opponents of air pollution this week for assertedly dragging its feet in efforts to lessen smog.

The criticism was voiced at the 52d annual meeting of the Air-Pollution Control Association, senior technical organization in the field. Its membership extends from Canada to Mexico.

About 1,000 engineers and administrators attended the 5-day convention. Dr. Leonard Greenburg, of New York, was named president of the association for the next year. He is commissioner of the city's department of air pollution control.

The Automobile Manufacturers Association and the industry generally were accused of reneging on pledges of thoroughgoing efforts to reduce exhaust fumes, a major source of air pollution in big cities. The industry was also accused of showing bad faith by refusing to participate in the convention.

The leading critics were Smith Griswold, director of the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District, and Warren Dorn, a member of the county board of supervisors.

RECENT ASSURANCES CITED

Mr. Griswold said that only a few months ago auto industry representatives had assured local officials and the public that they were trying to expedite development of exhaust controls, but needed more basic knowledge, yet shortly afterward, he continued, the industry withdrew from participation in the convention, a major forum for pollution information, "claiming they did not care to come to Los Angeles where they were criticized unfairly."

"They have been making excuses ever since 1956," he continued. "In February they promised a device within a year. Since then they have sent us exactly two units of one device—a catalytic afterburner. In tests so far this device has failed to measure up to the claimed levels of efficiency. The only devices which do appear to show promise are those developed by independent companies."

Mr. Dorn said:

"It seems that this vast industry, which has an annual income of some $20 billion, does not want the people of this area to know how little it has accomplished toward solving its part of the smog problem."

Mr. Dorn then cited the outlay by local industry of between $70 and $100 million for fume suppressing equipment, the taxpayers' outlay of $17 million in 12 years and a current annual budget for smog abatement of $4 million. Compared to these figures, he said, the auto industry's expenditure is unduly small.

"I submit to you," he said, "that with the people of Los Angeles County spending $1 billion a year on motor vehicles, the industry's expenditure of only one-tenth of 1 percent of that—only $1 million a year—could hardly be construed as the crash program demanded by the people of this county as well as the people of nearly every other metropolitan area of this vast country."

OCAW: Democracy in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, much has been said concerning the lack of freedom existing in our present day labor movement. The impression the public has received is that all labor organizations are undemocratic by their very nature.

Mr. Harry Seligson, professor of industrial relations at the University of Denver, has made a study of the internal administrative and managerial practices of the labor unions. He has found a striking example of an international union that enjoys the full benefit of a democratic internal organization. This union, the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International, AFL–CIO—OCAW—with a membership of 200,000, is a forceful example which rebuts the presumption that a spirit of internal freedom is lost in our present day American labor movement. I am confident that the great majority of our labor unions enjoy this freedom, and only the minority are plagued with corruption.

Under unanimous consent, I submit to the RECORD this study of Prof. Harry Seligson entitled "Democracy in Action."

OCAW: DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

(By Harry Seligson)

For several years the McClellan committee has been investigating unions. In addition to disclosing corruption and racketeering in some, it has also brought to light evidence of serious denial of rights of union members by their unions.

The investigation has stirred up considerable interest in these questions: When is a union considered to be democratic in its internal practices? How are the rights of its members protected?

This article is an account of how one union, the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International, AFL–CIO (OCAW), practices democracy. Formed in 1955—as a result of a merger between the Oil Workers International Union, and the Gas, Coke, and Chemical Workers Union—it claims a membership of about 200,000. Its headquarters are in Denver.

To the OCAW, democracy in a union means only one thing: the organization is fully and completely under the control of the members. This Constitution of the union provides this control in the form of checks and balances on the power of the officers, by granting a high degree of autonomy to the locals, by guaranteeing rights of the members, and by the Convention. The description which follows is from two sources: the constitution of the OCAW; and transcripts of the Convention of the old Oil Workers Union, 1918–1955, and of the OCAW, 1955–1958.

THE CONVENTION

The OCAW holds a convention every year. The members have defeated by wide margins proposals to extend this to once every 2 years. To date, the members have been unwilling to permit more than 1 year to elapse without reviewing the administration of the union by their officers.

The delegates to the convention are elected by the members of each local. Even the convention committees are elected by the members.

The rules under which the convention operates are proposed and adopted by the delegates.

Proposals for changing the constitution may be made by individual members, officers, locals, or district councils. These are referred to the constitution committee. The constitution obligates this committee to report to the convention every proposed amendment, either concurring with it or recommending rejections. In this way the convention has the opportunity to debate each proposal.

These conventions are definitely not rubber stamp bodies. On more than one occasion the transcripts show how the delegates have either rejected completely or modified substantially the recommendations of their administrative officers.

The delegates oppose vigorously requests by the administration of additional finances. With great care they review and examine the annual accounting of the secretary-treasurer and the audit by recognized certified public accountants. The frequently held conventions permit the rank and file, through their delegates, to act in the nature of a finance committee. There is no way possible for the officers to appropriate and expend moneys without the approval of the convention.

Officers are elected at the convention for 1-year terms. For many years the old Oil Workers International Union nominated its officers at the convention, but elected them by a membershipwide referendum. Each year a vocal minority at the convention seeks to revive this practice; it considers the referendum an important facet of democracy.

Although the same group of officers have been reelected repeatedly, it is not because opposition is throttled. Members with leadership qualities have many opportunities to make those known: in their locals and district councils, on companywide and subindustry councils, on the bargaining policy committee or the rank-and-file executive board, or as delegates to the annual convention where almost unlimited debate is the rule. In the case of the OCAW, reelection is an expression of the respect and confidence the members have in the leadership and integrity of the officers they return to office year after year.

The transcripts give a picture of conventions that are vigorous, vocal, articulate—even turbulent.

THE ADMINISTRATION

As the chief administrative officer, the president of an international union, has considerable power. Improperly used, abuses can result. The OCAW provides its president with sufficient power to execute union policy, but surrounds him with checks and balances.

(a) A 16-man executive board, elected annually from the members, meets every 3 months. (The officers sit on the board but may not vote.) It reviews all financial dealings of the administration, the president's decisions on policy, his appointments of regional district directors; hears appeals of staff members discharged by him, appeals from union members disciplined by their local or the international, appeals from locals over whom the president has placed an administrator; and, in general, keeps a close watch on the operations of the international office. The minutes of the sessions of the executive board are sent to each local.

(b) The president appoints the international representatives who service the locals in the field in organizing, bargaining, arbitrating. The president also has the power to remove them. However, they may appeal his decision to the executive board and, as a last resort, they may take their grievance

to arbitration. Until this arbitration procedure was adopted, the aggrieved staff member could appeal to the convention. In several instances, the convention ordered the discharged representative to be reinstated.

It should also be noted that the staff of the international office is represented by a union; the president is obligated to bargain with it on terms and conditions of employment.

(c) His appointment of trustees and administrators over locals is subject to appeal. In the 1958 convention, one local challenged vehemently the president's action in appointing an administrator over it. After lengthy and extensive hearings, the executive board sustained the president. The convention concurred.

(d) His opportunities to develop a political machine are practically nonexistent:

(1) He has no patronage to offer. International representatives appointed by him may not be removed without just cause.

(2) His appointments of district directors are subject to approval by the executive board.

(3) He cannot create a topheavy bureaucracy; the members vigorously resist any request for an increase in the per capita tax.

(4) His duties provide him with little spare time to make the rounds of the locals to build a following.

(5) He has no funds which are available for his unlimited and unrestricted use; every penny must be accounted for to the convention.

(6) His decisions, conduct, accomplishments, or lack of them are reviewed annually by the convention.

(e) At conventions he cannot prevent resolutions or proposed amendments to the constitution from being reported out to the delegates. He may speak for or against them but, as a general rule, is granted no more time than is given the average delegate.

(f) He must stand for office annually.

(g) He, as well as the other officers, may be suspended by the executive board for dishonesty, malfeasance, or maladministration. He may be recalled by a referendum vote of the members.

(h) His salary is relatively modest—$15,000 a year—with a limited expense allowance which must be accounted for. This, in a union in which the annual earnings of a highly skilled member of the OCAW may run as high as $7,500.

THE LOCALS

Locals exercise a high degree of autonomy.

No collective bargaining agreement can be made effective without the vote of the members. No strike can be called without the approval of the membership. Only the members of the local can vote for the delegates to the annual convention.

Locals need not be unduly concerned about having an administrator placed over them arbitrarily, or having their charters revoked without cause. Counting the period in which the old Oil Workers International was in existence, only about 10 locals were placed under an administrator between the years 1946 to 1958. Generally, administrators were appointed when there was clear indication of election fraud, mismanagement of funds by officers of the local, refusal to abide by the constitution of the international, or failure to pay the per capita tax. The trusteeships averaged no longer than 2 or 3 months in duration.

Charters of locals have been revoked or canceled only where the local has gone out of business, where its membership has dropped to a point below that required by the constitution, or where economy and efficiency dictated the merger of several locals.

THE MEMBERS

Important to a union member are the rights he has when his local or international charges him with violation of the union's constitution. The protections furnished the member by the OCAW are quite adequate.

(a) Charges against a member must be made in writing.

(b) An investigating committee examines the evidence at a hearing at which the accused may be present. He is given every opportunity to be heard and to present evidence in his defense. He may be represented by counsel if he so desires.

(c) The investigating committee reports its findings to the members of the local. A two-thirds majority vote of the membership is necessary to convict.

(d) If acquitted, the local may vote to reimburse the accused for expenses he incurred in his defense.

(e) If convicted, he may appeal to the executive board and, as a last resort, to the convention.

The number of members suspended or expelled by locals is unknown. However, few appeals have been made to the conventions. Of three known appeals in a 40-year period, one was by a member expelled because of membership in the Communist Party. Both the executive board and convention sustained the local.

Equally important to an accused is the speed of the judicial process. Quarterly executive board meetings and annual conventions insure speedy appeal procedures.

SUMMARY

In sum, the OCAW practices democracy in a number of ways: Annual convention, unlimited debate, elected convention committees; critical review and examination by the convention of activities of the administration; financial accountability of officers; annual election of officers; a rank and file executive board to review administrators' actions; district councils; autonomy of locals; due process provided the member in case of disciplinary action; adequate safeguards to prevent the creation of a vested political machine or the throttling of opposition.

These rights and protections guaranteed OCAW members are more extensive than any proposed by legislation now pending in Congress. Nor are they "paper" rights embedded in the union constitution and disregarded. "Worker control" is not a fiction; 40 years of annual convention proceedings tell the story of zealously guarded rights constantly reaffirmed and enforced.

Straining a Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, there is a problem today in the realm of our foreign affairs which has not received sufficient attention in this country. The Philippines were once our territory and are now our ally in the Far East. An article by a worthy and distinguished columnist has appeared in the July 8 edition of the New York Journal American, which speaks for itself. I include the article which follows:

[From the New York Journal American, July 8, 1959]

STRAINING A FRIENDSHIP

(By Bob Considine)

Our relations are worsening with the Philippines, the only democracy and only Christian country in the Asiatic world, and the most loyal of our allies in World War II. If permitted to deteriorate much more, we will have lost not only a bulwark but, more importantly, a trusting friend in a part of the world now in the throes of a vast reaction against the Caucasian and his notions.

The little brown brother is browned off at us. He is hurt. For four centuries under the Spanish and for half a century under us he lived off the fulfilled pledges and promises of the Great White Father. Now, prodded by a sense of independence, a hunger for what he considers just compensation, and the militant nationalistic voice of Senator Claro Recto, the most articulate of the anti-American voices, the Filipino is asking questions which the U.S. Congress seems in no mood to answer.

He feels that we owe him about $800 million and that it isn't accurate for us to complain that we've helped the islands with a couple of billions since independence. Double bookkeeping rears its head, he feels. But more than money is involved. There's a question of sovereignty and pride. The constitution we provided for the Philippine nation requires its Government to give Americans in the islands full and equal rights with Philippine citizens.

Foreign Minister Felix Berto Serrano and U.S. Ambassador Chip Bohlen are engaged in these delicate questions: Is an American soldier on or off duty when he commits a crime in the Philippines? How can a Filipino sue an offending American who has returned to the States? Why does the United States find it easier to pack its bad ones home rather than let them face Philippine justice? The Serrano-Bohlen talks have not always been cordial.

The fiscal rap against the United States boils down to this, earnest and worried Filipino friends tell me:

When General MacArthur made good his historic pledge to return, he approved Executive Order 22, signed by President Quezon, guaranteeing Filipino servicemen pay equal to that of American troops and officers. Secretary of War Stimson asked MacArthur to try to rescind the order. The General refused. Then Washington wouldn't back up MacArthur's revered "chop," or imprimatur, and the battered Philippine Government had to shell out about $350 million to make good the promise of the Great White Father. It wants it back because MacArthur signed as supreme commander of its forces.

Years earlier, a special broadcast by President Roosevelt to the beleaguered Filipino Freedom Fighters had said, "Everything will be restored, down to the lowest nipa hut." It was a rallying cry which succeeded in strengthening the resolve of the Philippine people to resist the Japanese invader.

In time, Congress authorized sums covering 75 percent of the value of property destroyed in battles between Japanese and Filipino guerillas, in U.S. air raids against Japanese-held strong points in the islands, and finally in United States and Filipino battles against Japanese positions. But prices had risen, and the appropriated money covered only 52.5 percent of the placement cost. There followed a promise to make up the difference, and many Filipinos borrowed money to rebuild against the day when Washington would come through. Washington didn't.

Before the war, we exempted the Philippines from processing taxes on the sugar

they sent to us. Since then we've been collecting such taxes, even though, by treaty, we said we'd never.

The Philippines hope to expand industrially, rid themselves of the cross of an economy anchored to the whims of sugar and copra. The Import-Export Bank, with the job of seeing that would-be debtors present only punctureproof applications and pay up as soon as possible, has turned down a steel mill deal which an American company wanted to put into the Philippines. The West Germans and the Japanese—of all people—now offer more liberal terms.

The Russians, naturally, are interested in the Philippines, too. So far they haven't gotten to first base. But they are very patient.

Government by Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, the controversy which has arisen between Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and leftwing members of the Democratic Party on the one hand, and the Democratic leadership of the House and the Senate on the other, is of vital concern to all citizens because it bears upon the direction of national legislative policies.

Mr. Butler et al. would seem to want to write a political record by passing so-called liberal legislation and confronting the President with the responsibility of killing the legislation because of its excesses even though the administration favors some action in the field though it may be lesser in amount or different in its provisions. The majority leadership of the Congress, however, seems to take the position that some legislative progress is more important than simply writing a political record and has sought to shape legislation so as to be veto proof.

Mr. Speaker, this subject has been discussed in a very thoughtful way in an editorial appearing in the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of July 11, 1959, entitled "Government by Veto," which I incorporate at this point in my remarks.

GOVERNMENT BY VETO

The American form of government, with its checks and balances, and the two-party political system has produced some strange situations through the years.

One which may be unique has developed in what is becoming generally known as government by veto.

The right to reject legislation has been used by all Presidents to get what they want. But the present situation, in which the President is using his veto power to hew straight down a fixed policy line and leaders of the opposing party, with its topheavy majority in Congress, frankly admit they don't have the votes to override, is, we believe, unprecedented.

It is largely the product of a peculiar political development which finds a popular Republican President faced with a Congress in which the majority of the Members wear a Democratic label.

The President, in the political vernacular, is a "lame duck." But, contrary to the popular myth, he is asserting powerful leadership and is using his veto pen, as he said in a recent press conference, to "get legislation passed which will benefit the United States and keep us solvent at the same time."

The Democrats in Congress are led by men who are practical politicians and experienced lawmakers. They know there is no point in bucking a stone wall. They compromise, when necessary, to get important legislation past the President and invite vetoes, for the record, when they believe it is politically advantageous.

By so doing, however, the Democratic leadership is incurring the wrath of the more liberal elements of the party—who also condemn the President.

All of which leads to another facet of the American political system which accounts for the existence of the current "government by veto."

What the liberals do not care to recognize is the true complexion of the legislative branch of the Government which, in turn, reflects the views of the people.

Despite the heavy Democratic majorities in both Houses of Congress, the legislative branch of the Government still is predominantly "middle-of-the-road," or even mildly conservative, rather than representing the views of the extremely vocal northern "liberal" wing of the party. And that is nothing new.

To put it another way, government now is by veto and coalition with the moderates and the conservatives of both parties making up the majority which acts in concert on most issues.

This condition accounts for the fact that President Eisenhower never has had a veto overridden and why the practical Democrats admit they cannot muster the votes to upset him.

It is the true nature of Congress, as gaged by the general leanings of individual members rather than the party labels they wear, which gives President Eisenhower his victories and reduces the cries of the liberals to the complaints of a minority.

Professor Raps Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star, July 13, 1959, edition, carried an AP story headlined from Milwaukee, telling of the severe criticisms of Prof. Fred E. Inbau of Northwestern University regarding decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, the article reading as follows:

PROFESSOR RAPS SUPREME COURT

MILWAUKEE, July 13.—A Northwestern University law professor asserted today the Supreme Court of the United States has imposed "artificial, impractical, and unnecessary restrictions" on questioning of suspected criminals by police.

Addressing the opening session of the National Sheriffs Association, Prof. Fred E. Inbau said that in attempting to protect the public interest, the High Court has been "instead protecting the criminals."

Law enforcement officers, he said, cannot protect society while complying with all the requirements of the Supreme Court. "The Court is turning guilty people loose in order to discipline the police," he said.

Mr. Speaker, I have personally known Professor Inbau since 1937 when it was my good fortune to take a special course on scientific crime detection at Northwestern University sponsored by Professor Inbau. Professor Inbau is perhaps the leading authority in the field of criminal law and the law of evidence. Professor Inbau had the rare privilege of being associated with Dr. Wigmore, that outstanding authority on the law of evidence and who was undoubtedly the leading authority of his day.

Professor Inbau has as rich a background and as much experience in the fields of criminal law and the law of evidence as any man in the United States, and certainly his opinions are entitled to great weight. Further, any fairminded person is bound to realize that Professor Inbau made these criticisms solely for the reason that he felt compelled to speak up against Supreme Court decisions which are contrary to the law and which are against the public interest and heavily in favor of the criminal. The Congress of the United States can well consider the opinions of Professor Inbau.

Address by Herb Plambeck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 29, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I hereby include an address delivered by Herb Plambeck, WHO radio farm director, over that radio station on Friday, June 26, 1959, on the subject of subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, I know Herb Plambeck. I know that when he speaks he speaks with sincerity and with purpose. In reading this address every Member of the Congress will be impressed with the reasoning, the sincerity and the logic of Mr. Plambeck's presentation. I feel that this is a masterpiece of simplicity in telling a story which needs to be told everywhere in America.

(By Herb Plambeck—WHO radio farm director)

Good morning, friends. This is the last time you will hear me on these morning Farm Highlights. Because according to present plans, this is my final program with you at this hour, I'd like to make it one to remember.

My topic this morning is easily the toughest of the many from which I might have chosen. Before we deal with it, let me say I leave this broadcast hour with much reluctance. You listeners have been exceedingly kind. Our sponsor has been more considerate. The station has been eminently patient. However, a realinement of some programs here, physical limitations, working hours, along with economics are factors in this change, in which WHO, the sponsor and I are all agreed. Moreover, the change will give my able, and young, associates—my boys—a golden opportunity * * * and one I am sure our listeners will appreciate.

Ordinarily, on a concluding broadcast of 12 or 15 years standing, the temptation is to reminisce. You can be sure the temptation applies this morning. Similarly, I would love to have stressed some favorite projects—soil and water conservation, work of good neighbors, June Dairy Month, 4–H and FFA programs, and a camp for Iowa's crippled children. All of these things would be enjoyable and easy to report compared to what I feel impelled to discuss—a question every American seems to be asking and every farmer must face.

I speak, of course, of the subsidy question—and I speak as an individual. In other words, I am absolving station WHO and our sponsors of any blame. Whatever the consequences, this matter must be dealt with. We are fast reaching the point where the misunderstanding between farm and city people will seriously injure both—and both groups have much to lose.

This topic is not new. You have heard references to it time and again on this and other WHO programs and in many other ways. The impact of it, however, is rapidly becoming greater and more dangerous. This was indelibly impressed on many of us the past few weeks when Life magazine, the Reader's Digest and other widely read publications have gone allout headlining what they describe as "the incredible farm scandal"—implying, in effect, that every rural resident is a parasite and a thief. It came forcibly to my attention at national meetings in the south and east last week. When I walked into a New York hotel, I was quickly advised that NBC wanted someone from the farm side to deal with this penetrating question. It was not an easy assignment. Since then there have been many more hours spent on this matter, talking it over with farmers, long distance calls, studying, researching bulletins, and reading letters from listeners.

Two things must be said before I go further. One is that I am not so conceited or misled as to feel I can, in a few minutes time, answer all the questions posed by those keenly intelligent writers, broadcasters, and other accusers, who have tremendously powerful forces on their side. Yet, I feel emphatically that even a few feeble voices, such as yours and mine, must be raised or else we are, in effect pleading guilty.

Secondly, for the record, I do not personally want, nor have I ever accepted, farm or other subsidies. In my own small farm operation, I accept no Government aids directly. Yet, I readily admit indirectly I have been affected, and so have you my friends, perhaps in more ways than you realize. And the time may come, if marketplace values drop still further, where some form of Government help will be necessary to save even those of us who are not now accepting any.

Most of us concerned with this program are interested in the family farm. To lose it could mean disaster, not only to farming as we know it but equally so to many segments of our great and thriving American economy as well.

Subsidies are one part of big government. Anyone who has seen total big government in action, as I have in Russia and Siberia, is gravely fearful of it. We pray this will never happen here. Yet there is no denying price supports and other Government aids have become an integral part of our economy here in this bastion of freedom. However, the big publications, numerous broadcasters, some chamber of commerce leaders, many key Government officials, some farm spokesmen, and others seem determined to make the American public believe subsidies go only to agriculture. This we bitterly resent. They would have America and the world believe farmers alone accept Government help. Nothing could be further from the truth. Nothing could be more unfair. Let me state a few facts, as I have them, and as I believe them to be true.

First, subsidies, to which Life magazine and a lot of the rest of us take strong dislike, are not limited to farm price support payments. Tariffs, as enacted by our first Congress back in 1789 to protect and promote business, are subsidies * * * designed to help protect American business. Special postal rates for magazines are subsidies * * * and this Nation's publishing industry has attained at least a part of its wealth and stature because magazine publishers seem quite willing to accept this subsidy. Cost plus is a subsidy; and when war materials were needed, no one in his right mind would have stopped the wheels to provide our troops with what they had to have. Depletion allowances on oil and mining industry taxes are gigantic subsidies, but we never hear about this. As I tried to point out in the broadcast from New York, farm people resent being singled out, of being accused of being alone in taking Government handouts. Rarely do we hear about the part Government plays in other facets of our economy.

I don't recall Life, in its scathing denunciation of agriculture, saying much about the $9 million or more it has received in a single year in the way of the postal rates subsidy. Nor does Reader's Digest say much about the $5 million it has accepted. Seldom is something written about the $38 million in annual subsidies estimated for just 14 or our major magazines, to say nothing of the hundreds of others.

I am not saying this is wrong. I like to read America's fine magazines as well as anyone else. I am glad millions of Americans can afford them. I know about the value of advertising, and how magazines and newspaper pages, along with radio and TV messages, help Mr. and Mrs. America to a higher standard of living. I recognize the educational value of all the publications. I write for some fine newspapers, myself. Certainly I do not want to change all this.

But, speaking as an individual, it seems to me that if the magazines are going to condemn agriculture, as criminals, for accepting Government help, then the publishers who condemn us ought to have the decency to admit to the same crime.

Similarly, the businessman who condemns farm price supports is not in the best position to do so. Business reconversion payments, which is still another subsidy, over the past 20 years or so, have totaled $43 billion or more. The oil people and mining people alone have gotten $23 billion.

Railroad presidents, airlines officials, families accepting housing or other help, military leaders, politicians, laborers, person after person who points to farm price supports as being shameful has every right to do so, provided he or she is equally willing to point the same finger at himself or herself for having not only similarly accepted Government help, but for having accepted 10 times as much in total as that which has gone to agriculture. The figures I have quoted are not mine. I have taken them from a U.S. Government bulletin, entitled "Government Subsidy Historical Review," printed in 1958.

I know two wrongs do not make a right, and that this sounds like the pot calling the kettle black; but I feel people who live in glass houses, even if they are on Times Square, have no right to criticize agriculture and to make whipping boys out of farm people, when they themselves are also accepting Government help, provided by you and me—the taxpayer.

There is much more to be said. I haven't even touched on some other unfair accusations, such as charging school lunch programs, foreign aid programs and much else against agriculture, when it really should be charged, at least in part, to the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, the State Department, etc.

And there's been no time to mention the subsidy to the American consumer, by way of cheap food agriculture is providing on the marketplace. Capper's Farmer estimated this to be $70 billion. No housewife seems to want to change that * * * even if Government subsidies have helped guarantee the overabundance and the staggering surpluses that make America the best and most economically fed nation on earth.

Nor have I touched on the endless ramifications of a prosperous agriculture and what it means to feed manufacturers, food processors, machinery and automakers, business, labor unions, and to the retailer, wholesaler, truckdriver, store clerk, butchers, bakers, candlestick makers, and the millions of others who benefit from a farming populace that has money to spend.

For me to quote the benefits all America gets from a prosperous, subsidized agriculture might give the impression I favor subsidies. As emphasized before, I personally dislike Government help. Like most everyone else, I treasure the freedom that has made America great. In no way do I favor trading liberty for subsidy. But let's be fair about it. If it's wrong for agriculture to have accepted $5 to $10 billion in subsidies over the past 25 years, isn't it equally wrong for the rest of the economy to have taken $50 billion or more in that same period?

As for you, and everyone else in America, you must make your own decision. It is not my place or purpose to condone or condemn Government aid, but as one U.S. citizen, identified with an industry I believe to be basic, namely, agriculture, I ask by all that's fair and right and decent that our accusers tell the whole truth * * * a truth that might hurt because the fact is, of all the Government help that has been accepted the last 25 years, agriculture has received only a small part of the total. Let's tell the whole story * * * fully and honestly, in the tradition that has made America—your land and mine—so great and so wonderful.

Sneaky Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Bulletin on July 4, 1959, published an editorial which I think is a very good exposition of the rate ceiling problem. It follows:

SNEAKY INFLATION

Nobody is for inflation so long as it's called by its right name.

But let it be called expansion of the economy. Or hold down the interest rates. Or no bonus for bankers. Then it's a different story.

A great many people will enthusiastically back any of these appeals, happily unaware that they are helping to bring about the very thing they dread.

This, as Joseph A. Livingston, financial editor of the Bulletin, has repeatedly pointed out, is the grave danger lying at the heart of the battle of the interest rate now being waged in Congress. Flying the banner, "Keep Interest Low," the inflationists are in a strategic position to make political hay by embarrassing the administration, and at the same time set the Nation on the path of an inflation from which there would be no turning back.

The cold fact is that the Treasury faces a crisis. It can't sell long-term bonds to ordinary savers or investors at the interest rates now fixed by law.

Why? Because industry, States and municipalities are all competing for the available funds at higher interest rates.

Secretary of the Treasury Anderson has asked Congress to let him meet the competion by offering an interest rate at which the Treasury can sell its bonds. The more responsible Democratic leaders have renounced the opportunity to embarrass the administration, and have offered a compromise (which was accepted) to give the President the onus of raising rates. But even this is opposed by those who want inflation under the name of expanding the economy.

They would keep the present ceiling on interest rates, knowing that this would eventually compel a resort to the watering of the currency through the unloading of U.S. securities directly onto the Federal Reserve banks.

This is inflation—and if it is permitted to come about the ordinary citizen, unacquainted with the machinery of finance, will never know what hit him.

High Taxes and Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a letter sent to me anonymously from a citizen of my State of Michigan. I am bringing it to the attention of the House in order that the writer's views may be available to Members of this body:

DEAR MR. BENTLEY: I am addressing you in this manner because I feel you are one of the few men in Washington who really have the interest of Michigan, our country as a whole, and last, but not least, the interest of the middle-class, poorly paid, middle-aged, common American citizen at heart. For sometime now you have sent questionnaires to our home and generally my son will reply to them. We have conducted a private poll among many, many acquaintances, neighbors, and friends, and, as a rule, the feeling is one of complete futility. For the average low-income person it is the endless struggle to pay the tax collectors, both city, State, and National. You struggle all your life to get a little humble home, and then you can hardly keep it and your head above water trying to pay—the word which is becoming one of the most hated in the American or English language—"taxes."

I challenge anyone to pick up a daily paper and not find some article in it relating the incident of some absurd spending in Washington, "Senate buildings, carpeting, drapes, air conditioning," to make it more luxurious for those who are supposed to be public servants and representatives of the American citizen. These items mentioned above are but pennies in comparison to the millions and billions spent foolishly abroad, all over the world, to enrich and nourish the grafters there so that they will have more vitality and strength to stab us in the back at the first opportune moment.

It seems that if our public officials, both city, State, and those in Washington sent there by the different groups of people back home because they solicited the job and promised to work for the interest of their fellow men, were truly honest, the vast majority would have to confess that their first interest and thoughts were how best they could feather their own nests, with feathers not rightfully theirs; and, as we have just noticed in Lansing, if they cannot agree any place on anything, there is one question they resolve unanimously, that they should have an immediate increase in their salaries, and this continues forever.

What is going to happen in a few years in a few more years, when the few that are now still struggling to be honest, pay for homes, taxes, exhorbitant medical fees, realize it is just no use, where is the tax money coming from? I personally know many who have been compelled to drop all kinds of insurance, hospital, life, etc., because they could not buy food, clothing and keep a roof over their head, if they retained the items mentioned above. So they live in fear of becoming ill and requiring hospitalization, and if they need to seek medical assistance they delay doing so because of the exhorbitant costs. But those right in the same city that have come in from the South in the last few years will in some manner get into homes and then proceed to get our welfare assistance for themselves, and will also bring in a string of relatives from the South and immediately they proceed to get assistance for them. It is a known and most deplorable fact that many women have as many illegitimates as possible, thereby increasing their monthly income for aid to children. Why is this allowed to go on from year to year? Detroit and many other big cities and yes the smaller ones too, tolerated this thing for 30 or 40 years. But if a person who has been paying taxes for 50 years, needed help, it is a different story.

I am enclosing an article clipped from a daily paper in Michigan, the author of which I have known for many years, and he is an honest and respected person. It relates I think what many honest Americans know. The largest benefactors of subsidies are millionaire groups in the agricultural area.

I think the greatest and most beneficial act you could perform in Washington would be to inform your colleagues just how disgruntled and unhappy the vast American people of integrity are, with their greedy political and many times stupid public servants. Public servants in name only. This last winter articles appearing in our daily papers proved just how quickly these men elected to public office proceed to employ all their relatives, rent their front porches, garages and attics to the U.S. Government. Put their student sons on the payrolls at salaries that many intelligent, middle-aged people, could only dream of receiving, after years of training in a chosen field. If those elected to public office in Washington don't soon turn the tide, I am afraid that before another decade passes, the glorious America that was, will become what history has told us about many other countries that were rotten and corrupt to the core. Those of ambition and integrity would like to seek a haven somewhere away from the welfare chiselers, such as our friend that took asylum in Australia, an example of a hard-working true American.

Many years ago a handful of brave people in a new country, besought with hardship and trials had the courage to rebel against powerful oppressors and tax collectors and their British war lords were finally routed. Where are our Washingtons, Jeffersons, and Franklins today? Because I feel you must be somewhere a descendant of some of them I am writing you today. Maybe you can influence your Washington associates to wake up before it is too late, and rescue the sinking ship of true American democracy. You might mention to them that one of the most unjust acts ever enforced on the American people is our present "robbing income tax." It is too bad also that a man like T. Coleman Andrews, a former Internal Revenue man could not have been elected into some office where he could do the American people some good. At the time he was running supposedly for President, in our little town we stood in line and tried to vote for him, but found out that we couldn't for some reason or other.

I have never written to a public official before, because I felt it was just wasted time. However, I believe (I hope I am right) that you may be one that is really working for the interest of the common, middle-aged, overburdened American mother and father.

A DISGUSTED MICHIGAN TAXPAYER
(One of many millions).

WANT ECONOMY

EDITOR THE NEWS: Our country is spending itself bankrupt. Inflation is pauperizing millions of people with fixed incomes and pensions.

The rest of the world is looking questioningly at the soundness of the dollar and our international credit. Our national fiscal policies are unsound and bid fair to get worse.

Great segments of our business, agricultural and cooperative enterprises are being supported by subsidies or tax exemptions. The necessary taxes to support this program are paid by the rest of us.

The outstanding and most flagrant example of this socialistic program is the agricultural subsidy, which costs over $7 billion per year.

Every employed person in the country pays over $120 per year in taxes to pay for it, plus higher prices for the agricultural prowork each month. A total of 6,000 dealers and 240,000 employees are looking for work. That too, is bad, but it is part of the chance you take in this business. In addition, 500,000 employees in automotive production are out of work.

We do not want subsidies and we do want to pay our share of taxes for every necessary governmental expense, including defense, no matter how costly, but we do not want to pay for subsidizing farmers, oil people and tax free co-ops and many others, and especially we do object to do-gooding projects all over the world and at home run by wastrel bureaucrats.

We want our Government to economize; stop spending money like it was going out of style and live within our national income, just like we as individuals must do. If necessary, for a year, in order to get solvent, we should be willing to pay higher taxes.

President Rebuffs Spenders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial, entitled "President Rebuffs Spenders," which appeared in the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic of July 9, 1959:

PRESIDENT REBUFFS SPENDERS

President Eisenhower repulsed a major budget-busting effort of the Democratic spenders in Congress by vetoing an omnibus housing bill which would have put the public housing program into high gear and opened wider the floodgates of inflation. In his veto action, the President demonstrated

clearly that the Democratic-controlled Congress will have to fit its spending proposals more closely to the administration pattern if it wants to get them through the White House.

The strongly worded veto message President Eisenhower sent to Congress amounted to a summary of his economic goals—restraint in spending to avoid inflationary budget deficits, reliance on private capital wherever possible, and putting Government interest payments in line with what it has to pay currently on money it borrows. He called upon Congress to write a less costly measure, along the lines of his recommendations last January.

The President said spending authorizations provided for in the bill totaled $2.2 billion as against his budget recommendation of $810 million. Sponsors of the catchall bill said it would cost $1.3 billion, but Republican estimates of eventual cost ran to more than $5 billion.

Provisions of the measure attacked by the President in his veto message were an outlay of $900 million over 2 years for urban renewal; authorization of 190,000 new public housing units, while 100,000 units previously authorized remain unconstructed; and direct Federal loans for housing for the aged when this need might be met by Federal insurance or private capital.

Most controversial feature of the measure is the public housing construction program. President Eisenhower asked for no new public housing, contending there is no need for further low-rent housing. The President's stand on public housing cannot be effectively challenged. The Government should be moving entirely out of the housing field.

The President proposed a 6-year urban renewal program costing a total of $1.4 billion.

The Democratic measure would have meant more Government debt, more inflation, and more socialism. Housing starts, without a Federal program, are expected to set new records this year.

It is unlikely that the spenders will be able to override the veto. There is no justification for pump priming.

The Trinity River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing, in great numbers, from our constituents who want extravagant spending stopped and who are concerned about inflation. Expenditures are inflationary when the funds are not in the Treasury, necessitating borrowing by the Government or the issuance of more money. Unfortunately, the big spending faction does not appear too concerned as to the source of the money or the state of the budget.

With the yearly interest alone on the national debt now up to $8.5 billion, seeking every means of cutting Federal expenditures should be paramount in our minds. On July 24, hearings will be commenced by the House Interior Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation concerning the joint development of the authorized Trinity River project in California. This project presents a splendid opportunity for us to save right now $60 million in Federal expenditures, for the private utility would build the power facilities itself, and at its own expense. As the Petaluma Argus Courier editorialized recently—

The Eisenhower administration long has taken the sensible attitude that it is foolish to spend taxpayers' money on such projects when private industry can do the job and do it at an actual profit for the Government. Under the partnership plan the taxpayers would be the beneficiaries by many millions of dollars in costs saved and taxes and fees paid by the utility.

This editorial then asks provocatively whether "Congressmen really think that many of their constituents would vote—if they had the opportunity—to pay higher taxes for the privilege of building with public funds a facility that private enterprise is willing and able to pay for?"

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the answer to the above question is an unqualified "No." And, as pointed out by the Mojave Desert News—California—this is "a measure that would have the Federal Government an immediate $60 million in construction costs, would channel $175 million into the Central Valley project, and would provide $145 million in Federal, State, and local taxes, over a 50-year period. If the public ownership zealots persist in their opposition now, they must do so with their true socialistic faces bared to the taxpaying public. It is to be hoped—and ardently—that Congress at last will be guided by the taxpayer's welfare and get things moving on the Trinity."

As above related, we have here the chance to cut out at once $60 million in expenditures, and to put into the Treasury, via falling-water payments and Federal taxes, about $258 million. This sum will inure to the benefit of every taxpayer in the Nation. We simply cannot afford to pass up this offer as contained in the pending Trinity River project bills.

The U.S. Economy and International Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have believed that both our Federal Government and the American business community have failed to use as effectively as possible our most potent weapon in the cold war to combat the totalitarian political and economic movement, namely, the demonstration of the superiority of our free enterprise economic system and our political system of freedom and individual dignity.

Effective advocacy and actual demonstration of the advantages of our free economic and political system through the investment of private capital in economic undertakings in friendly foreign countries is the means in my judgment whereby we can best promote economic and political stability in friendly foreign countries, enabling them to resist Communist military aggression and subversive infiltration.

I have repeatedly expressed these views and suggested methods whereby this valuable weapon in the cold war could be used more effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to attend a luncheon held June 30, 1959, by the International Economic Policy Association, an organization designed to mobilize the potential of the American business community in promoting the free enterprise system through the investment of private capital overseas.

I was very much impressed by the clarity and cogency of the remarks made by the president of the International Economic Policy Association, Dr. N. R. Danielian, and I believe they merit the consideration of not only the Members of Congress and the American business community, but also the American people generally. For that reason, I incorporate Dr. Danielian's speech at this point in the RECORD.

OPENING REMARKS BY DR. N. R. DANIELIAN, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY ASSOCIATION, NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE U.S. ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, JUNE 30, 1959, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The first national conference on the U.S. Economy and International Relations is hereby declared open. As president of the International Economic Policy Association, it is my pleasure to welcome you to this conference, which I hope will be the first in a series, to explore realistically and practically the problems confronting the United States and its allies in their struggle for survival as free and independent nations in a world of turmoil and conflict.

The International Economic Policy Association was organized 2 years ago by a group of citizens interested in the economic phases of our international policy in the conviction and hope that military deterrence will succeed in preventing total war and total destruction, and that the peaceful means of spiritual, intellectual and economic persuasion will determine the direction of political and economic society.

From the vantage point of probable coexistence, the struggle in the world resolves itself into a choice of institutions to achieve economic progress with political independence and, as a long-range aspiration, individual freedom.

In the stream of history, our form of civilization, based upon the ownership of private property, the protection of individual rights, and the selection of the Government by franchise, is a comparatively recent phenomenon. In contrast, absolutism has existed for centuries in one form or another, whether it is called the divine right of kings or the dictatorship of the proletariat. This system of ours is not only new, but it is also a minority position in the world, minority in terms of the geographical areas it covers as well as the number of people who live under it.

This system is under attack everywhere. The worldwide struggle in fact is a conflict between institutions—those of private property and personal freedom on the one side, and State ownership of the means of production and State control and discipline of people and their destinies, on the other.

All of you here have been conscious of this struggle and in one way or another have been involved, both here and abroad, in some aspect of this worldwide conflict. This conflict has military, economic and political aspects. The interrelationships of the various programs is not always clear as they are most complex. They include the national

budget, domestic tax rates, depreciation policies, price levels, the military aspects of mutual security, the economic aspect of Government aid, the private investment programs, the tax treatment of private investments abroad, the necessary guarantees to achieve confidence, the policies of other countries for the most effective utilization of both Government and private resources, the threat of dumping as a political weapon.

It is the purpose of this conference to explore these interrelationships and to clarify, if possible, not as a common position, but merely as an educational objective, the specific and coordinated action that needs to be taken in order to achieve the overall objective.

Having studied these problems over the past several years, the officers and directors of the association have adopted a number of specific program objectives. I shall merely touch upon a number of these to indicate the direction in which we propose to act.

We favor the mutual security program, with the proviso, however, that greater emphasis be placed upon the use and encouragement of private contracting, private consulting, private manufacturing enterprises, both here and abroad. We recommend the channelization of more of our lending resources through private institutions so that private ownership of property will become more widely spread.

We favor the extension of foreign investment guaranties to cover civil strife, rebellion, and insurrection.

We favor tax incentives to private enterprise to encourage them to undertake greater risks and be prepared to take a larger share in the worldwide quest for economic development.

We favor the use of local currencies under Public Law 480 for educational purposes as well as for encouragement of private ownership and private enterprise abroad through appropriate financial institutions.

We favor the employment of private organizations in the utilization of U.S. agricultural surpluses abroad over and above the existing commercial markets, including the use of private organizations in the expansion of handling, storage, and distribution facilities.

Each one of these programs requires translation into specific action. This is the area in which we hope to make a distinctive contribution.

Partial solution will not meet the present-day challenge. It is not enough, though desirable, to have tax incentives without guaranties against the uncertainties of military and political upheaval. It is not enough to have such guaranties if at any time host-country governments, with our help, may invest public funds in competitive government plants. It is not even enough to encourage private investment in one country and then use tax money to develop competitive government-owned plants in another, to earn foreign exchange by exports, and then destroy the chances of success of private investment in competing markets.

We hope, therefore, that those interested in tax incentives will also concern themselves with guaranties, with mutual security programs and their administration, with the agricultural disposal program and the use made of the local funds received therefrom, with the educational programs which are necessary to develop a new generation of entrepreneurs abroad, who in the long run, as leaders in their countries, will write the rules of business conduct.

It is easy to fail to see the forest for the trees. It is our hope that we shall keep the forest in view while we tend to the trees; and that you will join us in this effort—for the stakes are high—perhaps the very survival of our form of society.

SPEECH OF DR. N. R. DANIELIAN AT THE LUNCHEON IN HONOR OF THE CHIEFS OF DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to emphasize to this knowledgeable and sophisticated audience that the economic problems of the Western World are interdependent and they are, in large part, also affected by the fiscal, the monetary, and economic policies and programs of the United States and other allied nations. In solving the current problems, it is the difficult obligation of informed opinion and the duty of governmental leaders to confront these problems realistically. As your program indicates, we have attempted to touch upon the main segments of these problems; namely, the fiscal position and the limitations of the U.S. budget, the aims and objectives of developmental programs, the methods of utilizing governmental resources to advance these projects, and ways and means of utilizing the large reservoir of private capital and know-how in the pursuit of economic progress.

Perhaps just as important as the availability of resources is the definition of end objectives in the programs now under discussion. It is true, that all nations, regardless of form of government, desire, and each in its own way, strives for economic progress. To achieve this progress, there must be encouragement to capital formation, which is the process of saving a part of the gross national product of each country for reinvestment in productive equipment.

Assuming a condition of coexistence in the world and assuming also that all nations desire to encourage this process of capital formation and economic progress, then the principal issue in the world becomes the means whereby this is achieved. Here the world confronts a choice.

On the one hand, there are the proposals that this can best be achieved through State enterprise with complete discipline and subjugation of people to the programs of the State, which becomes the sole employer from farm to factory. On the other hand, there are those who believe, deeply and sincerely, that the process of economic progress and capital formation can best be attained under conditions of private ownership of property and by unleashing the creative initiative of people in the pursuit of their own happiness through their own labors.

This is a society of private ownership, which carries with it a series of free choices—freedom of choice in one's education; freedom of choice in one's employment; freedom of choice in where he lives or travels; freedom of choice in how he spends his earnings, in what he buys in the marketplace; freedom of choice in what he believes and worships; freedom of speech and assembly; and as a consequence of this freedom, the right to choose his Government by franchise.

There are these two choices before the world, and many countries are in the process of selecting one or the other or a compromise between the two.

We would not be true to our traditions and our beliefs if we did not attempt to demonstrate and actively pursue policies and programs which we believe not only promise economic progress, but, in the long run, more closely respond to the intellectual and spiritual needs of the human race, for in addition to economic progress and security, the system we believe in will also contribute to the intellectual and spiritual freedom to which every man aspires after his physical needs are met.

Power Facilities on California's Trinity River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the House Interior Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation has scheduled hearings for next week on the joint development proposal to build privately the power facilities on California's Trinity River. I recently noticed a well-written editorial in the San Bernardino (Calif.) Daily Sun on this subject. Among the views expressed indicating constructive thought from the taxpayers' standpoint were, "None of that power—or any other public power—is apt to be brought to San Bernardino County. Therefore the taxpayers of this county are among the many millions in the United States who are tired of putting up the money to subsidize users of electric power in a few favorite localities."

The article notes that, "The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has offered the Federal Government $4½ million a year for the falling water rights on the Trinity project. It would build the $60 million power facilities; it would pay the ordinary and normal Federal, State, and local taxes that a Government-owned project would not pay. This kind of money and savings are needed to help finance the California water plan that is to start with the Feather River project."

The editor concludes with the statement:

Representatives of sections which have no public power and probably never will, vote for huge Government subsidies that provide cheaper power in competitive regions. This is still a country of free enterprise. If regions want more power, let them encourage investors to develop it, just like all the rest of the country has done. If they want to vote their own bonds to go into the power business, let them proceed to do so. But it is high time the taxpayers who are to get no benefit from the development of such power tell their representatives in Congress to halt subsidies financed by all the people.

In opposing the construction of the Trinity powerplants by the Federal Government, the Los Angeles Times editorialized:

Considering that the Trinity River project would cost the Federal Government an estimated $225 million, without the P. G. & E. building the power installations, it would seem the Federal taxpayers—and the people of California are heavy Federal taxpayers—should be spared the additional cost.

After mentioning that:

The proposed contract will require the assent of Congress and no doubt will be fought by the fanatics of so-called public power development.

The Times sums up with:

The figures submitted by the Secretary, and the use of plain commonsense, would seem to indicate that private development is best for the interests of everybody.

In commenting on the pending Trinity joint development legislation, the Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press Democrat has reiterated that, "Particularly at a time when Uncle Sam is spending more than he takes in and urgently needs funds for everything from national defense to water development in California, the proposal makes sense." The editor points out that, "The proposed legislation provides a method to start installing generators now. And it also provides that Uncle Sam can take over the works anytime it gives 2-year notice that it wants to do so. This fair compromise probably will not satisfy the professional political semi-socialists nor the powerful Sacramento industrial area which will get power below what it costs the taxpayers if Trinity power is developed as a Federal enterprise. We doubt if it satisfies P.G. & E. either, since the compromise involves making a $60 million investment that the Government can end at any time. But the utility company has enough faith in the common sense of the arrangement to accept it. Here's hoping as much sense is shown by a majority of the Congress."

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the above quotations from Northern and Southern California newspapers indicate and represent the views of the great majority of the citizenry of the State. I am confident that the majority of the Nation's taxpayers would welcome and endorse the bills providing for Trinity joint development, as have irrigation districts, farmer groups, labor and business, for instead of subsidizing someone else, they would very much prefer to see $320 million enter the Treasury, not depart.

Falling In Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on July 7, 1959:

FALLING IN STEP

The change in sentiment on the part of the Democratic leadership in this, the 1st session of the 86th Congress, rates high among the more striking political phenomena in Washington in recent years.

An important key section of the new Democratic Congress with its overwhelming majority in the legislative branch of the Government came to Washington in January determined to identify the Democratic Party as a party of free spending. In December the President had reached the conclusion that the time had come when it had become imperative to reverse the trend of spending, which, in terms of total outpayments to the public, had reached the staggering total in fiscal 1959 of $94 billion.

For a brief moment the opposition was inclined to dismiss the President's proposal as merely an attempt to find a spectacular and desperate issue. By the time Mr. Eisenhower had completed his blueprint for a balanced budget for 1960 and embodied it in the budget message public sentiment had begun to fall in behind him. Developments tending to give increasing momentum to this included: the early figures on the 1959 budget as it began to take shape, indicating a deficit exceeding that of 1953, when the post-Korean rearmament program reached its crest; the continued rise in the speculative markets and the long drain on American gold stocks which had proceeded without interruption since February 1948. Perhaps the most serious single blow to the philosophy of spending was the fiasco that marked the majority report of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, made public in March of this year. Not only was this majority heavily one-sided but it had unusual prestige attached to it by virtue of the fact that the chairman was Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, highly regarded as an authority on economics on both sides of the Chamber.

Rightly or wrongly, the impression became widespread that this important congressional committee had permitted political considerations to enter into what should have been a purely economic study. At the very time the committee's report was being released official public statistics were demonstrating that economic recovery had reached a degree of momentum at which it was not only highly undesirable to continue pump-priming but that such a policy could have fatal effects in invigorating inflation.

Back to Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial, entitled "Back to Reality," which appeared in the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star of July 10, 1959:

BACK TO REALITY

Somebody asked President Eisenhower at his press conference if he was not fearful that his use of the veto power would result in a negative public image of the Presidency. The President answered rapier-quick:

"I'm not thinking so much of public images as I am of the public good."

In his assertion, there was reproof for that hackneyed image figure of speech. The President is tired of the image business—seeing through a glass darkly—and bids the country get down to reality.

And the biggest reality is the public good.

Emphatically, the President spoke for the public good when he vetoed the housing bill. It is a catchall piece of legislation, loaded to the guards with inflationary items, calling on the taxpayers to ante up $1,375 million or go into the red by that much.

Mr. Eisenhower lashed it unmercifully in his veto message; it is "extravagant, unnecessary, excessive, inflationary, discriminatory, and unfair." Its supporters have no good answer to any single one of those accusing adjectives.

Particularly, the President struck at the urban renewal—that's a fancy name for slum clearance—provisions of the bill. The sum called for is $900 million for a biennium. This is essentially a big city sugar plum; yet the whole economy picks up the check.

He also hit at the provision for 190,000 new public housing units. In the face of the fact that this bracket of Federal activity should be liquidated, and that the public housers already have authorization for 100,000 units still unconstructed, the bill asked for additional hundreds of millions to carry out public housing which nobody seriously wants.

The President sharply attacked another phase of the housing bill—direct Federal loans for housing for the aged. He said he felt private capital and possibly Federal insurance loans should pioneer in this field. A number of church organizations and fraternal societies are exploring the possibility of such housing, but are running into opposition from the elderly themselves. They don't want to be consigned to colony housing.

The veto message said flatly that terms of this inflationary bill would be an obstacle to constructive progress toward better housing for Americans. Instead of stimulating private investments, it would drive private credit from areas where it is urgently needed.

The question now is whether Congress will accept or override a strong and righteous veto; whether it thinks it ought to cram this unwanted legislation down the taxpayers' throats to maintain its legislative prestige, or whether it, too, will discard the image business and look to the public good.

The Role of Industry in International Economic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to the International Economic Policy Association, recently organized, designed to mobilize American industry to play an important role in the combat between free nations and the totalitarian Communist bloc through the investment of private capital in friendly, foreign countries.

I was privileged to attend a luncheon held in June 30, 1959, during the National Conference on the U.S. Economy and International Relations held under the auspicies of the International Economic Policy Association. I was impressed with the principal address delivered at that luncheon by Mr. John J. Powers, Jr., president and chairman of the board of Pfizer International, entitled "The Role of Industry in International Economic Development." I want to call the attention of the House to a passage of Mr. Powers' address quoting from the Mutual Security Act, Public Law 85–141, signed August 14, 1957, concerning the declaration of purposes of the Development Loan Fund as follows:

The Congress accordingly reaffirms that it is the policy of the United States, and declares it to be the purpose of this title, to strengthen friendly foreign countries by encouraging the development of their economies through a competitive free enterprise system; to minimize or eliminate barriers to

the flow of private investment capital and international trade; to facilitate the creation of a climate favorable to the investment of private capital; and to assist, on a basis of self-help and mutual cooperation, the efforts of free peoples to develop their economic resources and to increase their productive capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, the quotation was of special interest to me because it is the text of an amendment I offered to the mutual security bill on July 19, 1957, which was unanimously adopted by the House of Representatives after receiving the approval of both the majority and minority managers of the bill. The proceedings are to be found on pages 12210–12211 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 19, 1957.

Mr. Powers' remarks deserve the consideration of my colleagues in the House as well as the American business community, and I therefore incorporate his address at this point of my remarks.

THE ROLE OF INDUSTRY IN INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(By John J. Powers, Jr., president and chairman of the board, Pfizer International)

Much has been said of the need for greater utilization of private industry in cooperation with Government aid programs to further international economic development. Yet, too often, it seems to me we are moving in the opposite direction. One of the reasons may well be that we have not paused long enough to consider and make clear, even to ourselves, certain fundamental principles. Today, I should like to present one viewpoint about those principles.

First of all, I should make clear that when I speak of Government economic aid I do not include military aid, which is a subject of its own.

For perspective, I think it should be noted that the total of postwar economic aid of this type has not even begun to match the total of investment by private industrialists and private bankers since the end of World War II. In other words, the private sector is still by far the largest source of capital. Nevertheless, few would dispute that postwar economic aid has been an important factor in the reconstruction and vast expansion of the prewar industrial world. And I think it fitting to note that the American taxpayer performed one of the great enlightened jobs of history in helping put his European and Japanese competitors back into the marketplace.

Postwar industrial reconstruction is now behind us, but there is a great new industrial revolution stirring across the world in the so-called newly developing countries, and this has created a new focus of attention with respect to direct, nonmilitary Government aid—the need for it and the meaning of it. This revolution is particularly significant because many of the countries in which it is taking place are the so-called neutralist or undetermined countries in the great ideological conflict between the Communist bloc and the free world. Indeed, it is this which adds that touch of tension that so often tends to distort sober judgment and makes it particularly necessary to stop and examine our basic reasons for providing economic aid to these countries.

Let us recall that America was the first underdelevoped country of modern times to receive foreign aid on a massive scale, in all forms, and over a long period of time. French loans to the struggling colonies, British investments in our mines and railroads, Swedish, Dutch, and Spanish contributions of men and money—the governments and private investors of many lands helped build this country, and did so, incidentally, without destroying our newly won independence.

However, it is not primarily historical precedent but the compelling circumstances of the present which make international economic aid programs a vital necessity. Of these circumstances, the one that throws the longest shadow is the tremendous difference in standards of living throughout the world, the extremes of poverty and misery in many lands of Asia, the Middle East, Africa and in parts of our own hemisphere. It is true that this gap in human living conditions and opportunities has long existed, but in our century, as increasing numbers of men become free, they have—in the clear, clean atmosphere of liberty—seen better than ever before, and finally fully comprehended, their unequal position in relation to the peoples of other countries. It is this realization of inequality which makes of it an unbearable burden, and we of the West, who first made equality the primary standard of democracy, can scarcely fail to understand and sympathize with the deep compulsion now moving these peoples.

Therefore, I firmly believe that America—and all other countries in a position to do so—should join hands in a long-term international economic aid program having as its objective the ultimate closing of the gap in world standards of living, recognizing, however, that it must take generations to complete the task. We should do this not simply from a sense of charity, commendable as is that great virtue, but as a matter of self-interest—for along this path lies the one sure way to peace and order in the world. We must impose only one condition—that in accomplishing this objective we do not lose the very concepts of freedom which now impel us toward it.

The closing of the human gap is, I suggest, the proper basic motive for any broad economic aid program of the future. Aid should not be based on a contest between ourselves and the Communist bloc—some kind of electioneering campaign to see who can pass out the most favors to win the most votes in the newly developing countries. I believe that the motive for action is of fundamental importance—and if this kind of ward-politics viewpoint should ever become the real motive of any country or group of countries—every instinct within me tells me that they are doomed to failure. The great goals of the nations receiving our help assure that their leaders will have too high a sense of values to be swayed by a handout, and indeed that they will resent any but a business like approach, based on mutual interest and respect.

This sense of mutual interest and respect must be the atmosphere in which we all view international development objectives. But I want to emphasize the need for a completely practical approach to this vision of the future, and I mean practical on the part of all concerned. Those countries in which the need for economic aid is greatest did not participate in the first industrial revolution. Most of them have been colonies of greater powers. They have been principally suppliers of raw materials, quite often depending on only one or two commodities. Their histories are in the main a long struggle of attempting to maintain a reasonable foreign exchange balance in the face of their need to import so many of the things they must have. They see greater self-sufficiency as the sure road to security and the maintenance of their independence, and for this reason there has sprung up in these countries a tremendous desire for rapid industrialization. The factory for them has become a symbol of prosperity and security. Industrialization has taken on a sense of tremendous urgency, indeed the dimensions of a national emergency, and the emergency has seemed to justify taking any path toward the accomplishment of the objective.

Under these circumstances of haste and emergency, theses nations are all too frequently building and operating state-owned factories, engaging in state trading, and actually discouraging the private investor, in some strange belief that government can do the job of industrialization better and quicker than private industry. True, they have every right to determine their own course of action, but in the light of the colossal achievements of private industry in the free world, we cannot even begin to comprehend such a direction on their part. Perhaps this is one reason why there is increasing discontent with foreign aid on the part of the American taxpayer.

Here are the realities of the situation as I see it. The resources of these countries are extremely limited. No matter how much aid they receive, it could not possibly be sufficient to do more than start them on the road toward their ultimate goals. From a practical point of view, there is so much to be done that priorities must be established and objectives accomplished gradually, over a considerable period of time. Government resources are insufficient to finance all necessary public works projects, much less to construct factories which can be built and operated by private enterprise. The countries which try to do both spread their resources desperately thin and add to already overwhelming financial burdens. Would it not be infinitely more practical for them to encourage private investment—from within the country or without as may be desirable or necessary. Seek out the people who have already demonstrated their ability to build the great industries of the world and bring them to your countries. Recognize the problems of investing in a newly developing country and through your laws and regulations give those investors the opportunity, indeed, the desire, to build as they have done elsewhere.

What is it that often hinders the use of this obvious approach—the fear of economic imperialism? How can this be taken seriously today? What does it mean? How would a government lose control of a country in this day and age by permitting a series of foreign investments made completely at the discretion of, and under regulations established by, that very government? Furthermore, once the factory is built, even though accomplished with foreign money, know-how, and equipment, it becomes a part of its new country—the money has been spent, the know-how transmitted to local employees, the machinery secured permanently in place.

The seemingly shortsighted view of some of these countries is, however, not what really astounds me but rather that the policies of the American Government have all too often failed to encourage these nations in the direction of private enterprise. Indeed, the open-end, nonspecific government-to-government grants of past and current American aid programs, it seems to me, are a direct encouragement toward the building of industry in the public sector and often, I am sure unknowingly, abet programs sponsored by the Communist bloc.

Do we not reach the height of absurdity in the Western democracies if we continue to pour out economic aid for the purpose of socializing the productive units of a country? These countries are forming their patterns of government right now and, for the American or other Western taxpayers, who believes deeply in the idea of free enterprise, to push them along the path of state control of industry by providing funds for the purpose is indeed incredible. This is particularly so because the basic conflict in ideology which is represented by selecting state ownership and control of industry rather than free enterprise is the very issue in the conflict between the free and the totalitarian worlds, in which our lives are completely absorbed.

Fortunately I am not alone in this point of view. Indeed, I should like to quote from

Public Law 85-141 of August 14, 1957, amending the Mutual Security Act of 1954 relative to the Development Loan Fund. It says in its declaration of purpose: "• • • the Congress accordingly reaffirms that it is the policy of the United States, and declares it to be the purpose of this title, to strengthen friendly foreign countries by encouraging the development of their economies through a competitive free enterprise system; to minimize or eliminate barriers to the flow of private investment capital and international trade; to facilitate the creation of a climate favorable to the investment of private capital; and to assist, on a basis of self-help and mutual cooperation, the efforts of free peoples to develop their economic resources and to increase their productive capabilities."

If this is the intent of Congress, I submit that Government economic aid should be sharply directed into well-defined basic areas such as public works, power, and communications—namely, projects so vast in scope and so public in nature as to be inappropriate, in the newly developing countries, for the private businessman. I believe equally that the production of capital and consumer goods and services should be an obligation and responsibility of private enterprise. I believe that a country should look first to its own private business community, then call upon capital and technology from abroad to make up such deficiencies as exist at home. And if profits or royalties are sent abroad, this is a small price to pay for the contribution which the foreign entrepreneur leaves behind.

Let me make clear, then, where I stand on my own Government's aid program. I am for Government economic aid when it helps a country build harbors to bring in goods or ship them abroad, highways to move them by, dams to provide electric power and irrigation. I am against economic aid when it is used in whole or in part to build a government-owned textile mill, a chemical plant, a cement factory. I am for economic aid necessary to build schools in which to educate the young and in which to train the scientists and technicians who will help the country's growth and development, just as I am for economic aid to build clinics and hospitals in which to care for the maimed and the sick. I am against economic aid when it is employed to finance state institutions which buy and sell and trade in competition with the private trader. I am for economic aid which helps a businessman, whatever his nationality, build a factory and in so doing contribute to the economic growth of a country and to its political stability. I am against economic aid which would tend to make men creatures of the state.

The agencies for providing economic aid, either to a government or to private parties, exist in the United States and other countries today and these agencies should continue to be employed for the time being. But I earnestly recommend that the U.S. Development Loan Fund be used primarily for loans to private industry, which is the primary purpose for which it was created. However, in order to lay at rest the fear of industrial economic imperialism, and to make economic aid the truly joint effort it now should be, I believe that the Development Loan Fund type of assistance to private industry should eventually be channeled through international organizations. I mention as possible examples the International Development Association and the Inter-American Development Bank recently proposed by the U.S. Government.

The aspirations of the newly developing nations of the earth are, I believe, relatively simple—political independence and economic progress. It is my profound conviction that the road toward those objectives is the road of private enterprise, human equality, and individual freedom. These concepts were expressed—in words more eloquent than any I can muster—183 years ago: "• • • We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

I submit that this could be not just the American Declaration of Independence, but a philosophy for the political and economic self-fulfillment of all men, in all lands.

More Monkey Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the absurdities of the Pentagon's information policies were discussed at great length in the House of Representatives last April when I reported the on-again-off-again secrecy about the use of monkeys in research. The disclosure that a military secrecy stamp had been slapped on monkey research information—only to be lifted when the Pentagon wanted to issue a back-patting press release—drew a violent attack from the Pentagon's recently-resigned General Counsel, Mr. Robert A. Dechert.

The Pentagon's top legal adviser, who is a Philadelphia lawyer in every sense of the phrase, even went so far as to charge that disclosure of the fact that the United States uses monkeys in research would give aid and comfort to the Communists. Obviously, he thought that such disclosure would aid a potential enemy unless the information was released by the Pentagon's publicity experts.

Last May we were treated to another sample of monkey business at the Pentagon. On May 17, 1959, a reporter for the Louisville Courier-Journal asked scientists at the Fort Knox Army Medical Research Laboratory for information about the laboratory's use of monkeys in space research. He expected no trouble, for 2 months earlier he had written a long story about the research monkeys. But under the Pentagon's policy of selective secrecy, he was told that information about the monkeys suddenly had become a military secret.

The reason for the selective secrecy became apparent 2 weeks later when two monkeys were shot into space to the accompaniment of press releases, a special press conference and all the other paraphernalia of the press-agent's trade. Monkeys, it seems, are a military secret unless they can be used for the Pentagon's self-serving publicity purposes.

The House Government Information Subcommittee asked the Defense Department to explain its latest on-again-off-again secrecy gambit. In a vituperative reply, the Department's recently resigned General Counsel again denied that the Pentagon was monkeying around with research information. He pointed out that a classified memorandum from the Pentagon's No. 1 publicity man, Murray Snyder, advised only "careful handling" of monkey research information. But the legal expert admitted that the memorandum carried the military security stamp "Confidential" in big, red letters. This is most certainly careful handling, for the President's own Executive order directs that "Confidential" shall be stamped only on defense information which, if disclosed, "could be prejudicial to the defense interests of the Nation."

It now appears that the "Confidential" stamp was being used not to protect the "defense interests of the Nation" but to guard the interests of top administration policymakers who dare not let the American people know how they arrive at policy decisions. Mr. Snyder's classified memorandum transmitted State Department documents also classified "Confidential," and those State Department documents apparently warned of an adverse reaction against the United States in India where there is a cult of monkey worshippers. Such a reaction, the State Department documents apparently said, could be exploited against the United States by the Communists.

The absurdity of this policy is laid bare by the report of an American newspaperman recently returned from the Uzbek Socialist Soviet Republic. Using none of the facilities of the administration's farflung and expensive intelligence network, Mr. Robert Hotz discovered that monkeys are being transported from India to Russia, 8 tons to a planeload. He also discovered that the monkeys were used for research in Russia just as in the United States.

Thus there is no propaganda advantage to be gained by a Russian charge that the United States is using monkeys for research, for Russia is doing exactly the same thing. It is inconceivable that our cloak-and-dagger experts in the State and Defense Departments are unaware of the planeloads of research monkeys shipped to Russia.

The answer is obvious. Military security stamps are used in this case—and in many other instances—to cover up information until the administration press agents can squeeze out of it every possible drop of publicity for their own particular cause.

I commend to every Member of the House Mr. Robert Hotz' well-written exposé of the silly secrecy in the Pentagon, printed in the July 13, 1959 issue of Aviation Week:

MORE MONKEY BUSINESS

For the past few months there has been considerable furor between the Pentagon and the Congress on just how secret the use of Indian rhesus monkeys in space and medical research should be and just how prejudicial to the Nation's welfare disclosure of this information might be. If this all sounds ridiculous, it is because it really is.

But this monkey business is worth exploring in some detail because it is symptomatic of how peacetime censorship and Government thought control are being practiced by some Pentagon officials. It also affords a rare look into the alleged reasoning process

behind many of their more ludicrous decisions.

The current monkey business started with a complaint to Congress by the Dayton Daily News that the Pentagon was withholding information on the use of monkeys in space experimentation on the ground of military security. Representative JOHN MOSS, Democrat of California, whose House Government Information Subcommittee has done such a valiant job of exposing the official withholders of public information, investigated the Dayton paper's complaint. This simple inquiry produced an indignant explosion from the Defense Department's general counsel, Robert Dechert, whose letter of reply accused the Moss committee of everything from aiding the Communist cause to stealing Pentagon secrets.

Among other things, Mr. Dechert wrote the following gem about the monkey business:

"It is our belief that your committee's action in this matter not only has served to discourage respect for the security system but also the only real beneficiaries can be the Communist propagandists who want to stir up trouble between us and other nations."

Mr. Dechert also said the basic correspondence on this Defense Department policy must remain "confidential" and even the name of "another government agency involved" (State Department) was classified. Mr. Dechert was also joined in these loud wails of "security breach" and "offering aid and comfort to the enemy" by Murray Snyder, assistant secretary of defense for public affairs, who stoutly defended this viewpoint before the Aviation Writers Association convention in Washington last May.

Now what lies behind all of this Defense-State Department hush-hush that the American people can't be told for fear of undermining our defense posture and foreign policy? It is simply that these rhesus monkeys are imported by the planeload from India for use in important space and medical research and that in India, a land of many religions, there are some groups that would be offended by this use of an animal they hold in high regard. The State-Defense Department theory was that any disclosure of this fact would arouse Indians against the United States and endanger our relations with India.

The theory also was apparently held (we will never know because the documents on this subject are still confidential) that the Communists would use this fact as propaganda to create a rift between the United States and India. This hysteria reached such a peak that when the time came to fire two monkeys into space in an Army Jupiter missile a frantic search was made for true-blue native U.S.-born monkeys for the task to avoid any offense to Indian monkey worshippers. A Kansas-born rhesus was finally used.

All of this Defense-State Department hypothesis implies that this country must be doing something the Soviet Union is not. Otherwise how could the Russians turn this policy to our disadvantage? Is this hypothesis true?

For the answer I suggest that Mr. Dechert, since he is leaving the Defense Department and now should have ample time, Mr. Snyder and the State Department officials who collaborated with him on this policy take up a vigil on the airport steps at Tashkent, the capital of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic and the gateway of international air traffic between the Soviet Union and India. If they watch long enough they will see twin-jet TU-104 transports roar up to the servicing ramp and disgorge only a few Russians in long white coats. But these white-coated Russians will not be the only passengers in the jet fuselage that normally seats 70 human passengers. Inside are 8 tons of rhesus monkeys being flown from India to Moscow for use in all types of medical research including the space program.

Surely this must be a tightly held military secret protected by a Soviet security screen, but we decided to try to check the facts with Aeroflot, which has a monopoly on the monkey hauls between Delhi and Moscow.

"Certainly we carry monkeys out of India," the Aeroflot officials told us. "It is very profitable business. We charge the Soviet Government 11,000 rubles a flying hour to charter a TU-104 with an 8-ton money load from Delhi-Moscow.

"There is a doctor and four attendants with each load of monkeys."

We checked the story with medical men in Moscow. "Certainly we use Indian monkeys in research," they reported. Some of the institutes in the Moscow area use 15 to 20 monkeys a day in their activities. One British correspondent, with whom we talked, had recently been chased to Tashkent by his London office to investigate a report that an Abominable Snowman had strayed from the Pamir peaks and was terrorizing Uzbekistan. Investigating on the spot, the British reporter found the animal actually involved had shrunk to a rhesus monkey that had escaped the vigilance of his keepers while a Tu-104 was parked at Tashkent airport. He viewed the remains of the rhesus that had been treed and shot by an Uzbek tribesman.

This research on the rhesus in the U.S.S.R. raises some interesting questions about the still highly classified Defense-State Department monkey business that we hope Mr. Moss will refer to the Pentagon.

If the Soviet Union is importing monkeys from India for the same research purposes as the United States, how can this fact possibly be used by Communist propagandists, as Mr. Dechert so clearly suggests?

Do the Pentagon and the State Department know the Soviets are engaged in importing rhesus monkeys from India by the 8-ton Tu-104 load? If so, is this information "classified" and does it require withholding from the American people?

If State-Defense don't know, how can they formulate "defense" policy without even the elementary facts of the situation involved at their command?

If they do know, why are they using this situation as an excuse to withhold information from the American public on the grounds that this is information "the publication of which could be prejudicial to the defense interests of the Nation"?

Clearly, the suggestion of Mr. Moss that Mr. Dechert "do a little more homework and jump to fewer conclusions" is in order. And perhaps this whole ludicrous business of official monkey business can be useful in exposing the activities of a group of poorly informed bureaucrats who are trying to do the American people's thinking for them.

A Law Above Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., on July 11, 1959:

A LAW ABOVE POLITICS

When the Treasury Department announced this week that it would pay a near-record 4.728 percent interest rate on a $2 billion issue of 1 year, or short-term, bills it was not setting the highest rate in 38 years for the benefit of the Nation's bankers. Instead, it was borrowing money at the lowest price it could find—by competitive bidding in a free market that is governed by the nonpolitical law of supply and demand. There is no rule in this market which says that the owners of money—hundreds of thousands of investors and lenders represented through the banking system—must lend their money to the Treasury Department at any Government-fixed return, high or low. Only in a totalitarian state, where there is no free economy, can there be such a rule.

And even though investment in U.S. Government securities is the safest in the world, its attractiveness still is affected by the rate of return, compared with that available through other investment of money. Along with its tax income, the Government needs a continuing large supply of borrowed money—obtainable only in competition with other borrowers such as State and local governments, private business, mortgage programs, and the like. In this competition, the Government already has found a dangerously declining investor interest in its bonds—obligations running more than 5 years with a 4.25-percent rate ceiling and the smaller denomination savings bonds with a 3.26 maximum rate. As a consequence, the Treasury has been forced more and more into the short-term markets where there is no statutory rate ceiling. Excessive reliance on the short-term market is inflationary and hazardous in the massive refinancing operations needed to manage a $285 billion public debt.

The House Ways and Means Committee has voted now, in partial compliance with an administration recommendation, to give the President authority for a 2-year period to set aside the outdated long-term rate ceilings when found necessary in the national interest. This is an issue which has been made into a political football by administration critics. Nevertheless, it clearly is in the national interest for the Treasury to have greater flexibility in its debt management, and greater access to long-term money would help provide it. Congress should promptly approve the recommendations of the House committee.

Contracting Out—A Device for Reducing Federal Employment and Lowering Employment Standards Without Reducing Federal Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 3 of this year I submitted at page A770 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a mass of material on an incident at the Army Support Center in St. Louis involving the dismissal of a group of custodial employees on the pretext that their work could be done more economically under contract to a private firm. I was primarily concerned, of course, over the individuals affected by the dismissals, but my purpose in bringing it before the Congress was to point up a spreading policy throughout the Gov-

ernment of displacing career Federal employees in all kinds of employment by contracting out their work to private firms. The worst aspect of the practice, in addition to the unfairness to career employees, is that in many if not most instances the Government does not in fact save any money under these contracts.

Today, I retold the story of the incident at the Army Support Center in testimony before the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and in the course of my testimony brought up to date the case of the custodial contract at St. Louis, including the information from the General Accounting Office that the savings originally claimed by the Army were ridiculously overstated.

Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to our colleague, Judge DAVIS, chairman of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee, for the help he provided me earlier this year in my fight for the reinstatement of the group of custodians let go at the Army Support Center, and for his sympathetic understanding of the dangers to an effective civil service system inherent in the spreading contracting-out practice.

And I again thank Judge DAVIS, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity he provided me this morning to appear as the opening witness of the subcommittee's hearings into the manpower policies of the General Services Administration, including the policy in connection with contracting out work normally done by civil service employees.

Because of the number of Members of Congress who have expressed interest in the problem which I discussed in my testimony this morning, I am now submitting for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, by unanimous consent, the statement which I delivered before the Davis subcommittee, as follows:

CONTRACTING-OUT—A DEVICE FOR REDUCING FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND LOWERING EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS WITHOUT REDUCING FEDERAL COSTS

(Testimony By Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, St. Louis, before Manpower Utilization Subcommittee, House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, July 15, 1959)

Chairman DAVIS and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear at the opening of your hearings on manpower utilization and the contracting-out device, and to tell you of a situation which occurred in St. Louis which I think sums up in rather shocking fashion the reasons why the present administration's employment policies need a critical review—and cry for correction. I congratulate you, Judge Davis, and the subcommittee for becoming interested in this problem, and I am hopeful that out of your hearings, we will get the kind of legislation—or action—we need to prevent similar occurrences in the future.

Incidentally, I want to say that when this matter first came to my attention around the start of this session of Congress, I went to Judge Davis and found him, and the staff, extremely helpful and deeply sympathetic.

I am going to ask that the material I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 3 along with some later letters and other correspondence which I shall supply subseqently, be made part of my testimony today, if that is satisfactory.

ARMY CLAIMS SUBSTANTIAL SAVINGS

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is the kind of situation I hope you will pursue and in the future prevent:

Last December 17 laborers in an Army installation in St. Louis were notified they were being separated because their work was to be farmed out on a contract basis. All of the evidence clearly indicated to me that the contract would cost the Government far more than the wages of these 17 men. I asked the General Accounting Office to investigate that aspect of it, and I asked the Army for details.

I was assured by the Army that everything had been done in a perfectly proper manner, that the Government would save a great deal of money—a great deal—that the Budget Bureau directives called for this kind of policy, and that the 17 men would be helped to find other work. That was the Army's story in a nutshell, and what was not actually false about it was at least inaccurate.

Let me take these points in order:

USE OF INAPPLICABLE YARDSTICK

First, would the Government save money by contracting out the custodial work done by these 17 employees at St. Louis? In a letter to Chairman GEORGE MAHON of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee on February 4—the day after I aired this matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—the Director of Army Budget sent word for word a letter which another general had previously sent to me defending the contract in this case and asserting there would be a substantial reduction in direct costs. But in the letter which went to Congressman MAHON, there was an additional paragraph—not included in the version which I had received—giving actual figures. It claimed a saving to the Federal Government of $77,000, based on an estimated cost of 36½ cents a square foot, if the Government did the work, and 24.7 cents if the private contractor did it. These figures were, to me, incredible—unbelievable—and with good reason. The General Accounting Office has now provided that good reason. It said the figures were not only inaccurate but were, in part, based on admittedly inappropriate comparisons. In other words, the Army was basing the square-foot estimates for Government conduct of the work on an inapplicable yardstick—and knew it. It was translating into terms of 31 Federal custodial employees a cleaning job which the General Accounting Office said would actually be performed by only 21 employees. Now this is just plain statistical falsification. I don't know who did it, who lied, but the poor general who signed the letter to Congressman MAHON was handed false information. That is shocking instance No. 1 about this whole thing.

SAVINGS OF $94,000 SHRINK TO $28,000 AND LESS

After the General Accounting Office got the details on which the estimated savings were based, and after it went over them critically, it found that the maximum saving possible by farming out the work of these 17 custodial employees was not $94,000 as originally claimed by the Army or even $77,000 as later claimed, but less than $28,000. This was true, the GAO said, even though the contractor was cleaning for $53,613 the same area presumably, as the Army would have to pay $92,164 to clean with its own employees.

For, as it turned out, the contractor doing the work for $53,613 is not expected to do the annual housecleaning tasks normally performed by the regular employees—cleaning walls, partitions, fixtures, etc. The contract does not include those. It includes only regular cursory cleaning—a flick of a dust rag, emptying waste baskets, cleaning the floors, etc. If the annual housecleaning tasks were added to the contract, it would cost another $14,322—I will supply all of these figures for the record, Mr. Chairman, but in any event the alleged or apparent savings of more than $40,000 as between Government direct costs in doing the work and the contract cost had now shrunk down to less than $28,000.

ARMY FORGETS TO PROVIDE FOR SECURITY

But in looking into it further, the General Accounting Office discovered that the Army, in letting out a contract to clean a defense installation, had made absolutely no provision for assuring the security of the areas cleaned by catch-as-catch-can, hourly work part-time employees of an outside contractor. The civil service employees who were displaced were, of course, subject to security clearance. The contractor hired part-time workers for $1 or $1.12 or $1.25 an hour—people who had other daytime jobs and put in an extra 4 hours at night for additional income.

So the payoff is this: The Army would conceivably save a maximum of $27,000 or $28,000 through this contract, except that the cost of security measures was not taken into consideration. Furthermore, no consideration was given to reclassifying the Army employees into janitors; instead of laborers. These things might almost offset any savings obtained through this contract according to the GAO. Perhaps the Army may actually save a very few dollars in the end. But the lives of 17 career employees, many of them veterans, some of them 10-point disabled veterans, were completely disrupted—and for what?

Now, in addition to the fact that the savings claimed by the Army originally have evaporated into thin air on critical analysis by the General Accounting Office, what about the rest of the Army's assurances—that the men involved would be helped to find other work?

MEN DISPLACED SUFFER ECONOMIC DISTRESS

As of early this year when I first inquired about their prospects, I was informed that perhaps three would be placed in other jobs. I heard periodically from these men, and they reported to me on the hopelessness of getting other work through the Army. Three apparently were placed. Two gave up and went on retirement. One was fired for unauthorized absence; apparently things got too much for him, and he tried to drown his sorrow one night.

The rest were getting nowhere. I wrote letters in their behalf, I did everything I could, I raised cain because, frankly, I did not feel the contract was proper. Finally, 5 of the remaining 11 were referred to other Federal jobs and 6 were called back to work after a month's unemployment.

They were hardly back on the job, however, when they began writing to me that they were being made to regret having asked me for help. They were not assigned to their old jobs. They were put on a kind of standby basis, as extra helpers, and then a month or so later notified they were again being separated. At this point, another gave up and retired. One was sent to another installation to work, but was turned down as being too old. They write me heartbreaking letters about temporary jobs or no jobs. It is terrible what has happened to the families of these men. And why? For what?

CONTRACTING-OUT TO "SHORE-UP" AND PROVIDE "VIABLE" ECONOMY

I was informed that contracting out Federal jobs of this nature fits in with the Eisenhower administration's policy of turning as much as possible of Federal work over to private enterprise, as a means of shoring up the economy of the country—in behalf, as the Budget Director wrote me, of a viable economy.

Some of the Army brass put it differently: they said that a farming out of this kind of work would help to solve the general funding situation of the Defense Department, meaning, perhaps, that firing 17 janitors in St. Louis would make a big dent in balancing the $40 billion Defense budget. It would be nice to think that the firing of the 17 men would play a key role in balancing the Federal budget, but the facts do not bear it out, and meanwhile the budgets of these families were turned upside down.

CONTRACTS PROVIDE WAY OF HIDING COSTS

It is obvious what happened here. The orders came through to cut civilian personnel. The idea of cutting personnel is to save money. But instead of looking around for ways to achieve savings in personal services, consolidating jobs, or organizing the workload in a better way, someone came up with the idea of knocking out 17 jobs by reaching out to the lowest paid employees, firing a whole block of custodial workers and contracting out their work. The roster would show 17 fewer jobs. True, costs would not go down—but maintenance costs on a contract basis can be disguised very easily, and there would be the appearance of personnel savings. That is at the bottom of all of this extensive contracting-out activity—particularly in the Defense Department, but elsewhere too.

Now I hate to take so much of the time of this subcommittee to discuss in such detail what might appear to be a trivial incident involving a handful of men. But I retell the story here because I think it is the sort of thing you are anxious to uncover, and expose and correct—not just for 17 janitors in St. Louis, but for many of the thousands upon thousands of Government employees all over the country now being subjected to a similar kind of pushing around.

WAGE LEVELS THREATENED

This device of contracting out work which should be and which normally is performed by Government employees—by career employees under civil service—can lead to a breakdown of wage levels for those at the lower income levels, particularly. With enough unemployment—and we still have lots of it—a contractor can pick up part-time "moonlighter" workers to work for the legal minimum, thus displacing career employees whose wage standards Congress has decreed must be decent and fair—not merely the minimum which can be imposed under the Fair Labor Standards Act. The whole concept of civil service is attacked and threatened by this kind of policy. The men displaced in St. Louis wrote me they were offered work by the contractor to clean for $1 an hour, or $1.12 an hour, 4 hours a night, the same areas they had been doing before at regular pay of around $2 an hour on a full-time basis. Is this fair? Is it right?

LABOR DEPARTMENT CLAIMS LACK OF JURISDICTION

When I received that information, I contacted the Secretary of Labor to find out what standards are imposed by Federal law for employment on Government contracts of this nature. I was informed that the usual laws on wage standards on Government contracts did not apply in this kind of contract, and that the only requirement was probably the minimum wage law of $1 an hour. Here, it seems to me, is a good area to start in passing legislation to meet this problem. Is it the role of the Federal Government to help maintain and improve wage levels, or join in undercutting them? That is very much a matter of concern to this subcommittee, I know.

UNDER SECRETARY MILTON TO REVIEW FUTURE CONTRACTS

There are a few aspects of this contracting-out issue that might be noted at this point. First of all, as a result of my protests over the St. Louis incident, the Under Secretary of the Army, Mr. Hugh Milton II, a man I feel is very anxious to do the right thing, has ordered that in the future all proposed contracts of the kind entered into in St. Louis Army Support Center must be cleared with his office. If this had been done originally, I'm sure the incident would never have arisen.

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES ACTIVE ON PROBLEM

Furthermore, this subcommittee has done an outstanding job in spotlighting some of the incidents which have occurred elsewhere in the Government. You are doing an excellent job. The Government Operations Committee has also found some shocking instances of contracting-out practices. The Armed Services Subcommittee under Congressman MEL PRICE is examining into Defense Department military contracts, as part of its overall look at manpower policies in defense. And the Mahon subcommittee put into the report on the Defense Department appropriation bill, clear-cut language prohibiting the contracting out of professional services except where there is absolutely no choice in the matter from a national defense standpoint. That would not, of course, cover the kind of instance I have protested here today.

DEPENDING INTEGRITY OF CIVIL SERVICE

But I think Congress has repeatedly made it clear, that we do not believe the Government can always save money or can always do a better job by farming out work to private enterprise instead of continuing it in the hands of career Federal employees. I think we have made it clear that we do not think Federal employees are all drones and nincompoops and that private enterprise is always and invariably able to do a better job of any assignment than a Federal agency.

As the Members know, I am chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The canal is a hundred-million-a-year enterprise. It is well run—very well run. It is run in a businesslike fashion—by Federal employees. It was built by the Government directly—after attempts to have it built on a contract basis by private firms proved a dismal failure.

This is not to say the Government should run everything and do everything. But it is to say that in areas where experience has clearly showed that Government operations are efficient and effective and economical—and there are many, many such—there is no good reason, no legitimate reason, for upsetting the whole program, firing the employees, and indiscriminately farming out the work to private enterprise. This is the area you are investigating, and I want you to know that you have my wholehearted support for what you are doing. Thank you.

Labor Reform Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Monday, July 6, 1959 entitled "On Whose Side":

ON WHOSE SIDE?

After more than 6 weeks, the House Labor Committee is still struggling with the writing of a labor reform bill. The committee is under intense union pressure. Every member of it, and of course every member of the House, must face the voters next year. Union leaders are making the most of their concentrated power, especially in city districts, to affect the results of congressional elections.

So it is not surprising that the reports from the committee speak of a steady drift toward weakening one clause after another of the Senate-passed bill. The Senate bill itself, in our opinion, does not meet the public demand for a genuine and effective reform measure which adequately corrects the abuses exposed by the McClellan investigation. To water it down still further would represent a humiliating defeat of the public interest by organized group pressure.

Inevitably, the question is now arising: Would not half a loaf be better than none? A bill which carried out some of the needed reforms might very well be preferable to no legislation at all, but individual Representatives must be judged by their individual contributions to the final result. A Congressman who votes and works for a watered-down bill instead of a truly effective and comprehensive one must be prepared to go before the voters as a candidate who placed the union lobby's interest above the public interest.

It is not difficult to tell where the public interest lies. It lies first in reasonable but effective reform of internal union organization: In public accountability for union welfare funds and other finances, in protecting the rights of union members from usurpation by union bosses, in making the leaders more directly answerable to the rank-and-file. Secondly, the public interest demands effective legislation against secondary boycotts and "blackmail" picketing.

The first general objective can be attained by adopting the Senate bill's provisions on financial accounting and its bill of rights for union members, preferably with a stronger enforcement clause. The second objective requires rewriting of the Senate measure as it applies to "hot cargo" and blackmail picketing.

The House could find no better guide to legislation on the latter points than Secretary of Labor Mitchell's proposals. Mr. Mitchell is not trying to outlaw legitimate secondary boycotts—those, for example, which are directed against a company's performing struck work—nor is he trying to outlaw legitimate picketing. His proposed amendments would strike only at the kind of boycott by which a union wages a dispute with one employer by penalizing an innocent one, and at the kind of picketing which permits "top-down organizing" aimed at intimidating the employer instead of persuading the employees.

These are the minimum standards of an adequate labor reform bill, and Congressmen will be judged by whether they fight to protect or to tear down these standards. There is no public interest in legislation designed to weaken the right of collective bargaining. There is a strong public interest in legislation to curb the excesses of unscrupulous union leaders like Jimmy Hoffa. Every Congressman should be prepared to let his constituents know whose side he is on.

Colleges Fear Housing Veto Killed Their Building Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I submit an article from the July 10 issue of the Washington Post, entitled "Colleges Fear Housing Veto Killed Their Building Loans," in the hope it will be read by my colleagues, and others interested in the Nation's educational institutions.

The article follows:

COLLEGES FEAR HOUSING VETO KILLED THEIR BUILDING LOANS

(By Erwin Knoll)

President Eisenhower's veto of the $1,375 million housing bill confronts the Nation's colleges with the possibility that the Federal loan program for college housing may be scuttled for the second consecutive year.

Though discussions of the omnibus housing bill have focused mainly on its mortgage insurance and urban renewal provisions, higher education has a substantial stake in the measure.

The bill vetoed by the President included $300 million for extension of the 9-year-old College Housing Loan Program. Of the total, $225 million would have been allocated to loans for construction of dormitories; $37.5 million for college dining halls and related facilities, and $37.5 million for student nurse and intern housing.

Also in the measure was $62.5 million for a new loan program—construction of college classrooms, laboratories, and other academic facilities. Thought the amount was less than they sought, higher education groups welcomed the Federal breakthrough.

President Arthur S. Adams of the American Council on Education, which has spearheaded the campaign for the college loan program, voiced "great disappointment" at the veto.

He said the program "has been remarkably useful and successful," and added:

"We can only hope that some means will be devised to take care of this pressing need."

In his veto message Tuesday, President Eisenhower referred only briefly to college loan provisions of the housing bill, complaining that the interest formula would amount to a Federal "subsidy."

"To the extent that these and other programs merely displace private financing they lead to Federal spending that is entirely unnecessary," the President said.

Since 1955 the program has permitted colleges to borrow from the Federal treasury for housing construction, repaying at the same interest rate the Government pays. The vetoed bill would have continued this. Actually, college spokesmen claim, over the long run the program has cost the Government nothing.

An administration proposal, which has not received much attention in Congress, would substitute Federal guarantees of principal and interest on non-tax-exempt bonds sold by colleges to finance construction of housing and academic facilities.

The administration would also provide some long-term debt retirement assistance for college projects "which would serve the national interest in increasing enrollment capacity or improving and expanding teaching and research in the sciences or engineering."

College spokesmen complain that the administration program would force colleges to the private lending market at substantially higher interest rates.

Since its innception in 1950, the college loan program has resulted in construction of almost $1 billion worth of dormitories. In recent years, the program has accounted for about 60 percent of new campus housing.

Last year, when the omnibus housing bill failed to pass in the House, no new funds for college loans were provided. The Housing and Home Finance Agency now has a backlog of about $150 million in approved college loan applications for which no funds are available.

College enrollments are expected to double by 1970.

Recent Tour by Soviet Deputy Premier Kozlov

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the fact that on many occasions the executive branch of the Government will, by various means, promote some one individual for the Presidency of the United States. But I think it is disgraceful when such promotions jeopardize the security of our country and work for the benefit of our enemies.

My attention has been called to an article which recently appeared in the Detroit Times in which it was reported that during the recent tour of the United States by Soviet First Deputy Premier Kozlov, the Soviet press photographers were allowed to take pictures of everything of military and industrial intelligence value, but no action was taken to prevent them from doing so because of the effect it might have on the impending visit to the Soviet Union by Vice President Nixon.

We are warned by past experience what to expect from the Soviets, so I can see no reason why we should consider inviting or allowing to tour the United States any of the Soviet officials, regardless of whom it might be, regardless of whose political opportunities in this country might be enhanced.

The full text of the article to which I refer follows:

IS KOZLOV TOUR RED SPIES' FIELD DAY?

(By David Sentner)

CHICAGO, July 9.—The State Department yesterday suffered another headache in connection with the tour of Soviet First Deputy Premier Kozlov—industrial espionage.

The matter involved the pastime of the Soviet press photographers accompanying the Deputy Premier taking pictures of everything of military and industrial intelligence value.

Both State Department security detail and the Department's diplomatic escort officer have asked for guidance on what to do. However, the impending visit to the Soviet Union by Vice President NIXON has stymied any decision.

The practice of the intelligence agents of the Soviet Union, in their double role of news correspondents, aides, and officials, using cameras on everything that might be useful in case of war, started at the beginning of the Kozlov nationwide tour.

Taking advantage of diplomatic courtesy in photographing potential targets for Soviet bombers reached its zenith during the passage of the Kozlov motorcade from Chicago to adjacent steel plants.

With a member of the State Department security detail driving an open car containing crack photographers from the Soviet Government, every railroad center, shipping port, strategic highway crossing, and bridge, plus war material factory, was filmed.

Such favorite shots as girls in bathing suits or cheering groups were ignored by the Soviet photographers.

The worst types of hovels and slums along the line were filmed for obvious propaganda use against the United States.

Inside steel plants, similar to the previous technique used in the tour of automotive factories, the Soviet photographers had a spies' field day in photographing at close range intricate automation machinery and instrument boards.

One top steel official remarked:

"This must be a special tour arranged for Soviet industrial espionage."

Government Spending Many Billions on Stockpiles To Help Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, constantly the American press is telling the tale of the terrible handicap of having an abundance of food on hand.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article which appeared in the current issue of Labor, the railroad brotherhood newspaper.

This article discusses in some detail stockpiling of metals for the benefit of industry.

I ask the question, "Is food any less important to national defense than metals?"

GOVERNMENT SPENDING MANY BILLIONS ON STOCKPILES TO HELP BUSINESS

Daily papers which loudly moan about the $9 billion stockpile of surplus farm products are strangely silent about another stockpile which has cost the taxpayers, it's estimated, almost the same amount of money. This stockpile was the subject of recent House Appropriations Committee closed-door hearings, the record of which has now been made public.

The administration asked Congress for $287 million to replenish a $2.1 billion fund for purchase of "strategic" metals. Spokesmen for the administration said the additional money will be needed to pay for metals which are not needed, but must be paid for when they are delivered under unfinished contracts. Two of these contracts are for nickel.

The Government already has $97 million more of that one metal than can possibly be used, stockpile chief Franklin G. Floete testified. But Uncle Sam is committed to buy $200 million worth more from the Freeport Sulphur Co., and $45 million more from the M. A. Hanna Co.

The latter, incidentally, is headed by George M. Humphrey who, at the time this

contract was signed, was Secretary of the Treasury and generally recognized as the most powerful figure in the Eisenhower administration. The Hanna contract totaled $108 million.

Floete said that, in addition to the surplus nickel, the so-called defense stockpile now contains the following "in excess of needs": $327 million aluminum, $72 million copper, $46 million columbite, $59 million magnesium, $219 million tungsten, and $6 million cobalt. Yet that is only part of the story.

The defense stockpile also contains much more of many other materials than Uncle Sam needs. For example, Floete last week offered to sell 265 million pounds of excess coconut oil.

The defense stockpile surpluses are so enormous, Floete told the House committee, that they can't be sold without disrupting world markets. In other words, by buying and holding these metals and materials, Uncle Sam is supporting prices for their producers, not only in this country, but in other countries, too.

In addition to the defense stockpile, the Government also has another big one, built up by swapping U.S. surplus farm products for forein metals, minerals, and other raw materials. Reports say these two stockpiles contain $5 billion worth more materials than would be needed even in an all-out world war III.

Why don't the daily papers complain about this surplus stockpiling the way they do about farm surpluses? Is it because one benefits farmers, and the other enriches businessmen?

The Necessity of Discipline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following outstanding address by our friend and colleague, the distinguished and able ROBERT W. HEMPHILL will be of interest to the Congress and the people of the country:

THE NECESSITY OF DISCIPLINE

(Remarks of Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Member of Congress, Before the Order of Masons' Ladies Night Banquet, at Kershaw, S.C., on April 17, 1959)

Mr. Toastmaster worshipful master, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am always happy to be in Kershaw, and I am honored and flattered to be the speaker on your program tonight. My past association with so many of you personally, and my admiration for and appreciation of the high purposes of the Masonic order inspire my deepest gratitude and humblest feelings at the honor of being present.

In an age when there has suddenly burst upon mankind, partciularly those informed, or curious, in these United States, and certainly those who would gather in such an audience as is here assembled, the bewilderment of realization that science is now paving the way to the stars, stars which up to this time were heavenly pinpoints that we might some day hope to pass in the transition from this life to that which we call eternal, what can a man say to an audience, or what can an audience demand of a man in a position of government? The preachers of the day who, in turn, harped upon the age of peace at the end of World War II some what hopefully, the age of the atom, at the end of World War II, sometimes pretending almost a spiritual insight, the age of the hydrogen, the age of the jet just a few years ago, now talk about the age of space. Yes, the age of space, and there are many of us who wonder if we are going to have the courage, or the curiosity to make one of those dangerous trips to the moon. Then there are others of us who want to make sure that if we make some trip to the moon, that we have all the luxuries of an ocean liner, the comforts of a cocktail lounge, and the safety of our own living room.

Can we proceed another step in this semi-philosophy of what, where, how, and why? Are we brave enough to mirror our own image against the scene of events which are taking place, forgetting for just a moment the past, reckoning, surely, for the future. Have we the individual courage to ask, "Where do I fit into the picture—or do I fit into the picture at all?" The question is surely serious, and, I think it is just as serious as the question of survival. In the imagination of most men, trying to envision the horror aftermath of a hydrogen war, there is always the suspicion, if not the conviction, that, "after all, I just wonder how I am going to survive, when all these other people are going to get killed?" Am I going to become a caveman, and will my trusted .22 rifle, or the .44 I have hidden in the bed springs, mean the difference between my mastery of the situation and my annihilation?

Am I too serious? Well—you did not tell me to fill the night with jokes, to give you belly-laugh after belly-laugh—and, I am sure, you would resent my giving you any fairy tales.

Any of us who have the acumen to look around us at our brothers and sisters in nature recognize that they are governed by certain laws which they do not question, by certain necessities they accept and abide by. What student of nature, even a simple student, does not know that the fox teaches her young her cunning, at the cost of ferocious punishment if the young dare vary from the pattern? How apparent it is that the chick who fails to heed the cluck of the mother, and hasten to her, is devoured, lost, or destroyed? If you really love nature, suddenly come upon a mother bobwhite and her young, and hear her quick cry, and watch the young disappear before your very eyes; how much are you aware of the necessity of discipline among all natural creatures who accept the laws of God, which, after all, are the laws of nature, and its discipline?

Was it Spenser who said that a stern discipline pervades all nature, which is a little cruel but it may be very kind?

And was it Lew Wallace, who wrote the immortal "Ben Hur," who said it is never wise to slip the bands of discipline?

From the earliest time, we find that any religion which man has endorsed, has interwoven among its prerequisites a distinct directive of discipline. The greatest example of that is in our Christian faith. If we examine the Ten Commandments, found first in the 20th chapter of Exodus, and later repeated in the Pentateuch, we find that they are the discipline that God exacts, and expects of his chosen people. The first four are what God expects of man in his relation to God, and the last six are what God expects of man in his relation to fellow man. I challenge any philosopher to examine those rules, and eliminate any one of them as unnecessary, either to our way of life, or to our religion.

In the early days of this country, when the frontiers were fluid, the population small and scattered, and the complexities of life few in number, the Government of these United States found itself under no duty to impose upon the people a complicated set of laws as a guide for a free civilization. As our country grew, the necessity for more and more laws became apparent. I must say that most of them were good. And, if you think a minute, How necessary is law? Think for one moment what would happen if all the city ordinances of Kershaw were abandoned tonight. Who would be safe? What man would roam the streets, or allow the lady of his choice to go out to a movie without armed protection? What storekeeper would feel free to leave his store unattended?

All around us are evidences of the exacting discipline of a centralized Government. Planes that drone overhead by day and night to light at busy airports. The trains that rush through the night from city to city, and the buses and trucks which heavily crowd the lanes of U.S. Highway No. 521, are all subjected to regulations, in order that man might live with man, and competition might be a part of our way of life.

Unfortunately, our Government has enforced its discipline in every phase of life but government itself. We find too many public servants whose lust for power is so great that the impact of a conservative approach concerns them only to the extent that it would cut down their organization, and frustrate their rule. Time and again the committees of Congress have asked that saving be accomplished and economy practiced by a reduction of personnel. This, of itself, is no effort to put any person out of a job. We have provided many other methods such as attrition, absorption, merger of duties, and elimination of ineffective and nonproductive duties. We have urged consolidation instead of a job study intended to create more apparent responsibility. Despite the frightening signs of the times, the possibility of an inflation which will rob every person in this room of the real value of their retirement savings, or retirement program, the fact that the U.S. dollar is no longer the hardest dollar in the international currency, often serve only as topics of conversation over a highball. We have not, as yet, achieved the discipline so necessary to more efficient government.

There must be a reason for this.

In the Congress it has been my experience that when we talk of economy, and there are many of us, especially from the Southland, who really believe in economy, we find that everyone wants to economize, so long as the reduction affects the other fellow. I have been amazed at some of the groups which have urged spending upon us, and when we tell them that we are $280 billion out of balance, despite the hypocrisy of the lip service given to a balanced budget by our captive Chief Executive, they are unwilling to face the signs of the time. I do not know all about the waste in the military, but I do know there is waste and an overabundance of it, and many of the facts have been hidden from the American people by their own public servants, and never given the publicity they deserve.

Last year in the Congress one of my good friends stood in the well of the House of Representatives and told us about a trip he had made to a country which had just been the recipient of $200 million of your tax money. He stated that as soon as they found out he was an American, in order to travel in that country which had just taken our money, he had to have armed guards. What may be necessary to correct such a situation, I do not know, but he who eats my bread must sing my song.

Not long ago in one of the great periodicals of this country, the Readers' Digest, appeared an article entitled "The Best Hours of My Life," by a United Airlines pilot. He told the story of a long flight over the Pacific that he felt the urge to make. It was a story of bravery, and a story of courage, and a story of excitement and adventure. But above all, it was a story of discipline. The

story of a man who disciplined his mind and his body and his will to accomplish a purpose, chancing death in the process.

In January of this year on one of the great networks of this country appeared the Manion Forum, which included an interview with General Fellows, Chief of the General Headquarters Planning Section under General MacArthur in the Pacific campaign. I quote from significant wording from that broadcast:

"To win the cold war, and thereby avoid world war III, we must seize and hold the initiative. We can assume the initiative and win the cold war if we will unwrap a new and devastating weapon. This weapon is psychological warfare. Aimed unerringly at the Kremlin dictators, this new weapon would strike a decisive blow at the Kremlin's most vulnerable spot—its savage conflict with the Soviet people."

"Our problem is to convince the Soviet people that the American people are in sympathy with their dream of liberation; and that our cold war is not directed against the Soviet people but against Kremlin despotism."

Yes; we face a future, a future which, I am thankful to say, because I accept the challenge, has many mysteries, many problems, heartaches, and victories.

If we as a people are to survive; if we are to come to our senses domestically, if this currency is to regain the value, the respect that it should have as the evidence of the full faith and credit of a great people, we must discipline ourselves. The individual and the group must discipline themselves against the desire to use the Federal money, instead of the initiative of private business, or the governmental power of the State or the municipality. In our foreign dealings, once our discipline of ourselves is apparent, we will have less trouble with the world.

One of my friends on the Hill, who daily deals with problems of the subversives, told me the other day that we are losing the cold war, not because we are not fighting the cold war, but because we are not fighting communism. We are not training ourselves to think about this evil which is still among us. We are not training ourselves to do anything about it, or to be ready to do anything about it.

Upon us today is a crisis of great potential. We call it the Berlin question and we have a dateline of May 27, 1959. Somewhere in the past the undisciplined diplomats at the counsel table were outmaneuvered by the Russians. Make no mistake that Russian diplomats are disciplined, that their entire country is concentrated on the ambition to be the world power, and that they are making the sacrifices necessary to that realization. They are willing to die for their beliefs. Are you?

We read that the West is all for firmness, but that is not true. Once before the British sent a man to a summit meeting to indoctrinate a doctrine of appeasement. The results were horrible, and history has now catalogued the very word "Munich" is symbolic of a lack of firmness.

Today, in an effort to have peace without sacrifices, in a proposed world of coexistence in which the Christian nations and those of communism exist side by side, each commanding equal respect of the other, certain leaders either subscribe to a positive neutrality or a negative appeasement. A world desiring peace can ill afford such philosophy. All around us are evidences that neutrality is nonproductive.

I was amazed to read recently that England's ex-Prime Minister would stop the conquest of space to make the world a better place for humanity. He attempted to point out that it did not make any difference who got to the moon first.

I wonder if one who has been Prime Minister of England could be so naive and have such misjudgment. Who is going to stop the Russians from seeking the moon? Who is going to police the world?

Since the advent of the United Nations, Russia, with her veto power, has been able to nullify the police powers supposedly intended in the creation of that organization.

This is the world we face. I would be less than a man to tell you that the future presents no sacrifices and possesses no hardships. I would be less than honest to tell you that we can go our way without the personal discipline necessary to reflect in the national pattern a disciplined and determined people. I can say it is not a job for the Government. I do know that the picture is being written today.

How firm we are on the Berlin question may well determine whether we have peace or war. Any evidence of weakness may be fatal. If Russia were to think us unwilling to stand for freedom, Berlin could fear a blood bath such as Hungary experienced.

Again, these are the signs of the times—an era when men are looking into other men's faces for evidences of character, weakness, or discipline.

This is the challenge of today. It is not a challenge to the Government of the United States. It is a challenge to the people. And the people include you, include me. We forget when we see the massive Government funds, or the haughty bureaucrat coming into our community, that this Government is owned and supported by the little people like you and like me. Like the great French leader said, all of us who are in the positions of leadership have a peculiar feeling, if we are sensative to our responsibilities:

"There go the people, and I must follow them—because I am their leader."

Masons, Rotarians, members of the Lions Club, Kiwanians, John Does, and Mary Does, all have the responsibility, the privilege of writing the 1959, the 1960, the future pages of American strength and survival, as surely as we are met here tonight. It is a time of reckoning, a time of taking stock. We must discipline our desires, our ideas and our ambitions to those sacrifices necessary to keep this Nation great, its people free. I mean it when I say it is up to you. I can only pledge that I will do my part.

Thank you.

High Time for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial which appeared in Il Progresso Italo-Americano, newspaper published in New York on July 12, 1959.

The editorial follows:

HIGH TIME FOR ACTION

For more than a year and a half there has been an ever-increasing torrent of abuse and vilification directed against Americans of Italian origin, who comprise one of the most important segments of American life. A systematic campaign of defamation has been given wide circulation through slanted articles in nationwide newspaper chains and magazines, and books, which become "best-sellers" through the artful drumbeating of modern press-agentry. But the most frequent offenders are television and motion pictures through gangster portrayals on their screens, using Italian names for the evil characters or what are easily recognized as "Italian types."

One need only turn his TV dial and, lo and behold, there is one of those bloodcurdling sagas in which the unsavory villain is pictured as a hoodlum with "Italian" features.

Many years ago Il Progresso spearheaded a drive to eliminate the racial identification, in news items and stories, of elements caught in the toils of the law. That campaign was widely commended by public officials, editors, and publishers who agreed that the sins of the few should not be visited on the many; and for years no accused or convicted person was identified, in the public prints, as to race or color.

What has happened to change all this? In November of 1957 a group of Americans of Italian descent met in a small New York State village called Apalachin. Some of them had criminal records. The purpose of their meeting has never been explained. But if they were meeting for some nefarious undertaking, we not only do not condone them, but we denounce them and their ilk, for this tiny group of 60 furnished the pretext for bringing discredit and contempt on more than 12 million loyal, law-abiding, decent Americans of Italian origin who daily make their valuable contribution to the enrichment of our country in every field of human endeavor.

Since that day, sensation-seeking organs spawned the specter of a sinister international organization of criminals, presumably composed exclusively of men of Italian or Sicilian extraction, which they call the Mafia. And they have been making a Roman holiday of the terroristic activities of these men and their henchmen, attributing to them infiltration into and control of many legitimate businesses and undertakings, including labor unions. And in passing they mention Italian products and Italian communities which defer to the Mafia.

If this crime syndicate exists in fact, the conclusion is inescapable that all law-enforcement authorities: city, State, and Federal, have broken down. We cannot conceive of the disintegration of the FBI, the Treasury and Immigration Departments, and we resent this inference, as much as we deplore the insinuations against our people.

Like ourselves, many social, civic and fraternal organizations, as well as many individuals prominent in industry, in commerce, in civil service and in the judiciary, have openly decried the patently unjust association of all Americans of Italian heritage with the criminal acts of the few.

In this connection we are happy to note that two U.S. Senators: HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania and KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York have taken up the cudgels against the defamation of our ethnic group and have urged a national investigation. In letters to Attorney General William P. Rogers and Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson, the two Senators ask a full report on the alleged existence of a nationwide organization of criminals; what is being done to eliminate such a conspiracy if it exists; and, if no conspiracy exists, a statement to that effect. They also ask for a statement of policy of both departments of Government to protect the civil rights of people mistakenly identified with criminal acts, and instruction to Federal agents to beware of defamatory public statements about any minority group.

The letters go even further, when they point out that "the most serious of all have been the statements issued by some law-enforcement officers and Senate investigating teams" which tend to associate all Americans of Italian lineage with the unholy delegates

of crime and vice. The letters also state: "This is as heartless as it is untrue."

We most heartily endorse the position of Senators SCOTT and KEATING. It is high time for action. We have been patient too long. We are aroused as never before and we want an end to the ill-founded, vague condemnation of a fine, loyal and industrious people who—since the discovery of America by one of their forebears—have given it their full measure of devotion.

Minnesota Polls Rate Nixon Strongest Candidate in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, quite naturally, Minnesotans—as well as Americans in every other State of the Union—are very much interested in the presidential election of 1960.

Recently the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota Poll, one of the most reliable surveys of public opinion in the State, conducted a series of inquiries as to the relative strength of the men in both parties who have been prominently mentioned as candidates.

In the poll of July 5, 1959, 54 percent of the Republican voters of Minnesota selected Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON as the strongest presidential candidate for the Republican Party. According to the poll, 37 percent of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor supporters selected Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

The report on the poll's findings, as published in the Minneapolis Tribune, is as follows:

MINNESOTA POLL

Minnesotans' ratings of possible candidates in the 1960 Presidential race fall into these patterns in a statewide survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll:

A majority of Republican voters (54 percent) say Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON is the "strongest" presidential candidate the GOP could run in 1960, out of a field of eight prospects. Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York is next, with 32 percent.

(Last January, in a similar survey, Republicans were almost equally divided as to whether NIXON or Rockefeller was the "best" candidate the Republicans could run in 1960. But Rockefeller led among independents in January; now NIXON heads the list in that group.)

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY still is the top choice of Democratic-Farmer-Labor supporters for the Democratic presidential nomination. Thirty-seven percent of the DFL'ers pick HUMPHREY as the strongest of eight possible contenders. But his lead has declined since January when 49 percent named HUMPHREY the best candidate the Democrats could run for President.

Next among the current choices of the DFL rank and file are Senator JOHN KENNEDY, of Massachusetts (22 percent) and Adlai Stevenson (17 percent).

The views of voting age residents of the State are surveyed regularly by the Minnesota poll through interviews with representative cross sections of the adult population—persons living in cities and towns and on farms in all parts of the State.

In the latest study, in June, interviewers first handed each person a card listing eight men frequently mentioned as Republican prospects for the Presidency: Robert B. Anderson, U.S. Secretary of the Treasury; Henry Cabot Lodge, chief U.S. delegate to the United Nations; Neil McElroy, U.S. Secretary of Defense; James Mitchell, U.S. Secretary of Labor; Richard M. Nixon, Vice President; Nelson Rockefeller, Governor of New York; Harold E. Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota; Fred Seaton, U.S. Secretary of the Interior.

Then the interviewers asked:

"Right now, which man on the list do you think would run the strongest race for the Republicans in 1960?"

A similar question was asked in January, using the same list of names. The opinions of Republicans and independent voters in those two surveys are as follows:

Republican voters

[In percent]

	January 1959	June 1959
Nixon	41	54
Rockefeller	40	32
Lodge	7	6
Stassen	5	1
McElroy	1	1
Anderson	1	----
Mitchell	----	----
Seaton	----	----
No opinion	6	6
Total	101	100

Independent voters

[In percent]

	January 1959	June 1959
Nixon	24	42
Rockefeller	38	32
Lodge	13	9
Stassen	9	5
McElroy	1	----
Anderson	----	----
Mitchell	3	----
Seaton	2	1
No opinion	10	13
Total	100	102

In cases where a few persons name more than one man, the totals add to more than 100 percent.

The eight names included in the list of possible Democratic contenders are Hubert Humphrey, U.S. Senator from Minnesota; Lyndon Johnson, U.S. Senator from Texas; Estes Kefauver, U.S. Senator from Tennessee; John Kennedy, U.S. Senator from Massachusetts; Robert Meyner, Governor of New Jersey; Adlai Stevenson, former Governor of Illinois; Stuart Symington, U.S. Senator from Missouri; G. Mennen Williams, Governor of Michigan.

Opinions on the "strongest" candidate the Democrats could nominate for President in 1960 run as follows:

Democratic-Farmer-Labor voters

[In percent]

	January 1959	June 1959
Humphrey	49	37
Kennedy	20	22
Stevenson	14	17
Kefauver	10	9
Johnson	2	5
Williams	1	1
Symington	(1)	3
Meyner	----	----
No opinion	4	6
Total	100	100

[1] Less than 1 percent.

Independent voters

[In percent]

	January 1959	June 1959
Kennedy	27	26
Humphrey	35	17
Symington	4	12
Stevenson	6	10
Johnson	5	10
Kefauver	11	8
Williams	2	1
Meyner	2	2
No opinion	8	14
Total	100	100

Although Stevenson repeatedly has stated he has no intention of running a third time as the Democratic nominee for president, his stock among DFL'ers and independents is rising in Minnesota.

Persons who voted for Stevenson in 1956 divide as follows on the question of the strongest presidential prospect for the Democrats: Humphrey, 32 percent; Kennedy, 23 percent; Stevenson, 20 percent; others, 20 percent; undecided, 5 percent.

Mr. Speaker, a second Minnesota poll published last Sunday—July 12—shows that Vice President NIXON is preferred by more Minnesotans than any other candidate:

MINNESOTA POLL

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat-Farmer-Labor, of Minnesota, vie for top honors in a statewide survey on whom Minnesotans prefer for President in 1960.

Among voting-age men and women interviewed by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll, 22 percent prefer NIXON and 21 percent prefer HUMPHREY out of a field of eight Republicans and eight Democrats.

Next are Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic candidate for President in 1952 and 1956, named by 11 percent; Senator John Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts, also with 11 percent; Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, Republican, of New York, 9 percent; Senator Estes Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennessee, 5 percent.

In total, Democratic presidential prospects outscore Republicans, 52 percent to 36 percent.

A representative cross-section of men and women, aged 21 and older, was interviewed, in all parts of the State.

People were first asked to indicate which man they thought would run the strongest race for the Republicans, out of a list of eight GOP possible candidates. The question was repeated for the Democratic nomination, using a list of eight Democrats.

(As reported last Sunday, NIXON is the leading choice of Republican and independent voters on the GOP side. Democratic-Farmer-Labor voters name HUMPHREY most frequently as the strongest man the Democrats could run next year.)

After considering the two lists of candidates separately, each person was asked:

"Of all the men on both lists, Republican or Democratic, which one would you personally prefer to see elected President in 1960?"

The replies:

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Nixon	22	21	23
Humphrey	21	23	19
Stevenson	11	12	10
Kennedy	11	10	12
Rockefeller	9	9	9
Kefauver	5	6	4
Others	9	10	9
No opinion	12	9	14
Total	100	100	100

Other men on the Republican list are Robert B. Anderson, U.S. Secretary of the Treasury; Henry Cabot Lodge, chief U.S. delegate to the United Nations; Neil McElroy, U.S. Secretary of Defense; James Mitchell, U.S. Secretary of Labor; Harold E. Stassen, former governor of Minnesota; Fred Seaton, U.S. Secretary of the Interior.

The Democratic list includes LYNDON JOHNSON, U.S. Senator from Texas; Robert Meyner, Governor of New Jersey; STUART SYMINGTON, U.S. Senator from Missouri; G. Mennen Williams, Governor of Michigan.

Of the Minnesotans who voted in 1956 for President Eisenhower, 41 percent favor NIXON's election next year. Among those who voted 3 years ago for Stevenson, 35 percent now favor HUMPHREY in 1960, while 23 percent pick Stevenson and 15 percent are for KENNEDY.

The leading choices of DFL backers interviewed in the survey are HUMPHREY, 39 percent; Stevenson and KENNEDY, each with 16 percent.

GOP supporters' top preferences are NIXON, 56 percent; Rockefeller, 21 percent; Lodge and Stassen, each 4 percent.

Independent voters' choices are: NIXON, 18 percent; Stevenson and KENNEDY, each 13 percent; Rockefeller, 11 percent; HUMPHREY, 10 percent.

When all of the preferences for Republicans and all of those for Democrats are grouped, the responses form these patterns:

	Preference for Democrat	Preference for Republican	Noncommittal
Total, State	52	36	12
Big city residents	63	27	10
Smaller cities	46	40	14
Town	49	39	12
Farm	47	41	12
Labor union members	77	13	10
1956 Eisenhower voters	26	65	9
1956 Stevenson voters	88	3	9

Statement of Congressman Lane in Support of Forand Bill, H.R. 4700, Before House Ways and Means Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my statement before the House Ways and Means Committee in support of the Forand bill to amend the Social Security Act.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. LANE BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 4700, THE FORAND BILL TO AMEND THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, JULY 13, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, no one can dispute the fact that our social security program leaves much to be desired. Since 1935, we have extended the range of its coverage, and have increased its benefits on a number of occasions. As the United States, however, was one of the last of the established nations to inaugurate a system of social insurance, it was obvious that we would have to accelerate its development, in order to match the progress of other nations in this field.

There is some difference of opinion as to whether we are expanding our program fast enough. In this age of social and economic change, it is plain to see that our people regard the program in the United States as being far from adequate. The chief criticisms leveled at its deficiencies, center on the lack of insurance to cover the cost of hospital, nursing home, and surgical services for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

The surprising and commendable support of group insurance to cover hospital and medical expenses, by our working population, is one of the significant developments in our society since the end of World War II. People need and want security, against the economic hazards of old age, and the physical impairments that inevitably accompany the years of deterioration.

The aged require more medical care, but under the present organization of our society, they are the ones who are unable to pay for it. Rather than appeal to charity, some of them, clinging to their human dignity, prefer to suffer in silence.

This is a deplorable situation, unworthy of the world's richest nation. We have had 25 years in which to expand the Social Security Act and to provide health insurance for the aged, but have failed to make a beginning in this respect.

Those who oppose the legislation designed to balance that "social deficit," claim that it is unnecessary due to the number of the aged who are covered by private medical and hospitalization programs. This argument is self-defeating because of its contradictions. It fails to mention the drastic curtailment in benefits after the insured reaches the age of 65, or the millions who, because this is a voluntray decision, neglect to take out such insurance.

I was impressed last year by the statement of Dr. Eveline M. Burns, who testified on behalf of the National Association of Social Workers, the professionals who have the most practical knowledge and experience in this field. She testified in part: "We endorse the proposals contained in Congressman FORAND's bill, H.R. 9467, for the payment of hospital, nursing home, and surgical expenses for individuals entitled to OASI benefits. Even if it were deemed undesirable at this time to extend this privilege to survivor beneficiaries, we believe there is an overwhelmingly strong case for doing so in the case of the retired aged. The cost of medical care to the aged is increasingly becoming our major national social problem. It is the cause of a large part of the supplementation of OASI benefits and of the rising costs of public assistance, despite the declining numbers of old-age assistance recipients. It will become increasingly important with the growth in numbers of the aged. The question the Nation faces is merely the question of the best way to meet these costs. We believe that, for the long run, the most rational method is by way of insurance; and that the most feasible method of making sure that everyone shall be insured is to utilize the machinery of compulsory premium payment through OASI."

Congressman FORAND's bill, which this year bears the identification H.R. 4700, is notable because it will not only provide insurance against the costs of hospital and surgical services, but takes cognizance of the growing need for nursing home care. With the lengthening span of human life, we shall need more of this special type of service for the aged.

Congressman FORAND's bill will finance the extra cost, with respect to employees and employers, by gradual increases for both under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act to a maximum after December 31, 1968, of 4¾ percent. This, even though it is an addition to other taxes under the FICA to finance the provisions of the Social Security Act, is a small price to pay for removing the dread specter of fear and worry from the last years of our older citizens who are in need of medical care but are unable to pay for it from their social-security checks.

As long as legislation to provide such insurance is certain to be enacted in the near future, in response to public demand and social needs, I believe that our best course is to make the beginning now so that our program will be adjusted to the increasing percentage of the aged in our population.

Eagle Rock, Calif., Girl Scout Troop No. 994

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged on Monday, July 13, to have as my guests in a tour of the Capitol and a visit to the House Gallery, Girl Scout Troop 994 from Eagle Rock, located in the 24th Congressional District of California which I represent.

Troop No. 994 arrived in Washington Sunday, July 12, and after 2 days of sightseeing here, left for New York. Following 2 days in New York, the group will entrain for Montreal, Canada, where, after another day of sightseeing, the Girl Scouts will board a ship for a tour of Europe, to return home September 11.

A very interesting fact about this tour is that the money to pay for it was earned by the girls themselves. I believe that the story of this troop and its activities is interesting and inspiring. It shows what a group can accomplish for themselves and others if they put their minds and hearts to it.

Troop No. 994 was reestablished in 1954 as a troop for those interested in service and travel. Its membership now includes 43, of whom 24 are making the present tour. They have been going on various trips for the last 4 years, leading up to and preparing themselves for their main goal, the trip to Europe.

The first year the girls went on a week camping tour, learning how to build fires, cook out of doors, and handle camping equipment. During the second year, the troop went on several weekend trips, and on a 3-week camping trip to the Grand Canyon, Zion, and Bryce National Parks, and to Salt Lake City, Utah.

The third year, the girls were ready for a more ambitious trip, and toured the Southern States all the way to Miami, and went over to Cuba for 2 days. They traveled by chartered bus and cooked and camped out of doors during most of the trip.

The fourth summer was spent at home earning money for the European trip, except for 1 weekend outing. The girls got summer jobs, and later, part-time jobs during the school year to help finance the trip to Europe. This meant, of course, that they had to give up many social activities.

Other means Troop 994 used to help earn their fare was to hold paper drives, rummage sales, dinners, and doing all sorts of odd jobs. The parents of the girls helped participate in various of these activities.

All this while Troop 994 was very busy performing service activities. As part of their service duties, the girls adopted an old folks home. They would visit and take presents to guests, send cards on birthdays and holidays, give programs and caroling parties at Christmas.

Other service activities included putting on plays and serving refreshments at the children's ward at general hospital, helping patients to and from the auditorium, serve refreshments at the veterans' hospital, and helped put on children's programs at Halloween.

I would like to salute Girl Scout Troop No. 994 for their hard work and devotion to help their fellow man, and to make themselves better citizens. In their tour of Europe, they will be traveling as representatives of America. I know they will be wonderful ambassadors wherever they go.

The girls from Troop No. 994 making the trip under the leadership of Mrs. Maude N. Houtz, Mrs. Ernestine M. Zane, and Mrs. Willa McMullen, are: Misses Suzanne Arvidson, Patricia Giblin, Suzanne Haller, JoAnn Handwerker, Barbara Jo Hall, Barbara Hare, Barbara Herzig, Carleen Hines, Gale Jennings, Maureen Klein, Eva Lamm, Linda Lange, Dee Lazzaretto, Carol Sue Leech, Marjorie Meese, Margaret Mendelson, Claire Mount, Marion Page, Joyce Sheeley, Sue Tandy, Lani Wahl, Juliann West, Karon Zane, and Sharon Zane.

Fifteen other leaders and parents are also accompanying the group to Europe.

Statement of Mr. Benjamin E. Waite of Lynn, Mass., in Support of H.R. 4700, Before Ways and Means Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement of my constituent, Mr. Benjamin E. Waite, 48 Tudor Street, Lynn, Mass., before the House Ways and Means Committee in support of the Forand bill, H.R. 4700, to amend the Social Security Act:

STATEMENT BY BENJAMIN E. WAITE, J.P., OF LYNN, MASS., JULY 14, 1959

To the Ways and Means Committee on the Forand Bill, H.R. 4700:

I was born in England 1877, now 82. Migrated 1913 to United States on family bereavement. Six years on my town council, 1906–10; was parliamentary subagent which saw the birth and passage of England social insurance law, 1911.

I did not see England again until 1951 when I carried greetings from mayors of Massachusetts and Connecticut who were offsprings to mother towns in England. I had unique opportunity over widspread areas to judge results of 38 years under a complete social security system. I found tranquillity of mind, displaced tensions and fears which existed prior to 1911, superb health fit for any change or chance. That gave me fresh impetus for continuance of campaign. I have worked to that end from 1906 to 1958 and now 1959 so I celebrate golden wedded to social security. Until 1934 United States social security was politically absent. But in that year I got through a resolution for a national health law to be a part of a national security law at Washington conference. In 1935–36 and 1939 filed amendments in Massachusetts Legislature. In 1936 filed memorization law for Congress to enact a national health law—lost. In 1956 filed memorization for Congress to enact a national health law—Massachusetts passed. In 1936 appeared before Senate Labor and Education Committee on S. 3475; 1958 filed brief and endorsements on H.R. 9467 before Ways and Means Committee, pages 1200–1205.

I have been a designated justice of the peace, Massachusetts, 9 years. Social security has 3 prongs. We have unemployment compensation OASI, but the most important is missing—national health. Precedents exist unless the United States of America is like Raleigh (Fain would I climb but fear I to fall). Concord 184 years ago did not need a precedent or President Roosevelt in the 1930's with NRA, Blue Eagle, AAA, CCC, NIRA, FERA, and others.

The 47 most favored nations have health coverage. I give also a partial list of dates; Algeria, Albania, Argentina, 1944; Australia, Austria, 1893; Belgium, Bolivia, Czechoslovakia, 1948; Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, 1936–45; Germany, 1884, 1911, 1933; Great Britain, 1911, 1948; Greece, Hungary, 1891, 1927; Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, 1920–47; Portugal, 1919–33, Spain, 1933–43; Sweden Cradle to Grave, 1955; Switzerland, Turkey, Soviet Socialist Republics, 1911–27; Venezuela, Yugoslavia, 1922–47. Breathes there a man who will say these 47 nations are wrong and national health has deteriorated? Yet the United States of America denies its people health coverage when every sane person knows that in this fierce competitive age, industrial health is the most powerful factor in industry for the successful flow of goods. Any nation without national health law may win short races but not marathons. When Asia, Europe, Africa, Russia start full rolling the United States of America will face cut-throat competition. It has already begun. Switzerland won over General Electric for three generators that would have given 150 men a full year's work. Massachusetts indignation later caused cancellation. Therefore, at all costs, the United States of America must have a compulsory health law to survive. Seventy-five thousand released from Army as unfit in March 1959.

I was born in an era of folk medicine, 1877, in England. All around were small towns and villages. In each of these was usually a woman who knew medicinal value of herbs and roots which when brewed was found almost perfect remedies for most ills. Doctors in those days carried a small cabinet of supplies for immediate use. A Jonathan Rashleigh recently died, up to his end did just that, his cabinet contained tincture of rhubarb, genuine turkey powder, tincture of henbane, extract of taxaxaeum, powder of jalop, bottle of laudnum, ipecacuanha wine, scammony, sal volatile, brandy, blue pills, true jam powder, mercury with chalk. Doctors then were on a 24-hour day, 7 days a week, long before the phrase was invented "beyond the call of duty"; rarely submitted bill; patients paid out of meager funds. Folk medicine still persists even in the United States. In Vermont, United States, for most all ills is 2 teaspoons each of honey and vinegar and honeycomb. Gypsies, Indians, tribes still also practice. Globe, November 7, 1958, Henry Smith, age 101, states what kept him alive was a teaspoon of baking soda after each meal.

Globe 2, 1958, states Makhmud Evazov of Soviet Union, 150 age, still farms and rides horseback.

Globe 12, 1958, states there are 40,000 people over 100 years old registered at University of Kharkov.

Russia with a population of 200 million has 344,000 doctors; 70 percent are women. There are 16 doctors for every 100,000; said to be the highest ratio in the world. Could it be that lady doctors can prolong life better than males, or these men like penguins whose digestive track is free from bacteria. Russia's mortality is 7–9, United States is 9–3 per 1,000. In my four generations I have seen the passing of blood, letting leeches to stop bleeding. Surgeon operating with unclean clothes, instruments not clean, or rooms before germ infection was fully understood. Births not painless handled mostly by midwife under candle and paraffin lights.

Registered hospitals in 1957 in the United States of America were 6,848. Massachusetts is ninth with 209. In Massachusetts, medical institutions are, I believe, best in the United States of America. But in all hospitals need substantial funds despite endowments and community funds. In Beth El Hospital, 20,000 babies were born in 1950–58; 600,000 used this hospital; gave 4 million days free time. Boston City Hospital, where no means test is required, gave 35,000 free treatments in 1957. They have 1,570 beds, 600 doctors, most on salaries; also all administration staff clinic, 50 cents. Face an outlay of million for facelifting. Boston General Hospital, before admittance to a clinic a form must be filled (form enclosed), more searching than income tax; clinics, $3. Peabody City Hospital faces an outlay of $650,000 for repairs. Most hospitals inquire on entry and exit who is going to pay? If a national health insurance law is passed a greater part of free time will be abolished by payments; that in conjunction with nursing home care will reduce caseloads. Abolish small hospitals—share expensive equipment, pooling by medical faculty of all new and successful methods and make available to all practitioners. Not all hospitals are perfect. Richard Blum found four of California hospitals he examined needed complete changes in ethics and audit. In an understatement in Eleanor Roosevelt's column, hospital charges are almost prohibitive and vacancies exist in New York hospitals.

Charges in one Lynn hospital (form appended) are $17 a day; many are higher.

England has now taken in addition to hospitals 3,426 voluntary and teaching nursing homes and their endowments, 1910, 1911, 1948. Medical powers in all branches opposed came in later in full cooperation. Now England is united and has the cheapest managing cost. England and Russia pay time loss as well as medical care during sickness. Time loss is sound economy. In Russia women with jobs get full pay and 124 days' free maternity. In Russia 50,000 women have 10 or more children, belong to the Order of Motherhood. The common cold caused 50 percent of absentees. Cost United States $5 billion a year in man-hours and medicines.

U.S. News: 8 millions go in debt from heavy medical expenses. I have seen far too often a single carrier infect large numbers of workers. If pay loss existed carriers would stay home.

All doctors cannot take or care for their patients in hospitals. If Lynn is average, 1957 Lynn had 200 qualified doctors, 158 were ostracized. Hospital facilities should be available to all qualified doctors.

There are 171 veterans' hospitals, 17 domiciliaries in the United States. Each State has one or more. Twenty-three million veterans served in all wars, 22,633,000 can be potential users of these medical facilities. U.S. population 175 million, that leaves 152,367,000 not covered. If the United States can finance and manage veterans hospitals with sound defined policies, then why should not civilian veterans of labor have the same free medical protection, U.S. control, OASI and unemployment compensation. Why should health protection be the remarkable exception? I have belonged to the Blue Cross since 1946 (form appended); Blue Shield was out at 65. My payments were raise in stages $6.35, $10.25, $15.25, $22.05 a quarter. These raises got only minute benefits. Since an OASI retirement no more payments are required. Then on retirement all payments should cease whether Blue Cross or others and each retired person should have full medical health protection. In 1956 there were 221,700 doctors, only 160,387 belonged to American Medical Association; of 99,227 dentists only 86,872 belonged to Dentists Association.

It seems to be the policy of these bodies to prevent publicity unless approved. If these minorities could state by secret ballot, I feel sure numbers would vote a national health law. Doctors in main object to be on salary (since 1929 dentist salaries increased 83 percent; doctors 157 percent). So much for each patient as plan of other nations. January 1959 there were 7,000 research projects in 700 universities and private laboratories. U.S. Public Health Service, Bethesda, Md., support one-half of medical research of one-half of 6,500 employees are technicians, scientists on salaries (now even have testers). All on salaries, as well as Mayo, Ford, and other clinics. Salaries are not a bar to incentive to work at highest capacity. On the contrary, I believe these dedicated people work more serenely at their highest mental capacities. The world owes a debt to these men who in invention, prevention, curative medicine have developed methods to combat yellow fever, cholera, smallpox, cancer, typhoid, dysentery, typhus, and finding causes, preventing overcrowding, lice, mosquitoes, epidemics, are possible even now. 1947, 200 died daily in New York of smallpox, 7 million vaccinated; influenze 1928 one-half million died in the United States; 20 million affected over world from Iceland to New Zealand. Vaccine for influenza is available but not fully used, and polio shots in Detroit sent back cost and apathy of public. Some public health bodies do a great job in discovering carriers. Mary Fallon was the great carrier of diphtheria, and raw pork cause of another epidemic. October 1958, Boston, 1,600 osteopathic surgeons where Dr. Levitt warned that abuses of prepaid medicine plans of patients by doctors and hospitals may lead to Government health insurance.

Let's be frank. There are abuses by patients, doctors, and drugstores, if some towns in Massachusetts are a criterion of the Nation. Each is now alive as never before to police their organizations to prevent abuse. If and when national health law is passed, any illegal or evasive actions should be penalized in full. Clem Norton, March 14, 1959: $500 million spent on phony remedies for shortcut cases. News report: $250 million vitamins sold over counters. Doctors state $240 million wasted. Under health coverage patients would seek medical aid and not buy medications on impulse. Some doctors might aid drug buying in their newspaper columns in which they give advice to unseen inquirers. Some sell pamphlets at 25 cents; one advised a series at $7.50. Sign I saw in window of drugstore: "Come in, try pill, twill make you feel good. On the house." When I read that fine piece of literature, the hippocratic oath: One part, I will abstain from whatever is deleterious and michievous (oath appended). When druggists, doctors, osteopathic surgeons have in meetings warned their members that abuses of prepaid medicines plans may lead to national health insurance. In many towns and cities, prices, fees, drugs, have been excessive and protested, and each have promised to police their organizations. In 1947, 48 million prescriptions were filled in which wonder drugs were featured at stiff prices at a cost of $2 billion. A survey made by a reputable man showed 1,000 tablets of vitamins cost $1 to produce, sold to drugstore $5.40, to patients $8. Dexedrine, wholesale price for 1,000 tablets, $22.60 one firm; another firm $1.50. A tranquilizer drug, prices in 12 stores varied from 95 cents to $4.95 for 50 tablets. Aspirin, 12 cents to 67 cents for 100 tablets. I have known many cases of expensive prescribed drugs thrown away as harmful. But when these drugs are good for patients, are beyond reach, if for protractive use and means of most, particularly those over 65 who on August 1958 average on OASI, end of February 10, 1959, $71.62 checks. This sum must cover a month's expenditure.

News March 1959 (Jerome D. Fenton resigned from labor relations because $20,000 a year was not enough). State aid is more generous. Average monthly check $96.20, plus $6.50 day nursing home, $3.95 medical center, $11 a day chronic hospital. Doctors $3 office, $4 home. No limit on visits. Lynn limits $25 a month for drugs. Massachusetts is 4th for welfare care, 8th in wealth, 6th in spending, 9th in number of hospitals. Even Congressmen, when in session, get free medical treatment. Doctors' private patients charges are not standard in Massachusetts; $4 to $6, specialists, $10 to $15 for office visits. Doctors' home visits $5 to $6, plus drugs, transportation and other charges. Transfusion $25, X-rays $10. There are 84,166 on Massachusetts State aid. May have some shysters as are unfortunately in other parts of system of United States. But the majority are victims of the unequal distribution system. No one I affirm would want to go back to separation of family and over the hill to the poorhouse. I have seen many a husband and wife going to different workhouses and treated worse than animals. There can be no return—England has turned poor law institutions into hospitals.

In cities practice is growing for doctors grouping in office buildings, telephone answering service, immediate contact is delayed sometimes results in undue suffering weekend and nights. Doctors are not sometimes found. When appointments are made, waits of long periods sometimes occur wasting patient's time. Drew Pearson, August 30, 1958, states AMA spent $499,906 to create better public relations. Why was this necessary if doctors kept the Hipprocratic oath. There is a break in their ranks, 181,000 professional nurses favor Forand H.R. 4700 bill (News Report). William Decker, Corning Glass Co., says H.R. 4700 the best solution. Dr. Graham Beaumont, of England, visiting United States, when asked to compare British and U.S. systems said, in effect, there is no substitute for total health coverage as in England. Most large industries have some form of medical care but this is lost on severance and termination of employment. Doctors don't seem to like this form because it does not give free choice of doctors; other doctors generally feel that free choice of doctor is a fetish. I believe in free choice of doctors and hospitals.

In 1958 amendments, which increased OASI recipients 7 percent, to 12.6 million. Extra cost was 50 million. That 50 million I affirm will be spent largely on food (not vicuna coats). That should help farmers. Drew Pearson also states 6 million paid to subsidiaries, farms; billions for defense. News, March 2, 1957, Stanley Jankus fined $3,370 in 1956 for growing more than quota of crops for his own stock. That doesn't make sense. United States had given Formosa 2 to 5 million and 1 million for training and equipment of farmers; Italy 220 million, Austria 52 million, Yugoslavia 11 million. United States spends untold millions on space missiles—money is always found—while there are nearly 5 million unemployed and vast numbers in need of medical care beyond their present means. Money remains in Fort Knox, OASI pensioners 67,787 in number have left United States to live in Italy, Canada, Greece, England, Phillipines, Yugoslavia, West Germany, Ireland, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden because their pensions can secure a higher standard of living. If they remain in United States they are outside looking in—before retiring they were inside looking out. Above nations have health insurance.) If instead of giving these huge amounts to other countries for economic aid these sums were used for larger pensions and complete national health coverage, United States would be the greatest of democratic nations.

"Perils of Migrants" (Coronet, September 1958)—2 million migrants roam for work in seasonal occupation; roam States of Texas, California, Pennsylvania, Maine, Georgia, and others for crops such as tomatoes, potatoes, cranberries, cotton, and others. Housed frequently in unhealthy chicken coops, barns, some without sanitation, running water, light, etc., poses a threat of carrier disease and public health authority should be given greater funds and power.

Since the trends have over successive decades gone from rural to urban, tensions and fears have grown. Man is no longer a complete unit. He is a part of a production system. Day work to piece, assembly lines, high speed machines; time studies, factories moving to other towns or States—competition to jobs, costs of sickness; time studies for minimum motions, unemployment making mortgage payments difficult. When a man gets a job he cannot put his family on payroll. In Massachusetts there are 30,000 mental patients. Suicides 10th highest in the United States. A new Branch Rescue, Inc., privately financed, is part of Boston City Hospital. They deal with 150 a month; they saved 74 definite in one month's results of tensions and fears could be largely eliminated with national health coverage and adequate pensions. Pursuit of happiness in this troubled world for those retired is blocked by sickness costs, of high charges of funerals which have to be met by relatives because of inability to make provision out of inadequate pensions. Therefore adequate pensions must be provided and relief given by passage of H.R. 4700 which provides national health insurance. Freedom of speech exists but audience is missing for those retired except those who in standing room only meet on street corners or public squares—no comfortable plush hall, even these pass away and over years fresh groups form.

Freedom of religion, yes, before retirement, but after pension cannot contribute on former level. Therefore they sometimes stay away or be ostracized for low pledges. Pursuit of progress cannot be high geared—absence of NHI without a national health law.

Before retiring, food, shelter, clothing was reasonably possible. They were inside looking out. After retiring, on an average end, February 1959, $71.62, are outside looking in and wondering how to make both ends meet with material that won't stretch even by a market expert on bargaining and cheapest of food items. March News, Boston, given a grant of $39,000 to find out

why men grow old—above the answer—larger checks and health coverage. In four generations I have seen these heroic men, famous veterans of labor, bloodied and charged by lancers under material law for the right to organize in England. United States 1934 is martial law bloodshed on two each killed in San Francisco, Minneapolis, Toledo, for the right to organize. Those were days when secrecy at start was a must or else get beaten up or lose your job. Courageous men led their meetings, heavily policed, taking conspicuous notes and on trivial words arrest speakers. Yet these men worked very long hours at starvation wages. Few pleasures and no luxuries. England gave Sam Gompers, to become father of the labor movement, United States, but their loins sprung the race that have built the standards of living that exist today beyond the dreams of prophets who lived in previous centuries. They have given their all so that future generations shall not be called upon to endure the bitter hardship and untold suffering of the past. With national health coverage there will be problems of those not qualified at start to come under but are financed by public drives 1959 are nationwide; $170 million collected in United States, cost $26 million to collect. These drives increase each year. I get 17 appeals each year. These drives should be consolidated and eventually come under national health coverage. In this ultramodern age permanent limits of standards cannot be defined.

Changes occur almost with rapidity of light. To all it should be evident that if any considerable segment of population is impoverished from heavy costs of sickness cannot buy goods through lack of funds in U.S. markets labor will suffer economic loss. Shall we be governed by past century thinkers, such as John Stuart Mills, John Waltham, Herbert Spencer? In their philosophies land could not support an expanding population or grow food adequate for its need. That extreme poverty would always be with us. That war and pestilence would kill the weak and unfit have survival of the fittest; that births should be curtailed. How wrong they were.

There is no forseeable limit to what land can produce if the United States of America is a guide. Where land is taken out of cultivation and quotas of crops fixed for each producer, yet despite this there are in the United States of America surpluses of millions—$9 million worth in U.S. warehouses. Extreme poverty is not an insoluble problem in the United States of America. United States of America population even increasing—no diminution of adequate food with proper distribution.

In the United States we want the greatest good for all the people, then we must follow the light lit by two great humanitarians in the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who said to Francis Perkins, "I believe in the cradle to the grave," passage 1935, Social Security Law. Roosevelt National National Health Survey, 1935–36 and his frequent attempts to have compulsory health insurance in the United States and it is reported he with a doctor at the time of his death was drafting such a measure. Harry Truman only 5 months in office drafted plans and in subsequent years drew public attention to utmost need of national health insurance. He published in 1952 "Health Needs of Nation" in five volumes. The heat is on by four national bodies, each claims to be our best friend to stop compulsory health insurance. Insurance companies state we have the know-all and can give very low rates but in their invisible print, we shall have to make profits to pay for our $100 million buildings (as in Boston).

Some doctors say, "Under national health law you get only what you pay for. We can give you better service as private patients." They neglect to state that 47 nations who have health coverage have better health standards than existed before. If under U.S. health law they gave less than their best they would not last long. The public can't be fooled long. Druggists say, "Do it yourself if you are feeling unwell; use our drugs; you will find them in stores and markets vividly labeled just what they are and what they do and read our national publicity for other information." Nonprofit bodies racing to get under cover by adding 65'ers to Blue Shield. None admit that the President of the United States of America is head of a family of 175 million and is therefore vested with responsibility to keep his family vigorous and healthy. And the only way as 47 nations found is by a national health law. United States cannot longer stand among nations in splendid unisolation.

Allen Toynbee states the time will come when all the friends of civilization will be shared equally by all and that is practical politics. He and Vice President NIXON were on same platform in Boston recently and NIXON quoted above and said he was in accord. I shall watch our Vice President with great interest on all humanitarian measures.

"There is a tide in the affairs of man which taken at the flood leads on to fortune." The flood is here. On the crest is the long-awaited ship H.R. 4700 with a manifest and charter for a national health insurance law for the United States. Ready—aye—ready to land. Awaits Pilot FORAND with the ways and means to tie up to the 47-nation buoy.

Since writing above I have read report submitted to Ways and Means Committee, April 3, 1959, entitled "Hospital Insurance for OASI Beneficiaries" with astonishment because in that report pursuit of information did not go further than the booth on the front porch. I looked in vain for visits to Sweden, England, Russia, cradle to grave nations, whose systems are national successes, nor did this committee recommend books as helpful that are in the Congressional Library: Melchior Palyi, "Compulsory Medical and Welfare States"; J. G. Thwait's "Modern Medical Discoveries"; A. L. Barron, "Man Against Germs"; James Cook, "Remedies and Rackets"; W. Shiver, "Mid-Century Journey"; James Howard Means, "People and Goverment"; Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., "Coming of the New Deal"; Galbraith, "Affluent Society"; John Gunther, "Inside Russia."

There are many others ably written, judicial in character, that the Ways and Means Committee would do well to study, also in Congressional Library.

Father Blum's Views on Freedom of Choice in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in order that all points of view on the question of making Federal assistance available to church-supported schools may be made a part of the record, the Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., has requested that I make the following article a part of my remarks in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Father Thorning, who many of us remember for his prayers as a visiting chaplain to this body, is the pastor of historic St. Joseph's Church in Carrollton Manor, Md.

Of him, the distinguished assistant majority leader of the Senate, the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, said recently:

> The Reverend Joseph F. Thorning [is] one of America's greatest experts in the field of Latin American affairs. * * * He is a man of widespread reputation throughout the Americas. He has made many contributions to better understanding between the states which comprise the hemisphere.

The article, "Freedom of Choice in Education," is the work of the Reverend Virgil C. Blum, S.J., of Milwaukee. Father Blum's article, published in two installments, first appeared in the April 26 and May 3, 1959 issues of Our Sunday Visitor. I found his article to be both thoughtful and provocative, although I personally do not share Father Blum's point of view on this question:

FREEDOM OF CHOICE IN EDUCATION

(By Rev. Virgil C. Blum, S.J.)

The greatest anomaly of a nation dedicated to the exaltation and defense of liberty is its denial of full religious freedom to citizens who believe in God-centered education.

This is America. A Nation conceived in the proposition that all men are created equal and endowed by God with rights and liberties, nonetheless refuses equality and religious liberty to children and students who desire to study the source of man's rights and liberties. Although "we are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being," as the Supreme Court reminded us in the Zorach case, yet, through the imposition of penalties, we deny religious freedom to citizens who pursue a fuller knowledge of this Supreme Being—a knowledge which alone can support and give meaning to the principles of democratic self-government.

At a time when America is in danger of being engulfed by a totalitarian power that denies to the conquered, as well as to its own citizens, every freedom to which man aspires, it might be expected that our Nation would make doubly secure the liberties of its own people. Totalitarianism can be resisted only by an undivided and sincere dedication to liberty. Yet, instead of reaffirming the rights and liberties of our citizens, we are ourselves adopting measures which generally characterize the absolute state. By legislative enactments we are demanding conformity in thought and belief. This is in violation of the most fundamental rights of the individual—freedom of mind and freedom of religion.

Freedom of mind and freedom of religion are of the essence of a free and open society. An open society is legally tolerant of all ideas and beliefs. In an open society there is not, nor can there be, a state-established orthodoxy in belief and opinion to which all must conform. A free and open society provides constitutional guarantees to protect the rights and liberties of the individual. In such a society a majority cannot "proscribe" those who will not conform to a philosophic or religious "orthodoxy."

When, however, society, whether by direct or indirect action, begins to "proscribe" individuals for their opinions or beliefs, it ceases to be a free and open society; it becomes a closed society based on the principle of enforced conformity to a state-established orthodoxy, a society that is intolerant of nonconformist thoughts and beliefs.

There is in America today an increasing pressure to conformity to a state-established orthodoxy. There is an increasing intolerance of diversity of opinion and belief. I

submit that this closing of the door against freedom of thought and freedom of religion is well demonstrated by the discriminatory features of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and by virtually every education bill introduced in the 86th Congress.

• • • • •

In the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Federal Government demands of children, students, and teachers complete conformity to State educational policy as a condition for sharing in most of the benefits of the law.

• • • • •

This requirement of conformity to State-controlled educational policy is in radical conflict with the principles and guarantees of freedom of mind and freedom of religion. This demand of conformity as a condition for sharing in educational welfare benefits, compounded with like demands on the part of the several States, places such a high penalty on a choice of education free of political control that, in effect, the choice has been for most children and students effectively eradicated. They are compelled to conform to the State-established orthodoxy of State-controlled education.

Yet the U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly declared that parents have a constitutional right to send their children to independent schools. In the Prince case of 1944 the Court reaffirmed the fundamental doctrine of parental right in education when it asserted the principle of "the parents' authority to provide religious with secular schooling, and the child's right to receive it, as against the State's requirement of attendance at public schools."

It was in the Pierce decision of 1925 that the Court struck down an Oregon State law compelling all children to attend public schools. In a unanimous opinion it enunciated the fundamental principle that the child is "not the mere creature of the State." To prepare the child for "additional obligations," said the Court, is the "right and the high duty" of his parents. The Oregon law compelling attendance at State schools, declared the Court, "unreasonably interferes with the liberty of parents and guardians to direct the upbringing and education of children under their control."

When parents exercise this constitutional right by sending their children to independent schools, however, their children are deprived of all public educational benefits. They are cut off from all tax funds by all taxpayers for the education of all children and youth. This penalty, imposed on the exercise of a constitutional right, is an economic compulsion to conform to the State-established orthodoxy in the things of the mind and spirit.

It should be emphasized at this point that the State's obligations in education are to individual children and youth; these obligation are not to a school system or to educational institutions. Consequently, every individual child and youth has a right under the equal protection guarantee of the 5th and 14th amendments to share equally in the educational benefits provided by the taxpayer, and this without being coerced to surrender freedom of mind and freedom of religion.

Government may not condition participation in its benefits on the surrender of constitutional rights. This is a most fundamental principle of constitutional liberty. For "if the State may compel the surrender of one constitutional right as a condition of its favor," declared the U.S. Supreme Court in the Frost case, "it may, in like manner, compel the surrender of all." This would enable governments to do by indirection what they cannot do by direct action. But, said the Court, "it is inconceivable that guaranties embedded in the Constitution of the United States may thus be manipulated out of existence." Consequently, ruled the Court, a State "may not impose conditions [for sharing the benefits] which require the relinquishment of constitutional rights."

This constitutional guarantee notwithstanding, both the Federal and State Governments demand that children and students surrender freedom of mind and/or freedom of religion in the choice of school as a condition for sharing in educational benefits. Referring to this violation of liberty, Chicago University Law Prof. Wilber Katz points out that "we exact a price for the exercise of [the constitutional] liberty of parents • • • to send their children to religious schools."

Liberty at a price; this is the suppression of liberty. It deprives children and students of freedom of mind and religion in the choice of school, a right guaranteed by the first amendment. The late Dr. Bernard Iddings Bell, Episcopalian clergyman and educator, objecting to this violation of religious freedom, said that "as the American school system is now conducted, more and more conducted, there is no such thing as religious liberty in American education. There is liberty only to be unreligious."

The denial of educational benefits to children who seek a God-centered education penalizes the exercise of religion and, as such, is destructive of religious liberty. And, as Mr. Justice Black remarked in the Douds case, "freedom to think is inevitably abridged when beliefs are penalized by impositions of civil disabilities."

The denial of educational benefits to independent school children and students involves another violation of constitutional freedom. A denial of such benefits is, in effect, a coercive compulsion to conform to the philosophical and theological orientation of the state's schools. Such enforced conformity is in conflict with our two most fundamental constitutional liberties—freedom of mind and freedom of religion.

Every educational institution, or certainly its individual faculty members, is philosophically and theologically oriented. There is no such thing as philosophical and theological neutrality in the classroom. The questions "What is man?" "Where does he come from?" "What is his purpose?" "Is there a God?" cannot be avoided.

"On the fundamental religious issue," declared Sir Walter Moberly, formerly chairman of the university of grants committee of England, "the modern university intends to be, and supposes it is, neutral, but it is not. Certainly it neither inculcates nor expressly repudiates belief in God. But it does what is far more deadly than open rejection it ignores Him. • • • It is in this sense that the university today is atheistic. • • • It is a fallacy to suppose that by omitting a subject you teach nothing about it. On the contrary, you teach that it is to be omitted, and that it is therefore a matter of secondary importance. And you teach this not openly and explicitly, which would invite criticism; you simply take it for granted and thereby insinuate it silently, insidiously, and all but irresistibly."

"The ignoring of religion by the schools," points out Dr. Luther A. Weigle, former dean of the Yale Divinity School, "inevitably conveys to the children a negative suggestion. • • • It is natural for them to conclude that religion is negligible, or unimportant, or irrelevant to the main business of life."

This elimination of God from the child's most engaging activities through 12 or 16 years is of the very essence of secularism. Secularism eliminates God as a significant factor from all of man's day-to-day activities. Due to its theological orientation, secularism is in fact a negative religion. Secularism, remarked President Nathan Pusey of Harvard, has "itself become a faith and raised a hope that man can through his own efforts—without God—solve all the remaining problems which stand between him and a secular paradise on earth."

But whatever the philosophical or theological orientation of our State-controlled educational institutions or their faculties, the child and student cannot be forced to conform to it. For government to enforce conformity to any orientation—be it theistic, secularistic, or atheistic, Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish—is a most serious violation of freedom of mind and freedom of religion. Yet this is precisely what the Federal and State Governments are doing. They are enforcing conformity to the religious orientation of State-controlled schools as a condition for sharing in educational benefits.

To force a defenseless child to accept a philosophical and theological orientation of particular truths that clashes with his religious beliefs is not only a violation of his constitutional rights under the first amendment. It is a violation of his personal integrity. It is the forcible exposure to, if not a forcible impregnation with, ideas and beliefs in conflict with, if not in contradiction to, the most cherished beliefs of the child and of his parents.

When a Lutheran child who has been taught by his parents that God is the central fact of life that all his thoughts and actions must be performed with reference to God, is compelled to attend a State-controlled school which "insinuate(s) • • • silently, insidiously, and all but irresistibly" that religion is "a matter of secondary importance," as Moberly asserts, the child's freedom of conscience and his parents' right to direct and control his education are grossly violated by the State.

Democracy supposes a free people—a people who can think, and speak, and believe, and write, and assemble without Government interference. And freedom means the right to be different; the right of nonconformity. It means that government may not force its citizens to conform, whether it be in speech, in belief, or in thought. It means that government may use neither direct nor indirect means to force children and students to conform to the philosophical and theological orientation of State educational institutions. In the words of Mr. Justice Jackson, it means that government must "let men's minds alone."

When Government conditions its educational benefits on enforced conformity to State educational philosophy, however, it is not letting men's minds alone. It is intruding its secular arm into the mind of the student and demanding the right to orient truth as the condition for sharing in educational benefits. This subverts freedom and democracy. "The priceless heritage of our society," remarked Justice Jackson, "is the unrestricted constitutional right of each member to think as he will. Thought control is a copyright of totalitarianism, and we have no claim to it."

Our claim is to freedom, particularly to freedom of mind and freedom of spirit.

But how is freedom of mind and freedom of spirit to be achieved in education?

Virtually every democracy in the world achieves freedom of choice in education by supporting the school of the parents' choice. Because of constitutional, historical, and sociological conditions peculiar to America, many individuals who are dedicated to academic freedom advocate the direct-grant plan. Under this plan, government would give grants directly to parents or students to enable them to pay tuition, at least in part, in the schools of their choice.

The direct-grant plan, like virtually every social-welfare program adopted by the Federal and State Governments, subsidizes the individual person who is the recipient of the benefits of the particular welfare laws. For example, the needy aged person is the recipient of the benefits of the old-age assist-

ance program. He alone is subsidized. If he spends his Government subsidy at Macy's, Gimbles, Boston Store, or at A. & P. stores, Government does not quite obviously subsidize these stores. If he spends his subsidy at Milwaukee's Home for Aged Lutherans, Government does not quite obviously subsidize this church-related institution.

This principle of freedom of choice was also incorporated in the GI bill of rights. Veterans were not forced to attend State colleges as a condition for sharing in public educational benefits; they were free to attend the school of their choice. With subsidy in hand, they were free to attend the 474 Protestant, the 265 Catholic, the 5 Jewish institutions of higher education.

When government subsidizes the individual person, it establishes only a government-citizen relationship. It establishes no government-Gimbels or government-Harvard relationship. This has two important consequences. First, it creates no basis for government control of Gimbels or Harvard. Second, if the school attended by a government-subsidized student is church related, the church-state question cannot be raised.

It was for this latter reason that the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School in urging support of the tax credit plan (one form of personal subsidy), said that the plan could be adopted "without raising the issue of church-state relations."

Of course, constitutional principles and guarantees are not important when politicians deal with second-class citizens. Second-class citizens are to be treated as such regardless of rights and liberties guaranteed in the Constitution. It may seem strange that politicians can thus discriminate against the parents of 5 million children without fear of political consequences. But that is because people who for one reason or another think of themselves as second-class citizens expect to be treated as such. That's why they're second-class citizens.

About 50 Congressmen have sponsored or cosponsored educational bills in the 86th Congress. Most of these bills are similar to the Murray-Metcalf bills (S. 2 and H.R. 22). They propose to penalize parents who exercise freedom of mind and/or religion in the choice of school.

The Murray-Metcalf bills provide that the Federal Government shall subsidize education in each State in amounts directly proportionate to the number of school-age children. The subsidy will be $25 the 1st year and rising to $100 in the 4th year. Thereafter, the subsidy will remain $100 for each child of school age. However, if a child's parents exercise their constitutional right in sending him to an independent school, the Murray-Metcalf bills provide that the child and his parents shall be penalized. The child will be deprived of the $100 Federal subsidy for his education. The bills provide, moreover, that the $100 allocated for the child's education is to be redistributed to children who conform to the philosophical and theological orientation of the State's schools. As a consequence, in States like Illinois, New York, and others, each public schoolchild will receive a Federal subsidy of approximately $135 to provide for better education. This is characteristic of the closed society—conformity is rewarded, nonconformity is penalized.

Of course there are redeeming features for independent schoolchildren. Their parents will have, as befits good second-class citizens, the privilege, if not the pleasure of paying higher taxes to supply an additional $5 billion yearly for this program. After paying these higher educational taxes, they will have even less money than formerly for the education of their children in the schools of their choice. But that is as it should be with second-class citizens—ever-increasing taxes with ever-decreasing welfare benefits.

* * * * *

If parents who exercise their constitutional right in sending their children to independent schools were not treated as second-class citizens, the Federal Government would, under the terms of revised Murray-Metcalf bills, make direct grants of $100 per child to these parents to enable them to pay in part tuition in the schools of their choice. In adopting this subsidy method of financing the education of the individual child, the Federal Government would only be following innumerable precedents.

We live in a democracy. A representative democracy. We have representatives in Congress who represent territorial areas. We have other representatives in a "third house" who represent private organizations or pressure groups. These organizations or groups are made up of people with a common interest who organize to protect and promote this interest. It is generally recognized today that the representatives of private organizations have a tremendous influence in shaping the policies of all three branches of Government.

* * * * *

The Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and other Americans who have an interest in independent education are not organized to protect and promote their interest. Consequently, when, for example, the Murray-Metcalf bills come before Congress for consideration, the 5 million independent schoolchildren and their parents are all but totally unrepresented democratically in the legislative process. As a result, pressure groups that are opposed to freedom of mind and freedom of religion have the Members of Congress almost completely at their mercy politically.

Since the democratic process in America demands the balancing of pressures of particular interest groups as a necessary condition for achieving the common good, those people who have a common interest but do not organize to promote it are, in effect, making it virtually impossible for Government to achieve the common good. Their refusal to participate in the democratic process through the proper representation of their interest in effect partially disfranchises them and, more serious still, surrenders to opposition pressure groups a dominant unchallenged power to influence the most basic policy-decisions of Government.

It has often been said that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. If Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and other Americans who are interested in religious education will not organize to protect and promote freedom of choice in education they will, by default, be responsible for the fact that, as the tax burden for State-controlled education becomes increasingly heavy, an increasing proportion of American children will not have the opportunity of receiving a God-centered education. They will be responsible also, by default, for the increasing secularization of American society. Pressure groups that are aiming to bring about this complete secularization of our society are today virtually unopposed in their efforts to establish a closed society that is intolerant of freedom of mind and freedom of religion.

Freedom of choice can be achieved in America. But it can be achieved only through democratic processes. Private groups must be organized; legislators must be influenced; public opinion must be formed. If parents who are interested in academic freedom do not organize to achieve their objectives, and if they relinquish the important field of public opinion to the opponents of freedom of mind and freedom of religion, they will, because of this rejection of essential democratic processes, continue to be treated as second-class citizens. This rejection of democratic processes invites the advocates of a closed conformist society to demand, unchalleneged, that Americans conform to State-established orthodoxies in education and elsewhere as a condition for sharing in welfare benefits.

Foreign Aid Reappraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. DONOHUE. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a very interesting editorial on the important subject of foreign aid which appeared in the June 13, 1959, issue of the magazine, America.

The article follows:

Neither Senators MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana; J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, nor MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, should be classified as opponents of the concept of aid to underdeveloped nations. Yet each in his own way has expressed dissatisfaction with the manner in which our global aid program has been administered. All three would like a new approach to this much controverted arm of U.S. foreign policy.

On May 15 Senator MANSFIELD leveled his sights at that category of foreign aid known as defense support. He announced that he would move to eliminate this type of aid from the program within 3 years. This would mean a sharp curtailment in economic-aid grants to nations which have been willing to enter into anti-Communist military alinement with the United States. Such aid has been justified on the ground that it is needed by underdeveloped countries to support an armaments burden imposed by the acceptance of U.S. military aid. It is, as a March 1959 Government handbook on the mutual security program explains, aid demanded by the "need to secure a military contribution" on the part of nations which are willing to stand up and be counted in the cold war.

Senator FULBRIGHT is disturbed over the political debate which accompanies each yearly administration request for economic-aid funds. He feels that this endangers the entire program. He has therefore argued for the expansion of the U.S. Development Loan Fund to enable the Government to lend $1.5 billion per year for the next 5 years. As it is, the Government has no long-term lending authority. Each year it must beg appropriations for the next 12 months. This inevitably leads to cuts in the amount requested and makes for uncertainty in the long-range planning of the Development Loan Fund.

Arguing in similar vein, Senator MONRONEY has advocated the creation of an International Development Association to be affiliated with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The IDA would be empowered to make "soft" loans to underdeveloped countries, i.e., loans on easy terms and repayable, at least in part, in the currency of the borrowing nation. The United States would be expected to contribute one-third of a $1 billion international fund.

These proposals are aimed at two glaring defects in our economic-aid program. One, the lack of long-range planning, can and

should be met by some such imaginative plan as that proposed by Senator FULBRIGHT. The other, the unfortunate interlocking of so much of our economic aid with military security, can be met only by rethinking the purpose of foreign aid.

This year the administration is seeking $835 million for so-called defense suport. This means that, independently of outright military assistance, almost 50 percent of the program is considered a mere prop for U.S. military security. To a people accustomed to consider security only in terms of the military, it is becoming increasingly difficult to sell this type of economic aid. Moreover, such aid makes for hostility among the recipient nations, whose people are understandably suspicious of our motives.

Foreign aid would fare better both at home and abroad if only it were presented more idealistically. The program needs less stress on self-interest and more emphasis on our moral responsibility toward the poorer nations. Unless a better case is made for economic aid on its own merits, it will fail to gain the widespread support of the American people. As a first step in that direction, we suggest that economic assistance be divorced from the mutual security program, and that henceforth it be enacted as separate legislation on a long-term continuing basis.

Snohomish, Wash., Homestead Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, this is the year Snohomish, a city in my district in Washington State, celebrates its first Homestead Centennial. I believe it is fitting that recognition be given to this city for its 100 years of growth and progress.

Before 1859 there was no permanent settlement in what is now Snohomish County. These were the days when small bands of Indians existed by hunting in the virgin forest that covered the region and fished the streams. The canoe was the only practical mode of transportation.

The real settlement of the county began in 1859, and its cause was the relief that a military road would be constructed between Fort Steilacoom to Fort Bellingham. A number of men at Fort Steilacoom, watchful of an opportunity to improve their financial status, conceived a plan to build a ferry and a town at the point where the road would have to cross the Snohomish River.

They sent representatives to the site with instructions to acquire and hold squatters rights to the land in the vicinity of the proposed ferry.

The military road was extended northward across the river in 1859, but the next Congress, instead of voting appropriations for its completion, decided to abolish both of the forts. This action put an end to the road building by the Federal Government. As a consequent, all but two members of the syndicate to build Snohomish City withdrew.

One of these men, E. C. Ferguson, moved to the site and established a store. A number of young men who had worked on the military road were among the first settlers. Election returns show that 17 men voted at Snohomish City on July 9, 1860.

Snohomish City developed slowly although Mr. Ferguson never gave up the project and the county seat was situated there by vote of the people in 1861. Two decades passed before the prospect of a railroad stimulated business and speculation in the town and county. The railroad anticipated in 1887 was an accomplished fact in 1888, when the first train crossed the bridge near Snohomish City at 9:30 a.m., September 15.

A year later Snohomish boasted three general merchandise stores, four groceries, four hardware stores, three drygoods, and a number of pharmacies, meat markets, hotels, livery and sale stables, and bookstores.

Although the county seat was moved to Everett, Snohomish continued to grow. Snohomish was incorporated as a third class city by an act of the Washington State Legislature in 1890, and has a mayor-council government.

Today Snohomish has an estimated population of 4,000. Its industries include sawmills, cold-storage warehouses, and dairies, and its principal products are frozen foods, dairy products, and lumber. There are two railroads now, a weekly newspaper, hotel, and numerous small businesses.

Serving the families of Snohomish are 14 churches. Schools include a senior high school, junior high school, three elementary and a primary school. It has a first-class post office, library, and three parks. And, as in the past, its young men have responded to their colors by serving with Snohomish's fine National Guard unit.

To climax the 100th year of Snohomish, civic, religious, military, service, and industrial groups have worked together to present a week-long program between July 21 and 26. Although hundreds of townspeople have put in long hours during the past 2 years to assure a successful climax, the leadership has been placed in the hands of the following:

The president of the board of directors and active general chairman is Dr. Leeon F. Aller. Members of the board are Ed Johnson, Clyde Kinch, Clarence E. Brooks, and Lois Ekloff.

Committee chairmen and special events leaders include Harry Stites, Lawrence Bickford, Ernie Pinkham, Ernie and Lila Rainwater, Lois Crocker, Gerald Bauer, Randy Dawson, Ray Danklesson, Emma Dunbar, Roy Marler, Wilbur Ellis, Irene Swoboda, Bill Heath, Harold and Flo Rothgeb, Don Freeman, Helen Beasley, Betty Vanderhyde, Cristie O'Neal, Charles F. Burt, Oscar Jurgens, Freeman Lancaster, Ruby Lancaster, Mrs. John Gale, Hal Moe, Ed Stevens, Charles Sekulich, John Childers, Clarence Boyd, Evelyn Lysons, Neil Cochran, Clayton Knittel, Crystal Cochran, Virginia Aller, Laura Smith, Dale Renberg, Herb Stuart, Bob Twichell, Violet Lambert, Ed Holm, Fred Hereth, Burdette Ferguson, Harold Illman, Eldon Harvey.

During this week that will climax the celebration, bearded gentlemen and their ladies, dressed in the manner of the city's pioneers, will promenade the sidewalks of Snohomish. There will be Indians, more friendly today than 100 years ago, historical window displays, and a carnival to add color.

The opening day, fittingly, will be Young America Day. There will be a youth parade, picnic, games, contests, junior achievement award dinner, and the centennial queen's ball.

On Ladies' Day, Wednesday, July 22, the ladies' centennial tea and style show, the centennial queen's coronation, and the premier performance of the historical pageant "From Ox Team to Jet Stream" are scheduled.

Thursday will be Agricultural and Industry Day. A parade of old and new farm equipment, judging of the centennial belles, and fireworks will be the most interesting features.

Pioneer and Indian Day is scheduled for July 24. Plans have been made for tours of historical landmarks, industries and buildings. There will be a pioneer picnic, homecoming recognition ceremony, Indian activities, barbecue, and street dancing.

Saturday, July 25, will be Neighbors Day. This is the day of the centennial parade, boat races and the centennial ball.

The Centennial Religious Dedication Day will fall on Sunday, and will be observed in all churches. There will be an all-faiths religious observance in an open-air program with music by the massed choirs of all Snohomish churches.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who know the city of Snohomish have reason to be proud of the accomplishments and foresight of the early pioneers. We rightfully feel pride in the efforts and hard work of each Snohomish citizen who daily makes the city one of the best of its size in the Nation. Much has been accomplished in the past century, I am sure even more will be accomplished during the next 100 years.

Twenty-third Strawberry Festival, Marysville, Wash.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, Marysville, a city in my district of Washington State, is celebrating its 23d Strawberry Festival with events scheduled this week. The climax of the celebration, to which thousands of persons come each year, will be a grand parade and the Strawberry Cup races, July 18, 1959.

The festival originated in 1932 when the Marysville Commercial Club saw the need for a distinctive celebration for the

community. Because the area around Marysville produces many strawberries, eggs, and milk, the club decided to combine the three in strawberry shortcake to be served at the peak of the strawberry season to the young and old who would visit the city.

From a small, local event the celebration has grown to command top attention among communities of the State. The strawberry shortcake is not free anymore, but it is well worth the nominal charge, especially when served under the watchful eye of the Strawberry Festival queen.

I believe it is fitting to recognize this traditional festival that has been interrupted only during the years of World War II, and to recognize the efforts of the many persons who work to make the festival a success.

An Austin, Minn., Taxpayer Views the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, not long ago I received a letter from an Austin, Minn., constituent which is typical of many that I have received from the First District.

In order that the entire Congress might read what a number of people in the district are saying, I give you this well-written letter by Mr. George Brown:

AUSTIN, MINN., *June 30, 1959.*
The Honorable ALBERT QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. QUIE: I am very concerned over the apparent disinterest of the present Congress in three very important subjects affecting the American taxpayer: (1) inflation; (2) farm surplus; and (3) effective labor legislation.

I am aware that a much-amended wheat bill has been passed by both the House and Senate and vetoed by the President, because it failed to realistically attempt to solve the tremendous surplus problem; I also believe something similar occurred with regard to a tobacco support measure. Basically, however, the present Congress has done nothing to assist the American taxpayer out of the huge cost of warehousing, storing, and transporting our tremendous farm surplus in this country.

Equally important to us, the taxpayer, is the shrinking dollar. Certainly one of the reasons why this dollar has more than halved itself in value since 1940 is the tremendous budget deficit you, the Congress, have allowed to add up year after year, and it appears that rather than concern ourselves about reducing our Government expenses, our object has been to increase them. The biggest slice of the budget has gone, and will continue to go, to national defense. If half the things that we read in reliable newspapers and periodicals about the tremendous waste in our national defense program through duplication, petty jealousies, favoritism, etc., are true, it would appear that this slice could be reduced considerably.

After much publicized committee hearings on racketeering in unions, we believe that the average citizen fully expected that some type of legislation would be enacted during this Congress to protect the many thousands of honest, hardworking union members. Here again little or nothing has been done. People like Hoffa continue to throw challenge after challenge at you, the legislative body of our Government, and the committees that represent us in the investigation of the various unions.

One of my favorite sayings is: "There can be no freedom without a measure of discipline." We think it is time that Congress enacted some discipline for the American people without regard to political interest; we think it is time for the Congress to face the reality of the problems that are with us and that have been with us for some time, instead of postponing them for another year, another time, in the interest of avoiding political confliction.

Yours very truly,
GEORGE BROWN.

Backstairs at the White House or You Could Call It Burning Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article announced that the President has indeed been spending time in the White House in Washington. This I am sure will be a matter of great comfort to all of us who had begun to wonder whether the White House was the proper investment to the people of the United States in view of the President's many travels, vacations, golf jaunts, fishing trips, et cetera.

For the benefit of my many friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle I insert the article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of July 9, 1959, chronicling how, although at least present physically in the White House, the President has been having a difficult time with his golf game.

I am sure all the President's many friends and critics wish him not only improvement in his golf game but also in his relations with Congress and in his occasional attention to the weighty problems of running the Government of the Nation of some 177 million souls who look to him for leadership.

The article follows:

BACKSTAIRS AT THE WHITE HOUSE—YOU COULD CALL IT BURNING TEE

(By Merriman Smith)

Even the tourists gawking through the White House fence realize that President Eisenhower is having trouble with his golf.

The trouble really may be with Congress or Nikita Khrushchev, but the Chief Executive is sore at about every club in his bag.

TEED-OFF

Last weekend at Gettysburg, the President was threatening loudly to give up driving entirely because of the deteriorating quality of his tee shots.

And last Monday afternoon, he walked outside his office at the White House to hit some practice shots up to his putting green.

Here's what the tourists could see:

The President, standing deep in his one and only sand trap, taking a mighty belt at the ball. Ball moved only a few feet, remaining securely in the grasp of the trap.

The President then grasped his club anew and instead of hitting at the ball, he pounded the head on the edge of the trap. He slammed the club down again, tossed it to the ground near his bag and stalked out of the trap.

Furthermore, if he reads this he might go to club-swinging all over again. Those who should know say the President is getting a trifle sore about reading in the newspapers how he dubbed a golf shot and then commented on the same in a tone of voice rarely heard on radio and television.

SPECIALIST

All golfers go through trying periods when they seem to do everything wrong. Most weekend hackers attract only the attention of their foursomes, but when a President gets angry or vocally self-critical on a golf course, a lot of people know it.

If it happens at Burning Tree, only the members know it. But at the Gettysburg Country Club which is a semipublic course (outsiders can play by paying a greens fee slightly higher than that charged members), the number of people aware of a Presidential outburst depends entirely on where it happens.

If Mr. Eisenhower is close to the clubhouse or near another foursome, it would be most unnatural for other players or standersby to ignore a Presidential cry of dismay over a simple iron shot that either soars over the green or poops out dismally short of it.

STEAM

The President has some good friends who wish he wouldn't get so disturbed about his golf game. But their feelings are tempered by the possibility that he's using golf to let off steam that must build up within him as he copes daily with a multitude of crises, any one of which would get the average man excited for a lifetime.

Any number of emotional factors could be responsible, but the President seems to be hurrying his golf game more than he did a year ago. He may not realize it, but from somewhat of a distance, he seems to be playing impatiently. He can't wait to hit that next shot.

Golf is a game of a thousand errors and Mr. Eisenhower seems to search for new ones when he slugs a ball into the rough. Meticulously he never blames external forces, only himself. This well could be some sort of barometer of strictly business matters.

It will be interesting to see whether his game improves after Congress goes home.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N. Y.*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Appendix

How To Win the Economic Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address which I delivered on May 2, 1959, before the New Hampshire Council of World Affairs at Manchester, N.H., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO WIN THE ECONOMIC COLD WAR

(Remarks of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY before the New Hampshire Council of World Affairs, Manchester, N.H., May 2, 1959)

I am honored by your invitation, and honored to speak from a platform occupied, just a year ago tomorrow, by a valiant and dedicated soldier of peace, John Foster Dulles.

I know that all of you join me in wishing Mr. Dulles well, and in wishing Godspeed to his successor, Christian Herter.

The question before you is, How best can the United States fight the economic cold war with the Soviet Union in the atomic age?

The first thing to do in any fight is recognize what you are up against.

We are up against a nation that is streaking ahead in economic growth and technology, and that is totally dedicated to spreading its influence throughout the world.

Yes, economic growth and total dedication are the two forces we face in the Soviet Union.

As to growth, America and Russia today are disturbingly reminiscent of the fable of the tortoise and the hare.

Before sputnick streaked across the heavens, we assumed that we were the biggest, the fastest growing and strongest economy in the history of mankind. And for a long time we were, and we still are, the strongest and biggest.

But we became smug and complacent. We closed our eyes to the increasing signs of growth in Soviet technology and productive capacity. The hare, we thought, would win the race, "paws down," so to speak.

But while we rested on past laurels, the tortoise plodded on, seemingly unnoticed. Then came sputnik and, later, the first manmade planet, both stamped, "Made in Russia"—dramatic proof of the vast strides in technology and economic growth that had taken place in the Soviet Union.

We were momentarily stunned. But have we yet really faced up to the hard fact that the tortoise is still advancing far faster than the hare?

How many Americans realize that the Soviet economy is growing three times as fast as our own? Economists say that the Russian economy is growing between 6 and 8 percent a year. For the past 6 years, ours has been growing at the rate of 2 percent a year.

Many take comfort in the fact that American productive capacity is still so much greater than that of the Communists and it is. But we do not always use our capacity to the fullest.

Last year, when the American steel industry was running at about half of capacity, economists tell me that the combined steel production of Red China and Russia exceeded that of the mighty United States.

Think, for a moment, of the impact this has on the rest of the world—especially those nations of Asia and Africa, worn down by centuries of poverty, who are struggling now for a place in the political economic sun.

No one needs to remind them that 40 years ago Russia was a primitive, uneducated nation virtually devoid of industry or technology.

No one needs to tell them only 10 years ago, Red China was even more backward.

Yet, in a short space of time, Russia and China together were able to outproduce the greatest industrial Nation in history in so vital a commodity as steel.

In just four decades, the Soviet Union has produced a technology that could put the first earth satellite into orbit and the first man-made planet into space.

To the brown man or the black man or the yellow man in the early stages of his own war against poverty, this story of Russian and Chinese progress has the same excitement, the same inspiration, as the rags-to-riches rise of the self-made millionaire in America.

So the first thing we must do in waging our economic cold war is to face the facts about the growing Sino-Soviet economy and about the impact it has on the rest of the world.

And we must no longer underrate the Soviet growth of the past of the Soviet goals for the future, for they have met their goals in the past and they are likely to meet them again. And their stated goal is to outproduce America by 1970.

Make no mistake about it. Mr. Khrushchev is looking ahead 10 to 20 years. He has ambitious plans.

By 1965 he aims to add 30 million tons of steel capacity; more than 100 million tons of oil production; nearly 300 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity.

But he is not just planning an expansion of capital goods. Meat production is to more than double by 1965; butter production, already almost equal to ours, is to increase by almost 400,000 tons. There are to be more shoes and clothes for the Russian people, who are hungry to improve their everyday life.

We must not be lulled into complacency by the doctrine that a centrally planned and tightly regimented economy cannot match a free economy with its profit incentives. Four years ago, the Soviet leaders departed from the orthodox doctrine of Marxism, and copied the incentive and productivity ideas from the very capitalistic system they decry.

Yes, we can expect Russia's economy to grow apace—aided by the fact that the Soviet state manages the entire economy to serve national goals. It sets priorities on the use of resources and the plowing back of capital into the most needed uses.

This expanding Soviet economy will furnish an ever stronger base for the waging of worldwide economic warfare—an economic offensive in trade, aid, and investment.

The Soviet trade offensive is farflung and powerful. Russia has trade missions in many capitals of the world, including countries that have never had any trade with the Soviet Union.

These missions are quietly negotiating commercial trade agreements.

Russia has surpluses with which to bargain. And, unlike the United States, she vigorously and willingly uses them. She is using every weapon of economic power—including dumping, barter, credits, and trade.

In the field of aid and investment in foreign lands, Russia has taken over an American idea. Where America blazed the trail with the Marshall plan and point 4, Russia is following, with great energy and with considerable success.

Russian aid mainly takes the form of long-term, low-interest loans to foster capital investment.

In the past 3 years, the Soviets have extended more than a billion and a half dollars in credits.

There are extensive Soviet projects in the United Arab Republic, and in seven Asian countries.

The Soviets are helping to build a steel mill in India, Aswan Dam, roads, and bridges in Egypt, a cement plant in Afghanistan, a sugar factory in Ceylon—all of this coming, mind you, from a country which only four decades ago could hardly have built a factory within its own borders, much less help another nation to do so.

And all of this aid is furnished with an almost fanatic zeal. Foreign aid is not just a temporary side activity for the Russians. They mean business—and they are in the game for keeps.

Let me give you an example of Soviet oversea aid and in another area. The Soviets graduate some 18,000 doctors a year. No doubt they are sorely needed in Russia. Yet 2,000 of them are earmarked for export, so to speak, to foreign lands.

The Russians profess that this aid, these technicians, are offered without political strings attached. Their offers are attractive. It is litle wonder that needy countries accept them readily, and often ignoring the political implications of such generously offered aid.

How must America answer this challenge?

Let us be quite clear about this: the Soviet challenge is a total challenge—requiring a total response.

The Soviet challenge is across the board—more than military, it is also political, cultural, and above all, economic, public, and private.

Piecemeal, off-again-on-again improvisations are not sufficient.

We must plan long-range, and we must have the determination and the endurance to carry that planning through. Behind a military shield of strength, we must move forward on each of the nonmilitary fronts; everywhere we must sieze the initiative.

Can we do it?

We can do it, and we must. We have the capacity. We have what we need to meet the Soviet challenge, but we are not using it. It is only that our leadership has so far lacked the will to do what we can and must do.

There are hard facts of life that we must face.

First of all, we must build an ever-stronger economy at home in order to do what necessity and prudence demand abroad.

Only an expanding, fully productive U.S. domestic economy can support a sufficient effort in American foreign policy.

In the past 5 years, we have allowed our economic growth to lag; we have allowed some factories and workers to be idle—and we have deprived ourselves of billions of dollars in revenues that might have been devoted to needed tasks, at home and abroad.

Our economy is still not producing or growing to capacity. Until it does, we will be hampered in our ability to help others as we should.

Secondly, we must increase the flow of trade with other countries.

Our trade with other countries is not just a matter of profit making, but one of fundamental national power and policy.

We are a wealthy Nation. With only 6 percent of the world's population, we produce 40 percent of the world's goods and services.

Yet our country is dependent on imports from all over the world. Every automobile, for example, needs 38 essential materials which are largely imported. Not a single pound of steel can be made without manganese—nine-tenths of which we get from abroad.

Our economy also depends on exports: any substantial drop in exports could damage our entire economy. But America cannot export unless other countries have dollars to buy our goods and unless we make goods that people abroad will buy.

Thus, both the free world and America itself will benefit from a high level of trade. This may require some adjustments at home, but, as Adlai Stevenson once put it, "We shall have to make the choice between relatively minor adjustments caused by increased imports, and major adjustments caused by decreased exports."

Next, we must put our agricultural abundance to good use in waging the cold war.

The agricultural abundance of the United States is not a deficit but an enormous concentration of usable wealth.

There is something wrong when a nation stores food in caves while millions of people go unfed.

I can assure you of this: If Mr. Khrushchev had our farm surpluses in Russian warehouses, he would not be at a loss to dispose of them. He would be using them to win friends for Russia.

How to dispose of these surpluses overseas without disrupting world prices and without injuring other friendly countries who need to export farm products is not an easy problem.

But I believe a way out can be found. I believe the utilization program under Public Law 480 can and should be enlarged so that our farm abundance can serve the needy overseas without hurting our closest allies, and made to serve the ends of national policy.

On-again, off-again capitalization of industrial development in the have-not areas of the world must be replaced by long-term, firm commitments by the United States.

We must launch a 5-year development loan program providing $1½ billion yearly of desperately needed capital to underdeveloped nations.

In the 19th century, England provided vast sums of capital for the development of economically backward countries—including, I might add, the United States.

Today, America, the largest source of capital, is putting far less capital into development abroad, proportionately, than Britain in the 19th century.

Senators FULBRIGHT, KENNEDY and myself have proposed that we devote a billion and a half dollars each year to this 5-year development loan program.

Consider, if you will, the fact that we spend tens of billions of dollars every year for arms and weapons—the means of destroying our fellow man. If we afford to do that, can we not afford to spend a small fraction of those sums not for destructive purposes, but to help build a better life for the peoples of Asia and Africa?

And can we not, finally, recognize that this task of helping others to help themselves is not a passing task; the problem of poverty and ignorance will not vanish next year.

Can't we face up to the fact that our efforts must be long range? Why must we go through an annual agonizing reappraisal of our entire aid program?

We must put this program on a long-range basis, so that we can plan a comprehensive and effective program, and so that others can count on us for continued help. We must avoid the waste of stop-and-go, hot-and-cold programing.

Beyond these specifics, there is an overall change in emphasis in American policy that must take place if we are to win the economic cold war.

We must stop basing our aid on fear of communism and start basing it on love of our fellow man. We must be for people, peace and progress—and not simply against the evil threat of communism.

The preamble to our foreign aid program actually states that it is our policy to continue our aid programs only as long as [the Communist] danger persists.

The main effect of such a declaration is to turn communism into a sort of natural resource for countries that seek our aid—a resource worth millions in American aid.

There is the fictitious story of the tiny nation which, devoid of any Communists, was denied any U.S. aid and went to its neighbor to borrow a few Communists—only to be told that the neighbor needed every Communist it had.

This is not the American spirit. Nor is it the Christian spirit.

I say that we must help people not just because we detest communism, but because they are God's children, and they are hungry; they need our help.

I say that we should try to help educate them because ignorance defiles man's dignity.

What America needs more than a change of program is a change of heart.

It is not enough to merely perform the ritual of foreign aid. There must be faith—a faith in the importance and rightness of our policies.

We need more than the form—we need the spirit that inspired the original Marshall plan and the point 4 program if our aid programs are to be genuinely constructive and effective.

All that America has to do is to be herself. We know what hardship is; our history is replete with it. But our people banded together in adversity; the strong aided the weak. In unity we found strength.

It is in a unity of peoples who want to prosper and be free, that we can find an enduring peace. We can forge that unity by helping others along the road that we ourselves have traveled since we became a fledgling nation, only a century and a half ago—by sharing with others our own heritage of freedom.

Address by Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address delivered by the very able and distinguished Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, before the Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D.C., May 15, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FRED A. SEATON BEFORE THE RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 15, 1959

Let me begin with a statement which I sincerely believe to be true.

Neither water drops nor kilowatts are Republican or Democrat. To make political footballs of public or Federal water and power development is the surest way to kick them to pieces.

Historically, farsighted men of both major parties have together fought a never-ending fight for more than a half century—a fight to assure orderly and comprehensive harnessing of American rivers for irrigation, flood control, power development and, more recently, for recreation and fish and wildlife benefits.

With no intention of trying to minimize the reclamation accomplishments of previous administrations, I remind you that the Eisenhower administration has written a record of reclamation progress in the past 6 years of which it can pardonably be proud. That record means better living for countless Americans through long years to come.

In the 6 fiscal years of this administration, 1954–59, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior has had appropriated to it, through annual appropriation acts, a total of $1,143 million.

Putting it another way, since President Eisenhower entered the White House, the Bureau, for which formalized appropriations began in 1907, has received more than $1 out of every $4 appropriated to it.

In connection with these appropriations there is one very important fact which many sincere but ill-informed people do not know, or fail to understand. Simply stated, the sums in the Reclamation budget primarily are not expenditures in the ordinary sense of the word. Actually, they are sound investments. Ninety-three cents out of every dollar expended by the Bureau for construction and operation of projects will be paid directly back into the Treasury of the United States. Also, interest is paid on the amounts allocated to provide commercial electric power and municipal and industrial water. The other 7 cents in each dollar is charged against flood control, fish and wildlife conservation, and the development of areas for recreation.

The reclamation record is clear.

Between the beginning of the program and June 30, 1958, water and power users had repaid $365 million. Gross revenues from the sale of power, now averaging more than $76

million each year, make repayment ahead of schedule. Irrigators' repayment installments due under existing contracts are 99.8 percent current.

On the $4 billion of work now under construction by the Bureau, water and power users will make similar repayments.

Now let's look at some of the specific achievements since 1953.

The Bureau has installed generating facilities with a capacity of more than 700,000 kilowatts, including, for example, the 72,000 kilowatts of capacity put in at the Flatiron plant of the Colorado-Big Thompson project, the 114,000 kilowatts at the Palisades project in Idaho, and the 162,000 kilowatts at the Folsom plant of the Central Valley project of California.

From calendar years 1953 through 1958 the Bureau's activities provided facilities to serve approximately 900,000-irrigable acres in the West. And for the past 3 years land irrigated by Federal reclamation—authorized both before and since 1953—produced crops worth more than $900 million each year—the most valuable crops in reclamation history.

Here I want to recall to your mind the fact that these lands do not contribute in any significant amount to the surpluses of the so-called six basic agricultural commodities. In the 1957 crop year Federal reclamation lands produced only 7 percent of our upland cotton, 2.3 percent of our wheat, one-half of 1 percent of our corn, four-tenths of 1 percent of our rice, no tobacco, and no peanuts.

The main impact of the Eisenhower administration's achievements in reclamation will come 5 and 10 and 30 years from now, as more and more dams and reservoirs and powerplants which it has sponsored, and the Congress has authorized, go to work for the American people.

There are 48 of these new projects, or project units authorized, with a total estimated capital investment of nearly $1½ billion.

They will have a storage capacity of nearly 42 million acre-feet and will ultimately bring full and supplemental irrigation water to nearly 832,000 acres of land. Furthermore, they will provide 201,000 acre-feet of water a year to cities and industries, and have a generating capacity of nearly 1¾ million kilowatts.

Among these projects is the $24 million Talent division of the Rogue River basin project in Oregon, with a reservoir capacity of more than 100,000 acre-feet scheduled for completion by fiscal year 1962; the Trinity River division of the Central Valley project of California, with an ultimate installed capacity of nearly 370,000 kilowatts, and 2¾ million acre-feet of storage capacity, for completion by fiscal year 1963; the Ainsworth, Lavaca Flats, Mirage Flats extension, and O'Neill units of the Missouri River basin project in Nebraska, with a total cost of $93 million; the $45 million Glendo unit of the Missouri River basin project, scheduled for completion in fiscal year 1961, which will have a reservoir capacity of more than 800,000 acre-feet. It will bring flood-control benefits to the North Platte Valley from Glendo in Wyoming to Lake McConaughey in Nebraska; and the billion-dollar upper Colorado storage project—the largest reclamation undertaking ever approved in a single piece of legislation. It is one which will provide more than 1,200,000 kilowatts of electrical generating capacity and bring water to nearly 350,000 acres of thirsty land in five States. The completion of this project will be a noble monument to this administration's foresight and to the support given by both Republicans and Democrats in the Congress. The step-by-step completion of the participating units of this tremendous undertaking will do much to round out a full century of Federal reclamation achievement.

On some of these projects and on others authorized earlier, the administration has made 37 new starts. These will involve nearly a billion dollars.

Under the administration-sponsored Small Projects Act—a new and major milestone in reclamation legislation—the Bureau is now reviewing about $200 million of applications or expressions of intent for loans of $5 million or less for the construction and rehabilitation of irrigation facilities. This program is a perfect example of the partnership or teamwork concept in action.

Moreover, the administration has recommended to the Congress for authorization Bureau of Reclamation projects totaling more than $700 million on which the Congress has not yet acted. These include the $45 million Burns Creek Dam project in Idaho, the $159 million Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado, and the $483 million San Luis unit of the Central Valley project in California.

I know, of course, that there are enthusiasts who sincerely believe they are making a contribution to reclamation progress by trying to lengthen that list. It is our conviction that overextending the reclamation program—starting projects without a reasonable expectation that there will be enough money to complete them efficiently and expeditiously—can only result in costly construction stretchouts—stretchouts which are bad for the irrigator, the power user, and the taxpayer.

What we have been trying to do since 1953 is not just to put more ink on the engineers' blueprints or to build paper pyramids of bills authorizing projects for which there may be no appropriations, but rather to build real dams with real powerhouses across real rivers and thus put kilowatts on the line and water on the land. In this respect, we have had to conduct ourselves in the realization that Congress, in every session but one since 1953, has not seen fit to appropriate as much for reclamation purposes as the administration had recommended.

We must never forget that the continuing advancement of reclamation depends upon the continued understanding and support of the American people. Here, your own organization, and others vitally interested in the conservation of our water resources, can be of great help—both to keep a sensible and healthy program going and to prevent the program's being seriously burdened by overzealous kindness.

You and I will agree in our determination to continue the advancement of reclamation. In that common cause, we shall continue to rely on you, as we know we can, to see the facts as they are. That we must do if we are to maintain the progress of this program which has already brought such great good to our land.

Milwaukee Journal Commends Senator John Williams as Hard-Hitting Foe of Waste in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal has warmly commended the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for another splendid job he has done in exposing waste in Government.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial entitled "Waste, Waste, Waste: What's Being Done About It?" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WASTE, WASTE, WASTE, WASTE: WHAT'S BEING DONE ABOUT IT?

At the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard experience shows that there is a need for about 40 sandalwood chairs during each 9-month supply period. The Comptroller General checked the yard recently and found a stock of 1,055 of the chairs—enough for 20 years' issue.

This was one of the examples of waste and overexpenditure cited to the Senate the other day by Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, that hard-hitting foe of waste in Government.

Four naval shipyards were checked by the Comptroller General. And the story was much the same everywhere. There was little or no accounting control over $40 million worth of surplus materials found in the four yards. There was constant overestimating of materials needed. Surpluses were held instead of being released. Reports of materials on hand were inadequate.

WILLIAMS told of materials ordered by the Mare Island yard at San Francisco for repair of four destroyers. Materials valued at $537,000 were earmarked for the repair work. Only $117,000 of them were used. The Comptroller General checked 2,512 items ordered for repairs on 6 submarines and found that only 622 were needed and used. One shipyard needed $4,200 worth of teakwood and ordered it twice—ending up with $14,000 worth including some that it already had had on hand.

The Comptroller General reported nearly $850 million worth of materials used by shipyards in excess of need for the fiscal years 1956–58.

Here is another shocking case of waste, and another case in which WILLIAMS is doing the country a service by making it public. What the taxpayer keeps wanting to know is: What's being done about it?

Congressman Charles O. Porter, of Oregon, an Example of the New Tempo in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the belief that a Representative or Senator ought not concern himself with affairs away from home is rapidly disintegrating. The men and women of the 20th century find themselves a part of the world—not apart from it.

One of the people helping them realize why this is true is Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, of Oregon. How he is doing this is vividly summed up in an excellent and thoughtful editorial entitled "On the Run, But Not Ducking," which appeared in the July 7, 1959, edition of the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard.

Congressman PORTER's hometown is Eugene. The Register-Guard is his hometown paper. It is a paper quick to commend and quick to reprimand when it thinks that is in order. As the editorial writer observes:

One of the reasons we lend him (PORTER) general support is his willingness to oppose, and to be opposed. We enjoy exchanging brainstorms and brickbats with CHARLIE PORTER.

I think the editorial intelligently explains the speed of our age and demonstrates the many areas in which an elected representative can be of service. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE RUN, BUT NOT DUCKING

One of the best living demonstrations of the tempo of our age is the Fourth District's Congressman, CHARLIE PORTER. Monday, only a few moments after concluding an informal chat with him on half a dozen subjects, we found in our mail a mimeographed copy of remarks he made last Wednesday on the floor of the House. To oversimplify, and thus avoid beclouding the point of this comment, Congressman PORTER's Wednesday address had to do with the need for revision of the United Nation's Charter, as determined at a World Parliament Association conference he had attended the previous week in London.

Since leaving London, we thought, our Congressman has been back to his desk in Washington, has had time to prepare an important report on world law (and, somewhat as an aside, eyewitness notes on British use of American-made missiles). He has flown home to attend the funeral of a political colleague and friend, Dave Epps, and to visit western Lane for an on-the-scene check of proposals to create a national seashore park. On top of this, he's managed some visiting with his parents, friends and people, like us, whom he thinks should be better informed about our Government and its problems.

Despite it all, CHARLIE looked fit and rested Monday morning. Watching the time so he'd be able to drive to Portland and catch his plane back to Washington, he admitted qualms about Cuba's economic troubles, and denied that Red influence there is strong. He talked about Democratic presidential nominees, and, among other things, the outlook for pending labor-management reform legislation.

Reflecting upon his visit later, we were impressed by the man's continued, apparently inexhaustible vigor. And, by a remark he made about Fidel Castro needing opposition in Cuba.

Mr. PORTER observed that democratic government must provide means for peaceful expression of dissents to government policies. One major hazard of stifling opposition views is that of covering flaws and faults which even the best motivated policies will contain if they aren't forged in the furnace of hot and partisan debate. Cuba, our Congressman noted, does have freedom of the press—despite contrary reports—but there is yet no real opposition party, nor will there likely to be one until Castro schedules national elections and "gives 'em something to shoot at."

Congressman PORTER also used an example from Oregon politics to prove his belief that government is better when it is being hewed from two sides. And, we were mightily glad he did. Many times we agree with the Congressman; many times we don't. One of the reasons we lend him general support is his willingness to oppose, and to be opposed. We enjoy exchanging brainstorms and brickbats with CHARLIE PORTER.

Repeal of Loyalty Oath Provision of National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials commenting on the bill which Senator CLARK and I have introduced to repeal the loyalty oath provision of the National Defense Education Act. These two editorials reflect a widespread feeling that it is desirable to eliminate the requirements at once. I hope that the Senate will consider this bill in the near future.

There being no objection, the editorials were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise, June 26, 1959]

WOULD BE GOOD RIDDANCE

The Senate Labor Committee is to be commended for its approval of a bill to eliminate the loyalty oath requirement from the National Defense Education Act.

Especially gratifying is the fact that the vote for elimination was an impressive 12 to 2.

The measure would end the requirement that teachers and students receiving funds under the act must swear to their loyalties and attest that they have not been members of any subversive organization.

The rule is silly for the simple reason that a Communist would have no reluctance to lie under oath.

Then, too, it would make just as much sense to herd in the whole population for a loyalty oath as to require it of the civilians affected by this one act.

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, summed it up right when he said the oath has in no measure contributed to the national security, but it has led to serious and undesirable tensions between the Government and the academic community.

In other words, it is witch hunting that bears no promise of turning up witches.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette, July 2, 1959]

WHY PICK ON STUDENTS?

Pennsylvania's Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK and his young Democratic colleague from Massachusetts, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, deserve wide support for their legislative proposal to repeal the loyalty oath requirement in the National Defense Education Act.

Under this provision of the act, needy students seeking Federal loans with which to pursue their educations are required to sign disclaimers of subversive activities.

Several of the Nation's colleges, including three in Pennsylvania, have refused to participate in the loan program so long as this oath is required. Dr. Hugh Barton, president of Haverford College, has argued rightly that to file the disclaimer would be "tantamount to signing away one's right to freedom of thought as well as endorsing a Government action which makes the individual's opportunity for education contingent upon his personal beliefs." Senators CLARK and KENNEDY contend that the requirement is discriminatory against scholars as a class.

Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, under which the program is administered, has said that the "loyalty oath" does little or no good inasmuch as real subversives "have no scruples about signing such an affidavit and taking such an oath."

If needy students must sign a "loyalty oath," why not all the farmers who obtain Federal crop loans; why not all the myriad other beneficiaries of Federal largess? Since this requirement in the National Defense Education Act serves no purpose other than to discriminate against students, it ought to be repealed.

Money Troubles for Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that, today, the national highway construction program faces serious curtailment unless Congress can find an equitable way to provide funds for financing.

We recall that the Highway Act of 1956 proposed to modernize our 41,000-mile highway system over a period of 13 to 15 years.

Now, unfortunately, money troubles threaten to retard or shut down operations. The Congress, I believe, needs to make every effort to find a fair, realistic method to provide the needed funds for this program.

Now—and in the years ahead—the country will need an improved highway system to handle the increasing volumes of traffic for pleasure and business—and possibly for defense.

If there is a broad-scope cutback, it would also have a serious impact on the economy. Currently, about one-seventh of the economy reportedly depends directly or indirectly on transportation on the Nation's highways. Stoppage of the work would mean loss of jobs, idling of roadbuilding equipment, halting of community and State development projects, and a number of other adverse effects.

As we know, the administration has recommended a 1½-cent increase in the Federal gas tax to provide the needed financing. However, there is considerable feeling that taxes on gasoline are already extremely high. Too, a careful study is needed on the impact which such an increase in Federal tax would have on State economies—which depend to a great extent upon gas taxes as a source of revenue.

Among alternative plans that have been offered are included:

First. A one-half-cent temporary gasoline tax increase coupled with a suspen-

sion of the pay-as-you-go amendment to the 1956 Highway Act and a 2-year stretchout of the construction program, now scheduled for completion in 1972.

Second. A 1-cent temporary gasoline tax increase, possibly with a suspension of the pay-as-you-go provision.

Third. Granting authority to borrow money from the Treasury; and others.

In view of this critical situation, the Ways and Means Committee has scheduled hearings on July 22, 1959, to consider this matter.

Out of this committee action, I would hope will come recommendations for an equitable way to provide necessary finances for the highway program.

Recently, I have received letters from a variety of organizations, including the Wisconsin Highway Users' Conference, Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, Wisconsin Milk and Ice Cream Product Association, and the Madison Chamber of Commerce on this financing problem.

By and large, these messages reflect opposition to increases in gas taxes.

The question thus arises: From what source can funds be derived if the construction program is to go forward?

Recognizing the significance of the road-building program to the Nation, I believe that Congress should make every effort to find such sources for this much-needed financing.

To give my colleagues the benefit of the views of these organizations—which represent a broad cross-section of interests—I ask unanimous consent to have the letters printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative, a federation of farm cooperatives representing 90 organizations and more than 80,000 farm families, is opposed to any increase in the Federal gas tax at this time. We feel that if a major part of the $1.6 billion that is diverted from the $3.6 billion Federal excise tax on gasoline were returned to the States as Federal aid for highways, it would not be necessary at this time to increase the Federal gasoline tax.

We hope you will give serious consideration to this matter and oppose the various proposals which would bring about an increased cost to farm people.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH M. COOPER,
Assistant Executive Secretary, Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Wisconsin Milk and Ice Cream Products Association, which represents the great bulk of the independents, cooperatives, and major companies who are in the bottled milk and ice cream business in Wisconsin, would like to urge you to vote against any increase in the Federal gasoline tax rate.

Yours respectfully,

BURDETTE L. FISHER,
Executive Director, Wisconsin Milk and Ice Cream Products Association, Inc.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The 87 State organizations which make up the Wisconsin Highway Users Conference are deeply disturbed by proposals to increase the Federal gasoline tax and want you to know of their opposition to any increase.

The membership of the conference, representing a cross section of Wisconsin's citizenry, is already on record against any more gasoline taxes as indicated by their attached 1959 legislative program.

We are confident there is no popular demand for a highway program which is contingent upon a tax increase, in fact, we believe that the majority of the American people share our views. A Trendex News poll report, just released, affirms that "considerably less than half of the public wants the Federal highway program to go ahead as planned. Resistance to taxes is the major reason."

Any increase in gasoline taxes in unfair to the motorist, inflationary, and will be detrimental to our entire economy.

There is absolutely no reason to contemplate a gasoline tax increase as long as 42 percent of the special Federal automotive taxes now being collected from the American motorist is diverted to nonhighway use.

It is incredible that the motorist pays $3.6 billion in Federal automotive taxes when only $2.1 billion actually goes toward highway construction. If the remaining $1.5 billion which is now diverted for other purposes were rightfully spent for highway construction, it would not only keep the highway program on schedule, but would provide a surplus for future emergencies.

There are many factors which call for the defeat of any proposal to increase the Federal gasoline tax rate:

1. Any increase can have a serious effect on the U.S. automobile industry, and the economy as a whole. As one example, the trend toward foreign cars is growing rapidly and each foreign car purchased in America causes a loss of employment in the domestic automobile industry and the industries which supply it. A recent survey indicates that 88 percent of Americans who purchase foreign cars do so because of gasoline economy.

2. A gasoline tax increase will discourage highway travel, representing a threat to the investment of many small Wisconsin businessmen who make their living by providing services to the motoring public.

3. Reduced gasoline consumption means less gasoline tax revenue for Wisconsin and will seriously impair this State's ability to carry out the newly proposed highway program.

4. Any decrease in highway travel will have an adverse effect on States such as Wisconsin which depend heavily upon the tourist industry.

5. Present taxes on gasoline are already far out of line with any comparable product in the entire economy. Wisconsin motorists already pay a sales tax on gasoline amounting to 38 percent whereas the excise tax on the most trivial of luxury items is about one-fourth as much.

6. The trend toward foreign cars not only idles American workers but will impair the ability of the American automobile industry to underwrite present personnel costs and to carry out planned expansion.

7. Higher gasoline taxes add to the cost of nearly every consumer item. Wisconsin farmers depend upon commercial trucks to move their products to market and increased transportation costs will generally lead to higher prices.

8. The Federal interstate highway program was enacted on the claim that it was essential to the national defense, civil defense and the well-being of the economy as a whole. It is grossly unfair to compel the motorist to finance a highway system which benefits everyone, regardless of whether they own an automobile.

9. The Wisconsin motorist is already paying a total of $105 million annually in combined Federal and State gasoline taxes, $43 million in other excise taxes, $38 million in State registration fees as well as other special automotive taxes. He has no special ability to pay taxes but is an average American with average means. Over 50 percent of the cars in the United States are owned by families earning less than $5,000 a year.

Under the circumstances we have just outlined, we sincerely believe that the citizens of Wisconsin will greatly appreciate your efforts on their behalf by vigorously opposing any increase in the Federal gasoline tax rate.

Yours very truly,

LOUIS MILAN,
Chairman, Wisconsin Highway Users Conference.

JULY 3, 1959.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It would seem to me that the current attempt to increase the Federal gasoline tax should be opposed. The present Federal tax of 3 cents per gallon, in addition to our State tax of 6 cents, makes a total of 9 cents per gallon tax. I am sure you will agree that this is a high percentage of tax on any one product.

Furthermore, I understand that about $1.6 billion of the $3.6 billion collected last year by the Federal Government in automotive excise taxes is being diverted to the general fund. I believe that this $1.6 billion should also be allocated for road construction purposes before any additional gasoline tax is voted.

Sincerely,

I. W. LACKORE,
Executive Director, Madison Chamber of Commerce, Inc.

Mayor Zeidler, of Milwaukee, Pleads With President Eisenhower for Urban Renewal

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the outstanding experts in the country on urban renewal is the mayor of Milwaukee, Frank Zeidler. On July 10 Mayor Zeidler wrote President Eisenhower calling for a strong urban-renewal program. This letter puts the case for an adequate urban-renewal program so cogently that I ask unanimous consent that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that all Members of Congress will have an opportunity to read it.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAYOR'S OFFICE,
Milwaukee, Wis., July 10, 1959.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
White House, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In view of the serious problems of housing and urban renewal in the United States, permit me to

make some comments on the situation, in the hope that you will support a strong program of urban renewal.

As the older parts of American cities continue to decay, there is now only one effective solution to the problem, and that is through a program of slum prevention, slum elimination, and rehabilitation, with joint participation by Federal and city agencies sharing in planning and costs.

It has been argued that slums are local responsibilities and should be eliminated by use of State and local funds only. The cities have done their best and have strained their financial resources in many instances to match Federal grants. In our own State the cities have had a great deal of difficulty in qualifying for Federal urban-renewal funds, owing to obsolete prohibitions embodied in the constitution of the State of Wisconsin affecting municipal powers. The cities twice have had Federal urban-renewal funds withdrawn because of difficulties in State law. Moreover, the State itself is having financial problems which would deny any hopes of State grants for urban-renewal funds. Even if the State of Wisconsin had adequate funds for urban renewal, it appears to be unable, for constitutional reasons, to grant State funds to cities for this type of internal improvement. Many States have been unwilling to help their cities, even when they could, and as a result cities have turned to the Federal Government in desperation.

It has been argued that the urban-renewal program is inflationary. I cannot believe that any program which adds to values as much as the urban-renewal program does can be so considered. It provides real, actual capital assets that are productive to the Nation's wealth. Indeed, it could be argued that if the urban-renewal program is inflationary, then so are any capital improvement programs of any government, for the paving of streets, the provision of sewerage and water, the furnishing of schools and museums also add to costs. But the values thus created are the true wealth of the Nation and add to the efficiency and productive capacity of the Nation.

Urban renewal in the cities is vital for the economic and social health of the Nation. It is equally as important for our foreign policy as is foreign aid. If the people of the world whom we are trying to impress get the viewpoint that the U.S. Government cares nothing for the distress of the inhabitants of its crowded slums, no amount of such foreign aid will overcome the impression that the U.S. Government does not really have the interests of people at heart, but merely the protection of its monetary wealth. Foreign aid has been used to rebuild cities throughout the world. Some aid should be forthcoming to help rebuild U.S. cities.

I, therefore, urge you to sign the housing bill, S. 57.

Yours respectfully,

FRANK P. ZEIDLER,
Mayor.

Tribute to Ernest Bloch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a great citizen of Oregon, the famous composer and conductor, Ernest Bloch, has passed away. He has exercised for many, many years a great influence in the cultural life of Oregon. His son, Ivan Bloch, is known to many Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper article on the death of Ernest Bloch be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERNEST BLOCH, COMPOSER, DIES

PORTLAND, OREG., JULY 15.—Composer and conductor Ernest Bloch, 79, died today in a hospital where he had been under treatment for cancer.

Mr. Bloch, whose works ranged from the tone poem "America" to symphonies and the opera "Macbeth," had been a resident of Agate Beach on the Oregon coast since 1940. He entered a hospital here July 7.

The composer-conductor was born in Geneva, Switzerland, July 24, 1880. He studied violin under the virtuoso, Eugene Ysaye, but gave up the idea of a concert career when he found violin practice took too much time from his composing.

But that technique he developed in studying the violin served him well in composing for strings. "Nigun" from his "Baal Shem Suite" is in the repertory of nearly every concert violinist. We won renown for his "String Quartet No. 2" and his "Quintet for Piano and Strings." His "Israel" symphony and "Schelomo" are widely admired and his sacred service and "Concerto Grosso" are frequently performed.

The Paris Opera Comique accepted "Macbeth" and presented it November 30, 1910. Early in 1916, Mr. Bloch came to America as conductor for the touring dancer, Maud Allen. That enterprise went bankrupt, and he was stranded in a strange country whose language he did not know. He nearly starved for a few months but finally was appointed teacher of composition at David Mannes School of Music in New York.

The turning point in Mr. Bloch's career came when he won the $1,000 Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge prize in an international competition in 1919. He founded the Cleveland Institute of Music in 1920 with six students and directed it until 1925 when he had more than 700 students. He became an American citizen in 1924.

For the next 5 years he was director of the San Francisco Conservatory. He wrote his epic rhapsody "America" and submitted it anonymously in the Musical America contest in 1928. It was the unanimous choice of five judges from 93 scores. He was awarded $3,000.

An endowment by a San Francisco music-lover enabled Mr. Bloch to devote 10 years to composing, and he returned to Geneva and spent the next decade in Europe. He lived in Italy, France, and Sweden before returning to the United States in 1939.

From then on he was associated with the University of California as professor of music. From 1941 on his winters were spent in Agate Beach.

Among his other notable works were Avodath Hakodesh, the first complete performance of the Jewish service, Three Jewish Poems, and Suite Symphonique.

The work, "America" which he derived from folk songs, was dedicated to Abraham Lincoln and Walt Whitman.

He was the only American to be voted into the Academy of St. Cecelia in Italy and the only composer to be awarded the New York Music Critics' Award twice.

Survivors include a son, Ivan Bloch, Portland industrial consultant; and two daughters, Mrs. Paul Smith, New York City, and Mrs. Stephen P. Dimitroff, Mill Valley, Calif.

Connecting Channels Key to Vast Interconnected Water System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway—formally dedicated on June 26—is an accomplishment that holds great promise—as well as challenges—for the Nation.

We recognize, of course, that a waterway system—like a chain—is only as strong as its weakest link. Full utilization of the seaway in the future will depend, to a great extent, upon the deepening and improvement of the linking channels between the Great Lakes.

Currently, for example, work is underway on the connecting channels between Lake Superior and Lake Huron, Lake Huron and Lake Michigan, Lake Huron and Lake Erie. Until this is accomplished, a number of Great Lakes States, including Wisconsin, will be denied the full benefits of the seaway.

My colleagues will recall that earlier this session I urged approval of $29 million in the 1960 budget for modernization work on the connecting channels. The U.S. Corps of Engineers had indicated that they could effectively utilize this amount in order to complete work on the channels by the target date of 1962.

The public works bill, H.R. 7509, now ready for conference, contains $27 million earmarked for channel work.

Although this is about $2 million less than I had urged, I am hopeful that it will enable the Engineers to carry forward construction at a pace rapid enough to allow completion of the channels by the 1962 target date.

Early completion of the channels is essential for developing maximum traffic through the seaway with its economic rewards; also, the early attainment of capacity volumes of trade and commerce through the waterway will be a determining factor in paying off the debt of construction.

Recently, the Evening Telegram, of Superior, Wis., published a splendid article, relating to the scope, size and significance of the interlake connecting system in the overall waterway system. I ask unanimous consent to have the article entitled, "Connecting Channels Key to Vast Interconnected Waterway System," by the U.S. Army Engineer Division, North Central, Corps of Engineers, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Superior, (Wis.,) Evening Telegram, July 10, 1959]

CONNECTING CHANNELS KEY TO VAST INTERCONNECTED WATERWAY SYSTEM

(By U.S. Army Engineer Division, North Central, Corps of Engineers)

The Great Lakes connecting channels, generally referred to as the connecting channels, include the waterways between Lakes

Superior and Huron, Lakes Huron and Michigan, Lakes Huron and Erie. The St. Marys River, including the shoal approach to the head of the river, is the connecting channel between Lake Superior and Lake Huron. The Straits of Mackinac and approaches thereto comprise the connecting channel between Lake Huron and Lake Michigan. The St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair and the Detroit River, with the approaches in Lake Huron to the head of the St. Clair River and in Lake Erie to the mouth of the Detroit River, comprise the connecting channel between Lake Huron and Lake Erie.

The international boundary between Canada and the United States passes through all of the Great Lakes and their connecting channels, except Lake Michigan which is wholly within the United States.

NATURE'S CHANNELS TOO SHALLOW

Although the lakes are deep, the connecting rivers had shallow reaches in their original state and over the years it was necessary to dredge the river channels to provide adequate depths to accommodate deep-draft lake vessels. In addition, the St. Marys Falls in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie were impassable and locks were required to overcome the drop at the Falls to permit vessels to pass between Lakes Superior and Huron.

At the present time controlling depths of 25 feet in downbound channels and 21 feet in upbound channels, when the ruling lake level is at low water datum, are available between Lake Superior and the lower lakes. The deeper depths were provided in the downbound channels to accommodate deep-draft loaded ore carriers.

In addition to the channel improvements in the connecting channels, four locks (the Poe, Davis, Sabin and MacArthur) and two approach canals have been constructed in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie. One of these locks, the MacArthur lock, is equal in size to the St. Lawrence Seaway locks and can accommodate any vessel which can pass through the seaway. Congress has authorized construction of a new modern Poe lock with a depth over the lower sill of 32 feet to replace the existing Poe lock. This additional large deep-draft lock now under design is required to accommodate the large volume of deep-craft Great Lakes traffic which cannot pass through the two older locks with depths over their sills of only 23 feet.

Traffic between Lake Ontario and Lake Erie is through the Canadian Welland Canal which has locks adequate for modern deep-draft navigation and has been deepened to 27 feet as part of the 27 foot St. Lawrence Seaway from Montreal to Lake Erie. However, the connecting channels between the lakes west of Lake Erie require deepening to accommodate the increasing number of larger, faster, and more economical vessels in the Great Lakes fleet and to accommodate the deep-draft traffic through the St. Lawrence Seaway.

DEEPER CHANNELS NEEDED

Recognizing the inadequacy of the connecting channels for the newer deep-draft vessels and with the advent of the St. Lawrence Seaway which would provide a 27-foot depth channel westward only as far as Lake Erie, the U.S. Congress, upon study by the U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers, authorized deepening the connecting channels between Lake Erie and the upper three lakes to provide channels with a minimum controlling depth of 27 feet. The improvement was found to be fully justified in the interests of Great Lakes bulk cargo traffic alone, although it was recognized that the deepened channels would provide commensurate depths with those provided in the St. Lawrence Seaway.

(The U.S. portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway project was accomplished by the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp. with the U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers, as design and construction agents).

WORK STARTED 1957

The project for deepening the connecting channels to 27 feet was initiated in May 1957. It is primarily a large-scale underwater excavation job, embracing the removal of about 64 million cubic yards of earth and rock. It requires the mobilization and deployment of one of the largest and most varied fleets of dredging equipment ever assembled, and exceeds by far any previous undertaking of this kind during the 133-year experience of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on the Great Lakes.

When completed in 1964, this project will have cost approximately $146.5 million, but it is estimated that savings of almost $10 million in three commodities alone—iron, ore, stone, and grain—will be made annually in the transportation costs.

THE PROJECT

Under the direction of the U.S. Army Engineer District, Detroit, work on the multi-million dollar connecting channels project was started in May 1957 on the Amherstburg Channel of the Detroit River and Middle Neebish Channel in the St. Marys River.

All channels will be dredged to a minimum controlling depth of 27 feet. The scope of work in each area is as follows:

St. Marys River: Deepen 63 miles of channel, varying in width from 300 feet to 1,500 feet, to depths varying from 27 to 30 feet. Remove isolated shoals. Construct anchorage areas at Point Iroquois Shoal 29 feet deep and in Lake Nicolet 28 feet deep.

Straits of Mackinac: Remove shoals over an area 4,000 feet by 1,250 feet, between Mackinac Island and Round Island to a depth of 30 feet and removal of Poe Reef Shoal to a 30-foot depth.

St. Clair River: Deepen 46 miles of river channel, varying in width from 700 feet to 1,400 feet, to depths varying from 27 to 30 feet. Included in this phase of work is a cutoff channel at Southeast Bend in the St. Clair River which will be 6 miles long, 700 feet wide and 27 feet deep. It will eliminate the use of the present hazardous Southeast Bend Channel.

Lake St. Clair: Deepen 17 miles of channel, varying in width from 700 to 800 feet, to 27.5 feet.

Detroit River: Deepen 32 miles of river channels, varying in widths from 300 feet to 1,200 feet, varying in depths from 27.5 to 29 feet. Deepen channel extending 9 miles into Lake Erie from the Detroit River light to 28.5 feet over a width of 1,200 feet. Remove Pelee Island Shoal to 28.5 foot depth.

EQUIPMENT AND MEN

The project requires an array of equipment including dipper dredges, large hydraulic dredges and a sea-going hopper dredge. Each dipper dredge is attended by one or two large tugs, a derrick boat, one or two launches and from 2 to 4 large dump scows. In channels with rock bottoms, dredging must be preceded by submarine drilling and blasting operations involving special drill boats. The work force necessary to man and supervise the dredge fleet requires from 800 to 1,000 men.

WORK DIFFICULT

The dredging job is complicated by the constant stream of lake vessels—one every 15 to 20 minutes day and night during the height of the navigation season—that pass through the connecting channels during construction. This traffic is stopped or slowed down only when navigation is hazardous because of fog, storm, or accident. For example, during a navigation season, some 30,000 vessels pass through Detroit River channels. Because of this heavy traffic which cannot be stopped, the dredging work must be done in half-channel widths with normal vessel traffic proceeding at reduced speeds in work areas. Work is carried on continuously except for the winter months when ice conditions require layup of floating plant.

CALUMET-SAG CHANNEL A MISSISSIPPI RIVER LINK

Concurrently with the connecting channels project, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is also improving Chicago's Calumet-Sag channel to provide an adequate and modern connection between the Mississippi River and Lake Michigan via the Illinois waterway. This 327-mile long barge canal links the Great Lakes with the barge system of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. U.S. Army Engineers are widening the Cal-Sag from 60 feet to 225 feet with a 9-foot depth.

FURTHER STUDIES UNDERWAY

The need for improvements at harbors on the Great Lakes to accommodate the large, deep-draft vessels which will transit the deeper channels has been recognized. The U.S. Congress has directed the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to make a study to determine the advisability of further improvements of harbors on the Great Lakes in the interest of present and prospective deep-draft commerce. In determining whether improvements can be justified at Great Lakes harbors, three major elements are studied: prospective traffic, engineering design, and economic analysis. Every improvement must be a sound investment.

A WATERWAY TO SERVE UNITED STATES AND WORLD

When the job is finished, the Great Lakes navigation system and its links with the Atlantic Ocean and the Mississippi River will provide a vast, interconnected waterway system, reaching from Montreal to Mexico (via the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway), from Pittsburgh to Sioux City and from Superior-Duluth to the ports of the world.

JOINT EFFORT

The seaway is a major achievement in the history of both Canadian and United States transportation. The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, in conjunction with its counterpart, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, has brought this long awaited dream to realization.

A Declaration of Interdependence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, by request, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a declaration of interdependence.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION OF INTERDEPENDENCE

When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for a group of Americans representing their country in devoted loyalty, determined to raise their voices in freedom's sacred independence, with eternal gratitude for the unanimous declaration of the 13 States of America in Congress, July 4, 1776 (the 183d anniversary of which we

celebrate today), a decent respect for the opinions of mankind requires that we reaffirm the standards and principles which have made us mighty and respected. We hold these truths to be self-evident that character and reputation are not the outcome of chance, but are earned through years of fidelity to principle; that the worker and his employer are partners in production: that the most of the best be theirs to share; that the people should control government instead of government controlling people; that if men do not consent, they are not free and tyranny prevails; and that all rights affecting free enterprise can be reduced to the one right as defined by Justice Brandeis, namely: "the right to be left alone."

We, therefore, the undersigned members of the Leaders Association having been invited to belong to this distinguished association by virtue of our long and honorable business record, the recognized quality of our product, and the unassailable fairness of our policy do issue on this historic national holiday our declaration of interdependence, hereby publishing and declaring our steadfast belief that labor and management, management and government, government and national welfare, national welfare and mankind's fate are interdependent in the sight of God and man. And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence we pledge ourselves to fight for our principles by sincere endeavor, and shining example, in order to preserve and protect the sacred heritage handed down to us on this great day.

H. Roy Eshelman, Herbert H. Winslow, John Cavedon, J. Lee Ferguson, Jr., Francis C. Rooney, Earl E. Raymond, C. G. Walters, Louis J. Eckstien, L. McPhaden, J. W. Barber, Louis T. Koerner, Frank C. Callahan, Edward P. Bailey, Dorothy M. Tracey, Ernest T. Boger, Philip H. Thayer, George A Thornton, Earle O. Hultiquist, Arvid J. Kling, Paul O'Abbe, Norman J. Murray, Harry Simms, William J. During, Kenneth A. Weatherwax, Gerald P. Hull, R. L. Gehrt, J. A. Lavallee, William L. Hansen, Benjamin S. Katz, Dewey Zwicker, George T. Downs, Jr., Warren P. Miller, I. L. Rush, S. Abbott Smith, J. E. Fuller, John R. Clark, R. H. Alexander, R. E. Chesebro, S. J. Clark, LaMar Mutschler, Myron W. Owen, L. H. Erickson, A. J. Krantz, John A. Johnson, Sturgis C. Rice, J. A. Fribley, D. W. Ellis, T. F. Mahoney, George B. Horne, E. V. Bukolt, E. L. Mory, W. C. Furnas, C. H. Abbott, J. H. Gibson, Charles V. Roberts, Arnold J. Dodge, Ediom R. Jerome, L. G. Wood, G. W. Way.

Tribute to Walter H. Evans, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on July 13, a great citizen of Oregon, the Honorable Walter H. Evans, Sr., who for many years was judge of the Federal Customs Court, passed away. Mrs. Morse and I join in extending to his survivors our very deep sympathy. To his son, Walter, Jr., who for many years has been a leader of the bar of the State of Oregon, I extend my very sincere condolences.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, from the July 15 press, announcing the death of Judge Evans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1959]

W. H. EVANS, SR., 89, EX-CUSTOMS JUDGE—JURIST HERE FROM 1931 TO 1941 IS DEAD—HAD SERVED ON CIRCUIT BENCH IN OREGON

PORTLAND, OREG., July 13.—Walter H. Evans, Sr., retired judge of the U.S. Customs Court in New York, died at a hospital here early Monday. He was 89 years old.

Mr. Evans, who served on the court from 1931 to 1941, was a former assistant U.S. attorney. He had been district attorney and then circuit court judge in Multnomah County.

He was born at Elizabeth, Ind., on April 17, 1870.

MADE SOVIET-TRADE DECISION

Judge Evans wrote rulings of the U.S. Court of Customs here in a number of important cases In 1937 he was the author of the court's opinion that it was proper for the United States to discriminate commercially against the Soviet Union because the two nations are not on terms of international friendliness.

The court in that case upheld the collection of revenue duty of 10 cents a hundredweight on coal imported from the Soviet Union. Earlier, the court had ruled against the payment of duty on coal imported from Germany and Britain.

In the coal case it was also Judge Evans who wrote the original ruling, in 1933, which decided that the levy on coal imports from the two nations was "discriminatory and in violation of the most favored nation treaties * * *."

The decision was hailed then in Washington as "a distinct victory for the State Department." Secretary of State Cordell Hull had outlined his tariff policy, frequently, as being governed by the most-favored-nation system. The ruling was, in fact, a major victory for the then young administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, although the case had been initiated under the administration of President Herbert Hoover.

In 1935 Judge Evans concurred in an opinion of the Customs Court here, which held that Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., had exceeded his authority when he amended regulations to restrict to 1 quart the amount of liquor a returning traveler could bring into the country duty free. The three judges of the court in that case decided that the statutory exemption of $100 on the personal effects of travelers must stand.

Judge Evans was a Hoover appointee. At his retirement in 1941 he received a personal letter from President Roosevelt, praising his devotion to duty.

An Outstanding Lady of Journalism Passes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 11, 1959, death came to one of the South's most gracious ladies, Mrs. F. T. Raiford, who for 23 years had actively served as publisher of her newspaper, the Times-Journal of Selma, Ala.

Her passing is a great personal loss to me, as I had long admired her and counted her as a dear friend.

Her passing also took from southern journalism one of its outstanding persons, the last remaining woman editor of an Alabama daily newspaper. Since 1936, when she took over the reins left by the death of her husband, she exercised well founded control and journalistic courage in the policies of her newspaper.

As a mark of respect for Mrs. Raiford, I ask unanimous consent for inclusion in the RECORD of some of the editorials commenting on her life.

The editorials referred to follow:

[From the Selma Times-Journal]

MRS. F. T. RAIFORD

Death came kindly as she slept early Saturday morning to Mrs. F. T. Raiford, cofounder and publisher of the Selma Times-Journal, and Selma's private citizen number one passed from the scene as graciously and as unassumingly as she had lived.

Her passing marked the end of a long, brilliant and productive career, which has not been equaled for public service by any individual Selmian of our time. Modern Selma itself serves in the nature of a monument to Mrs. Raiford because there have been few public developments in the past quarter of a century which do not bear in some fashion the imprint of her influence.

While, as sole owner, the Times-Journal was her newspaper, it really has belonged to the community because its columns always were open to promotion of any worthy cause in contribution to the welfare and upbuilding of Selma.

If there was any weakness in her astuteness as a business executive, it was willingness to devote the entire resources of the Times-Journal to public service, regardless of damage to her operational costs budget.

The effects are evident on every hand and it would require a diligent and determined reporter to compile a representative record of her achievements for a city she loved with sheer devotion.

Because she always retained the reserve which often is characteristic of ladies of the old school, Mrs. Raiford evaded the spotlight of public attention unless the interests of The Times-Journal or the community demanded her appearance, and her personal contacts were limited by the necessities of a heavy work load.

In consequence, she was not as well known to many Selmians as should have been their privilege. In fact, to some she was more a legend than a personality. Perhaps it was Selma's unfortunates who knew her as well as any, because to her they came in a steady stream when in need of succor or sympathy. These they always got, for she recognized neither color nor creed when there was a worthy cause to meet.

But as concerns her associates on The Times-Journal, it was a different story.

They all knew her as a gracious lady with a great heart and an even greater capacity for understanding individual problems.

It is something of a paradox that she had a will of iron, and once she was convinced a cause was just, nothing could move her position. Coupled with a rare brand of both personal and journalistic courage, this attribute made the Times-Journal and its publisher factors with which to reckon even on a national basis.

Selmians know, of course, that they have lost a great friend and a great force for

progress, but it is going to require the perspective which only time can give for them to grasp and appreciate the full extent of their loss.

[From the Anniston Star]

A Loss to Journalism

In the death of Mrs. F. T. Raiford, who was publisher of the Selma Times-Journal for 22 years, Alabama and Southern journalism lost one of its most engaging characters.

Mrs. Raiford, who died in her sleep Saturday night, took over the reins of publication immediately after the death of her husband, to whom she had been an able assistant, and had guided the destinies of the paper ever since.

Mr. Raiford was one of the ablest newspaper writers in the State, and when he passed away she put Ed Field, formerly of Anniston, in his place. And while she managed the business end of the paper, Field maintained the editorial tradition of the paper with a style that has always been crisp and alert.

No one will miss Mrs. Raiford more than her editor, to whom she was a mother. Between the two they published a paper that has character and readability. Mrs. Raiford, a native of Selma, was widely known in newspaper circles and was greatly beloved in her hometown.

[From the Montgomery Advertiser]

Mary Raiford of the Selma Times-Journal

When F. T. Raiford, editor and publisher of the Selma Times-Journal died years ago, he died not entirely. For the passion of his devoted widow, Mary, was to carry on the Times-Journal just exactly as she believed he would have.

The key to the operation of the paper was always the creed as established by the collective acts of F. T. Raiford, of which creed the widow was the prophet. She was a woman of force and determination and there was never any question that the Times-Journal would go on.

In her endeavor, which took her into late old age, Mrs. Raiford had two essential advantages. She had, as she deserved, the respect of Selma; and she had Ed Field, a hardworking, conscientious, and highly competent editor.

Probably the next management of the Times-Journal will undertake changes; a newspaper does have to be renewed physically and otherwise. No doubt the changes will be sound. But however successful they are, they will be based on the character that Mary Raiford maintained in the paper.

Oil Depletion Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, contained herein is an analysis recently compiled by the Independent Petroleum Association which points out some very important and interesting facts about the much-discussed oil depletion allowance. I hope these facts will help clear up a great deal of misunderstanding that has been created about this matter.

The analysis follows:

Percentage Depletion and the Price of Gasoline

Percentage depletion means lower prices for oil to the consumer. Even critics of depletion recognize this fact.

Edward S. Mason, dean at Harvard University, has stated that the effect of depletion is "to expand investment and output—thus bringing down mineral prices." Prof. Arnold C. Harberger of the University of Chicago has testified that "More oil can indeed be obtained by tax concessions * * * (but) * * * If the rest of the economy wants more oil, it should be willing to pay for it by way of a higher market price."

Elimination or reduction of depletion, therefore, would mean less oil at higher prices, as illustrated by the following figures:

A. Average U.S. price of crude oil in 1957, $3.09 per barrel.

B. Maximum amount available from 27½ percent depletion,[1] spent by oil producers to find more oil, $0.85 per barrel.

C. Loss in funds for oil exploration because of additional income tax if depletion were eliminated (52 percent tax rate on $0.85 per barrel), $0.44 per barrel.

D. Increase in price of crude oil necessary to provide $0.44 per barrel for exploration after payment of 52 percent tax, $0.92 per barrel or 2.2 cents per gallon.

An increase of 2.2 cents per gallon in the price of crude oil would necessarily mean an increase in prices paid by consumers for petroleum products. The price for all products could increase by 2.2 cents per gallon, but it is more likely that the increase would be passed along in the form of higher prices for gasoline, the principal product derived from crude oil. As it takes 2.3 gallons of crude oil to make a gallon of gasoline, an increase of 2.2 cents per gallon in the price of crude oil would mean an increase of about 5 cents per gallon in the price of gasoline at the service station.

[1] The 27½ percent applies to gross income, but because depletion is limited to 50 percent of net income, the average for the industry is no more than 23 percent. However, depletion also applies to income from natural gas which is not included in the price of crude oil used above. If all such factors were taken into consideration in a more detailed calculation, the results would be approximately the same as shown in this analysis.

Pink Painters at Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Richmond News Leader of July 8, 1959:

[From the Richmond News Leader, July 8, 1959]

Pink Painters at Moscow

We are still sore about this exhibition of American works of art at Moscow this summer, and even last night's announcement that 25 or 30 19th century paintings will be rushed abroad as an offset to 50-odd abstractions leaves us cold. This act of expediency may quiet some criticism, but it will do little to remedy a basic misconception on the part of some gullible Government officials.

The exasperating facts are now common knowledge: Of 67 American artists chosen for representation at this exhibition, 34 have records of affiliation with Communist fronts and causes. Twenty-two of these 34 have a combined total of 465 Communist connections. Three have taught at Communist Party schools. Two were former owners of the Communist magazine, New Masses. Five have publicly supported Communist candidates for public office. More than half of the 34 have contributed art material to Communist magazines. One of the group, Max Weber, has been publicly identified as a party member. Another, Jack Levine, whose caricature of an American general was referred to in the President's recent press conference (right), has a record of 21 Communist front affiliations. Philip Evergood has more than 75 Communist front connections; Ben Shahn has been affiliated with a couple of dozen Communist causes.

These are the American artists, God save the mark, whose work was chosen for this particular American exhibition.

How was the work chosen? A jury chose it. And who chose the jury? Mr. George V. Allen, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, chose the jury. How did Mr. Allen happen to pick these particular jurors? He asked art critics and others in the art world to suggest jurors to him. Did Mr. Allen consult with the State Department's own Bureau of Cultural Affairs on this exhibition? It is not known that he did. Were political considerations ever pondered at all? No, the jury made its choices on the merits of the painting and sculpture, and gave no regard to the political views of the artists.

Where is one left by that colloquy?

The jurors were Franklin C. Watkins, of the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts; Lloyd Goodrich, director of the Whitney Museum of Modern Art; Henry Radford Hope, chairman of the fine arts department at Indiana University; and Theodore Roszak, sculptor and teacher at Sarah Lawrence College. It is pointless to criticize these gentlemen. They served as professional jurors, and put together this art exhibit as they would put together any other. They did what they were asked to do.

But in the whole of the State Department and in the mazes of the USIA, wasn't there one responsibile man who could understand that this show in Moscow was not just another art exhibit? Is there no one in high office in foreign affairs who comprehends the political nature of these "cultural exchanges"?

If there is any good purpose at all in such official exhibitions, it lies solely in the furthering of American interests behind the Iron Curtain. The aim presumably is to impress the people of Communist lands, and not to please the art critics of Pravda. Our Government is engaged deliberately in spreading propaganda, not in exhibiting art. And unless this is understood, nothing about the venture is understood. That Mr. Allen so obviously fails to understand this, considering his position as director of the USIA, is perhaps the most appalling aspect of all.

The jury's selection is bound to foster an impression abroad that half of all American artists are sympathetic to communism is some degree, and that a third of them are actively engaged in aiding Communist causes. This slander upon American artists and sculptors is bad enough. What is worse, from the point of view of the taxpaying public, is that public funds now have been squandered and a propa-

ganda opportunity now has been lost for want of some clear-eyed and realistic management somewhere.

How long do the top people in our Government propose to behave like empty-headed children in a world of grown men?

Will the Family Farm Fade Out of the American Scene?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Farm Editor Robert W. Boyer of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror has written an interesting editorial entitled "Will the Family Farm Fade Out of the American Scene?" which appeared in the July 11, 1959, issue.

The editorial was written based on the observations of some of the finest and most efficient farmers in Blair County, Pa., as they ventured their opinions as to whether a way of life is imperiled in the oft-repeated statement that the family farm is doomed as one of the Nation's prized assets.

Editor Boyer has treated his subject in an able manner and against a background of down-to-earth sentiment from typical family farmers who express hope for the survival of the family-size farm, despite the encroachment of mechanized corporate farms with their absentee ownership. Summing up some of the advantages of family life on the farm, Blair County's outstanding young farmer of 1959, Dick Frederick, of Duncansville, Pa., said in part:

Showing in a dairy show, attending a good cow sale, going to a fair, a twilight meeting, civic events, and attending church are the things a farm family enjoys.

The editorial referred to follows:

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, July 11, 1959]

WILL THE FAMILY FARM FADE OUT OF THE AMERICAN SCENE?

Out among the broad, fertile valleys of Blair County, a $7 million industry is thriving. But this industry doesn't have the usual "corporate immage," with its army of employees, foremen, superintendents, managers, and presidents, for agriculture has no department heads. Almost its total personnel are families, and there is no chairman of the board, unless one looks upon father in this exalted position.

For, out there in the industry of the farms, everybody works, and even on the unpleasant task of keeping books, there are few farmers who do not occasionally at least have the help of wives or high school daughters.

And there also are few farmers who are not uneasily aware of the changing times.

They hear about it at their agricultural extension and Grange meetings, they read about it in the papers, and they learn about it the hard way when they pay out thousands of dollars for a bulk milk tank, or some new type of farm equipment.

IN THE MIDST OF CHANGE

They are in the midst of change, and, while the average farmer may be much too busy to have time to ponder the future, the plain fact remains that agriculture is right in the middle of the technological revolution, and it is no different from other segments of American life, for it cannot remain unaffected by the rapid course of scientific revelopments and the changing pattern of national life brought about by them.

But, the farmer may be affected more than anyone else—for, while progress may alter the working habits of some people, and the living habits of many others, for the farmer, it will alter both working and living habits.

And so, the questions which are arising with increasing frequency these days, and which sometimes trouble the farmer's dreams involve one of the oldest traditions of the land, "What will become of this farm in the years ahead? I've spent my life enriching and tilling its soil, developing these fields and pastures. I'm making it into a good land. Will it be my family's land 25 years from now? Will my sons keep it and develop it for their sons, or will they have to leave it and go to the cities to work and live?"

DARK THOUGHTS

These are dark thoughts for a man of the soil. For it is part of his very nature to build, to bring forth from the earth, and he likes permanency. His is not the sentimental affection of the city man for animals as pets, and vegetation as things of mere beauty.

For the farmer lives with nature. He is among the most practical of men, and he knows that while his golden wheat fields are beautiful, they cost him time, labor, and money, and in their tawny waves lies the staff of life.

And, he finds beauty in the strength and proportions of his cattle, for their basic worth is in their ability to produce food for man, and a living for him and his family, and his affection for them is for living things which he has raised up and nurtured and cared for, and for which there is a purpose in the scheme of things, a purpose which he tries to further by breeding better animals, and growing finer crops. Death, too, is part of the pattern, and he accepts that as an integral part of the life of plants and animals—and man.

THE CORPORATION FARM

And so now, he hears about "vertical integration," and the rising need for further farm mechanization, and the added cost. He learns he must produce more, and he reads that the corporation farm may replace that of traditional family farm life in another generation.

But, the farmer also may find some comfort if he examines the situation further. For all this change is not necessarily bad.

In fact, those figures thrown at him by agricultural extension speakers and others show that agriculture is among the strongest elements of American life despite the fact that the farm population is dwindling.

In 1910, 32 million Americans lived on farms, 35 percent of our population. Now we have about 21 million on farms. By 1975, it is predicted only 7.5 percent of our population will live on farms, or about 17 million.

RISE IN PRODUCTION

This shows the vast rise in farm production, and it shows too that further rise will be needed. It indicates, too, that there must be a considerable increase in living standards of all our farm families; for if production must rise further, so must income, and it follows that only the most qualified, the ablest, will be able to hold a place in agriculture.

The uninformed look at these figures showing dwindling farm populations and charge that agriculture is declining. But, to the contrary, it grows stronger, for it is expanding.

Today, for every 100 workers on farms, there are 90 others engaged in supplying farmers with goods and services, and about 100 more in processing the goods produced on the farms. And this total labor force—or agri-business force, comprises about 37 percent of our total workers.

HUMAN VALUES

But, here again, the element of human values enters the picture. Sociologists are studying the American farm, trying to determine its real importance to the American way of life, and what would be lost if the traditional family farm were to disappear in the predicted vortex resulting from a combination of agricultural technology and urban—or suburban—encroachment upon farmlands.

The family farm remains one of the most effective training schools for strong character. In Congress, and in many States, political efforts now are being directed toward methods for saving the small farm, viewed in the light of social, moral, and spiritual values as well as in the light of economic efficiency, as one State's resolution put it.

A fundamental reason for the character-building value of the farm is its requirements that all members of the family must work together on the common task of providing a livelihood. Such a life breeds initiative, and the ability to work, into children; it develops independence of thought and strength of resolution.

Will the family farm disappear in the near future? That question is regarded by many as important to the future trends in American life.

Not all farmers by any means are convinced that the family farm will go.

YOUNG FARMERS HOPEFUL

Bob Dauberman of Roaring Spring RD was a town boy who loved the life of the farm, and as a youngster, used to seek out farms where he could work. Now, after studying agriculture in college, and serving as a Blair County assistant farm agent, he has a fine farm of his own. Bob speaks and acts deliberately, and he shook his head slowly. "I don't think the family farm is on the way out. The farmer will have to produce more, that's all. I like to farm, but I dont' know that I'd want to be in farming if I had to do it the way it was done when I worked on a farm as a kid."

So, technology isn't all bad. To Bob, the family working together is one of the most valuable contributions the farm can make to American life.

And while he didn't say so, he managed to convey the idea that as long as men love the freedom of the open fields, the sight of their own cattle feeding off their own lush pastures, and the fine lines of good animals, there will be a family farm in American life.

Dick Frederick of Duncansville RD, Blair County's Outstanding Young Farmer of the current year, said, "Farming always has been a great joy to me. I was raised on a farm and saw its advantages and interests. I started farming because I always liked livestock and working with the soil. It is gratifying to see the progress you're making as the years go by. And, also I think farm life is second to none for rearing children.

"Farming is a continual reinvestment, and a farmer seldom has much cash. To make a success of farming, I feel you must be happy and satisfied to make this reinvestment, and maybe sacrifice some pleasures.

"But, I wouldn't want you to think we haven't any pleasure.

"It's different from the townman's, though. Showing in a dairy show, attending a good cow sale, going to a fair, a twilight meeting, civic events, and farm meetings, and attending church are the things a farm family enjoys."

Ultimately, technology, and agri-business may help to preserve the family farm.

Technology enables the farmer to produce more, and to meet the demands upon him, and agri-business performs many of the jobs in the city that once were a part of farm routine. Now, the farmer can specialize.

And, whether or not we have the type of life represented by the traditional family farm probably will depend, finally, upon how much we want to keep it.

And this will mean frank and enthusiastic support of that kind of wholesome living in every rural community of America.

West Virginia Is Getting Shortchanged—IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that during the Korean conflict, my home State of West Virginia ranked first—at the very top of the list in percentage of its population serving the Nation during that time.

And I should like to add that a larger number of West Virginians were killed in battle than those from any other State—based on the percentage in service.

I believe this proves conclusively that West Virginia has contributed generously to the defense of our Nation in days past. Should the need arise, I know that my great home State would do so again.

And yet West Virginia, which gave more men and lost more men on the basis of its population, ranks a dead last in Defense Department spending and installations.

For the ninth time on the floor of this House, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to this shameful discrimination against the Mountain State.

Every other State—many smaller in size and in population—has a bigger share of the defense budget, bigger payrolls, more installations.

I have figures—the Defense Department's own figures—to bear out my contentions, and I am appending them to this statement to confirm West Virginia's great contribution to the Nation's armed service in the Korean conflict.

Yet our reward, seemingly, is to remain absolutely last in the modern, cold war Defense Department budget, despite our record of patriotism, valor, and duty.

I have said previously, and I now repeat, that it is a national disgrace for West Virginia to be first in war, first in peace, and last in the hearts of the Pentagon.

	Number serving in the Korean conflict as a percentage of total population	Estimated number serving in the Korean conflict [1]	Population, 1950 [2]
1. West Virginia	4.73	95,000	2,005,553
2. Maine	4.59	42,000	913,774
3. New Hampshire	4.50	24,000	533,242
4. Vermont	4.50	17,000	377,747
5. North Dakota	4.35	27,000	619,636
6. Oklahoma	4.29	96,000	2,233,351
7. Rhode Island	4.29	34,000	791,896
8. North Carolina	4.23	172,000	4,061,929
9. Alabama	4.21	129,000	3,061,743
10. Virginia	4.18	139,000	3,318,680
11. Kentucky	4.17	123,000	2,944,806
12. South Dakota	4.13	27,000	652,740
13. Nebraska	4.07	54,000	1,325,510
14. Tennessee	4.07	134,000	3,291,718
15. Utah	4.06	28,000	688,862
16. Massachusetts	4.05	190,000	4,690,514
17. Florida	3.96	110,000	2,771,305
18. Oregon	3.94	60,000	1,521,341
19. Arkansas	3.92	75,000	1,909,511
20. Idaho	3.90	23,000	588,637
21. Kansas	3.88	74,000	1,905,299
22. Connecticut	3.88	78,000	2,007,280
23. South Carolina	3.87	82,000	2,117,027
24. Arizona	3.86	29,000	749,587
25. Pennsylvania	3.85	405,000	10,498,012
26. Wisconsin	3.84	132,000	3,434,575
27. Minnesota	3.82	114,000	2,982,483
28. Iowa	3.81	100,000	2,621,073
29. Wyoming	3.78	11,000	290,529
30. Georgia	3.77	130,000	3,444,578
31. Missouri	3.76	149,000	3,954,653
32. Nevada	3.75	6,000	160,080
33. Montana	3.72	22,000	591,024
34. Texas	3.72	287,000	7,711,194
35. New Mexico	3.67	25,000	681,187
36. Indiana	3.63	143,000	3,934,224
37. Colorado	3.62	48,000	1,325,089
38. Maryland	3.62	85,000	2,343,001
39. California	3.58	379,000	10,586,223
40. Louisiana	3.57	96,000	2,683,516
41. Washington	3.57	85,000	2,378,962
42. Mississippi	3.53	77,000	2,178,914
43. Michigan	3.49	223,000	6,371,766
44. Illinois	3.42	298,000	8,712,176
45. Ohio	3.41	271,000	7,946,627
46. New Jersey	3.37	163,000	4,835,329
47. New York	3.25	482,000	14,830,192
48. Delaware	3.14	10,000	318,085
49. Alaska	1.94	2,500	128,643

[1] Source: Department of Defense.
[2] Source: Bureau of the Census.

	Number killed in battle in the Korean conflict as a percentage of total number serving	Estimated number serving in Korean conflict [1]	Population, 1950 [2]
1. West Virginia	0.84	95,000	2,005,553
2. Arizona	.81	29,000	749,587
3. New Mexico	.78	25,000	681,187
4. Kentucky	.70	123,000	2,944,806
5. California	.67	379,000	10,586,223
6. Ohio	.65	271,000	7,946,627
7. Michigan	.64	223,000	6,371,766
8. Nevada	.63	6,000	160,080
9. Indiana	.62	143,000	3,934,224
10. Louisiana	.62	96,000	2,683,516
11. Oklahoma	.62	96,000	2,233,351
12. North Dakota	.62	27,000	619,636
13. Colorado	.61	48,000	1,325,089
14. Maryland	.61	85,000	2,343,001
15. Virginia	.61	139,000	3,318,680
16. Arkansas	.60	75,000	1,909,511
17. Minnesota	.60	114,000	2,982,483
18. Missouri	.60	149,000	3,954,653
19. Montana	.60	22,000	591,024
20. Tennessee	.60	134,000	3,291,718
21. South Dakota	.59	27,000	652,740
22. Texas	.59	287,000	7,711,194
23. Illinois	.58	298,000	8,712,176
24. Nebraska	.57	54,000	1,325,510
25. Pennsylvania	.57	405,000	10,498,012
26. Georgia	.56	130,000	3,444,578
27. New Hampshire	.56	24,000	533,242
28. South Carolina	.56	82,000	2,117,027
29. Wyoming	.55	11,000	290,529
30. Kansas	.54	74,000	1,905,299
31. Maine	.54	42,000	913,774
32. Vermont	.54	17,000	377,747
33. Washington	.54	85,000	2,378,962
34. Wisconsin	.54	132,000	3,434,575
35. Idaho	.53	23,000	588,637
36. Alabama	.52	129,000	3,061,743
37. Mississippi	.52	77,000	2,178,914
38. Iowa	.50	100,000	2,621,073
39. Florida	.50	110,000	2,771,305
40. Utah	.49	28,000	688,862
41. New Jersey	.48	163,000	4,835,329
42. Oregon	.46	60,000	1,521,341
43. New York	.46	482,000	14,830,192
44. North Carolina	.45	172,000	4,061,929
45. Massachusetts	.44	190,000	4,690,514
46. Delaware	.43	10,000	318,085
47. Rhode Island	.42	34,000	791,896
48. Connecticut	.39	78,000	2,007,280
49. Alaska	.36	2,500	128,643

[1] Department of Defense.
[2] Bureau of the Census.

Caribbean Situation: Cuba and Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, two news stories about the Caribbean situation in the Washington (D.C.) Daily News of July 9, 1959, supply additional information about the latest developments in Cuba and Guatemala.

The two news stories follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 9, 1959]

SASTRO RISKS LOSS OF OUR AID FUNDS—U.S.-OWNED RANCHES SEIZED

HAVANA, July 9.—Premier Fidel Castro's revolutionary regime plunged ahead today with plans to swallow up two big American ranches at the risk of losing U.S. foreign aid.

Announcement that the two ranches were being taken over in Oriente Province coincided with reports that soldiers had been stationed at key buildings in Santiago, Oriente's capital, birthplace of the Castro revolution.

Although a number of alleged "counter-revolutionaries" have been arrested in Oriente recently, reports said the guards were placed on the alert against the possibility of an invasion from the Dominican Republic.

(The Dominican Republic has put its forces on an alert against the possibility of an invasion from Cuba.)

The two ranches involved in the takeover were the 20,000 acres owned by Lykes Bros., Inc., of Tampa, Fla., and 66,300 acres operated by Sumner Pingree, of Hamilton, Mass.

TAKE OVER

Cuban authorities moved onto the Pingree ranch yesterday and notified the Lykes

ranch manager they would move in there August 1.

In Washington yesterday, the Senate voted 59 to 32 to cut off aid to countries which in the future expropriate American-owned property without fair compensation. The measure was an amendment to the foreign aid bill which still must be ironed out by a joint House-Senate committee.

The extent of the Lykes and Pingree takeovers was not defined. A Lykes official in Tampa said the Government apparently intended to assume only management of the ranch without actually seizing it.

Both the Lykes and Pingree ranches have been held under Spanish royal grants dating back to the turn of the century.

FAIR COMPENSATION

Just what compensation might be involved was not clear. The government has said in the past it would issue bonds for seized land payable in 20 years at 4 percent interest.

The U.S. Government subsequently cautioned Cuba against taking land without paying fair compensation.

The Pingree and Lykes ranches were the first American-owned properties to date to be affected by Castro's massive land reform campaign. They are larger than any of the Cuban-owned farms seized so far.

The Prime Minister's brother, Raul Castro, commander of the armed forces, flew with Air Force Chief Juan Almeida to Oriente Province yesterday to inspect the area.

[From the Washington Daily News, July 9, 1959]

GALICH ELECTION IS CITED—LEFTISTS ON RISE IN GUATEMALA

(By Edward Tomlinson)

The extreme leftists apparently are on the way back to power by the ballot box in Guatemala.

In last Sunday's special elections in Guatemala City, Luis F. Galich, candidate of the left-wing Revolutionary Party, was elected mayor. Next to the presidency this is the most important elective office in Guatemala.

The Revolutionary Party not only has had the open support of the Communists, but several known Reds have been elected to Congress on the party's ticket. In fact, the organization is made up of the same elements that supported the Communist-dominated government of Jacobo Arbenz which was overthrown by popular revolution in 1954.

NO RED

Friends of Mayor-Elect Galich insist he is no Red. Yet he never has openly spurned Communist support, and his brother, Manuel, has long been one of the leading Communist agitators in Central America.

Senor Galich was the winning candidate in the regular mayorality elections of last January but his victory was canceled on a legal technicality. Sources close to the Government said the real reason was the fact that the Revolutionary Party accepted the cooperation of the Communists. Meantime, PR candidates won control of municipal councils in several other leading cities.

In last Sunday's election the Communists put up a straw candidate of their own who got a mere token vote. Observers are convinced this was a feint to deceive the gullible, and to make sure the governments would have no legal grounds for disqualifying Sr. Galich again.

JUBILANT

At any rate, the leftists are so jubilant over their latest victory they are already preparing for the 1961 national elections. They talk openly of running former President Juan Jose Arevalo for president.

Sr. Arevalo is a Marxist professor who, while chief executive, permitted the friends of Moscow to penetrate Guatemala's university and other institutions. He openly encouraged a wave of anti-Yankeeism fanned by the Reds against U.S. investments in Guatemala. Then Sr. Arevalo put Sr. Arbenz into office as his successor and thus paved the way for the Communists to dominate the nation until the successful Castillo Armas revolt.

The former president has been in exile ever since, and is now a lecturer on politics at the National University of Venezuela in Caracas.

Pensions for the Self-Employed in New Zealand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to Dr. Frank G. Dickinson of the National Bureau of Economic Research in New York City, from Prime Minister Walter Nash, of New Zealand, with reference to the retirement plan for the self-employed now in operation in New Zealand.

PRIME MINISTER,
Wellington, New Zealand, July 2, 1959.

FRANK G. DICKINSON,
Bronxville, N.Y.

DEAR DR. DICKINSON: As promised in my letter of April 17, I am writing to give you such information as is at present available about the superannuation scheme for the self-employed.

Eligibility: The scheme is open to all self-employed persons and also to major shareholders who are not members of a superannuation scheme.

Special restrictions: (a) The minimum term is 10 years.

(b) Policies may not mature earlier than the member's 60th birthday (55th birthday in the case of a female), nor later than the anniversary following his or her 65th birthday.

(c) At the maturity of an endowment assurance or pure endowment policy at least three-quarters of the proceeds must be left to purchase an annuity with any of the life offices, although if one-quarter of the proceeds of all policies held by a member in the event is less than the purchase money required for an annuity of £52 a year, he may elect to take the amount of the purchase money in cash.

(d) Policies cannot be assigned or charged.

(e) Policies cannot be surrendered within 10 years before maturity.

Tax exemption: The maximum tax exemption which may be claimed on ordinary insurance policies and/or contributions to the National Provident Fund or a Friendly Society is £175 per annum or 15 percent of the taxpayer's assessable income whichever is the lesser.

Under the self-employed scheme, however, self-employed taxpayers may claim an additional tax exemption on the amount by which £250 exceeds the amount claimed in respect of premiums on ordinary policies and National Provident Fund or Friendly Society contributions, provided the additional premium is paid in respect of a special policy issued in terms of a trust deed which is attached to each policy issued.

General comment: (a) By the nature of the scheme as outlined above it is in the interests of many intending applicants to effect ordinary policies or national provident pensions to the full extent of the normal tax exemption before they elect to take policies under the scheme.

(b) The field for applications tends to be confined to such taxpayers who already hold or are willing to effect ordinary policies, etc., for an annual premium of £175, who are self-employed, who are less than 55 years of age and who are prepared to pay more than £175 a year in premiums.

(c) Because eligible taxpayers are usually at least approaching middle age, and because for practical purposes the maximum annual premium payable under the scheme is only £75, sums assured are modest and the corresponding annuities are too small to appeal as a worthwhile provision for retirement.

Data available: Life Offices have operated the scheme since May 1, 1958 but the National Provident Fund came in as late as March 15, 1959. Consequently, it is yet too early for comparative statistical details but it is felt that the available figures are satisfactory in view of the short time the scheme has been operating, the alternative provisions available (being social security benefits, insurance and other National Provident Fund pensions) and taking into account the availability of tax exemptions and the other factors I have mentioned.

The Government Life Insurance Office reports for a year's operation that self-employed business represents about one-third of 1 percent of the new policies and sums assured and I am led to understand that other Life Offices' experience is on similar lines. Contributors represent a cross-section of self-employed persons and it is significant that Life Offices have secured some additional ordinary new business as a result of interest initially shown in the self-employed scheme.

In the first few weeks of operation, which included the end of the tax year, the National Provident Fund accepted 95 applications and in 3 months, 104, representing 26 trades and professions. By far the greatest response has come from the medical profession whose Co-operative Assurance Society reports 500 applications, which represent 18 percent of the total number of registered medical practitioners of all ages who are resident in New Zealand.

Revenue loss: I am unable to state how the estimated revenue loss of £100,000 compares with the actual cost to the revenue. On this point you will appreciate that the first claim for the additional special exemption will arise when final tax is assessed later this year but the full impact of the scheme will not arise until final taxation for 1960 is assessed. Apart from this factor, the statistics available would not be adequate to make such a comparison.

I hope that this information will be of help to you and will give you some picture of how the scheme is shaping. I am also enclosing copies of a pamphlet issued by the National Provident Fund and the deed in use by life offices.

Kindest regards to Mrs. Dickinson and yourself.

Yours sincerely,

W. NASH.

Class of 1959, U.S. Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the State of Colorado is indeed proud to be the home of the U.S. Air Force Academy, which recently marked an historic mile-

stone with the graduation of its first class. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD a commemorative poem written by Milford Shields, poet laureate of the State of Colorado.

CLASS OF 1959, U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The First Class of the first class of the air,
Yours is an honor excellent and rare;
Four years have winged you to a high estate;
On this dynamic day you graduate.

The eyes of many men are turned on you
Who fly our flag across the trackless blue;
You who will hold the ramparts of the sky
Command the forces of the free on high.

With planes as missiles in atomic age,
You are the keepers of our heritage;
O gallant Captains of our outer space,
We here salute you with a freeman's grace.

Distress in the Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address to the House on July 7, 1959, I dealt at length with the vitally important subject, "Caribbean Sea, Panama Canal, and the Monroe Doctrine."

An informative news story in the Washington (D.C.) Daily News of July 6, 1959, by Mr. Edward Tomlinson, the distinguished Latin American correspondent of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, supplies additional documentation on the threatening situation to the south of us.

The indicated news story follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, July 6, 1959]

DISTRACTIONS IN THE CARIBBEAN—IF THE REDS DIDN'T START THE FIRES THEY'RE SURE FANNING THE FLAMES

(By Edward Tomlinson)

The Communists may not have set all the political fires now smoldering in the Caribbean. But if the whole area doesn't burst into a general conflagration it won't be their fault.

It is becoming more apparent every day that the Reds are out to subvert the forces that are attempting to right grievous wrongs in several of the countries. Our own and other key democratic governments of the hemisphere are gravely concerned.

SINCERE INTENTS

Fidel Castro may be sincere in his desire to overthrow Generalissimo Rafael Trujillo of the Dominican Republic along with the Somoza brothers of Nicaragua, so as to bring freedom and justice to the people of those two little republics.

But the Reds in Havana who night after night are permitted Cuban radio facilities to denounce "these despots" and at the same time to castigate "the imperialist Yankees who support them," are not interested solely in peace and freedom for the oppressed Dominicans and Nicaraguans.

The government of President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela may honestly share the views of the Cuban Prime Minister and many others about the dictators. But the heads of the big Communist Party, the Communist-dominated university students and the large number of leftist and fellow traveling newspaper columnists in Caracas, who daily echo the Cuban Reds, hardly could be thinking only of political freedom for their neighbors of the Spanish Main.

WHY THE UNITED STATES?

Otherwise, why do they have to include the United States, which has never had a dictator, in the same category with the Trujillos and the Somozas?

Exiled Nicaraguan rebel spokesmen based in Costa Rica, Honduras, and other nearby countries boast they have only begun to fight. Only last week, the Cuban Government, apparently with one eye on the OAS observers who have been investigating the Central American scene, announced it had arrested more "Nicaraguan exiles" who were about to set sail on an expedition to their homeland. Leftist students and other extremist elements in Honduras continue to organize demonstrations of sympathy for their neighboring compatriots.

STIRRINGS

Reliable reports from Panama say that leftist university students on the isthmus are readying a new campaign to force President Ernesto de la Guardia out of office. The Reds as well as the followers of Fidel Castro in Cuba are calling for the head of President Francois Duvalier of Haiti, along with that of the Dominican dictator.

Meantime, diplomatic sources are convinced that General Trujillo himself is prepared to march into Haiti in the event of an all-out attack on his own country.

In fact, intelligence sources throughout the area are not only reporting these and many other activities to their respective governments, but they point out that known Communists have penetrated and in some cases are directing many of these groups.

LEADERS

Enrique Jiminez Moya, a Dominican exile, who is reported to have led the June 14 invasion of the Dominican Republic, and who General Trujillo insists has been killed, was long known for his Communist connections in Cuba and elsewhere, as well as for his bitter hatred of the United States.

Concepcion Palacios, who masterminded the Honduras-based expedition against Nicaragua, which the Honduran Army frustrated and captured 10 days ago, was a well-known member of the Communist Party in Mexico.

As one of our oldest Caribbean diplomats puts it: "Nothing would suit the Kremlin more than chaos on our doorstep. It would divert our attention from the balance of the world, which with tremendous sums of money and arms we have tried to bolster against the Red menace. It would also make the neighboring Republics easier to penetrate and take over later on."

Personal Incentive Must Be Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Oregon Journal of Portland, Oreg., Saturday, June 13, 1959:

[From the Oregon Journal, June 13, 1959]

PERSONAL INCENTIVE MUST BE SAVED

James A. Farley, writing recently in Atlantic Monthly, will not end the dispute as to what the terms "liberal" and "conservative" mean, but he sheds some light on the subject.

"Ironically enough," he says, "because I have favored—and favor—every bit of progressive legislation to distribute risk, the conservatives regard me as a liberal. And because I insist that the distribution of common risk can never be a substitute for individual effort, the liberals regard me as a conservative."

While Farley may not find favor with either the doctrinaire conservatives or liberals, we suspect his position will find favor with a good many people who are more concerned with finding solutions to today's problems than they are with labels.

Farley worked closely with Franklin D. Roosevelt when details of the New Deal were being hammered out, but broke with him over the third term issue.

In 1933, he recalls that collective bargaining was a "theoretical illusion," children were working who should have been in school and a majority of those over 60 years of age were dependent upon relatives for support. He decried those conditions and still does but contends the philosophy of the program to remedy them has been twisted out of its original meaning and intent.

"More particularly," says Farley, "to build a floor over a community of quicksand is quite different from putting a ceiling over the productive and creative elements of the individual. It is one thing to put in a minimum wage level, it is quite another to put a ceiling on personal incentives, which our present hodgepodge tax system does."

There will be those who say the Farley of New Deal days has been corrupted by his years as chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. and president of the Coca-Cola International Corp., but what Farley has really done is to put his finger on the dilemma faced by most modern States—how to alleviate misery and eliminate abuses which grow up under a strict laissez faire system and at the same time not destroy initiative and create government paternalism.

We have examples of the dangers in those who would use aid to dependent children as a way of making a living and in those who attempt to convert unemployment compensation to a regular part of their annual income.

"It seems to me," says Farley, "it is American to hate dependence of any kind," and he adds that it is silly to argue that crutches were invented as substitutes for legs.

Laws and strict supervision of our welfare programs can minimize abuses, but if hatred of dependence is to continue to be an American ideal, this concept will have to continue to be taught in the home and the school. Independence cannot be legislated.

Address by Ernest S. Marsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on June 23 of this year at the Sherman Hotel in Chicago a very excellent address was given by Ernest S. Marsh, president and chief executive officer of

the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway system before the mechanical division and electrical section of the Association of American Railroads. Because of the interest in transportation and the study which has been undertaken of this important matter, I ask that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ADDRESS BY ERNEST S. MARSH, PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, ATCHISON, TOPEKA & SANTA FE RAILWAY SYSTEM, BEFORE MECHANICAL DIVISION AND ELECTRICAL SECTION, ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS, JUNE 23, 1959, SHERMAN HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL.

It is a pleasure and an honor to have this opportunity to appear before the annual meeting of the mechanical division and the electrical section of the Association of American Railroads.

I have always considered these meetings to be of immense value to the progress of the industry. When you sit down together in a spirit of friendly cooperation for the exchange of ideas and information gained from experience and concentrated study, it cannot do other than make a substantial contribution to progress in improving railroad service to the public. In the final analysis our function is rather simple. We are in the business of moving something or someone from one place to another and our every thought in daily operations and long-range planning must of necessity be directed to performing that service in the most efficient and economical way.

Your group plays a most vital part in this business because it has to do with the motive power and cars that perform the essential and basic function in railroad transportation. It might be fair to say that no railroad can be better than its equipment. That means the suitability of adequate equipment, the condition of it, and even its appearance to the traveling and shipping public.

You and your committees have done an outstanding job in producing improved performance through new mechanical and electronic developments. You deserve the applause and the appreciation of the whole industry. You deserve continuing support, and I say continuing support because the necessity for further improvements is a constant one. There are great challenges before you.

We are in a brandnew era of railroad transportation. An era that demands good clean, comfortable, and pleasant passenger service. An era that puts emphasis on fast, dependable freight service and intensified efforts to reduce costs of operation and maintenance. An era where we must recognize the inaction of Congress to give us fully adequate remedies to provide competitive equality with other forms of transportation. A keenly competitive era in which we must do more things to help ourselves, both servicewise, ratewise, and costwise. A good service and competitive rates are necessary to attract more business and a sustained high volume is needed for efficient utilization of the plant and lower costs per ton-mile. Costs for ratemaking purposes should be based upon the increased volume that could be attracted rather than upon statistics of the past without inclusion of that volume—only in this way can the public receive the benefit of the most economical form of transportation.

Yes, we are in a new era—an era of faster freight trains to try to give better and more reliable service than our competitors on the highways. We are convinced it is regaining business and certainly it is arresting further erosion of traffic we have been handling. Within the past 16 months, since March 1958, the freight train schedules between Illinois junctions and California have been reduced by 2 days westbound and 1 day eastbound. Back in 1926 there was much ado about the Santa Fe Chief being put on a 62-hour schedule from Chicago to Los Angeles—today we run freight trains faster than that. This is of interest to you because the expedited schedules call for freight equipment to be in good condition, and to avoid undesirable delays en route they call for closer attention to inspections at originating and intermediate points, particularly inspections of the running gear. Especially is that true with respect to journal boxes.

I need not tell this group that the No. 1 operating problem today continues to be the hotbox. A satisfactory solution of that problem at a reasonable cost which would promote early application to all cars is probably the greatest single challenge before you, the suppliers, and the people engaged in research. Although many experiments have been made with oil specifications, controlled clearances, journal lubricating devices, and other arrangements, the age-old problem becomes more acute and of more serious consequence to dependable operations. The facts are, however, that the figures show a worse performance in 1958, measured in car miles per hotbox, than the industry had 5 years ago. Our own figures show a poorer performance than we had 18 or 20 years ago. I relaize that faster schedules, reduced terminal time at intermediate points, and perhaps heavier loading, have not been conducive to a better record. These circumstances strongly suggest that without your untiring and commendable efforts a more troublesome comparison might exist, still it may well be a case where engineering and research on this particular subject have not kept pace with the tempo of modern transportation. So far, the roller bearing appears to be the nearest approach to elimination of hotboxes, but the roller bearing is a very expensive item—it would cost upward of $1.5 billion to change out all of the old freight cars in the country—$1.5 billion that the railroads do not have to spend. Despite the initial cost, we on the Santa Fe consider the problem of such importance that the 2,400 new freight cars in our 1959 program will be equipped with roller bearings, except for 96 cars that we purchased "off the shelf" in order to obtain quick delivery. I am sure the friction bearing problem will come in for lengthy and serious discussion in your further meetings at this session. It is of growing importance that a suitable remedy be found, and the sooner the better.

Another serious problem confronting the railroads, and the whole economy for that matter, is inflation. It seems to me that the inflationary trend is going to be with us for a long time. The constant pressure for higher costs of labor and material and more and more spending by Federal and local governments is taking us down a road that is certain to bring severe results to the Nation's economy and its people, just as it has done in other countries where inflation has run its course. The cost basis today is pricing much business out of the market and pricing our people out of jobs. There are hundreds of examples of the growing sale of foreign goods in this country. To mention one—just day before yesterday, I saw a newspaper statement that some 45,000 tons of European steel have been unloaded at Chicago in the 49 days since ocean ships began arriving here on May 4. The account said "the threat of a steel strike, of course, is a factor to be considered, but the primary reason for the influx of foreign steel is that much of it can be delivered at the port of Chicago at a cost less than it can be bought at an American mill." That is true also with reference to Japanese steel which is being sold at Chicago for less than it can be produced in mills right here at home.

It is no secret that many purchasers are going to the foreign markets. One large concern made a statement this month that the foreign production not only increases current stock but also the price is better and it helps establish supply sources less likely to be choked off by strikes. Is there any wonder we have unemployment? It has to stop somewhere.

The inflationary spiral that is so common to all industry is making it increasingly difficult for the railroads to have available funds for all desirable and needed improvements. It is probably appropriate to say that the increases on the railroads have just about followed the national pattern in other basic industries. However, it is fair to say also that this inflationary spiral hits an industry like the railroads harder where prices are not so easily nor readily adjustable, and where labor costs take up such a large proportion of operating revenues.

These pressures bear more heavily on the railroads too because of the high ratio of investment in physical plant and equipment and the necessity for carrying on a substantial capital expenditure program on a regular basis. To illustrate the long-term cumulative effect of competitive conditions and constantly rising costs of doing business, I would like to give you a comparison that seems particularly revealing. Back in 1929, our best peacetime year prior to World War II, the Santa Fe had 16.6 billion revenue freight ton-miles. In 1958 this increased to 33.2 billion. Total revenues amounted to $267 million in 1929 with a net railway operating income of $68.6 million. By 1958 the total revenues were $595 million, over two times as large as 1929, yet the net railway operating income was actually less at $63.3 million, even after including $8.5 million of a temporary nature by reason of tax amortization of certain facilities for which necessity certificates were granted.

We have had no increase in our take-home pay despite the fact that the physical volume of business doubled from 1929 to 1958 when measured in revenue ton-miles handled, and despite the further fact that the total money investment in road and equipment went from $1,094 million to $1,860 million, an increase of 68 percent.

Now, when it is considered that we need to provide modern equipment and facilities at several times the costs of the late twenties to handle an increased physical volume, the squeeze that is taking place becomes abundantly clear.

Rate increases based on merely absorbing higher operating costs, even if they are timely and adequate to do that, add nothing at all to the net income and the financial ability to make capital improvements. Depreciation accruals, based as they are on original costs, do not come anywhere near providing the money for replacements alone.

Probably the most interesting feature of the comparisons between 1929 and 1958 is that, even with the increased volume, we were able to come as close as we did to the net railway operating income of 1929, in view of the terrific increases in the costs of wages, materials and taxes. How we were able to show even this inadequate result is somewhat of a long story, but, in a few words, it stems from doing things to help ourselves.

It is reflected in a comparison showing 16,109 fewer employees in 1958 to handle approximately twice the physical volume. It is reflected in a comparison of freight gross ton-miles per train-hour—a commonly ac-

cepted index of efficiency combining both the train load and train speed—which increased 160 percent over 1929. Briefly, these are the results of a concerted program of modernization and improvement of the physical plant with the adoption of new technologies and techniques, in which the group here today has had such an important part.

Of course, productivity has increased but wage increases have far outdistanced that improvement. In the post-war period since 1946, our wages per hour paid for have increased from $1.14 to $2.49, a rise of 120 percent. One measure of productivity, that is car miles per hour paid for, has increased 65 percent. The real index—the one that affects the results—is car miles per dollar of wages paid. That has gone down 25 percent in this period.

The inflationary pressures are felt keenly in our financial ability to make capital expenditures. We are providing many expensive freight cars especially designed to take care of the particular needs of shippers, including, of course, the popular DF or damage free cars, mechanical refrigerator cars, covered hopper cars, covered gondolas, air-slide cars, and new shock control cars utilizing a sliding underframe principle.

The cost of new freight cars today is simply amazing in relation to prior periods. The cars we have in our 1959 program will come at an average price per car of $15,000. Increased effort needs to be directed to reducing substantially this initial cost through improved design, use of lighter but stronger metals and alloys, and improved techniques in car production. Increased efforts should be directed to getting greater utilization of freight cars through reduction of bad order time and through designs that will serve multiple purposes and reduce empty return mileage of special equipment.

The railroad today is vastly different from the railroad of 1929 when we had no such things as centralized traffic control, diesel locomotives, air conditioned passenger cars, radio communication, mechanized maintenance and freight handling equipment and the many other improvements in common use today. If we were still operating at the efficiency levels of 1929, or the middle forties for that matter, we would have an overall deficit of many millions of dollars.

This is mentioned to show that, as we march ahead with modernization and try to keep step with new equipment and methods, we can never consider the job fully completed, because what was modern yesterday may be obsolete tomorrow. The past has seen great changes in the railroads, but it takes a terrific amount of money to keep going ahead with the improvements needed to maintain the type of up-to-date service that will attract revenues and translate a part of those revenues into earnings.

A continued improvement program is not just a desirable thing—it is an essential element in a railroad's survival. Funds for improvements come from three sources: (1) Depreciation accruals that are allowed as a charge against earnings during the life of the various units of property; (2) earnings retained after payment of Federal income taxes; and (3) borrowing—the repayment of which must ultimately come from earnings.

Depreciation accruals are quite unrealistic. They completely disregard what should be the first essential of any business concern, that is, it should cover its full cost of merely perpetuating the business before it can be considered to have made a profit or to have a taxable income. To the extent that depreciation accruals fail to provide money for replacements to stay in business, the profits are overstated and largely taxed away. This is tantamount to a drastic and continuing capital levy. These false profits are treated and taxed as real profits, but actually they must be used as one of the costs of remaining in business. Somehow, we should be able to stop overstating taxable railroad profits and quit treating this capital consumption as taxable earnings.

We had hopes of getting some help from Congress that would have gone a long way toward remedying this undesirable situation. As a matter of fact, the Smathers bill, as it came out of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce last year, contained a provision for a construction reserve which would have permitted us to set aside funds for capital improvements and deduct them from taxable income of the year, with the requirement that they be used for such improvement purposes within a 5-year period. If not so used in 5 years, the funds would then become taxable with certain penalties.

Because of the opinion that the construction reserve fund constituted a tax measure and should have originated in another committee of Congress, the provision was lost by an amendment on the Senate floor, which eliminated it from the bill without prejudice.

Such a construction reserve would enable management to plan ahead and undertake desirable improvements necessary to adequately meet transportation demands. With such a reserve I am confident the industry would do much more modernization and replacement and would do it faster.

Congress provided treatment somewhat similar to the construction reserve in the Merchant Marine Act and, of course, everyone is familiar with the substantial public expenditures being devoted to waterways, highways, and airways. Last year the Secretary of Commerce placed before Congress a 5-year, $2,783 million program aimed at modernizing the Nation's air traffic control and navigation systems.

I mention these programs only for the purpose of making a significant contrast. They represent advance appropriation of tax money for improvements relating solely to transportation. All the railroads ask is some advance treatment of their own money, also for improvements relating to transportation.

In my opinion, there is no subsidy or Government gift at all attached to the construction reserve proposal. No more than the cost of the property, less salvage, can ever be deducted through depreciation charges. The actual cost is simply deducted sooner. Depreciation, however timed, is an expense, or a cost of doing business. It represents the annual estimate of value used up by wear and tear and obsolescence of property devoted to and used in the business. It is just as much a cost of conducting a business and just as much a deductible expense as the wages paid to the crew that handles the equipment. Each dollar of depreciation, just like each dollar of wages, properly reduces the Federal income tax by 52 cents.

There is no argument at all as to the amount of the deduction or the legitimacy of it. The question relates simply to the period of time in which the taxpayer is allowed to take it. What he takes now, he cannot get later. Certainly there would be no long-term loss of tax revenue to the Government. Quite likely, there would be no immediate loss or sharp decline in tax revenue. There might even be an immediate increase in tax receipts, as conceivably the adoption of the construction reserve could so stimulate capital expenditures as to put taxable income in the hands of builders and suppliers and their employees right down to the source of raw materials to such an extent that the Federal Treasury would realize greater net tax receipts.

I said earlier the provision for a construction reserve was struck from the Smathers bill without prejudice. The question is—without prejudice to whom? We had hopes this provision would receive favorable consideration in the current Congress. Instead of something helpful, the railroad legislation that has come out of this Congress further added to the burdens of the railroads. You are all familiar with the recent amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, which increased payroll taxes quite substantially, far above the payroll taxes in nonrailroad industry. An increase that will in time range from $120 million to $200 million per year. We had rather anticipated some increase from this Congress, but the size of it came as quite a jolt.

There was a modified version of amendments under consideration by the House that would have been less expensive by about $60 million per year. A more rigid and costly bill was passed by the Senate in a near-record time of something like 15 minutes, and this was almost immediately adopted by the House with little debate. Then it was signed into law without comment. Thus, we find the industry that is least able to bear added tax burdens being saddled with the greatest of these. While I never want to see railroad employees treated any worse than any other workers, still I think the railroads are not so prosperous that they can be expected to pay far more than other industry for unemployment insurance, which is now extended from 26 weeks to 39 or 52 weeks, depending upon length of service. Why did we get this treatment at Washington? It boils down to the only explanation I have heard—political expediency. An interpretation of political expediency includes expected popularity at the polls in the next election. Assuming that to be accurate, then in a very broad sense the railroad industry, through this increase in payroll taxes, is making an enforced contribution of at least $60 million per annum for political purposes. Who said a corporation cannot legally contribute to such causes?

This added tax of so many millions per year takes money that the railroads could use to good advantage in strengthening their competitive position so as to hire more people. Actually, it works against the very interests of railroad employment. It is clear that Government is hopeful that industry will continue to spend large sums for expansion and improvement in the interest of sustaining employment and production. Yet, it is not nearly so clear how the railroads are presumed to continue such outlays when Government itself aspires to spend at its own discretion so large a proportion of the profits produced by taxpaying businesses.

As I said before, we are in a new era of railroad transportation. An era of great opportunity and continuing progress, much of which starts with you who are here today. All of us must be alert to new methods and new ideas. I have confidence that with fair treatment, the unbounded determination to accomplish progress in railroading will measure up to the challenges of the future.

Soviet Newspaper Assails Role USIA Plays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have here an article which appeared today in the New York Herald Tribune,

written by Mr. Tom Lambert of that newspaper's Moscow bureau, and headlined "Soviet Paper Assails Role USIA Plays—U.S. Agency Raked for Anti-Red Work." I ask unanimous consent that the clipping appear in the Appendix of the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The Tribune item reports that the All-Union Society of Political and Scientific Knowledge published in the most recent issue of its monthly review International Life an article which attacked, in some length and detail, our Information Agency. The semischolarly treatment went to considerable pains to define the purpose and operations of the USIA throughout the world, emphasizing the Agency's dual role of combating communism through explaining the true nature and merits of the capitalistic system and through its vigorous promotion of American foreign policy among peoples of foreign lands.

The Soviet article pointed out that the USIA is very active throughout the world; that it presents its propaganda like real facts. It paid tribute to its audience emphasis, and even observed biliously that the Agency publicizes the peace movement of the world as a weapon of Moscow.

Mr. Lambert writes from Moscow:

An attack here on the USIA can be considered a compliment to its effectiveness, especially in the ideological field.

Such coverage in one of the Soviet's top-caliber propaganda organs, Mr. President, represents a fine—if backhanded—tribute to the work of the USIA. Indeed, considering the totalitarian personality of her cultural organizations and the outright control Russia holds over her press, the appearance of the article Mr. Lambert writes about constitutes evidence of effectiveness of the highest degree. The various programs implementing our country's overall foreign policy do not get under the Communists' skin unless they are successful.

Here is high praise indeed, Mr. President, demonstrating the fearful respect the Soviet high command has for the USIA. I call it to the attention of the Senate as proof of the fine work our overseas information program continues to do.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 16, 1959]

SOVIET PAPER ASSAILS ROLE USIA PLAYS—U.S. AGENCY RAKED FOR ANTI-RED WORK

(By Tom Lambert)

Moscow, July 15.—Often assailed in Congress as a boondoggle, ineffective, and expensive, the U.S. Information Agency has just come under brisk attack here for its vigorous promotion of American foreign policy and its campaigns against communism.

If some Congressmen think the USIA's efforts are fruitless, that feeling is not shared by one of the Soviet Union's highbrow propaganda organs, the All-Union Society of Political and Scientific Knowledge.

Writing in the latest issue of the society's monthly publication, International Life, A. Gromov evinces considerable unease about the USIA's work, which he sees as two-pronged:

First, to praise capitalism in the United States and "to slander socialism (communism) and the Communist Party."

Second, to "justify the aggressive foreign policy of the United States and to pose the foreign policy of the U.S.S.R. as aggressive."

NOTES ROLE IN TV

An attack here on the USIA can be considered a compliment to its effectiveness, especially in the ideological field.

Mr. Gromov noted soberly that the USIA is active in foriegn television, "supplying foreign countries with propaganda films," and in radio and publishing. He reported that the USIA is "very active in all countries of the world," and is particularly busy in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The USIA's aim, he alleged, is to try to dominate the information mediums of other countries.

In another backhanded compliment to the USIA, Mr. Gromov said the Agency tries to consider the cultural and other features of other nations in which it disseminates information; that it tries to influence foreign trade unions, businessmen, and some political organizations, and that it attempts to present its information about the United States not as propaganda, but "like real facts."

RECALLS A NIXON TRIP

This appraisal from the Soviet Union, a veteran in propaganda, cannot but please the American USIA specialists as a tribute to their choice of audience.

Mr. Gromov told his readers that the USIA is flexible. The agency jumped into an extensive campaign to combat anti-Americanism in Latin America after Vice President NIXON's visit touched off demonstrations against him and the United States, the Soviet writer reported. Likewise, he said, the USIA began emphasizing abroad the achievements of Negroes in the United States after the Little Rock incident.

He said also that the USIA was working diligently in foreign nations accepting American missile bases to convince the people of those lands that such bases were deterrents to aggression. The Soviet Union, of course, views installation of such bases as aggressive and warlike.

SUSPICIOUS OF "VOICE"

Mr. Gromov was suspicious but not violent, about the Voice of America. He said the Voice "and all its private branches" are not averse to distorting facts, but noted "in recent times the ruling circles of the United States tried to make all the programs more objective."

There was a catch in this move, however, he declared.

The "ruling circles" now prefer that "the most provocative broadcasts be made by other stations, which are formally considered private, but are subsidized by the State budget of the United States." He apparently was referring to such institutions as Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberation and others engaged in anti-Communist information programs.

DUAL ROLE SEEN

As Mr. Gromov viewed it, the USIA has a dual offensive-defensive role in U.S. foreign policy.

Defensively, he said, the USIA's job is to retrieve American prestige in the foreign policy field.

Its "activity is in direct proportion to the decrease of influence of the United States," he asserted, "to neutralize the defeats of Washington's foreign policy." He implied that publication of the Soviet Union's 7-year plan was a defeat for American foreign policy, and reported that there had been a counter move in Washington to expand and invigorate the USIA to tell abroad more of the American story.

The USIA, he wrote, is on the offensive in Asia and Africa, pumping out millions of books in English and the local languages about the United States.

DISTORTION CHARGED

In Africa, he continued, the USIA is working "to drive out the European colonizers" and institute American "rule over the black continent."

Mr. Gromov complained also that the USIA publishes various anti-Communist tracts, that it distorts Marxist-Leninist teachings as old and outmoded, and that it gives advice on how to struggle against communism.

He grumbled that the USIA labels "the peace movement of the world as a weapon of Moscow."

Let's Get Acquainted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, on June 22, many Members of the Congress and myself attended a breakfast given by the American Seed Trade Association. It was their first effort to bring to the knowledge of the Congress that there was such an association in existence and of the few things that they had done for agriculture. One of the highlights of the meeting was the address by their past president, Mr. Charles B. Mills. It was a nice talk full of facts and several stories intermingled which made it very interesting.

I thought the Members of Congress who were not there should have the opportunity of knowing what Mr. Mills had to say and I request it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Mills' talk follows:

LET'S GET ACQUAINTED

(By Charles B. Mills)

I would hate to have you think that the seed trade is no more intelligent than the present speaker. There are only a few reasons why I was asked to occupy this spot: (1) I don't talk very long; (2) I don't give you anything weighty to create worry or retard your digestion; (3) I am from a small midwestern town where we don't claim to have the solution to the world's problems. We just help create them; (4) I represent the grass division of the industry, which is about as low down as you can get.

I am told it is never safe and certainly not popular to try to impress, though confidentially the seed trade considers itself the world's most vital industry. So naturally, I would like to make our guests realize that there is a seed industry in the United States and that it is handling the truly basic commodity, for without seed—there would be no food. Thus seed is the very source of life. This industry, therefore, is charged with the responsibility of seeing that seed is always available to take care of our ever-increasing population. If that be modesty, please make the most of it.

It was stated recently on the Garry Moore show that 35 firms control field, grain, garden, and grass seeds, so that within their hands lies the destiny of all America. In other words, if these 35 firms say you don't eat—you don't. Of course, we're all safe, because they want to eat, too. I suspect that all 35 firms are represented here this morning. In which case I want to remind them that there

are persons here, also, who can make their actions illegal, so don't become overly impressed with your authority.

We like to think that this association is not guilty of what the late Charles Kettering called grooved-in thinking. He illustrated it by saying that sometime prior to 1910 he addressed a group of electrical engineers in Detroit, and among other things informed them it would soon be possible to start an automobile without cranking it. His audience was so skeptical that one man actually arose and moved that they adjourn rather than listen to such eyewash. Mr. Kettering was also informed by leading paint manufacturers that to paint a car properly, 26 days were required and that Kettering was wasting his time trying to lower the time factor. One did admit that he might by superhuman effort lower the time by 2 hours. The ultimate today is 1 hour, thanks to a man who was never guilty of grooved-in thinking.

Like other successful American businesses, the seed industry has moved steadily ahead, benefiting from extensive research, even though in the case of agricultureal and horticultural products, it always seems very pokey.

Thanks to advances in agriculture, we are producing bigger crops with less seed on fewer acres. That's a hard record to beat. And I think it may be safely said even within a half mile of the Department of Agriculture, that our industry itself has been responsible for much of the progress and the forward thinking which has resulted in producing better strains of everything we sell.

My own interesct has been grass for beauty rather than for eating, although I am told that grass contains every element man needs to survive. So if occasionally some of you folks in public life get turned out to pasture, please keep in mind that it is not a starvation assignment.

Some of you seedsmen have heard me say that grass plays a vital part in man's life from the cradle to the grave. Actually, it does not stop there. Considering that the grave needs grass, we have one of the few businesses where people can still use our products after they are deceased.

According to George Washington, "In a free republican government, you cannot restrain the voice of the mutlitude. Every man will speak as he thinks, or more properly, without thinking, and consequently will judge of effects without attending to their cause." What I think George meant is that things can get pretty loused up before we know what's causing it. This has been known to happen even in the seed business. One of the greatest causes of grief these days is no doubt the result of taking action without having all the facts. I make that statement not only because it is true, but also because it gives me a chance to tell the following story:

A certain minister was getting concerned about the lack of knowledge of the scriptures among grade children, so he invited himself to visit the sixth grade of his local school. At the proper time he arose with great dignity and called up a promising looking boy in the first row to do likewise. "Young man," began the minister in a stern voice, "Do you know who destroyed the walls of Jericho?" The boy hesitated for a few seconds and then made the bold assertion that he had had nothing to do with the vandalism—in fact he didn't even know who the Jerichos were.

This made the minister even more certain that he was proving his point. So he conferred with the boy's teacher and told her of his concern. Miss Jones was very forthright. She let it be known that the youth was one of her prize pupils and a symbol of honesty. "If he says he had nothing to do with it," she insisted, "then I'm willing to guarantee that he didn't." Our visitor seemed to be getting nowhere so he carried the case up to the school principal. Here was a man who stood squarely behind his teachers.

"Miss Jones is one of my best," he asserted proudly. "If she is willing to accept the word of that boy that he didn't do it—then I also say he didn't."

Still convinced that he had a mission to perform, the confused minister went next to the president of the school board. Now he'd get some results. He had an interesting listener. The story was unfolded step by step and here was the board chairman's response. "The board of education is a responsible constituency. It stands back of its principals and teachers. Regardless of how those walls were damaged—if you'll submit a bill to the secretary of the board, we'll remit in full."

Perhaps I should be allowed one example within the industry. Back at the beginning of the last war, and we hope it was the last one, we received an inquiry from an Army Air Force installation in one of the New England States. It called for 5,000 or 10,000 pounds of Bermudagrass seed. I reported that we didn't handle it, but might venture the information that it just wasn't the grass for a cold climate. I'm sure my advice wasn't appreciated and no doubt some fellow seedsman filled the order. Just for curiosity, I made inquiry concerning the background of the lieutenant who signed the inquiry. It developed that he came from Louisiana and no doubt with justifiable pride, wanted to duplicate the ground cover of his home State. Unfortunately, he hadn't brought the weather with him.

Perhaps the need to know more about each other's affairs is reason enough for us to get a little closer to the place where things are likely to happen, and closer to the people who help make them happen. I have no specific case to recite and even if I knew one, I wouldn't mention it because this is a gathering devoid of worrysome situations. We would like to go away from here feeling that we know each other better and have acquired mutual respect for each others problems. Who knows, you people in Government may have almost as many of them as we do.

St. Louis Globe-Democrat Asks, "Does Congress Have the Courage?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, with the labor bill expected to reach the floor of the House next week, I believe all Members of the House should have the opportunity to read and study an excellent article by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN which appeared in last Sunday's issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

All of us know of the magnificent job done by Senator MCCLELLAN and his committee colleagues in their conduct of the 2-year investigation of improper practices in the labor-management field.

Likewise, the conclusions he has reached and the proposals he has made for corrective legislation deserve our thoughtful consideration.

Last year, on May 14 and again on August 18, I urged my colleagues in the House ot give their support to a strong and effective labor bill.

The additional evidence produced since then by Senator MCCLELLAN's committee increases the urgency of action on our part.

I am including in these remarks the Globe-Democrat article by Senator MCCLELLAN as well as a thought-provoking Globe-Democrat editorial, titled "MCCLELLAN's Vibrant Challenge," in the same issue:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, July 12, 1959]

DOES CONGRESS HAVE THE GUTS TO DO ITS DUTY?—MCCLELLAN SOUNDS CALL FOR LAW TO PROTECT PUBLIC AND WORKERS AGAINST ABUSES BY UNIONS

(By Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Chairman, the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor-Management Field)

If the Congress does not have the guts to do its duty and pass a strong labor bill, then this country is in a pitiful condition.

For more than 2 years, the Senate Select Investigating Committee of which I have been chairman has worked to provide the facts about improper practices in the labor-management field.

We have heard more than 1,400 witnesses under oath. We have filled 45 volumes with the printed record of public hearings.

The record is clear, and it is available to Members of Congress as well as to everyone else.

The record shows, to a shocking degree, flagrant abuses, corruption, and exploitation, including the denial of basic human rights to union members.

These evils are admitted. Their existence cannot be challenged or denied. Indeed, they are spread so fully and extensively on the public record it seems to me only a most stupid fool or irresponsible liar would attempt to deny they are prevalent in some areas.

These conditions should no longer be tolerated. The American people, in my judgment, want this present session of Congress to act and to pass effective remedial legislation.

But there are those on both sides of the issue, representing labor and management, who apparently do not want any bill passed at this session of Congress.

For a long time I had hopes—and I think the country was led to believe—that the Congress would receive at least some measure of cooperation and support from the leadership of the AFL-CIO.

Certainly we never expected any cooperation or assistance from the James Hoffa segment of organized labor. But now we find that after a Hoffa blast at the bill passed by the Senate, even the leadership of the AFL-CIO is apparently joining in an effort to defeat this legislation.

I am disappointed, and I think the country is disappointed.

To me the attitude of the honest labor leaders with respect to this legislation is disgusting.

CITIZENS SHOCKED

Instead of opposing the bill, they should be helping the Congress to amend it where necessary and strengthen it, to the end that we may drive the crooks out of organized labor and restore decent operation and administration in those union affairs where corrupt and racketeering practices now prevail.

Must the Congress throw up its hands and quit, or shall the Congress accept the challenge and, as legislators and representatives of the American people, exert the most ingenuity and talent we possess to write legislation to deal with this problem?

As I have stated on the floor of the Senate, and before the House Labor Commit-

tee, the citizens of this country have been shocked and nauseated by the disclosure of abuses which have been perpetrated upon the working people in some labor unions by the thugs who have muscled into power and who masquerade as labor leaders and as friends of working people.

The forms these impositions and abuses have taken have become familiar to all of us by countless repetitions. They include:

The capture or purchase of local unions.

The denial of democratic processes in the unions.

The denial of freedom of speech and freedom of assembly for union members.

The denial of the right to vote and to have any voice in the selection of officers.

The denial of a voice in the formulation and adoption of policies.

Brutal, physical violence, vandalism, instilled fear, and economic coercion, used to silence objectors.

The use in some instances of union funds to corrupt public officials.

The direct extortion of money from small businessmen, who are peculiarly vulnerable to racket union shakedown tactics.

The looting of union treasuries and welfare funds.

The use of trusteeships for power purposes.

Forcible top-down organization by compelling employers to violate the legal and moral rights of their employees by delivering them under contract to the unions—without the employees' knowledge in many instances, and in other cases against their will and without their consent.

The appointment of known criminals and unreformed convicts to positions of trust and authority over rank-and-file union members.

The objections is raised many times, "Well, this only applies to a small segment of labor."

LAWS NECESSARY

We pass laws against theft, burglary, and murder, not because a majority of the people are criminals, but because there is a minority element that must be curbed.

Without laws against such crimes, the criminal element would take over and dethrone law and order and decent society.

Without adequate legislation to protect honest and decent unionism and union members, there is danger that the underworld element and the racketeers will gobble up the George Meany's and the other leaders who represent the best in organized labor, rob them of their power, and finally gain a stranglehold on the economy of our country.

We do not need laws against thievery for 95 percent of the people of this country. We do not need laws for the unions that want to do right and treat their members as human beings and respect their rights.

It is that other minority percentage that is telling the AFL–CIO to go to blazes with its code of ethics, and that says, "We will run our unions to suit ourselves."

TWO FACTS EMERGE

Two main facts emerge from the long record the Senate committee has compiled:

1. Almost invariably the abuses, the compulsions, thievery, thuggery, skulduggery and sometimes skull-splitting tactics are practiced against workers.

2. The arbitrary powers over workers thus acquired by such tactics almost invariably are used—or misused—for personal aggrandizement, power, and personal enrichment.

Some of the so-called unions that resort to such acts are, in fact, more like businesses operated for private profit rather than unions for the benefit and welfare of the workers.

The profit is made and goes into the hands of individuals by the ruthless exploitation of workers and by the cynical perversion of unionism.

Thus, the only resemblance between such corrupt unions and decent legitimate unions is that both are treated alike by the law. Both kinds have the same exemptions and privileges under the law. Both have the same unrestrained tremendous powers.

Most unions use these powers with propriety, or at least with a measure of restraint, but some do not.

It is the possession of these powers and the present lack of adequate regulation of them which invite corruption and which make the union movement attractive and profitable in some instances for exploitation by the racketeers, the unscrupulous, and the corrupt.

HOW MANY VICTIMS?

No one knows how many thousands or even millions of workers are the victims of such exploitation or how many more workers may readily become victimized if effective laws are not passed to prevent it.

But mark this well: No one is immune.

The invasion of unionism by thugs and hoodlums has gone much further and is more extensive than we may think. The Senate committee has barely scratched the surface.

For every case that has been investigated, there are hundreds of complaints that the committee could not touch for lack of time and resources.

The complaints still come in to the committee offices. Some are individual cases. Others involve entire unions. We shall never be able to get around to all of them.

We do know that every worker in the country is a potential victim.

Every union man who is not protected by effective law which he can use against beatings and tortures and job loss as reprisals for assembling, for speaking up in meetings, for making inquiry about the financial affairs or other actions of his union or its governing body, is a potential victim.

BILL INADEQUATE

Every citizen of the Nation is a victim to a degree of the consequences of the spread of corruption.

The most tragic potential victim of all is the honest, decent, idealistic union.

For there is a Gresham's law of people, and the bad will drive out the good if the incentive is present for the bad to move in.

I supported the labor cleanup bill in its form as passed by the Senate.

I would do so again. I would vote for the same measure if I did not have an opportunity to vote for a stronger bill.

That bill—Senate bill 1555, which is pending along with others in the House Labor Committee—is inadequate. It does not fully meet the legislative needs.

The bill will not, as it is now written, correct all of the evil conditions and improper practices that we know exist.

It can be strengthened. It should be strengthened before it is enacted into law.

If the House of Representatives will make the necessary improvements, we can yet pass an exceptionally good labor reform bill at this session of the Congress.

PROTECTION ASKED

The Senate Select Committee has authorization from the Senate to continue its investigations until next January 31. Though there are complaints enough to keep us busy until long after that date, the committee plans to cease its activities by the end of this year.

If the Congress, with the benefit of the record already made, fails to meet its responsibilities and enact legislation which will get results, the Congress would no doubt still fail to do so even if we double the record.

At our hearings we have uncovered untold examples of such conduct as this: A union bully or goon walks up to a union member who is giving him trouble and says, "Do you love your children? You know, they have to walk 10 blocks to school. I suggest you don't be at the union meeting tomorrow night."

We have additional letters in our file begging us for protection in just such instances.

What will the Congress tell the letter writers? What protection will the Congress give them?

Can the Congress fail and neglect to act without silently acquiescing in such deeds and condoning them?

What do you think?

It should not, it must not falter or fail.

McCLELLAN'S VIBRANT CHALLENGE

Deep and righteous anger suffuses the article by Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN written for the Globe-Democrat and appearing in this issue. The Arkansas Democrat, for almost 2½ years head of the Senate Rackets Committee, warns unless Congress has "the guts" to pass a strong labor bill at this session, the country is in a pitiful condition.

He is so right it hurts. Obviously it rowels him to the core to contemplate the political blocks and congressional fear of labor lobbies, which threaten to kill needed labor legislation, or emasculate it to a dross of patchwork drivel.

Chairman McCLELLAN has sat in these committee hearings for countless hours, listening to a parade of depravity and union prostitution unveiled before his committee. He knows the needs of labor act reform. Who better?

More than 1,400 witnesses have been hailed before this Senate inquiry. The recital of malpractice and miscreance in the record is tremendous and shocking.

Abuses bared include purchase of unions, denial of democratic processes in unions, bar on unionists' freedom of speech and ballot, brutal violence, dynamiting, vandalism and coercion, corruption of public officials, the looting of union treasuries, the appointment of known criminals to union jobs of importance and trust.

Of the array of witnesses, 310 took the fifth amendment when questioned by the Senators. They refused to tell anything "for fear their testimony might tend to incriminate them." Dave Beck tallied the record, taking the "fifth" 240 times.

This unlidding of evil operations in labor heirarchies has been holding the headlines more than 2 years. Some of the stories unfolded are unbelievable scandalous. The The committee has spent $1,500,000 on the job, interviewed 40,000 persons and established a fantastically replete record of union abuse.

Certainly the malpractices do not apply to the vast majority of labor. But as the Senator tersely observed, we don't pass laws against theft or murder for the majority of citizens.

Congress is reluctant to do anything about the situation. The 1960 election campaigns color its thinking; labor is a big integer in political opportunism.

The Senate has passed a measure, which is far from satisfactory. It does not come near the recommendations of President Eisenhower, and the McClellan bill of rights, which the Senator sought to incorporate, was torn to tatters by Senate vote.

The House still has a chance to pass a competent bill, one which will remedy the injustices of labor-management operations to great degree; cull out criminal and unscrupulous infiltration in top union echelons, give labor a democratic franchise, free union ballots, and public finances.

Speculation is that the House will, to use the Senator's bald words, not "have the guts" to adopt an effective labor act.

If it hasn't if it does not force the Senate to enact a law that adequately deals with the maze of iniquities and perversions of union

authority—one of the most sensational and valuable investigations in congressional annals will have been in dismal vain.

The Nation will have been visited with a tragic show of political cynicism.

The Saar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in our concern about the continuing world crisis, we often overlook many encouraging developments which indicate clearly that the world is moving toward a better understanding of the ways of achieving peace.

One of the recent examples of this is the transfer of the Saar from its autonomous status to its place as a part of the Federal Republic of Germany, in line with the vote of the people of this area in 1955.

The Saar land has for centuries been the scene of bloody battles between Germans and Frenchmen for the control of this area along the border of the two countries. In 1944 and 1945, as a member of the American 3d Army, I participated in the great destruction which was rendered over the Saar in the fighting at that time.

Today most of the wartime destruction has been repaired, and the wartime bitterness has been vastly reduced. I think history will record that one of the most farsighted achievements of the Fourth Republic was the willingness of French political leaders to work out the agreement with Chancellor Adenauer which has now reached its culmination.

As a member of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, I am proud of this demonstration of the mutual understanding and friendship that has developed between France and Germany.

Under unanimous consent, I include two editorial comments on the recent completion of the economic incorporation of the Saar into Germany, from British and American newspapers, the Manchester Guardian and the New York Times as reprinted as the guest editorial in the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

QUIET REUNION

Sunday night's quiet change-over in the Saar is a striking example of the mutability of political passions. At midnight, the Saar's customs border moved back to the frontier with France. Politically, it has already been part of the German Federal Republic since January 1957. More time was allowed for the economic incorporation which has now been completed well ahead of schedule. On Monday the Saarlanders began to exchange their francs for marks. Some will find their wages going up; others are worried because their social benefits, particularly family allowances, will go down after an interim period. But there has hardly been any sign of nationalist feelings, and we may therefore be tempted to ignore the remarkable change in these matters between 1935 and 1959. In 1935, the Saar offered the first example of Hitler's influence and terror spreading beyond the frontiers of his power. Reunion then was a mere foretaste of aggression to come. Today it is looked upon by Frenchmen and Germans as a token of a new relationship between their two countries and as a symbol of common allegiance to Europe. If it is true that common memory and a common ideal—rather than a common blood—make a nation, Dr. Erhard's prediction that economic and national borders will not much longer divide peoples in Western Europe may not be overoptimistic. It is also true, of course, that European integration is not an ideal shared with equal conviction by all the citizens of the two countries, nor have those who share it always the same ultimate purpose. Some Germans may hope to control a united Europe; some Frenchmen may simply hope to control the Germans. But who, in 1945, would have dared to hope that the common experience of Hitler's war would carry the two nations so far and so quickly towards mutual understanding and friendship?

THE SAAR A SYMBOL

An event of deep symbolic significance for the new Europe has just taken place in the Saar. There, on the stroke of midnight Sunday, France wrote finis to its last territorial dispute with Germany by turning over, 6 months ahead of the allotted time, complete economic as well as political control of this rich borderland. By doing so it strengthened still further the new French-German entente that is the rock on which a united Europe is being built, giving new hope to those Europeans who, in spite of a current resurgence of separate nationalisms, continue to cling to the vision of a future United States of Europe.

Like Alsace-Lorraine, the Saar has long been a bone of contention between France and Germany. By the will of its people, as well as by the fact of two German defeats, Alsace-Lorraine has returned to France. But the people of the Saar, voting in two plebiscites in 1935 and 1955, continued to cling to Germany and France accepted their verdict. It turned over political control of the territory to Germany on January 1, 1957, and has now liquidated the customs union that still bound the territory to France for a transition period of 3 years.

The return of the Saar makes West Germany the strongest industrial power in Western Europe, so prosperous that today it has more job vacancies than unemployed. Furthermore, this return of the Saar, following a voluntary exchange of border strips between Germany and Belgium, completes German reunification in the West and does so by the democratic process. What is more, it strengthens European unity and the whole North Atlantic Alliance that must depend on it. For both these reasons congratulations are due to President de Gaulle and Chancellor Adenauer for solving a difficult problem in a manner that should serve as a model for solving other intra-Western disputes.

Unlocking a New Water Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD the following remarks on the saline water conversion program by Dr. A. L. Miller, a former chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and now Director of the Office of Saline Water. Dr. Miller's address was delivered to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at its meeting in Washington last May 15.

UNLOCKING A NEW WATER SUPPLY

I am delighted that you saw fit to invite me to address your organization on the saline water conversion program. This program is so frequently misunderstood, I believe I can safely assume there are men in your group who may ask the question: Why should we conduct expensive research trying to develop conversion processes for additional potable water when all we have to do is properly utilize our present supplies.

First of all, I would like to point out that this is not an expensive program. Since it was initiated in 1952, total appropriations amount to just $4 million. Congress has authorized but not appropriated $10 million for five demonstration plants. The office hopes that by the fall of 1960 it will have at least two and possibly three demonstration plants ready for operation, or at least in the advanced stages of construction.

I will agree with the skeptics that there is no shortage of water. Over three-fifths of the globe is covered with water—far more than we will ever need—but most of that water is now unusable because of high dissolved salt content. I would like to point out that there are many areas—not only in the arid deserts of the world—but here in the United States as well—where drinking water, not to mention agricultural and industrial water, is in short supply, available only at an excessive price.

The law of supply and demand governs the cost of water, but it is impossible to put a value upon it—simply because it is a basic necessity of life. Without water a city or a nation would perish, mankind faces the same fate.

The President's Commission on Water Resources and the Geological Survey have projected the use of fresh water in the United States. This survey indicated that the demand for agricultural, industrial and domestic water will increase to 597 billion gallons per day in 1980, more than double our present rate of demand. Most of this increase is in the industrial category. In 1930, for all uses, we were using approximately 530 gallons per day per person. Today we are using a per capita supply for all purposes of about 1,600 gallons a day.

The population of the United States is presently about 176 million. In other 10 years it will surpass the 200-million mark. These new mouths will all need water and food to survive. They will also make great demands upon industry for new products to improve the standards of living.

There are a great many places along the shoreline that rely upon deep wells for fresh water, who today are finding that their supply of water is being made unfit for use because overpumping has permitted salt water to dilute their aquifers. The arid areas of the world can be made to grow and prosper if they are fortunate enough to obtain a supply of fresh water. This fresh water may be from yet undeveloped natural sources—if they exist, or it may be taken from the sea or surrounding brackish waters by conversion.

For the moment, accelerated development and wise use of our present natural supplies is the best answer for many areas, but there is a limit to that development. The hydrologic cycle does not change. Areas in the West still receive only 10 or 12 inches of rain a year even though their population has increased 55 percent since 1940.

Long ago, southern California had to reach hundreds of miles across deserts and mountains to the Colorado River to slake its growing thirst. Once crticized as a wasteful overdevelopment, it is now clear that within 10 years it will be inadequate to meet the growing demands of industrial and domestic users.

Through an ambitious project—still to be authorized and estimated to cost $1½ billion—the people of southern California hope to develop and transport water from the Feather River in northern California. Without discussing the pro's and con's of this venture, I think you will all agree, water from this project will be far more expensive than water now obtained from Hoover Dam. This is the point I want to make: new supplies of natural fresh water will be ever more expensive while at the same time, the cost of converting sea water to fresh will be coming down. In some areas these cost curves will cross and concerted sea water will be the least expensive of the two.

There are already some areas where this has happened.

A conversion plant on the arid island of Aruba is turning out fresh water from the sea at the rate of 3,500,000 gallons per day at a cost of $1.75 per thousand gallons.

Compare this to the situation on St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands. To meet their water requirements in 1957, they had to haul 33 million gallons of water by barge from Puerto Rico at an average cost of $6 per thousand gallons. Israel, as another example, has developed all of her natural water supplies. If this bustling litle nation is to grow and prosper they must have more water and the one remaining source is the sea.

Brewing a drink of water from the sea is easy—but still expensive. The saline water conversion program is designed to develop inexpensive conversion processes to produce potable water from the sea and brackish waters that cover the globe.

Much progress has been made in reducing cost. When the program was initiated in 1952, the actual cost for reducing sea water to potable water ranged from $4 to $5 per 1,000 gallons. We expect our demonstration plants to do the job for about $1 per 1,000 gallons. Converting brackish water, depending on the amount of dissolved salts, will cost from 30 to 60 cents per 1,000 gallons. This is well within the range and competitive with many present domestic sources of drinking water.

In the United States there are 24 of the States that touch upon the ocean. Only three of these, Delaware, Alabama, and Oregon are not represented by cities bidding for one of the three sea water conversion demonstration plants Congress has authorized the Department of the Interior to build. Our recent survey of these sites revealed that most bids were motivated by an urgent, indeed, in a few instances almost desperate, need for additional water supplies. For the same reason over 60 cities have asked to be considered for one of the two brackish water conversion plants that are authorized.

Through the ages, natural supplies of water, fluctuating in an erratic manner, have governed the rise and fall of civilizations. Some of the most creative and cooperative ventures in the annals of human advancement were applied to the development of water resources. As a part of his quest for water, man has been trying for a long time to change salt water into fresh. Probably a lot longer than most people realize.

Aristotle wrote about it. Caesar was able to obtain fresh water from the sea at Alexandria. Francis Bacon discussed the problem in some detail in 1561. Queen Elizabeth I had a standing offer of $28,000 (tax free) for anyone who could make the ocean water potable at a low cost. Thomas Jefferson conducted some successful experiments in 1791.

Since the Office of Saline Water was established it has received more than 600 suggestions for treating sea and brackish waters. The office has actually worked on 60 research and development contracts. At the present time more than 20 research activities are being carried on at universities and research groups. These contracts range from $1,000 to $245,000.

The Congress recognized the need for an economical method of producing potable water from salt and brackish waters, and in 1952, passed the first legislation on this subject. At the present time the Congress has asked that the program be accelerated and the Office of Saline Water is moving in that direction. Two of the processes to be utilized in the demonstration plants have been selected and a third is under consideration by a Process Selection Board representing science, industry, and government. A Site Selection Board composed of qualified engineers from outside government will meet the 16th, 18th, and 19th of May and it is my hope they will be able to select, at an early date, one or two sites from the more than 140 applications that have been received to date.

Congress has authorized five different demonstration plants. The law specifies that we must locate a plant on the east, west, and gulf coasts for sea water tests. Two of these plants will produce at least a million gallons of fresh water a day. Two plants are authorized for the conversion of brackish inland water. One will be located in the arid areas of the Southwest, the other in the Northern Great Plains. One of these will be designed with a capacity of at least 250,000 gallons per day.

I am convinced that there is no limit to what science can accomplish when free men and women are able to apply their scientific and technical knowledge to the problems involved. Research and education are shortening the time and increasing the span of progress. However, as research in chemistry and science marches on, the glassiness of the laboratory must sooner or later get into the factory for a try in the mass production field. The Office of Saline Water looks for scientific men and women who will convert research to reality. We are not interested in those who say ideas won't work. We have a group of dedicated men and women in the Department. In addition, the office has a group of some 75 consultants, experts in their fields, who assist in making the program work.

I am satisfied the cost of converting sea and brackish waters will be reduced. The final plant or plants may be a combination of several present methods now under consideration.

As a physician, I can recall that the cost of vitamins have been reduced from dollars to cents as production increased. Antibiotic drugs have been reduced in price by research. This will happen in the Office of Saline Water. As more plants go up, the cost of removing the salt will come down.

I have great faith in the future of America and what will be accomplished in our efforts to make saline and brackish waters fit for human use. I am convinced that a breakthrough can well occur that will help to solve our problems. The gap between the present fresh water resources and the cost of converting water from the sea is being narrowed. The program, while it may not seem important today, will be most important for the generations yet unborn.

I am hopeful that these remarks of mine will make the officers and membership of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, as well as the general public, have a keener appreciation of the future water needs of mankind. No community can grow or prosper without water. Your group is dedicated to building up the resources of our Nation. Your work in many areas is the protection of damage done by uncontrolled forces of water. This parade of progress must march on. You can well join hands with others who are interested in a reliable supply of potable water. In many areas this will mean desalting of the sea and brackish waters.

In the search for a key to unlock a new source of water, I am reminded of the words carved in stone and placed over the Speaker's chair in the House of Representatives. They are the words of Daniel Webster: "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its power and build its institutions, promote all its great interest and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered." We are trying to do that, gentlemen, in the Office of Saline Water.

Report of Committee on Industrial Water Use, Pollution Abatement, Wildlife, and Recreation to the 46th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the report which was made to the 46th annual national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress by the permanent committee on industrial water use, pollution abatement, wildlife, and recreation.

I have been honored by being appointed as national vice president of the congress, and I enjoyed serving again as chairman of this committee, which it is agreed by all has rendered a distinct service to the people of the United States.

The committee met on May 13, 1959, and continued in session throughout the day, reaching complete agreement on its proposed report. On May 15, at the final session of the congress, the committee's report was presented by the vice chairman, Judge J. E. Sturrock, of Texas, and was unanimously agreed to by the convention.

I was again impressed by the keen interest shown by the committee members representing the many diverse geographic areas of our country, and it was obvious that there is a growing awareness throughout the country of the increasing importance of this complex problem of sound water-use and pollution-abatement policies and programs.

The report of our committee is as follows:

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, 46TH NATIONAL CONVENTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 13–15, 1959

(Report of committee on industrial water use, pollution abatement, wildlife and recreation)

The committee reviewed its report adopted at the annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held May 14, 1958, and reaffirmed the broad and constructive principles for development of adequate water supplies set forth therein, emphasizing particularly the need for constructive policies relating to conservation, municipal and domestic use, pollution abatement, flood control, irrigation, recreation, industrial use and other beneficial purposes.

The chairman presented a record of accomplishments under the provisions of Public Law 660, providing for Federal assistance to communities for the construction of waste treatment facilities. He submitted charts showing comparative expenditures for such facilities during the 5 years 1952–56 prior to the enactment of Public Law 660. Contract awards for sewage treatment works construction averaged $220 million annually during that period. In the first full year of the Federal grants program, 1957, construction expanded 58 percent over the previous annual average to reach $351 million. The second year of the program, 1958, brought an even greater increase in construction, with contract awards reaching $389 million—75 percent over the earlier 5-year average. After only 2 years of operation the program has proved a great success, resulting in construction which has cleaned up 14,000 miles of the Nation's streams for a multitude of water uses. The great bulk of this increase in construction during 1957 and 1958 came from projects receiving Federal aid. These facts point strongly to the conclusion that if it had not been for these grants, sewage treatment works construction would have remained at about the average level experienced during the 5-year period preceding the current program.

It is the sense of the committee that even the limited program permitted by Public Law 660 has been an outstanding success.

The chairman called attention to the fact, however, that expert estimates concurred in the conclusion that the essential rate of construction of such facilities over the next 8 years was of the order of $575 million annually which will be necessary to eliminate the huge backlog of construction needs and provide for plant obsolescence, replacement and population growth demands. These surveys also indicate that a doubling of present Federal funds is necessary in order to increase construction to the required level of $575 million annually.

In the light of these facts the committee deplored the attitude expressed by the Bureau of the Budget and the President that Federal participation in this program should be discontinued. It was the sense of the committee that legislation should be promptly enacted to strengthen the provisions of existing law for dealing with this urgent problem, including increased Federal financial assistance to communities and improved enforcement procedures. In this connection, the chairman called attention to the principle provisions of H.R. 3610 recently reported favorably by the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives. These include:

(1) Grants for projects in the amount of 30 percent of the estimated reasonable cost thereof or $500,000, whichever is the smaller, with the provision that no grant of more than $250,000 shall be approved for a project in any State until all previously filed applications from that State and political subdivisions thereof for grants not exceeding $250,000 have first been approved;

(2) Municipalities to join together to build joint treatment facilities with the amount of grant allocable to each community as if it were a separate project;

(3) Reallocation of grant funds from States not using funds because of lack of projects to States having projects approved for which grants have not been made because of lack of funds;

(4) One hundred million dollars to be appropriated for purposes of construction grants for any fiscal year; and

(5) An aggregate of $1 billion to be appropriated for such purposes.

Thereupon, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, 1. That this committee recommends the adoption of H.R. 3610 and respectfully urges that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress address a communication to each member of the Congress of the United States strongly endorsing the provisions of H.R. 3610 and recommending its immediate enactment into law. A suggested form of letter for this purpose is attached as exhibit A to this report.

"2. That this committee recommends the appropriation of $45 million for fiscal year 1960 to implement the provisions of Public Law 660.

"3. That this committee recommends an appeal to the Congress from the decision of the Bureau of the Budget and the President for reconsideration of the decision heretofore announced to include no funds in future budget estimates for Federal assistance in the construction of pollution abatement works in accordance with the principles of Public Law 660.

"4. That this committee requests each member of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to enlist support from Members of the Congress of the United States for the actions proposed in the preceding resolutions."

The attention of the committee was directed to the long continuing problem of pollution of the Potomac River in the District of Columbia region. It was the sense of the committee that sanitation standards in the area of the Nation's Capitol should set a standard for the world and that the polluted condition of the Potomac River in the District of Columbia metropolitan area demanded immediate and constructive action by the Federal Government. The committee was gratified to learn that a satisfactory plan for dealing with this problem had been evolved as a result of an enforcement conference held under Public Law 660. The committee expressed satisfaction that as a first step improvements in the Blue Plains sewage treatment plant have been completed, but it was strongly of the opinion that the additional elements of the plan involving the construction of a system of interceptor sewers should be undertaken promptly.

Thereupon, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That the committee recommends to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress the adoption of a resolution in the form attached to this report as exhibit B."

Reports from Representatives of all sections of the Nation contained dramatic evidence of growing water problems. It is clear that the population of the United States will continue to grow rapidly, that the needs of industry, agriculture, and the general public for adequate supplies of water will continue to mount; that with improved means of transportation and greater leisure time, demands for recreational facilities for hunting, fishing, boating, and related forms of enjoyment will grow apace, and that the growth of industry and population will aggravate and intensify the already serious pollution abatement problem confronting the Nation. Accordingly, the committee reaffirms its conviction that all uses of water are interrelated and are of concern to the public generally, and that conservation, control and equitable disposition of our water resources are matters of profound interest to the development of the national economy and the welfare of all the people. It is evident that the water problem will become as vital to the national interest in 10 years as the missile program is today. Clearly, also the increasing pressures of various public demands for water use urgently require the long-range planning and effective coordination to assure maximum realization of the public values inherent in our precious water resources.

In view of the growing importance of water resource development, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*. 1. That recreation should be included as definitely as any other factor in the evaluation and programing of land and water development projects.

"2. That the committee records its continued adherence to the principle that provision be made for storage and reservoir projects to increase needed low flows downstream, without reimbursement, to the extent warranted at present or during the economic life of the project where the benefits of such low flows are widespread, general and nonexclusive.

"3. That the committee recommends improved coordination among the agencies at all levels of Government for the more effective development and use of water resources; and

"4. That the committee recommends a more adequate program to ascertain, assemble, and disseminate in useful form basic data relative to surface and ground water resources.

EXHIBIT A

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress, assembled for its 46th annual convention in the City of Washington, D.C., on May 15, 1959, has considered the growing urgency of the problem of water pollution abatement.

It appears that with the rising population, rapidly increasing per capita water use and developing industrial and recreational needs for water, current levels of expenditures for pollution abatement facilities are grossly inadequate. Reliable estimates clearly demonstrate the imperative necessity for a level of expenditures for these purposes of approximately $575 million annually.

Evidence submitted to the convention compels the conclusion that only through increased Federal assistance to local communities can this national problem be solved. Accordingly, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress respectfully urges the immediate enactment into law of H.R. 3610, which it believes to be an essential step in the constructive solution of this growing national problem.

EXHIBIT B

Whereas, at the conclusion of a conference held under the enforcement provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act providing for enforcement measures to abate pollution of interstate waters, the conferees unanimously agreed that the District of Columbia will provide secondary treatment (including chlorination of the effluent when necessary at its Blue Plains plant) and reduce pollution of storm water overflows by constructing a system of interceptor sewers, and that the construction of such interceptor sewers be completed at the end of calendar year 1966 and appropriate financial arrangements be made to accomplish this end;

Whereas the installation, maintenance, and operation of such remedial facilities are

necessary to control pollution of the interstate waters of the Potomac River flowing past the Nation's Capital;

Whereas the present polluted condition of the Potomac River as it flows through the District of Columbia makes the river unfit for recreational uses and constitutes a health hazard, symbolizing the seriousness of similar pollution problems throughout the Nation;

Whereas the District of Columbia is the Capital of the Nation, requiring that sanitation standards in the area should set an example for the world;

Whereas the District of Columbia needs financial assistance in order to reduce storm water overflows by 1966 and because of the national character of the city the Federal Government has an added responsibility to help finance the higher standards required of the District of Columbia: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Rivers and Harbors Congress urgently recommends that the Congress of the United States, the District of Columbia and the Maryland and Virginia communities concerned take immediate appropriate action to secure abatement of pollution of the Potomac River in the Washington Metropolitan Area; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Rivers and Harbors Congress recommends that the Congress of the United States enact appropriate legislation authorizing Federal financial assistance to the District of Columbia for the construction of a system of interceptor sewers to abate further pollution of the Potomac River due to storm water overflows.

PERMANENT COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL WATER USE, POLLUTION ABATEMENT, WILDLIFE, AND RECREATION OF NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

Chairman, Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, Chisholm, Minn.; secretary, William J. Hull, Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Washington, D.C.

Members

New England division: Walter G. White, chairman, Water Resources Board, State of New Hampshire, Concord, N.H.

North Atlantic division: George R. Shanklin, chief engineer, Division of Water Policy and Supply, State of New Jersey, Trenton, N.J.

South Atlantic division: Miles J. Smith, vice chairman, North Carolina Board of Conservation and Development, Salisbury, N.C.; Harry H. Saunders, vice president, St. Joe Paper Co., Port St. Joe, Fla.

Southwestern division: Judge J. E. Sturrock, general manager, Texas Water Conservation Association, Austin, Tex., vice chairman.

Lower Mississippi Valley division: Leonard N. White, engineer, Arkansas Geological and Conservation Commission, Little Rock, Ark.; Calvin T. Watts, assistant director, Department of Public Works, State of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.

North Central division: Marvin Fast, executive director, Great Lakes Commission, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Missouri River division: Milo W. Hoisveen, chief engineer, North Dakota Water Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak.

Ohio River division: Laban P. Jackson, commissioner of conservation, State of Kentucky, Frankfort, Ky.

North Pacific division: Marshall N. Dana, chairman, Commission of Public Docks, Portland, Oreg.

South Pacific division: Walter G. Schulz, division chief engineer, Division of Design and Construction, Department of Water Resources, State of California, Sacramento, Calif.

Velma Johnston Feted by Defenders of Wildlife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a short talk made by Mrs. Velma Johnston of the Double Lazy Heart Ranch, Wadsworth, Nev., at a dinner held in her honor by the Defenders of Wildlife, which was attended by a number of representatives of several humane organizations and the entire Nevada congressional delegation.

Mrs. Johnston came to Washington to testify before the House Judiciary Committee on Wednesday, July 15, 1959, in behalf of my bill H.R. 2725, to prohibit the hunting of wild horses and burros by airplanes, trucks and other mechanized equipment. She has become nationally famous as "Wild Horse Annie," because of her love, devotion and untiring efforts to protect these animals. Her remarks follow:

Because we are here together this evening, it is obvious that we all have been exposed to, and are afflicted with, the same malady—a severe case of mustang fever. It is raging at high temperatures throughout the Nation, is highly communicable, not only by exposure to a person already having it, but also through the written word. Once having contracted it, there is no known cure.

Rather than talk at this time of the shameful abuses to which the wild ones have been subjected during the past decades, for much has been written about them, and more of the grim business will be discussed tomorrow, I would like to indulge in a luxury against which I have rigidly schooled myself since early in this fight, and that is the luxury of sentimentality. Because it is expected of a woman, I have deliberately avoided it—so that I could meet any opposition to our legislation with an objectivity and logic that has commanded respect, if not agreement.

My thanks, first, to you representatives and to the organizations which you represent, and to the lawmakers, for the know-how and the strength you have shown. Also to the many organizations throughout the country that have contributed much.

The spotlight is on us now, who are here in Washington to plead the case for the mustang, but I would like for you to meet a few of the off-stage players who have given much to help bring this about. Humaneness has no political or religious affiliations, therefore, the cast of characters is a diverse one.

The gentle nuns of the Servants of Mary, in Ladysmith, Wis., through whose efforts the dean of Wisconsin's delegation in the House, the Honorable ALVIN O'KONSKI, introduced a bill comparable to Congressman BARING'S H.R. 2725. The conservation class in their high school has made this its project. Tomorrow at the convent, prayers for our success will be doubled and redoubled.

A cowpoke in his nineties who could well remember the wild ones he'd broke and rode.

An ancient Sioux Indian Chief whose only regret is that he can't come upon those two-legged skunks of wild horse chasers with a band of Sioux warriors armed with .30–.30 rifles.

Virginia Gillas in Miami Beach, Fla., who, though thousands of miles away, has worked shoulder to shoulder with me.

Bonnie Gray, for several years world's champion cowgirl.

The blind man in New Jersey who read the story in the Braille edition of Reader's Digest. All that penetrates his dark world is the diminishing beat of the wild horse hooves, that once pounded the plains in a mighty crescendo.

The Girls Friday throughout the country, whose nimble fingers typed the story they sent to their friends.

And their bosses, who have, knowingly or unknowingly, donated paper, envelopes, and postage.

My own beloved executive, from whom I have often borrowed an hour or two between nine and five to meet a crisis, for crisis do not always occur on one's own time—and who has cheerfully picked up long distance telephone charges and other expenses along the way—whose post office box is more often than not fuller of Wild Horse Annie's mail than his own.

My husband, upon whose strength I have leaned, and who has cooked countless meals and swept the floors to give me time to do all that has had to be done.

My mother, who learned to type so she could set up a card filing system and help me in a dozen ways.

The children throughout the country—and their teachers—who have undertaken this as a class project. A letter that tugged at my heartstrings came from a man whose seventh grade class had voted to send me the balance in their treasury when the term ended in June. A check for $5 was enclosed, and the letter ended with the words, "With our admiration and our love."

Tex Gladding and Jack Murray, whose personal courage has often nipped in the bud, the plans of a would-be roundup artist.

Those nameless ones in the field, ever alert, whose observations have enabled the stopping of roundups before they start—oftentimes in a manner resembling a first-class cloak and dagger operation.

A missionary in Africa's Belgian Congo, who sent words of encouragement, for he recalled many a happy hour as a boy in Colorado, spent on the back of his fleet cowpony.

A sergeant in the Black Watch Regiment of the Scottish Highlanders—stationed in distant Cyprus during the time when international chaos could have exploded like a 4th of July firecracker. He wrote, "More power to your elbow."

Louise the journalist, and Fritts the photographer, who spent 3 days at the Double Lazy Heart Ranch, and who had come from far-off Amsterdam to get the story for the Universal News Organization's European outlets.

The horsebreeder and author in Portugal, through whose kindness I have one of the finest collections of horse books in the country—all in Portuguese.

My doctor, bless him, who has somehow managed to patch me up, and with a skillful blending of the right proportions of go pills and slow pills, has kept me on an even keel.

Only the Infinite Timekeeper for all mankind knows the number of hours that have been spent to bring us to this moment.

The wild ones have done nothing to deserve the treatment that has been handed them. The late John Trotwood Moore, southern editor and author, expresses so much of how I feel in these words:

"Out from the past, the dim bloody, shifting past, came this noble animal, the horse, side by side with man, fighting with him the battles of progress, bearing with him the burdens of the centuries. Down the long, hard road, through flint or mire, through swamp or sand, wherever there has been a footprint, there also will be seen a hoofprint. They have been one and inseparable, the aim and the object, the means and the end. And if the time shall ever come, as some boastingly declare, when the one shall breed away from the other, the puny relic of a once perfect manhood will not live long enough to trace the record of it on the tablet of time."

My Greatest Experience in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to some remarks which were delivered at a junior achievement banquet in St. Paul on May 6, 1959, by an exchange student from New Zealand, Anne Walton-Wooller.

This is such a sound testimony for the free-enterprise system which we seek to preserve, that I want to call it to the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that these remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

MY GREATEST EXPERIENCE IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Anne Walton-Wooller)

"An American field service scholarship provides a year of study and experience in the United States." These were the exciting words which appeared on the award-of-scholarship form which I received at home in New Zealand just over a year ago. In April 1958, study meant what it means to me today—schools, books, homework; but, I was rather vague as to what experience in this contest would include. "Experience," says Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, "is the effect upon judgment or feelings produced by personal or direct impressions." According to this definition, I feel that belonging to Junior Achievement has been the greatest single experience I have had during my stay here in your wonderful city.

Junior Achievement has for those young people who join it many things to offer. It depends on the enthusiasm with which the individual enters the program—for as Christ said in the Bible, "As ye sow, so shall ye reap." Thus, each person gets from Junior Achievement what he puts into it. I would like to tell you what I, as a foreign exchange student have gained from being a member of this great organization.

From talking to other achievers and doing some research myself, I have discovered that it is usual to get about 10 different things from Junior Achievement; amongst these, knowledge of business, business contact, self-confidence, new friends, and plenty of fun. But, the one thing I would especially like to tell you about is not included in this list. It is understanding—understanding of your Nation's economic philosopy and how it compares with that of my own country. In New Zealand, the American system is still known as capitalism rather than free enterprise, and as a result there clings to it yet vestiges of the bad name Karl Marx gave it years ago when he predicted that under capitalism, the rich would get richer and the poor would get poorer. The United States is seen from afar off as the land of big business where the little man has little chance to succeed. We cannot be entirely blamed for this conception since we do not get much detailed information as to how the American system works.

Over the last 50 years, while the free enterprise system has expanded tremendously in this country, there has been much social legislation in New Zealand. As a result, we can today be called a welfare state; but, being a welfare state does not prevent our having capitalistic, free enterprise industries. Rather, it creates attitudes which are unhealthy if capitalism is to continue for any length of time within the socialized state. Perhaps I would give you an example of what socialism does to a nation's thinking. Soon after I arrived in St. Paul, I was surprised and delighted to find that my 13-year-old American sister, Lucy, was busy making potholders and dishcloths and selling them in the neighborhood at quite a reasonable profit. She was earning money, learning its value and at the same time exercising initiative. Could this be done in New Zealand? Yes it could. The only snag is, people would think you were penniless. It is one of the things that just isn't done. It is another case of conditioning. The Government does a certain amount for the people and they get the attitude "why should I bother to take the initiative? Let the Government do it."

What can be done to remedy this situation? When a man's initiative and natural desire to make something worthwhile of his life are destroyed, his ambition and imagination are deadened. I am convinced that if Junior Achievement could be established in New Zealand, it would have the effect of creating the right attitude towards free enterprise in the minds of the young people and with this accomplished, a less socialistic economy could be achieved. From my experience, I have found that through the JA program we teenagers (1) become more aware of the free enterprise system as something live and fascinating, (2) our interest in its operation is stimulated by membership in active companies, (3) there is fostered a more personal concern for the continued existence of this unique version of capitalism which provides Americans with the highest standard of living in the world.

On behalf of all the Achievers in the St. Paul program, and especially the other American field service students, I wish to thank sincerely you, the businessmen of the city for your support of junior achievement and the great opportunity you have given us to learn by doing.

Describing Nebraska to New Yorkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Nebraska is a wonderful place to live and to raise a family. As part of its series on States of this country, the Sunday News, New York City, recently carried an article about the Cornhusker State, and under leave to extend my remarks, I insert it in the RECORD at this point.

DESCRIBING NEBRASKA TO NEW YORKERS

(This is one of a series of editorials in the Sunday News, New York City, the newspaper of largest circulation in the country, 3,500,000. The magazine of the Midlands has been reprinting these editorials on nearby States.)

The first white man to enter what is now the Cornhusker State was probably the Spanish explorer Francisco Vasquez de Coronado, in 1541.

He and his 30 comrades were looking for the allegedly gold-studded kingdom of Quivira, which turned out to be nothing but a collection of poverty-stricken Indian villages near present-day Nebraska's southern border.

Though fought over by Indians, Spaniards, French, and British, the area wasn't really explored until early in the 19th century. Among those who acquainted Americans back east with its possibilities were Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, Zebulon Pike, Maj. Stephen Long, and Lt. (later Gen. and first Republican Presidential candidate) John C. Fremont.

Major Long, in the 1820's, reported that Nebraska was a "great desert, entirely unfit for agriculture." This was one of U.S. history's more notable bad guesses.

Mid-19th century Nebraska, was the site of the Oregon, Mormon and California trails, over which traveled the great covered-wagon migrations of pioneers bound for the Far West and the Pacific coast.

It was made a Territory May 30, 1854, and a State March 1, 1867.

Politically, the State is unique in one respect. Since 1937, it has had the Union's only legislature consisting of but one house, instead of the customary two.

COULDN'T BE FARMED, EH?

In population, Nebraska ranks 34th among the States—mid-1958 estimate, 1,457,000. In area—77,227 square miles—it is our 15th largest State.

Having the biggest underground water supply in the Nation, Nebraska is able to irrigate some 2 million acres. Total acreage under cultivation comes to about 22 million acres.

On this vast expense of land, Nebraska farmers in 1957 (latest figures we have) raised 222 million bushels of corn, almost 78 million bushels of winter wheat, nearly 8 million tons of hay, and a lot of oats, clover and sugar beets.

Livestock population on January 1, 1958, totaled 4,675,000 head of cattle and 2,044,000 pigs.

Mineralwise, Nebraska is a considerable producer of petroleum, cement, volcanic ash and such semi-precious stones as chalcedony, agate and jasper.

Its two most famous citizens to date were William Jennings Bryan (1860–1925), "Boy Orator of the Platte River," and three-time Democratic candidate for President; and Senator George W. Norris (1861–1944), long-time radical Republican battler for presidential primaries and direct election of Senators, and against war, the draft, and the Versailles Treaty which wound up World War I.

OMAHA—LINCOLN—THE WEST

Omaha (population around 300,000) is Nebraska's largest city, and the second largest is Lincoln, the capital.

Omaha is noted chiefly for its tremendous livestock market and meatpacking industries, as a big distribution center for wheat and corn, and for its popular Ak-Sar-Ben carnival and festival in October of each year. Omaha's Joslyn Memorial Art Museum attracts thousands of visitors annually.

In addition to being the home of the University of Nebraska, Lincoln has one of the Nation's handsomest State capitol buildings.

Boys' Town, famous haven for abandoned or neglected youngsters, is about 14 miles

west of Omaha. Founded with a borrowed $90 by the late Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Flanagan, Boys' Town now has more than 50 buildings on 1,500 acres.

Hunting, fishing, and vacationing are all good in Nebraska, which has numerous State parks—notably Fort Robinson, Chadron, Victoria Springs, Niobrara, Ponca, Arbor Lodge, Stolley, and Fort Kearney.

The hill and badland country in and around Crawford is virtually alive with memories of such old western characters as Buffalo Bill Cody, Luther and Frank North, Big Bat and Little Bat Batistte, and such Indian warriors as Crazy Horse, Dull Knife, American Horse, and Red Cloud.

The Pioneer Village at Minden (132 miles west of Lincoln) is a giant museum containing more than 20,000 items depicting man's progress since 1830—and sorry, but we must sign off.

Ellis Leads Co-ops Astray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is not a habit of mine to permit unjustified attacks on me to go unchallenged.

In this regard I feel duty bound to make reference to statement in Rural Electrification, the official monthly publication of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Clyde Ellis, manager.

For years Mr. Ellis has attempted to smear me in the minds of REA members.

In Mr. Ellis' magazine I am referred to as a longtime foe of Federal projects. My record over the years in support of all worthwhile Federal projects and REA is ample refutation of this unwarranted attack. The facts are, as the record will prove, I have supported every dime appropriated by the Congress for REA during the 21 years I have had the honor to serve the people of the Seventh Iowa District.

Mr. Ellis' magazine recently publicized a few remarks made about me by Governor Loveless, of Iowa, in which the Governor referred to my speech of May 4 last—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6625—on the need to preserve our American way of life and to halt the "trend toward the Khrushchev goal of socialism and slavery for our grandchildren," as a ranting attack on TVA and said he was positive that I was not speaking for the people of Iowa. In this respect I believe I know the hearts and minds of the people of Iowa and I am sure that the majority of them prefer the American free enterprise system rather than a Socialistic welfare state where they would be but vassals of the bosses of such a government. I would be happy to furnish anyone desiring it, a copy of my May 4 speech entitled "Socialism or Freedom for America—I Took the Oath."

Recently Mr. Ellis attempted to sell down the river the rural people he is supposed to represent. In this regard I call attention of my colleagues, and the rural people of the Nation whom Clyde Ellis purports to represent, to the text of the June 29, 1959, issue of The Lowdown on Farm Affairs From Washington by Glenn Martz which is as follows:

ELLIS LEADS CO-OPS ASTRAY

Clyde T. Ellis, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association general manager, has once again stirred up a hornet's nest by attempting to exert influence on legislation not involving REA.

This time, however, he has brought down the wrath of some of REA's strongest supporters in the House of Representatives.

Ellis, once again taking the CIO–PAC line, upon which he has more and more relied for his philosophy rather than the grassroots sentiments of the rural electric co-op managers and directors, this week sent secret letters to certain Congressmen urging them to vote against H.R. 3—the States rights bill.

H.R. 3 has as its objective the curtailment of court decisions which prevent the States from enacting legislation against security risks, Communists, and acts of sedition.

This secret letter came to light in House debate on the measure when Congressman WILLIS was asked if H.R. 3 would injure the REA program.

Mr. WILLIS, in replying, stated:

"Mr. WILLIS. I want to say that Mr. Ellis, in fairness, should have sent a letter to all Members. I doubt that there has been a greater supporter of the REA program in this Congress than myself. It happens that the largest REA group in the world is from my congressional district. I attend all their yearly meetings. I do not think I have ever voted against any program involving REA that I considered fair and just over the years." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House, p. 10726.)

Whereupon, Congressmen CRAMER and CHELF joined in the debate.

Here is an excerpt of their observations:

"Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman further that this bill could not possibly have anything to do with the REA and Mr. Ellis is about as wrong on that as he was on REA reorganization.

"Mr. CHELF. Exactly.

"Mr. CRAMER. And that is because it involves interstate commerce. That is the basis on which REA was established. This bill cannot have and does not have anything to do with interstate commerce, it being a constitutional provision which the bill could not possibly abrogate.

"Mr. CHELF. Amen."

SOUTHERNERS AMAZED

Some southern Members could hardy believe their ears when they heard Ellis' secret letter read on the floor. One of these was Congressman PILCHER, of Georgia, a strong supporter of REA. He immediately left the floor and sought the opinion of Walter Harrison, national president of National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Harrison's telephone reply was then reported by Congressman PILCHER to the full House.

Here is the report as taken from the RECORD:

"Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Chairman, regarding the letter from Mr. Ellis, I have just talked to Mr. Walter Harrison, national president of the Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and he says he is 100 percent in favor of this bill." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House, p. 10726.)

DORN SPEAKS OUT

Sentiment of southern Congressmen to Ellis' role was expressed by Congressman DORN, of South Carolina, when he addressed the House as follows:

"(Mr. DORN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

"Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have not received a single letter from any of the members of the REA cooperatives in my district opposing H.R. 3. Therefore, it came as a shock to me, and all southern Congressmen today during debate when we learned of a letter written by Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, opposing H.R. 3.

"In this letter, Mr. Ellis very skillfully followed the Socialist line by intimating that the 4 million consumers of REA power in America were opposed to this great States rights bill of Judge HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, could be further from the truth. Mr. Ellis is doing REA a great disservice by misrepresenting the thinking of REA members and by projecting himself into legislation and debate on this floor which in no manner affects REA or the REA cooperatives.

"Mr. Ellis, by opposing this States rights bill, is not working in the best interest of REA. By joining the CIO and the NAACP in opposing this great legislation he is only hurting REA. Last year H.R. 3 passed this House by an overwhelming majority. It passed this House again a few months ago by a comfortable majority. It is interesting to note that nearly all House Members from the REA areas voted for States rights. This fact alone would indicate that Mr. Ellis is wrong. Mr. Ellis, in my opinion, does not represent a majority of the REA consumers in opposing H.R. 3.

"Mr. Speaker, I am a consumer of REA power and I voted for H.R. 3 last year and again this year and I will continue to vote for it. Mr. Ellis does not represent me as a farmer and consumer of REA power. I believe H.R. 3 is in the best interest of rural communities, free local government, and States rights. REA has nourished and grown in areas with this States rights philosophy. This legislation was made necessary by the Steve Nelson case. Steve Nelson was a Communist convicted under the State laws of Pennsylvania. The Supreme Court of the United States turned Nelson loose on the public on the grounds that there was a Federal law against sedition and espionage. This bill, H.R. 3, is an effort on our part to change the law so that our States can continue to have laws, as well as the Federal Government, against sedition, Communist intrigue, and overthrow of our representative form of government.

"It is strange to me why anyone would project the great REA cooperatives and the membership into this debate here today. I condemn this attempt to line the REA up with the Supreme Court and the defenders of Steve Nelson.

"Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3 is the most important States rights bill in a generation. Rural people everywhere are for individual liberty and States rights. The Farm Bureau is actively supporting H.R. 3. The Grange has time and time again adopted resolutions against too much Federal control and has always favored States rights. Mr. Speaker, you will not find Communists, seditionists, or Fascists out on our farms tilling the soil. REA consumers are patriotic Americans. They believe in liberty and the Christian principles upon which the United States was founded. They have nothing in common with Steve Nelson. They do not believe in these many wild decisions of the Supreme Court. Our farmers are opposed to gangsters, crooks, and racketeers. Speaking for my fellow REA consumers all over the United States, I honestly believe they are overwhelmingly for States rights, individual liberty, and H.R. 3. I hope H.R. 3 as passed by the House will be acted on in the other body and become the law of the land." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House, p. 10746.)

HIDDEN HAND

In view of developments on Capitol Hill, the interesting question being raised

amongst Democrats in Washington is—why did Ellis, a former Arkansas Congressmen, and long a stalwart of Democratic strength on Capitol Hill, turn against his former colleagues?

The answer is not easily found.

It can be found, however, in the philosophy of the group in Washington with which Ellis has, more and more, in recent years, associated himself and espoused their causes.

This group is composed of a steering committee calling itself the E.C.I.C. (Electric Consumers Information Committee). Actually the group is composed of left-wing adherents of socialization of the power industry in America.

Leading the list are such men as Leland Olds, former Chairman of the Federal Power Commission whose nomination was opposed by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON on the strength of Olds' writings in the Communist newspaper, the Daily Worker; Ben Stong, now active in the labor movement; Jerry Voorhees, former ADA Congressman from California, who was defeated by Richard Nixon; Walter Reuther, vice president, CIO–AFL; Clay Cochran, economist now working for the CIO–PAC.

All of these are in no way connected with farmers and rural electrification—yet they dictate the policies for Ellis.

It is also of interest on Capitol Hill that Ellis' letter urging votes against H.R. 3 lined up squarely with the Communist Worker which also urged defeat of H.R. 3.

The latest issue of the Worker carried a front page banner line in bold type declaring that "H.R. 3 Perils Liberties".

It is the same line taken by various left wing groups which don't want States to have the power of legislating controls over those trying to undermine the traditional principals of government on which the Nation was founded.

It is now clearly apparent that Ellis has led a fine group of rural people into the hands of a group of political and social schemers who are intent on using the good cause of rural electrification and the funds of its members to espouse and further their own left-wing legislative projects and policies.

IN RETROSPECT

Mr. Ellis' clever attempt to generate votes to defeat the States Rights bill without consulting member co-ops or letting them know he was doing it is his usual method of operation.

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association manager has for years been going to Capitol Hill in support or opposition to legislation not even remotely connected with REA.

As in his current letter opposing H.R. 3, he invariably indicates that he is expressing the sentiments of some "4-million REA consumers".

As previously pointed out by the Lowdown, about the only part REA consumers play in National Rural Electric Cooperative Association lobby activities is to furnish the dough to finance it.

Each connected consumer of REA power is taxed all the way from a 12½ cent minimum to 18 cents through a check-off system.

Few farmers know they contribute to Mr. Ellis' cause.

However, the sum total of his dues taken each year, according to his own records, is approximately $400,000.

In addition to this other revenue flows into National Rural Electric Cooperative Association coffers from subscriptions to the organization's official magazine—a publication which also adds to the kitty through the sale of advertising.

Then there are other enterprises which add to the overall total including a complete insurance setup.

All in all, Mr. Ellis takes in a gross of a scant million dollars a year.

And, as pointed out in recent issues of the Lowdown, this money is used to put out a veritable barrage of propaganda against mythical opponents of REA and push for the expansion of public power projects to the exclusion of private enterprise.

Right now, Mr. Ellis is trying to tighten his hold on the co-ops in his groups by promoting a plan to take over the investment of their reserve cash.

It will be recalled that most of the money used to finance construction of Mr. Ellis' million-dollar, ultramodern office building in Washington was borrowed from co-op reserves at an extremely low interest rate and on a 30-year repayment plan.

National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's dues structure for operating co-op members has been increased on two occasions since 1955.

In March of that year, annual dues were set at 10 cents per connected meter (the former maximum) or one-tenth of 1 percent of gross operating revenues, whichever was greater, up to a maximum of 12½ cents per meter.

Effective February 7, 1958, the dues schedule was revised again, this time to raise the ceiling by 50 percent, to 18¾ cents per connected meter per year. The minimum dues was increased from 10 cents to 11 cents per meter.

A full year before the 1958 increase took effect, General Manager Clyde T. Ellis reported, at the organization's 1957 annual meeting, that National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's dues income had multiplied sevenfold since 1943, to a 1956 total of some $400,000.

National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's budget for the year 1958 anticipated a gross income of $957,133.06.

JOHNSON FLAYS ELLIS

Democratic Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON has long been aware of Mr. Ellis' use of the power and prestige of National Rural Electric Cooperative Association membership to promote alien causes.

He has not only been aware of it, but has warned National Rural Electric Cooperative Association membership against being led astray.

In a speech before a regional National Rural Electric Cooperative Association meeting in El Paso, Tex. (October 25, 1949), Mr. JOHNSON summed up Mr. Ellis' pattern of behaving this way:

"For your political life as for your business life I recommend a four-word slogan: 'Stay Out of the Red.'

"As you would not permit REA to become a mat upon which selfish interests wipe their feet, neither must you permit REA to become the lamb's skin in which the wolves of alien radicalism cloak themselves.

"The graveyard of good intentions is filled with the remains of individuals and organizations who nosed into affairs which were not their own.

"Recently in Washington a man who represents your co-ops called me to discuss the nomination of Mr. Leland Olds to the Federal Power Commission. As you may recall, I had some interest in Senate action on that appointment. During my discussion with this man, who telephoned me, I told him that on the basis of Mr. Olds' record I personally could not approve his nomination, and that the Senate would not approve it.

"I tried to point out that a clever but deceitful propaganda campaign was under way to high pressure me and high pressure the Senate into confirming Mr. Olds. The propagandists pretended that Mr. Olds was a martyr being crucified by the big power companies and the big gas companies. That was simply not true; it was the same old smokescreen behind which many men hide when they need to hide their records.

"There was no reason in the world for you or your co-ops to become involved in that fight; but 2 days after my conversation a man purporting to speak for all of you (Mr. Ellis) went on record publicly with an endorsement of the nomination.

"Shortly afterward the Senate turned down the nomination by a vote of 53 to 15.

"Because of one man's endorsement, REA co-ops were associated permanently with a discredited and disreputable propaganda campaign in which REA should not have been involved.

"I tell you sincerely you have a bigger job to do than serve as a tool of the smear artists and the propagandists who want you to fight their battles for them by smearing the Senators who are for you."

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Leland Olds, as pointed out, is now a member of the leftwing Electric Consumers' Information Committee, a committee which plugs for socialized power, and with which Mr. Ellis works closely.)

The next interesting question posed by this recent Ellis fiasco is, How long can he last now that these southern Congressmen have found him out?

Msgr. John M. Puskar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Monday, July 13, 1959, commenting upon the death of Rt. Rev. Msgr. John M. Puskar, J.C.L.

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader, July 13, 1959]

MSGR. JOHN M. PUSKAR

The death of the Right Reverend Monsignor John M. Puskar, J.C.L., in the prime of life is a heavy loss not only to St. Joseph's Church, Nanticoke, and the Roman Catholic Diocese of Scranton, but to the community and Americans of Slovak extraction throughout the area. Like the late Msgr. John J. Federowicz, whom Monsignor Puskar succeeded as director of Catholic Charities in Nanticoke, Monsignor Puskar was an outstanding churchman, beloved by parishioners and respected by all who had the privilege of his acquaintance or friendship.

A native of Plymouth, Monsignor Puskar was at St. Joseph's, third oldest Slovak parish in the diocese, for 30 of the 37 years he was in the priesthood. A brilliant scholar, successful administrator, and dedicated pastor, he was a diocesan consultor as well as a domestic prelate, by designation of the late Pope Pius XII in 1956, in recognition of his fidelity to duty and achievements in the local field. He gave freely of his time and talents to many organizations and worthy causes.

But it was in the role of spiritual leader that this modest man of God achieved his principal distinction. The greater the honors heaped on him and the responsibilities he assumed, the more humble he seemed to become. While his name is associated with St. Joseph's at Nanticoke, St. Joseph's in Wilkes-Barre, which he built as a young priest, is also a monument to his zeal.

Apart from a tour of duty in the diocese of Pittsburgh after his ordination, his entire career has been devoted to Wilkes-Barre and Nanticoke parishes, just across the river from his hometown. He was another who found his acres of diamonds in his own backyard.

What's Wrong With the Highway Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, "What's Wrong With the Highway Program?" by Frank P. Tighe, appearing in June 1959 issue of Motor Age:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM?

(By Frank P. Tighe, Editor)

The Nation's $40-billion highway program is in trouble. Money trouble. Congress thought the urgently-needed new roads could be paid for by moderate new taxes on motorists, truckers, and others who use the highways. That was in 1956, when the program was written into law.

It isn't working out that way. Tax collections are falling far short of the sums needed to build today's expensive superhighways. New sources of roadbuilding dollars must be found—and quickly. Time is of the essence.

Blunt truth of the money-muddle is that the entire highway program is likely to run into a painful slowdown period if some new financing isn't forthcoming from Washington soon.

The Eisenhower administration is very sensitive about this possible breakdown in one of its proudest accomplishments—the bold new network of interstate and local roads spreading out in all 50 states. President Eisenhower and the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads are determined to do all they can to keep the construction going forward on schedule—even if it means deficit financing for a temporary period.

But borrowing to build the new roads is easier said than done. The so-called Byrd amendment (sponsored by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat) says the construction program must be kept on a pay-as-we-go basis. In order to get essential roads built during the past 2 years, the Byrd amendment has been suspended. Should it be suspended again? That's a hot issue in the Congress, and we'll be hearing much more about it in the weeks ahead.

WHAT CHOICES OPEN?

Well, what can be done and what should be done to keep the roadbuilding program in high gear? These are the choices open to us:

1. We can increase tax on gas and oil again, or we can increase taxes on persons and corporations. The White House wants the gas tax increased by 1½ cents per gallon. But most Congressmen agree that motorists and truckers are paying their share already. And it is doubtful if higher rates on income would produce much more revenue. Most are taxed to the limit now. So higher taxes this year are not likely. This leads us to the possibility of—

2. Cash advances from the U.S. Treasury or from the sale of special highway bonds. These moneys would be secured by guarantees of payment from future gas and oil tax collections. This is a possible solution to the problem that is receiving serious attention in the Congress. The other choice is—

3. Stretch out the pay-as-we-go program beyond the 1972 cut-off date. This would mean placing 100 percent of the burden of building roads on those who drive on them. It would postpone some badly needed construction. Not a desirabel plan.

WHERE AUTOMOTIVE TAX MONEY GOES

The tax money the Government collects on gas and oil is supposed to be spent entirely on roads. It isn't. Much of it is shortstoped by the Government and spent for other purposes—projects unrelated to roadbuilding. This is unfair to all who use the highways. It's unfair for two reasons: Motorists and truckers are not getting what they pay for in their gas taxes, and they are being forced to pay more than their shares of general Government expenses.

Here are the leaks:

Taxes collected in 1957, $3.7 billion.
Spent on roads, $2 billion.
Sidetracked from road funds, $1.7 million.
And again:
Taxes collected in 1958, $3.3 billion.
Spent on roads, $2 billion.
Sidetracked from road funds, $1.2 billion.
Total road money lost in these 2 years, $2.9 billion.

Anticipated loss during next 12 years, if this leak is not plugged, $14.5 billion.

Who uses our highways?

	Number registered (1957)	Mileage traveled (1957) (billions of miles)
Cars	55,900,000	528.3
Single unit trucks	10,300,000	88.9
Heavy trucks	634,000	24.3
Buses, motorcycles, etc	300,000	5.5

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Our growing highway needs

	Population (millions)	Vehicle registration (millions)	Miles traveled (billions)
1939	130.8	31.0	271.0
1950	150.9	48.9	451.7
1956	167.2	65.1	622.9
1961	180.6	77.0	753.0
1966	195.3	89.1	898.6
1971	211.6	101.2	1,051.4
1976	229.7	113.6	1,200.2

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Solution to the vexing highway financing headache lies in spreading the burden to all who benefit, rather than increasing the present special taxes on the small segment considered the primary highway users, more and more people believe.

All Americans, not just motorists, truckers, and bus operators, benefit from these new highways. With the present 3 cents a gallon Federal tax on top of State gas taxes averaging 6 cents, motorists today pay some 41 percent in taxes on each gallon of gas they buy. Coupled with taxes on autos, tires, grease, and oil, the driving public today is paying a heavy road toll.

But, Congress and officials generally are beginning to realize that it's not only the driving public who benefits from the new highways.

The farmer who will be able to get his produce to market faster and in better condition; landowners who will find their property values skyrocketing; industries which will be able to get and ship their goods faster and move into new labor areas; retail and service firms which will draw customers from larger areas; offices whose employees will save time and effort, and the public generally will benefit from these new highways.

These realizations, pointed out in a recent U.S. Commerce Department study, are beginning to hit home with Congress. The lawmakers are engaging in a bitter fight over how to pull the program out of trouble. President Eisenhower's proposal that the gas tax be increased by 1.5 cents is apparently dead.

Temporary borrowing through revenue bonds for 2 or 3 years is more likely to be the final outcome, and appears to be the fairest solution. It will further raise the cost somewhat because of the interest charges, but the effect will also be to relieve motorists and other highway users from sharply increased taxes, and to spread the cost to the country as a whole.

Tax collections might solve the road financing problem. No new Federal automotive excise taxes would be needed. Instead, more of the collected money would be steered into roadbuilding.

That's the way some Congressmen would find additional funds for highways. They see the Government collecting 10 percent on the sales of new cars and 8 percent on auto parts and accessories. But the money from these two taxes is not being earmarked for roadbuilding.

Revenues from the passenger cars alone have topped $1.2 billion in a single year. Putting some of this money into new highways seems a good idea to a number of Congressmen.

Tax writers in the House Ways and Means Committee are thinking of guiding about half the passenger car tax into the highway program. They are also considering claiming some of the parts and accessories tax money for roads. These moves could add another $750 million a year to the Federal share of highway funds.

Representative MICHEL, Republican of Illinois, would go all the way in marking automotive and highway-use taxes for roadbuilding. He would put all the Federal taxes—car, truck, bus, motor fuel, tire, tube, parts, accessories—into new road construction. He sponsors a bill, H.R. 4389, to carry out this plan and believes it would add another $1.5 billion a year for roads.

Congress talks of paying the States for highways accepted in the interstate highway net. The national network standards are high, and States that have built roads meeting the standards are anxious to be reimbursed.

Bills now under discussion in Washington would require payment of $4.3 billion to the States between mid-1961 and mid-1976. But the bills won't make much headway this year. Congress is more concerned with how to find funds for new roads than with payments for existing highways.

On the Inflation Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the General Electric Co. has given a substantial boost to the Nation's efforts to strengthen the value of the dollar by announcing a price cut in its turbines, both large and small. Undoubtedly there are a number of reasons that prompted General Electric to take the initiative in this regard. The best commentary that I have seen was made by the New York Times in an editorial appearing in the July 16, 1959, issue of the Times which I include in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ON THE INFLATION FRONT

One of the giants of American industry has just administered some of its prices downward. The General Electric Co. has an-

nounced on successive days reductions in prices of its turbines, both large and small.

In a Nation that had become used to the "ratchet" movement of heavy-industry prices—up, steady, up again, and never down—this is to be heartily welcomed. Furthermore, the General Electric Co.'s announcements, both in what those announcements say and what they do not say, contain some hints of better days to come on the inflation front.

First, the company said the price reductions were made possible by improved manufacturing processes that have cut costs. There would be nothing unusual about this except that it has not been happening enough in the economy as a whole in the postwar period. Improved efficiency has all too often been eaten up in higher wage and other costs, with prices the same or even rising.

Second, in its announcement on the big turbines the company said it would modify the "escalator" clause in its contracts—a clause under which customers have been required to pay more than the originally agreed price if a certain index of costs rose.

The change is aimed to help sales, but it also may represent a shrewd hunch on the part of General Electric that costs in the future may be a lot more stable than in the past.

Finally, what the announcements did not say was that foreign competition is a large element in the decision, at least for the big turbines. The revival of Western Europe is producing a benefit that Americans had perhaps not foreseen—the infusion of an extra element of competition in parts of American industry that have been to some extent immune during most of the postwar period.

In a sense, we as consumers are getting our Marshall plan money back.

A Veto Sheer Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor numerous times in support of the Tennessee Valley Authority and on July 13 included in the RECORD a list of 10 reasons why the TVA self-financing bill should be approved by the President.

The Washington Post in an editorial in their July 16, 1959, edition states that in their judgment a Presidential veto of this bill—and I quote—"would be the sheerest folly."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DOUBLE VETO FOR TVA?

A Presidential veto of the Tennessee Valley Authority self-financing bill—either in the form passed by the House or as approved by the Senate—would, in our judgment, be the sheerest folly. But a veto is what Senator DIRKSEN has demanded, despite the unanimous approval of the bill by the Senate Public Works Committee and the blessing of the Treasury Department, and there are disquieting reports that the Budget Bureau, which opposes the measure, may indeed persuade the President to disapprove the bill.

This, we submit, would represent a total misreading of the facts and of the merits of the proposal which, we believe, should more than satisfy the longstanding conservative demands for a regularization of TVA's finances. The bill would put an end to Federal appropriations for new TVA generating facilities, authorizing the Authority instead to raise its own funds through bond issues which it would retire from revenues and which Congress could veto. It would provide for retirement, with interest, of most of the outstanding public investment in TVA power facilities. It would limit, for the first time, the area which TVA may serve.

But all of this apparently is not enough for Mr. DIRKSEN and the Budget Bureau. They oppose the bill, it seems, because it would not give the Budget Bureau authority to pass on TVA's financing plans before they are submitted to Congress. In other words, they want a double veto on TVA's program for paying its own way.

If TVA is, as the President once alleged, an example of "creeping socialism," the Dirksen-Budget Bureau notions of how to govern TVA amount to "galloping reaction." The Authority would, in effect, be deprived of all significant authority by the placing of such additional hobbles on its operations. A bill substantially along the lines of the Senate version ought to be enacted and approved if TVA is to continue to serve its present area effectively.

St. Lawrence Seaway Already Brings Hope and Prosperity to Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme delight that I call the attention of Congress to one of the first fruits of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Little did the Members of this great body realize what the St. Lawrence Seaway would mean to the central United States when they, in their wisdom, voted for the appropriations which made the St. Lawrence Seaway possible.

Wisconsin is a Midwestern State lying almost equidistant between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and lying in the northern half of our continent. We have always been both an industrial and an agricultural area and the fruits of our shops as well as the produce of our farms has been forced over the years and through the generations to find its way into the markets throughout the world by means of the railroads. This means that transportation was slow; it meant handling several times; it was costly and it meant that the Midwest could never reach its full potential as a producer of both industrial products and farm products.

One of the finest and richest parts of the State of Wisconsin consists of the First District, lying between the Illinois State line on the south, and Milwaukee County on the north. On the shores of Lake Michigan between these two boundaries are two industrial cities: Racine and Kenosha. Both have fine harbor inlets and both in years past have enjoyed much commerce on the Great Lakes. The city of Kenosha, however, has a natural harbor; it has a turntable that can accommodate all but the very largest oceangoing vessels. With the advent of the St. Lawrence Seaway the city fathers of Kenosha appropriated money to purchase lakeshore and harbor property. The city also constructed port facilities and industrialists from the city of Kenosha, principally Mr. Nicholas Demos, who is the owner of the Kenosha Auto Transport Co., which transports automobiles and trucks in all of the 49 States and in Canada, and whose home office is located in Kenosha, started developing business that could be handled through the new port of Kenosha. So successful have these efforts been that the port of Kenosha in its beginning year will be visited with over 100 ships loaded with cargo from every corner of the earth.

The port has already become the capital port of the Midwest for the foreign automobile business, and most foreign made cars, which are destined for midwestern use, will enter this country and are this year entering this country through the port of Kenosha. This port will also facilitate the export of the Rambler, the Wisconsin made car manufactured by American Motors in its plants in Kenosha and Milwaukee, thus creating more jobs for the workers in Kenosha and Milwaukee, and in turn creating more business for the business community because of an expanded payroll.

A newly formed corporation in which stock has been purchased by many community minded men is building new port facilities. This corporation has recently purchased the property of the Simmons Co., which has done business in Kenosha for the past 90 years. It has developed the harbor that is second to none and the harbor, as developed, new and modern, will permit ships to unload without waiting and without the large use fee charged in many of the urban and busier centers. This harbor is so busy that every day since the opening of the lake traffic there have been boats in the harbor and frequently there are boats offshore waiting a turn to get in. This harbor activity and the business brought to this midwestern community through this port which is located in the hometown of the American Motors Co., which manufactures the Rambler, has brought a degree of prosperity to this city and to the entire surrounding area that has been hitherto unknown.

The city of Kenosha is prosperous; employment is high; it is only recently that this city was on the list of the major unemployment centers of the country. Today everyone who wants to work is working at top wages. Other companies are performing subcontracts, either for American Motors or the many other large manufacturing plants in the area, and all are participating in the shipment of goods either in or out of the Kenosha Harbor. This new harbor is destined to become one of the leading Great Lakes ports.

On July 7 Bernard Gettelman, a former State senator from Wisconsin, whom I had the pleasure of serving with when I served as a Wisconsin State senator, and who is now collector of cus-

toms for Milwaukee, Wis., served notice on Kenosha that it had been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as the first port of entry on the Great Lakes since the advent of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

This distinction of being "first" in recognition was certainly due to the people of Kenosha, to Kenosha's mayor, the Honorable Eugene Hammond, to the harbor commission, and particularly to Nicholas Demos who has worked so hard and so long to develop this harbor into what it is today.

Their plans call for the building of a large grain elevator which will take care of much of the grain from the surrounding States of Illinois, Iowa, and of Wisconsin itself. This grain will be shipped overseas in ships that are bringing the products of Europe and South America to the Midwest. This is truly progress on the march.

First, may I say thanks to this Congress for voting for the St. Lawrence Seaway, and next may I say congratulations to the forward and progressive people of Kenosha, Wis., who have worked so hard and so diligently to bring about this important and highly successful, this elaborate port to Kenosha. Congratulations on being the first to be recognized by being designated as a port of entry by the Federal Government.

Resolutions Adopted by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the report of the resolutions committee which was adopted by the 46th convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington, D.C., recently.

The resolutions committee, of which I had the honor and pleasure of again serving as chairman, consisted of one delegate from each State, Territory, island possession, and the District of Columbia. The members gave careful and painstaking consideration to the matters before them, made many constructive suggestions, proposed numerous changes in the draft of the resolutions presented to them, and reached agreement thereon.

The convention was attended by registered delegates from 50 States, including Alaska and Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, in addition to many registered delegates, guests, visitors, representatives of the press, and so forth. Texas again sent the largest delegation, 33; New York was next, with 19; while Louisiana was third, with 18.

These delegates were from all sections of the country, representing both legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government; State, city, county, and other local governmental agencies and interested groups; commercial, waterway, flood control, and reclamation associations; agricultural, labor, industrial, and trade organizations; and transportation interests; with memberships totaling several million.

We believe this expression of representatives of such different interests and pursuits is strong evidence of the general sentiment of the people of the United States concerning the matters dealt with in these resolutions:

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE TO THE 46TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MAY 15, 1959

FOREWORD

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress, now in its 58th year, intends to continue its efforts toward an expanded program of water resource development. The continued economic wellbeing of our Nation depends upon such development and our membership, composed of Federal, State, and local officials has dedicated itself to it. We are determined that our efforts shall not be in vain. The stakes are too large to have it otherwise.

MAINTENANCE OF PROJECTS

This National Rivers and Harbors Congress recognizes and commends the attitude that Congress has adopted, respecting Federal waterway and flood control maintenance, by increasing appropriations therefor. This attitude is consistent with the contention of this body that if there is justification for building a waterway or a structure for flood control there is certainly justification for proper maintenance to permit their use to the fullest extent.

A large backlog of deferred maintenance has accumulated in many of the harbors and waterways of the Nation. Until this is overcome, the full potential of such projects cannot be realized.

We urge Congress to reassert and continue its policy of providing adequate maintenance funds for current maintenance, and additional funds to eliminate the backlog of deferred maintenance on those projects for which the Federal Government has assumed responsibility.

STUDY BACKLOG

In the past, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has noted the substantial backlog of studies in the program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This backlog has been increased by the passage of the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill during the last session of Congress and the new studies regularly being authorized by Congress. The orderly development of the Nation's water resources is dependent on the expenditious completion of these studies and a continuing program of new studies. Adequate appropriations and retention of highly qualified manpower are essential to complete the studies and reduce the backlog. In order to build an adequate staff of engineers and assistants to conduct these studies efficiently and improve the quality of water resource studies, it is necessary for the corps to anticipate a consistent and higher level of appropriations. It is urged that Congress increase these appropriations gradually for 2 or 3 years and not permit fluctuations to adversely affect the program.

FOREIGN PROJECTS

We urge the Nation's Congress to examine the matter of foreign projects financed directly or indirectly with funds of the United States. Such projects are not restricted by a ban on new starts, nor are they authorized after economic justification as are domestic water resource projects. We believe they should be authorized by the Congress on an individual basis and be subject to favorable cost-benefit ratios in the same manner as are domestic projects.

Domestic water resource projects cannot compete with blanket authorizations for foreign resource development as is now the case.

NO NEW STARTS

The attitude on the part of the Bureau of the Budget that there will be no new construction or planning starts of water resources projects destined to provide stability to this country is deplorable. For fiscal year 1960 we have the largest peacetime budget in our history and contrary to the needs and thinking of a large segment of our people it contains not one single new construction start. If this attitude continues the impact on the citizens of our 50 States will be terrific. It is our intention to devote our best efforts to methods of seeing that it does not continue, to the extent that we urge the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to assure a minimum of new starts each year.

ITEM VETO

We are alarmed by information in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the previous Congress as to the possibility of a provision by which the President would be empowered to veto legislative provisions as well as appropriation items. Should Congress succumb to this suggestion by a former director of the Bureau of the Budget our chances of carrying forward a public works program to meet the needs of our growing population will be practically nil. By the same token we stand to lose the confidence of our friendly foreign nations and the race for resource development by the Soviet Union. We can also be alert to efforts to curtail these programs through the imposition of a ceiling on expenditures as has been tried in the past.

OMNIBUS RIVER AND HARBOR LEGISLATION

The time has again arrived when the development of our resources can be well bolstered by enacting legislation to provide authority for the many worthy projects that have been studied and reported on by the respective Federal agencies. The proponents of these projects have been patient throughout the required study process and they now expect to see them acted on by the Congress thereby enabling them to be eligible for planning funds. We urge the Congress to respect the patience thus far exhibited and authorize these worthy projects.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

We join with the citizens of our Nation and those of our neighbor to the north in the realization of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Its helpful impact on the heartland of our Nation and elsewhere here and in Canada is conceded. To those who have labored long and hard for this accomplishment we offer our congratulations and with pardonable pride take a small amount of credit for the part we have played.

Moreover we join with our leaders and our people in expressing pleasure in the fact that Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, will join our President to lend dignity to the formal opening of this important transportation artery on the 26th of June 1959.

TOLLS ON WATERWAYS

We strongly reaffirm our long standing opposition to tolls on our waterways. These public properties benefit a large segment of our people and that benefit should not be subordinated to a desire by some elements to place a price tag on the use of these lifelines. We will continue to prevent strangulation of waterways by such imposition. Returns to our Federal treasury through taxes realized make tolls needless.

LOCAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Repeated efforts to require a greater amount of local contribution on various wa-

ter resource projects indicates a trend to divorce Federal fiscal responsibility from projects which are in the national interest. These projects are a national problem and should be financed with Federal funds with local contribution commensurate only with clearly defined local benefits. Local communities, however, should not be denied protection because of their inability to contribute.

WEATHER MODIFICATION RESEARCH

This Rivers and Harbors Congress supports a greatly expanded research program in the atmospheric sciences with particular emphasis on weather modification due to its impact on future water resource development in the Nation.

Inasmuch as the National Science Foundation, created under Public Law 85-510, has this program as a portion of its responsibility, we urge the Congress of the United States to continue adequate appropriations in support of the full scale program of the foundation.

Eli Whiteley, Congressional Medal of Honor Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 26, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the most recent issue of the Texas Aggie, the school journal of the A. & M. College of Texas entitled "Teacher Exemplifies Medal of Honor Awards":

TEACHER EXEMPLIFIES MEDAL OF HONOR AWARDS

The college produced six Congressional Medal of Honor winners during World War II. Two of the heroes are living and four awards were made posthumously. One of the living is a teacher at the college.

The four who gave their lives during the conflict were Lloyd H. Hughes, 1943, of Corpus Christi, who was a U.S. Air Force second lieutenant; George D. Keathley, 1937, of Olney, who was a U.S. Army staff sergeant; Turney W. Leonard, 1942, of Dallas, who was a U.S. Army first lieutenant; and Thomas W. Fowler, 1943, of Wichita Falls, who was a U.S. Army second lieutenant.

The two survivors are William G. Harrell, 1943, of Mercedes, who was a U.S. Marine Corps sergeant, and Eli L. Whiteley, 1942, of Georgetown, who was a U.S. Army first lieutenant and who currently is an instructor in the agronomy department.

HONORED IN COKE BUILDING

Portraits of the six men, with their congressional citations, are displayed on the second floor of the Richard Coke Building.

To illustrate the type of action for which the awards were made, Whiteley's Congressional Medal of Honor citation is quoted:

"1st Lt. Eli I. Whiteley, 41, 15th Infantry Regiment, for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of life above and beyond the call of duty."

WOUNDED SEVERELY

"Lieutenant Whiteley, while leading his platoon on December 27, 1944, in savage house-to-house fighting through the fortress town of Sigolsheim, France, attacked a building through a street swept by withering mortar and automatic weapons fire. He was hit and severely wounded in the arm and shoulder, but he charged into the house alone and killed its two defenders. Hurling smoke and fragmentation grenades before him, he rushed to the next house and stormed inside, killing 2 and capturing 11 of the enemy. He continued leading his platoon in the extremely dangerous task of clearing hostile troops from strong points along the street until he reached a building held by fanatical Nazi troops. Although suffering from painful wounds which had rendered his left arm useless, he advanced on this strongly defended house and, after blasting out a wall with bazooka fire, charged through a hail of bullets. Wedging his submachinegun under his uninjured arm, he rushed into the house through the hole torn by his rockets, killed 5 of the enemy, and forced the remaining 12 to surrender. As he emerged to continue his fearless attack, he was again hit and critically wounded. In agony and with one eye pierced by a shell fragment, he shouted for his men to follow him to the next house. He was determined to stay in the fighting and did remain at the head of his platoon until forcibly evacuated. By his disregard for personal safety, aggressiveness while suffering from severe wounds, determined leadership, and superb courage, Lieutenant Whiteley killed 9 Germans, captured 23 more, and spearheaded an attack which cracked the core of enemy resistance in a vital area."

The Nebraska Farmer Speaks Out on Food for Peace Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the June 16 issue of the Nebraska Farmer. I believe it will be of interest to my colleagues, especially those from the farm States, due to the excellent reputation of the Nebraska Farmer.

FOOD FOR PEACE

There's more than meets the eye involved in a food for peace program. In such a program there can be a danger of making more enemies than friends.

And this danger involves more than offending the countries that are competing for the same agricultural export markets that we are. It also later involves the peoples who are helped temporarily by our giveaway programs.

Here's an illustration, related recently by Stanley Andrews, now executive director of a national project in agricultural communications.

The United States started a powdered-milk disposal plan in Burma, Andrews related, and it took considerable time and effort to teach Burmese children in Rangoon that the milk was actually good to drink. They just never had been used to milk. Finally they got to liking it, and the program went well. We disposed of a lot of milk surplus, the Burmese kids had a much-improved diet, the United States made some friends.

Under the surplus disposal program, the milk was available in Rangoon at 10 cents a pound.

Then came the revolting development.

We whittled our surplus down to size and cut back on our disposal program. The price of the milk in Rangoon went to $1.40 a pound.

You can guess what happened then. There wasn't any more milk for these children—not after a fourteenfold jump in the price. We had jerked the rug right out from under some people whose friendship we had obtained. We weren't their friends any longer. Their view of us was considerably dimmer than it had been before we started giving them milk.

Andrews drew the obvious conclusion. In a food for peace program, the food must be used to implement our foreign policy, not as a way to get rid of surplus—as a weapon, not a dump.

Food for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, consistent with my fight for a food-for-peace program and my constant working to make the American people aware that our greatest asset with which to fight the cold war, I am happy to see the Des Moines Register in an editorial on the subject make some cogent comments on this vital subject regarding the administration's attitude toward Senator HUMPHREY's food for peace plan. I am happy to place this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Des Moines Register, July 13, 1959]

A BETTER FOOD FOR PEACE PLAN

In his farm message to Congress last January, President Eisenhower made a strong plea for a food for peace effort. He said he was setting steps in motion to explore with other surplus-producing countries the means of using farm products to reinforce peace. Since then, Secretary of Agriculture Benson has begun talks with Canada and other wheat exporters on this matter.

Apparently, the administration is interested (or at least Ike was) in expanding the sales of farm products for foreign currency under Public Law 480—and lending this money back to the countries involved for economic development.

This program, though it was viewed mainly as surplus removal at the start, has proved to be a valuable instrument of aid to underdeveloped countries. In the first 4 years of this program, about 61 percent of the foreign currencies received were plowed back into economic development, primarily by loans but with some grants.

While underdeveloped countries need loans of dollars and other hard currency for purchase of capital goods abroad, they also need to pay workers on development projects in local currency. Since savings are limited in a poor country and tax systems often weak, it is difficult to raise this money without inflation. When the United States lends back the money received from sale of farm products, in effect, workers are paid partly in food, instead of money.

In view of the experience under Public Law 480 and the President's statements about food for peace, we find it hard to understand the administration opposition to Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY'S proposed amendments to the law. Senator HUMPHREY also calls his plan food for peace. His proposal would put the sales for soft currency on a 5-year basis. At present the authority is for 1 year. It would also make possible wider uses of the currency, includ-

ing expenditures for educational exchange programs.

The Humphrey amendments to Public Law 480 would set up a Peace Food Administration outside the Department of Agriculture. They would instruct the Administration to seek cooperation with other countries and with United Nations agencies in making use of food for development projects. The program would be made much more flexible by authorizing donations or sales of farm products for national food reserves in other counties. The bill would permit use of foods not technically in surplus, such as pork, but which are in plentiful supply.

On the whole, the Humphrey plan would be a commendable step forward in making use of American farm abundance as part of our foreign aid program. The administration might logically find some objections to details—but if it means what it says about food for peace, it certainly should approve the broad outlines of the Humphrey plan.

Perhaps the most important needed change in Public Law 480 is extending the authority for agreements beyond 1 year. Five years, as proposed by Senator HUMPHREY, is none too long. Receiving countries can make far more effective use of the farm products if they have assurance of a certain supply over a period of years. India, for example, would then be able to count on the agreed amount of wheat for the duration of a 5-year plan.

With the farm surpluses now on hand, plus the prospects for further production increases, there is no reason under the sun why this country cannot make long-term food supply agreements. The administration ought to get behind this change. It is inexplicable to us why the administration, after all its talk about long-range foreign aid, should be opposing long-range programs in both the Development Loan Fund and the use of surplus food.

Impounding Dam on the South Branch of the Potomac River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a resolution which I have received from Mary Katharine Barnes, president of the West Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs, in session July 11, 1959, at Charleston, W. Va., in which this organization memoralizes the Congress to prohibit the construction of an impounding dam on the south branch of the Potomac River. I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to this resolution. It reads as follows:

RESOLUTION OF WEST VIRGINIA FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore indicated that there should be formulated a comprehensive water development plan for the Potomac River Basin; and

Whereas the Congress, having appropriated public funds to complete a study and survey of said development program; and

Whereas it appearing that one such study has been completed and another thereof is now being considered; and

Whereas it further appearing that by various amendments to the said appropriation bill and through other measures to be considered by the Congress, said water development plan will inevitably take the form of a large impounding dam on the South Branch of the Potomac River; and

Whereas it appearing that the construction of said dam will flood the most valuable farm land in Hampshire County, the oldest county in the State of West Virginia; and

Whereas such dam would destroy many landmarks of historic value and otherwise cause irreparable damage far beyond any economic value to be derived therefrom: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive board of the West Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States and, more particularly, the representatives in Congress from the State of West Virginia to take all steps and to do all things necessary to prohibit the construction of an impounding dam on the South Branch of the Potomac River, in Hampshire, Grant, Hardy, and Mineral Counties, W. Va.; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be mailed to the Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS, representing the Second Congressional District of West Virginia and to Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH and Senator ROBERT BYRD.

Executive Board of the West Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs in session July 11, 1959, Charleston, W. Va.:

MARY KATHARINE BARNES,
President.

No Time for Lavender and Old Lace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the 43d District of New York was honered on July 10, 1959, by the distinguished presence of Miss Bertha S. Adkins, Under Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. Miss Adkins addressed the Chautauqua Woman's Club at renowned Chautauqua Institution during a week devoted to the problems of the aged. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of Miss Adkins' address.

NO TIME FOR LAVENDER AND OLD LACE

(By Bertha S. Adkins, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

Those of you who have been coming to Chautauqua for many years and who are familiar with its history know what an important influence it has been in the field of adult education. It is doubly significant that the General Federation of Women's Clubs, which has pioneered in so many fields of women's work, should also be a part of this great institution. I am honored by being invited to open this season's important program, arranged by the federation and designed to increase a greater understanding and clearer insight into the problems of women around the world.

I have very recently attended a seminar in Bogotá, Colombia, South America, as the official U.S. representative on the Participation of Women in Public Life. It was sponsored by the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations. This was, for me, a most interesting and rewarding experience. At a time when rapid social change is universal, nothing is more dramatic than the change in the status of women, as they are taking an active place in national and international life, exchanging information and ideas with one another, but solving their own problems. To be sure the pace varies, the problems differ in content and degree, but all women are undoubtedly working toward the same goals. Women's influence has transcended boundaries to become a global one, and many have assumed responsibilities in promoting world understanding and citizenship.

And within the confines of our own shores and borders broad knowledge of our own complex problems must be acquired as a background for effective work toward their solution. These are problems which stem from the general increase in population, mobility, automation, urban living, and the added years of life. These needs have brought into being many organizations with different purposes but each with a clear call to women to volunteer their services to help the thousands of voluntary organizations that make up our many faceted national life. It is a well known fact, says the recent national study on manpower, that the only possible reservoir of untapped manpower is woman power. This is a far cry from the popular lecturer who told his audience that the largest empty spaces in this country dwelt under the permanent waves of women.

It is by now a well established fact that women are not only here to stay but they have an important contribution to make in the preservation of our way of life and both men and women have acknowledged this.

Perhaps the real block to progress, in accepting women into full partnership, is the unwillingness of so many women themselves, as they grow older, to undertake of their own volition anything of significance. Well, we cannot live by canasta and television alone, nor have we earned the right to sit down to be entertained for the rest of our increasingly lengthened span of life.

Have you ever stopped to consider some of the reasons given by women for withdrawal from the main stream of life instead of continuing to renew and augment their contributions to society?

There are those persons whose unwillingness to think or act is a sign of selfish unconcern for any but themselves. Others are satisfied to stay in a rut and show no desire for new outlets and new interests. Some are content to sit and enjoy their prejudices and secondhand opinions, not caring to know the true facts or change their opinions. This self-satisfied complacency is a major deterrent to the development of wider horizons of interest and endeavors. As a result women settle into grooves of incapacity.

I am amused when people come up after I have spoken and say "I enjoyed your talk so much" or "I agree with everything you said." Then I say, "I hope you are going to do something about it," to which they reply in shocked amazement, "Who, me?"

As a matter of fact mature women can actually bring about a new era in which the skills and abilities which they possess can be related to our present political scene and to the progress which this country can make toward world peace.

Have we thought seriously enough about the influence which we, as women, can have upon our life and times to willingly turn our backs upon the opportunities? We women are consumers and, as such, we wield immense power through our buying. In our free market economy the buyer has the last word. This is a sobering thought and should provoke serious consideration about problems we do not often discuss or fully understand.

We are citizens and, as such, have a clear duty to work for those national, State, and local legislative policies and programs which will make our country a better, safer, happier place in which to live.

It is inevitable that in our times women are undertaking more fully the responsibili-

ties of citizenship. Responsibilities which can no longer be ignored.

Beyond our immediate neighborhoods lie the larger community, the State, the Nation, and the world as a challenge to this generation. Our obligation to be a good neighbor can best be met, both in this country and abroad, when we work together to solve the problems of humanity.

As we try to live creatively, particularly as our years increase, we should consider the special values which maturity brings to the role of older women.

I think we are able to recognize and interpret social changes. Experience and calm judgment have given women an awareness of the needs of society and have enabled us to develop the ability to adapt ourselves to changing circumstances. This is a most significant asset.

Another contribution of mature years is that of providing direction and leadership toward sound social planning. The greater our perspective the greater our insight should be into social problems. We should also have acquired the knoweldge of how to combine community and government action to solve these problems.

Perhaps the most unique contribution of all is the ability which mature women possess as mediators between groups, a role much needed in our society today. All of the accumulated wisdom and sensitivity which experience and the enrichment of years well lived can bring are utilized in this important skill. Women can be proud of this talent so much coveted and so greatly needed.

We have no time to talk about growing old or retiring from the activity about us. There is too much to be done and the world is too exciting to turn our backs upon it. Life is a great and unending experience full of new adventures if one continues to be useful and active. There is so much to see, to tell, to learn, to do. The old patterns of retirement are out of date. Modern retirement provides additional free time for new outlooks, new insights, growth, opportunities for service of unlimited variety.

There is actually no retirement age for volunteers. Maintaining a happy and useful life brings dignity to old age. By our own activity we know that we have the opportunity to change the old idea that growing old was something to dread and fear. In fact, I think we have already done much in that direction, and old age is even becoming fashionable.

About 3 years ago the Social Security Administration did a study of 62 centenarians who were receiving old age and survivors insurance benefits. Oddly enough, several of these were still working—one at age 118. Although all of these centenarians conceded that they were old, none said that he had finished living and the general impression of the interviews was that most of them had found fulfillment in their interest in living. In fact, Mrs. Pinky Gaines, aged 107, a hospital worker in Concord, N.C., had just retired and was headed for the beach. Even though she said, "I look like a fool, wearing shorts." She believed in keeping up with the times.

Many years ago Cicero made a statement which rings with truth for us today: "Not by physical force, not by bodily swiftness and agility are great things accomplished, but by deliberation, authority, and judgment; qualities of which old age is not deprived, but with which it is as a general rule even more abundantly provided."

And George Santayana added another dimension to the qualities of older people:

"Nothing is inherently or invincibly young except spirit. And spirit can enter a human being perhaps better in the quiet of old age and dwell there more undisturbed than in the turmoil of adventure. * * * Old places and old persons in their turn, when spirit dwells in them, have intrinsic vitality of which youth is incapable."

Shift of Public Opinion Against Farmer Will Not Help Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent editorial presentation from the Advance-Yeoman, of Wickliffe, Ky., of Friday, July 10, 1959, relating to the public opinion campaign being waged against the farm program in some of the Nation's press:

[From the Wickliffe (Ky.) Advance-Yeoman, July 10, 1959]

SHIFT OF PUBLIC OPINION AGAINST FARMER WILL NOT HELP AGRICULTURE

Combined with other worries, the farmer seems to have lost most of his friends in his struggle for survival. Public opinion is being exerted in many sections against farm subsidies and the farm program. The hue and cry against the farm program is heard throughout the Nation's press.

Many of the metropolitan papers are against the farm program and blasting it daily. This is sure to impress urban dwellers who have no understanding of the farm problem or interest in it. Recently the powerful Life magazine added their voice in a blast at the farm program and quoted statistics on large corporations and companies who were profiting by ASC cost-sharing programs to the detriment of the average citizen. They gave a powerful, convincing argument except for one sentence to the effect that the only solution to the farm program was to discontinue it and let competition drive the small farmer who used inefficient methods out of our economy.

To us, such a statement makes as little sense as telling the man with 10 children who has trouble feeding them to go around and pinch off some heads so that the rest of the children will be well-fed.

With so much criticism on help to the farmer and a presidential election coming up soon, this situation does not look good for the farmer. Tobacco support prices have really taken a beating in the press. Since Kentucky's biggest farm product is tobacco, produced on small farms in a State of small farms, this lack of sympathetic understanding in cities is sure to have weight in Congress and an adverse effect on our economy.

Where will the small farmer go when he is starved out on the farm? Where will the Nation go when the inefficient small farmer is eliminated? Will he go into manufacturing or service industries? There is no local manufacturing that can absorb these people—they will become transients hunting jobs throughout the Nation. Labor is having its own troubles. Automation has cut the union membership in every major industry * * * and decreased membership is hurting the unions. The automobile industry has been badly damaged. Foreign imports are making noticeable inroads on American production and into American export markets by offering goods produced more cheaply. We see it in automobiles, electrical goods, steel, machine tools, office equipment, and even in farm machinery. We are being priced out of the world markets and more and more U.S. firms are building factories in other parts of the world in order to compete in world trade as well as to supply U.S. demands.

Census figures show a farm population of 22½ million. No longer do they influence elections the way they used to do but that's still a lot of people. There are an estimated 10 million more whose income is dependent upon agriculture. You cannot deplete the earning power of more than 30 million people without visiting a killing depression on the remaining 130 million.

Government subsidies are not high enough to be much help to the farmer. And it is not true, as the Wall Street Journal maintains, that the farmers raise inferior products to take advantage of price supports. This may be true in a few isolated cases, but there are a few inequities in any law. It is true, however, that the smallest farmer cannot take advantage of the present farm program like the biggest farmer can. This segment of our population is the hardest to reach.

Many editors, sitting in air-conditioned offices, contemplating the fate of the small farmer, need to change places with him in the tobacco field for awhile. It would help their viewpoint to wipe a little honest sweat out of their eyes.

Don't Discourage the Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that one of the country's most challenging responsibilities is to adjust our thinking and our public and private policies to a more realistic and understanding appreciation of the role of our retired men and women.

The number of people in our population over 65 years of age is increasing so fast that in 10 years it is estimated that 10 percent of the total population will be included in that age group; and about that same time the key age group of 20 to 65, from which almost our entire working force is drawn, will be reduced to only one-half of the overall population.

The significance of these facts from the point of view of the health and psychological welfare of our retired people has been usefully emphasized in an article appearing in the July 12, 1959, issue of This Week magazine, a Sunday supplement of the New York Herald Tribune.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article in the RECORD and I commend it as well worth the attention of our colleagues.

Indirectly, Mr. Speaker, it points up another important aspect of Government policy toward the retired. This involves the discouraging effect of the Social Security Act on the decision of retired workers to obtain part-time employment, whether for psychological purposes, as the article recommends, or because of real financial need. The present annual earnings limitation of $1,200 is distinctly outmoded. As a retirement test, it is unrealistic, unwise, unfair, and discriminatory.

It is unrealistic to keep the earnings limit at $1,200 a year in complete disregard of the ravages of inflation and the

great increase in the cost of living since the limit was first established.

It is unwise to discourage retired people from doing the part-time work which medical authorities are increasingly recognizing as vital to the health and emotional welfare of our older people.

It is unfair to impose the same limits on the earnings of widowed mothers supporting minor children which are imposed on retired people with no dependents.

It is discriminatory to penalize social security beneficiaries for earning more than $1,200 a year when there are no limits on the unearned income such as savings and investments which more fortunate beneficiaries may receive without loss of benefits.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to liberalize the retirement test in these respects: First, raise from $1,200 to $3,600 the limit on annual earnings which widowed mothers of children under 18 are allowed without loss of benefits; second, raise from $1,200 to $2,400 the annual earnings limitation for all others receiving benefits; and third increase from $80 to $100 the amount of excess earnings permitted before deductions of monthly benefits are required.

The above-mentioned article follows:

[From This Week magazine, July 12, 1959]

WHY SHOULD YOU RETIRE AT 65?

(By Louis Orr, M.D., president, American Medical Association)

ORLANDO, FLA.—This year more than 500,000 men and women will retire.

For many, it will be a lifelong dream come true. For others, it will be a death warrant.

I am referring to those individuals who will be forced out of their jobs by compulsory retirement plans—plans put into effect in the belief that once an employee passes his 65th birthday he suddenly becomes an "old" man, too old to continue working.

At the outset, I want to make it clear that I am not opposed to retirement for anyone who wants to retire. I am opposed, however, to any arbitrary system which forces retirement at a given age.

There is no scientific rhyme or reason for selecting "65" as the magic number separating the productive from the nonproductive, the healthy from the unhealthy. Physicians have no convenient rule-of-thumb definition for old age. We see certain degenerative signs as men progress in years, but we also see many men 65 and over in better mental and physical health than persons 10 or 20 years younger.

There is, however, positive evidence that forced retirement can do irreparable mental and physical damage to an individual. As one recent study of the aged points out: "The change from provider to the one being provided for is the major causative factor in emotional disorders of the aged."

In America our attitude toward the aging has undoubtedly contributed to the steadily increasing number of persons 65 and over in mental hospitals. In Japan, a society which traditionally assigns positive assets and values to aging, mental illness actually decreases with age.

NOT ALL BREAD AND HONEY

There is a well-known biological axiom which states that organisms and tissues tend to die when they no longer serve a useful purpose—an axiom reinforced by hospital studies indicating that one of the major causes of premature and preventable senility is simply monotony and boredom.

My home State of Florida is widely recognized as a mecca for the retired. But I, and many other doctors, see a continual stream of patients for whom retirement has not meant a carefree life of bread and honey. Instead, it marks the beginning of a series of physical and emotional problems—severe hypertension, paranoia, stomach and kidney ailments, persistent headaches—triggered, quite often, by other than organic causes. One typical case was that of a 67-year-old accountant who had been forced into retirement 2 years earlier. Financially, retirement posed no problems; the man had a comfortable pension, savings, and owned his own home. His wife consulted the doctor initially. She was afraid, "that John might be getting slightly senile."

At first, her husband had enjoyed his leisure, the opportunity to fish, garden, read, or just relax. But for the last 8 months, nothing seemed to interest him, his ability to concentrate and his memory faltered, he had frequent headaches, was irritable. A short, joint consultation and a few phone calls sufficed for diagnosis and treatment. The cure: a part-time job in the business department of one of the many new factories in our area. John's symptoms disappeared shortly after his return to work.

But the bulk of our population over 65 is not, and—if arbitrary retirement continues to be enforced—will not be as fortunate as this man. With the loss of job, many men lose their self-respect; their customary roles as homemakers and providers; their positions as productive and useful members of society. Many never recover from these losses.

As a person ages, he is often less able to bounce back from stress and tension. Dr. Francis Braceland, former president of the American Psychiatric Association, observed that: "In some patients who develop a psychosis for the first time in old age * * * the role of stress is quite often evident. * * * Retirement from work often antedates the illness. This bears out the thesis that one of the greatest sources of gratification in life is work and that its loss may have tremendous psychological impact."

The role of stress in aggravating heart disease, migraine, arthritis, and ulcers has been indicated time after time in both medical and lay magazines.

After extensive examinations of 3,000 persons, Dr. Lawrence E. Hinkle, Jr., and Dr. Harold G. Wolff, of Cornell University Medical College, announced that they believed that fully one-third of all human illnesses—from colds to cancer—can be traced to man's reaction to his environment. The study showed that individuals tended to become ill when they were forced to adapt to difficult situations and that the greatest number of major afflictions were among persons who believed that their life situation was unsatisfactory and had the greatest difficulty adjusting to it.

A SERIOUS IMBALANCE

Today, 1 out of every 12 persons is over 65; in 10 years the count will be 1 out of 10. Government population projections predict a serious imbalance in our labor force within the next decade; a smaller working group supporting more children and elderly people. Today, 57 percent of the population is between the ages of 20 and 64; in 20 years, only 43 percent will be in this age group.

If industry continues to slough off workers as they reach 65, the result, aside from medical considerations, can only be a sizable financial drain on the "productive" segment of the population.

Companies offer many reasons for compulsory retirement—misconceptions also held by millions of Americans. The most common: older workers don't produce enough; they're not as efficient; they're too weak; they have more accidents.

Any medical man and some enlightened personnel officers know these arguments don't fit a large number of the men and women over 65.

In one test of a group of normal people aged 60 to 80, a sizable number were actually faster than the average of any younger group in performing any measurable mental function.

Other studies found no difference in attendance records between older and younger workers; that elderlry workers actually had fewer accidents; that any decrease in speed or physical capacity was compensated for by steadiness, reliability, and accuracy.

Economic arguments are also put forth in defense of compulsory retirement. However, a Department of Labor study group composed of experts from the pension and insurance fields found that later retirement reduces considerably the overall costs of pension programs: total payments made to a worker who retires at 67 average 15 percent less than if they started at 65.

The committee also stated that: "The impression that the related benefits of group life insurance, workman's compensation, and sickness and accident insurance cost a great deal more for older workers is mistaken. If benefits for dependents included maternity care, the cost may be less."

CLEAR AND URGENT DANGER

The dangers of compulsory retirement are clear and urgent. The American Medical Association, through its Committee on Aging, has asked labor and industry to stop and reevaluate their support of arbitrary retirement systems. We ask that they be abandoned in favor of more flexible and practical systems. And we ask that they be abandoned now.

Alternatives can be found among the many varieties of voluntary retirement plans in which the decision to retire is based on a worker's ability on the job rather than his age.

Lockheed Aircraft, for example, instituted voluntary retirement in 1942; 17 years of experience have proved that age does not determine a man's capabilities. The work record of every Lockheed employee, regardless of age, is reviewed regularly. When a decline in efficiency appears to be caused by an increase in age, the situation is discussed with the employee. He may be transferred to a less exacting job or recommended for retirement. Personnel files at Lockheed show hundreds of employees 65 and over at work as inspectors, flight test mechanics, drill press operators, and in many other skilled job classifications.

In many companies the decision to retire is a joint one based on frank discussions between the employee, his physician, job supervisor, and a personnel man. Other organizations have similar review boards. Interestingly, at such places the decision to retire is often initiated by the employee. The important point is that the worker has a choice; he is consulted, not arbitrarily let go.

THE SEMIRETIREMENT PLAN

Another alternative is semiretirement. In the Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co., Chicago, workers can take a 1-month leave of absence at 65, 2 months at 66, and so on. As time away from work increases, the employee reaches a point where his pension and social security benefits provide more income than his salary does.

A large Midwestern department store places retired employees on a daily hiring list, thus allowing them to keep busy 2 or 3 days a week. Another office switches its over-65 workers to a 4-day week.

The method is immaterial. What is important is letting the qualified 65-year-old continue working if he wants to. As long as arbitrary retirement plans exist, continued employment for older Americans will rank high on the list of urgently needed preventive health measures.

HOW SOME BIG FIRMS SOLVE THE OLD-AGE PROBLEM

"Flexible retirement" plans pose many problems for industry. But more than 20 major U.S. firms have already put into effect programs in which employees do not necessarily retire at 65. Among them are such companies as Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing, Montgomery Ward, International Harvester, American Airlines, American Motors, Consolidated Edison of New York, and the Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co.

The Wrigley plan, for example, gives a month's leave of absence in addition to regular vacation to an employee who reaches 65 and wants to keep on working. The following year he gets 2 months' leave, the third, 3, etc. Says Philip K. Wrigley, company president:

"From our 8 years' experience with the plan, we have found it successful in accomplishing two things:

"First, it enables the older employees to develop new interests and adjust to retirement living. Second, it gives younger men the opportunity to take on more responsibility gradually, while receiving the benefit of the older employees' knowledge and experience."

Such plans are an indication that problems of retirement are coming more and more to the fore. Recently, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming named a group of leading citizens to serve on a special National Advisory Committee for the White House Conference on Aging.

And in Atlantic City last month the National Industrial Advisory Committee and the American Geriatrics Society unanimously passed a resolution urging "a more realistic and flexible" system of retirement for American workers.

Unrealistic Income Limitations on OASI Beneficiaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mrs. John Rosevear of Elmira, N.Y., which points up the problem faced by those who receive old age and survivors insurance benefits under the Social Security System and who must supplement this income with employment.

The current income limitations are unrealistic in the light of today's dollar purchasing value and I believe the Committee on Ways and Means should give serious consideration to my bill, H.R. 2429, and the many other measures now pending before it which would increase the income limitations to a more realistic figure.

The above mentioned letter follows:

ELMIRA, N.Y., *July 3, 1959.*

Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON,
37th District of New York,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ROBISON: I wish to call to your attention the plight of those of us who collect social security and have our earning capacity limited to $1,200 a year. Speaking for myself, I recently became a widow and will be entitled to collect my husband's social security when I become 62, which will be August 6 of this year.

Wishing to supplement my income, I have found a very congenial position. This position, though for only 4 hours a day, is one of responsibility and my employers are willing to pay $35 per week or approximately $150 per month. They not only are willing to pay this much but prefer to do so, as they wish to be able to demand performance accordingly. However, I am in the ridiculous position of having to tell them that I cannot accept more than $100 per month, and no prospect of a raise ever.

It is not that we who collect social security are asking for additional funds, or at any rate I am not, many of us simply want to be able to compete in the business world with other normal human beings. We hear and read so much about the problems of older people and how necessary it is to help them to help themselves. Well I, for one, am asking for an opportunity to help myself.

If there be any Congressman who has tried recently to live on social security and $100 per month, may he be the first one to get up and defend this ruling or law.

Respectfully yours,

MRS. JOHN ROSEVEAR.

The Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our Ambassador to Mexico, Hon. Robert C. Hill, made an address to the graduating class of the American Institute for Foreign Trade, Phoenix, Ariz., June 3, which constitutes a worthwhile contribution on the subject of foreign affairs. By reason of Mr. Hill's ability as an observer, together with his wide experience, few people in our Foreign Service are better prepared to speak on this subject. Ambassador Hill certainly ranks high among our many able men in foreign service. His address impresses me so much that I feel it should be put in the RECORD that it might be more widely available.

Some of the major papers in Mexico had editorials on this speech which I would like to include in the RECORD because of the firsthand observations which the editors made of Mr. Hill's impressions.

The address and editorials follow:

THE CHALLENGE

(An address delivered by U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, Robert C. Hill, before the graduating class of the American Institute for Foreign Trade, Phoenix, Ariz., June 3, 1959)

When Carl Sauer, your president, invited me to address the graduating class of the American Institute for Foreign Trade, I rearranged my schedule to permit me the opportunity to speak to this representative group of Americans who are about to leave on important assignments overseas. Today, every American who lives abroad in any capacity is an ambassador of the United States. You are as important to the welfare of the United States as any Government official. Your conduct and your actions will be carefully watched by all people with whom you come in contact abroad. This constitutes a challenge to all of us.

This is really a challenge to ourselves. It is the challenge that right and justice shall prevail. It is the challenge to believe in our concern for human dignity and the individual rights of peoples everywhere. It is the challenge to believe in and practice our democratic ideals. It is the challenge to believe in our historic institutions. It is the challenge to believe in the vast potential of our free economy and a better life for everyone. It is the challenge to communicate these convictions in a positive way to the foreign peoples with whom you come in contact.

However, there are some today who believe the challenge to be Soviet Russia. As a result, I have become greatly concerned with the distorted image of Russia that seems to be increasingly held by many of my fellow citizens. You will recall that the Chinese Communists use the term "paper tiger" to describe the United States. It would appear to me that this term should apply instead to the Soviet Union. In looking at Russia, many of us seem to see only the snarling face of the tiger and not the paper behind it. This seems to be frightening some of us half to death. This image of Russia cannot be attributed only to Communist propaganda, massive though it may be. Many people innocently contribute to this image with dire warnings regarding Soviet advances. Though of course they do not mean it that way, they sound as though they really do believe that communism is the wave of the future.

Recently my wife and I visited Russia and the satellite countries. I came away to freedom encouraged to note that we are many years in advance of their economic development. I returned to breathe the free air outside of Russia convinced that we are miles ahead of them. As General "Lightning Joe" Collins kept reminding us some years back, the Communists are not 10 feet tall.

I am not referring to Russian boasts of military strength. I am not qualified to speak on military matters. What concerns me here are social and economic factors relevant to the two nations.

I learned while traveling in Europe that Mikoyan's report on what he saw in the United States of our economic strength has shaken the confidence of Mr. Khrushchev and company. This is not surprising. After all, none of the other principal Soviet leaders presently in power has ever seen the United States.

Why not seriously consider arranging for other important Soviet leaders to visit us? Why not show them what the United States is really like? Let them see with their own eyes our steel mills, our automobile plants, and our aircraft industry. Let them visit TVA. Show them acres of workers' houses and nearby supermarkets. Let them talk with the American worker at the machine and with the American farmer in the field. Let them get it straight from our citizens. Let's open the eyes of the Soviet leaders. We have nothing to lose and everything to gain by letting them see the power and stability of the United States. The majority leader of the U.S. Senate, LYNDON JOHNSON, stated some time ago: "If we remain economically and militarily strong, we need have no fear." In my opinion, there is absolutely no doubt about it.

We must seize upon new and dramatic ideas to demonstrate to the world what the United States really stands for. Facts do not speak for themselves. They must be communicated. We have not fully utilized our strength in this critical area. You can call it salesmanship, public relations, information, or what you may it is of overwhelming importance.

Let me give you a specific instance. The Russians have done, a massive job of selling the idea in the United States—and elsewhere in the world—that their TU–104 jet is the outstanding development in aviation today. When they want to impress a visiting head of State, they fly him in one of these planes. Or if a high Russian official is going abroad on an important mission, they often send him in their latest aircraft. But the real truth is that, commercially, the Russian jet has been rejected abroad. Aviation experts say it is neither practical or economical. Commercially, they can't sell it.

On the other hand, the United States has jet aircraft in operation and in commercial use both here in the United States and abroad. These powerful jets have not been rejected by domestic or foreign buyers. When Vice President NIXON goes to Moscow in July to open the important American exhibit in Sokolniki Park, why not send him in a Boeing 707, a Douglas DC–8, or a Convair 880? Why not consider sending our top officials to important meetings throughout the world in our latest aircraft? I don't propose this in order to flaunt our military strength, but to demonstrate the great technical advances we have achieved. If Vice President NIXON flies to Moscow in one of our own big jets, let's invite the Russian people to visit the plane. Let them judge for themselves concerning U.S. productive capabilities versus those of the Soviet Union.

What we are talking about here, essentially, is face and prestige. We are talking about communicating facts to foreign peoples in imaginative and dramatic ways. When Mrs. Hill and I visited Warsaw, I was shocked to see how the American Embassy personnel lived. Our American Ambassador lives in modest quarters, while only a few blocks away the Soviet Ambassador lives in a palace. Our Foreign Service personnel in Warsaw are living in quonset huts on the Chancery grounds and in apartment buildings that would have long since been condemned in the United States. Now I am not suggesting that our people overseas should live in an extravagant fashion. I am saying they should live in decent and comparable quarters, if only for purposes of morale. They certainly should not be restricted by the Communists to second-rate quarters that give to the Polish people the false impression that we are not a proud and a strong Nation.

Warsaw is the most depressing city I have ever visited in my life. It was 90 percent damaged during World War II, and today the rubble still remains. And all the while the Russians bleed the Poles white. In Warsaw the Russians have built a monument to themselves—a towering so-called cultural institute that looms over that ruined and desolate city. I thought as I looked down from this building on the devastation below that the world should know more about this condition. How many people in the world are aware that 14 years after World War II Poland remains crushed? Is this what the Soviets mean when they talk about aid? They supposedly have been aiding Poland for 14 years, and look at its deplorable condition today. Is this an example of the kind of aid they mean when they offer economic assistance to other nations around the world? Contrast this with the reality of American cooperation offered those war-devastated nations in Europe when they asked us for a helping hand. Contrast the prosperity of West Germany with the poverty of Poland today.

While in Moscow, I visited a housing development where allegedly 200,000 people live. From photos, the development looks impressive. But a personal inspection revealed that the construction of this vast housing development was unbelievably bad. Some of the buildings only 2 years old have already been condemned.

Even Pravda in a recent editorial took note of this. As quoted in the Washington Post of May 7, the official Communist Party paper said: "The quality of some of the newly erected building 'can be greatly criticized'." William A. Jordan in a recent New York Times magazine article, "Why Russia Needs the Iron Curtain," said: "Authorities on Soviet affairs say more important than keeping foreigners from seeing too much of Soviet life, it is necessary for the Kremlin leaders to prevent any considerable number of their own people from seeing the reality of life in other lands."

The brutal truth is that the Soviet tyranny, just like every tyrannical regime in history, is built on the sweat, blood and misery of its own people, while its leaders have the gall to boast of economic progress.

In my opinion, people should not let themselves be victimized by Soviet propaganda. People should stop giving the appearance of being spellbound by the various publicized technical achievements of the Soviet Union. Our people should remember that the Russian people still live at virtually the same low standard of living as they did back in 1917. Now the Russians say they want to help other nations raise their standard of living.

On a humorous note, speaking of Russian ignorance about the outside world, let me tell you of my visit to a Moscow factory. This was described by Intourist as the outstanding factory in the Soviet Union. My host proudly showed me a bicycle they manufacture, and spent 15 minutes demonstrating the coaster brake. He said it was a new Russian invention. When I told him that 34 years ago—as a boy in New Hampshire, I had a bike with a New Departure coaster brake and so did all my friends, my host was astonished and said he didn't believe it.

Having spent 21 years at home and abroad as Ambassador and businessman and having the opportunity to inspect various manufacturing plants, I can tell you that this particular factory—supposedly one of Russia's best—was obsolete by U.S. standards.

When you are told about the wonders of Russia, you might ask yourself these simple questions: Have you ever wondered why Soviet diplomats so often try to escape to freedom on the eve of their return to Moscow? Have you ever thought of the terrible decision these men and their families have to make when, after a few years abroad, they look at the open roads of the free world and know they must go back to the narrow prison of their homeland? Have you observed the photos of their sorrowing faces, as, flanked by Moscow's burly guards, these seekers for freedom are hustled aboard a plane in Canada, Australia, Burma, or London to be never heard from again? Have you ever heard of an American diplomat who jumped off an Embassy wall to remain in an Iron Curtain country rather than return to the United States?

We need, somehow, to have greater penetration of the Iron Curtain. For one thing, instead of the U.S. Information Agency being criticized, in my opinion, it should be supported by the American people. We must have an information program armed with facts to compete with the massive instrument of Soviet propaganda. On both sides, we need to know more about one another. I say, go and see for yourself. But in doing so, get behind the facade and dig into the real facts about Russia. As more of our citizens go to Russia, I would like to see many more Russians emerge from behind the Iron Curtain and come to the United States to see for themselves our way of life.

I would like to urge all of you to contrast the rise in the standard of living in the United States where we have what has been called the continuing revolution with that of Russia. I think you will be astonished at how far we have come in such a short time. This represents another problem in communication. Many people in the world think that the United States somehow has always been a rich country with a high standard of living. This is not true. Arm yourself with facts and get the true story across to your foreign friends. We have come a long way in the past 50 years, a fantastically long way. This progress has not been accomplished at the expense of our democratic ideals, nor wrung from the sweat and blood of the American people.

As you travel and work abroad, communicate to our foreign friends that we are not trying to cast the rest of the world in our image. We do want them to understand that we are ready and willing to help them along the road to economic progress and with no political strings attached. We believe that social and economic progress in any country is a contribution toward our own search for peace and prosperity in a world of greater abundance for all.

Speaking of contrasts between systems of government, compare the Mexican Revolution with that of Russia. Here we have a great neighboring nation, dedicated to the ways of freedom and justice, a nation that continues to achieve extraordinary economic and social progress as each year passes. Next year—1960—Mexico will celebrate the 150th anniversary of her first revolution, that of 1810 when the Grito of Dolores, the cry of revolt, was heard from the doors of a little church in Dolores. Next year, Mexico will also celebrate the 50th anniversary of her revolution of 1910, the uprising which set the framework for modern Mexico. In all its phases, the Mexican Revolution, to use Lincoln's words, has been a revolution of the people, by the people, and for the people, and not as was the revolution in Russia—for the glorification of party and state against individual freedom and the pursuit of happiness.

Possibly you would be interested in a few additional comments about your neighbor, Mexico, and the other countries of Latin America. Here we find a vast area, rich in resources with an exploding population, industrializing rapidly, an area that shares our democratic ideals, an area making enormous progress. Here we find a dynamic part of our three Americas—North America, Central America, and South America—with which we are vitally concerned, and with which we must intensify the whole range of our relations. Here we find an area which is an important bastion of the free world, where proud nations cherish their freedom and independence.

Working together under modern conditions means the creation of a long-range, mutually helpful pattern for cooperation. It does not mean thinking of Latin America in terms of occasional, one-shot profitable deals. It means that constructive, workable solutions must be found for the problems of inter-American trade. We have to think in terms of a mutually beneficial balance for the long pull. I am happy to say that my experience in Latin America has shown me that the vast majority of American firms operating in the area do think and act in exactly these terms of long-range, mutual interest.

The economic opportunities lying ahead for Latin America, as in our own country, are beset with many problems. In our search for ways to work with Latin American countries to solve these problems, we have recently been carefully reexamining our policies. Within the last 2 years, a number of constructive moves have been made, including our participation in a billion dollar inter-American bank designed to accelerate economic development. This idea, I might add,

originated with Mexico at the first Inter-American conference in Washington in 1889.

We have also been reexamining our policies with regard to one of the most critical problems affecting numerous Latin American countries, stability and fair prices for key raw materials. The leveling of the peaks and the valleys in the supply and the prices of raw materials present a formidable problem which must be solved. Some feel strongly that stability can only be achieved by international price or quota agreements such as that which has operated well for many years for the sugar industry. Why, the question arises, cannot this type of agreement operate equally well in the case of coffee and cotton and other basic agricultural and mineral products? Others strongly question the feasibility or desirability of the commodity agreement approach. Still others feel that the long-term solution for individual Latin American countries lies in greater diversification of production and increased industrialization. Much serious attention is also being given to the gradual development of broader commercial and economic unification within the Latin American area—that is, the common market idea.

I make this reference to some of the basic Latin American problems in order to underline their importance. For if the Western Hemisphere is to achieve that needed progress in economic development that so many millions of our fellow Americans to the south insist upon, these problems must be solved. Inevitably, they will be solved through increasingly intensified inter-American cooperation. The challenge to us all is to find the most practical and workable means to accelerate this cooperative spirit. I say challenge to us all because, as many of you go abroad to Latin America on your individual business pursuits, you—even as individuals—will see and feel the effects of these broad problems. Therefore, it is up to you as individually responsible leaders to think beyond your immediate concerns and to contribute in every way you possibly can in both idea and action toward the solution of these problems. This is the way in which you will be real representatives abroad of the United States of America.

In these remarks on this very important evening of your lives, I have tried to indicate to you some aspects of the challenge we face as a nation and as individuals. From the very nature of the American Institute for Foreign Trade and my previous visit to your school, I know that you here have eager, inquiring minds. When you arrive at your foreign post, get out and mix with the people. Exchange ideas with your foreign friends. Learn to speak their language. Make a positive contribution to the ideals and institutions of the free world.

May God bless you in your various assignments.

[From the Mexico City Excelsior, June 5, 1959]

DICTATORSHIP OR FREEDOM

The continuing dilemma that is the essence of the road that the individual, society, or the state is to choose—the dilemma in which man must decide between dictatorship or freedom—has seldom been set forth with such clarity of decision as was done by Ambassador Robert C. Hill in his speech in Phoenix, Ariz.

Without resorting to the subtleties or trickeries of language, avoiding somber or threatening tones, deleting the tedious and vain expressions "I saw" and "I know," without praising some and insulting others, Mr. Hill, in the comprehensive address to which we refer, set before the world the need for choosing between the road to freedom and the road to dictatorship.

In referring to the road to freedom, Mr. Hill accurately pointed to one of the most outstanding events of our day, the Mexican Revolution.

In fact, how great is the difference between the Mexicans of 1910 clamoring for the public liberties and the Russians of 1917 establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. And what an extraordinary difference between one movement, made up of the Mexican people of 1910, and the intellectual sedition which took place in Russia in 1917.

The Mexican Revolution may have made great, extremely great, errors; but all was saved because its leaders did not—like the Russians—demand the establishment of a violent dictatorship for the benefit of an intelligent oligarchy instead of a democracy for the welfare of the people.

Let us not consider wherein Ambassador Hill's speech may benefit his country in its struggle against international communism. But let us make the necessary and thorough considerations about the usefulness of such a document to the doctrine of independence and sovereignty of peoples, to public and civil freedom of Mexico and the world and to the guarantee of a reign of permanent justice.

WITHOUT DOORS OR WINDOWS

Our country * * * is more than just a flagbearer for a social issue as a consequence of the revolution; our country has been and is the champion of freedom.

Consequently, if we are to defend ourselves against communism and to safeguard Mexico against the dictatorship of the proletariat and against Soviet propaganda, we must rely on the high dedication to liberty of all Mexicans. * * * Freedom represents good as against the evil of Sovietization. * * * Mexico is a nation without doors and without windows. * * * Mexico is a country without secrets because Mexico loves and practices collective freedom.

We allow strangers freedom of movement. * * * Because our people love and respect public freedom—the strongest wall against communism—there never has been an attempt to curb freedom of the press or freedom of expression.

Therefore, Ambassador Hill's opinion fills us with pride and satisfaction. * * * The U.S. diplomat asks that more and more Soviet citizens visit and study his country, the United States. We repeat that Mexico's doors are wide open to all, with the exception of those whose aims are to create chaos or to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat or any other dictatorship.

[From the Mexico City El Universal Grafico, June 5, 1959]

THE PAPER TIGER

The statements made in Phoenix, Ariz., by Mr. Robert C. Hill, U.S. Ambassador in Mexico, have been widely commented upon throughout the world. Among other things, Mr. Hill stressed the contrast between the Mexican revolution, which was truly a people's revolution, and the Russian revolution, which had as its purpose the glorification of the Communist Party. Mr. Hill also said that the Chinese Communists use the term "paper tiger" to describe the United States. "It would appear to me," said the Ambassador, "that this term should apply instead to the Soviet Union."

The distinguished diplomat then went on to describe some of the observations he made during his recent trip to the Soviet Union, where he saw for himself that the much-talked-about Soviet power was inferior to that of the United States.

But the most important part of Mr. Hill's statements was the reference to "the brutal truth of Soviet tyranny, which, like every tyrannical regime in history, is built on the sweat, blood, and misery of its own people, while its leaders have the gall to boast of economic progress." However, what he did not say—and undoubtedly not because he ignores it—is that, as far as propaganda is concerned, the Soviets are ahead of the United States and of other countries. Of course, this propaganda costs money, much money, obtained with the blood and sweat of the oppressed peoples; but undoubtedly this propaganda has had results. Europe first, then Asia, and now America have seen how the clever and cunning farce, the great lie of the Red paradise, infiltrates and penetrates to such an extent that it makes some converts who believe blindly that the Communist regime is better than the democratic form of government.

All of America is saturated with Red propaganda. And it has been positively established that most of this literature is produced by the Soviet Embassy in Mexico. When we were children, our grandparents used to scare us with the childish threat "Ahi viene el coco" ("Here comes the scarecrow"). History now repeats itself. Moscow is trying to scare us again. But the Russian scarecrow is outdated. The world knows that Khrushchev's threats are nothing but bravado. Russia will never dare to attack the Western Powers because she would lose the war as she has lost them all. She wants to dominate the world but * * * with propaganda. She wants to enslave humanity but with fairy tales. But the Kremlin leaders should remember that all fairy tales, no matter how long, have an end. And this end may be closer than they think.

[From the Mexico City El Zocalo, June 8, 1959]

HILL'S SPEECH: TWO REVOLUTIONS

Speaking in Phoenix, Ariz., before the graduates of the Foreign Trade Institute, the U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, Robert C. Hill, uncovered the Communist farce, pointed to the brutal tyranny which reigns in Russia and in the satellite countries, and then showed the contrast which exists between the Mexican revolution and the revolution of 1917, which the Bolshevik Party used to take over Russia.

With firmness of thought, the Ambassador pointed out that our revolution could be described as truly a revolution of the people, by the people, and for the people—to use Lincoln's unforgettable words. On the other hand, the Russian revolution served only to glorify the party and to crush individual freedom and human dignity.

The North American diplomat spoke of our efforts, of our struggle, of our aspirations and of our customs and, in every one of his statements, he emphasized above all that Mexico is a country where the revolution has brought about a regime of dignity and unity.

Speaking of the Soviet Union, he defined it as a "paper tiger," stating that the West must not let itself develop a fear complex and must look behind the facade of Soviet imperialistic communism and see the humiliations and sufferings which it has brought to its peoples. For, after all, Russia has built its power on slavery. And this cannot possibly be compared to the strength of civic consciousness which our revolution has brought about in its 50 years of existence.

History has proven that Marxism-Leninism is inadequate both as a philosophy and as a science. And the main reason for this is first of all that this doctrine ignores human values and secondly that it is based on hatred and the negation of the concept of patriotism.

To illustrate that this is true, we wish to point out that in the difficult hours of World War II when Hitler's hordes invaded hundreds of square kilometers of the territory of the Soviet Union, the propaganda for the defense of the latter country was not based on Marxist dialectics, on Leninist positions, or on doctrines originated by Stalin. Holy Russia was used again as a theme. Holy Russia was invoked by those who, shortly before, were denying the concept of patriot-

ism and were propounding the concept of internationals based on class struggle.

The Russian revolution of 1917 was marred from its very birth. It was marred because the dictatorship of the proletariat implied the very negation of any sense of unity and signified the taking over of power by a group representing an absolute minority lacking any sense of patriotism.

The state which the Russians call a Socialist state is a denial of freedom; it is a state which expropriates the national wealth of the country at the cost of the slavery of large masses of people. Therefore, the Russian revolution was neither of the people, by the people nor for the people.

Democracy is nothing but a system of political organization under which, for the benefit of the people, the people themselves elect their representatives who govern in their name and who, with the people's support, plan the development and progress of the country.

The mere use of the word "democracy" does not guarantee the government is truly a democratic one. Just like other things in life which can be imitated and falsified, there is a counterfeit democracy, an imitated democracy, a false democracy.

But Mexico has established a political and economic system perfectly adjusted to its needs in which the collective interest is guaranteed by constitutional norms which reflect the common aspiration.

But above all, the noteworthy, the most definitive aspect of the Mexican revolution was to have brought about a political system which encourages the struggle for unity and exalts the concept of patriotism.

For a country to be truly free, these rights which our Constitution upholds must be fully guarded * * * these rights which are ours and which no Mexican will ever allow to be violated.

Furthermore, the constant preoccupation with progress and social justice is linked in our minds to absolute respect for human dignity. We do not want and cannot conceive of collective concepts based on slavery.

The U.S. Ambassador to Mexico—who lives among us and whose skill, warmth and personality no one can deny—has proven that he has understood the very essence of our revolution and, in comparing it with the Russian revolution, he has truly pointed out the abyss which separates the two: It is the difference between the negative hatred represented by the concept of class struggle and the firm and coherent concept of nationalism without xenophobia and of progress without slavery.

[From the Mexico City Excelsior, June 6, 1959]

TRUTH: A SECRET WEAPON

We want to underline other parts of the important speech made by Ambassador Hill in Phoenix, Ariz. They confirm the fact that democracy's most powerful secret weapon against Soviet totalitarianism is truth.

Whereas U.S.S.R. propaganda disseminates lies throughout the world for the purpose of impressing naive people with a supposed technical, social, and economic development, Hill urges that all facilities be accorded to the people on the other side of the Iron Curtain so that they can travel to the United States to see for themselves and compare the high standard of living enjoyed by U.S. workers.

Ambassador Hill urges his countrymen to display U.S. prosperity as the best weapon against Russian lies. "Why don't we seriously consider the possibility of arranging for visits of important Soviet leaders?" asks the U.S. Ambassador. "Why don't we show them what the United States really is?"

An article in the New York Times magazine, by William A. Jordan, expresses more or less the same idea. The writer points out that "experts in Soviet affairs say that more important to Kremlin leaders than preventing foreigners from seeing too much of Soviet life is preventing their own people from witnessing living conditions in other countries. The Russian man in the street thinks that his living conditions are not as good as those of North Americans, but he has no idea as to how different they really are. Nor does he realize that he enjoys much less of the good things of life than the people of almost all other European countries."

The realization of the contrast between slavery and liberty, between a life of privation and a life filled with comfort and abundance—that is, the difference between the U.S.S.R. and the United States—is the best and most powerful weapon that democratic nations can wield in the cold war against Communist imperialism. The secret weapon most feared by the U.S.S.R. is truth, and this explains the Iron Curtain and Soviet propaganda geared to maintain a situation that is possible only through isolation and lies.

ECONOMIC BALANCE

Better relations between the countries of our hemisphere cannot be achieved while there is a tremendous economic difference between countries and while Latin American nations are forced to sell raw products and to buy manufactured goods at the prices set by economically powerful nations which control the world market.

Resentments will disappear only when an economic balance is achieved on this continent, when imports and exports are balanced and disadvantageous competition, which causes the ruin of countries with limited resources, is abolished. Through long and sinister experience, Latin America knows that for charming expressions of cooperation and solidarity to be believed they must be based on fair treatment, without one-sided privileges.

Ambassador Hill agrees with us in envisaging this goal as he set forth in his recent speech at Phoenix, Ariz., during graduation week at the American Institute for Foreign Trade. He specified that "working together under modern conditions means establishing a system of far-reaching cooperation that will be mutually useful. It does not mean thinking of Latin America only in regard to occasional momentary and greatly profitable business deals. It means the need for finding constructive and useful solutions to the problems of inter-American commerce. We must think in terms of balance that will in the end be of mutual benefit. * * * One of the most critical problems affecting numerous countries in Latin America is that of fair and stable prices for key materials. * * * Some people feel stability can only be achieved by setting international prices or quota agreements, such as those governing the sugar industry. Why would not the same type of agreement be equally useful in the case of coffee, cotton and other agricultural products and basic minerals?"

Considering present crises in relation to coffee, cotton, zinc and other Latin American products, Ambassador Hill's statements are of current interest and it is to be hoped that they will be taken into consideration by U.S. political and economic leaders. In order to affirm the ties which unite the free peoples of America before the totalitarian threat of the U.S.S.R., we must be, reciprocally, good friends and associates.

Hill emphasized that "our problems should be solved by means of ever-increasing inter-American cooperation. * * * The challenge to us all consists in finding the most practical way of strengthening this spirit of cooperation," he said, "in order to reach an economic balance without which the prosperity of American nations is impossible. No effective alliance can be based on inequality; lasting friendship and business association demand mutual respect of our real and common interests."

Report on Arbitration by the Commission on the Administration of Justice in New York State

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House I include herewith a report on the subject of arbitration procedures in the courts made by the Commission on the Administration of Justice in New York State. This report refers to the satisfactory results as the result of arbitration procedures achieved under Mr. Justice Nathan Sweedler, former justice of the Municipal Court of the city of New York. It reads as follows:

Arbitration as a process intended to supplement, not supplant the work of the court, is a more effective method of disposition than conciliation. Although the rules governing arbitration have been in effect since 1917, they have hitherto received small attention.

In April 1932, Justice Sweedler, of Brooklyn, initiated a plan under which he offers voluntary arbitration to the parties in each action coming before him. Broadly speaking, his purpose was twofold: to make real use of the municipal court arbitration rules and to help relieve calendar congestion. He himself provides a certain number of arbitrators, any one of whom, the parties may choose to arbitrate their controversy. He has obtained the services of many prominent attorneys and laymen.

As soon as the parties have presented themselves to the arbitrator, he causes them to sign an agreement binding them to accept the results of the arbitration. The plaintiff and defendant then tell their stories, on the basis of which the arbitrator makes his award and the court enters judgment.

It was observed that, while attorneys were present, they took little part in the proceedings, the arbitrator acting as judge and counsel. Because he could dispense with the rules of evidence, much time was saved. Litigants seemed satisfied with the results of arbitration, possibly because of the attitude of the arbitrators, one of whom explained in each case why he held as he did. In one case, the arbitrator, after holding for the plaintiff, brought about an agreement that the plaintiff would not press for payment until the defendant obtained a position.

Attorneys, also, were favorably disposed toward arbitration. Their reaction was, however, that they would be more willing to arbitrate before a lawyer than a layman.

Both jury and nonjury actions have been arbitrated in the courts presided over by Justice Sweedler. He himself estimates that in about 2 years he has disposed of between 1,500 and 1,800 actions by informal methods of disposition including conciliation and arbitration. He further estimates that, if arbitration and conciliation became settled practices, at least 50 percent of the actions

in the municipal court would be disposed of by these methods of disposition.

The system has had excellent results and has met with general approval. In November 1931, Justice Sweedler, in denying a motion to set aside the award of an arbitrator and restore the case to the trial calendar declared that this was the first objection to the award of an arbitrator in the year and a half during which he had provided facilities for arbitration. (See *Schulter* v. *Lerney*, 142 Misc. Rept. 21.)

There have been several other recent applications of arbitration. On March 6, 1933, Justice McHugh inaugurated in the Second District of the Bronx, a system of arbitration much like Justice Sweedler's except that it applied only to nonjury actions. During the month 142 cases were arbitrated.

During the month of January 1933, in the ninth district in Manhattan, Justice Lauer conducted, in connection with the regular calendar of the court, a special calendar of arbitration. After his appointment as president-justice, the experiment was continued by Justice Roeder. A number of attorneys consented to aid the court and were in daily attendance, prepared to act without compensation as arbitrators and conciliators. Their names were published in advance in the Law Journal. The notice in the Law Journal stated that it was hoped in this way to dispose of twice the usual number of cases. Seventy-five cases were arbitrated. The attorneys acting as arbitrators were circularized by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York for comments and criticisms.

Thus, wherever tried, arbitration has been an unqualified success. Besides doing away with the animosity that often springs up at trials, it provides expeditious and equitable disposal of actions with little if any expense to the litigants or the city. At the same time, wider use of arbitration would measurably decrease the intolerably congested conditions of municipal-court calendars.

The Association of the Bar of the City of New York has several times endorsed arbitration and suggested its extension to the justices of the municipal court.

Amendments to the National Banking Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the House Banking and Currency Committee today favorably reported H.R. 8160.

In connection with the consideration of this bill in subcommittee, of which the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PAUL BROWN], is the chairman, the question was raised about the provision in the bill which dealt with nonnegotiable paper.

In order to clarify the factual situation with reference to such paper, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Honorable Ray Gidney, was requested to furnish certain data.

He has done so in a letter dated July 14, 1959, addressed to the distinguished chairman of Subcommittee No. 2.

In view of the fact that the hearings have already been printed and in order that the membership of the House may be fully apprised of these facts, and at the suggestion of Mr. BROWN, I submit herewith the information as contained in that letter, as follows:

JULY 14, 1959.

Hon. PAUL BROWN,
Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: At our conference a few days ago it was suggested that it would be desirable to have some information as to the reasons for the development of nonnegotiable consumer paper and the amount held by the banks in that form.

It appears that among the reasons for the creation of the consumer installment paper in nonnegotiable form the provisions of State legislation are very important. Following is a brief summary of law provisions for a number of States relating to this matter.

The following States have in force a retail installment sales act which, by its terms, prohibits the taking of a promissory note or other instrument which could cut off defenses of the purchaser in connection with a retail installment sale:

New York: Applies to sale of all commodities.

Pennsylvania: Applies only to sale of motor vehicles.

North Dakota: [1] Applies to sale of all commodities.

The following States have in force a retail installment sales act which does not contain an express prohibition but which provides that the contracts "shall contain all the agreements of the parties":

Connecticut: Applies to sale of all commodities.

Colorado: Applies only to sale of motor vehicles.

Kentucky: Applies only to sale of motor vehicles.

Maryland: Applies to sale of all commodities.

Minnesota: Applies only to sale of motor vehicles.

New Jersey: Applies only to sale of motor vehicles.

Wisconsin: Applies only to sale of motor vehicles.

The following States have in force a retail installment sales act containing neither the express prohibition nor the clause quoted above, but which has specific and detailed requirements as to the provisions of the retail installment contract:

Illinois: Applies to sale of all commodities.

Iowa: Applies only to sale of motor vehicles.

Massachusetts: Applies only to sale of motor vehicles.

Michigan: Applies only to sale of motor vehicles.

Mississippi: Applies only to sale of motor vehicles.

Ohio and Indiana have in force a retail installment sales act which is applicable to the sale of all commodities, and which expressly authorizes the taking of a negotiable instrument in connection with such sale.

We find that aggregate figures for holding of nonnegotiable paper are not presently available, though it is clear that State laws have made the use of this type of obligation necessary for retail consumer installment sales.

From the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System we have obtained the following information showing relative volume of consumer paper acquired direct and by purchase in 1958:

Total of all installment loans acquired by all commercial banks during the calendar year 1958	$14,645,000,000
Aggregate of such loans which were purchased	6,370,000,000
Aggregate of such loans which were originated by the respective banks for their own accounts	8,275,000,000
Total of all installment loans held by all commercial banks as of Dec. 31, 1958	12,730,000,000
Aggregate of such loans which were purchased	5,883,000,000
Aggregate of such loans which were originated by the respective banks for their own accounts	6,847,000,000

It will be noted that of the total installment loans held at December 31, 1958, over 46 percent represented purchased paper of which a very large proportion would be nonnegotiable.

A large New York City bank has given us the following information for all central reserve city banks in New York City. Consumer installment credit totaled $799 million. Of this total, $328 million were in personal loans, usually direct loans on promissory notes and generally in negotiable form; $149 million on consumer installment credit extended for automobiles (new and used) of which about half were on a direct loan basis, and the other half were on dealer-originated nonnegotiable retail installment contract with some form of recourse on the dealer. In actual practice the banks credit check the individual purchasers and rely principally on the purchasers to repay the obligations, although there may be some measure of recourse on the dealer.

Credit outstanding for property improvement purposes totaled $153 million in these banks. The bulk of this is on a direct-loan basis, with negotiable promissory notes either the FHA title I plan or the bank's own plan. Assuming the direct loan part to be about $100 million, there would be about $53 million in such paper which originated with dealers and in a nonnegotiable form. Again, the banks generally credit-check the maker and look to him for repayment, rather than to the originating dealer or contractor for any measure of recourse.

A large Philadelphia bank advises that, of the paper which it has purchased from dealers, between 75 percent and 85 percent is in nonnegotiable form. This is practically necessary to meet the requirements of the uniform commercial code as enacted in Pennsylvania. The bank considers that there is not much difference in the safety of the consumer paper as between nonnegotiable and negotiable.

A moderate-sized Pennsylvania bank with $4 million of consumer credit states it has $1.5 million in automobile loans, practically all taken from dealers and nonnegotiable in form. In response to a question as to whether they could readily evaluate the credit standing of the individual makers of the paper thus acquired, they replied that they could readily do so as they keep their automobile paper segregated by dealers and also have their own credit files on the individual makers. They estimate that 75 percent of the paper would be of a quality which they would be willing to discount without the endorsement of the dealer. They know most of the people in their com-

[1] North Dakota has amended its version of the retail installment sales act by deleting this express prohibition. The new act provides that the contract "shall contain all the agreements of the parties." It is uncertain as to when the new act takes effect.

munity personally and can readily comply with the proposed provision for evaluation of the credit of individual makers.

We learn that New York State and Missouri have amended their laws practically in line with the provisions of section 3(d) of H.R. 8160. The action taken in New York is particularly interesting, and I quote a comment received from a New York City bank concerning it:

"The first—senate introduced No. 856, chapter 984, of the 1958 laws—was prepared under the direction of the New York State Banking Department for the purpose of amending the general lending limits of section 103–1 of the banking law, applicable to State-chartered commercial banks and trust companies (similar amendments were made to section 294–8 of the banking law, applicable to State-chartered industrial banks). We understand that, in drafting this bill, the banking department adopted the principles set forth in the ill-fated Financial Institutions Act of 1957, H.R. 7026, section 24, page 32.

"Apparently there was some confusion as to the applicability of this legislation, and the banking department prepared two new bills for the 1959 session of the legislature—assembly introduced No. 2801, for commercial banks and trust companies; and assembly introduced No. 3007, for industrial banks—which were enacted into law under chapters 701 and 620, respectively. The principal effect of the 1959 legislation was to more precisely define 'installment consumer paper,' as used in the statute. A copy of section 491, referred to in the bills, is enclosed for your information.

"If H.R. 8160 is enacted, national banks doing business in the State of New York then will be on an equal footing with the State-chartered commercial and industrial banks in this area of banking. The larger banks have little interest or concern in this matter, but the smaller banks providing consumer installment credit financing facilities in their respective communities might need the relief afforded by this legislation."

Copies of the New York legislation above mentioned are attached.

I hope that this material will be helpful to the committee.

Sincerely yours,

R. M. GIDNEY,
Comptroller of the Currency.

U.S. Rights in Certain Areas of Antarctic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of a resolution approved by the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies:

ANTARCTICA

Whereas the proposed treaty with 11 other nations regarding scientific harmony in the Antarctic includes as part of the arrangements a freezing of the status quo relative to territorial claims; and

Whereas the United States has made no announcement of Territorial claims in Antarctica although having rights to vast tracts through discovery and exporation; and

Whereas the language of the proposed treaty indicates that the way may be opened for the United Nations to take over the administration of the Antarctic: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American coalition urges the U.S. Government to announce its rightful claims and assert sovereignty over the Antarctic areas discovered by the United States rather than surrrender this sovereignty to the United Nations; and

Resolved, That the American coalition supports the principle of House Joint Resolution 97 declaring the right of sovereignty of the United States over certain areas of the Antarctic Continent.

Federal Construction of the Trinity River Powerplants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have observed a significant change in the tune played by the California public power advocates of Federal construction of the Trinity River powerplants. Nearly a year and a half ago, the House Interior Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation held 8 days of hearings, totaling over 400 pages, on the joint development proposal to construct the Trinity power facilities.

But the committee was not permitted to vote on the bills providing for joint development, although 6 months passed between the time of the extensive hearings and adjournment. I believe it is safe to state that the issue is about where it was 1½ years ago because the voters were lacking at that time to kill the bills in committee. This conclusion is supported by a statement issued on August 22, 1958, by a majority of the House Interior Committee members, urging "that the Secretary of the Interior not request funds, and the Appropriation Committees not approve funds for the Trinity project power facilities until such time as the Congress has had ample opportunity to carefully consider and act on this legislation."

An editorial of June 23, 1959, entitled "Months Delay Last Year—In a Hurry Now," from the Oroville Mercury, of California, emphasizes that partnership opponents are now "in a hurry for action on Trinity power," and that they say, "Congress should appropriate $2.5 million now to begin Federal work on the power features." The article further relates, "Now, without a vote ever having been taken, and with the weeks of the hearings wasted," the Federal construction supporters want "to nullify the whole thing and have Congress do what would cost the country $60 million unnecessarily in caiptal investment. That is bad enough; but when one considers that the city of Sacramento would get the power if the Government developed it, and would get it at half price, while farmers in the Central Valley made up the difference between the Sacramento price and the cost of production—$80 million—it will be seen that there is something very shady in the whole matter." The article concludes with the observation that "the House Appropriations Committee, no doubt having in mind the 'dilatory tactics' employed last year, recently turned down the request for Trinity power funds."

The Petaluma Argus Courier recently stated editorially, "This is one area of Government spending where an economy-minded President can do a little cutting of that spending," and that "it is foolish to spend taxpayers' money on such projects when private industry can do the job and do it at an actual profit for the Government. Under the partnership plan, the taxpayers would be the beneficiaries by many millions of dollars in costs saved and taxes and fees paid by the utility."

On June 23, 1959, Dave Minch's column in the Red Bluff (Calif.) Daily News related that he had talked to many residents of the area near Trinity and was "of the opinion that by far the majority" in this locality "are not in favor of Government development of any project where private capital is available. Several things have caused this change over the last few years. One is that people do not have faith in the efficiency of public development of such projects; another possibly is that quite a percentage of people in this area own stock in the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and believe the Government is interfering in a project that could be developed much more reasonably by private capital. These are, of course, in addition to the enormous amount of taxes that would be lost if the Government did the developing." According to the company's 1958 annual report, which is available to anyone for the asking, Pacific Gas & Electric is owned by 226,180 individual and institutional investors, over 65 percent of whom have California addresses; therefore, it is quite likely, as Mr. Minch mentions, that a number of the company's nearly 150,000 California stockholders reside in the small communities of the Trinity area, such as Red Bluff. Here are some of the "little people" who are part owners of Pacific Gas & Electric and are naturally desirous of their local company's participating in the projects in their localities. This is true public ownership.

Cities Have a Responsibility, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the recent U.S. Conference of Mayors held in Los Angeles was marked by considerable criticism for what one newspaper categorized as "stinginess in Federal aid to cities, particularly in respect to housing and urban renewal."

One of the speakers, a former mayor himself and now a U.S. Senator, was quoted as telling the conference:

I am unable to understand the philosophy of government which treats the cities as beggars at the backdoor. The partnership of Federal and city governments makes sense in politics, because as things stand now, it is the only break through the discriminations practiced against them in so many State legislatures.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this partnership should be a real partnership with a sharing of the responsibilities as well as the costs. As a commentary on the conference regarding the administration policy concerning urban renewal, I include in these remarks an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor for July 13, 1959, which points out very well that the cities and individual landowners have responsibilities, too, and until effective measures are taken by the municipalities, criticism on their part directed toward the Federal Government is often a case of the "pot calling the kettle black":

BATTLING THE SLUM LORDS

American cities, spending billions of their own and Federal tax money to fight slums, have largely overlooked the possibilities of furthering the same aim by fighting slum landlords.

It would be an exaggeration, of course, to say that all owners of slum properties are cheating both their tenants and the other taxpayers of their cities. But many thousands of them are doing just that. And, under existing tax practices, they are being financially encouraged to do so.

In a survey of major American cities made by this newspaper it was found that many such landlords, by chopping up existing dwellings into single rooms, were getting a return on their investment of from 22 to 50 percent per year. At the same time, these landlords often sought (and got) yearly abatements on the amount of local property taxes paid, because of the fast deterioration of their tenements. They also sought (and sometimes got, on the basis of high rental income) big eminent domain payments when their rundown properties were finally taken for slum-clearance projects. And they were meanwhile using property depreciation to reduce income tax payments.

There are several remedies for this apparent official encouragement to slum breeders—remedies consistent with the principle of equitable taxation and careful of the rights of property ownership.

Aside from tight enforcement of building safety codes, probably the most useful remedy lies in the field of property tax assessment. Many tax experts feel appraisal of slum tenements should be based on their income-earning capacity. Others urge that urban land be assessed relatively higher, buildings lower.

Such appraisals would tend to make it unprofitable for landlords to operate dilapidated structures, since their taxes would remain relatively high even when their buildings deteriorated.

The high land assessment formula also tends to encourage the growth of efficient new commercial buildings in slum areas, thus helping to accomplish by justifiable tax control what slum clearance programs now are using tax revenue to accomplish.

In essence this system is a fair method of restoring a realistic tax balance to cities that find themselves burdened with what New Haven's Mayor Richard Lee calls Bowery buildings on Tiffany real estate.

Another remedy now being used in some cities (notably Chicago, St. Louis, Philadelphia, and Baltimore) is that of requiring actual owners of multiple dwellings to register under penalty of fines or jail sentences. This legally difficult system prevents absentee ownership from becoming hidden ownership, and pins down responsibility for repairs and taxes.

We urge all cities facing the slum problem to examine these methods of tightening up on the profiteers who do so much to create slums. Statistics indicate why tax-bought renewal and rehabilitation programs cannot alone overtake the growth of new slums unless some such preventive techniques are also adopted. Some 12 million city dwellings in the United States are defective. One out of every four city dwellers lives in a slum.

For these slum-dwellers and for the heavy-hit taxpayers who support the war on slums through Federal and local levies, it is only just that existing government checks on urban real estate be tightened to catch those who now make money by creating new slums.

U.S.S. "Long Beach" Christened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a significant event in the history of seapower occurred Tuesday with the christening of the U.S.S. *Long Beach* at the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co.'s Quincy, Mass., yard. The 14,000-ton, 761-foot-long *Long Beach* will be powered by two atomic reactors and be armed solely with guided missiles. The ship is our Navy's and our country's first nuclear powered surface ship. Under command of Capt. Eugene P. Wilkinson, first skipper of the U.S.S. *Nautilus*, the *Long Beach* undoubtedly will create as much history on the seas' surface as did Wilkinson's prior command beneath the seas. Atomic Energy Commissioner Harold S. Vance made the following appropriate remarks on the occasion of the christening:

It is a pleasure and an honor to participate in this historic launching of the U.S.S. *Long Beach*, our first nuclear powered naval surface ship.

I am sure this event is one of pride for this old shipbuilding community, whose contributions to the development of the United States as a world seapower date back to the construction of the Yankee Clipper ships. Just as those early ships were constructed to gain our freedom as a maritime Nation, the *Long Beach*, a revolutionary naval vessel, is being constructed to guarantee that this freedom is not destroyed. A product of the missile and atomic age, this magnificant naval vessel with her two powerful nuclear engines, will be free to travel the seas for unprecedented distances at high sustained speed. Her endurance and mobility will far outstrip her conventional predecessors. She is the *Nautilus* of our surface naval forces. This nuclear powered cruiser will pave the way for the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, the *Enterprise*, being built at Newport News, and the nuclear-powered guided missile destroyer leader, the *Bainbridge*, whose keel was laid recently at this Bethlehem yard. These ships are the forerunners of our nuclear powered surface Navy, just as the *Nautilus* provided the technological basis for our nuclear-powered submarine fleet.

The progress represented by these surface ships is particularly noteworthy when one reflects that less than 5 years have passed since the first atomic-powered ship, the *Nautilus*, went to sea. In that brief period the Atomic Energy Commission, in cooperation with the Navy, has developed or has under development 8 different types of naval nuclear propulsion plants designed to power many types of submarines and surface vessels. They range from a plant to drive the small hunter-killer submarines, the *Tullibee*, up to the *Enterprise*, powered by 8 reactors. I doubt that many scientific fields have seen as intense a development effort over so short a period of time as has been the case for naval nuclear propulsion. The conversion of the Navy to nuclear power is well underway.

I hope we all can appreciate the stirring challenge that has been presented to this shipyard with the construction of its first nuclear-powered ship and that we are all well aware of the changes that have had to be made to face up to the new and higher plateau of design, production, and quality control that is intrinsic to the construction of any nuclear powerplant, especially one which has to operate in the stringent confines of naval application and with the reliability and safety essential to a successful naval vessel. Those of us who are experienced in the shipbuilding business know that the hardest part of the job is still ahead; is will be a test of the very character of this yard, and all of its technical talent.

We recognize too, that to fabricate the new materials and components unique to the naval nuclear program, industry has been required to develop new production techniques and extend industrial skills to new heights of technical accomplishments.

We of the Atomic Energy Commission are proud of our association with the Navy in the design, development and construction of this important ship. The reactor plant for this ship and its land-based prototype now operating in Idaho, were developed at the AEC's Bettis Laboratory operated by the Westinghouse Electric Corp. The effective integration of the AEC, Westinghouse, Bethlehem, and Navy efforts that are being applied to this ship was made possible by the unique organizational setup which has been so successful in the development of the *Nautilus*, the *Seawolf*, the *Skate*, and the *Skipjack*. I am referring of course to the unified direction of this entire Naval nuclear propulsion development program by Vice Admiral Rickover who acts for both the Navy and the AEC in these matters.

Like many other military developments, the naval nuclear power program has produced innumerable benefits to our civilian programs. The nuclear powerplants developed at the Atomic Energy Commission's Bettis and Knolls Atomic Power Laboratories, although highly classified in themselves, have provided to the entire atomic power industry basic knowledge in the fields of physics, chemistry, shielding, radiation, metallurgy and heat transfer. Much of the technology of our civilian power program is based on naval nuclear propulsion developments. It is heartening to know that the great efforts which go into these military programs have peaceful derivatives which we expect will have widespread benefits in other fields.

The seagoing operation of the *Long Beach* will serve as the real proof testing of the many technical concepts and the pattern of developments that have led to her nuclear plant design. Personnel assigned to operate this plant have been carefully selected and intensely trained not only to operate the controls but to understand the basis and

limitations of their design. Operating experiences from such personnel will provide a valuable addition to our reactor technology and broaden the base of knowledge upon which plants of the future will be designed.

The United States has achieved world leadership in the development and application of atomic power for naval propulsion. The construction of this cruiser is direct evidence of our intention to maintain the technical lead in this field. To the men in the Navy who conceived it, to the many industrial concerns that furnished the components, to the shipbuilding industry who built it, this ship is a great tribute. The AEC is proud of its partnership with the Navy and industry in accomplishing this task.

Chicago Captures the Heart of Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to the beloved Bing Morris, who left our own Congressional Hotel 3 years ago to take over the Park Plaza in Toronto, for an editorial in the Toronto Telegram of July 7, 1959, which I am extending my remarks to include. Bing writes me:

I find in the 3 years I have been here that Toronto papers are neither pro nor anti-American but call the shots as they see them. That they saw, in Chicago's welcome to the Queen, an unusual warmth is really a tribute to your constituency.

The editorial follows:

THE QUEEN CONQUERS CHICAGO

The whole of North America has taken the Queen to its heart, so what could be a more appropriate place for the most tumultuous welcome of her tour than Chicago, the geographical heart of the continent.

Chicago is many things to many people, but to all people it is a city of wonderful superlatives, always breaking new ground to achieve the biggest and the best. In its welcome to the Queen, it was true to style.

With a quarter of a mile of red carpet and an expansive greeting, Chicago showed its good neighborliness as a great city of great people.

It was left to Elizabeth, the symbol of all that is good in government and the descendant of George the Third, the king who started the feuding in the English-speaking family, to draw from Chicago the final evidence of its great heart.

The Queen swept through the Windy City adored, cheered, and applauded by millions. Few cities on this continent, none in Canada, could have staged such a populous welcome. But Chicago was just trying to give the little lady a good time.

The affection that so many people feel for Chicago begins to take meaning. Carl Sandburg, the poet of Chicago, wrote affectionately of his dynamic hometown as: "the hog butcher of the world, toolmaker, stacker of wheat, player with railroads and the Nation's freight handler; stormy, husky, brawling city of the big shoulders."

Sure it, is all these things, but it is more. Beneath its roughness is a heart that beats for a continent, a heart that is a true symbol of pioneer America. It chases prosperity, but it can stop to show a warm heart to a visiting queen from a friendly neighbor.

In doing so, Chicago has made many new friends on this side of the border. Well done, Chicago, we couldn't have done better ourselves. We're glad you like our Queen. Chicago has qualified for honorary membership in the Canadian Confederation.

Maybe, one of these days, Toronto will have the honor of saluting the head of the American Union. We will never be able to exceed the standard set by Chicago, but perhaps we can arrange to spread out a half mile of red carpet for the President, one of these days.

Hospital and Surgical Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 23, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means on H.R. 4700, known as the Forand bill, to provide medical care for the elderly under the OSAI, are proving to be very thought provoking. Indeed, the subject is controversial and there seems to be a sharply drawn line between the reasoning of opponents and proponents of the bill.

A Texas witness, Dr. Milford O. Rouse, past president of the Texas Medical Association and current president of the Southwestern Medical Association, testified in opposition to the bill. I would like to present both the testimony of Dr. Rouse and an editorial from the Dallas Morning News—Dallas, Tex.—dated July 15, 1959, entitled "Blueprint for Socialism":

STATEMENT OF THE TEXAS MEDICAL ASSOCIATION ON H.R. 4700 BEFORE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BY MILFORD O. ROUSE, M.D., JULY 16, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Dr. Milford O. Rouse of Dallas, Tex. I am appearing here as a representative of the Texas Medical Association. I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before you, and to discuss with you the views of the medical profession in our State concerning the provisions of H.R. 4700.

The medical profession of Texas is acutely aware of its great responsibility to make available the best medical care possible for the aged as well as for the State's entire population of more than 9 million. We are particularly cognizant of the existence of certain medical care problems among our senior citizens. We fully concur that efforts to resolve existing problems should be continued and increased.

Nevertheless, we do not agree with advocates of H.R. 4700 as to the nature and extent of existing problems, nor as to the means of resolving them. In a State steeped in the traditions of individual liberty and initiative, we feel that the voluntary private approach should continue to be utilized to provide hospital and surgical benefits for older persons. Permit me to summarize the basis of our opposition to this legislation, and to report the positive approach which is being pursued vigorously in our State.

The policymaking body of our 8,000-member association repeatedly has expressed its opposition to H.R. 4700 and similar legislation. The basis of our position is as follows:

First, and foremost, we feel that hospital and surgical services for the aged can and should be handled in keeping with the American traditions of free enterprise. Blue Cross-Blue Shield of Texas and the private insurance companies have demonstrated their ability to meet the extensive insurance needs of the growing population of our State.

Second, we oppose Federal intervention in medicine because it is detrimental to the doctor-patient relationship and to good medical care. We believe that each illness is a personal problem which is of primary concern to the patient and to the doctor and not to an expensive third party like the Government. We oppose Federal intervention because we believe that the patient should have unrestricted free choice in selecting a doctor. We also believe that the doctor owes his unqualified responsibility directly to the patient and not to a Federal agency which might use the individual's tax contributions in order to pay for his medical bills.

Third, H.R. 4700 actually is national compulsory health insurance. It embraces the principle of Government regulation of professional fees, wages, prices, and services.

Fourth, we do not feel it will solve the primary problem of financing medical care for the aged. In our State, for example, only 42½ percent of the aged are covered by social security benefits.

And fifth, this legislation will result in higher taxes, and less take-home pay for all covered by social security. It also will impose another tax burden on the employer. It could result in the fiscal wrecking of the entire social security system.

Permit me to report that the Texas Medical Association is fully engaged in a multiphased program which is designed to alleviate many existing problems related to medical and surgical services for the aged. Following preliminary investigation, the association's committee on voluntary health insurance reported that a need does exist for a tailormade insurance plan for the 675,000 Texans who are 65 years of age or older. The committee has asked Blue Cross-Blue Shield of Texas to undertake a fact-finding survey related to all aspects of medical care for the aged. We believe that at the completion of this study that we will have far more accurate information than presently is available. With these facts on hand, our committee will formulate a realistic plan of coverage for the aged, a plan designed to fulfill those needs which are brought out in the survey. The Texas House of Delegates has authorized Blue Cross-Blue Shield to initiate the plan, and I am pleased to report that it will be introduced in October.

Several other positive programs are worthy of brief mention. The association's committee on voluntary health insurance has embarked upon a comprehensive plan designed to control the costs of medical care, and to keep the availability of good medical care within the reach of as many individuals as possible. The Texas Medical Association's committee on aging has been very active. It presently is completing an intensive educational and informational program among the profession. The committee, in cooperation with the American Medical Association, conducted a very successful regional conference on aging in Dallas. Another State conference is in the planning stage, and likely will be presented at the Texas Medical Association's annual meeting next April. In addition to its independent activities, the Texas Medical Association is cooperating with many other State organizations which hold the primary responsibility for health services. This past April our State Association joined with the Texas Hospital Association, the Texas Dental Association and the Texas Association of Nursing Home Operators to form the Texas Joint Council To Improve the Health Care of the Aged. This Council is exploring the entire spectrum of problems relating to the aged and the aging process. During the past 18 months, the association has been working closely

with private insurance carriers and Blue Cross-Blue Shield to encourage a million more Texans to procure voluntary health insurance.

In summary, we in Texas believe that this legislation is unwise and not needed. We believe that private, individual care is greatly superior, and far less expensive, than Government medicine. We hope that you will reject the proposed legislation which is before you. In this way, you will be endorsing the philosophy of free enterprise which has given the United States the highest quality of medical care in the world today.

Thank you very much.

[From the Dallas Morning News, July 15, 1959]

BLUEPRINT FOR SOCIALISM

A blueprint for American socialism is now on display in Washington. It is the Forand bill on medical care. Since 1935 the pseudo-Socialists in Washington have been trying to put the Federal Government in charge of all medicine.

The Forand bill would extend Government aid for medical expenses to those receiving social security benefits. Sixteen million persons—mostly over 65—would get hospital, surgical, and nursing home treatment under a Government-run program.

The Government would contract to pay hospitals, nursing homes, physicians, and dentists for their services. Estimated cost for the first 2 years is $2 billion, but as more and more reach 65 that cost would soar.

The bill would be paid by everyone who pays social security taxes. Already those taxes are scheduled to reach 9 percent of the payroll up to $4,800—in the years ahead.

But the staggering cost is not the worst feature of it. This is the entering wedge for socialism on all fronts. If this bill passes, it will be amended in the future to apply to all persons on social security rolls at all ages.

Once the medical profession is socialized, then journalism, law, engineering, and every other profession and business will be attacked.

Washington has no more business providing free medical care to people over 65 than it does to provide them shoes and bread and automobiles. That is the point made by Dallas Representative BRUCE ALGER in hearings on the bill Monday: Existence of a problem in this country, like medical care, does not justify Government control to solve it.

The British have had socialized medicine 11 years. A recent survey showed that an average waiting period of 4 months is necessary for a child's tonsillectomy. There is little freedom in choosing doctors. The doctors spend more time in filling out government forms than in treating illnesses.

Medical care is a problem for any family—and why? Because most families do not budget for it. They budget for a car, for food, clothes, entertainment—but gamble they will not be sick. It's an unpleasant thought, and unpleasant thoughts are put into the background. When trouble hits, the money is not there.

Is that a valid reason for the Federal Government to step in and provide the service? Should it do the same thing if you get behind on your car payments?

Either this country stops the steady push toward socialistic services or it goes headlong into them. That is the issue with the Forand bill.

Shall We Keep Our Cake?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by Wendell E. Long of the Bennett County Booster, Martin, S. Dak.

Mr. Long very aptly describes the change in philosophy which has taken place in this country in recent years from the time when a man assumed it was his own responsibility to provide for himself and his family, to the present time when Uncle Sam is expected to provide this security. His editorial is as follows:

[From the Bennett County Booster, Martin, S. Dak., July 9, 1959]

SHALL WE KEEP OUR CAKE?

Millions of Americans no longer go into and out of debt, as their forebears did. Today's family goes into debt when it starts as a family and stays there indefinitely.

Car dealers say that the most ideal prospect for a new one is the man who is just about to make his final payment on the bus he now drives.

Nowadays, management of the family finances has passed from the household to the bank or finance company. What's left after the first-of-the-month payments are made is left for day-to-day living.

And Americans seem to like it this way.

No one seems to give a serious thought about the problem of making payments when the breadwinner is out of a job.

Perhaps, this can be attributed somewhat to inflation which has resulted in a whole new generation having grown up in an era when jobs hunt men, not vice versa.

Full employment is not only a political necessity, it appears to be a matter of life and death for most of us.

This desperate need for full employment fostered by loss of household management of finances, the Booster believes, is a dominant factor in the continually stronger demand for "cradle to the grave" security.

The most deplorable thing about this security trend is that it is impossible to achieve in a democratic, capitalistic state.

"Cradle to the grave" security can be provided only by an all-powerful organization or group that can own, control and equitably distribute all wealth. Of course, such an organization could only be government.

That of course, is communism. And a communistic state can offer cradle-to-the-grave security.

But on the other hand, it destroys all the individual initiative to get ahead. There is no reason for any person to exert any extra effort to accomplish any task or any great feat because there is no reward.

Let's take a good look at our present system. Except for dipping our fingers slightly into socialism, it is still every man's responsibility to provide for himself and his family. If he works hard, puts forth his best effort and honestly seeks out his place in life, he may be reasonably assured of financial security for himself and his family. The less effort, the less work and the less determination he exhibits, the less security he will be able to provide.

In other words, the need for people to provide their own security and their own standard of living is the driving force that makes great accomplishments possible.

That driving force has built the United States to its present position in the world and given its citizens the highest standard of living ever known to man.

Now, instead of allowing the same system to continue, we have allowed our success to go to our heads. We take for granted our high standard of living and have lost sight of the fact that it is possible only through sincere and unrelenting effort.

We want to shirk our responsibilities, exert less effort in return for greater rewards, and generally pass off all our problems to someone else to solve.

In other words, we are trying to get rid of the driving force that gave us our great wealth and still enjoy the benefits.

It can't be done. We cannot have a high standard of living and cradle-to-the-grave security at the same time. We cannot eat our cake and have it, too.

United States Should Make Claims in Antarctica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many Members will be interested in what David Mills had to say about U.S. claims to certain areas in Antarctica in one of his radio broadcasts. I am inserting it in the Appendix of the RECORD for their information:

Exploration of the Antarctic Continent was greatly widened during the recent International Geophysical Year. To plan the indefinite continuation of such joint exploration, President Eisenhower has proposed an international conference of 12 nations. But 3 months of diplomatic discussion of the idea has failed to reach any agreement.

The stumbling block is the President's suggestion that for the duration of such exploration all claims to territory in Antarctica should be frozen. Congressional critics feared this would prejudice our own rights by opening the door wide for Soviet exploration which the Communists would use later to claim territory for themselves. The congressional suspicions are confirmed: The Soviets object to the President's plan precisely because they fear it would prevent them from establishing claims they do not now have.

The Reds are already planning a very large exploration program for next season which would carry them into almost all corners of Antarctica.

Seven countries have laid claim to Antarctica territory, either on the basis of discovery, or on the argument that the regions of Antarctica opposite their lands should be theirs. These claims overlap and none of these seven wishes to prejudice their supposed rights.

Although the United States has done the major part of Antarctic exploration, it has claimed nothing, and does not recognize the claims of others. The purpose of the President's suggestion was to keep the continent open for peaceful scientific research, but the failure of the diplomats to agree suggests that the alternative approach might be much more effective. That is for the United States to claim all that it has explored and iron out conflicts with the other seven claimants. This would leave no room for a Soviet foothold in Antarctica, and the proprietors could permit all the peaceful exploration their hearts desire.

Fourth of July Message: "Wake Up, America"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on July 4, the Fort Lauderdale News printed a fine editorial "Wake Up, America," which I believe will be of interest to all Members. In the hope that the comments of Editor Jack Gore will be an inspiration and a stern warning, I have requested that it be printed here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FOURTH OF JULY MESSAGE: "WAKE UP, AMERICA"

(By Jack W. Gore)

We have often wondered in recent years if Americans of this generation would ever have the courage and the fortitude to defend their liberties with the same determined attitude that their forefathers did when they broke away from English rule and fought a bitter war against overwhelming odds to establish their God-given right to govern themselves.

Somehow, it seems, as this Nation grows older, larger, more prosperous and more powerful, our people tend to become less appreciative of the heritages handed down to them by past generations.

Here in America today, for instance, you don't find many people who are deeply concerned about the vast changes that have taken place in our governmental structure over the past 30 years. Many are well aware of the fact that these changes have come about, and that the overall effect of them has been to give us a type of government vastly different, vastly more expensive and vastly more socialistic than was ever envisioned by our Founding Fathers.

Yet, how few of the many who are well aware of these changes really are interested in doing anything more than just shaking their heads over what's happening.

The vast majority seem content to take the attitude that there's not much one person can do to change the drift of a nation. So they go on doing nothing while the Federal Government becomes ever more dominant, the self-seeking politicians grow bolder and bolder, taxes get heavier and heavier and pressure groups grab an ever firmer grip on the throat of the country.

People today seem to have a great fear of speaking up to defend the principles upon which this Nation was founded. More and more in recent years we have noted an increasing trend among our most successful and most intelligent classes of people not to let themselves become involved in controversial issues of the day. More and more we have noted that even among those who are contributors to our "Letters to the Editor" column there is an increasing trend for anonymity as if the mere act of a person expressing his ideas on paper and identifying himself with those ideas automatically labels that person as a nonconformist or a crackpot.

What this trend signifies, of course, is that Americans are losing their "guts." They are becoming afraid to take a definite stand for or against anything, and in the process they are fast becoming a faceless mass of humanity increasingly controlled and directed by an institution of their own creation—their own Federal Government.

Back in 1776 it took a tremendous amount of courage and determination for men to stand up and demand an end to the oppressive acts of the British Crown. In those days there was no freedom of the press and precious few other rights which an individual citizen could call his own. Those who sparked the American Revolution did so in full knowledge of the ignominous traitor's death that lay in store for them if they failed in their attempt to break away from British rule.

Today it is no crime to speak out in opposition to Government policies with which we don't agree. No man can be called a traitor nor can he be hauled away to jail and punished for standing upon his rights as a free man in a free country.

Yet, it is sad to see how few there are who are willing to stand up and be counted when a controversial issue arises today. Fear of taking a stand and speaking our piece is making us a nation of sheep looking for someone to lead us along a path of untroubled security. Why think for ourselves anymore when there is always someone smarter around we can look to for guidance? Why worry and fret about the state of our Nation when it is a lot earier and certainly much more pleasant to let our Congressmen and our other elected officials do that for us no matter how badly they botch up the job? Why be concerned over the future of our children in this land of ours when it takes all of our time and effort merely to keep up with the present?

If our forefathers had abandoned themselves to this kind of thinking there would never have been an American nation. There would never have been a Declaration of Independence and a Constitution which has stood for centuries as a beacon light for freedom-loving people the world over.

We need to wake up in this Nation. We need to realize on this Fourth of July that the security we all long to possess isn't something that can be handed to us by an act of Congress or a Presidential proclamation. No government can promise a citizen security without limiting his rights and the trouble with this Nation today is that too many Americans mistakenly believe they can get security from the Government without paying for it in one way or another.

Antarctica's Importance Grows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, a newspaper article by Walter Sullivan has recently been brought to my attention. It points up the growing importance of Antarctica, and should be of interest to Members of Congress who have some concern about the future of that continent so far as our Nation is affected:

ANTARCTICA'S IMPORTANCE GROWS—MANY NATIONS VYING FOR A SHARE

(By Walter Sullivan)

During the past week the highest echelons of this country's Government have been concerned with the most remote region of our planet. The National Security Council has been trying to decide such questions as these: Should the United States remain in Antarctica? What should be our objectives there? How should we try to achieve them?

An aura of cooperation marked the International Geophysical Year and extended to its many activities in Antarctica. Now that the IGY is over it is feared that this may change. The fact that the situation is not static was demonstrated on Thursday when Poland asked for a voice in settling the future of Antarctica. The Polish Embassy in Washington sent notes to this effect to the 12 nations that have been consulting to find a formula that would freeze the political status of that continent.

The advent of the space age has significantly affected the importance of the continent at the bottom of the world. And it is being suggested that the South Pole, where the United States now has a scientific station established under IGY auspices, may one day be as strategic a position in the era of air transportation as the Panama Canal was in the days of dependence on sea routes.

Because of its location on the spin axis of the earth, the South Pole has unique advantages for the observation of space vehicles. The best satellite orbit—the only one that covers all parts of the globe—is a north-south track over both poles. A single station at the South pole could collect information from every pass of a satellite in polar orbit.

SPACE TRACKING

As with all satellite capabilities, this would have military applications as well. Likewise a single tracking station at the pole—unlike stations elsewhere on the turning earth—could keep continuous watch on any space probe launched toward a point in the heavens south of the Equator. It is no coincidence that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is represented on the Interdepartmental Committee on Antarctic Research.

The antarctic also may step into a new role in monitoring our planet and its environment for nuclear explosions. The network of stations proposed by the Geneva technical conference on monitoring a test ban is said to call for eight sites in Antarctica.

Perhaps the most valuable known resource of the antarctic today is scientific information. We must know what role its harsh climate plays in the world's weather. We should learn what lies within its mountains, how much ice there is and what lies beneath it.

The frightening pace of population growth is bound, sooner or later, to force us to turn to the resources of the icy continent. Its minerals are little known and difficult of access by present standards, but this will change. Its coastal waters teem with potential foods which we have not yet learned to capture and make palatable.

AIR HUB

As for transport, commerce between the southernmost countries is now small. But

the United States has been negotiating with them for trans-Antarctic air routes. It is noted that the construction of the Air Force base at Thule, Greenland, opened the Arctic to transpolar air routes and some believe the building of a field at McMurdo Sound would do the same for the Antarctic. It might cost $100 million or more, but whatever country built it would control a year-round link between that continent and the rest of the world.

The most subtle motive for Antarctic activity is prestige. For the Latin-American countries, Argentina and Chile, who claim Palmer Peninsula in rivalry with one another and with Britain, this has become an emotionally charged issue.

For the two great powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, the problem is a more general one. If each is to maintain its claim to world leadership it must play an important role in the scientific exploration of Antarctica. Should the United States withdraw from the continent, some fear that the high-quality research of the Russians there would have an impact on world opinion comparable to that of the sputniks.

Assuming that the United States does not withdraw from Antarctica, what sort of political future should it try to achieve for that region? At the start of the IGY seven nations claimed pie-shaped slices of the continent, all converging at the pole. They were Argentina, Australia, Britain, Chile, France, New Zealand, and Norway.

The United States and the Soviet Union made no claims, but both had reserved their rights in the area.

The IGY led to a tacit understanding that no nation would raise political issues and thus upset the research program. A half-dozen Soviet stations were established in the Australian claim, some of them manned by only a handful of men. The United States likewise set up seven stations, all but one of them in sectors claimed by others.

Although the entry of the Russians into Antarctica produced some alarm within Australia, the expeditions worked in harmony.

To continue this cooperation, scientific representatives from the nations concerned formed the special Committee on Antarctic Research. It comprised the 12 nations active in the program—the 7 claimants, the United States, the Soviet Union, Belgium, Japan, and South Africa.

The Committee, known as SCAR, held its most recent meeting in Australia last February. It was agreed that Poland, which was taking over one of the Soviet Antarctic stations, would be admitted to SCAR once a wintering party had been established by the Poles.

U.S. PROPOSAL

Last May, with the stated intention of preserving the scientific cooperation that marked the IGY, the United States proposed a treaty that would freeze the political claims and create some sort of international administrative machinery. All the members of SCAR agreed to discuss the plan, but the South American countries have been reluctant to bury their claims and the Russians have been hesitant to sign any treaty which gave such claims legal status, even though frozen.

The present friendly atmosphere in Antarctica derives from an absence of conflict of interest and the harshness of the environment. One leading scientist has suggested half seriously that no one have a say in the rule of the continent until he has spent a year there. This, he feels, is enough to purge a man of thought habits engendered by the heritage of international politics.

Do We Have a Gentleman in "the Gallery"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles which appeared in the July 3, 1959, edition of the Island Times, Puerto Rico's only English-language newspaper.

ADMIRAL GALLERY FETED BY TRUJILLO

Adm. Dan Gallery was guest of honor last Thursday night at a reception given by Dominican Dictator Rafael Leonidas Trujillo in Ciudad Trujillo.

Admiral Gallery said he had accepted an invitation to a party the same day given by the U.S. Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, Joseph Farland, for a group of Coast Guard cadets stopping there during a summer training cruise. He took along the Navy steel band, "Admiral Dan's Pandemoniacs," to play.

From his own party Farland (who was at the time under fire for diplomatic "indiscretions" after being photographed with renegade Dominican pilot Juan Ventura Simo) took Admiral Gallery and his steel band boys, along with another visiting admiral, to Trujillo's party. "I didn't know anything about Trujillo's party until Farland took us there," Admiral Gallery told this paper Tuesday.

During the reception an American flag was unfurled with the claim that it had been taken from one of the yachts used in the recent "unsuccessful invasion attempt."

PORTRAIT OF A DICTATOR

The everyday human crime, although it may appall us, is accepted as part of the general scheme of things. A man who murders another or betrays his friends—a rapist or a racist—a sadist or a thief—fills us with horror and anger. We may not understand what makes people commit crimes, but we are able to grasp the fact that they have been committed and we react accordingly. Man's mind, however, balks at monstrosity. If we find a man who has committed all of these crimes, not once or 10 times but hundreds or thousands of times, caused other to commit them, and continues to commit them, our imagination goes into a state of shock. We are unable to comprehend such enormity. Can anyone accurately measure the effects of a hydrogen bomb, or draw a picture of genocide?

Such a man, we use the word only in its zoological sense, is Rafael Leonidas Trujillo y Molina, self-styled benefactor of the Dominican Republic. No list of his crimes, although it includes the countless thousands of people massacred on the Haitian border in 1937 and the numberless, nameless political opponents that he has caused to be assassinated, and his use of torture, terror, falsehood, and corruption could give a true idea of the damage that he has done to his country and to mankind. When a ruler not only exhibits inhuman degeneracy, but also promotes and nurtures it as a policy of state, it is bound to infect the whole body politic. When the inevitable retribution comes it is likely to be bloody, unreasoning, and uncontrolled. The Dominicans and their friends who are trying to rid themselves of this malignant growth have the sympathy of the whole world.

ADMIRAL'S ERROR

Not being familiar with the protocol covering officers of the armed forces, we don't know if they are subject to the obligations (and immunities) of diplomats. We think not.

In any case, the action of Adm. Dan Gallery last week in attending a reception given by Trujillo—not to mention taking along the steel band which he sponsored here—strikes us as a disservice to the citizens of his present home, whose belief in democratic principles is as deep as their hatred for the men who trample them.

Admiral Gallery has made himself a respected and admired civic-minder member of our community. We can neither respect nor admire his action last week.

PERHAPS TRUJILLO'S STAR IS SETTING

(By Earl Parker Hanson)

It is hard to tell just what is going on in the Dominican Republic, but the Benefactor and his fellow workers sure seem to be busier than a bunch of bird dogs, proving to everybody who will listen that nothing at all is going on and that every revolutionist who lands is cut down, immediately and relentlessly, either by Trujillo's brave soldiers or by the embattled country people who love their dictator so much that they'll take the machete to anybody who dares say a word against him.

The official line that there is no revolution left and that all the would-be rebels have long ago, officially, gotten their just deserts, may of course be largely correct, even though the rebel radio was still functioning and broadcasting somewhere in the Dominican Republic as of last Monday and perhaps even as of today. I haven't checked, and though it is always hard to know what one can believe when the two-bit Caribbean Generalissimo, Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina, and his cohorts, open their mouths and go through the motions of protesting too much.

Whatever is happening and has happened in the last few weeks, we know now that Trujillo's days are numbered and that virtually all of Latin America is holding its collective thumbs in ardent prayers that the number of those days be small.

The wave of democracy that began in Argentina a few years ago, and swept north to Peru, Colombia, Venezuela, and across the Caribbean to Cuba, is too powerful to be resisted indefinitely by Trujillo, even if it is true, as they say, that he has strengthened his air force by hiring Japanese mercenary pilots, and his army by stuffing it with a lot of Spaniards. The man who runs that "well-ordered graveyard" called the Dominican "Republic," who at one time bolstered his democratic regime by butchering at least 10,000 Haitians in one night's border incident that spread all over the country, who later perpetrated the Moca massacre which failed to make the newspapers though it accounted for somewhere between 250 and 500 victims, whose murderous fingers have reached into New York, Havana, and God knows where else, whose agents spend well over a million dollars per year attempting to buy good will in the United States, who did in Galíndez, Gerald Murphy and Morris Ernst, who recently had the unmitigated gall to stop one of Luis Ferré's steamers on the high seas, who runs an office here in San Juan to use the U.S. mails for spreading his libelous lies, is himself acting almighty nervous these days, as though he knows that he won't last any too long, and that it may not be too many months before he and his friend Batista have to pack up

and get out—maybe, as has been rumored because people like that aren't always too welcome in too many places, to Liberia to play pinochle with President W. V. Shadrach Tubman who is a pleasant enough fellow but himself no great shakes as a democrat.

There is one thing you can be sure of. If Trujillo does fall, there will be a lot of true-blue. Americans around who will say it's the Communists who did it, that's who it is, and the Communists are busy everywhere and are taking over Latin America, and it's a big shame. Just why such people insist on giving communism and the Communists so tremendous a buildup, I don't know, but I do think that they should be investigated as maybe being Moscow agents for spreading the colosal lie that only the Communists care about liberating millions of people from the clutches of one of the world's bloodiest and most ruthless murderers of human freedom. That seems to me one of the surest ways of making communism immensely popular throughout Latin America, except that the Latin Americans don't seem to fall for the line and have in recent years demonstrated a fine capacity for doing their own liberating instead of having Moscow do it for them.

Some of our best legislators are already laying the foundations for the line about the Communists, like Senator EASTLAND of Mississippi, who last September got up in Ciudad Trujillo to tell the Dominican legislature that Christianity, as personified by Trujillo, and communism, as apparently personified by all who don't like him, can't live side by side in this world, and who went on to say that Trujillo is one of the free world's great men for whom everybody should thank God, and who went so far as to say "as a U.S. Senator I respect him, I admire him, and I render him homage." (Maybe those weren't his exact words, since I believe that he probably spoke in English, and I got the speech in Spanish as published in the Dominican Republic's Diplomatic Information Bulletin, and this is therefore a retranslation, but no matter: it is astonishing enough any way you read it.)

Next to EASTLAND on the same occasion and platform was Senator W. Jenner of Indiana, who also made a speech, packed with adulation for the Benefactor, but I haven't the stomach to translate any part of that one, though it doesn't make much difference—you know already what kind of oratory it is.

I just wish that such people, representing the world's greatest democracy, would stop buttering up, and bolstering up, one of the world's worst remaining enemies of everything that democracy stands for.

American Committee for Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday, July 18, 1955, I had the honor and pleasure of calling the attention of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives to the fine work being done by a group of patriotic citizens in combating communism. You may recall that I brought to the attention of the Congress the fact that in 1951 a group of farseeing citizens had formed the American Committee for Liberation. The American committee supports Radio Liberation and the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R.

In my address at that time, I mentioned the fact that Radio Liberty was beaming news and other vital information through the Iron Curtain, 24 hours a day, in Russian and 17 other languages spoken in the Soviet Union. I mentioned the fact that in these broadcasts Russians actually talked to Russians—Ukrainians to Ukrainians, Uzbeks to Uzbeks, and so on—as the majority of the broadcasts were not only written but broadcast by emigres from the U.S.S.R. I said further in my remarks, and I quote:

> I want to commend the efforts of the American Committee for Liberation and the people who have worked so hard to realize its aims and objectives. The accomplishments of the committee in the fight against communism constitute a worthy example of what can be achieved through cooperative efforts of private citizens.

I felt this to be a modest tribute to a fine organization. And if I spoke feelingly then, I can honestly say that the remarks are merited twofold today—some 4 years later—in view of the progress made by the committee in both the quality and quantity of output under its able president, Howland H. Sargeant, a former Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs.

At the time of my former remarks in July 1955, the committee's radio station at Lampertheim, Germany, had nine transmitters totaling 86 kilowatts of power. Today, the committee has installed four of the most modern 50-kilowatt transmitters and five 20-kilowatt transmitters with a total power of 300 kilowatts.

In addition, the American committee has initiated, on a pilot basis, the installation of what will be one of the most powerful short-wave broadcasting stations transmitting to the Soviet peoples.

Across the world, from the island of Formosa, the American committee is broadcasting to the Far Eastern areas of the U.S.S.R. Radio Liberty went on the air from Taipei in the summer of 1955 with one 20-kilowatt transmitter broadcasting to the maritime provinces of the U.S.S.R. and Sakhalin Island. Today, Radio Liberty broadcasts from Formosa 40 hours a day, 10 hours on each of 4 transmitters with a total power of 150 kilowatts. This station now reaches the populated areas along the Trans-Siberian railroad east of Lake Baikal, as well as the maritime provinces.

Progress, however, has not been confined to the technical equipment of Radio Liberty. The programs, too, have been increased and made more effective. At the European headquarters of the American committee in Munich there are nine desks covering the main ethnic groups in the U.S.S.R. These desks broadcast in Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Armenian, Azerbaidjani, and Georgian as well as in other major languages of the Soviet Union. News constitutes an important part of each program with items of interest broadcast to the citizens of the U.S.S.R. which they would not be able to get otherwise.

When Djilas, the Yugoslav Communist leader, wrote his book "The New Class," exposing the weaknesses of communism, Radio Liberty broadcast a daily summary of the actual contents of the volume at dictation speed. It is also interesting to note that a year before the great Russian poet and author, Boris Pasternak, was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature, Radio Liberty was already hailing "Doctor Zhivago" as a great literary triumph. When the Nobel Prize was awarded to Boris Pasternak, Radio Liberty broadcast passages from "Doctor Zhivago" together with comments on the novel by leading Western intellectuals. It also reported the actual developments in the Pasternak affair, including facts that were being kept from the Soviet public by its rulers.

In its programs, Radio Liberty attempts to stress internal developments in the U.S.S.R. and in the Soviet orbit which are denied to the Soviet peoples by their own media or presented to them in distorted fashion. Radio Liberty also attempts to acquaint its listeners with the institutions, ideas and ideals of the free world as possible alternatives to the totalitarian system forced on them by their rulers.

Since my last remarks to you on the subject, the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R., a self-governing body of emigree scholars, incorporated under German law and supported by grants from the American Committee for Liberation, is continuing its valuable work in the battle for freedom from communism. Each year the institute holds and important conference attended by free world scholars of every nationality who actively participate in seminars on the vital problems of the day. The Institute publishes a monthly bulletin in English on current Soviet affairs and also issues 12 other periodicals, mainly in English but also in Arabic, Turkish, Russian, and Ukrainian. These are widely distributed to scholars, journalists, and opinion leaders throughout the world.

A unique, and it seems to me, extremely worthwhile project of the learned scholars of the Institute was the preparation and publication of a biographical directory of the living personalities in the U.S.S.R.; a sort of "Who's Who in the Soviet Union." This publication has found wide use among students, professors, journalists, authors, and so forth, who specialize in Soviet affairs.

The Institute also prepared and sponsored a series of half-hour broadcasts under the title of "The Anatomy of Soviet Communism," which were carried over the Mutual Broadcasting network for 13 weeks and which aroused much highly favorable comment. It is estimated that some 7 million listeners heard the programs.

The American committee launched a program to inform academic centers sponsoring Russian area studies about it work and its capabilities on research and information which could be useful to these institutions. The major link in communicating with them is a publication, News Briefs on Soviet Activities.

Published bimonthly, News Briefs presents its audience with insights into current Soviet affairs as interpreted by its emigre staff members. News Briefs is sent to about 2,000 educators in colleges and universities throughout the United States. Tapes of Radio Liberty broadcasts for use in Russian language classes are also made available by the American committee.

For the emigres from the U.S.S.R. themselves, one of the most important projects of the American committee is the publication of a semimonthly newspaper in Russian entitled "Our Common Cause." From a small original printing of 1,000 copies, the circulation has risen to 15,000 copies with distribution in all the main centers of emigre concentration in the free world. This publication aims to keep Soviet emigres in touch with current news and thinking in the Western World about their former homeland. It also works to gain their continuing support for the efforts of the American committee and other free world agencies fighting against communism.

The Soviet Union cannot afford to ignore the activities of the American Committee for Liberation. Within a few hours after Radio Liberty went on the air, back in March 1953, the Soviets starting their jamming tactics and have expanded their efforts in this area manyfold since that time. Indeed, engineers have estimated that the Soviets are spending at least 10 times as much to jam the broadcasts as the American committee spends to get them through the Iron Curtain.

And Radio Liberty gets through. Enno Hobbings' statement in the New Leader of October 6, 1958, that Radio Liberty broadcasts pierce the curtain is confirmed by free world visitors to the U.S.S.R., by Soviet visitors to the free world, by defectors and by mail to Radio Liberty from the Soviet Union.

One of the best opportunities for audience research that Radio Liberty has had was the Brussels Fair last summer. Radio Liberty interviewers spoke to a sizable sampling of Soviet visitors and much useful information was gleamed for future Radio Liberty programs. The Brussels study also conclusively established that like the Voice of America and the BBC, Radio Liberty has a respectable audience in the U.S.S.R.

Radio Liberty broadcasts mention an innocuous-sounding name and address in the free world to which Soviet citizens may write as if addressing a relative or wartime acquaintance abroad. The resulting letters—all anonymous, naturally—have meaning beyond their words. Some ask for the small comfort of a reply: "If you receive this, please sing 'We Met by Chance.'"

A few heartier souls transmit information they think may be useful to Radio Liberty. A Ukrainian wrote:

The Bolsheviks are as scared of your words as the devil is scared of incense. Many people listen to you, but they are afraid to write letters.

Radio Liberty naturally cannot know how large its audience is—

Says Howland H. Sargeant, president of the American committee—

but every now and then a message comes from the target areas that makes staff members proud of their work.

He cited one recent letter which said:

When I hear your voice, my eyes fill with tears of joy. I have a feeling that I, too, have friends.

Pravda and Izvestia continually blast the efforts of the American Committee for Liberation. The Committee for the Return to the Homeland was especially set up by the Soviet Union to try to lure emigres back behind the Iron Curtain.

But despite all attacks, the group of emigres from the Soviet Union in cooperation with their American partners in the American Committee for Liberation continue to go about their task quietly and efficiently, achieving impressive results.

I feel my colleagues will be as interested in this interim report on American Committee for Liberation activities as they were in 1955, when I called their attention to this splendid record of achievement.

The following are publications of the American Committee for Liberation since 1955:

PUBLICATIONS OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE

First. "Biographic Directory of the U.S.S.R.," a basic reference work which contains biographical data on over 2,000 prominent figures in Soviet public life. The 782-page volume was published by Scarecrow Press, Inc., for the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R.

Second. "Soviet Youth: Twelve Komsomol Histories," a book published by the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R. in July 1959.

Third. "Stalin and the Soviet Communist Party: A Study in the Technology of Power," a book by Abdurakhman Avtorkhanov which will be published for the institute this fall by Frederick A. Praeger Publishers, New York.

Fourth. "Genocide in the U.S.S.R.: Studies in Group Destruction," published by the Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Fifth. "Opposition to Sovietization in Byelorussian Literature," a study by Anthony Adamovich of Soviet literary policies and resistance to it in Bélorussia, a Soviet Republic.

Sixth. "Anatomy of Soviet Communism," a documentary radio series in pamphlet form based on broadcasts by radio station WOR, New York, and the Mutual Broadcasting System, by the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R.

Seventh. "The Khrushchev School Reform," an analysis of the recent Soviet educational changes, prepared by the Central Research Department, Radio Liberty.

Eighth. "Life in a Siberian City," a study of life in Siberia by Yevgeny Zhago, who left this area in 1956.

Ninth. "Boris Pasternak and Dr. Zhivago," a study by Arkady Gaev of Pasternak, the man, and the significance of his work, "Dr. Zhivago."

Tenth. "Foreign Trade as an Instrument of Soviet Policy," a study on Soviet economic policies in the underdeveloped areas, prepared by the Soviet Affairs Analysis Service of the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R.

Eleventh. "Berlin," a compilation of analytical materials pertaining to the Berlin crisis, prepared by the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R.

Twelfth. Nashe Obshcheye Delo—Our Common Cause—a biweekly publication in Russian for the free emigration from the Soviet Union.

Thirteenth. News Briefs on Soviet Activities, a bimonthly news bulletin on Soviet developments.

Fourteenth. "The Soviet Writers Revolt, 1956–57," by James Critchlow, Research Department of Radio Liberty.

Some Observations on Highway and Urban Economic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following important observation on highway and urban economic development in the RECORD.

These remarks were made by Mr. William R. Davlin, secretary, Pennsylvania Department of Commerce, and chairman, Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, at the bi-State conference on highway planning for urban growth, Binghamton, N.Y., May 25, 1959.

It covers exceptionally well the tremendous problems arising from the complexity of the relationship between the economic development of our urban areas and the growth of highways.

Mr. Davlin's remarks follow:

It would be laboring the obvious to say that this topic of highways in relation to the economic problems and opportunities of our cities is a large one. It is much too large for a single luncheon address or for the competence and orientation of any speaker, at least this one.

It is in recognition of that situation, I suppose, that this splendid conference on highway planning for urban growth approaches the topic in symposium fashion, with an array of speakers viewing the matter from the standpoint of their several specialties and interests.

If these remarks of mine are to deal in something more than easy generalizations, applicable everywhere because of their elementary simplicity, or nowhere because of their vagueness, I should perhaps pause first to identify for you the viewpoint from which I am speaking.

My own official responsibilities and duties relate to economic development and redevelopment in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The two major programs of the State's commerce department which I head deal with (a) industrial development, aimed at fostering expansion of our existing industry and attraction of new industry from the outside through research, plant location data services, guidance of community industrial

development efforts, national advertising and industrial financing, jointly with banks, insurance companies and local nonprofit corporations, and (b) urban planning and renewal through technical advisory services to urban planning and redevelopment agencies, supervision of the Federal 701 planning assistance program, and administration of Pennsylvania's grant-in-aid program for urban slum clearance, redevelopment and renewal, supplementing the Federal program under Housing and Home Finance Agency.

During the past 3 years, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, itself, through its commerce department, has spent just over $20 million on these programs. A somewhat larger sum is projected for expenditure during the 2 years beginning this June.

Participating in these programs are more than 100 official urban planning commissions, 44 urban redevelopment authorities, and 80 community industrial development corporations, these latter and our department working in close collaboration with financial institutions, utilities, railroads, and industrial realtors. Cooperating and collaborating, too, are other appropriate agencies of State government, including importantly, the Pennsylvania Department of Highways.

The problems with which we are dealing are in some ways unique, and our approaches to them are certainly not applicable everywhere.

For one thing, though Pennsylvania ranks third in population and second in industry, nationally, some of her basic industries—lumbering, textiles, railway shop maintenance, anthracite and bituminous coal, steel—have experienced technological or market readjustments that, over the years and continuing into the present, have greatly reduced manpower requirements and left numerous cities and areas with chronic labor surpluses.

This is largely in contrast to the economic history of cities in neighboring New York, Ohio, New Jersey, and most other States.

For another thing, our cities all of them, are among the older cities of the Nation, many dating back to colonial times. Some of them, in layout and architecture, were built to provide a great deal of charm and good taste; but they were not designed for the populations they now accommodate, nor for the automobile, the jet age, and the coming population explosion. In this, they are not unlike cities in neighboring New York, Ohio, New Jersey, New England, and the larger cities of the near Middle West and the old South. Still other of our cities, however, were built around lumbering, coal, and steel operations, in areas of extremely rugged topography. They were not built to be charming; declining employment and a shifting economic base deprived families of the stability of income required for the building and maintenance of good residential housing, and the tax revenues required for adequate municipal facilities and services. These cities, then, have more than the normal amount of residential, commercial, and industrial blight, obsolescence and deferred maintenance in public facilities.

It is against that kind of a background of urbanism that these remarks on highways and urban development are made. The problem of development for the Pennsylvania city is doubtless quite different from that of Dallas or Fort Worth, or Denver, or Salt Lake City. It may be more akin to that of a city in New York or one of our neighboring States—with the difference that not only must many Pennsylvania cities plan for the very large population and industrial growth implicit in the population and gross national product projections, but it must work at this with a sense of acute urgency in order to replace that portion of the State's economic base lost through the readjustments and maladjustments experienced in basic Pennsylvania industries.

What is the problem for such a city? The answers recall the old story of the blind men describing the elephant after separately touching him at various points on his anatomy.

To the mayor and council it is a problem of mounting requests and expenditures for municipal services and facilities, in face of a deteriorating tax base and the preemption of major revenue sources by the Federal Government.

To the downtown merchant it is the flight of the retail dollar to the shops and shopping centers of suburbia; it is the losing race between off-street parking and the constantly growing number of automobile owners insisting on entering central city to shop or work.

To the transit company it is the continuing decline in the volume of passengers utilizing mass transit in face of increased operating costs.

To the industrialist it is the inefficiency of the old, multistoried plant, hemmed in by still other plants, and streets, and rail lines, leaving no room for expansion nor for parking of the cars of the workers who refuse to use mass transit.

To the citizen it is the neurosis-inducing congestion, traffic jams, expensive parking (if he can find it), the perils of pedestrianism despite the genius of the traffic engineers. (The other day I heard of a visitor in a strange city who phoned his host from downtown explaining in the course of the conversation that he was at the corner of "walk" and "don't walk.")

Modern highways and modern highway planning alone, can't solve these problems, of course. Indeed, modern highway projects can both contribute to a solution and at the same time compound the problem, as for example, we pour additional thousands of shoppers and workers from suburbia with their individual automobiles along high-speed, four-lane, limited-access expressways into the central city to struggle with its congestion in search of parking. The mayor has lost a taxpayer, the frustrated worker is late to work or late getting home, the merchant has an irate customer, the transit company has lost another passenger, the central city plant loses a disgruntled employee to that new industrial park out in the county.

With exceptions, variations in degree, and spectacular though piecemeal successes, that impressionistic sketch is pretty much the picture at the core of most of our Pennsylvania cities, and, by our observations, most cities of the Nation's East regardless of size. It may hold as well for cities in other great regions of the Nation.

Yet the central cities of our urban areas, precarious as their present plight may be economically, and baffling as are the related physical facts of living and land use, have so valid a function to play in our American life that they will and must survive. Much of business and finance, shipping, merchandising, warehousing and distribution, major activities in art and music and education, and the theater require central city locations for optimum efficiency and convenience. And, residentially, the central city continues to be the preference—even the growing preference—for a vast number of those employed in such undertakings.

This brings us inevitably to the observation, so oft repeated as to sound like a meaningless platitude, that the solution to the present and future problems of the central city lies in a comprehensive and coordinated approach to those problems. This need not scare us. Neither the elements of the problem nor its solution are as closely articulated as the gears in the transmission of an automobile. It is, rather, that each element of the problem must be attacked concurrently, knowledgeably, adequately, and in relation to the other elements. Such coordination doesn't require a czar or commissariat or all the powers in a single agency. Mainly it requires wisdom and good communications between the various agencies and organizations at work in the field.

On the basis of population projections, it is obvious that our present central cities are not going to contain the population growth that is in store for urban America. Their limited land areas and problems of congestion dictate two major avenues of adjustment for them: First the clearance and reuse of blighted residential, commercial and industrial land, and, secondly, an integrated system for the movement of people into and out of downtown and near downtown, involving mass transit, expressways and related major street improvements, and parking facilities; and of the latter, for a variety of reasons, the greatest of them would seem to be mass transit.

But the urban area is more than the central city, and it is beyond the corporate limits or downtown that the bulk of future growth must come. And here highway developments have gotten ahead of urban planning. These high-speed roads carrying traffic at 50 miles per hour extend the radius of urban development to 20 or 25 miles from downtown, opening up those outlying sections to growth. Not in many places have we added this dimension to the scope of our urban planning activity.

Throughout the entire urban area, downtown and outlying, we need effective programs of land-use controls, so that the location and extent of traffic generating uses are subject to regulation. Such land-use control can take the form of zoning, subdivision regulation, purchase of development rights and other techniques not yet explored. We need to think of new patterns of land uses which will include industrial plants and regional shopping centers located around the periphery of the urban area. Traffic around the circumferences of these areas will probably increase faster than that into and out of the central city; advance acquisition of highway rights-of-way for circumferential routes when land is relatively undeveloped in terms of urban uses can mean very large savings in ultimate highway expenditures.

All of these problems of urban growth are already upon our major metropolitan areas, and with a vengeance. They are present in kind, but not with the same critical urgency, in our medium-sized cities. And those cities are soon to become large cities, by today's standards. They have a chance to avoid the crises. They have time to prepare.

Our medium-sized cities have enough of a taste of the maladies and frustrations of congested urbanism so that a discussion of highways and urban planning in these terms is not likely to seem mere theory to civic leaders and the general public. But without intelligent understanding and support from civic leaders and the general public, there is little hope for avoidance of an irrational, costly and inefficient growth.

Step No. 1 for these cities is the visualization of the problems before they occur—a job of local education, through the press, in movies, by models and drawings, by forums and discussion groups. In the absence of such local educational efforts there is a tendency for the public to accept urban maladjustments as inevitable. Well conceived educational efforts can instill a feeling of self-confidence and assurance that the community can control and solve its problems of growth.

As we achieve a comprehensive approach to the solution of these problems of urban development and redevelopment, comprehensive and areawide, a very large part of the job of urban highway planning will

have been achieved, and highway planning and construction in urban areas need no longer proceed in a partial vacuum with respect to other aspects of urban land use and urban economic life. In the field of Federal assistance to slum clearance and urban renewal the concept of the workable program of urban planning and development is a prerequisite for receiving funds from Washington. This same type of concept might well be adapted to the system of Federal aid to urban highways as a means of hastening the integration of highway developments into planned programs for controlled growth of our urban areas.

Further, with respect both to our metropolitan areas and medium-sized cities, there is a special problem involving land-use and highway planning that bears directly on economic development, and that is the problem of industrial land. We have said that our central cities will not contain the population growth in store for urban America. Neither will they contain the industrial growth. To provide the manufacturing, warehousing, and distribution space that growth will require, vast new acreages of industrial land will be needed for new and expanded industrial facilities on the periphery of our cities. Wise planning and the related zoning controls must see to it, now, that this land is reserved, and sagacious developers should see that it is developed.

In doing that, we will be providing directly for an expanded urban economic base. Not to take that provision is to put the urban economic base in jeopardy, for it is difficult for the unglamorous purpose of industrial land to compete with the more exciting and speculatively interesting commercial and residential uses. In many places, an ultimate industrial land shortage threatens to put a ceiling on urban economic growth.

Highway planning has a vital role to play in this. Negatively, proper highway planning can avoid alinements that destroy or reduce the acreage of outlying urban land potentially available for industrial use. Positively, through wise planning of alinements and interchanges in relation to rail lines, feeder roads and utility connections in outlying urban areas, highway planning can greatly maximize the acreage or urban land potentially available for industrial use.

There is another aspect of this matter of highways and economic development that is particularly vital to us in Pennsylvania, in light of the economic vicissitudes to which I referred initially, but which is also pertinent to our neighboring States. Outside our metropolitan areas and medium-sized cities, the new interstate, regional system of highways holds great promise for accelerated industrial growth in our smaller cities.

Pennsylvania's Turnpike, stretching across the State from Ohio to New Jersey was a pioneer in modern, limited access highway development. In recent years it was extended from Philadelphia northeastward, through the distressed anthracite area to Scranton, where its terminus will soon be connected by the Penn-Can Highway with the Binghamton area, where we meet today, and other New York cities into Canada.

And now, the new interstate program will give Scranton and the anthracite area a new expressway extending to the Southwest, past Harrisburg, into Maryland and Virginia. Recently, ground was broken for still another East-West highway from the Delaware River at Stroudsburg through the Poconos, the anthracite area and westward through the relatively underdeveloped forest and bituminous coal lands to Sharon on the Ohio line. And a new North-South highway will connect Erie, on the St. Lawrence Seaway, with the Pittsburgh industrial complex and on southward into West Virginia.

The areas and mileage these new interstate projects will traverse have but a few of our major cities. They are smalltown Pennsylvania, the very towns that stand most in need of economic redevelopment. Thanks to the transportation requirements of Pennsylvania's steel and coal and limestone, historically and presently, dozens of them are well served by trunkline railroads. Now they are to be served by modern-day, four-lane, limited-access highways.

The interchanges of these highways will number several hundred, and a very large number of them will offer superior basic advantages for plant location. The expansion of plant capacity related to a growing population and gross national product, coupled with the preference for an adaptability to small communities exhibited by manufacturers in many product fields, means that these new highway projects will open up dozens of Pennsylvania's distressed area communities to new industrial growth, as they will in small towns along the new interstate highways in other States.

The approaches to these planned interchange points need to be carefully studied if they are to serve the purposes of basic economic growth. Left to chance and random development, they can become a hodgepodge of filling stations, motels, hamburger joints, bars, souvenir shops, and what not—and raw land of potential industrial value gobbled up in uses making no basic contribution to the local economies. Moreover, the use of land along the interchange approaches will be entirely beyond the scope of Federal control; it will be wholly a matter for determination by units of local government, often our smallest units of rural local government.

Here is a task for civic leadership; only, again, with broad public understanding and support, will proper land use planning and the related zoning and other controls be instituted, to maximize the value of the interchanges for economic development. In Pennsylvania, this is a matter that has engaged the joint efforts of our State department of highways, our State planning board, and the State department of commerce.

What can one say, in conclusion, on this matter of highways and urban development? Again, it is too vast a subject to embrace in a single statement or by any one individual or specialist.

When we talk of urban highways, we are talking about urban transportation, and transportation enters into every phase of the economic life of our cities. And it enters into urban economic life in different ways, depending on the size and nature and history of our cities.

But this stands out: To serve their purpose in an optimum way in urban development, highway projects require broad, imaginative, practical, and effective programs of urban land use planning and control: this imposes obligations and responsibilities upon the general public, civic leaders, and agencies of State and local government who have no direct obligations and responsibilities in the field of urban highway planning, as such.

But such a jointure of responsible interest and action is at the heart of the survival and orderly growth of our metropolitan areas and medium-sized cities. For our smaller communities, underdeveloped or maladjusted economically, it is part and parcel of the job of creating economic growth and stability. This, of course, is the job of building America.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*——408 A St. NE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*——
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*——
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*——
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*——
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*——
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*——
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Engle, Clair, *Calif*——3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*——
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*——
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*——
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*——
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*——3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*——
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*——2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*——
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*——
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*——
Proxmire, William, *Wis*——
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John, *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*——
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*——

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS JUSTICES ASSIGNED TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Promises and Challenges of the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 17, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last weekend I was pleased to participate in a number of ceremonies in Wisconsin held to commemorate the significance of the St. Lawrence Seaway to our Badger State and the Nation.

As a sponsor of the seaway legislation, I was particularly gratified to see the enthusiasm and realism with which our Wisconsin communities, not only recognize the importance of the seaway to our future, but also the dynamic spirit with which they are laying the groundwork for gaining maximum benefits from the completed waterway.

We recognize, of course, that full rewards will be attained by constructive and realistic planning, as well as by a willingness to undertake and resolve the problems that confront us in the future.

During the celebrations, I was privileged on a number of occasions to review the problems and challenges ahead relating to full utilization of the seaway.

As an illustration of the major challenges that, I feel, still lie ahead of us, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts of my remarks at Superior, Wis., where, incidentally, a splendid 4-day celebration was held in recognition of the St. Lawrence Seaway to the community.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY HAILS SIGNIFICANCE OF SEAWAY TO SUPERIOR'S FUTURE—URGES UNITED STATES-CANADIAN CONFERENCE TO ELIMINATE BOTTLENECK AT WELLAND CANAL

I am delighted to have the opportunity to participate in your special seaway program here in this fine port of Wisconsin.

Your splendid 4-day program—in recognition of the significance of the St. Lawrence Seaway—is a most inspiring illustration of community cooperation and forward-looking spirit.

The deep-founded enthusiasm and realism with which your fine community, and others around the State, are laying the foundation to obtain ever-greater benefits from the seaway excites the imagination; and strengthens a confidence in the willingness and ability of communities, like Superior, to progress and create a better life for your citizens.

You in Superior are opening a new chapter in one of the most historically interesting and promising periods of the world's history.

The completion of the Seaway exemplifies one of the steps in this Age of Exploration—this Age when we have shrunken the world so that every nation is neighbor to every other nation.

In a nation whose population is increasing 3 million a year, we can expect that this area will receive the impetus of this growing country. We know that human progress is a never-ending business. It is an age of whirlwind scientific advancement. The Seaway—a magnificent engineering feat—is akin to our satellite program and other great discoveries in the scientific field. Overall, it is a part of man's irrepressible effort to conquer and extend control over forces of nature in order to harness them for the service of mankind.

SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY DAY

As you know, the St. Lawrence Seaway was not completed without a long, hard-fought struggle.

For myself, I have considered it a real privilege to share in the efforts to complete the seaway—a project that I believe will bring measureless benefits to Wisconsin and our Nation.

Today, I am humbly grateful for the honor you have shown me—in naming this "Senator ALEXANDER WILEY Day."

The experience makes me feel very humble and grateful.

The spirit in which you bestow the tribute is deeply gratifying.

I welcome, too, the invitation to share this splendid occation in celebration of the completion of the seaway.

BENEFITS OF THE SEAWAY

With you, I look forward to rewards which Superior, and other communities, will reap from this great project.

For a moment, let's look briefly toward the future. What can Superior expect from the seaway?

Among other things:

1. The increased flow of trade and commerce in and out of this fine Superior-Duluth Harbor will bring new economic life to our homes, farms, factories, stores, and other places of residence and business.

2. There will be traffic of greater volumes of farm products, particularly of grain, from the States west and southward. Until now, the grain often had to be transferred to smaller vessels at the seaway.

3. Port cities, such as Superior, will experience new growth and expansion.

4. More jobs will result from the increased business and industrial activity.

5. There will be a demand for more services.

6. We can expect—and encourage—an increased tourist trade—now our third largest industry; with a stimulated flow of visitors from other States, Canada, and other lands around the globe.

7. The presence of the destroyers here in the harbor; and the movement in recent weeks of an estimated 80 foreign ships in and out of the Superior-Duluth Harbor; the record of a 50 percent increase in traffic over a year ago through the seaway itself—all of these are only symbols of yet greater things to come as a result of the seaway.

This is, of course, only a brief review of the new kind of life and activity which the seaway will create for Superior and other port cities around the Great Lakes—America's fourth seacoast.

CHALLENGES AHEAD

We recognize, however, that the picture is not all rosy.

Through the aura of celebration, let's take a penetrating look at the challenges ahead.

What are they? The major ones include paying off the costs of the seaway through tolls, expanding the capacity of the Welland Canal, completing the connecting channels, finishing port improvement projects, developing better tie-ins with rail and trucking networks to expeditiously handle goods and materials, developing a suitable system of deicing the seaway.

COST OF SEAWAY

First of all, let's take a look at the cost of the seaway.

Overall, this joint United States-Canadian effort to improve, deepen, and modernize the St. Lawrence Waterway runs at somewhat over $1 billion; including the New York and Ontario power development projects.

CANADA GETS 71 PERCENT OF SEAWAY TOLLS

To pay off the seaway costs, tolls are charged for vessels utilizing the waterway.

The major objectives in establishing tolls have been:

1. The lowest tolls consistent with the encouragement of maximum traffic; and with the need for revenue to make the project self-liquidating within the 50-year period required by legislation.

2. A simple toll structure.

3. And the most convenient method of collecting tolls.

Generally, there has been a popular opinion that the tolls would be distributed on a 50–50 basis between the United States and Canada. However, this is not true.

The costs of construction of the seaway have been shared approximately on a 70–30 basis, with Canada bearing the larger financial burden. By agreement between our two countries, it has been stipulated that tolls would be distributed in proportion to the investments. Consequently, with this agreement, Canadians will receive about 71 percent of the tolls from the international rapids sections of the seaway. This does not, however, include tolls on the Welland Canal, an all-Canadian project, but officially a part of the seaway. All tolls from this canal go to Canada.

WILL TOLLS PAY OFF THE SEAWAY?

Now the question arises, Will the tolls pay off the cost of construction?

Today the Welland Canal is the No. 1 trouble spot which affects the revenue as well as the volume of traffic on the waterway.

Of the 8 locks in the Welland, 5 are single locks—permitting approximately 28 passages a day in both directions; that is, about 14 passages each way per day.

According to estimates, the capacity of the St. Lawrence Seaway ranges to about 55 million tons a year.

Unfortunately, the capacity of the Welland Canal may be considerably below that level—some say as low as 46 million tons annually.

Consequently, the seaway, despite its completion, will—until improvements are made in the Welland Canal—continue to be limited by the capacity of the Welland.

The ability of the seaway to pay off its obligations also may well depend, for example, upon how soon action can be taken to twin the locks of the canal.

According to earlier calculations, an income from tolls of $16 million annually was expected to retire the seaway debt. Because of increased costs, however, it is now esti-

mated that the United States-Canadian costs will run about $28 million.

Even though early season traffic through the waterway was larger than anticipated—almost 50 percent over a year ago—the traffic income will not yet provide the $28 million.

Consequently, the future of the seaway is tied to the Welland Canal, both in terms of volume of traffic and of paying off the debt.

NEEDED: UNITED STATES-CANADIAN CONFERENCE TO ELIMINATE THE WELLAND BOTTLENECK

I believe that a United States-Canadian conference, aimed toward finding a solution to the Welland bottleneck, would be in the best interests of both countries.

The conference would include representation of the U.S. and Canadian Governments including members of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation—the agency charged with responsibility for U.S. construction—and its Canadian counterpart.

We recognize, of course, that Canada already has a tremendous investment in the seaway. According to estimates, "twinning" the locks of the canal may well cost an additional $150 million.

However, in view of the significance of maximum utilization of the seaway to both countries; the fact that traffic is already jamming up at the canal resulting in waiting periods of 24 to 36 hours, or longer, for ships travelling the seaway; and the time lapse which inevitably accompanies the start and completion of such a large project, I believe that efforts should be made as soon as possible to find a solution to the Welland bottleneck.

COMPLETION OF GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

The United States, too, has a challenging job ahead; namely, the deepening and improving of the Great Lakes connecting channels.

According to estimates, the total costs will run about $146 million. Until now, about $46 million has been spent on the project.

Currently, we are attempting in Congress to get approval of adequate funds—about $29 million for fiscal 1960—so that construction can go ahead on the channels.

Unless this project is completed by its target date—1962—Wisconsin and other Great Lakes States west of Lake Erie will be denied full benefits from the seaway—perhaps as long as 1963 or 1964.

FURTHER PORT AND HARBOR DEVELOPMENT

To supplement development work on the seaway, the connecting channels, and the Welland Canal, there is still also the task of further deepening and improvement of harbors around the Great Lakes. The Corps of Engineers has been making a comprehensive study of Great Lakes ports. According to estimates, this may cost another $100 million for deepening of the harbors sufficiently to handle 27-foot draft vessels from the St. Lawrence Seaway.

In addition, there is the job—faced largely by local communities—of adequately developing docking, unloading, warehousing, and other facilities, together with dovetailing water traffic with rail and road transportation.

This, then, is a brief look at some of the problems to be resolved, and challenges to be faced in the future.

SCOPE OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECT

From time to time, there are attempts to show just how great a construction and engineering job has been accomplished on the seaway.

For illustration, the following comparative figures on the construction project have been calculated:

The power produced by the generating stations of the waterway would equal the power of a double line of horses reaching almost two and one-half times across the continent.

If the rock and earth removed from the project sites were piled into wheelbarrows and the wheelbarrows were spaced 10 feet apart, they would reach around the world 210 times.

The steel used in construction would encircle the earth if it were pressed into a single large bar.

The concrete poured for the project, if distributed evenly, would provide each U.S. resident—every man, woman, and child—with a piece weighing 48 pounds.

In more specific terms, the seaway construction job—dwarfing the world's other well-known waterway projects—included construction of a new waterway in scattered sections of a 369-mile area from the Welland Canal to Montreal; construction of hydroelectric power projects that would generate more than 1.8 million kilowatts of electricity; more than 22,000 persons working around the clock for 4½ years with giant floodlights illuminating construction areas at night; engagement of more than $75 million worth of construction equipment; excavation of over 210-mile cubic yards of dirt, rock, and river bottom (according to estimates it would take over 60,000 railroad cars to haul it away); more than 6 million cubic yards of concrete were poured during the construction; the homes of more than 6,500 Canadians were lifted from their foundations and shifted to other sites; three whole communities—Iroquois, Ingleside, and Long Saulte—were built to accommodate displaced resident; on the U.S. side, 225 American farm families and about 500 cottages were moved.

This, then, is briefly a look at the size, scope, and significance of the seaway.

HISTORY OF SEAWAY LEGISLATION

Now, I would like to turn back the pages of history briefly to give you an inside look into the struggle behind the enactment of the Wiley-Dondero law that authorized the deepening, developing, and modernizing of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The battle was a long and a difficult one. The courage and strength of many men constributed to victory. I would at this time like especially to pay tribute to the splendid leadership of President Eisenhower—without which the seaway dream would not have become a reality.

Over the years, lip service has been given to the idea of a completed, improved, and modernized St. Lawrence Seaway. Six previous Presidents, including Wilson, Coolidge, Harding, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman expressed interest in the U.S. development of the seaway.

However, it was President Eisenhower who "took the bit in his teeth"—stating that he not only favored it, but would use the strength of his office to support efforts for approval of the project.

The battle within the hallowed halls of Congress to get approval of legislation to carry forward the St. Lawrence Seaway project was not an easy one.

STRONG OPPOSITION TO SEAWAY

The opponents of the seaway were legion and powerful. Who were they?

The opposition forces included the eastern railroads and money interests; the eastern seaboard and the gulf ports; shipping interests on the Atlantic and gulf coasts; overall, it is estimated that over 200 clubs, organizations, and associations—many of them abounding in legislative strength—opposed the seaway.

You may ask: In the face of this strong opposition, how was the project finally approved?

In 1952, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator Arthur Vandenburg of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I was appointed chairman of a subcommittee before which a seaway bill was pending.

Hearings were held on the legislation. The bill was favorably reported by the subcommittee, and the full Foreign Relations Committee, to the floor of the Senate. Unfortunately, the opposition mustered forces and the bill was killed.

As I look back, the battle that ensued was, indeed, an educational experience in tactics which opposition forces devised to stop the legislation.

Again in 1953, when your senior Senator was privileged to be chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I reintroduced a seaway bill, appointed a subcommittee, and appointed myself as chairman. Again, we held hearings and again it was possible to get favorable action by the full Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Having learned a lesson the hard way, I knew that a meeting with President Eisenhower to discuss this legislation was essential. I felt the bill was important not only to Wisconsin but to the economy and defense of the future of this country. Graciously, the President granted the appointment and we had a full dress discussion on the legislation.

Upon request, the President was kind enough to review the complete report by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers relating to the proposed seaway. After completion of the review, the President promised full support for the project.

Recalling that previous Presidents had uttered similar words, Mr. Eisenhower promised full support not only in words, but also in deed.

WILEY BILL—MUST LEGISLATION

There was, however, one more battle to fight. The big question was: Should it become must legislation?

What does this mean? Just this: That it must be brought up on the calendar of the Congress for consideration.

During a conference at the White House, late in 1953, to determine a calendar of must legislation for the next session of Congress, the meeting almost turned into a real powwow.

Let me say, frankly, that interests opposing the seaway—the railroads, eastern ports, and others—were not without their spokesmen in Congress.

After a "toe to toe" political exchange, however, it was agreed that the seaway would become must legislation.

During the ensuing weeks, there was a great deal of "missionary work" to be done. This included discussions, conferences, reviews of the merits of the project, rebuttals to arguments aaginst the project, and endless efforts to open eyes, as well as to dissuade those who, because of special interests, were strongly opposed to the seaway.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to recount all the infighting that took place at that time. However, the history book shows that on January 20, 1954, the Wiley bill passed the Senate by a vote of 51 to 33. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reports the votes of those who came over and those who refrained from voting.

With the major battle won in the Senate, the legislation sponsored by Congressman George Dondero, of Michigan, then literally rolled through the House of Representatives.

In some instances, those who had once opposed the legislation found themselves voting in support of it.

On May 13, 1954, President Eisenhower signed the Wiley-Dondero Act into law—culminating 50 long years of dreams by many people to make the seaway a reality.

Now, let's look briefly at additional challenges ahead of us.

SEAWAY DE-ICING

A major battle that must be fought—and won—is combating the age-old foe of winter ice. As you know, winter freezing results in the most important physical limitation of the St. Lawrence Waterway.

The average navigation season, computed over a 37-year period, has been limited—due to ice conditions—to the following averages: The Welland Canal, 252 days; the St. Mary's Falls Canal, 250 days; the St. Lawrence canals, 241 days; and Montreal Harbor, 235 days.

As these figures illustrate, icing is plainly a major obstacle to full utilization of the seaway, as well as to trade on the lakes themselves.

As you know, we can normally figure on about a 230-day navigation season for upper lakes boats; and a 245-day season for ocean-going vessels plying between ports along the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway and overseas ports (allowing 15 days on the high seas beyond the Gulf of the St. Lawrence at the beginning and end of navigation).

This certainly does not compare favorably with the movement from U.S. ports along the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts, where there is a 345-day navigation year.

To lay the groundwork for possible ultimate development of a de-icing system on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway, I have introduced a bill in the Senate—S. 2242. The proposal, if enacted—as I believe it should be—would authorize the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to make a comprehensive investigation and study of a means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year.

The development of a de-icing program would, of course, be a necessarily long-range program. However, there have been enough successes with such systems—in Greenland, Canada, and the Scandinavian countries—to merit a complete study of their applicability to the Great Lakes, connecting channels, ports and harbors, and the St. Lawrence Seaway.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is a brief review of the history, problems and challenges evolving around the greatest engineering and construction feat on the North American Continent—the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Now, friends, in conclusion, I want to express my warm appreciation for the opportunity to join in your 4-day gala celebration in recognition of the significance of the St. Lawrence Seaway to Superior, to Wisconsin, and the Nation.

Too, I want to again humbly express my deep gratitude at your gracious tribute in calling this special day in your celebrations "Senator Alexander Wiley Day."

Thank you very much.

Administration Education Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 17, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming, who is in his own right a well-known and respected educator.

This statement discusses the education proposals of the administration and because I feel it is very informative, I thought it should be called to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

On June 4 I reviewed this Department's legislative program. I pointed out then that what would be accomplished in the fields of health, education, and welfare would be determined in the following 90 days.

In the 40 days which have elapsed since that review, most of the Department's noncontroversial programs have made reasonable progress. Unfortunately, there has been no action on school construction. As for the status of two of our other major proposals—those in the fields of higher education and civil rights—recent developments call for special comment at this time.

1. HIGHER EDUCATION CONSTRUCTION

The Congress has taken no action on the administration's recommendations for Federal assistance in financing the construction of college housing, classroom, administration, and related facilities.

Administration measures on this subject have been lying dormant in the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare since February. In the meantime, Congress attempted to deal with this subject in an omnibus housing bill.

This bill the President found necessary to veto on July 7. The President specifically disapproved of the provisions relating to higher education construction because they "would * * * substitute public for private financing." He stated, however, in his veto message that "the college housing program proposed in the budget message of [January 1959] should be enacted."

The budget message recommendation would provide an additional $200 million for the current college housing loan program in order to permit a phasing out of that program and an orderly transition to the administration's new higher education construction program.

The time has come for the construction needs of higher education to be considered separately and on their own merits, unencumbered by consideration of other specialized housing problems.

The administration's proposals, if enacted, would provide assistance which is vitally needed by our colleges and universities in order to meet a problem that is, literally, almost at their doorstep—the rising tide of enrollments. The administration has proposed an emergency, 5-year plan that includes:

1. Federal guarantees of principal and interest on non-tax-exempt bonds sold by colleges to private investors to finance construction of housing, classrooms, administration, and related facilities. The proposal allows $1 billion as the aggregate total of guaranteed bonds outstanding at any one time over the 5-year period.

2. Debt retirement assistance in the form of Federal commitments to pay 25 percent of the principal on long-term (over 20 years) bonds (either taxable or tax exempt) issued by colleges and universities to finance construction of housing, academic, or other related facilities. Aggregate Federal payments would be limited to $500 million, representing 25 percent of a total principal construction cost of $2 billion. This assistance would be limited to projects which would increase enrollment capacity or improve and expand teaching and research in the sciences and engineering.

The administration proposal would be more effective than the existing college housing loan program in two major respects:

(a) It would result in lower annual payments of principal and interest by the institutions, assuming loan maturities of 20 to 25 years and interest of 4½ percent or less (A comparative tabulation is attached.)

(b) It would include classrooms, laboratories, libraries and related facilities, as well as the types of income-producing buildings (cafeterias, dining halls, dormitories, etc.) now eligible for college housing loans. The total volume of academic building construction provided for under this program would be at the rate of about $200 million a year for 5 years as compared with the total of $62.5 million in direct loans for such facilities provided for in the vetoed housing bill.

2. CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM

As part of the administration's civil rights program, I transmitted to the Congress on February 5, 1959, two proposals in the field of education. The Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary which held hearings on civil rights legislation this spring recently reported a civil rights bill to the full committee. I was pleased to note that two of the titles of this bill (titles VII and VIII) incorporate the proposals recommended by this Department. The full committee is now meeting to consider the subcommittee bill. To me, this is the most hopeful sign yet that Congress will enact at this session the reasonable and non-coercive civil rights measures requested by the administration.

One of the Department proposals (title VII of the subcommittee bill) would amend the laws providing assistance to federally affected areas (Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, 85th Cong.) to authorize the Federal Government to provide for the free public education of children of military personnel where the local public schools are closed as a result of official action by State and local governmental authorities.

The second Department proposal (title VIII of the subcommittee bill) would authorize grants to State and local school authorities to pay half the costs of special services required in carrying out desegregation programs. It would also authorize the Commissioner of Education to collect and disseminate information on the progress of school desegregation and to provide technical assistance in the development and conduct of desegregation programs upon the request of States and local agencies.

Costs of borrowing under the College Facilities Act of 1959 compared with the present college housing program

[Per $1,000 of borrowing]

	20 years		30 years		40 years	
	4¼ percent	4½ percent	4¼ percent	4½ percent	4¼ percent	4½ percent
1. Annual payment of interest and debt service	$75.22	$76.88	$59.60	$61.39	$52.42	$54.34
2. Total payment	1,504.40	1,537.60	1,788.00	1,841.70	2,096.80	2,173.60
3. Total cost if Federal Government pays $250 (¼ of principal)	1,254.40	1,287.60	1,538.00	1,591.70	1,846.80	1,923.60
4. Annual payment by institution	62.72	64.38	51.27	53.06	46.17	48.09
5. Annual payment by institution under present college housing program	[1] $67.99		[1] $51.85		[1] $44.14	

[1] Assuming interest at 3⅛ percent.

Use of So-Called Executive Privilege

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 17, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the President's last press conference Mr. Clark Mollenhoff asked a question relative to executive privilege. At that time he did not get much of an answer, but I wish to invite the attention of Senators to an editorial entitled "The Misplaced Anger," which appears in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal.

Unfortunately, over the years, under both Democrats and Republicans, there has been too much of a shift in power to the Executive, at the expense of the legislative branch of the Government. This is unhealthy, because it does away with the coequality which is supposed to exist under the Constitution.

Because of the importance of this question I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Wall Street Journal be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MISPLACED ANGER

President Eisenhower is a man who believes that public office is a public trust, and for that reason it is understandable that a question about "impudence, mismanagement, and fraud" in Government caused him to show anger.

The question, asked at his latest press conference, concerned the use of the so-called "executive privilege" by Government agencies to deny access to information to the General Accounting Office.

The General Accounting Office was created by the Congress as an auditing and investigating agency, empowered to keep a check on the executive branch of Government which spends the money Congress appropriates. The GAO was made independent of the executive branch on the sound ground that if it were part of that branch it could harly be expected to investigate itself impartially.

However, the GAO has had increasing difficulty in getting all the information it believes necessary to carry out its function as an auditor because the executive branch has pleaded so-called executive privilege—that is, that it has a right to withhold information not only from Congress but from its own auditors.

Recently, Comptroller General Joseph Campbell put the complaint of the GAO specifically when he reported to Congress that the Department of Defense was withholding necessary information.

Mr. Campbell said the Defense Department denies GAO information "expressly required by law to be made available." This, he said, creates the "opportunity to conceal substantive evidence of waste and extravagance, improvident management, poor procurement practices, or other adverse conditions." It also creates "public distrust as to the desires of the military for unquestioned secrecy."

Now in the conditions described by the Comptroller General, there is certainly all the opportunity in the world for "imprudence, mismanagement, and fraud." These are not the reasons, however, that Government agencies like to keep to themselves what they are doing. One example is found in the testimony of F. Trowbridge Von Baur, general counsel for the Navy, when he appeared before a House Government Operations Subcommittee.

He said, "If we give something to the General Accounting Office there is no power on earth that can restrain the General Accounting Office from giving that material to the Congress if the Congress wants it. Also, through that channel we know very frankly, material of that kind is apt to reach the newspapers and the headlines, and we feel that this kind of material, opinions, conclusions, and advice from subordinates, would mislead, confuse, cause a lot of commotion."

A lot of commotion, to be sure, is what most bureaucrats want none of, where their bureaucracies are concerned. But, while understandable, that is hardly reason for denying material, internal papers or no, that the General Accounting Office says it must have if it is to carry out its legal responsibility of checking on Government agencies.

Mr. Eisenhower has a great many responsibilities in other fields and so he cannot be expected to know the extent to which his own executive agencies and departments are using executive privilege to keep from the public knowledge to which the public has a right.

Along with his belief that a public office is a public trust, Mr. Eisenhower also believes, unless we are greatly mistaken, that the public is entitled to know what its Government is doing. And if he were to inquire into the extent of secrecy, we have an idea the President would be far more angered at some of his own bureaucrats than at the reporter who brought the secrecy to his attention.

Tribute to President of the American Optometric Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 17, 1959

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, one of North Carolina's finest citizens, Dr. P. N. DeVere, of my home town of Morganton, N.C., has been elected president of a great national organization of professional men, namely, the American Optometric Association.

This association is to be congratulated upon the wisdom it has exercised in making its choice. The Morganton News-Herald for July 10, 1959, contains an editorial indicating the unselfish service which Dr. DeVere has rendered to his community, his State, and his Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY SHARES IN DR. DEVERE'S HONOR

Morganton and Burke County are justifiably proud that one of the professional men in our community has been given the top national honor in his field. This is especially significant since this is the first time, to our knowledge, that any man in North Carolina has ever approached his standing in that profession.

Dr. P. N. DeVere, who has been practicing optometry in Morganton since 1939, was elevated last week to the office of president of the American Optometric Association during the association's 62d annual congress in Dallas, Tex.

What is almost as significant is that he has not only been elected president of the association, but he has also held all four of the top offices in the national group.

Four years ago he was selected second vice president, and he has steadily ascended the ladder of national offices each year. From second vice president, he stepped up to first vice president. Last year he was chosen president-elect, which was the real test of his popularity among his associates, and the expression of confidence in his professional ability and character.

His recent confirmation as president of the association, although in some ways a mere formality, marks the crowning honor that Dr. DeVere's fellow eye specialists could bestow upon him. We are confident that he deserved the honor.

Dr. DeVere has amply demonstrated that his professional ability is based upon a sincere desire to be of service to humanity. Instances of his uncompensated participation and leadership in worthy public service projects are too numerous to mention.

On the national level, he is a member of the Research Committee of President Eisenhower's Committee for Traffic Safety, and a member of the National Research Council on Night Visibility.

On the State level, to name a few of his activities, he is optometric consultant to the North Carolina Department of Motor Vehicles, a member of the Governor's traffic safety council, and a member of the board of directors of the North Carolina Parent-Teachers Association.

On the local level, he is a director of both the State Bank of Burke and the Morganton Building and Loan Association, and holds offices and memberships in service, lodge, and recreational organizations literally too numerous to mention.

Dr. DeVere is also a devoted family man.

We can forgive the fact that he was born in Washington State and educated in Illinois. We are proud that Dr. DeVere calls Morganton home.

A National Fair Trade Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 17, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a recent newspaper column in the Cincinnati Enquirer by Mr. Ed Wimmer, vice-president and public relations director of the National Federation of Independent Business, adds significant evidence to the argument for a national fair trade law.

Mr. Wimmer and his organization have been tremendously effective leaders in the fight for protection of independent businesses. Mr. Wimmer is unquestionably one of the best-informed men in the country on the problems and needs of small business.

Particularly noteworthy in this column is a statement by the president of a department store chain to a congressional subcommittee concerning the purposes and effects of the sort of price-cutting practices that a fair trade law would prohibit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of this column be published at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the greatest battles ever fought for the preservation of freedom of opportunity in the American marketplace, has been conducted by the National Association of Retail Druggists, and the Bureau of Education on Fair Trade, in attempts of these two groups to bring about passage of effective fair trade legislation.

Dr. John Dargavel, head of the drug association, and the team of Maurice Mermey, bureau director, and Herman Waller, general counsel, have carried the fight into every nook and corner of the Nation. They have compiled an amount of evidence in support of proposed fair trade laws that no reasonable person, either in or out of Government, could fail to respect. Among exhibits recently presented before congressional hearings by Mr. Waller, included a bulletin from the St. Louis Better Business Bureau, which read:

"A noisy advertiser in St. Louis who claimed 'lowest prices in town' was lowest on only 7 out of 75 items offered by competitors. Yet, one such advertiser like this can ignite the fires of a price war, bringing harm to everyone." Another interesting statement submitted was by Fred Lazarus, president of Federated Department Stores. Said Mr. Lazarus:

"The current bad pricing situation is actually the result of an attempt to lead the public to believe that prices in one store are generally lower than in other stores, and this just isn't so. * * * The public should understand that no store can stay in business and sell its merchandise below overhead cost unless it subsidizes loss leaders with profits from other merchandise. * * * Loss-leader selling hits tens of thousands of small businesses that perform a real service to the communities—as distributors of the very merchandise being used as loss leaders."

In the BBB release you have a result of expert research, and even though Mr. Lazarus has indulged in a little self-incrimination, who will say that he doesn't know what he is talking about?

Consider the testimony of Mr. Mermey when covering a price study of items offered by two large New York discount houses, which showed profits on "unfamiliar" goods ranging up to 269 percent in one discount store, and 300 percent in another, and you'll see what the BBB and the defenders of fair trade are trying to get across—that something for nothing just ain't.

Ohio legislators set example of enlightened thinking on fair trade for the U.S. Congress. Bill passed Ohio House 123 to 4; Senate, 30 to 2.

How You Can Influence Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 17, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that, in our representative form of government, policies and programs can be most effectively administered if created upon the solid foundation of public support.

As a youthful Nation, the United States has been catapulted into a position of world leadership.

If our country is to adequately perform its role as a free world leader, we must encourage greater and greater participation by our citizens in formulation of domestic and international programs and policies.

There are, of course, a great many unanswered questions relating to our international responsibilities and obligations. These include: How can we most effectively carry out our responsibility for United States and free world security? What is the extent of our obligation in international affairs? To what degree should we tap our resources, brainpower, and manpower to assist friendly nations economically; to wipe out disease, poverty and illiteracy; to lay the foundation of ideas and ideals upon which to build a better future?

In today's world—in which time and space as barriers and protective walls are rapidly diminishing—there is a real need for further crystallization of our role in world affairs and of greater public attunement to our obligations and responsibilities.

The future of the free world—in fact, of life on the globe—may well depend upon the success with which we recognize, and assume, our proper role in the international community of nations.

The July edition of Kiwanis magazine carried a thought-provoking article by Saul K. Padover, entitled "How You Can Influence Foreign Policy."

Constructively, the article reviews ways and means by which individuals and community leaders can and should participate to a larger degree in the formulation of public opinion as it relates to our foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW YOU CAN INFLUENCE FOREIGN POLICY

(By Saul K. Padover)

Now that the United States and Canada are deeply immersed in foreign affairs, with commitments on a global scale, the question, the vital question, is: How—and how well—do our community leaders perform their function in enlightening the people?

The question is crucial because, unlike domestic affairs, international problems are too complex and too difficult for the average citizen to understand without guidance. For example, in a recent nationwide poll conducted by the New York Times on the Berlin issue, about 39 percent of the Americans queried did not know whether Berlin was in East or West Germany and proved poorly informed on many other aspects of the problem. Here is where effective, well-informed leaders might have helped.

Who are the leaders? In every community there are individuals or small groups with power and influence. They shape public opinion and create the policies that influence their fellow citizens. These men are the leaders. If they provide proper enlightenment and direction they contribute to a sane and sensible policy. If they fail, their country is in trouble indeed.

American and Canadian life today exemplifies Jefferson's conception of a natural aristocracy. Whether in business or government or the professions, our leaders are those whose positions were attained through individual effort and skill, rather than birth. Cases of inherited wealth and social status do exist among the leaders, but the majority, including the last two Presidents of the United States and the present Prime Minister of Canada, come from modest homes. Surveys indicate that most leaders—mayors, presidents of civic organizations, Members of Congress and Parliament, heads of industries—are college graduates; and, on community levels, more than half of them have professional degrees. The educational ladder—that is, training for positions of power and influence—still remains the primary avenue of advancement.

Of all the categories of leadership, that of business is perhaps the most influential. In every community in our two nations, it is the top business leaders who are admired and heeded. Business and service organizations, particularly in the smaller and middle-sized communities, are main centers of influence regarding public (including international) affairs. A speech or statement before the chamber of commerce or Kiwanis is likely to carry more weight than a lecture in a classroom or, for that matter, a sermon in church. Furthermore, local newspapers and radio-TV stations—direct and continuous molders of public opinion—are the property of community leaders. To put it in different terms, ownership of these media, which are often multimillion-dollar properties, almost automatically bestows influence and power—leadership—on the proprietor.

Business leadership in our communities is rarely absolute, however. The leader, to be successful, cannot act contrary to the basic expectations of those he hopes to lead. A man challenging the fundamental beliefs and hopes of the community, no matter how rich or powerful he may be, soon finds himself "out on a limb," likely to end up talking to himself in a social vacuum. Hence, in all communities the leaders—whether political, social, professional, or economic—are nearly always "joiners." They belong to anywhere from a half dozen or two or three dozen local or national organizations that are very influential in their communities. Through these organizations — Kiwanis, Rotary, Lions, chamber of commerce, American Legion, community fund, church affiliations—they exert influence and help to set community patterns of thinking and doing.

In what fields do leaders lead? Everywhere they occupy themselves primarily with local affairs, although on occasion they may deliver a talk on foreign policy. Community needs—such as schools, housing, taxes, and real-estate development—absorb the time and interest of the leaders, as well as of the public at large. Problems of state or provincewide nature concern them mainly insofar as they impinge on the communities. As for national affairs, they are of secondary interest, confined largely to elections or to some special doings in Washington or Ottawa.

This general situation gives a partial answer to our question as to what the leadership does in foreign policy. By and large, the answer is that the leaders do very little. Although they are somewhat better informed on foreign affairs than the general public, the truth is that most of them are indifferent. About 1 out of 10 leaders in American communities trouble themselves with world problems, but this figure may be too high. In Canada, traditionally more foreign affairs minded, interest is more pronounced, but still not startlingly so—especially in the West.

Two main reasons account for this general indifference to international problems on the part of most community leaders. One is remoteness; the other is helplessness.

Leaders are inclined to feel, as does also the general bublic, that foreign affairs are not only foreign but very far from home—far both physically and psychologically. The world's trouble spots are distant places on the map, and it requires an effort of the imagination to realize that the current troubles in Iraq or Tibet may have serious consequences for our own future. Even more important is the prevailing feeling among leaders that international affairs are out of their hands.

With the best intentions in the world, what can even a prominent community leader do in the field of foreign policy?

To sway events, he has to have the ear of a high government official, he thinks, and if he does not, why waste his time? In other words, the leader knows that on a community level his efforts can bring tangible results: the school, the park, the swimming pool for children he helps to build are there for all to see, use, and appreciate. But what can he do in or for India, Ghana, New Guinea, or even his State Department or Department of External Affairs? He senses that he can do nothing, and this begets frustration and, ultimately, indifference.

The truth, however, is that local leaders are too pessimistic on the subject. They are not, or at least they need not be, as helpless as they think themselves to be. To be sure, they cannot formulate foreign policy or execute it or directly change the course of events abroad. But they can do the next best thing: they can shape and enlighten public opinion for desirable ends. For democracies such as ours it is public opinion that, in the last analysis, decides major policies, including those affecting foreign affairs. Without the support of the people through their representatives in Congress and Parliament, important policy decisions cannot be executed in our capitols.

Today, public opinion in regard to international affairs is of peculiar importance because of finances. In the past, foreign policy consisted largely of consular activities, diplomatic negotiations, and treatymaking, requiring a minimum of financial outlay. Nowadays, however, our positions as world leaders involve a minimum of routine diplomacy and a maximum of dollars. In the last decade, the United States spent nearly $20 billion on nonmilitary assistance abroad. During the same period Canada, with one-tenth the population of the United States, and one-thirteenth the national gross product, spent $2.5 billion.

Under the Constitution, money bills are the prerogative of the Congress, which means that the latter, operating through the powerful standing Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee in the House, now plays a preponderant role in foreign affairs. Hence, the American people are deeply involved in the situation, since they are called upon regularly—every 2, 4, and 6 years—to vote for those who make and carry out foreign policy in Washington. Canadians are equally involved, for while policy is made in a somewhat different manner than in the United States, the chief decision makers—the Prime Minister and Members of Parliament—are also elected officials.

At this point, public opinion comes fully into play. The wisdom, or lack of it, shown in the voters' choice of their Representatives depends largely on prevailing local opinion. Opinion, we have seen, is molded by local leaders, first from the business community and, secondly, from professional, civil, religious, and educational bodies. But in foreign affairs these leaders have not lived up to their potentialities. The majority of them are indifferent to "political" problems that transcend the boundaries of their communities. It is a disturbing fact that the American press as a whole devotes on an average less than 5 percent of all its news space to international affairs; most newspapers, indeed, give less than half that amount. Canada, again, is somewhat more foreign affairs minded. A pre-World War II survey put the figure at 10 percent; today it is probably somewhat higher. But even this figure is no bargain in a changing world. The leaders of the press, both editors and publishers, justify their practice on the ground that their readers are not interested in foreign affairs. This, however, is an avoidance of responsibility in an age of crisis.

The local leaders can do much more than they are doing at present to enlighten the public on international problems which are now matters of national survival.

They can, for one thing, give greater support to existing organizations devoted to foreign affairs. At present, 60 cities in the United States have councils on foreign relations or world affairs; 20 cities in Canada have branches of the Institute of International Affairs. But membership and attendance are generally small. The leaders can organize systematic study groups. They can provide for a continuing series of lectures in their communities. They can keep in constant contact with their legislators. They can, above all, enlarge the foreign policy content of the media and encourage the writing of interpretative articles in the newspapers. They can stimulate public debate on the airwaves.

These suggestions are not councils of perfection. Nor are they fringe luxuries. The way the world is going, they are, indeed, urgent necessities for our survival as a free world power. For in any democracy there is absolutely no substitute for public opinion. Vital decisions cannot be left to the specialists or the much-abused "politicians." The people have to make them. And the community leaders have to assume the burden of guidance and leadership more than they have hitherto done.

Let's Not Forget That Laos Was Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 17, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Worchester Evening Gazette of Thursday, June 18.

The Gazette is one of our leading newspapers in Massachusetts.

As one who has visited Laos, South Vietnam, and Cambodia, I can readily see how important the preservation of Laos as a free nation is in that area of the world. I think this editorial is certainly worthy of the attention of all of us.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S NOT FORGET THAT LAOS WAS SAVED

The current argument in Congress over the aid program to Laos is ironic. Those who charge that the thing was shot full of bribery, corruption, and politics seem to forget that the program was also one of the most brilliantly successful in the whole history of U.S. foreign aid. It literally snatched a whole country—Laos—from the jaws of communism.

Two years ago most observers would not have given a plugged nickel for Laos' chances of surviving in freedom. Snuggled up close to Red China and the Red North Vietnam, it seemed a sitting duck for Communist subversion. Its long border with Burma on the west was a nest of intrigue in which private armies, guerrilla, Communist, and bandit roamed. Its 1,800,000 people seemed to have little attachment to the ideas of freedom and little understanding of the dangers of communism.

Yet, in the past year the Communists, who almost controlled the government 2 years ago, have been practically neutralized. Government forces have surrounded the last battalion of Communist troops.

The tip off to the way things are going is shown by the sudden demand by Red China and Russia to have an investigation of the "critical" situation in Laos. Prime Minister Nehru of India, in a rather fuzzy-headed way, has given his support to the Soviet and Chinese demands. He says the situation in Laos is unsatisfactory.

It is certainly unsatisfactory to the Communists, who are being driven into a corner. Just why there should be international meddling at this time is hard to understand from the western point of view.

In the meantime, the indignant Congressmen in Washington should take a hard look at what we have accomplished in Laos. To be sure, we poured in millions of dollars of supplies and arms, and some of it was wasted in graft and politics. But after all, it's not every day that we can claim to have saved a nation from the Reds.

River and Harbor and Flood Control Projects

SPEECH
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I understand this is a bill to authorize the construction of public works to be paid for by Federal funds. Am I right, I ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is an authorization bill only. First of all, the Bureau of the Budget will have to approve any appropriation items that may be necessary. Next, the President must include them in his budget message to Congress, and finally Congress must appropriate the money.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Usually, when the House authorizes an appropriation, we follow through with an appropriation bill for some amount.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Usually, but not always, by any means.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not always; but this being a public works bill, unanimously reported out, it would be a fair guess to say that the projects will be paid for by Federal funds. I assume I did need not ask the gentleman, that Federal funds means the taxpayers' dollars. So we are or should be interested in the amount as well as the authorization.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The amount contained in this authorization bill is a little over $600 million. This bill carries authorizations for expenditures amounting to a little over $600 million which is about half, and I understand a little less than half of the amount that was carried in the previous bill 2 years ago. So the committee has done a pretty good job of screening these projects. The number of projects that have been authorized has been very limited. Seemingly, the report indicates there are projects that are vitally needed. Some, of course, are the continuation of projects that have been underway and, I believe, the gentleman from Michigan, if he studies the report, will find that the measure is one of the most satisfactory bills of this type to come before the Congress for a long, long time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is my understanding, but one thing still bothers me a little. Our experience with the highway construction, which is federally financed and in part by the States, is that as soon as we get through a bill to construct a project, the cost begins going up and we just get less of whatever we are trying to buy with the amount that is authorized or finally appropriated than we could have bought just before the authorization. That practice really hurts and should end. I know the gentleman from Ohio was interested in labor legislation which will prevent or at least lessen the cost of project whether public or private, because a little while ago he asked the leadership when something would come out on the labor bill—we have on the floor here now a very distinguished member of that committee who has participated in the deliberations all through, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY]. I wonder if the gentleman from West Virginia will give the gentleman from Ohio any information as to when we will quit trading and bargaining over there on political matters and get out a bill—if that is what we are trying to do.

Mr. BAILEY. May I suggest to the gentleman from Michigan that the matter is quite controversial in the committee, and I think we should continue with our deliberations, which I hope will end in a day or two and we will have some kind of a bill to bring to the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In your judgment, will we get a rough draft by Monday or Tuesday of next week? Perhaps tomorrow or Saturday?

Mr. BAILEY. Probably Tuesday.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I hope that will give the gentleman from Ohio the information he wants. He says there is some controversy there. We are divided in a way between the ADA, the Reuther men, the steel fellows and, yesterday, for the third or fourth time, a representative of Mr. Hoffa, and he is a Republican, was in my office and I asked him what Mr. Hoffa wanted. He said they did not want any bill at all. So you gentlemen, if there are any here, who are inclined to accept Mr. Hoffa's views, I give you that for what it is worth. Of course, there are some of us over there on committee, and I happen to be one who thinks we should have legislation at least on three subjects. One covering this no man's land which will give a remedy to those who are too small to be recognized by the National Labor Relations Board, and another one which will give us, give people generally a protection against secondary boycotting and against organizational picketing. We may all assume that the Kennedy-Ervin bill covers pretty thoroughly the racketeering and extortion phases and so far as I know there is no great opposition to the provisions in there which deal with those two subjects. But the other three we just must have.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Alumna Lucy Hon Cuddy, B.A., 1911, Is One of Anchorage's First Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 17, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the title above is copied from the magazine Arkansas Alumnus for July 1959. This heads an article about Mrs. Lucy Cuddy, of Anchorage, and was written by my friend Stanley J. Erickson, also a resident of Alaska's largest city. It is a most interesting, well-written article about one of Alaska's great ladies and I take pleasure in giving it even wider circulation by asking unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALUMNA LUCY HON CUDDY, B.A., 1911, IS ONE OF ANCHORAGE'S FIRST CITIZENS—ALASKA'S GRAND DAME FROM ARKANSAS

(By Stanley J. Erickson)

If any lady can lay claim to the title of "Grande Dame" in the biggest city of our largest State, it is an alumna of the University of Arkansas, Lucy Hon Cuddy, B.A., 1911. Not that Alaskans are wont to put much emphasis on such titles or that Lucy Hon Cuddy preoccupies herself with such superficial trappings of the vital role she has played—and is playing now—in the development of our newest State.

Chairman of the board of the State's largest bank, member of the board of regents of the University of Alaska, and first chairman of Anchorage's United Good Neighbors drive, Lucy has been a part of the Alaska scene for 43 eventful years and is one of the State's most respected and loved citizens. Traditions passed down to her from her Arkansas heritage, and ideals instilled at the University of Arkansas have in turn been transmitted by her into the cultural foundations and the fabric of our newest State.

It was in 1916 that Lucy Hon of Fort Smith decided that she had sufficient resources to warrant the risk of going the way west; 5 years' teaching experience in Arkansas, a liberal amount of youthful self-reliance, and a generous allotment of youthful disdain for the counter advice of her elders. She decided that if she was actually to seek her own fortunes in the west, it would be as far west as the country's territory extended. That was Alaska and she soon found herself a job as a teacher in Valdez.

Teachers at that time were rarely destined to continue in a state of maidenhood in such a male-dominant town as Valdez. In Valdez, "If they didn't get a teacher married off in her first year, they got her a job as telephone operator in the Valdez exchange, where she would meet more people," Lucy explains. However, the possibility of such career transference never confronted Lucy. When she and a young College of Puget Sound law graduate, Warren Cuddy, met, the die was early cast for the termination of her teaching career and assumption of the role of housewife and mother. Her parents back in Fort Smith did insist, however, that the young couple's union be blessed and perhaps made more certain through performance of the marriage rites back in the more civilized society of Arkansas. "They looked quite suspiciously on a man who chose to seek his life in such a dangerous and uncivilized country. But then, his parents back in Washington had the same misgivings about a girl who would venture into those northern ramparts."

With their nuptials properly performed under stateside sanctions, and with the trepidations of their families somewhat allayed, Lucy and Warren Cuddy returned to Valdez, Warren soon to become the U.S. attorney for Alaska's western judicial district, itself about the size of Texas.

"We came to Alaska about the end of the horse and dog team era and at the beginning of the model T era," Lucy says, and goes on to explain it was the model T that really got Alaska on the road; that and the Alaska Railroad which the Government was building at about the same time, running north and south from Anchorage to connect the seaport of Seward, on the Gulf of Alaska, with Fairbanks, 450 miles north in the heart of the interior.

"Valdez lay at the foot of a low mountain pass. A trail and road of sorts led up and over the pass and meandered northward also to terminate at Fairbanks. The big task those days was to make that trail work as a road, and I don't know how many tons of horsepower I put forth behind our model T pushing it up the Richardson Highway over Thompson Pass." Today the Richardson is a fine, paved highway linking Valdez with Fairbanks and Anchorage.

When Anchorage in the late twenties and early thirties became the more important town, and the center of Federal Government activity was moved there from Valdez, the Cuddys and their two young sons moved along also. Warren entered private practice and gave more and more time to the young First National Bank of Anchorage, later as its president; Lucy took an active interest in helping to build the new town and in raising her two sons, David, Jr., and Dan.

The Cuddys didn't let themselves become provincial Alaskan sourdoughs, however. Every year or two there was a trip outside—sometimes to Europe or South America—and a constant widening of horizons and the broad spectrum of interests in peoples, events, and ideas that now so clearly characterize Lucy Cuddy. There were tragedies, too, the loss of their son David at Anzio, and in 1951, the death of her husband. She and her son Dan stepped in to take over active direction of the bank, now growing at an even faster pace, she as chairman of the board, Dan as president.

In 1956, the bank built a large addition with a fine lobby and a big plate glass front, before which just about everyone in Anchorage passes during any 2-week period. And that gave Lucy the opportunity of putting into practice one of her pet ideas—that of dynamic public interest displays.

"One of the things we all miss in a new country such as Alaska is our roots and our links with the fine old traditions and hallmarks of our stateside origins," Lucy explains. She decided to make the bank lobby and that big plate glass front a show place for these symbols of the roots, traditions, and memories of Alaskans. Her first display was her own—family heirlooms from Arkansas—grandmother's clock, her woven coverlet, and patchwork quilt, an old doll, candlesticks, family album, odd pieces of old glass.

Since then, hardly a fortnight passes without a change of display. Today, there may be an art show, displaying the varied painting talents of Anchorage residents. Next week, perhaps an exhibit of old coins, to be followed by an exhibit of fine ivory carving from the Arctic North. Lucy's bank thus serves not only as the leading financial institution of the North; it also acts as a kind of museum for Alaskana and Americana, with Lucy as curator. Mrs. Cuddy has received national recognition in banking circles for this work and for her other activities in promoting public relations on a high level in the field of finance.

Lucy's Anchorage, by virtue of the airplane and its unique position up near the top of the hemisphere halfway between Tokyo and Copenhagen over the Pole, has become literally a crossroads of the world. Each day sees transpolar planes of KLM, SAS, and Air France stopping there. Likewise, aircraft of Canadian, Japanese, and American carriers stop there for refueling. Far from remaining a distant isolated place, it is fast becoming perhaps the most urbane and cosmopolitan small town on this continent, if not in the world. Into Lucy's bank may walk, one after the other, a homesteader with problems of financing his cabin and land clearing, a Texas oil developer with a couple of million looking for a likely place to explore for Alaska's new-found oil, a representative of Japanese industry interested in Alaska coking-coal deposits, a trio of young Swedes to change their Swedish kroner into American dollars before a weekend of skiing or trout fishing.

Lucy Hon Cuddy, presiding as chairman of its board, reflects this cosmopolitan character of her bank's clients. Alaskans travel 20 times more by aid than do their cousins in the south "48"; so too does Lucy. Last year she traveled around the world in a group that included her sister and brother-in-law, Arkansas alums, Mildred Hon Murry and Dr. Harry E. Murry.

She's as much as ease in Caracas, Venezuela, as Cordova, Alaska. She might turn up anywhere, as she did to the surprise of an old classmate, Phil Huntly, B.C.E., 1910, who was sitting in the lobby of the Imperial Hotel in Tokyo a year ago when his wife, the former Kathleen "Neen" Garvin, former student '12, got into a conversation with Lucy and discovered not only that they were from the same State but also classmates with fond mutual remembrances of Fayetteville and the university.

But there's always this drive to come back to Alaska, she admits. None of this Palm Springs-Phoenix-in-the-winter stuff for her. Her home is one of the oldest in Anchorage, but it's moved along with the changing scene and today sits long, low, and modern on a bluff in the heart of downtown Anchorage, overlooking the harbor and a vast panorama of mountains and a distant shore 2 miles across the inlet on which moose, wolves, and brown bear roam and where a few hardy homesteaders are only now beginning to settle. From her window she can see a new $8 million ocean dock abuilding or watch powerful diesels pulling long trains of construction supplies and electronic gear for the Alaskan military bases. To her left, a few blocks along the bluff, well diggers are driving test holes for a 12-story pair of office and hotel buildings.

Books and magazines scattered around her living room attest to her catholic tastes: The Atlantic, Harper's, The New Yorker, Harry Golden's "Only in America," Hardy's "Return of the Native," and Max Shulman's "Rally Round the Flag Boys."

It was perhaps the broad viewpoint that is suggested here, together with her intimate knowledge and understanding of Alaska, that led the governor 2 years ago to appoint Lucy Hon Cuddy as a regent of the University of Alaska. The development of this institution is now one of her closest interests.

The University is as fast growing as the rest of Alaska; its geophysical institute is doing outstanding and pioneering work in probing the secrets of physical phenomena in the far north, and its scientists are learning secrets of agriculture on ground that covers everlasting ice.

Four years ago, when Anchorage business leaders decided the town had grown sufficiently large to warrant a single United Good Neighbors activity, their logical choice for its first chairman of the drive, and the person to bring together representatives of all walks—labor, government, business, interracial—was Lucy. As first chairman of the United Good Neighbors drive, Lucy was brought closer to the newest generations of Alaskans, the young migrants from the "South 48," eager to make Alaska a successful State.

And now there's another generation of Cuddys, her five grandchildren from whom Lucy is receiving new rewards and experiences in her full life. In this full life one of the guiding principles that has stood with her is a maxim she learned back in the university:

"Education is only the preparation for self-education."

Proposed Turkey Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 17, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD correspondence I have received from North Dakota, and a statement before the North Dakota Farm Bureau Livestock Commission by Leslie Johnson, of Manfred, N. Dak., all having reference to proposed turkey legislation.

There being no objection, the letters and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU,
Fargo, N. Dak.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The board of directors of the North Dakota Farm Bureau Federation, at their recent meeting held in Fargo, June 17, discussed current turkey legislation before Congress and unanimously went on record in opposition to all nine known turkey bills now before the House and Senate of the United States (H.R. 5180, H.R. 3069, H.R. 5071, H.R. 1344, H.R. 5583, H.R. 5614, H.R. 2490, S. 1395, and S. 430). These bills, it was felt, involve eventual Government ocntrol of the turkey industry. Their vote was based on recommendation of the North Dakota Farm Bureau Livestock Committee which also unanimously opposes the enactment of these legislative measures. It was the opinion of the Livestock Committee and board of directors that these bills would not benefit the turkey industry in long run, but would hinder the operation of the law of economical production if enacted. North Dakota is definitely in an advantageous position from the standpoint of low-cost turkey production operations and has climatic conditions which are conducive to relatively disease-free and profitable operations. Some of the legislative measures before Congress would tend to freeze turkey production areas and would not allow production to shift to the lower production cost areas.

We are opposed to Senate bill 1395 because we question the feasibility of extending a Federal Marketing Act to a national level due to the administrative cost and complete control of the turkey industry which would result. We favor marketing agreements where they are used in localized areas, to develop the orderly marketing of a particular product. We also oppose this bill because of the monopoly powers which it would give to a producer committee to be provided under the bill, and feel that the program resulting from the passage of this legislation would be a gross waste of the taxpayers' money. We have attached a statement presented by Leslie Johnson, Manfred, N. Dak., representative of the poultry industry on the North Dakota Farm Bureau Livestock Committee, which brings out not only aspects of the turkey industry in North Dakota and its tremendous potential, but also some of the reasons why the North Dakota turkey grower does not want Government control of his industry. North Dakota farmers need more, not less alternative enterprises on their farms as their wheat acreage consistently continues to be cut, and turkey production provides a very good alternative enterprise at the present time. We urge you to protest this alternative by opposing the enactment of the above-listed bills.

Sincerely,

G. J. STAFNE,
Secretary.

STATEMENT BEFORE NORTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU LIVESTOCK COMMITTEE BY LESLIE JOHNSON, MANFRED, N. DAK., REPRESENTATIVE OF POULTRY INDUSTRY ON NORTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU LIVESTOCK COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, probably none of you will ever raise turkeys. There is one aspect of turkey production, however, that may be of interest. We are all concerned about the tremendous surplus of good North Dakota grain.

A unit of 10,000 turkeys will consume, in 6 months, 500 tons of grain; that's 1 million pounds.

One man, working alone, and by no means overworking, can produce 10,000 market turkeys, or about 100 tons of the best quality meat.

Turkey meat is the highest in protein, the lowest in fat, and the lowest in cholesterol of any meat.

The consumption of turkey can be greatly increased without having too much effect on the consumption of red meats. We don't like turkey every day, but we like it quite frequently, and probably eat just as much beef and pork anyway.

There are about 750,000 turkeys raised in North Dakota. These utilize nearly 40,000 tons of grain.

North Dakota is not ranked among the leading turkey producing States, but it should be. We can produce turkeys more economically than growers in any other State. Our experience has been that we can make a net labor return of about $1 per head more than producers in the leading turkey States.

There is now before Congress nine separate bills concerning the regulation of the

turkey industry. One of them is backed by the National Turkey Federation, but all are opposed by the North Dakota Turkey Federation, and by us growers, who feel we can compete on the open market with any grower, anywhere.

Mr. Chairman, I propose a resolution, or other appropriate action, to be submitted to our Congressmen, indicating our opposition to the following bills, and I have them listed here by number. H.R. 5180, 3069, 5071, 1344, 5583, 5614, and 2490; S. 1395, and 430.

Thank you, gentlemen.

NORTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU,
Fargo, N. Dak.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The North Dakota Farm Bureau board of directors, on recommendation of the North Dakota Farm Bureau land and water use committee, composed of G. C. Robinson, chairman, Otis Tosset, Clarence Jensen, Ken McIntyre, and Bert Hill, vote unanimously to support House bill 5555, introduced by Congressman ROGERS, of Texas, and Senate bill 1416, introduced by Senator Moss, of Utah, which concerns the preservation of State water rights, which is in peril at the present time.

As you know, under present conditions, the Federal supremacy theory of water gives the Federal Government priority over the State in determining the use of water supplied. In other words, the Federal Government, under present law, could go into an established irrigation area, for example, stop the flow of the water into the canals, and divert it to another Government use without receiving permission from the State involved by simply serving summons on the farmers affected.

This has happened, as you know, in California and other States and has created a great hardship on farmers in the area affected.

Water-rights legislation is of particular significance to North Dakota as we begin plans for irrigation from the Garrison Reservoir.

There are many other water-rights bills up before Congress at the present time, but, after an analysis of these legislative measures, we feel that House bill 5555 and Senate bill 1416 are the only measures which will guarantee State priority over Federal supremacy in water-rights cases.

The North Dakota Farm Bureau board of directors and the North Dakota Farm Bureau land and water use committee urge you to do everything possible to secure passage of the bills. It may be the last opportunity.

Sincerely,

G. J. STAFNE, *Secretary.*

Why Nobody Can Save Any Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD portions of an article published in Life magazine, The Life magazine has done us a service by showing that fiscal responsibility should begin at home, that much of our family incomes are siphoned off by the installment collectors and the tax collectors, and by indicating that fiscal responsibility is needed in the Nation's seat of Government, just as it is needed in the Nation's families.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOBODY CAN SAVE ANY MONEY

(By Ernest Havemann)

In St. Louis there lives a young man of 28 who, in the opinion of his contemporaries, really has it made. This young man has a special gift for technical writing: the articles and brochures on complicated equipment and procedures which modern industry needs in such quantity. As a result he has moved up rapidly and now finds himself earning $12,000 a year. This startles and pleases him. "Ten years ago," he says, "I figured that $12,000 was on a block of Easy Street that I'd be lucky to reach by the time I was 50, if ever." But it also greatly worries him, in a way that his envious friends probably never suspect.

At least once a week this young man sits down with paper and pencil and draws up a balance sheet of the family finances. He has done this so many times that he knows the figures practically by heart. But he is moved to repeat the process over and over by a kind of fearful and deadly fascination which the figures possess for him. "I feel," he says, "that some hidden, mysterious, cancerous element is eating away at my income—and that I would solve my problems if I could only find it, recognize it and blot it out." On his optimistic days he cannot bring himself to believe that he is really so financially insecure as his figures tell him. On his pessimistic days he foresees a future when he will sink deeper and deeper into this unfathomable morass. He is not a particularly extravagant young man and not noticeably neurotic, but he privately admits that his budget has got him down.

The young man and his wife figure that expenses which they cannot possibly reduce in any way eat up $905.77 of his $1,000-a-month salary. They allow themselves $65 a month for the babysitters, the once-a-week restaurant meal and the liquor which they consider a minimum reasonable amount of social life and entertainment. Total outgo: $970.77. Left over: $29.23.

The young man grinds his teeth and says, "Even $29 a month isn't a decent cushion between fixed costs and ruin—and most months the $29 just seems to evaporate anyway. We have absolutely no savings. All sorts of problems loom ahead. Now that we have three children, our house is no longer big enough for us. But all we have in it is a $1,000 equity, which isn't enough for a down payment on a bigger house. In the meantime our present house is getting to the point where it's going to need some expensive maintenance. I have to drive to work and we really need a second car for my wife. But we still owe $1,200 on the one we've got. * * * Well, aside from the present, what am I going to do when the three kids start to school and need additional clothes and maybe tuition? How about when they go to college? What about the time when I retire and my income is shut off altogether? I don't think we have any hope in the world of ever accumulating any substantial savings."

While many readers of this article who have to struggle along on far less than $12,000 a year may be tempted at this point to send the young St. Louisan a long-playing record of "Hearts and Flowers," his is, in many ways, a typical 1959 American family. Most of us are making considerably more money then we would ever have guessed 5 or 10 years ago and far more than our grandfathers ever dreamed of making. Our pay checks say we are rich. The monthly bank statement and the stack of unpaid bills on the pantry shelf say we are "stony broke." We have to ask ourselves a sad, bewildered question: "Where does the money go?"

Marriage counselors state flatly that money, not sex, is the greatest cause of trouble between American men and their wives. (Usually one spouse thinks the other is so extravagant as to be hellbent for bankruptcy and an indigent old age. Sometimes, on the other hand, one spouse considers the other too stingy to take advantage of all the delightful new ways which have been devised to spend money pleasantly.) Whenever the pollsters have tried to find what the Nation is most worried about, finances have ranked at or near the top of the list. In the world of business, it is one of the great ironies that among the most prosperous of all firms in this period of unprecedented prosperity have been the banks, small loan companies, and automobile finance companies which specialize in supplying money to people temporarily or permanently afflicted with shorts.

THOSE STATISTICS ON SAVINGS

Those of us who keep wondering where the money has gone are frequently aggravated by items in the financial pages of the newspapers. "Average Man Saves 7 Percent of Salary," the headlines are likely to say, or "National Savings Reach Record $630 Billion." Apparently everybody but us is taking advantage of the national prosperity and stashing money away "like crazy." What is wrong with us that we have no savings accounts, no stocks and bonds, no mason jars full of $100 bills buried beneath the garden walk? Are we extravagant? Improvident? Immoral?

We may be all these things but we are certainly not unique, all the statistics on the financial pages notwithstanding. The statistics, indeed, are thoroughly misleading. It is true that Americans are now saving at the rate of $18 billion a year—but only if you accept the statisticians' definition of savings. As these experts figure it, any reduction of a debt is listed as a saving. In other words, the extravagant rascal who goes from bank to bank and from loan shark to loan shark until he has committed his next 3 years' pay is automatically a big saver thereafter. Every time his creditors catch him and force him to pay back a dollar on his monstrous debt, he is credited with a dollar's worth of "saving." In a way, of course, this definition is legitimate, but it is scarcely what our forefathers meant by thrift, nor what most of us mean by it today. The man who is in debt up to his eyeballs hardly considers himself a big saver just because he has managed to reduce the debt by $500 in the past year.

It is also true, at least according to the latest figures of such a respectable statistical agency as the Federal Reserve Board, that the total accumulated savings of Americans amount to $630 billion, a most impressive sum. There is nothing phony about the definition in this case: the Federal Reserve Board counts nothing but such irreproachable items as cash in the bank, stocks, bonds, and the cash value of insurance policies. But an analysis of the statistical tables shows that the total is accounted for chiefly by a relatively few fortunate people, presumably prospectors who struck oil or uranium, authors who wrote five straight best-sellers, corporate executives who got a lucky stock bonus, rich boys who inherited a bundle that father made before taxes, widows whose husbands carried big insurance policies.

At the last count only about 10 percent of all U.S. spending units (a statistical term which includes bachelors, spinsters, and widows as well as families) had $5,000 or more in savings, and it was this one happy exception in 10 who accounted for most of the $630 billion total. The majority of Americans, it can be seen in the fine print of the Federal Reserve Board's reports, would have had a hard time scraping up as much as a few hundred dollars in cash, and are only holding this pending the arrival of the bill collector.

GOP Economic Policy Ignores Hunger Pangs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 17, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, our colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is an avid reader of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette. On more than one occasion he has brought to my attention—and I am sure to the attention of others—editorials and opinions expressed by that outstanding West Virginia newspaper. The latest one has to do with an editorial entitled "GOP Economic Policy Ignores Hunger Pangs," published in the July 15, 1959, issue of that newspaper.

In view of the meat in this editorial, I believe it would be well worth while for Members of the Senate to read it with great interest and appreciation.

We all know, of course, that West Virginia is in straitened circumstances, and has been for a number of years, because of declines in certain elements of its economy. It is our hope that, with the able assistance of the two distinguished Senators from West Virginia, the Congress will be able to bring about an alleviation of this difficulty in that beautiful State, to the end that its economic stability can be restored to an even keel and its people given the hope to which they are entitled.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Charleston Gazette be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP ECONOMIC POLICY IGNORES HUNGER PANGS

Following a custom of long standing the Eisenhower administration has lately been making political capital at the expense of some of our more unfortunate citizens. In the most gleeful and "I told you so" tones, it has been pounding home the theme that business is in a boom the likes of which this Nation has never seen.

It's not our intention here to find fault with what Mr. Eisenhower and his minions have been saying about the more obvious facets of the economy. We're in a period of generalized prosperity. What's more, rarely has confidence in the boom's lasting power been so high among so many experts. But bright though the prospects are, there's a gray side that deserves more attention than it's been getting.

We're speaking of the fact that in spite of high and rising prosperity almost 11 percent of the Nation's employable workers are still without jobs in 179 areas spread across 29 States. West Virginia is one of those States.

Summed up, here's what we find when we look beneath the froth of the administration's pronouncements:

The boom has hardly touched the pockets of joblessness in cities hit by major industrial upheavals or migrations.

A full one-third of the Nation's unemployed are concentrated in such chronically depressed cities as Pittsburgh, Detroit, and Atlantic City.

Many of these cities were depressed even before the 1957–58 slump hit full stride, and it has made an already bad situation worse.

The hardest hit are not fly-by-night towns, dying because of the stupidity, greed, or laziness of their own people. They're communities with proud histories, above-average schools, good cultural and recreational facilities, an established place in the American scheme.

For the most part they were caught in the backwash of progress itself, and try though they have to improve their lot, technological changes, switches from old to new production techniques, development of new operational methods, new processes, and the like have kept them depressed in spite of prosperity elsewhere.

So let's face the truth. If a business upsurge already 14 months old still leaves us with so many soft spots, there is little chance that anything short of help from the outside will erase their problems.

Let's face this truth also. So many of the jobless in these labor surplus areas are either too old or too short on cash to learn new skills, and their local governments are so sapped by depression that they're not financially able to render the necessary assistance.

What we need under such bleak and oppressing circumstances is a program of technical assistance, financed in part at least by the Federal Government, which will again make these people employable and the areas or cities where they live healthy contributors to the Nation's economy.

The Senate has already passed an area redevelopment bill aimed at this objective. It is now awaiting action in the House. But even if it passes there, which it probably will, Mr. Eisenhower is on record as opposing it, as he was a year ago when today's starving millions were just beginning to feel the pangs of prolonged hunger.

And why does he oppose area redevelopment? It's an old Republican story. Mr. Eisenhower wants more than anything else to keep his big business friends happy.

The status quo rather than hunger is the issue with the Republicans. Let the hungry grow hungrier; the budget must be balanced at all costs.

Chicago Water Diversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 17, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the recent hearing in regard to Chicago water diversion, I was unable to be present. I prepared a short statement, and I have attached to it excerpts from proceedings in the House of Commons.

I have received a number of inquiries about this matter. In order to make this material available for distribution, I ask unanimous consent that my statement and the excerpts from the proceedings in the House of Commons be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, ON CHICAGO WATER DIVERSION, H.R. 1 AND S. 308

Gentlemen of the committee, I am informed that on July 13 H.R. 1 and S. 308, relating to diversion of water at Chicago, will be considered by the Public Works Committee.

Unfortunately, I shall be unable to attend the opening day of the hearing because of a previous commitment in the State of Wisconsin.

As you know, these bills propose to authorize withdrawal of an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water per second from Lake Michigan.

The proposed legislation raises serious questions of domestic, international, and legal concern, which I believe deserves your attention.

DOMESTIC ISSUES

(1) These bills propose to divert water from one watershed to another, an action which would appear unwarranted and inequitable unless it is done by mutual agreement of all States concerned.

The Chicago district has diverted three rivers which used to flow into Lake Michigan. Besides that, it takes 3,200 additional cubic feet per second. Now, the district wants to take an additional 1,000 cubic feet. Ten years ago, the plant in Chicago operated efficiently. Since that time the district has loaded it with additional sewage and taken in additional territory so that the plant does not operate efficiently now.

(2) The proposed diversion would divert additional water from a body of water common to many States. If carried out, it threatens to damage rights of abutting property owners; port and harbor developments around the Great Lakes; traffic through the St. Lawrence Seaway; $500 million power project on the seaway; and other navigational interests around the Great Lakes.

(3) The additional diversion, which the Federal Government is asked to authorize, is not needed for navigational purposes, or for purposes of commerce—which purposes are the only constitutional basis for the Federal authority over streams and water. It is questionable, therefore, whether the Congress has authority to direct diversion for purposes completely removed from navigation and commerce.

(4) The underlying purpose of the increased diversion is to help the city of Chicago resolve its sanitation problems.

Chicago created this situation, and as the Supreme Court said in 1929, it is for them to remedy it. How can it be remedied? By improving its plant and doing what Milwaukee does—purify its sewage and return it to the lake 95 percent pure. Chicago doesn't return any of the water taken. In this connection, we must remember that Illinois occupies only 50 miles of the lake front, while three other States occupy a total of 500 miles. We must remember also that these other three States account for about two-thirds of the population living around the lake and the future needs of these other States must be taken into account before further diversion is permitted of the water of Lake Michigan.

(5) The bill would set a dangerous precedent upon which our Canadian neighbors could base their decision to divert water flowing into the United States, particularly the Columbia and Kootenay Rivers in the Great Northwest, thus jeopardizing power and other interests in this country.

INTERNATIONAL ISSUES AT STAKE

The diversion of water from Lake Michigan is of deep concern to our Canadian neighbors.

Recently the Canadian Government stated unequivocal opposition to the proposed water diversion legislation. (See Canadian note and comments from Canadian House of Commons annexed.)

The Canadian Government stated that such diversion would not only jeopardize its shipping, commercial, port development,

and other interests around the Great Lakes, but would also violate in letter and spirit the provisions of several agreements and notes exchanged between the United States and Canada.

Furthermore, the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 between the United States and Canada provided that no further diversion of boundary waters be undertaken without the approval of the International Joint Commission then established. And, although Lake Michigan was exempted from the boundary waters definition, article II of the treaty provides that "any interference with or diversion from their natural channel of (nonboundary) waters on either side of the boundary * * * shall entitle the injured parties * * * to * * * legal remedies."

The development of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the exchange of notes between the two countries has resulted in the understanding that no unilateral action, which would result in materially affecting the operation of the seaway, would be undertaken.

PENDING ACTION BY SUPREME COURT

Currently, the Supreme Court is considering the matter of water diversion at Chicago. The Court has appointed U.S. senior circuit court judge, the Honorable Albert B. Maris, as special master to consider the diversion cases relating to Chicago.

Congressional action, I believe, should be held in abeyance until the Court has had an opportunity to consider the case and issue its findings.

For your use, I am enclosing exhibits relating to the appointment by the Supreme Court of a special master to consider the case and the statement reflecting the position of the Canadian Government on this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—WISCONSIN ET AL. *v.* ILLINOIS ET AL., NO. 2 ORIGINAL; MICHIGAN *v.* ILLINOIS ET AL., NO. 3 ORIGINAL; NEW YORK *v.* ILLINOIS ET AL., NO. 4, ORIGINAL; ILLINOIS *v.* MICHIGAN ET AL., NO. 15, ORIGINAL (JUNE 29, 1959)

Per curiam.

The motion of Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry for leave to file brief in Nos. 2, original; 3, original; and 4, original, as amicus curiae, is granted. The amended application of complainants for a reopening of the decree of April 21, 1930, in Nos. 2, original; 3, original; and 4, original, is granted.

The motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in No. 15, original, is granted.

It is ordered that Honorable Albert B. Maris, U.S. senior circuit judge, be, and he is hereby, appointed special master in each of the causes, with authority to summon witnesses, issue subpenas, and take such evidence as may be introduced and such as he may deem it necessary to call for. The master is directed to hold hearings with all convenient speed, and to submit such reports as he may deem necessary.

The master shall be allowed his actual expenses. The allowances to him, the compensation paid to his technical, stenographic, and clerical assistants, the cost of printing his report, and all other proper expenses, shall be charged against and be borne by the parties in such proportion as the Court hereafter may direct.

[From Proceedings of the Canadian House of Commons]

CHICAGO DIVERSION—STATEMENT ON CANADIAN ATTITUDE TO U.S. LEGISLATION

Right Hon. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker on April 8 the honorable member for Rosedale asked: "Would the Prime Minister tell us the attitude of the Canadian Government toward the legislation recently passed in the U.S. House of Representatives in regard to the diversion of water from the Great Lakes at Chicago?"

I replied, after dealing with one or two matters of history, and said: "We are paying the closest attention to this matter, at the same time not wishing to do anything that would in any way cause a situation to arise which might not be beneficial."

I now wish to bring the House up to date on this subject. When I last spoke on April 8, I stated what the fact was, that the Government was giving careful consideration, and since then has given further consideration to the most effective manner of making known Canada's opposition to the bill which, as I said a moment ago, has passed the House of Representatives and is now before the Senate Committee on Public Works. A note registering the reasons for Canada's objection was delivered on April 9, and with the leave of the House I ask permission to table it so that it might possibly appear in "Votes and Proceedings." I am not going to read the entire note, but just two particular paragraphs thereof to indicate the general tenor and attitude of the Government in this regard. In the third paragraph the following appears:

"Every diversion of water from the Great Lakes watershed at Chicago inevitably decreases the volume of water remaining in the basin for all purposes. The government of Canada is opposed to any action which will have the effect of reducing the volume of water in the Great Lakes basin. Careful inquiry has failed to reveal any sources of water in Canada which could be added to the present supplies of the basin to compensate for further withdrawals in the United States of America. The Government of Canada considers that many agreements and understandings between the United States of America and Canada would be broken if unilateral action were taken to divert additional water from the Great Lakes watershed at Chicago and directs attention to provision of two treaties in particular."

The first is the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 and the second is the Niagara Treaty of 1950.

The general summation of the attitude of the Government in this regard is contained in the last two pertinent paragraphs:

"Because of the importance attached by the United States of America and Canada to the honoring of international undertakings in letter and in spirit, the government of Canada views with serious concern any possible impairment of agreements and undertakings relating to the Great Lakes basin. Furthermore, the alarms created by repeated proposals for diversion which inevitably disturb the people and industry of Canada are a source of profound irritation to the relations between our two countries which we can ill afford.

"I am instructed, therefore, to express the hope of the government of Canada that the United States of America will view this matter with equal concern and will be able to give satisfactory assurances that unilateral action will not be taken which would imperil the present regime of the waters in the Great Lakes basin and the status of the agreements and understandings to which I have referred."

Mr. SPEAKER. Would the Prime Minister perhaps modify his request so the letter will be printed as an appendix to Hansard?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the House agreeable to having this document printed as an appendix to Hansard today?

SOME HONORABLE MEMBERS. Agreed.

[For text of document referred to above, see appendix.]

Hon. L. B. PEARSON (leader of the opposition). Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could say a word with regard to this extremely important matter. I think the house will have learned with satisfaction that a note in the terms which the Prime Minister just read has been, I think on April 9, presented to the U.S. Government. It will be recalled that a note in not very strong terms was presented by the Canadian Government last year expressing our concern. This note of April 9 seems to be a much stronger one, and I think that is all to the good.

I believe I am right when I say that this note, however, presented on April 9, has been presented at a time when it is too late to influence Congress which has, if I am not misinformed, already taken action in this matter. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it now remains for the President of the United States to protect Canada's rights in this matter by vetoing action which may have been taken by Congress. Perhaps if this note had been presented earlier before congressional consideration had been given, it might not have been necessary to rely entirely on the President of the United States to protect our interests in this matter.

However, the note has been presented and I hope it will have the effect it should have in preventing the United States from taking action which would be a breach of treaty arrangements between the two countries.

Mr. H. W. HERRIDGE (Kootenay West). Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this group I want to say that we are extremely pleased to hear the statement of the Prime Minister with respect to this latest note. We are, also pleased to note that it is in stronger terms than any previous note. We support the Government in any effort it may take to protect Canadian interests. We in this group hope that the Congress of the United States will pay attention to this day's proceedings and note from the proceedings that Parliament in this respect is unanimous.

[From the House of Commons Appendix, Apr. 16, 1959]

CHICAGO DIVERSION—CANADIAN NOTE TO UNTED STATES

[No. 184]

THE CANADIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D.C., April 9, 1959.

SIR: I have the honor, on instructions from my Government, to refer to proposals for legislation in the United States of America concerning an increase in the diversion of water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago drainage canal. It is noted that one proposal to this effect has been approved by the House of Representatives and will shortly be considered by the Senate. During a period of many years there have been numerous occasions on which the Government of Canada has made representations to the Government of the United States of America with respect to proposals concerning the diversion of water from Lake Michigan out of the Great Lakes watershed at Chicago.

Many of these representations have been directed toward particular proposals then under discussion by U.S. authorities. Because of the importance of the question, the Government of Canada believes it timely to reexamine the considerations which it regards as most important concerning any proposals for additional diversion of water from the Great Lakes watershed. Accordingly, in order that there may be no misunderstanding as to the views of the Government of Canada, I have been instructed to bring the following considerations to your attention.

Every diversion of water from the Great Lakes watershed at Chicago inevitably decreases the volume of water remaining in the basin for all purposes. The Government of Canada is opposed to any action which will have the effect of reducing the volume of water in the Great Lakes Basin. Careful inquiry has failed to reveal any sources of water in Canada which could be added to the present supplies of the basin to compensate for further withdrawals in the United States

of America. The Government of Canada considers that many agreements and understandings between the United States of America and Canada would be broken if unilateral action were taken to divert additional water from the Great Lakes watershed at Chicago and directs attention to provisions of two treaties in particular:

(a) The boundary waters treaty, 1909: The applicability of either article II, paragraph 2 or article III of this treaty depends upon the interpretation of physical facts.

If Lake Michigan physically flows into the boundary water Lake Huron, article II preserves to Canada the right to object to such a diversion which would be productive of material injury to the navigation interests in Canadian waters.

If, as has been asserted by eminent U.S. jurists, article III of the treaty applies, no further diversion shall be made except with the approval of the International Joint Commission.

(b) Niagara Treaty, 1950: This treaty allocates water for scenic and power purposes. The amount of water which shall be available for these purposes is the total outflow from Lake Erie. The specific inclusion of certain added waters in article III of the treaty emphasizes the underlying assumption that existing supplies will continue unabated. In addition to these treaty provisions, there is a further agreement of far-reaching importance. Power development in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec is predicted upon agreed criteria for regulation of the flows of the St. Lawrence River. The order of approval of the International Joint Commission of October 29, 1952, as supplemented on July 2, 1956, and accepted by both our Governments, forms the basis for the construction and operation of the hydroelectric power installations in the international section of the St. Lawrence River. Criterion (a) of this order of approval assumes a continuous diversion out of the Great Lakes basin limited to the present 3,100 cubic feet per second at Chicago.

Navigation and commercial interests depend upon the maintenance of the basis upon which channel enlargements have been designed in order that vessels of deep draught may proceed with full load to and from the ports of the upper Great Lakes. In this connection I would refer to the following matters:

(a) The construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Legislation in the two countries and the several exchanges of notes concerning the construction and operation of the seaway now just completed are based on the assumption and understanding that there will not be unilateral action repugnant to the purposes of the legislation. Withdrawal of water from the Great Lakes basin would materially affect the operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway;

(b) Dredging. By agreement contained in the various exchanges of notes between the two countries, profiles have been prepared for the excavation which has taken place or is about to take place in the International Rapids section of the river, in the Amherstburg Channel, and in the St. Clair River. These agreements are based on the implied understanding that material changes would not be made in the volume of water available for navigation;

(c) New channel. In an exchange of notes dated February 28, 1959, it has been agreed that a new channel should be constructed to eliminate the so-called southeast bend of the St. Clair River. The agreement by the Government of Canada to this proposal was based on the understanding that there would be no artificial interference with the present supplies of water.

Because of the importance attached by the United States of America and Canada to the honoring of international undertakings in letter and in spirit, the Government of Canada views with serious concern any possible impairment of agreements and undertakings relating to the Great Lakes Basin. Furthermore, the alarms created by repeated proposals for diversion which inevitably disturb the people and industry of Canada are a source of profound irritation to the relations between our two countries which we can ill afford.

I am instructed, therefore, to express the hope of the Government of Canada that the United States of America will view this matter with equal concern and will be able to give satisfactory assurances that unilateral action will not be taken which would imperil the present regime of the waters in the Great Lakes Basin and the status of the agreements and understandings to which I have referred.

Please accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

A. D. P. HEENEY.

[From the House of Commons Appendix, April 23, 1959]

CHICAGO DIVERSION—MEETING BETWEEN PRIME MINISTER AND MEMBERS OF U.S. CONGRESS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Laurier). May I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister be good enough to tell the house whether he received Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, this morning in order to discuss with him the question of the diversion of water from the Great Lakes Basin into the Chicago Drainage Canal; and would the Prime Minister say, if he met the Senator, what was the result of the interview?

Right. Hon. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Prime Minister). The honorable member for Essex West also intended to ask this question. Some few days ago the U.S. Ambassador suggested that it might be possible for me to meet with U.S. Senator DOUGLAS and Congressman YATES, one a Member of the Senate from Illinois and the other a Member of the House of Representatives, from the same State. They were here this morning and I met with them, though they were not here in any sense as an official delegation because the suggestion had been made that the meeting might provide an opportunity for them to place before the Government the views which they hold respecting the bill which would provide for an additional diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago.

I listened to the expression of their views and we had a very interesting talk together, but I may say without any equivocation that I was unable to offer them any hope that as a result of the expression of their views the known opposition of the Government of Canada to the bill would in any way be diminished.

That is clear enough, I think, to make it understandable to all that while I was very happy to meet with these gentlemen, their views did not alter the views expressed in the message to the Acting Secretary of State of the United States, sent by this Government on April 9.

National Seashore Area on Padre Island, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 17, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, my proposal to establish a national seashore area on Padre Island in Texas has been widely discussed.

Therefore, I shall not relist its many attributes or the dangers of the beach being closed to the public by private ownership, but will simply request unanimous consent to put into the RECORD at this time some of the comments of others.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald for Thursday, July 2, 1959, entitled "Shoreline S O S."

I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Corpus Christi, Tex., Caller for Saturday, June 13, 1959, entitled "Final Approval Is Urged on Beach and Park Bills."

In addition, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Beaumont, Tex., Journal for Friday, June 26, 1959, entitled "Public Should Always Have Easy Access to Beaches."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, July 2, 1959]

SHORELINE S O S

The Interior Department's request for $15 million to purchase and preserve 100,000 acres of the Nation's shorelines surely merits the support of Congress. Since the end of World War II private developers have been turning desirable shore lines into residential and commercial areas so rapidly that unless Congress acts soon the public may have access only to rocky ledges and dangerous beaches.

The shoreline legislation, sponsored by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, Oregon, would authorize the Government to establish three national seashores. Among areas recommended for preservation by the National Park Service are the great outer beach on Cape Cod, Padre Island off Texas on the gulf coast, a 23-mile stretch of sand dunes and caves in southern Oregon, and the Indiana dunes along Lake Michigan.

Action is especially urgent if the striking Indiana dunes are to be saved. As Senator DOUGLAS points out in his letter, two steel companies are preparing to sweep the dunes away for an industrial site. The very least Congress can do is to enact the modest legislation Mr. DOUGLAS is proposing to preserve these dunes from imminent destruction.

Shorelines ought to be preserved for historical as well as recreational reasons. Man will probably never be able to duplicate the sweeping grandeur of many shorelines. These areas should be protected from commercialization so that succeeding generations can enjoy them in their natural and irreplaceable beauty.

[From the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Caller, June 13, 1959]

FINAL APPROVAL IS URGED ON BEACH AND PARK BILLS

Corpus Christi and the entire coastal bend must watch with anxious concern the close race against Tuesday adjournment deadline to complete action on the legislative measures to assure permanent public enjoyment of this area's vast and varied seaside recreational resources.

This is a critical juncture in the coastal bend's long-range development, an opportunity that should not be delayed, and possibly missed, by involvement in any other political business. The Governor and legislators have responded commendably to the urgency of the situation; it is now up to

them to demonstrate that they can serve the public interest by completing final action.

The House passed a concurrent resolution to authorize the creation of a national seashore recreation area on Padre Island, in accordance with the Yarborough bill now pending in Congress. The Senate concurred Friday in granting that necessary legislative consent. The resolution amicably adjusts the Federal, State, local, and private interests involved. Legislative approval opens the way for a park development that can make this one of the outstanding recreation spots in the Nation.

The other pending measure is to remove any danger of public exclusion from the gulf beaches that could result from further interpretation of the recent Luttes case. Governor Daniel opened the special session to this bill, and it has House favor. The Governor issued a ringing call for the preservation of the public rights and uses of the gulf beaches up to the vegetation line, which have been held by the State in trust for the people since the days of the republic. It is now up to the State senate to protect that Texas heritage.

Nothing which the legislature has done or may do in the regular and one or more special sessions, including the taxing and spending bills, are as important to the coastal bend as these recreation and conservation measures, which do not involve any State funds. They can give the people of this area a fonder memory of the 56th legislature than they are otherwise likely to have.

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Journal, June 26, 1959]

PUBLIC SHOULD ALWAYS HAVE EASY ACCESS TO BEACHES

In signing a resolution giving Congress consent to make Padre Island a national seashore area, Governor Daniel rightly recognizes a growing need for public access to and use of Texas soil kissed by Gulf of Mexico waters.

Development of Padre Island as a national park would not be setting a precedent. It would be following the trend started in an earlier and successful effort to save the Big Bend area for the public.

The island, with one of the longest and finest beaches on the coastline, would be an additional inducement to tourists from other States to visit and enjoy Texas every month in the year.

Congressional action to make Padre a park, or seashore area, ought not to conflict with pending legislation aimed at keeping gulf-coast beaches open to the public. Actually, the Secretary of the Interior has asked Congress for money to buy only a part of the island. There probably would be room left for sufficient private commercial developments.

The real danger in not doing something now about such coastal areas is the possible loss of them to commercial developers. Once they are developed and, so to speak, fenced in by such developers, the public could easily be made to pay through the nose to wet its toes in the gulf waters.

This ought not to happen.

Is There Equal Protection in Kentucky Coalfields?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial apeared in the Harlan Daily Enterprise, a newspaper published in my congressional district, bearing the title "Is There Equal Protection in Kentucky Coalfields?" The problem of law and order in some parts of southeastern Kentucky is such at the present time that I would like to help focus the attention of Congress on this serious situation now faced by our good citizens in some of my counties. Personally I do not have one single dime invested in any coal mine anywhere, but many law-abiding people in my district have actually invested their lifetime savings in various coal-producing properties. They deserve to have their property protected and all our people, whether rich or poor, black or white, union or nonunion, believing or unbelieving, deserve to have life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness without molestation of lawbreakers or peace destroyers. The editorial is as follows:

IS THERE EQUAL PROTECTION IN KENTUCKY COALFIELDS?

There are times when it becomes difficult for even the most firm believers in the due process of law through the courts and regulatory bodies of our Government to hold fast in their beliefs.

Certainly the thinking people of eastern Kentucky today must be wondering what has happened to the fundamental principles on which our Government was founded that guaranteed the protection of private property. For the coal industry in eastern Kentucky apparently no longer has such protection.

Coal tipples, coal augers, and railroad bridges have been destroyed and three lives have been wiped out since the coal strike began March 9. The property loss alone runs into hundreds of thousands of dollars, and who can claim to place a value on the lost lives?

The eastern Kentucky coal operators and the railroad have based their hopes for protection of their property on the Federal courts and the National Labor Relations Board. And that is only proper.

But what has been the result of action taken by these governing bodies? Right on the heels of the NLRB's second postponement of their hearing on the operators' complaints against the United Mine Workers, a coal auger and shovel were dynamited in Perry County. The NLRB claims that present court orders will maintain the status quo. Does the status quo mean more coal tipples, augers, and railroad bridges destroyed? Does the status quo mean more lives uselessly lost? That is the only logical assumption based on the situation as it has existed for the past 4 months and the NLRB's statement.

Delay after delay, through postponement, of any final action by either the Federal court or the NLRB has practically voided any protection of private property that these sources can give, even though the Federal court has granted an injunction against union violence.

Does the NLRB realize that most of the financial losses now being suffered in the coal fields are losses that cannot be replaced? Does the NLRB realize that many coal operators can no longer insure their property against losses by fire or violence? Does the NLRB realize that many insurance companies will no longer write such insurance and are in fact actually cancelling many policies covering coal mining porperty? These insurance compaines realize what has been apparent for some time in eastern Kentucky, that coal operators' property is not adequately protected under any form of law enforcement and that to insure this property is to run too great a financial risk for even the largest insurance companies.

Our Nation's laws also guarantee the protec-right to negotiate contracts without fear of intimidation or violence from any source. A casual look at the records will show that these rights are zealously enforced by the courts and regulatory bodies of our Government.

Our Nation's laws also guarantee the protection of private property and they do not require that management must accept every union demand made to them. The thought that comes to mind in view of the present situation is this:

Are private property holders in the eastern Kentucky coal fields receiving equal protection under the law due them from our courts and regulatory groups? If not, where lies the future of eastern Kentucky, and the Nation?

Statement of Representative L. H. Fountain Before House Committee on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 29, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to include the statement of Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee, which was presented to the House Committee on Agriculture at this morning's session. While Representative FOUNTAIN was unable to personally deliver this statement, it was capably presented and elaborated upon by chief counsel for the subcommittee, Mr. James Naughton.

The facts contained in this statement are extremely pertinent to the general farm program and to the fiscal responsibility of the United States Government. I commend Representative FOUNTAIN for releasing this information, and believe that as his subcommittee continues to investigate in the matters outlined in this statement, the Congress will be better apprised of the situation, so that corrective legislation may be undertaken where necessary.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE L. H. FOUNTAIN, PRESENTED TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, JULY 17, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the invitation extended by the chairman to present this statement.

I strongly endorse the extension of Public Law 480. This legislation has been of great value in providing needed food and fiber to friendly nations of the world and at the same time helping to dispose of surplus agricultural commodities by increasing exports. In view of the prospect of continued agricultural surpluses in the future and a continued need for these commodities by countries which are not in a position to pay for them in dollars, I believe it essential that the programs authorized under Public Law 480 be continued.

On the whole, I think that Public Law 480 provides appropriate authority for carrying out its stated purposes. I hope and trust, however, that the Agriculture Committee will give careful attention to the provisions of this complex legislation in order to ascer-

tain whether improvements can and should be made.

As you may know, I am chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee which has responsibility for inquiring into the activities of the Department of Agriculture with respect to economy and efficiency. This subcommittee is conducting a comprehensive investigation of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. As a part of this investigation, we are presently giving particular attention to Government financing of surplus agricultural commodity exports under title I of Public Law 480. Because of the complicated nature and tremendous size of this program, the subcommittee's investigation will not be completed for some time. In view of your present consideration of the program, however, I think it is advisable to call your attention to some of the information developed in our investigation. Since the subcommittee's investigation has not been concluded, I want to stress that my comments at this time represent my personal views as a Member of Congress and are not intended to express the official position of the subcommittee.

Title I agreements under Public Law 480, as you know, are negotiated through diplomatic channels between the U.S. Government and foreign nations. Under the agreements, the Department of Agriculture makes available a specified dollar credit for financing of exports of designated surplus agricultural commodities. The foreign government itself either uses the dollars to finance imports, or authorizes private importers to make use of the dolars for this purpose. Importing countries or firms make their own arrangements with exporting firms in the United States for purchase of the designated commodity. As soon as the exporter loads the commodity on board ship he submits a copy of his sales invoice, along with copies of the bill of lading, to a designated bank (usually in New York) and is immediately paid the face amount of the invoice by the bank. The bank, in turn, is immediately reimbursed for this payment by the Department of Agriculture. The importing country or firm pays the agreed price in local currency to a designated bank in the importing country, where it becomes available for use by the U.S. Government. A large proportion of the funds developed through title I transactions has been loaned back to the importing country.

In title I transactions, CCC pays out dollars for foreign currency at an agreed exchange rate. In some cases the agreed exchange rate has been more favorable than the free market rate. In order to prevent title I transactions from being used to convert foreign currency into dolars at a profit, Department of Agriculture regulations specify that the exporter's sale price must not exceed the prevailing range of export market prices. Each transaction is reviewed by the Department to ascertain whether it is in compliance with the price regulation and a claim is supposed to be made against the exporter if the price is excessive. The ICA also conducts price review on section 402 transactions.

From the begining of the title I program in 1954 until June 30, 1959, title I agreements were negotiated covering commodities with an export market value of more than $3.3 billion. Actual shipments during the same period amount to nearly $3 billion. About $2 billion more has been expended to finance exportation of surplus commodities for foreign currencies under programs authorized by sections 550 and 402 of the Mutual Security Act and administered by the International Cooperation Administration and its predecessor agencies. Procedures used under these programs are similar in most respects to those used under title I.

Transactions under title I have been handled, almost without exception, through private exporting firms. However, the commodities shipped usually either come from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation or are subsidized for export by that agency. In some instances, commodities which are neither held in inventory nor supported by CCC—such as evaporated milk and poultry—have been authorized for export under title I upon a finding by the Secretary of Agriculture that they were in surplus.

Although exact figures are not available, our investigation indicates that a comparatively small number of firms have received the bulk of Government funds expended to finance exports under title I. I would estimate, on the basis of preliminary information, that less than 10 firms have probably received at least half of the billions of dollars expended by CCC and ICA to finance commodity exports in the last 5 years. If grain shipments only are considered, I would judge that 5 large firms probably handled more than half of the Government financed shipments. A number of the largest firms, incidentally, although incorporated in this country, are essentially worldwide commodity traders owned or controlled by foreign interests.

I should like to call the attention of the Agriculture Committee to certain areas of weakness or possible weakness in the manner in which the Department of Agriculture is administering the title I program. Ordinarily I would prefer to wait until our investigation was completed before making any comments, but at your chairman's request, I am calling these matters to your attention at this time in view of your current study of the title I program. I want to stress that any critical comments I might make concerning the manner in which the program is being administered should not be interpreted as opposition to the program itself, since I strongly support its continuation.

Congress has a difficult task in trying to ascertain whether the title I program is being administered effectively and economically and whether changes should be made. This job is made even more difficult, in my opinion, by the failure of the Department of Agriculture to provide Congress with complete and unslanted information concerning the manner in which the program is working. This situation is certainly not limited to the title I program and, human nature being what it is, perhaps it is too much to expect the Department to voluntarily disclose program weaknesses while it is claiming accomplishments. I have noticed, however, as I'm sure you have, that the Department is plentifully supplied with favorable information which it disseminates widely.

On the other hand, even though the Department may be aware of things that are wrong with a program, a congressional committee will seldom receive this information unless it really digs for it. And when we do request information which might disclose waste or poor administration, the Department sometimes either takes an unreasonably long time to release it or even tries to refuse it altogether.

I have learned through experience, also, that reports which are furnished by the Department do not always give a complete and fully informative picture. For example, our subcommittee has been receiving for some time what we presumed were copies of all agreements signed under title I. During the course of our current investigation, however, we learned that the published agreements furnished to congressional committees are not always complete. According to the testimony of Agriculture Department witnesses, important parts of agreements are sometimes contained in separate documents which are kept secret. No notice is given in the published agreements that they are not complete.

The basic weakness in the administration of title I program, I believe, is the apparent failure of responsible officials of the Department of Agriculture to appreciate the value of a dollar and to take ordinary commonsense precautions in spending the taxpayers' money.

The Commodity Credit Corporation buys and sells billions of dollars worth of commodities every year. Its inventory is larger than the combined total inventories of the five largest U.S. industrial corporations. An increase or decrease of a fraction of a percent in operating costs means literally millions of dollars to the taxpayers.

Officials of private corporations many times smaller than the CCC are, I am sure, constantly on the alert to make savings or additional profits for their stockholders. They keep closely informed about their operations in order to insure that there are no unnecessary or wasteful expenditures and that sales are not made below the market price. No one expects a Government agency to be run as a profit-making organization or exactly like a private business, but the Government's business should be conducted as carefully as a prudent private businessman would conduct his own operations.

Unfortunately, this is not always true of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Too often congressional investigations have shown instances of waste and carelessness in the operation of the CCC. Moreover, in most of these cases, those in charge of the CCC apparently either did not know or did not care what was going on, because it was obvious that government money was being wasted. As an example, our investigation of CCC activities revealed that dry milk sold by CCC for less than 10 cents per pound had been resold to the Army for 34 cents per pound. The documents provided to CCC as proof of export showed clearly that the milk was being resold to another Government agency at more than triple the CCC sale price. Yet, so far as I know, no CCC official ever questioned these transactions until after the subcommittee investigation.

Since 1954, the International Cooperation Administration and its predecessors have spent about $2 billion to finance exportation by private firms of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currency. A very substantial portion of these commodities came from CCC stocks and much of the remainder was subsidized for export by CCC. The subcommittee's investigation has developed evidence of extremely large margins, in some cases, between the price at which CCC sold commodities and the price at which ICA financed the identical commodities for export. For example, CCC sold 7,000 tons of broken rice at an average price of about $38 per ton; ICA paid $58 per ton to have the same rice shipped overseas, a difference of more than $100,000 on just one transaction. Yet the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation, when asked whether there was coordination between CCC and ICA with respect to prices, testified: "I don't know why there should be," and went on to say that as long as an exporter got the commodity purchased from CCC out of the country within the specified time "that is all we are interested in."

It is bad enough that CCC officials have never been interested in comparing their sales prices with the prices at which ICA was financing export of the same commodities. What is even worse is that CCC officials have seldom even compared their sales prices with the prices at which their own agency was financing the identical commodities for export.

The Department of Agriculture does conduct a price review on transactions it finances, and that portion of the price which exceeds the prevailing range of export market prices is ineligible for financing. However, price review procedures leave much to be desired. The subcommittee's investigation disclosed that the Department of

Agriculture relies primarily upon competition to keep prices at reasonable levels. However, selection of importers is left entirely to the discretion of the foreign government concerned; the Department has no procedures designed to insure that exporters are selected on a fair and competitive basis. Furthermore, many so-called sales are between two branches of the same worldwide firm; a situation in which competition obviously is not a factor. Affiliated firms, in fact, might often be tempted to increase prices, rather than decrease them, in order to exchange foreign currency into dollars at a favorable rate.

Even if competition did give reasonable assurance that prices were not excessive—and I do not think it does—the Department of Agriculture's dependence on it would still be an abdication of the Department's own responsibility for assuring wise and careful expenditure of public funds.

The Department of Agriculture bases its price review on a comparison of the price charged by the exporter with the "prevailing range of market prices" on the date of the sale. However, with the exception of cotton, the Department has no knowledge of a sale until weeks or months later when banks which have made payment to exporters apply to CCC for reimbursement. At that time a statement by the exporter as to the date the sale was made is submitted. Since the price of the commodity concerned may vary considerably between the alleged contract date and the date CCC receives notice of the transaction, there is an obvious opportunity for submission of false contract dates in order to justify otherwise excessive prices. Furthermore, under this system, a firm could make a contract with a subsidiary to be financed by CCC and then back out without penalty in the event an increase in the price of the commodity made it more profitable to sell elsewhere.

At the time the price review is made, CCC funds have already been paid out to banks which in turn have paid the exporters. Thus, if excessive prices are discovered, it is necessary to attempt to collect claims rather than simply withholding payments. Although CCC has authorized banks to pay out several billion dollars on its behalf, it has specifically released banks from liability in the event they make payments to companies furnishing price review documents which are incomplete or obviously irregular.

The Department of Agriculture does not have—or at least did not have when our investigation began—uniform price review procedures. Instead these procedures vary from commodity to commodity. They are set forth in letters and telegrams issued by different commodity divisions, and are not available in compiled form. There is little, if any, centralized control over the price review procedures—in fact, the subcommittee made a diligent inquiry concerning cotton price review and was unable to find any official in Washington who would admit to knowing what those procedures were, let alone how they were working.

Even though CCC and ICA were both conducting price reviews on the same kind of transactions involving the same firms and the same commodities, their procedures varied widely and we found no evidence that either agency had ever made any attempt to coordinate such procedures.

The subcommittee found that personnel making grain price reviews had instructions not to file claims even where they determined that prices were excessive, unless the price exceeded the average market price by a specified tolerance of as much as 4 cents per bushel. This tolerance was made known to the grain trade, and the subcommittee has evidence that the trade took advantage of this knowledge.

Cotton price review, until after the subcommittee's investigation, was apparently based on the domestic price of cotton, even though CCC was selling cotton for export at prices at least $30 per bale lower. The head of the New Orleans Commodity Office, which handles cotton price review operations, admitted that their procedures were "pretty sorry."

The Department of Agriculture has little real assurance, particularly with respect to cotton, that the quality and quantity of a commodity financed is actually delivered to the importer. The Department has financed exportation of more than 3 million bales of cotton at a cost of over $500 million. However, unless it was specifically requested by the importer, to the best of our knowledge none of this cotton was inspected by the Department to make sure it was the quality it was represented to be. The subcommittee has found a number of instances where cotton purchased from the CCC was resold under Public Law 480 as a much higher quality. In one case, for example, the General Accounting Office traced 206 bales of cotton sold to an exporter for about $95 a bale. The exporter claimed that the cotton was a lower grade than represented in the CCC catalogue and received an average refund of about $20 per bale, making the cost per bale to the exporter approximately $75. The same cotton was then sold under Public Law 480 as a much higher grade, and CCC financed this transaction at a price of $124 per bale, a gross margin of $49 per bale. The head of the New Orleans Commodity Office told the subcommittee that he had recommended that CCC inspect all cotton being financed under Public Law 480 but that the cotton trade opposed this and his recommendation was not adopted.

At the request of the "trade," Department of Agriculture regulations provide that claims for excessive pricing on title I transactions will be made within 90 days or not at all. This, in effect, means that the Department has adopted an administrative statute of limitations of only 3 months—many times shorter than the legal limitations provided for Government claims. The advantages to the trade are obvious, but it is difficult to see any benefit to the taxpayers. Agriculture Department witnesses claimed the provision was necessary to relieve the companies of burdensome preservation of records. However, it is interesting to note that the International Cooperation Administration, which deals with the same firms on the same type of transactions under section 402, has no such arbitrary limitation on claims. Most of its claims, in fact, are made after the 90-day period has passed.

It is interesting, also, to compare the records of the Department of Agriculture and the ICA with respect to claims collected. Even though ICA procedures were far from adequate, that agency collected $1.6 million in claims on some $383 million in transactions examined. Nearly 80 percent, by value, of the claims filed were collected, and only about 20 percent were withdrawn or still pending. CCC, on the other hand, examined transactions totaling well over $1 billion and filed 155 claims amounting to $1,207,000. Only 12 claims, totaling $24,000, or 2 percent, were collected. Sixty-six claims, amounting to $202,000, or 23 percent, were still pending, and 77 claims, totaling $901,000, or 74 percent, were withdrawn. CCC officials had no comment to make concerning this comparison.

Although some refunds have been made as a result of complaints by importers, to the best of our knowledge CCC has never made a single claim on the more than $500 million in cotton transactions it has financed.

I am sure you have noticed, as I have, an apparent tendency on the part of the Department of Agriculture to try to excuse transactions with private firms which result in waste of the taxpayers' money on the ground that Congress directed the Department to utilize private channels of trade and therefore it had no alternative.

I think this kind of excuse is completely invalid.

It is quite true that Congress has stated, on numerous occasions, that private channels of trade should be utilized "to the maximum extent practicable." This is not, however, a mandatory directive to use private firms under any and all circumstances. It simply expresses, in my opinion, the intention of Congress that private firms should be utilized whenever such firms are in a position to provide necessary services at a reasonable cost. On the other hand, the interpretation which the Department appears at times to be suggesting, would mean that Congress intended to require the use of private firms to provide unnecessary services at excessive costs. I doubt that you will find many Members of Congress who would take that position, particularly when some of the major beneficiaries of such a policy would not even be U.S. owned firms.

I think the intention of Congress is well expressed in the following language adopted by the Foreign Affairs Committee without dissent in its report on the Mutual Security Act a few weeks ago:

"The committee desires to emphasize that language in the act with respect to use of private channels of trade 'to the maximum extent practicable' should not be construed as a mandate that private trade channels be used under any and all circumstances without consideration of the cost to the American taxpayer. It should be clear, under any reasonable interpretation of the law, that ICA is not required to finance exportation and sale for foreign currencies of surplus agricultural commodities in a manner which results in excessive costs to the taxpayers. Questions of efficiency and economy should be carefully considered in determining whether and how it is practicable to use private channels of trade in particular transactions."

I could place more credence in the Department's apparent contention that it has been forced to waste money because it was obliged to follow the policy of Congres if it had not been for some past experience with the Department on this very point. You may recall the cheese cases which our subcommittee investigated some time ago. In them, the Department bought cheese and butter and immediately resold it to the same companies at a lower price without ever moving it, sending the companies involved checks for the difference in prices totaling more than $2 million. Our subcommittee concluded that these weird transactions were not in accordance with the law. Our conclusion was supported by the Comptroller General, the Attorney General, and the decisions of every Federal judge who ruled on the resulting court cases. To the best of my knowledge, however, the Department of Agriculture still maintains that it had a perfact right to do what it did.

In the present situation, I might note that Agriculture Department officials testified that they felt that Congress intended any benefits resulting from use of private trade channels should accrue to U.S. firms. Yet the Department's regulations are so loose that these officials had to admit that if Amtorg, the Russian state trading agency, were incorporated in New York it would qualify as a U.S. firm.

It would hardly seem appropriate, moreover, for the Department to contend that there is a mandatory directive to use private trade channels in all cases since the Department has made direct Government to Government sales on at least a few occasions.

I should like to emphasize that I would personally like to see commercial exports expended and the role of government reduced, wherever this is possible on a sound

basis. One of the most important purposes of Public Law 480 is to stimulate and facilitate the expansion of foreign trade in agricultural commodities. Although many studies have been made, if the Department has conducted a really objective and critical analysis of the foreign trade situation with a view to permanent expansion of commercial agricultural exports, it has not come to my attention. I am sorry this has not been done, because we need to be accurately informed about our export situation. We need to know whether our activities have really expanded exports with some hope of continuation or whether what we think are markets will disappear the moment we stop financing shipments.

We need to distinguish, in my opinion, between exports that are essentially government-aided commercial shipments and exports which are essentially gifts to foreign countries without real prospect of developing markets. It is easy to see the benefit to the national economy which can result from Government assistance in developing commercial markets. Most of us would agree, also, that gifts of surplus commodities to less fortunate nations generally have been and are desirable. However, it would be difficult to justify unnecessary dollar expenditures to channel what are essentially gifts through private firms.

I have been able to cover only a very small part of the information developed in our investigation. I am sure no one needs to remind you of the complicated nature and vast extent of the title I program. Our subcommittee will do its best to prepare a comprehensive and objective report on this subject, but it will be many months before we can complete our investigation.

In order to be as helpful as possible at this time, I should like to make the following recommendations representing, of course, my personal opinions rather than the official position of the subcommittee. They are necessarily based on preliminary and sometimes incomplete information. In some cases, also, the Department may already have begun corrective action as a result of our investigation. As you will note, all of these recommendations could be carried out by the Department of Agriculture and other agencies concerned without additional legislation. I want to make it clear that the matters I have criticized are not due, so far as I have observed, to Public Law 480 itself but to the regulations adopted by the Department and the manner in which the program has been operated under those regulations.

In my opinion, the most important single step that can be taken to insure greater economy and efficiency in the operation of the title I program is for Department of Agriculture officials to inform themselves completely about their operations and to take commonsense precautions to see that they are getting a dollar's worth of value for every dollar they spend. I would specifically recommend that the Department of Agriculture:

I. Take immediate action to improve coordination between the various Federal agencies having responsibilities with respect to exportation of agricultural commodities.

II. Make a thorough study of present methods of administering programs for Government financed exports of surplus agricultural commodities, with the view of obtaining greater economy and efficiency in such programs. Such a study should include consideration of:

(a) What services are performed by companies participating in title I transactions where the commodities involved come from CCC stocks or are subsidized by CCC. The study should ascertain whether the services performed are necessary, whether the cost to the taxpayers is reasonable, and whether it would be more desirable to compensate firms performing necessary services as brokers or agents rather than as entrepreneurs.

(b) Whether the present method of allowing banks to make payments on behalf of CCC without opportunity for prior audit properly protects the public interest.

III. Strengthen CCC price review and claims regulations and procedures, including:

(a) Requiring exporters to furnish contract information (such as quality, terms of payment, delivery terms and any other data which might affect the price) on the date the contract is made in the case of all large transactions.

(b) Taking adequate steps to insure that the quality and quantity of commodities delivered in title I transactions are in accordance with the quality and quantity financed.

(c) Comparing prices at which CCC sells commodities with the prices at which it finances commodities to insure that margins are reasonable.

(d) Eliminating the arbitrary tolerance now being allowed before making claims on grain transactions.

(e) Eliminating the arbitrary 90-day limitation on claims.

The above suggestions are, of course, not intended to cover all aspects of CCC financing of commodity exports, but simply to bring some of the more important points to the attention of the Agriculture Committee. I will be glad to provide any further information I have that may be helpful to the committee.

About That Housing Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the July 9, 1959, edition of the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World. Executive Editor Forest W. Amsden makes some astute observations and suggestions:

PICKING UP THE PIECES

Although President Eisenhower's veto of the housing bill is easy to deplore, such action won't do housing much good. The bill has been vetoed and barring a miracle, Congress will not override the President's objections.

Politically, there can be no recriminations. The people of the Nation, and the people of Oregon for that matter, have twice placed this administration in power and presumably knew the administration's philosophy in doing it. The housing bill veto is typical of that philosophy.

An attempt to override the veto should be made even though it is doomed to failure. After that, Congress must try to pick up the pieces and rescue a number of essential programs—provided for in the Presidentially rejected bill—in new legislation before this session ends.

Shortness of time before the fall recess makes it unlikely that a basic or comprehensive bill can be drawn and passed which would meet the Eisenhower requests. However, legislation can be passed to, for instance, rescue the Federal Housing Administration from a situation which finds it running out of authorization to insure mortgages.

Withdrawal of FHA from the field of mortgage insurance, even temporarily, would be a severe blow to homebuilding, on which this area is so dependent. With clouds of a soft market already on the horizon, failure to increase FHA authorizations might prove to be a disaster.

The Importance of the Dairy Herd Improvement and Sire Proving Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, next year when the Department of Agriculture prepare its budget and the Appropriations Committees of both Houses consider agriculture appropriations, I hope that a vitally important program of importance to dairy farmers will be given proper funds to insure continued and improved service to agriculture.

I am referring to the dairy herd improvement and sire proving program. This program performs a real service to dairy farmers. It gives farmers essential information that can mean more net income. It is a true cooperative program between the Federal Government, State governments, and the dairy farmers themselves.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD a recent editorial from Hoard's Dairyman magazine on the subject and a statement from the National Milk Producers' Association to a Senate committee:

MORE RELIABLE SIRE PROOFS

Dairymen now have 1,600,000 cows being tested for milk production. Last year they invested over $8 million in this extremely important herd improvement service.

But the testing of the individual cow for feeding, management, and culling information provides only part of the benefits which accrue through our D.H.I.A. program. Of great importance is the use of these records for proving dairy sires.

As each record on a cow is completed, a report is sent to the State D.H.I.A. office where records are checked and forwarded to U.S. Department of Agriculture's Dairy Cattle Research Branch. Here calculations are made to prove sires, quickly and accurately, so that the best sires may be discovered and used to greatest possible benefit during their productive lives.

Last fall we reported in these columns that an estimated 30 to 40 percent of today's sire proofs may be misleading. Too often the proofs have measured the man rather than the sire. In other words, the quality of feeding and management had more influence on the daughters' records than did the transmitting ability of the sire. The effort currently being made is to try to eliminate the environmental influences.

We reported how electronic machines can calculate and print reliable sire proofs almost instantaneously. They can do calculations and come up with reports which are practically impossible to do with manual labor. To prove this statement, it is only necessary to report that a new electronic machine now available can make over 6 million digit calculations per minute.

Because this equipment is available in the department, the service to dairying can be provided at a very low cost. The equipment cannot be used, however, because the Depart-

ment of Agriculture has not asked the Congress for the necessary funds to transfer the present records over to the machines.

The department has not requested these funds in spite of the fact that its own Dairy Research Advisory Committee, for the last 3 or 4 years, has given first priority recommendation to expanding and improving the D.H.I.A. activity. In addition, such organizations as the American Dairy Science Association, the National Milk Producers Federation, the National Association of Artificial Breeders, and many other groups have requested U.S. Department of Agriculture to provide more adequate support for this work. It is difficult to understand how greater evidence could be accumulated to justify the merit of the change to the use of these highly efficient machines.

To convert to electronic equipment the first year will cost $150,000. Thereafter, the cost will be somewhat less. If this sire proving work were done with present equipment and manually, the cost would be at least $275,000 annually and the proofs would still not be reliable because it would be physically impossible for people to do manually what the machines can do so quickly. Because the electronic equipment is already available through the Commodity Stabilization Service, the per-hour cost of using this equipment would be less than one-half the normal per-hour cost to the dairy research branch.

We hope the Congress will use better judgment in approving a U.S. Department of Agriculture budget than the department did in preparing it and submitting it to Congress.

COOPERATIVE DAIRY HERD IMPROVEMENT AND SIRE PROVING PROGRAM

We respectfully direct the committee's attention to the fact that funds available for this program have remained at a static level for several years with provision being made only to meet Federal employees' pay increases authorized by the Congress. We believe the significance of this program to dairy farmers plus the increased demands made on it warrant the action of this committee and the Congress to approve additional funds for program operations.

The cooperative dairy herd improvement and sire proving program performs a real service to dairy farmers. It gives farmers information that can mean more net income. It is truly a cooperative program among Federal and State Governments and dairy farmers. The bulk of the cost is borne by the dairy farmer participants. It is estimated that of a total program cost of $8 million in 1958, some $300,000 were Federal funds and about $500,000 were from State funds. The remainder came from dairy farmers. The success of the program, however, depends greatly on the processing of the data received by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the dissemination of this data to farmers.

The basic data on individual cow performance is collected by D.H.I.A. supervisors and forwarded to the State colleges. The colleges in turn forward this information to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This data is processed to determine the production performance of daughters of individual bulls. This performance is then compared with the performance of the dams to determine sire proving. Such proving can indicate the bulls of superior transmitting lines. This is the information that dairy farmers and artificial breeding associations use in their breeding programs. This information, together with other data available from D.H.I.A., helps farmers adjust their herd management to assure best possible income return.

The economic significance of information through D.H.I.A. to individual dairy producers can best be illustrated by the following table based on D.H.I.A. information gathered in 1957. The table shows the relationship among the level of production to feed and other costs and income:

Level of production	Feed costs	Total costs	Net returns
4,000 pounds	$115	$232	—$4
6,100 pounds	143	286	31
8,000 pounds	168	336	64
9,894 pounds	180	360	76
12,000 pounds	194	388	111
14,000 pounds	215	430	153

The problem we face and the one we ask the committee to give its attention is the threat to the success of the DHIA program unless steps are taken to make it possible for the U.S. Department of Agriculture to participate fully in the program by cutting down the time lapse between receipt of data and publication of results. At the present time this lapse is estimated between 10 and 12 months. This is inordinately long. The solution to the problem is quite simple and calls for a minimum cash outlay. An increase of some $150,000 in the Department's budget request for DHIA will make possible the mechanization of data processing to the point where up to date and more complete sire proving information can be placed in the hands of dairy farmers in reasonable time to be useful.

More Fizzles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald, June 17, 1959. I commend it to the attention of the Members of the House:

MORE FIZZLES

It has been obvious for some time that this country is making very little headway in overcoming the Russian lead in earth satellites and ballistic missiles. But the failure yesterday of the latest American satellite launching together with the fifth successive fizzle of an Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile and the malfunction of another Polaris missile adds up to a useful and forceful reminder of how seriously the country's rocket program is lagging.

The Nation was assured months ago that the Atlas would be ready for the troops by the end of this month. The date has been officially postponed, and it seems clear enough that no one at this stage can be sure that Atlas will ever be a dependable or really useful combat weapon, even though it may ultimately be good enough for space research projects in which an occasional failure is not so critical. Polaris is a newer weapon and deserves a further period of trial, but the repeated failures here, too, are disquieting. And of course in the satellite field, the Russians remain far ahead in thrust and payloads and for that reason could well be first with a man in space.

The pinch-penny research budgets of earlier years and the marvelously confused and disorganized direction of development efforts since Sputnik I have both contributed to this potentially disastrous lag of the American missile and space program. Perhaps there is no way quickly to build the great fund of experience and to achieve the consistency of direction and of effort that seem to be needed for success in these fields. It may be that a dictatorship has a democracy at an unavoidable disadvantage.

We think that the President could move things along more quickly, however, if he and his Defense Secretary would stop trying to make American progress look better than it is and avoid any more overly optimistic estimates like that on the operational date for Atlas. A little sense of urgency and realism at the top might help to straighten out the rivalry ridden confusion down below in which the American space program seems to be floundering.

Less Regulus, More Regular

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in a blast-off from the U.S.S. *Barbero* to Mayport, Fla., the Postmaster General a few days ago shook loose a sizable chunk of taxpayer dollars when he projected the first official missile experiment of the U.S. Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the taxpaying public of the United States is entitled to know to which appropriation the cost of this experiment was allotted. The taxpayer is also entitled to know the cost of printing both the envelopes and the enclosures that were transported in the mail missile.

The Regulus I, which was used as the carrier for the missile mail, is now outmoded and has been replaced by flashier flashes in the sky.

It is hard at this point to determine whether the record of our launching of missiles is poorer or better than our record of postal service. Accordingly, it is difficult to conclude whether it would be better to send mail by missiles or missiles by mail. One thing is certain—our mail service should be more regular than more Regulus.

A few days after the mail by missile episode, the Washington Post published a cartoon by Herblock showing mail being unloaded from a missile and bearing the caption that if this speedy mail movement is continued, it will soon be possible to transport mail across town in fewer than 4 days.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I intend to ask that a financial accounting be given of the Postmaster General's latest public relations stunt. The neatest trick the Postmaster General might turn is to make suitable use of available transportation and distribution media. In the Portland region of the Postal Service, there have been highway post office routes discontinued in recent weeks. We would not have this problem if the Postmaster General were not playing games with sectional centers and satellite offices, to use the outer space terminology of the Heller Associates engineering firm.

Missile mail and satellite offices are being used to throw stardust in the taxpayers' eyes. Congress should act now to demand a strict accounting of postal expenditures in these fields and in the area of public relations as well.

Wiley-Dondero Canal Living Monument to the Efforts of Wisconsin's Senior Senator, Alexander Wiley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 17, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we recall that on June 26 the St. Lawrence Seaway was formally dedicated.

The ceremony marked the completion of a 50-year struggle by those who dreamed that deepening and improving the St. Lawrence River would ultimately serve the interests not only of the great agricultural-industrial complex of the Midwest but also the economy and defense of the whole Nation.

Today I should like to pay tribute to my colleague who, through his relentless effort, helped to spearhead the campaign to successfully enact legislation to authorize the modernization of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I speak, of course, of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], from my own State of Wisconsin.

In recognition of his efforts as a sponsor of the seaway legislation, a portion of the great waterway bears his name, having been designated the Wiley-Dondero Ship Channel.

Recently the Evening Telegram of Superior, Wis., carried a splendid article reviewing the commendations received by the senior Wisconsin Senator for his fine efforts on behalf of the seaway legislation. The article reflects the views not only of those who worked shoulder to shoulder with him on behalf of this project, but also of those who, though opposing the project, graciously recognized his leadership in achieving enactment of the seaway law.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY-DONDERO CANAL LIVING MONUMENT TO THE EFFORTS OF WISCONSIN'S SENIOR SENATOR

The St. Lawrence Seaway project had been attempted for a good many years before work actually began on the huge undertaking. It was only after a long uphill fight that the greatest engineering project of the second half of the 20th century in the United States, as it is referred to, became an actuality, greatly through the efforts of Senator Alexander WILEY, of Wisconsin.

The living monument to Senator WILEY's efforts is the Wiley-Dondero Canal, the 10-mile long shipping channel which is an indispensable part of the deep-draft seaway. The canal was named in honor of Senator WILEY and former Michigan Representative George Dondero who piloted the Wiley seaway bill through the House of Representatives.

COMMENDATIONS

Here are but a few of the commendations paid to Senator WILEY.

Senator H. Alexander Smith, New Jersey:

"It is often said that some segments of the public may tend to forget some of the accomplishments of their legislators in Congress. I believe, however, that the tribute to the man who has so consistently set upon and hatched the idea that has at last come into fruition in the legislative measure about to be acted on finally by the Senate. I pay tribute to the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY. His great humility and fine self-effacement have, of course, caused him to omit mentioning his own name. However, all his colleagues pay testimony to the persistence, vigor, and great vision with which he has pursued this great cause. Today, we saluate him for his victory in connection with this great ideal."

MOMENTOUS

Senator Potter, Michigan:

"Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the leadership shown by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] throughout the work on this momentous piece of legislation.

"This is the first Congress in which the bill has received favorable consideration by either House of Congress. I wish to join the other Senators who have spoken in expressing my appreciation for the leadership shown by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY.

"So, Mr. President, this occasion is a momentous one which the people of the great Midwest will cherish for many, many years to come."

Senator HUMPHREY, Minnesota:

"Mr. President, I cannot help notice how much joy and happiness there is in this Chamber. In victory there is great joy. There is today no Member of the Senate who deserves to feel a sense of accomplishment and fulfillment of purpose more than the Senator from Wisconsin.

"I was highly honored to be privileged through the good advice of the Senator from Wisconsin, of being a cosponsor of S. 2150."

Senator KEFAUVER, Tennessee:

"Mr. President, I cannot let this occasion pass without adding a word of commendation of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin and the other Senators who joined him in bringing about the fulfillment of the long-time dream of a St. Lawrence River Seaway.

"The senior Senator from Wisconsin has exercised a great deal of statesmanship in bringing together the Senators and the interests of various sections of the country and finally accomplishing the passage of the proposed legislation."

Senator Ferguson, Michigan:

"Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on the subject in praise of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. At times it can be said that, after all is said and done. I believe this is an exception. The exception is that, in this instance, we have finally done more than we said."

Senator Lehman, New York.

"Mr. President, I take great pleasure and satisfaction in congratulating the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY, on the final enactment by both Houses of Congress of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill.

"I wish to express my satisfaction, and appreciation for the efforts of the senior Senator from Wisconsin. Without his interest, without his determination, and without his continued agitation for this legislation, particularly after fine record with respect to the St. Lawrence Seaway should not be forgotten by the people of our country. In particular, it should not be forgotten by the people of Wisconsin, who, like the other lake States, will reap tremendous dividends from the seaway down through the years. The Wiley law is generally regarded as the greatest single milestone in the history of the lake States in this century."

Senator Knowland, California, Senate Republican leader:

"I should not want this opportunity to pass without paying my tribute to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee (Mr. WILEY). Over a period of a great many years he has diligently worked for the enactment of this legislation. It has been a rather heartbreaking job over the years, because of the obstacles of one type or another which have been thrown in the way."

Senator DIRKSEN, Illinois:

"So, Mr. President, today I pay tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations for his efforts without which the final enactment of the bill would have been impossible."

Senator DOUGLAS, Illinois:

"I should like to add a word of congratulation to the eminent chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations for the part which he has played in securing the passage of the bill. As a somewhat junior member of the Senate, I have watched his very effective work, not only in committee and on the floor, but off the floor; and I would say that his has been perhaps the greatest effort toward getting the bill passed. We of the Midwest owe a debt to the Senator from Wisconsin. I am sure the citizens of his State are grateful.

"I want to express the appreciation of the members of all parties for the very effective and untiring work which the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin, who is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has devoted to this task."

Senator AIKEN, Vermont:

"Let me say that for the past 2 years it has been a great pleasure to be a cosponsor of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill under the able, sincere and enthusiastic leadership of the senior Senator from Wisconsin."

Senator COOPER, Kentucky:

"Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in expressing admiration for the successful fight which the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has made in connection with the passage of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill.

"It was the long-continued insistence and the fine and convincing arguments of my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, which removed any doubt I may have had about the bill. I congratulate him for the successful outcome of his efforts in connection with the great St. Lawrence River project."

Senator Thye, Minnesota:

"Mr. President, when I came to Washington I found such Members as the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] working vigorously to accomplish the development of the seaway. I was pleased to see that a great many of the newspapers of Wisconsin commended the great contributions made by our colleague in achieving the passage of Wiley bill, S. 2150, to complete the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway."

Senator Gordon, Oregon:

"Mr. President, I have been glad to note that the newspapers of Wisconsin have given well-deserved credit to the senior Senator from that State [Mr. WILEY] for his valiant and successful sponsorship of the St. Lawrence Seaway law."

NEWSPAPER COMMENT

Two Rivers Reporter:

"No man deserves more credit for the success of the project than Wisconsin's Senator ALEXANDER WILEY. It was he who, more than any other legislator, worked unflaggingly

to engineer the undertaking through both Houses.

"While Senator WILEY was, of course, thinking of benefits for his State, he was nonetheless an exponent of the seaway for the Midwest and the Nation as a whole."

Sturgeon Bay Advocate:

"Senator WILEY in his efforts on behalf of the bill has displayed genuine statesmanship in the service of both his country and the State which he presents in the Senate."

Wausau Daily Record-Herald:

"Wisconsin's Representatives and Senators, it may be noted, were in unanimous support of the legislation, but special credit belongs to Senator WILEY who sponsored the seaway proposal in the Senate and played a leading role in obtaining its passage."

Burlington Standard-Democrat:

"Our congratulations to Senator ALEXANDER WILEY for his successful labors toward the passage of the St. Lawrence Seaway project. Our Wisconsin senior Senator worked hard for this State for many years, being the only man, at times, who would stand up and be counted."

Wisconsin State Journal:

"This State can be proud of its many hard-to-lick citizens, public and private, who have fought for the seaway for more than 20 years.

"In that category must be included ALEXANDER WILEY.

"It was WILEY, perhaps more than any other individual, who kept the seaway issue alive during its darkest days."

Wisconsin Rapids Daily Tribune:

"Principal spokesman for the administration in steering the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation to final enactment was Senator ALEXANDER WILEY. He led the fight in a manner which gained for him the admiration and respect of all his colleagues, Republican and Democrat alike, regardless of whether they favored or opposed the project. He deserves a great part of the credit for bringing the seaway to realization. Wisconsin should be proud to acknowledge his splendid work and thank him for it."

Eau Claire Leader-Telegram:

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Chippewa Falls, has been in the forefront of seaway battles during his three terms as United States Senator and it is fitting that the legislation finally passed bears his name—the Wiley-Dondero bill. WILEY led the fight in the Senate and Representative DONDERO, Michigan Republican, was floor manager of proseaway forces in the House."

SENATORIAL OPPONENTS

Senator BEALL, Maryland:

"Mr. President, as a member of the opposition, I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for the tremendous job he has done.

"I think the Senator from Wisconsin is to be congratulated for his generalship in the handling of parliamentary matters in connection with the bill. I cannot refrain from congratulating the Senator from Wisconsin on his victory today."

Senator BUTLER, Maryland:

"May I say that I congratulate my very worthy adversary, the Senator from Wisconsin, not only on behalf of myself but of others who participated in the opposition."

Senator STENNIS, Mississippi:

"I recall that when I first came to the Senate, more than 6 years ago, the Senator from Wisconsin was working on a bill on the same subject matter. He has spoken on this subject many times since then, always with great sincerity, earnestness, and persuasion. I know he has worked very persistently for the bill, both among his colleagues in the Senate and elsewhere.

"As one who did not vote for the bill, I wish to commend him very highly.

"I feel that at times his work made the difference between abandoning the bill and continuing with it. I salute and congratulate him on his fine achievement, which I know will prove to be most worthwhile for a great many people, even beyond his own State."

Security of Workers' Jobs Should Begin at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I am always perturbed by any indication of American workers losing their jobs. Therefore, I have been considerably concerned by an article under the heading "Ghost Plants in Packing Town." This article should be seriously pondered by Members of Congress, especially that part of the article calling our attention to the foreign products coming into our American stores at the present time. As the article says:

We have no quarrel with our worker friends in other countries. They too have their problems. But, it would seem to us Americans that the security of workers' jobs should begin at home.

How true that is. Every time an American worker is displaced or loses his job it should be considered a real tragedy. And if I should hear of two dozen men in my district losing their jobs, I would want to put a rough pebble in my shoe for at least 1 full day so that I could feel this evil thing and keep it on my mind and try to figure out some kind of remedy. We must never forget that our first obligation, after our duty to the Lord, is toward our own country and its people, all of which the Lord Himself gave us to honor and cherish. The article I have mentioned is as follows:

GHOST PLANTS IN PACKING TOWNS

(By Patrick E. Gorman and Thomas J. Lloyd)

The saddest sight on the American industrial scene is a closed factory or plant. From coast to coast these sad sights are increasing. These empty buildings look like, and actually are, job morgues. Thousands of workers' jobs were destroyed when the plants closed, and most of them are closed forever.

MORE THAN ITS SHARE

The meat packing industry has had more than its share of these graveyard plants. It is doubtful if slaughtering or production will ever resume in them again. Packing towns are becoming ghost towns. Some say that mechanization is to some extent responsible. Others blame these sad sights upon poor management. Management, very erroneously, criticizes the unions for this unhappy situation. Whatever the cause, the tycoons in the packing industry should shed a tear over their inability to cope with an industrial situation which could, and should, be remedied, thus saving the jobs of thousands upon thousands of workers who need them.

It is hard to believe that Chicago, which was once the heart of the giant meat industry, is now but a shadow of its former stature. The Swift & Co. plants which normally employed nearly 10,000 workers in Chicago, now look deserted and forlorn. In all of the Swift operations in Chicago at present, there are but slightly more than 900 still enjoying production employment with this giant concern. The ghostly atmosphere hovering about the Armour plants in Chicago is equally as pathetic. No longer does Armour slaughter or kill hogs in this once powerful metropolis of meat packing. Wilson & Co. long since has moved out of the Windy City, lock, stock, and barrel.

If, perchance, bad labor relations did have something to do with the situation, then there is the consoling thought that our international union in no manner is responsible. We are proud that we have lived up to our agreements faithfully with no quickie strikes or slowdowns permitted.

Chaos, sooner or later, had to develop because only recently the shelves of our retail stores were being abundantly stocked with canned meat products labeled, "Produce of Argentina." These Argentina products came from packing plants bearing the same name as several of the large meat packers of the United States. Recently, by Government order, all this has been remedied, at least temporarily, because of the hoof and mouth disease among cattle which is raging rampant in some South American countries.

FOREIGN MEAT

We ask the wives of our members, the next time they go to the butcher shop, to look around. What will they see? Canned hams galore from Denmark, Holland, Sweden—in fact from all countries not operating directly behind the so-called Iron Curtain. Shipload after shipload of beef from our friends in Australia are finding their way into the markets of the United States, and strangely again the same powerful names in the American meat packing industry are operating in the land "down under."

It is impossible for strictly American operated meat packers to compete with the somewhat lower quality of beef from Australia. It is dumped on the open market cheaper per pound than the American packers can produce it. There is every likelihood that our American packers who have plants in South America and other foreign countries would like to bring in more of the products produced in these foreign lands. The reason—packing plant workers in the United States are employed under good union conditions. They benefit from the American standard of living. They receive wages and working conditions better than that which is received by workers in foreign lands. If the American market can be flooded with meat from foreign countries, production here will fall off badly. If this is accomplished our unions could therefore be weakened, and a harder bargain can be exacted at the conference table.

Certainly we are proud of the wage rates we have negotiated in years gone by for the men and women in the meatpacking industry, but it has been difficult for all workers to keep pace with the high prices of all commodities.

MORE GHOST PLANTS

Now comes more ghost plants in packing towns. Armour & Co. just recently announced the closing of six more of their plants. This giant in the meatpacking industry will then have but 1,000 people in all of its Chicago operations. The jobs of 9,000 formerly employed by Armour & Co. here are in job morgues, never, except by miracle, to be revived.

"NO HELP NEEDED"

Two thousand Chicago packinghouse workers in this latest Armour layoff will be walking the streets going from employment gate to employment gate of industries in which they are not experienced, and the probability is that they will face the heartbreaking sign, "No help needed." Other Armour plants which will close, according to their statement, will be at Columbus, Ohio; East St. Louis, Ill. (with some 1,500 employees); Fargo, N. Dak.; Denver, Colo.; and Tifton, Ga. Previous to this announce-

ment, Armour abandoned its plant at Atlanta, Ga. Armour also may abandon their plants in Kansas City and St. Joseph, Mo.—not only abandon them, but demolish them. If this is done, it is probable that they will build a new plant, to take the place of the two old plants, somewhere in between Kansas City and St. Joseph.

DREAMS DESTROYED

In the meantime, the ranks of the unemployed in the meatpacking industry, as a result of the closing of all these plants which should be operating, will look back upon these ghostly morgues with heavy hearts. These were the places in which they earned their livelihoods. From these plants, paying good wages, they had hoped they could send their children to college. Gone are the hopes that they could buy their own homes not too far away from packing town.

All of these dreams are vanishing because, as indicated, packing towns in most cities are becoming ghost towns.

It seems that there is a responsibility on the part of management and the unions in the industry to make more frequent use of the conference table; for each to lay their cards on the table and examine carefully all of the reasons why these sad sights of closed plants are multiplying. A remedy certainly can be found between management and the unions, and when the remedy is found both should pound hard upon the door of Uncle Sam with a demand that "We have a right to live too."

We have no quarrel with our worker friends in other countries. They too have their problems. But, it would seem to us Americans that the security of workers' jobs should begin at home. Other countries, where our Nation is giving a helping hand, have no unemployment problems. They have our open door here for their products, and in some countries of our foreign friends there actually is a shortage of workers instead of unemployment and closed plants as we witness here.

Sooner or later, there will have to be regulations. Why isn't it done before closed doors will appear on every industrial scene to a greater extent than what exists today? A body can give only so much blood to save another without dying itself. Such is quite true on the world political scene. It is about time for action, because really, it's later than you think.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Independence Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to include in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks delivered at the Independence Day observance which was sponsored by the Edison Park Community Council at Olympia Park, Chicago, Ill., on this past Fourth of July. The Edison Park Community Council is to be congratulated for arranging this patriotic gathering to call attention to the significance of this day. The remarkable spirit of the people present at this gathering clearly showed that in the Edison Park area of Chicago the full import of the meaning of Independence Day was deeply felt by the entire community. I am proud that the Edison Park area is in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois, which I represent. My remarks follow:

REMARKS BY HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, 11TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, ILLINOIS, DELIVERED AT THE INDEPENDENCE DAY OBSERVANCE SPONSORED BY THE EDISON PARK COMMUNITY COUNCIL IN OLYMPIA PARK, AVONDALE AND OLYMPIA AVENUES, CHICAGO, JULY 4, 1959

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, may I first take this opportunity to thank the Edison Park Community Council for arranging today's Fourth of July tribute. I was very interested to learn from the Association of Community Councils that your community celebration being held today is one of the last such neighborhood celebrations still being observed in this city. It is lamentable, indeed, that the annual Fourth of July observance has now become an occasion for "taking a day off," so to speak; a day for going out in the country; perhaps playing golf; or maybe even catching up on the many household chores that confront the average homeowner.

Instead of seeing headlines which rally the Nation to observe this most beautiful of our holidays, which reflect upon the independence of our Nation, in modern America, the headlines issue sober warnings that hundreds of people will be killed in traffic fatalities over the Fourth of July weekend.

Because you people and the committee of Edison Park Community Council do take the time and effort to put this holiday in its proper perspective, the residents of Edison Park, at least, are reminded of the real meaning of this holiday. I congratulate you and commend you for setting aside the more comfortable pursuits in which you could today be engaged, and instead are participating in this tribute.

God grant that what you are doing here today could again be repeated all over our Nation so that we, as Americans, could properly reflect on the full meaning of the Fourth of July, on the depth of Independence Day, and what it really means to the people of our Nation.

I was indeed very saddened when I read an account by an enterprising Chicago reporter last week that a survey which he had conducted among many people of our city showed overwhelmingly how few Americans really understand the meaning of July Fourth. I might say I was even chagrined to see how many people thought that July Fourth is a tribute to the end of World War I. Others expressed a belief that it is a holiday signifying the end of the War of 1812. Tragically, only a relatively small percentage of those interviewed by this reporter actually knew that the Fourth of July is an annual tribute by the American people to the Declaration of Independence signed by the Founding Fathers of this Nation, a declaration which had dedicated this Nation to the fundamental belief that people are endowed by our Creator with the inalienable right to be free.

Because of the fine work which the people of this community are doing to keep the true spirit of this holiday, I feel certain that if that reporter were to conduct his survey in this area, he would certainly find much more impressive results.

What is the real meaning of this holiday?

On July Fourth in 1776, the Declaration of Independence was signed. The 56 men who gathered in that hot and sultry room in Philadelphia so long ago to read and sign a paper that had been drafted by Thomas Jefferson did not know they were helping to create the Eighth Wonder of the World.

The simple words reaffirmed their conviction in the belief of human dignity and their disgust with tyranny. Each man who signed his name pledged his wealth, his position, and his life to preserve the message of justice contained on that single sheet of paper, regardless of the personal consequences to himself. And largely because of the efforts of these few men, the Thirteen Original Colonies went to war with England and won the independence they were seeking so strongly.

Their single-minded devotion to justice and equality for all men, not only those of their generation and their century, but to those who would come after them and would witness the changes of an expanding nation, helped to make this document an enduring guidepost for our democratic concept of Government. This guidepost has lasted, inviolate and unchanging, for almost two centuries. If we want to continue its tradition as the greatest example of dedication to democratic principles the world has ever known, we must take the time to refresh our memories. We must remember what this Declaration of Independence stands for, and further, what we ourselves stand for today.

"That governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed—that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it." Those words are as fresh and eloquent this afternoon as they were 183 years ago, and they apply to each of us in 1959 as much as they did to our forebears. This, then, is the fundamental precept on which our Government is based.

Think of it, for a moment. Each of us has been guaranteed by right, not privilege, the ability to speak freely, without fear of persecution, and to worship as our minds and hearts urge us. If the Government we have voted into office does not measure up to its promises and our expectations, we can express our disapproval by voting it out of office. We can sit down and write to our Congressman, telling him what we think of the job he is doing; and if our opinion is unchanged when he runs for reelection, we can express our approval or distrust with a vote for or against him.

Government is so much a part of our lives today that we must all participate in its growth and development. We parents should encourage intellectual curiosity in our children to explore American history, to compare it with histories of other nations, to find out more about our vast country in relation to its position with the neighboring powers in the world. As parents, we must guide our youngsters to better enable them to meet the new problems of their generation and to solve some of the old ones. Our Government needs intelligent, receptive and resolute people, with the courage of their convictions and the ability to carry them out.

In many nations of the world, children are taught their national history throughout every year they attend school. They are encouraged to think about politics from a very early age; to discuss current events and their significance to their own countries and to the world in general. Pride in nationality and heritage is part of the basic makeup of most of the nations on our globe.

In America, however, too often our youngsters place their greatest value on the material aspects of their surroundings, and I fear that, more and more, we are failing here in this country to instill in our young generation the full meaning of liberty. History teaches us that the democratic processes of great nations had been subdued or even brazenly crushed by tyrants and dictators only because the people failed to recognize that to be free requires great sacrifices.

These sacrifices manifest themselves in many ways. One such sacrifice is the giving up of aimless leisure—the complete waste of time which so many of us, both young and old, engage in—and instead use this time for worthwhile intellectual pursuits toward a better understanding of the complex structure of a republic.

Orators all over the country are today extolling the great virtues of freedom and liberty. And yet, do we really know what is the true meaning of freedom and liberty? I am distressed that so many of our Americans who speak with great pride of their own liberties on the one hand, can be so quick to deny these same liberties to others on the other hand, whenever we disagree with them.

What do I mean? Simply stated, if we are going to have liberty, we must have liberty for all. The very cornerstone of liberty and freedom is the right to dissent or disagree. Only when we Americans recognize this fundamental right to disagree can we give full meaning to the words "liberty" and "freedom."

Your right to disagree with your Government; your right to disagree with your Congressman; is inviolate; but you must remember that if you are to have this right, you must also recognize that your fellow citizen has this right.

This is a fact that more and more of our citizens tend to forget. As a result, the Nation is slowly slipping into the limbo of conformity. Nothing can destroy our Nation faster than conformity because it is out of

the free discussion of debate and ideas—even though frequently we do not agree with some of these ideas—that we find the basis for the dynamics of a republic.

Emerson once stated, "Whoso would be a man must be a nonconformist."

We must distinguish, however, between irresponsible obstructionism are responsible nonconformity if we are to conduct ourselves as decent Americans.

The men whom we are today honoring, the authors of this great Declaration of Independence, the founders of our Republic under its concept of freedom for all, were perhaps the greatest nonconformists in the history of this country. Because they refused to surrender to the ideology of tyrannical rule, they banded together and had the courage to write a new concept around which free people could rally.

Imagine if you can what those, who today find so little patience with nonconformists, would be saying about Jefferson and his followers if they attempted to write a declaration of independence in 1959 instead of 1776.

Admiral Rickover, the father of the atomic submarine, likes to tell the story of the ancient Locrians in Greece, who gave freedom of speech to all of their citizens, though at a cost which many must have considered too high. He recalls that at public meetings anyone could stand up and argue for changes in law and custom on one condition: a rope was placed around his neck before he began to speak, and if what he said did not meet with public approval, he was forthwith hanged.

Here in America in our time it would indeed be tragic if democracy deteriorated into mass tyranny over the unconventional individual.

I subscribe fully to what this great modern day Navy admiral recently stated when he said that democracy and equality do not require that we deny to the minority of people with creative minds the right to use them in their own way and to their fullest potential. People who use their minds successfully ought not to be expected to pretend they are just like everybody else.

We are today confronted with perhaps the most dangerous situation that has faced our Nation by the ever mounting rise and despotic ambitions of international communism, stubbornly determined that the free institutions, which we honor here today, can be destroyed and replaced with the tyranny of Kremlin rulers. This Nation will find means of survival only by giving full encouragement to those who come forth with new ideas to fight this menace.

It is from diversity of ideas that springs the great strength for a free people to survive. When we deny any American an opportunity of full and free expression, we rob ourselves of that precious quality that distinguishes man from all other orders, his stubborn determination to think for himself and his inalienable right to be different.

It is up to you parents to encourage your children toward the development of intellectual curiosity. This is what disturbs me about some aspects of our modern educational institution. In too many instances, whether by design or just outright neglect, our youngsters are being denied the full facilities for learning the basic 3 R's. In some communities, homework is viewed with scorn. I hope that you, as parents in a wonderful community, will observe more intensely whether your youngsters are getting the fundamentals of education. Remember this: An American, to fully respect and honor his freedom must first be able to understand the complexities of his society.

In Russia, under Communist rule, in the satellite countries, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, East Germany, Hungary, and Rumania, the Communist governments imposed on those traditionally freedom-loving people their determination that the young generations must learn only what the Communists want to teach them. By sterilizing the thinking processes of these young people, the Communists are convinced they can preserve their own dogmatic principles and survive. We in this country must resolve that our young people will be given the tools with which to think, so that never will our American people have to march in the single cadence as is being forced upon the people of these Communist-enslaved nations.

Public apathy is the worst scourge of any national or political ideology. We in America take so much of our material wealth and our prosperity and our leadership of other countries for granted. We don't stop to realize one simple fact: The Communist elements in the world believe just as strongly in their form of government, to the point of forcibly conquering other nations and incorporating them into the Communist governmental structure. How, then, can we afford to take our democratic principles and our guaranteed freedoms so lightly?

The time to resist those powers who would conquer the free world by force is not when their invasion forces are sighted on the horizon, but by stamping out their pervasive influence now, before it has even the smallest chance to become rooted. To do this, we must be armed with a belief in our Government and our elected representatives.

We must recognize the rights expressed in the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed us in the Constitution—the rights of life, of liberty, and of the pursuit of happiness. This isn't a stock phrase we must memorize in school and promptly forget at graduation. We must have a knowledge of what these rights provide, we must recognize them, appreciate their value, and exercise them in our daily lives.

The Declaration of Independence is our testimonial to the intrinsic value of every human person, and it is the first such document in the world to do this. We have been endowed with the powers of selecting capable Government officials, and we are free to use this power within the flexible bounds of a two-party system.

Congress and each individual Congressman must be sensitive to the will of the majority of the people represented. However, if the people through lethargy or ignorance or indifference do not express an opinion, how can Congress be truly expected to anticipate the will of the population? Government is only as good as the people behind it, and that, my friends, places the responsibility squarely on our shoulders.

Our responsibility is to become worthy of our heritage, to carry on the traditions of liberty and human equality through our own generation and pass it on to the next. If we are to preserve and perpetuate what has been given to us at such great costs, we must educate ourselves to the discrepancies in the political ideologies which are confronting us today. We must keep faith with the future by studying and benefiting from the experiences of the past.

I am certain that so long as organizations like the Edison Park Community Council and its officers continue arranging these Fourth of July observances, where the entire family—mother, father, and their children—can come here and pay tribute to the Declaration of Independence and the great flag of America—now with its 49 stars, and soon with a 50th star—this community at least will not fall prey to foreign ideologies. Our freedoms are secure so long as you demonstrate your great respect for the Declaration of Independence, and for this, I admire you and express pride in representing you in Congress.

Thank you.

America's Territorial Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my addresses on the Panama Canal, I have made frequent reference to the question of territorial seas in connection with an attempted encirclement by the Republic of Panama of the Canal Zone.

An informative article dealing with the measurement of territorial sea by Mr. Neal Stanford was published in the July 11, 1959, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, and is included in these remarks:

AMERICA'S TERRITORIAL SEA—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Neal Stanford)

Everybody (well, nearly everybody) knows that the U.S. territorial sea extends 3 miles (nautical miles, that is) from the coast. In this area U.S. sovereignty is complete—though ships of other nations normally are allowed to enter the 3-mile limit under what is called the right of innocent passage.

Figuring out America's territorial sea, then, sounds like a very simple operation—just draw a 3-mile limit around the United States—and there you have it.

The trouble is—there you don't have it—as I quickly discovered from the State Department's geographer, G. Etzel Pearcy. Figuring out this country's territorial sea, I found can be as complicated as charting outer space or harnessing the atom.

This question of just where our 3-mile limit really is can be very important—for an unfriendly ship operating only a few yards within U.S. territorial waters might well create an incident. Also certain countries (the U.S.S.R., the United Arab Republic, Panama, among them) are trying to get international agreement to push territorial waters out to a 6-mile limit. They failed some months ago to sell this proposition to a United Nations-sponsored conference—but they intended to renew their bid at another UN meeting in Geneva next spring.

There are innumerable things that make charting this country's 3-mile limit (or a 6-mile limit, if it should come to that) frightfully complicated. The reason is that in order to have the territorial set charted exactly 3 miles mrom any point along the coast—a highly irregular coast—some very fine and precise measurements have to be taken. Immediately the question arises as to what to do about bays, inlets, islands, river deltas; what about low tide and high tide; piers, breakwaters; buoys, bridges; reefs, shoals, or rocks exposed at low tide?

First of all, I discovered, the low tide along the coast is the normal baseline from which to measure. Next, arcs of circles with radii of 3 miles are swung from every point along the low-tide line. The result is, theoretically, a 3-mile limit that is neither more nor less than 3 miles from the closest coastal point. But at this point the subject becomes complicated.

Take big bays, little bays, and just coastal indentations. To distinguish a bay from a mere curvature of the coastline, the semicircle test is made. A line is drawn between the entrance points of the coastal indentation. Then a semicircle is drawn into the indentation with the line just mentioned as diameter. If the water thus closed off

is larger than the semicircle, then it is a bay; if smaller, it is only a coastal indentation. In the case of a bay the 3-mile limit is drawn from the baseline across the entrance to the bay; in the case of a coastal indentation, it must be chartered 3 miles from all coastal points.

However, there is an exception to this—under international agreement: If the entrance to a bay exceeds 24 miles, then a baseline, of not more than 24 miles, must be drawn within the bay—drawing it to enclose the maximum water area possible.

But what about bays that have several islands across their entrances? In such cases a closing line is drawn from island to island to coastlines. To be a bay, the area of water closed off must be larger than that of a semicircle the diameter of which is the sum of the individual closing lines.

Next as for islands. Islands have their own territorial seas. Those within 6 miles of each other have territorial seas which overlap. If these are within 6 miles of the mainland, they coalesce with the territorial sea of the mainland.

As for shoals, reefs, and rocks that are exposed at low tide but submerged at high, they do not have territorial seas of their own. However, if such a shoal, reef, or rock lies within a territorial sea of the mainland or an island, its low-water line may be used as a baseline for measuring the 3-mile limit.

When it comes to piers, breakwaters, other manmade installations, these are accepted as part of a coast's baseline. Bridges are not.

It is obvious that offshore islands tend to increase the area of the territorial sea. Were the 3-mile limit extended to 6, it is also apparent that, while the coastline territorial sea would be twice as far out as at present, the 6-mile limit would not just double an island's territorial sea, but quadruple it. And this could mean the territorial sea of some islands would coalesce with that of the mainland, closing off channels now open to international sea traffic.

Yes; it is all quite complicated figuring out just where America's 3-mile limit is—however easy it sounds. And figuring out a 6-mile limit, thank goodness, need not be 4, or even 2, times as difficult.

On-Campus Housing for College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a very interesting letter received from Dr. Harold C. Case, president of the Boston University, of Boston, Mass., urging that in any housing legislation which might be enacted into law a provision be included therein in relation to loans to college institutions for certain purposes. As Dr. Case said:

Since the Housing Act has become law of the land, it has proved to be a very valuable instrument for assisting colleges and universities to finance on-campus living facilities for their students. It is fair to say that without this legislation, institutions in the United States would not have been able to expand their plan to care for the increasing demands of students.

I am in agreement with Dr. Case's views.

The letter follows:

BOSTON UNIVERSITY,
Boston, Mass., July 10, 1959.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: Undoubtedly you have received the expression of opinion of many groups regarding the so-called omnibus housing bill which was recently vetoed by the President. As the president of the New England university offering educational opportunities to the largest number of area residents, I feel it is my duty to ask you to give your full support to at least those portions of the housing bill which relate to educational institutions. Since the Housing Act has become law of the land, it has proved to be a very valuable instrument for assisting colleges and universities to finance on-campus living facilities for their students. It is fair to say that without this legislation, institutions in the United States would not have been able to expand their plant to care for the increasing demands of students.

I should also like to call to your attention the fact that this is the second successive year in which the college housing facilities have been a part of an omnibus housing bill which was vetoed by the President. It is unfortunate that legislation which so seriously affects higher education generally has been the victim of omnibus aspects of housing which have little relation to education.

May I therefore express my conviction that housing legislation is urgently needed. If the President's veto is sustained, may I earnestly request you to lend your support to the introduction of separate legislation which would authorize appropriation of funds for college and university housing as presently contained in the omnibus housing bill, but as a separate piece of legislation.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD C. CASE,
President.

On the Inflation Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 16, 1959:

ON THE INFLATION FRONT

One of the giants of American industry has just administered some of its prices downward. The General Electric Co. has announced on successive days reductions in prices of its turbines, both large and small.

In a nation that had become used to the "ratchet" movement of heavy-industry prices—up, steady, up again, and never down—this is to be heartily welcomed. Furthermore, the General Electric Co.'s announcements, both in what those announcements say and what they do not say, contain some hints of better days to come on the inflation front.

First, the company said the price reductions were made possible by improved manufacturing processes that have cut costs. There would be nothing unusual about this except that it has not been happening enough in the economy as a whole in the postwar period. Improved efficiency has all too often been eaten up in higher wage and other costs, with prices the same or even rising.

Second, in its announcement on the big turbines the company said it would modify the escalator clause in its contracts—a clause under which customers have been required to pay more than the originally agreed price if a certain index of costs rose.

The change is aimed to help sales, but it also may represent a shrewd hunch on the part of GE that costs in the future may be a lot more stable than in the past.

Finally, what the announcements did not say was that foreign competition is a large element in the decision, at least for the big turbines. The revival of Western Europe is producing a benefit that Americans had perhaps not foreseen—the infusion of an extra element of competition in parts of American industry that have been to some extent immune during most of the postwar period.

In a sense, we as consumers are getting our Marshall plan money back.

Report of National Projects Committee to the Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of the national projects committee, which was unanimously adopted by the recent 46th national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington on May 13-15, 1959.

The permanent national projects committee of the congress consists of an outstanding expert on water-resource problems from each of the major drainage basins of the United States. They serve without compensation of any kind whatsoever and bear all of their own expenses when coming to Washington and while here serving on this committee.

The committee's purpose is to assist the sponsors of projects in preparing and presenting their data, so that they may be placed in line for approval. The projects recommended by the committee and endorsed by the congress are vigorously pressed for inclusion in the Government's public-works program, and appropriations or allocation of funds sought therefor.

We are grateful to the members of this committee for their public-spirited service in an effort to assist the Congress of the United States and the governmental agencies charged with the responsibility for these public works, as well as the people in the areas to be served thereby.

The members of the committee who served at its recent session are as follows:

Projects committee: Representative PHIL WEAVER, Falls City, Nebr., chairman.

New England division: Member, William S. Wise, executive secretary, Flood Control and Water Policy Commission, State of Connecticut, Hartford, Conn.

North Atlantic division: Member, Brig. Gen. James H. Stratton, U.S. Army, retired, consulting engineer, New York, N.Y.

South Atlantic division: Member, H. H. Buckman, consulting engineer, Jacksonville, Fla.; vice chairman.

Southwestern division: Member, Dale Miller, executive vice president, Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Houston, Tex.

Lower Mississippi Valley division: Member, Hu B. Myers, chief engineer, Department of Public Works, State of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.

North Central division: Member, Al Hansen, comptroller, city of Minneapolis, Minneapolis, Minn.

Missouri River division: Member, John B. Quinn, executive director, Missouri Valley Development Association, Inc., Lincoln, Nebr.

Ohio River division: Member, J. I. Perry, chief engineer, Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission, Indianapolis, Ind.

North Pacific division: Member, Herbert G. West, executive vice president, Inland Empire Waterways Association, Walla Walla, Wash.

South Pacific division: Member, Vice Adm. Murrey L. Royar, U.S. Navy, retired, Washington representative, Oakland (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce.

Western intermountain region: Member, E. W. Rising, Washington representative, State Water Conservation Board of Montana, Helena, Mont.

REPORT OF THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE TO THE 46TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MAY 15, 1959

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In pursuance of the call of the President, your projects committee met on May 13, 1959, to reconsider the projects submitted since the last session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Hearings were afforded all who made appearance.

The committee at this session has examined 54 proposals embracing all resource improvements with which this Congress is concerned, including navigable waterways, harbors, flood control, hurricane protection, soil conservation, reclamation and water conservation.

Of the proposals examined, this committee is convinced that 27 constitute projects sound in conception, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status to warrant endorsement, involving a total estimated cost of $291,145,800. Nine proposals appear to be without sufficiently advanced development to warrant project endorsement at this time, but are believed to be meritorious and entitled to further consideration by this committee, if and when additional information may be adequate to warrant an endorsed status. We find that on 13 proposals, surveys have been authorized but the reports of said surveys have not been completed and we therefore recommend in these cases that the Congress request the appropriate authority to complete reports of its investigations and surveys as soon as practicable in order that action may be taken toward classification by this Congress. We find five proposals which on preliminary examination appear to be desirable and needful, and we accordingly recommend that engineering and economic investigations of survey scope be made in these cases with a view to developing projects for subsequent authorization.

Appendix A of this report sets forth in detail a list of all proposals and projects examined and the action taken thereon.

Since our national convention last year, the Congress enacted Public Law 85-500, the omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill, which was approved by the President on July 3, 1958. This act authorized construction of 139 river and harbor, beach erosion and flood control projects in 44 States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

The total estimated Federal cost of work authorized in the bill is $1,556,230,500, of which $1,356,230,500 is for the Corps of Engineers and $200 million is for Missouri River basin work by the Department of Interior.

The grand total is broken down as follows:

Type of improvement	Number of projects	Estimated cost
Navigation and beach erosion	71	$202, 350, 700
Flood control	68	545, 579, 800
Basin authorization	12	608, 300, 000
Department of Interior (Missouri River)	1	200, 000, 000
Total	152	1, 556, 230, 500

There are also authorizations for 61 surveys in 27 States and Hawaii. In addition the act contained several general provisions, including a section on water supply which liberalizes the policy applicable to advance provisions of facilities needed to meet future needs. This section is particularly appropriate to the future planning of Federal reservoir projects in order to serve the expanding economy in an orderly manner. Section 208 of the act eliminated preliminary examination reports. This and other improvements are expected to provide more economical and faster preparation of survey reports.

The projects included in this act are of high importance to the Nation's expanding economy and should be provided as soon as practicable. Your projects committee, therefore, recommends that the Congress of the United States be requested to give consideration to early appropriation of funds for construction of these projects.

Flood control became a major part of the national water resource investment program when in 1928 the Congress declared a national interest in preventing human suffering and economic losses from floods in the Mississippi Valley, and authorized the Alluvial Valley project. In 1936 flood control was authorized on a nationwide basis. The flood control projects of the Corps of Engineers completed or placed in partial operation have already prevented flood damages totaling about $9 billion, which is about twice the amount invested. The reservoir system of the Corps of Engineers with millions of acre-feet of storage capacity are mitigating the damaging effects of floodwaters and are benefiting water supplies, pollution abatement, recreation and fish and wildlife. However, construction of authorized projects and additional authorizations are necessary to alleviate flood conditions in other parts of the country. The devastating floods in the Ohio River basin this year, as well as those along the west coast and in the Atlantic and Gulf States during the past few years, are fresh in our minds and show that much remains to be done in the field of flood control particularly in the determination of the feasibility of projects for the prevention of these flood damages and the loss of human lives. Where and when another great flood may strike is not known but it could be in any river basin at any time.

The inland waterways which now total over 22,000 miles handled about 115 billion ton-miles of cargo in the calendar year 1957. This does not include the Great Lakes which in 1957 handled over 117 billion ton-miles. There are over 400 improved coastal harbors.

The hydroelectric power production facilities of the Corps of Engineers are contributing greatly to alleviating power shortages, particularly in the critically deficient Northwest region. During the fiscal year 1958, 27 billion kilowatts were generated at projects operated by the corps, representing 20 percent of the total hydroelectric power produced by all sources in the Nation.

As we all know, the Corps of Engineers survey program is nationwide and it includes investigations called for by Congress to determine the practical means of reduction of loss of human lives and damages to property. Reports recommending flood control works on many of the most severely damaged areas through the country have been completed and submitted to Congress by the Chief of Engineers. As a result of hurricane damage to our coastal and tidal areas, three projects, New Bedford-Fairhaven, Narragansett Bay and Texas City were authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958.

Many other areas which have been severely damaged have been designated for detailed study and a number of these investigations are well advanced. Congress has also authorized investigations to study hurricanes including the securing of data on hurricane frequency and behavior and the establishment of means to prevent the loss of lives and property that have been experienced. It is evident, therefore, that the development of plans for the control of floods and minimizing the destructive force of hurricanes are of paramount importance. In this connection, we must never for one moment lose sight of the objectives of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in supporting this great program of water resource development.

The need for funds for carrying out investigations for flood control, hurricanes, navigation, and related uses is as urgent at this time as any time in the history of this program. The investigations should go forward in order that a well-planned construction program can be made for the time that construction funds will be available for those projects which may be recommended as a result of these studies and that are authorized by Congress. Although much work remains to be done in the field of water resource development throughout the country, we feel that the problem is being expertly handled by the Federal agencies in cooperation with the States concerned. The need for full scale development of our water resource program is greater today than ever before. The projects committee, therefore, considers it highly important that sufficient funds be provided in order that the Federal agencies can carry out their respective water resource program in an orderly fashion. Your committee is concerned over the large backlog of investigations authorized by Congress to be carried out by the various Federal agencies and recommends that appropriations be increased at this time in order that the backlog be reduced and that an adequate reserve of current projects may be built up for activation particularly at this time when the economy of the Nation appears to warrant construction of worthwhile public works.

We wish to commend the various Federal agencies involved in the investigations and provisions of water resource projects on their improvements in development of sound procedures of project analysis and formulation, and the increased cooperation among agencies and with the States and local interests. We believe that true partnership between the Federal Government and its citizens lies not only in the sharing of costs, but also from the common sharing of problems and their development and solution. An example is the many hurricane studies being made along the eastern and southern seaboards, in which the States, local munici-

palities, and many of the Federal agencies are cooperating in making these studies.

Respectfully submitted.

PHIL WEAVER,
Chairman.

(NOTE A.—A project which has been placed in class II, III, IV, or V by the committee may be reexamined from time to time upon due application and the submission of material supplementary information, with a view to advancing its classification; but no project will be reported upon by the committee more than once in each year.)

(NOTE B.—Attention is called to the fact that when a project is once put in class I, endorsed, such status continues and it is unnecessary to follow up at subsequent sessions with new applications. All projects "endorsed" by the Congress, upon the recommendations of the committee, retain their status until finally constructed, unless such action is rescinded by the Congress, and the Congress stands pledged to do everything possible to assist in reaching that goal.)

APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL OF PROJECTS RECEIVED BY THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE

APPENDIX A

[Letter "R" following the project number indicates revision of a previous application]

DIVISION I—ENDORSED

[Endorsed. This means that it is the judgment of the Committee that the project is sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status; and that its construction is justified by the public interest it will serve]

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division	Classification
728-R6	Morehead City Harbor	North Carolina	South Atlantic	I
813-R2	Pantego Creek and Cucklers Creek	do	do	I
823-R	Baltimore Harbor and channels	Maryland	North Atlantic	I
840-R	Freeport Harbor	Texas	Southwestern	I
841-R	Galveston Harbor and Channel; Houston ship channel; and Texas City Channel.	do	do	I
863-R	Boston Harbor (reserved channel)	Massachusetts	Northeastern	I
883-R4	San Juan Harbor	Puerto Rico	South Atlantic	I
890-R5	Kahului Harbor, Maui	Territory of Hawaii	Pacific Ocean	I
892-R	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway	Texas	Southwestern	I
1097-R	Turkey Creek Reservoir	Kansas	Missouri River	I
1097-A-R	Sutphen Mills Reservoir	do	do	I
1097-B-R	Woodbine Reservoir	do	Missouri River	I
1097-C-R	Humboldt Reservoir	do	do	I
1097-D-R	Camp Creek Reservoir	do	do	I
1097-E-R	Onaga Reservoir	do	do	I
1097-F-R	Grove Reservoir	do	do	I
1097-G-R	Clinton Reservoir	do	do	I
1099-R	Michigan City Harbor	Indiana	North Central	I
1110-R	Bayfield Harbor	Wisconsin	do	I
1119	Saxon Harbor	do	do	I
1120	Two Rivers Harbor	do	do	I
1121	Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico, modifications of	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley	I
1124	Port Everglades Harbor	Florida	South Atlantic	I
1125	Yaquina Bay and Harbor	Oregon	North Pacific	I
1129	Shenango River Reservoir	Pennsylvania and Ohio	Ohio River	I
1133	Caesar Creek Reservoir	Ohio	do	I
1135	Santa Cruz Small Craft Harbor	California	South Pacific	I

DIVISION II—MERITORIOUS

[Meritorious. This means that the committee believes that although the project is not sufficiently advanced in status to warrant its present endorsement, it is meritorious and that the committee is willing to consider in due course, its advancement to division I upon presentation by its sponsors of additional evidence justifying such action]

781-R5	Raystown Reservoir	Pennsylvania	North Atlantic	II
793-R6	Cleves flood protection	Ohio	Ohio River	II
1039-R3	New York Harbor; entrance channels and anchorage areas	New York and New Jersey	North Atlantic	II
1100-R	Wilmington Harbor	North Carolina	South Atlantic	II
1114-R	Flint River channelization, flood control, hydroelectric power, water conservation.	Georgia	do	II
1116-R	Apponaug Cove	Rhode Island	Northeastern	II
1123	Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea, anchorages	Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.	North Atlantic	II
1139	Municipal commercial harbor at Dubuque on Upper Mississippi River (dredging).	Iowa	North Central	II
1140	North Branch Park River flood control	Connecticut	Northeast	II

DIVISION III—EXPEDITIOUS REPORT ON AUTHORIZED SURVEY REQUESTED

[Expeditious report on authorized survey requested. This means that the committee believes that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress should request the engineering authority to expedite any report on any authorized investigation or survey of the project to the end that appropriate further action may be had thereon in regard to its classification]

876-R4	Whitewater River, West Fork, at Brookville	Indiana	Ohio River	III
1039A-R3	New York Harbor anchorage area (port of New York entrance channel project)	New York and New Jersey	North Atlantic	III
1062-R	Passaic River Basin flood control	New Jersey	do	III
1086-R	Port of New York to St. Lawrence River Waterway	New York, Vermont, and Quebec, Canada.	do	III
1094-R	Rend Lake	Illinois	Lower Mississippi Valley	III
1096-R	Deep draft and small craft harbor development—Port San Luis	California	South Pacific	III
1101-R	Cold River Dam	New Hampshire	Northeastern	III
1122	Petersburg small-boat harbor (expansion of facility)	Alaska	North Pacific	III
1126	Norfolk Harbor and channel to Newport News	Virginia	North Atlantic	III
1132	Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway (New York State barge canal)	New York	do	III
1134	East Fork Reservoir; East Fork, Little Miami River	Ohio	Ohio River	III
1136	Tidal flood protection for city of New London	Connecticut	Northeastern	III
1138	Mississinewa River channel improvement, Randolph County	Indiana	Ohio River	III

DIVISION IV—PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR SURVEY

[Recommended for survey. This means that the committee believes that sufficient showing on behalf of the project has been made to warrant further examination in the form of an adequate survey by an appropriate agency of the Federal Government]

1127	Southern Branch of Elizabeth River, Norfolk Harbor	Virginia	North Atlantic	IV
1128	Imperial Beach small-craft harbor (Oneonta Lagoon)	California	South Pacific	IV
1130	Searsport	Maine	Northeastern	IV
1131	New Harbor navigation project	do	do	IV
1137	Brazos River and Harbor Survey	Texas	Southwestern	IV

Ways of Improving Relations Among Suppliers, Dealers, and Jobbers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, recently, Mr. John Nerlinger, Jr., executive secretary, National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., addressed the management conference sponsored by the Indiana Independent Petroleum Association, at Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., on April 8, 1959.

My colleagues in Congress who are interested in the problems of the small businessman will find it well worth reading because of its broad and intelligent approach to a serious problem. In addition, I believe that the speech will be of great interest to the many people in the Nation who are concerned with the problems in the petroleum industry:

WAYS OF IMPROVING RELATIONS AMONG SUPPLIERS, DEALERS, AND JOBBERS

There are a number of reasons why I am particularly happy to have the opportunity of being here today. Personal considerations such as the opportunity to see old friends and acquaintances and to make new associations among my fellow oilmen are, of course, important. In addition, and even more important, is the opportunity afforded by the intellectual integrity and breadth of thinking of this group for meaningful and significant discussion in depth of the basic realities involved in improving relations between suppliers, jobbers, and retailers.

There are five steps which I shall follow in an effort to make my contribution to this discussion as meaningful as possible:

First. The definition of terms so as to encompass the basic realities of the relationships between suppliers, jobbers, and retailers.

Second. Analysis of basic industry relationships in which improvement is needed and discussion of the fundamental objectives and direction of such needed improvement in terms of economic principles.

Third. Analysis of industry relationships and the need for improvement in terms of human values and the ideals of our democratic society—wtih discussion of the fundamental objectives of such needed improvement from the standpoint of human values and democratic ideals.

Fourth. Analysis, evaluation, and recommendations as to the means by which the needed improvements in industry relationships may be attained.

Fifth. Discussion of the ultimate questions: Which road? Which destination? Who will make the decisions? How will they be arrived at and carried out?

To recapitulate:

Step 1 is definition.

Step 2 is analysis in terms of economic principles; in other words, diagnosis of the economic sickness.

Step 3 is similar to step 2, but in terms of basic human values and democratic ideals instead of economic principles.

Step 4 is a discussion of remedies—ways of reducing or eliminating the causes of the economic sickness and disruption of human values in our industry's internal relations; and

Step 5 is a prognosis on the ultimate questions of where our industry is going and how we will get there.

The balance of my paper deals with the subject matter of these five steps in numerical order:

I. DEFINITION OF TERMS

One key factor in making this discussion as meaningful as possible is the way in which we define our terms, particularly the term "relations" as used in the subject of our discussion. If we define the term "relations" the way it seems to be understood by some public relations experts—as having to do only with attitudes, or the psychological cover or verbal aspect of underlying realities—we will miss the opportunity afforded by this meeting for discussing ways of improving industry relations at the most meaningful level and in the most significant terms.

The key to reaching the subject in depth is in defining the term "relations" to mean not merely the attitudes which are at the surface, but so as to embrace the underlying economic and social realities which are the actual substance of the relationship between suppliers, dealers, and jobbers.

My contribution to the discussion today, therefore, deals with the fundamental economic and social realities of the relationships under consideration and ways of improving these realities and relationships, and not, except incidentally, with ways of disguising the realities, manipulating opinion, or having friendly attitudes without regard to the realities.

This in no way implies any lack of respect or concern for those friendly feelings which we retailers and jobbers, along with others in this industry, have done our best to engender. Friendly feelings, good attitudes, good feelings between different divisions of the industry, are very worthwhile and very helpful. It is important that we should know and like one another and do the things which will kindle the personal warmth that dissolves many problems. I like the people in this industry and I believe in industry relations meetings, even when there is little attained by them except the glow of personal warmth associated with closer acquaintanceship and personal understanding.

Much as we like the camaraderie of such sessions, however, sometime or other we have to face the problems underlying the relationships with which we are dealing in depth where the problems are. That is the opportunity which this meeting affords us.

Hence, discussing the relations between suppliers, jobbers, and retailers in this talk, I define the term "relations" to mean the totality of factors, arrangements, and practices constituting or affecting the relationships between suppliers, jobbers, and retailers as sellers and buyers for resale in our free enterprise economic system and under our constitutional and democratic system of government.

The words "among suppliers, dealers, and jobbers" following the word "relations", in our subject, may be defined as embracing conjunctively three structurally separate but interacting relationships; namely (a) the relationship between suppliers and jobbers, (b) the relationship between suppliers and retailers, and (c) the relationship between jobbers and retailers.

II. ANALYSIS OF BASIC INDUSTRY RELATIONSHIPS IN WHICH IMPROVEMENT IS NEEDED AND DISCUSSION OF THE FUNDAMENTAL OBJECTIVES OF THE NEEDED IMPROVEMENT IN TERMS OF ECONOMIC PRINCIPLES

The principles of our free-competitive, free-market economic system constitute the most generally recognized and widely accepted yardstick for measuring economic conduct and economic relationships in our society.

The appropriateness of free enterprise principles—as a yardstick for measurement of economic relationships and need for improvement in such relationships in the oil industry—is further acknowledged and demonstrated by the position of industry leaders as articulate spokesmen of the free enterprise system and as formidable opponents of any form of government interference with the free market economy—and, of course, by the fact that the tremendous assets and prosperity of the dominant companies in the oil industry are, in so large a measure, the result of freedom afforded under our free enterprise, free market economic system.

"We are fighting for freedom itself," Mr. Frank Porter, president of the American Petroleum Institute, has said, adding "and either the oil industry stays free or one by one the lights of private enterprise will go out."

Since economic freedom for the largest companies in a particular industry under the principles of our free enterprise system can hardly be defended or long preserved if such economic freedom is denied small business competitors in the same industry—all divisions of the oil industry and all industry members from the giant integrated companies to the smallest retailers have a fundamental mutuality of interest in the analysis and evaluation of industry relationships in terms of economic principles of the free competitive economic system.

Confining our analysis to negations of free market principles which are peculiar to supplier-jobber-dealer relationships in the oil industry (that is, disregarding patterns such as price leadership and administered price techniques which are characteristic of economic concentration generally), we find that there are five basic aspects of supplier-dealer relationships, three of which apply also to supplier-jobber relations, which are basically hostile and adverse to the most fundamental principles of our free-competitive, free-market economy.

First, there is the control over prices and margins resulting from many major integrated suppliers' dual role as competitors of their own jobbers and retailers at succeeding levels of distribution. In gasoline distribution, from the marketplace in which retailers purchase the product from suppliers to the marketplace in which consumers purchase the product from retailers, margins and prices which would otherwise be determined by the competitive conditions of a free economy are fixed in many areas by the fact that at least 11 of 20 major integrated suppliers are competitors of their own retailers through commission and company-operated stations. Prices posted and advertised in these commission and company-operated stations fix the retailers' margins, very often at a level less than would be fixed by freedom of competition. This process thus destroys the basic principle by which prices are determined in a free-market, free-enterprise economy, namely, free and independent competition between many buyers and many sellers acting independently at succeeding levels of distribution.

When the results of athletic contests, horseraces, or buying and selling activities in particular securities are rigged—that is, determined in advance by factors other than honest competition in accordance with the rules of the game, the sport, or the market—the resulting "fixed situations" or predetermination of the results by noncompetitive factors are clearly recognized as being as disastrous to the game or to the trade in the security involved as they are offensive to integrity and our sense of fair play.

"Fixed situations" in gasoline price competition—that is, predetermination of the results of competition through patterns of dual distribution in which price squeezes are applied to retailers and jobbers through suppliers' use of company operated and commission stations—are similarly disastrous to fair competition, destructive of small business' right to compete on the basis of efficiency, offensive to our ideals of fair competition and therefore basically hostile to the

principles of a free market, free enterprise economy.

A second broad negation of free market, free enterprise principles in the relationship between suppliers and both jobbers and retailers occurs in the widespread practice of price discrimination by suppliers between customers for resale who are in competition with each other or with the supplier. Jobbers are as vulnerable to this anticompetitive practice as retailers, though they may not have been subjected to it on so wide a scale except as regards price discrimination in supplier sales to commercial accounts.

Overwhelming evidence from the oil industry has been accumulating for nearly 100 years to show the appalling effects of price discrimination in destroying free competition and leading to monopoly.

As shown in the record of the Government's case against the Standard Oil trust (*U.S. v. Standard Oil Company*, 173 Fed. 177, modified and affirmed, *Standard Oil Company v. U.S.*, 221 U.S. 1), during the years 1870 to 1882 the Standard Oil trust used rebates, preferences, and other price discrimination practices as primary instruments of acquiring approximately 90 percent control of the entire industry.

Though reduced somewhat by congressional enactments to deal with the problem and particularly by the Robinson-Patman Act, price discrimination practices have continued to inflict appalling injuries in our industry—as shown in the records of congressional investigations, antitrust cases, and Federal Trade Commission proceedings.

Retailers and jobbers in many areas know of these destructive injuries to competition by price discrimination practices from their own harsh practical experience—especially since weakening of the Robinson-Patman Act by the Supreme Court decision in the Standard-Detroit case in 1951.

Economists (Prof. Vernon E. Mund, University of Washington; Prof. Horace Gray, University of Illinois, and others) show the conflict between price discrimination and price competition under free competitive conditions analytically through definition of the free market economy as characterized by transactions openly and publicly arrived at in a free market with all competitors having an equal right to buy or sell at the same current competitive price.

The third element in the relationship between suppliers and retailers which militates against the principles of free competition is the captive status of the overwhelming majority of branded retailers under leases and dealer agreements.

By the terms and effect of their leases and dealer agreements, these captive lessee dealers are required to purchase their requirements of gasoline from the particular supplier who owns or controls the station at the prices which the supplier posts. This is a double negation of basic conditions of a free market economy: First, because it isolates the retailer as a purchaser from the normal competitive opportunity of purchasing gasoline from his supplier at competitive as opposed to supplier-determined prices, and second, because the retailer who is bound to the particular supplier by lease and dealer agreement is foreclosed from even the nominal competitive alternatives of going elsewhere when charged an exorbitant price.

The fourth factor affecting the relationship between suppliers and both jobbers and retailers which is adverse to principles of our free competitive system is the extent to which the supply-demand equation in establishment of retail facilities is thrown off balance by uneconomic over-investment by suppliers in such retailing facilities. Economically speaking, the exact measure of such overinvestment is statistically difficult to determine since no major integrated supplying company has ever published a departmentalized profit and loss statement showing to what extent its investment in retail facilities is or is not self-liquidating or justified by the rental return on such facilities. Opinions differ and the extent of such uneconomic over-investment will certainly be different with different companies. But as we look around us and figure the tremendous costs of the modern stations being built in profusion by so many major suppliers, we are able as experienced oil men to calculate that a cent to a cent and a half a gallon rent does not defray the costs of these inflated station building programs. And to the extent that this investment in retailing facilities is not justified by the rental return, it constitutes a basic interference with supply-demand relationships and is an uneconomic disturbance of free market conditions.

The fifth group of practices in supplier-retailer relations which are adverse to principles of our free competitive economy are those practices coming under the general heading of lease domination and T.B.A. pressure. Compulsion as opposed to free choice in buying and selling is abhorrent to the spirit of a free economy, and such practices on even a limited or receding scale are inherently destructive of retailers' economic rights and profit opportunities in a free competitive society.

As practical men in the retail division of the petroleum industry have felt the impact of these five types of destructive and anticompetitive practices on themselves and their fellow dealers, and have observed the adverse effect of these practices on internal industry relationships between suppliers and retailers, they have shown an increasing concern for finding means to eliminate these abuses.

It is deeply significant, I believe, that the great majority of the recommendations and proposals for improvement in relationship between suppliers and retailers adopted by the duly accredited delegates representing the Nation's organized retailers at annual sessions of the retailers' national trade association, the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, during the last 12 years since NCPR was established, deal with and seek the solution for problems arising in connection with the five types of anticompetitive practices described above. These are the areas of injury not only to retailers but to the relationship between retailers and suppliers—and in applicable categories, to the relationship between suppliers and jobbers as well.

In the fourth part of this paper, dealing with specific means for attaining the needed improvements, I will present the proposals and recommendations from the Nation's organized retailers dealing with improvement in industry relationships through elimination of abuses in the five categories described above.

But before leaving this analysis of problems in industry relationships from the standpoint of economic principles—it will be helpful to state clearly the objectives to which proposals should be directed for dealing with these problems in the light of economic principles—and here, with as much emphasis and earnestness as I am capable of, is my statement of those basic objectives:

Effective proposals must be directed (a) to the objective of applying, extending and protecting principles of the free competitive-free market system in the oil industry and to economic relationships among suppliers, jobbers and retailers—and (b) to the parallel objective of eliminating destructive practices which are adverse to the basic economic rights of oil's small businessmen, particularly jobbers and retailers, to compete on a basic of efficiency under the fair competitive principles of our free enterprise-free market economic system.

III. ANALYSIS OF INDUSTRY RELATIONSHIPS AND THE NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT IN TERMS OF HUMAN VALUES AND THE IDEALS OF OUR DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY—WITH DISCUSSION OF THE FUNDAMENTAL OBJECTIVES OF SUCH NEEDED IMPROVEMENT FROM THE STANDPOINT OF HUMAN VALUES AND DEMOCRATIC IDEALS

This step in our analysis is similar to step 2—but in terms of basic human values and democratic ideals instead of economic principles.

The underlying principle of democracy is stated by political scientists to be the principle of Government by consent as opposed to Government by force or arbitrary authority. And in the light of the political philosophy under which our constitutional system was developed, there has been an extension of the democratic concept of consent in the political sphere—to protection for individual freedom of choice against tyranny and unwarranted compulsion in other basic social and economic relationships. More succinctly stated, this concept means that America stands for democracy versus dictatorship in business and economic relationships as well as in Government—that business relationships based on consent and the mutual advantage of all parties thereto, rather than on economic coercion, are a basic ideal of our democratic society.

Analysis shows that of the five types of economic practices affecting relations between suppliers, jobbers, and dealers in the oil industry which violate principles of the free competitive system, at least four of these principal types of practices are also offensive to the democratic ideals which affirm individual human values and the principle that business relationships should be based on consent and mutual advantage, not economic tyranny or coercion.

The "fixed situation" predetermined competitive result of price squeezes applied through commission and company-operated station competition—the unconscionable injustice of price discrimination in which some purchasers for resale are required to pay a higher price for the principal product they sell than is charged other purchasers for resale with whom they must compete—the aggravation of both the commission station price squeeze and price discrimination types of injury through retailers' captive status—and the direct pressure and control tactics which are sometimes found to exist in the form of lease domination as to business methods and T.B.A. purchases—all do violence not only to the economic principles of our free competitive system but also to basic human values and the ideals of our democratic society.

Therefore, further basic objectives for improving the relationships between suppliers, jobbers, and retailers must be (a) the realization of conditions in industry relationships under which the democratic ideals of dignity, freedom of choice and consent in commercial relationships (as opposed to economic tyranny or coercion) are fulfilled, and (b) the elimination of any practices in industry relations which do serious violence to the individual human values and democratic ideals of individual dignity, freedom of choice and democratic consent as opposed to dictatorship and arbitrary authority in business as well as in government.

In the broadest and deepest sense, these objectives for protection and realization of human values and democratic ideals, as well as our economic objectives for extending and protecting principles of the free enterprise system involve an allegiance to morally sound principles, the principles which give substance to opportunity and the American way of life—principles upon which I hope all in the oil industry can agree.

Surely, I am convinced, many of the repressive practices which are rife in our in-

dustry today doing serious injury to the relationships between suppliers, jobbers, and retailers would be brought to an end—if only those responsible would have the courage to say to themselves, is this practice morally right?—and to be governed by the answer.

How much good could be accomplished for our industry and in our industry if each of us, every company executive, every individual businessman, every person whose decisions affect the conditions in our industry, could act in accordance with the morally sound business principle that true prosperity, whether in a community, a nation or an industry, is founded on consideration for one's fellow man and his right to the just fruits of his endeavor, free from unwarranted pressures or interference—and that neither true prosperity nor worthwhile business success can be secured through practices which impoverish others or degrade their opportunities.

IV. ANALYSIS, EVALUATION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO THE MEANS BY WHICH THE NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS IN INDUSTRY RELATIONSHIPS MAY BE ATTAINED

What are the specific means and methods by which the objectives for improvements in our industry relationships, outlined in the second and third steps in this paper, may be advanced and attained?

The ideal means for advancing these objectives, surely, would be the development within our industry of broadly observed enlightened concepts of business ethics which would totally reject industry practices which are competitively unfair under our free competitive system, hostile to democratic ideals, or morally wrong.

If that sounds like a dream, it is still worth remembering that dreams, though not fully realized in reality, may still point the way and change reality for the better. I know, and so do you, some men in all divisions of our industry who have worked conscientiously and devotedly notwithstanding discouragements and disheartening obstacles, toward this objective. Their efforts will continue. Their influence will increase. Their dream lays the foundation and gives encouragement for the success of the practical means and methods by which the great objectives envisioned can be fully carried out.

As to practical actions and specific means for attaining these objectives, I will now present some of the significant recommendations of the last two annual sessions of the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers. All of these recommendations were unanimously adopted by our delegates.

Here are the N.C.P.R. proposals, with a few sentences of comment, these proposals being grouped in this presentation according to the forum in which they are to be presented or means adopted for carrying them into effect, that is, (a) proposals for matters to be presented in industry relations discussions and (b) proposals dealing with problems in industry relationships where some form of legal or governmental action or legislation is proposed as a solution.

(a) Proposals for matters to be presented in industry relations discussions:

The following recommendations by action of our last annual session, were directed to be presented in meetings of the service station advisory committee of the American Petroleum Institute by a five-man committee to be appointed by President Cash B. Hawley of the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, and also, where appropriate, to be taken up and negotiated with executives of any supplying company involved:

"(1) It is recommended that, in industry discussions of equitable lease provisions, favorable consideration be given, among other matters, to provisions embodying the principle that, when certain levels of gross sales volume are reached, certain percentage rental reductions be applied to afford dealers an incentive toward greater business opportunity without the penalty of inequitable rent increases.

"(2) In the light of the undisputed public record that most major oil companies recognize the independent small businessman's status as an independent service station operator, it is recommended that any service station operator or his rightful legal heirs seeking to dispose of his business be permitted to negotiate the sale of that business, including accrued going concern value, without undue interference by the supplying companies.

"(3) It is recommended that any charges made by a supplying oil company against a service station operator for a mechanical credit card recording device or other similar mechanical operating devices be held to an absolute minimum charge which can be substantiated by cost to the supplier when and where the charge is questioned or challenged; and that N.C.R.P. oppose any discriminatory charges for such devices.

"(4) It is recommended that the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers adopt a policy whereby it is unalterably opposed to any marketing practices which include the consignment of gasolines or other petroleum products to any reseller without making the usual tank wagon charges or normal invoice charges or normal invoice charges at the time of delivery.

"(5) It is recommended that the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers condemn the policy of any major oil company's charges for installation and use of any and all forms of company brand signs where such charges are imposed by pressure or dictation in violation of the dealer's rights as an independent businessman, and urges all independent service station operators to resist any attempt by any company to levy any such charges and to discontinue the payment of any such charges where such charges are illegally imposed by pressure or dictation in violation of service station opertaors' rights as independent businessmen under the antitrust laws."

The foregoing recommendations originated with the committee on retailer-supplier relations at our last annual session. Following are additional recommendations for matters to be presented in industry relations discussions or in meetings with particular supplying companies where appropriate, originating with other committees and adopted by our last annual session:

"(1) We recommend continuing effort on the part of N.C.P.R. to sponsor and promote the adoption of an industrywide code of ethics and standards.

"(2) Re overbuilding of service stations: It is recommended that there be a declaration of N.C.P.R. policy that the oil industry should be a good neighbor and avoid service station building in neighborhoods where it would be inappropriate or harmful to adjacent properties.

"(3) That we approve and commend joint action by the N.C.P.R.-N.O.J.C. liaison committee in recommending exchange of economic information and compilation of economic research data—as adopted at the liaison committee meeting in New Orleans, La., in May 1958.

"(4) Approval for N.C.P.R. proposal (on which no action has so far been taken) that N.O.J.C. and N.C.P.R. cooperate in planning a jointly sponsored conference of all industry groups interested in raising the standard of ethics and services of the retail petroleum and automotive service industries and for the solution of basic problems which adversely affect the service station operator.

"(5) In regard to the effect on branded service station operators of supplier sales of branded motor oils and T.B.A. to discount houses—recommended that we vigorously condemn such practices involving price discrimination against branded dealers and that immediate protest be made to suppliers whose products (branded) appear for sale at cutrate prices in chain stores, bargain centers, etc., where prices at which such branded products are offered for sale are below branded service station operators' cost or so low as to strongly indicate price discrimination against the branded service station operators."

The following resolution originated on the floor and after extended discussion was adopted by the delegates at our last annual session as a policy statement:

"Be it resolved that N.C.P.R. go on record as supporting the principle of complete separation of retailing from other divisions of the industry."

In addition, here are important recommendations for matters to be presented in industry relations meetings and in discussions with company executives from our preceding annual session, these matters being still on our current and active list for action through industry relations channels:

(1) That we recommend inclusion of a most favored dealer clause in standard forms of service station leases and accompanying dealer agreements. Under the provisions of such a most favored dealer clause, the dealer who is obligated under the lease and dealer agreement to purchase gasoline from the lessor-supplier would be granted the following protection:

The supplier shall agree with the dealer to supply the dealer gasoline at the lowest price at which such supplier supplies the same product to other retailers with whom the lessee dealer is in competition.

(2) Discussion of problems and injuries in connection with continuance in operation of uneconomic marginal stations.

(3) Continue to present in industry meetings and meetings with company executives evidence and information supporting the advantages to retailers and suppliers alike of longer term and more equitable leases—such longer term and more equitable leases being essential to raise standards and attract better men to the service station business, as well as by reasonable standards of fairness and equity between suppliers and their retailers.

(4) That misrepresentation of service station profit opportunities in dealer recruitment be taken up with suppliers and that prospective dealer counseling services by affiliated associations be conducted to protect prospective dealers against such misrepresentation and give needed help.

(b) Proposals dealing with problems in industry relationships where some form of legal or governmental action or legislation is proposed as a solution:

Here are basic recommendations of our last two annual sessions in the field of national legislation defining legislative objectives to which our efforts are currently directed for improvement in the relationships between retailers and suppliers, and for antitrust law enforcement.

(1) The establishment of a National Oil Industry Supplier-Retailer Relations Board is proposed by the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers for the purpose of providing a forum in which complaints of antimonopoly injury in the field of oil industry supplier-retailer relations may be expeditiously heard and adjudicated with prompt granting of remedial relief and in which such complaints may be presented either by the complaining parties themselves or under legal procedures of such clarity and simplicity as to keep the complainant's legal costs and expenses at a minimum and within the means of the average small retailer; appeals from determinations by such board should, we believe, be defended by attorneys for the board without legal cost to the parties.

In the case of a claim involving two or more retailers of a single supplier, all of the retailers of such supplier having an interest in the matter, according to rules to be determined by the board, should have the

right to be collectively represented in a hearing upon the matter. Remedial relief to be granted by the board could be in the form of cease-and-desist orders or mandatory orders directing an affirmative course of conduct within established limitations.

(2) In regard to the problem of unfair competition by company-operated and commission stations with their own retailers—support for national functional divorcement legislation prohibiting suppliers from competing with their own retailers.

(3) In regard to the problem of price discrimination—vigorous support for adoption of the equality-of-opportunity bill.

(4) Cooperation with Federal agencies and support for vigorous enforcement of existing antitrust laws where relief against anticompetitive practices in gasoline distribution can be obtained thereby.

Comment

As seen from the preponderance of NCPR proposals for discussion and negotiation of industry problems in industry meetings and with companies involved, we believe that intraindustry councils are needed to study and seek solutions to intraindustry problems.

We have, moreover, three very important suggestions for making such intraindustry councils and industry discussion sessions truly effective instruments to accomplish the results which are so necessary.

First is the need that industry relations councils established to seek such solutions be constituted in accordance with basic democratic principles. Recognition must be given to the right of retailers to be represented in such councils by the national trade association of their own choosing, the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, with which the overwhelming majority of the Nation's organized gasoline retailers are affiliated, and the same right for jobbers.

Democratically constituted voluntary jobber-retailer relations councils (recognizing the same right for suppliers as for retailers and jobbers) will take nothing away from suppliers which is rightfully theirs, and its establishment will give suppliers the cooperation of retailers and jobbers in studying and seeking solutions to intraindustry problems which cannot be solved by suppliers alone.

Our second cardinal suggestion for making industry discussions and industry council meetings more meaningful and successful is that such meetings must actually come to grips with the real problems as they exist—even if this means a reversal of some of the ground rules now observed under which realistic discussion of basic problems has been unbelievably difficult.

Further, integrated company representatives must be willing to accept changes in the interests of the whole industry. If a few giant suppliers who have used their tremendous economic power in a way to cause the basic economic problems with which we are dealing, enter such negotiations determined to discuss nothing and yield nothing which does not leave them free to continue the same abuses, the meetings can be no more than a calculated farce.

Our third suggestion is a reminder in all due respect to industry leaders who use industry conferences to call for confidence in themselves that the call for confidence will be more convincing if it is acompanied by a demonstrated awareness through words and actions that confidence must be deserved, and can be deserved if industry leaders will apply their very considerable abilities to working out feasible solutions to the industry relations problems that really matter.

V. DISCUSSION OF THE ULTIMATE QUESTIONS: WHICH ROAD? WHICH DESTINATION? WHO WILL MAKE THE DECISIONS? HOW WILL THEY BE ARRIVED AT AND CARRIED OUT?

In simple truth, it is not unlikely that the last call is now being sounded for a rational solution to our industry problems.

With all respect, I earnestly suggest that what has been lacking in creative leadership by major company policymakers—leadership capable of envisioning the needs of the supplier-jobber-retailer relationships in breadth and depth. There is a desperate need for such creative leadership now, provided also that it must be forceful leadership—leadership forceful enough to override the empire building rivalries of individual company policymakers and to make this a united industry by improving the quality of the relationships which it encompasses.

I believe it is not yet too late for our industry, by democratic cooperation, to pick up the pieces into which our interests and relationships have been fractured by mistaken policies or practices. But time is of the essence.

In conclusion, I wish to quote a few words from N.C.P.R. President Cash B. Hawley's message to the entire oil industry at the beginning of this year:

"There are periods in history where complacent attitudes which tolerate old uses because things have always been that way can no longer suffice—when the alternative to curtailing old abuses is to lose the opportunity for leadership and cause new forces to rise and undertake the task.

"If this great industry is run like a closed corporation and those who come to the door seeking justice and fair opportunity are kept waiting at the door or put off indefinitely rather than having the opportunity to take their place and perform the part which their interests justify—the closed corporation will be signing its own death warrant. Other forces less moderate than those asking recognition at the door will find a way in—a way to batter down the closed door or to demolish the whole edifice if need be.

"We know what those forces will be if oil industry leaders do not now avail themselves of the opportunity still afforded them to broaden the base of industry leadership and prosperity and to include retailers in the interests served by industry decisions—in short, to abolish abuses which make a mockery of the free enterprise system.

"What will it avail industry leaders to keep the door of real progress closed to organized retailers—only to have the edifice of their own prosperity demolished by nationalization or an allout union assault on the retail division of the industry?

"The most vital question for the future of the oil industry is whether or not the top policymakers in 1959 take the actions which are so desperately needed to solve problems that will not wait very much longer for solution."

Boston: Hub of Space Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the leadership of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and of the city of Boston, in the governmental and business life of our country, is well known. While the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the city of Boston are ancient in the terms of the Western Hemisphere, the people of Boston and Massachusetts have always maintained their forward-looking views in relation to government and business. No matter what economic changes have taken place, Massachusetts and Boston have been the leader in progress. In the world of today and tomorrow, forward-looking minds in Massachusetts and Boston are looking ahead, again evidencing leadership in the economic revolution in the field of atomic and nuclear energy, as well as electronics, and in the far-reaching field of astronautics—outer space—that has taken place.

As evidence of this I include in my extension of remarks a very fine and informative article written by William E. Howard, entitled "Boston: Hub of Space Research," and appearing in the issue of July 13, 1959, of Missiles and Rockets, magazine of world astronautics:

BOSTON: HUB OF SPACE RESEARCH

(By William E. Howard)

BOSTON.—Few cities physically show the Nation's explosive growth in missile space manufacturing and research more than Boston—a culturally endowed community which long ago laid claim to being the "Hub of the Universe," and where industry today is in the process of making this extravagant boast come true.

The entire metropolitan area is rapidly emerging as the country's leading research center. Scientists in hundreds of laboratories are conceiving and putting together the sophisticated offensive and defensive weapons of tomorrow. And they are responsible for much of the brainwork going into astronautic systems which one day will enable man to explore space.

Nowhere is the magnitude of this fast-expanding activity more eye-arrestingly apparent than along a 65-mile stretch of superhighway skirting the city from north to south in a great arc. Down the length of this busy artery there already are more than 200 modern plants employing more than 30,000 persons.

This is route 128—Boston's "golden industrial semicircle." Less than 10 years ago, it did not exist. Route 128 was only a country road meandering through meadows and woods, and connecting suburbs.

Where there were pig farms only a few years ago, today industrial parks are springing up. Once-quiet towns are the scene of more development. Industrial brick and mortar investment alone is estimated at $140 million. The entire complex—including business and home development—is valued at more than $500 million, and the figure is increasing.

Land values have shot up from $1,000 an acre to as much as $26,000—with plenty of takers. All segments of industry are represented in this booming new area. But electronics is far and away the most predominant.

Key to growth: Originally, conversion of Route 128 into an expressway was conceived primarily as a way to divert traffic around Boston's congested streets. But by the time it was opened in 1951, developers were already making plans to attract new industry. Electronics manufacturers just beginning to open a vast new market were the first to see its advantages for locating efficient one-story plants—with the highway affording quick transportation and the historic old towns offering pleasant living.

Gravitation to Route 128 was slow at first. Then research took over, mushrooming the growth of the electronics industry and forcing the construction of new plant facilities. Concurrently, in the early fifties, came the development of missiles with their heavy electronic requirements.

One after the other, Raytheon Manufacturing Co., CBS Electronics, Sylvania Electric, Avco and other well-known companies moved out to the new highway.

Paving the way for the migration were such real estate developers as the Boston firms of Cabot, Cabot & Forbes and R. M. Bradley & Co. They were the ones that launched the industrial park plan, offering in one package a ready-prepared site, well-located, and engineering facilities to design any type of plant for purchase or lease. Both firms are credited with contributing greatly to the orderly development of Route 128.

Thirteen industrial parks are either completed or in final construction stages and three more are being started. These parks are absorbing, too, an ever-mounting number of new firms spawned in the dawning of the space age.

Illustrative of what is happening is the case of Itek Corp. Founded about 2 years ago by four Boston University engineers, Itek now has more than 700 employees engaged in classified reconnaissance satellite and other space work. In quick order it bought one plant on 128, leased 65,000 square feet of the Waltham Watch Co. works, and is planning to build a laboratory on a 43-acre site in Lexington near the Golden Semicircle. Incidentally, Itek also has a new west coast installation.

Another spectacular example is Transitron. Founded 6 years ago with 8 employees, it now has 3,000—and is the second-largest semiconductor producer in the Nation.

In the past 2 years more than $52 million has been poured into new plants along Route 128—and developers feel there is room to double the present total. Visibly supporting their optimism, the fabulous expansion pace keeps on accelerating.

Air Force millions: Perhaps the biggest single contributor to the amazing boom—not only along 128—but elsewhere in the metropolitan area, is the Cambridge Research Center of the Air Force's Air Research and Development Command. CRC has been and still is funneling millions of dollars into research.

As of May 31, CRC had outstanding 1,199 contracts totaling $320 million. Millions more in contracts, production and research, are being poured into the area by the AMC, NASA, ARPA, the Army and Navy, and private industry as well.

The MIT influence: Hand in hand with CRC as a font of new ideas, knowledge—and industrial talent—is the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Scores of firms owe their existence to MIT, through its creation of new productive fields of research and provision of brains to work them.

Harvard and other Greater Boston institutions also are producing a continuous stream of technical talent.

In September, the Mitre Corp., a nonprofit organization which takes its name from MIT, will move into a $2 million plant at Bedford along Route 128. Mitre, under a contract with MIT, serves as the technical staff for the Air Defense System Integration Division working on correlating activities of human operators with the complex electronic gear of SAGE.

Mitre, which has H. Rowan Gaither as chairman of its board, expects to expand to a $5 million facility and eventually employ 1,500 to 2,000. The firm presently is located in Lexington, where ironically, the liberty of the Nation was once entirely in the hands of human operators. On the village green 77 minutemen armed with muskets fired on the British in 1775 in the first conflict of the Revolutionary War.

MIT made history at its Lincoln Laboratory along Route 128 by bouncing a signal off of Venus in February 1958, when it was 28 million miles from earth, with a 90-ton radar telescope. It took a year to decipher the data, and the feat was disclosed only a few months ago.

From MIT's instrumentation laboratory, headed by Dr. Charles S. Draper, has come the all-inertial guidance system for Titan, which is being manufactured by A. C. Spark Plug division of General Motors, and many more important contributions to the defense effort.

Within a decade: Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce officials estimate there are more than 430 missile, electronics and nucleonics-connected industries—almost all founded within the past decade. These are scattered throughout the area. At last count, however, 63 were situated along Route 128.

One of the oldest research firms is the Arthur D. Little Co. of Cambridge, which among other items is deep in cryogenics and is preparing the design and specifications of MSE for fueling Atlas and Titan. National Research Corp., also of Cambridge, has just come up with a new cryogenic storage vessel which has insulation improved by a factor of 15 over conventional devices.

At Waltham, Infrared Industries is producing missile guidance devices; at Lawrence, missile-carrying cases are being made by Craig Systems; and at Burlington, Dynametrics, Inc., is hard at work on an Avco subcontract making measuring devices for Titan nose cones.

The activities of Greater Boston firms go into virtually every missile/space system, either as components or—as in the case of Raytheon, which has the prime contract for Sparrow and Hawk—the entire system.

The business scene shifts continually. Bomac, producer of Klystron tubes at Beverly, Mass., at the northern end of Route 128, recently merged with Varian of Palto Alto, Calif. Texas Instruments of Dallas has acquired Metals & Controls Corp. of Attleboro—the Nation's first privately owned nuclear fuel manufacturer.

Bostonians are looking to at least three firms to put them in the forefront of the space race. Avco at its new $23 million laboratory in Wilmington is working on interplanetary shockwave research and developing space systems. At the new Goodrich-High Voltage Astronautics, Inc., in Burlington, work is being launched in development of ion propulsion engines. And at Raytheon engineers are working on a sky station which would hover miles above the earth in a fixed position—powered by microwaves beamed from the ground.

The Challenge in Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial of the WDSU Broadcasting Corp., which was broadcast over WDSU–TV and WDSU radio on July 14, 1959:

THE CHALLENGE IN TRADE

The importance of Russia's announced aim to overtake this country in world trade cannot be overemphasized.

But, at the same time, we believe the United States cannot afford to overlook another challenge in trade. This is the challenge from friendly nations, not only in the world market but also in the domestic market.

We already have seen an example of this other challenge in the automobile industry. The imports of foreign small cars have risen so steadily that now the Big Three of the auto industry are planning on bringing out small cars in the fall. Two other companies already are producing a made-in-America version of the European small car.

There are other facets, however, which are not so obvious as the emergence of the foreign car.

Take, for example, Japanese radios. In the first 3 months of this year, nearly half of all the radios sold in this country—excluding car radios—were imported from Japan.

American radio manufacturers are not blind to this competition. Most of them, however, say they have no plans to import for the domestic market either Japanese radios or radio parts.

One industry spokesman put the issue on the line this way:

"The only way," the spokesman said, "for American manufacturers to cope with the Japanese import situation is to show more ingenuity and to design and produce better equipment."

This, we think, is the way it should be. The way to beat foreign competition in the domestic market is not by erecting high tariff walls. Nor is it to simply utter the phrase "buy American" and hope that everybody will.

The way for America to meet the challenge in both the domestic and world market is for this country to keep producing superior goods and at a price that will attract the consumer. Despite our thriving economy, we cannot afford to feel secure in our position. For trade affects all of us and a failure to respond to this challenge means a downturn in the American economy.

In other words, if somebody is going to build a better mousetrap, it had better be us.

Representative Earl A. Bollinger Addresses Madison County Citizens During Ground-Breaking Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address given by Representative Earl A. Bollinger, of Madison County, at the historic ground-breaking ceremony on July 12, 1959, for the new Madison Memorial Hospital to be constructed in Fredericktown, Mo.:

REPRESENTATIVE EARL A. BOLLINGER ADDRESSES MADISON COUNTY CITIZENS DURING GROUND-BREAKING CEREMONY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is the text of the address given by Representative Earl A. Bollinger, of Madison County, at the ground-breaking ceremony last Sunday afternoon for the new Madison Memorial Hospital to be constructed in Fredericktown. Bollinger was the main speaker and chosen to give the address because he is the one who best represents the people of the county.)

Standing here I am truly cognizant of the honor that you bestow on me in allowing me to contribute my small bit to this momentous occasion. It is with pleasure that I address my friends and neighbors and join with them in this ceremony which marks another milestone in the ability of the people of Madison County to work together toward a cause that is beneficial to all.

I am happy to have been a witness to such an assemblage which may well be regarded as proof of the interest felt in this benevolent undertaking and a will that the good work will not be in vain. True enthusiasm means daring and uncompromising devotion. It is not sentiment or intoxicant, but an ardent and quenchless hope that what should be, shall be. This is dedication of your hopes to a common cause. Hope is creative, doubt is abortive, so let us hope, then act. The men who the not willing to deny themselves any possible gain, who forget that a vote is a vow, who forget the patriotism of paying taxes, who forget that law is like a bicycle and the way to keep it standing is to keep it going. That one whose very bones are flabby with civil neglect, such a man is not a man but a manikin. Upon the souls who are full of the enthusiasm of duty rests the unconquerable. To him who truly lives and does, the veil of the visible becomes more and more transparent.

We do not always listen to hear the deep breathing of the people ready to respond to the prophet of progress, we bite into one bad ear, and forget the green stalks of corn that array a thousand prairies. We find one brackish or dirty pool and forget the trickling of thousands of beautiful clear springs, we see one whirling copper cloud and doubt the sun. I am happy this is not the application used by our people in Madison County, we have been united and success has been ours. I could not impress upon you too much that in this project every citizen of Madison County has had a part in the initial pull, and with everyone pulling together on the final pull it will be a grand success.

The job is not finished, we must keep our enthusiasm high and our will bent to success. We have one more big pull and that is to see our purpose through to the ultimate end. That is the step you embark upon today. With your permission I shall digress for a few moments and touch only lightly upon the physical structure of this project. In the first place I understand we are the first to incorporate a nursing home and hospital as one, in a new building. Our good and gracious Government has contributed 50 percent of the cost, by the bare essentials of arithmetic this is a bargain for the people of Madison County. It will contain 25 beds in the nursing home portion and 42 beds in the hospital proper. In this manner more of our people will be served because we are giving a service to those in need of nursing care as a result of infirmities, as well as those needing direct hospital care.

It may be added that the building, from the elegance of its architecture and its conspicuous situation will prove a striking ornament to the area in which it will stand. It will bring more doctors to our area which will supplement the ones we now have. In times of emergency you will be able to get to a hospital quicker because of shorter distance. Another great attribute is the fact that you will have your loved ones close by and will not need to drive great distances to visit. It will bring wealth to our community in jobs and by many other means. It will enhance the position of our country as an enticement to industry and people of other places. These are a few among many of the attributes this structure will give you. Perhaps greatest of all it will give you that feeling of achievement that you have made your county a better place to live, for you and yours.

No doubt we are launching an example, that will be followed by many other groups. Building this hospital is a challenge but one we accept gladly because challenge has become traditional with us. We are ambitious and our neighbors around us know it. We are now building another monument to that ambition and our neighbors will be watching, and we will as in the past give them a good show. The masonry and steel they will see readily, but the concerted effort we will show them by our united front, will be the revelation they are seeking. May I say to you in summary, that the occasion today is a ground-breaking ceremony which means starting the foundation, these physical foundations are only masonry and steel, but the truly great foundation, the only one that can stand under the strain is the one we mould from the ambitions of our people.

We are united now as in the past. This will be a crowning triumph. Look around you and take inventory of the many fine things we have in our county that others do not have. You have an abundance of schools and may I add good schools, good roads, industrial expansion, utility expansion and most of all, the kind of people who know the importance of all these fine things and their contribution to the betterment of the area in which they live. I submit to you that it will be necessary for us to apologize to the coming generation for lack of progressive attitude and ability. These expansions stand as monuments to your foresight and ingenuity. And may I add that we owe these the responsibility of passing on something better, as they will their successors. It takes time infinite to build a perfect community, and with everyone striving together through generation after generation, we arrive a little closer to that sought after perfection.

Over a century and a half ago Washington broke ground for the United States Capitol, in what was little more than a wilderness, but it has stood. Through the united efforts of our people, it has not been in vain, great additional buildings have been added since, which is proof and example of the way in which we have grown as a Nation and the sphere of progress that is possible through efforts that are united. The material problems that face us today are not such as in Washington's time, but the need for expansion and united effort is even greater.

Success is mandatory, failure we cannot afford. Our great country was founded on this basis and we have inherited through united efforts the will for success. What better pattern and what greater project could be followed as an example for our own many causes. As I bring my remarks to a close I wish to thank you again for the honor of speaking to you. I hope I leave you preparing a mental toast "prosperity to Madison Memorial Hospital," and thoroughly resolved that it shall flourish.

Facts Are on Chicago's Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the continuing legislative interest in Lake Michigan water diversion, I am including in the RECORD two articles from prominent Chicago newspapers which are clear, concise explanations of the House version of the bill which we recently passed and which the Senate is now considering:

[From the Chicago American, July 14, 1959]

FACTS ARE ON CHICAGO'S SIDE

The lake diversion dispute with Canada seems to be repeating a familiar pattern. Spokesmen for Chicago and the Illinois waterway produce proof after proof that Canada's opposition to a temporary increase in diversion is selfish and irrational; then the Federal Government makes another concession to Canada.

The Canadians, evidently, feel no need to defend their extraordinary stand that Chicago has no right to the extra water it urgently needs, and that Canada can decide how the United States may use water which is entirely within its own boundaries.

A delegation from the Chicago sanitary district, testifying before a Senate public works subcommittee yesterday, emphasized that the water is actually Chicago's by right.

It pointed out that the boundary waters treaty of 1909 allowed Canada to divert up to 36,000 cubic feet a second from the Great Lakes, while the United States was allowed only 20,000 cubic feet. The reason for this disparity is that the treaty did not include Lake Michigan. An unwritten reservation allowed extra diversion for Chicago.

Lake Michigan is not a boundary water, and Elihu Root, then Secretary of State, would not allow it to be included in an international agreement.

Unfortunately, the unwritten reservation is now also unheeded. Canada has gained by default the right to interfere with Lake Michigan diversion.

The delegation also showed that for 40 years Canada has grabbed every advantage it could to increase its share of Great Lakes water. In terms of electric power, it has gained a margin of nearly $330 million over the United States. Yet it is now bitterly fighting a proposed increase that would amount to about $18,000.

In 1950 the Niagara treaty was signed, providing for an equal diversion of outflow from Lake Erie for Canada and the United States. The treaty also provided, however, that any share of the water allowance not used by one nation could be used by the other. Since Canada had cannily started building powerplants years before the United States, the equal diversion turned out to be 104,000 cubic feet a second for Canada and 16,400 for us.

The Canadians got another $30 million worth of power from a 1940 agreement permitting them to divert 5,000 cubic feet per second into the Great Lakes from its Long Lac-Ogoki system. In the high-water period of 1952–1953, that extra diversion increased the millions of dollars' worth of damage to American lakefront property. That didn't bother Canada.

In contrast, the sanitary district delegation said that Chicago was willing to pay for any proved damage that might result from the extra diversion that Illinois needs.

It is inconceivable in the face of evidence like this that an impartial judgment could go against Chicago. So far, however, Canada has had the winning argument: Canada is a foreign government, so it must be right.

An excellent example of the airy disregard for facts that prevails among opponents of the Chicago diversion was provided yesterday by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York. Rockefeller sent a statement to the Senate committee declaring that "any reduction" in the amount of water available for electric power production at Niagara Falls would make it necessary to raise the rates for users of current.

Obviously Rockefeller was sounding off without knowing what he was talking about. At the same hearing Representative THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Democrat of Illinois, testified that the increase Chicago is asking Congress to authorize "will not be injurious in any respect" to any community on the Great Lakes. And that opinion is shared by the U.S. Army Engineers. They have said repeatedly that the increase would make no perceptible difference to lake navigation or to power production.

[From the Chicago Daily News, July 15, 1959]

CHARGES ON LAKE DIVERSION DISPUTED—FAIR TEST IS THE ANSWER

A no-holds-barred attack by Michigan on the efficiency of the sanitary district's sewage treatment methods makes it clear that opponents of greater lake water diversion for Chicago will stop at nothing to thwart the city's fight for justice in this matter.

There is no justification in fact for charges before the Senate Public Works Subcommittee that the district is engaged in unorthodox sanitary treatment or that "a large volume of sewage" goes directly into the Chicago sanitary canal.

The American Society of Civil Engineers has described the district's $420 million sewage collection and disposal system as one of the "seven wonders of American engineering." The sludge lagoons, a particular target of Michigan's attack, are widely used and accepted sanitary settling tanks.

It is simply not true, according to B. A. Scheidt, the district's chief engineer, that large quantities of sewage bypass the district's treatment plants. The district, it so happens, has just completed a comprehensive check on every outfall along its entire system from Wilmette to Lockport and found fewer than half a dozen instances of waste directly entering the sanitary canal. All were industrial, and the violations are being corrected.

No sewers are ever bypassed, according to Scheidt, except to divert storm waters when they reach a point in excess of 175 percent of normal dry weather flow and overtax the treatment plants. This is a normal practice, followed at Milwaukee and other lake cities.

If it accomplishes nothing else, the latest attack may backfire on Michigan and other lake States opposing Chicago. It points up one of the real needs behind Chicago's fight for increased diversion, which is to increase the flow in the sanitary canal and the Illinois Waterway.

Despite an ever-increasing load on its sewage disposal system, the district gives complete treatment to all wastes and removes more than 90 percent of the impurities before discharging the effluent into the sanitary canal.

It has repeatedly asked for more water to assist in flushing away the effluent and as an aid to the expanded navigation needs of the Chicago region. It is currently seeking a 1-year test increase from 1,500 cubic feet of water per second to 2,500 cubic feet per second.

There is reason to suspect that Michigan's opposition and that of the other neighboring Great Lakes States is based not on a fear of lowered lake levels, as they pretend, but upon jealousy over Chicago's favorable port position as the connecting link between the Great Lakes and the lakes-to-the-gulf water route.

Untruth, misrepresentation, and misunderstanding have kept the diversion arguments going for nearly three decades. There is one way for the Senate to determine where the truth lies and that is to pass the diversion bill and and let a fair test be made.

More Pigs, Lower Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to my remarks in the RECORD on July 7, 8, and 9, I include the fourth in a series of articles prepared by Mr. Alvin F. Bull, managing editor of Wallace's Farmer, concerning the farm problems. This article appeared in the July 18, 1959, issues of Wallace's Farmer:

MORE PIGS, LOWER PROFITS

(By Al Bull)

More pigs mean lower prices. This is the same with most industries turning out products for sale.

In agriculture an increase in supply of food items drops prices so much that total income is less than from the original smaller supply. When this happens, demand is called inelastic.

Here's a simple example:

Suppose you are making a product and that you can sell 100 units for a dollar each. If you make 110 of these units, you must cut the price to 80 cents to sell the larger output.

Output	Price	Income
100	$1.00	$100
110	.80	88

Gross income is less from the 110 units than from 100 units. A 10-percent increase in supply decreased price by 20 percent.

An extreme example, some folks will say. Not so. Let's look at hogs.

Here are U.S. Department of Agriculture figures for 1954 through 1956:

Year	Million head slaughtered	Average price per 100 pounds	Income from hogs (billion)
1954	66.0	$21.60	$3.5
1955	75.4	15.00	2.7
1956	77.8	14.40	2.6

If you want to do some figuring, the price drops here are about in line with the simple example given above.

Most other agricultural products not under price support can supply similar case histories. Eggs, for example, are in big supply right now—and prices are down sharply.

Broiler production under integration zoomed in recent years. And prices nosedived. This increased-production low-price route is the usual one for sections of agriculture moving under integration.

Expanding markets faster than population growth within the United States is extremely difficult. Desire for food is limited by the capacity of the stomach—which is largely inelastic.

Two factors do tend to stretch farm markets a little each year. One is rising per capita incomes. The other is a growing population.

Population has been increasing by 1½ to 2 percent a year. That's a help, but no complete solution. The same crop acres now in production will be able to supply the food for the 230 million people expected by 1975, according to USDA estimates.

The climbing income level is of limited help, too. Most folks are already eating about all they really want. So they have a choice of how to spend the extra cash.

Choices include a second car or television set, a boat, better quality food, more built-in food services, and more restaurant meals.

This gives a clue as to why agricultural demands are inelastic while demand for autos or television sets may not be.

If prices dropped low enough, you might buy a second television set or a second car.

But no matter how low prices get you're not likely to eat four eggs for breakfast instead of two. Or to start eating a second breakfast every morning.

Desire for food is limited by the capacity of the stomach, while desire for services, better clothes, improved housing, and the like seems almost endless.

Most of the expenditures for food go toward improved quality or added services. Perhaps the homemaker buys a cake instead of a cake mix.

U.S. consumers find themselves in an enviable position. They are supplied with more food than they can eat. And money enough to buy pretty much what they choose. Food takes a smaller percentage of their income than in the past.

Most nations of the world would gladly trade their food problems for the one we face.

A little study of inelastic demand is rewarding. History shows that it also works in reverse.

That is, a decrease in supply increases prices enough so that total income is greater than from a larger crop.

If enough resources can be transferred from agriculture to other industries, output will be reduced. Then agricultural income will rise.

It isn't easy to get inelastic demand working in the price-raising direction. We have more production facilities than we currently need. They are controlled by millions of operators making independent decisions. An individual decision has no measurable effect.

With this situation, most folks tend to do what is best for them as individuals. Often this is contrary to the best interest of the industry.

The inelastic demand situation we face indicates one thing. We can't produce ourselves to riches. Adequate incomes to farm people can come only by balancing our production with demand in some way.

With adequate guidance, probably from government, decisions could be lined up in the direction of lower production and higher incomes.

In Support of H.R. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Members of the House and Senate a statement by Mr. Robert M. Mitchell, vice president of the Whirlpool Corp., in support of my bill, H.R. 5.

This is one of the most comprehensive statements that it has been my pleasure to read and it devastates the revenue arguments of the Treasury Department. The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY ROBERT M. MITCHELL, VICE PRESIDENT, WHIRLPOOL CORP., IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 5

I

Last December I had the privilege of appearing before this committee's Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy. I urged for the subcommittee's consideration the establishment of a special category of domestic corporations to be known as world trade corporations whose oversea earnings would become subject to the Federal income tax only upon distribution to the U.S. stockholder.

In my testimony I stated that:

"The committee will recognize that this concept is not novel. In fact, it is merely an effort to repatriate to the United States

those American corporations who are now resident in Panama, Canada, the Bahamas, Venezuela, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Belgium, Liechtenstein, and numerous other so-called foreign profit sanctuaries.

"The committee is also aware that the reason for the expatriation of investment capital through U.S. ownership of foreign holding companies is to enable American corporations to accumulate foreign earnings for the expansion of foreign operations without any liability for U.S. income tax. Foreign corporations are exempt from tax on their foreign earnings, by law.

"In effect, therefore, all that I have been saying to you is: Under present law, a U.S. corporation can achieve the desired deferral of U.S. tax on income from foreign operations by organizing a foreign subsidiary. This involves a considerable number of business headaches, apart from taxes. Instead of continuing this practice, let's recognize the facts of life by practical legislation which could furnish the same incentives and advantages for American corporations who have been heretofore deterred by the complexities and expense of organizing and operating a foreign subsidiary."[1]

The tax deferral concept (which was also supported by numerous other witnesses before the subcommittee) was embodied in section 2 of H.R. 5, a bill entitled "Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act of 1959," and introduced on January 7, 1959, by the Honorable HALE BOGGS.

The Foreign Business Corporation—as the tax deferral corporation was designated in section 2 of H.R. 5—was described by its legislative sponsor as the cornerstone of his bill.

Rarely has a tax measure received such widespread support as has H.R. 5, particularly the provision of the bill which would allow the creation of a Foreign Business Corporation.

H.R. 5 has been endorsed by the following leading business, trade, and farm organizations in the United States:

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce.
The National Association of Manufacturers.
U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce.
National Foreign Trade Council.
The New York Board of Trade.
The Detroit Board of Trade.
The Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.
The Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce.
American Farm Bureau Federation.
Machinery and Allied Products Institute.
Manufacturing Chemists Association.
U.S. Inter-American Council.
Illinois Manufacturers Association.
Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.
New York Export Managers Club.
New England Export Club.
The World Trade Center in New England.
The Free Enterprise Association.
Milwaukee Association of Commerce.
Milwaukee World Trade Club.

Two dozen or more individual industry trade associations support the bill.

A private, confidential questionnaire mailed on May 26, 1959 to some 4,500 U.S. companies engaged in foreign trade to obtain information relative to H.R. 5 elicited returns from over 1,100 firms, or more than one-fourth of the number addressed.[3] One of the highlights of this survey was the overwhelmingly favorable attitude of the respondents to H.R. 5. About 900 firms indicated that the proposed legislation would prove stimulating in some way to their business activity abroad. The provision of the proposed legislation which was cited most often for the stimulating effect it would have on oversea business activity was the deferral of U.S. tax through the Foreign Business Corporation. In a separate postcard to Congressman BOGGS indicating support or opposition to the bill, 995 firms were favorable and 286 of these stated their willingness to testify in support of the legislation. The list of companies whose names were introduced into the committee's record as willing to give testimony in support of H.R. 5 is a veritable "who's who of American industry," encompassing as it does firms of all sizes and representative of all segments of American industry.

The stature of the companies and of their officers who actually appeared at the hearings in support of the bill was in and of itself eloquent testimony of the wide support enjoyed by H.R. 5 throughout the business community.

It is notable that only one witness requested to be heard in opposition to the proposed legislation.

It is an extraordinary fact—perhaps it is best to describe it as an historic fact—that never before has virtually the entire business community been so completely united because any comparable legislation as now prevails in the case of H.R. 5.

In addition, two important studies on the subject of expanding private investment overseas—one, the Straus report, prepared pursuant to a congressional mandate,[3] the other, the Boeschenstein report,[4] prepared at the request of the President—in general support the principles embodied in H.R. 5. Both reports give emphatic support to the concept of tax deferral through the instrumentality of the Foreign Business Corporation.

In a major address on "U.S. Foreign Policy the Rule of Law," Vice President NIXON endorsed tax deferral as a significant device for increasing private oversea investment.[5]

Arrayed agains this impressive background of responsible support for the Boggs bill is the Treasury Department. The review below highlights the basic ambivalence which characterizes the Treasury's position.

II. HOW VALID IS THE TREASURY'S POSITION?

1. The so-called revenue losses: The Treasury's position vis-a-vis the Boggs bill in substance reduces itself to this: the Treasury would be willing to give unqualified support to H.R. 5[6] and to the tax deferral features of the proposed legislation if it were not for the heavy revenue losses. These losses are estimated at $300 million to $500 million, of which sums $200 million to $400 million result from the extension of tax deferral to export income. Since under the Treasury estimates, the bulk of the so-called loss results from the inclusion of export income under the tax deferral umbrella, the validity of the export income figures is crucial to the Treasury's case. Indeed, if the Treasury's estimates cannot be supported, it follows that the Treasury's opposition collapses—or some other ground for opposing the legislation will have to be found.

Hence, the first question which needs an answer is, How did the Treasury derive its estimates? This question was, in fact, asked of the Treasury's spokesman at the public hearings by Congressman BOGGS. The answer of the Treasury spokesman boils down to about this: The estimates on the revenue loss from extension of tax deferral to export income (which covers the bulk of the so-called loss, $200 to $400 million) were speculative. The Treasury's witness stated with commendable candor that the estimates on exports did not purport to be more than speculative. Moreover, the witness conceded that the estimates were based on many assumptions to which the Treasury was forced to resort because of the absence of complete data on exports.

There are two other things wrong with the Treasury's estimates. For one thing, corporate income tax returns (to which the Treasury, of course, has access) "do not provide adequate information concerning the corporations which might qualify under section 2 of the bill as foreign business corporations."[7]

For another, the corporate tax returns do not disclose the taxpayer's present practices or future intentions with respect to deferral of income. "Without knowing present practices or future intentions of interested firms, an intelligent approach to this problem is precluded."[8]

A. The Burgess estimates based on a sampling of over 1,100 business firms

Mr. Ralph E. Burgess, economist for the American Cyanamid Co. (and a former revenue estimator on the staff of the Treasury Department and the Joint Committee for Internal Revenue Taxation) reported to the committee the results of a confidential, private questionnaire sent on May 26 to approximately 4,500 firms engaged in foreign trade. Over 1,100 firms, or more than one-fourth of the number addressed, responded. This sampling is unique in that it is the only one of its kind ever directed toward furnishing a realistic and factual foundation for estimates on the revenue effect of tax deferral.

The sample described by Mr. Burgess represented almost $114 billion of 1958 sales—slightly more than one-third of total manufacturing sales in the United States during 1958—and $6 billion of exports for the same period, or approximately one-third of the total 1958 U.S. exports. Mr. Burgess further informed the committee that small, medium, and large companies were adequately represented in the sample.

In reporting on the revenue effect, Mr. Burgess advised that over one-half the firms responding presently utilize a foreign base corporation to handle either all or part of their exports. More than four-fifths of all firms in the sample, Mr. Burgess noted, handle their export sales either in whole or in part directly, that is to say, without using a foreign subsidiary. Mr. Burgess assumed that such firms would be potentially eligible to utilize a Foreign Business Corporation under H.R. 5. In fact, 485 firms replied to a specific question that they would conduct their export business through a Foreign Business Corporation should the proposed legislation be enacted. These firms estimated that their total tax deferred, based on 1958 experience, would be $57.5 million. Since the survey encompassed 31.4 percent of the total dollar volume of 1958 U.S. exports, the sample was expanded to include a national total. On this basis, Mr. Burgess testified, "The total tax deferred by all U.S. exporting firms utilizing this legislation would be on the order of $183.1 million."

This upper figure is, as Mr. Burgess pointed out, a theoretical figure which will not be attainable since all firms may not wish to utilize the provisions of H.R. 5 for the transaction of all of their oversea business, including exports. Moreover, as Mr. Burgess states:[9]

"The intentions of the firms which presently handle all exports directly require further consideration. When queried on this point, about seven-eights of the firms presently handling all exports directly and nearly three-fourths of those companies intending to establish a foreign business corporation under H.R. 5 specified that if the bill is not passed, they would nevertheless establish a foreign corporation to conduct such business in the future. * * * One can anticipate that the tax payments of these corporations will in any event be deferred. This expected revenue effect coupled with the deferment of additional tax, as other direct exports are initially channeled through presently existing foreign corporations, would act as a significant offset to the deferral loss indicated earlier. Thus, the $183.1 million potential is truly a maximum that is unlikely to be approached. This, the most important disclosure of the survey, in my opinion, justifies discard of the Treasury's unsupported, exaggerated revenue estimate."

In what was perhaps the understatement of the day, the reaction to Mr. Burgess'

Footnotes at end of speech.

testimony, was nevertheless, succinctly stated by Congressman NOAH MASON, Republican, of Illinois, when he commented: "I am inclined to agree with you that the Treasury's estimates are exaggerated."

B. Estimate of Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation

The basic weakness in the Treasury's estimates was disclosed by Mr. Colin Stam, chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, when, in a letter dated July 2, 1959, to Congressman BOGGS, he said: [10]

"The tabulations of data from corporate income tax returns do not provide adequate information concerning the corporations which might qualify under section 2 of the bill as foreign business corporations."

Mr. Stam's letter to Mr. BOGGS indicated that, using the same sources of data as did the Treasury, his estimate of the annual revenue loss which would result from the provision in section 2 for deferring tax on the income of a foreign business corporation would be $75 million for all industries excluding export trade.

"Our estimate of loss for export trade is $75 to $150 million, so the total for this provision would be $150 to $225 million."

Mr. Stam observes that his estimates are based on the assumption that one-half of the taxable income of the foreign business corporation will be retained abroad.

C. Prof. Ezra Solomon's estimates

Ezra Solomon, professor of finance at the University of Chicago, who appeared before the committee on July 9, estimated that if tax deferral is confined to income from foreign investment alone, the maximum loss would be about $165 million a year. It is to be noted that this figure assumes that foreign business corporations will retain 100 percent of their earnings. Based on the current pattern of about 40 percent retention, the revenue loss, Professor Solomon testified, will be about $65 million a year.

If tax deferral is extended to cover income derived from exports as well as from investment, Dr. Solomon places the maximum loss—assuming 40 percent of net earnings will be retained—at about $190 million.[11]

In the preceding discussion the concept of revenue loss has been used imprecisely—just as it has been similarly used by the Treasury Department. Over the short run there is a loss but only in the sense that the Treasury forgoes immediate tax revenue; and, moreover, the so-called loss applies only to the revenue effect of the first year of the (proposed) law's operation. Over the long run there is no loss because foreign income must eventually be distributed to the U.S. stockholders. At this juncture, the full 52-percent tax rate applies.

Recapitulation of estimates of revenue loss if tax deferral covers export income

[In millions of dollars]

	Low	High
Treasury	200	400
Burgess	50	183
Stam	75	150
Solomon		190

From the foregoing table it will be seen that, although three different techniques were employed, the three independent estimates support each other; and in no instance do they yield an estimate as high as 50 percent of the Treasury's (maximum) figure.

What happens to the Treasury's case when the estimates on which it has predicated its opposition to H.R. 5 are found to be invalid? Since the Treasury figures of revenue loss have been shown to be exaggerated and unsupported, it is respectfully submitted that the committee would be justified in disregarding them * * * along with the Treasury's reservations regarding H.R. 5.

2. The Treasury's limitation on the geographical coverage of the Foreign Business Corporation: Although there is no sound basis for the Treasury's proposed geographical limitation on the operations of the Foreign Business Corporation, it is, nevertheless, useful to examine whether even these proposed limitations contain any substantive merit.

The busines community is entirely sympathetic with the national objective of promoting private investment in the less developed nations of the free world. The business community merely asks whether the Treasury's proposed method will enable American business to do the job.

Will limiting tax deferral to income derived from the underdeveloped countries spur private investment in these lands? Such a notion has superficial appeal. When subjected to analysis, the scheme breaks down. Why would companies now utilizing a foreign base corporation with world-wide application of tax deferral be willing to trade this privilege for a foreign business corporation with the geographical and other limitations on tax deferral proposed by the Treasury? To ask the question is to answer it.

There are other difficulties inherent in the Treasury's plan. Pressed to give a definition of the underdeveloped countries, Secretary Dillon listed these regions: Latin America, Africa (other than the Union of South Africa), free Asia (other than New Zealand, Australia and Japan), and Europe (with the possible exception of Greece, Spain, and Portugal).

Secretary Dillon further indicated that the list of countries classified as "underdeveloped" would be kept by the Secretary of the Treasury, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State.

Putting aside the lack of administrative and diplomatic feasibility (which the Department of State has apparently been forced to overlook in the interest of going along) the attempt to achieve a geographical sectoring of the flow of investment capital flies in the face of economic reality and business efficiency. While all of Latin America is included in the definition of underdeveloped, it can scarcely be said that the state of development of the economies of Brazil, Argentina and Mexico is comparable with, say, Burma, Ceylon and Vietnam. Yet all are included in the same definition. Brazil, Argentina and Mexico are developing economies where there already exists a sufficiently advanced technology to sustain the beginnings of local consumer goods industries for the manufacture of, for example, refrigerators, washing machines, radio and TV sets. By comparison, Burma, Ceylon and Vietnam are as yet primitive or subsistence agricultural economies. Italy is excluded from the Secretary's definition of "underdeveloped." Yet, southern Italy is a primitive, subsistence economy—even more underdeveloped than either Spain, Greece, or Portugal, which are included. The Italian Government is actively seeking private investment for this long-neglected region. Yet, under the proposed definition it would be ineligible.

Incidentally, what happens after an investment has been made in one of the classified underdeveloped countries and 5 years later, just as the enterprise is about ready to pay out its first dividends, the country is removed from the classified list of underdeveloped countries?

It is universally recognized that the level of private U.S. investment in the underdeveloped countries is pitifully small. It is confined largely to extractive activities—petroleum and mining. As Chairman MILLS himself observed during the hearings, the Treasury proposal will do little, if anything, to stimulate other industries to invest in these areas.

Fundamentally, any limitation of deferral to the poor lands is a mirage. To be effective, tax deferral must generate income for reinvestment. If there is little investment to begin with, then, there is little resulting income; and the privilege of deferring the tax on such slender income is hardly worth the candle.

While the objective of promoting investment in the less developed countries may be sound, the technique which the Treasury proposes cannot even begin to make a significant contribution to this end.

The fundamental difficulty with the Treasury's geographical limitation is that the underdeveloped lands have not held any attraction for U.S. manufacturing investment capital because most of their economies are not economically viable. These nations fall into two categories:

(a) The countries born out of chaos: South Korea, Taiwan, Pakistan, South Vietnam.

(b) Former parts of the British and French Empires or their spheres of influence: Laos, Cambodia, Jordan, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia, Greece, and Turkey.

None of these countries is capable of existing without subsidies. Most, if not all, of these countries are the recipient of U.S. foreign aid or defense support (a euphemism for economic subsidy).

Indeed, the Honorable Leonard J. Saccio, Deputy Director of the International Cooperation Administration, in an appearance before the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on the House Appropriations Committee, freely conceded that seven countries in the Far East require "economic assistance in the form of defense support" in order to exist.[12] He listed these countries as: Cambodia, Taiwan, Korea, Laos, the Philippines, Thailand, and South Vietnam. The point to be noted here is that subsidizing these nations has little or nothing to do with economic development or improving the standard of living. These subsidies are necessary in order to put food into the stomachs of their people, and to keep these countries from reverting to chaos.

Although these nations have great strategic importance to the free world, they are the high risk areas in which American companies cannot possibly afford to risk their stockholders' money.

This is not to suggest that there are no possibilities for private investment in these areas. They do exist but on a selective rather than a diversified basis—for pharmaceuticals, sewing machines, bicycles, and other light industry, if not for the industries that represent advanced technology and require large capital investment.

We do suggest that the flow of outside capital needed to support the rate of economic growth sufficient to make these economies viable cannot be satisfied by private investment alone at this stage of their development. If private capital moves into these areas, it will, as suggested above, do so on a selective basis, probing each area for profitable advantage.

Plainly, the sources of such investment capital can only be found in the developed areas of the world. Under the Treasury's scheme, however, capital from the developed areas cannot flow through a foreign business corporation into the less developed areas.

The unfortunate implication of the Treasury's proposal is that it seeks to compel private U.S. industry to operate abroad in a geographically circumscribed area. Mr. Ralph Straus puts it well when he said in his testimony: [13] "Private U.S. industry cannot be compelled to operate abroad by government fiat; it must participate voluntarily."

It is significant that the Straus report expressly repudiates the Treasury's geographi-

Footnotes at end of speech.

cal limitation on the operations of the Foreign Business Corporation, viz.: [14]

"We believe that there should be no geographical limitation on the foreign activities and sources of income of an FBC because the diplomatic problems and domestic pressures involved in choosing particular countries or areas would make a general system of legislative or administrative selection very difficult. Moreover, since the FBC involves tax deferral rather than tax reduction, it is appropriate for investment both in developed and underdeveloped countries."

Mr. Roy Ingersoll, chairman of the board of Borg-Warner Corp., enunciated the overwhelming opposition of the business community to the Treasury's crippling proposal to limit the geographical operations of the foreign business corporation when he testified: [15]

"In my opinion this limitation is completely unrealistic and if the proposal is accepted by this committee, H.R. 5 will be virtually ineffective in accomplishing an increase in private foreign investment. This is true because as I have previously stated, at the present time domestic capital demands are so great that there is little, if any, left over for American business to invest in foreign countries. The source of funds for such investment must therefore come from the profits generated abroad. These foreign profits are not at the present time being generated to any extent in underdeveloped countries and probably will not be for some time. Where then would the funds for increased foreign investment come from if the Treasury Department's proposal were accepted?

* * * * *

"I must state frankly that, if the Treasury limitations are imposed on the Boggs bill, the entire purpose of the (proposed) law is emasculated. * * * The Treasury version of this bill, which would only benefit a company investing in underdeveloped countries after it had earned the money there in some future year and would not permit the transfer of earnings in other oversea markets to such underdeveloped countries, would be worse than nothing. It will be of no value to American industry."

---

[1] Private foreign investment: Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 85th Cong., 2d sess. (1958) 78.

[2] See testimony of Mr. Ralph E. Burgess, economist for the American Cyanamid Co., July 8, 1959.

[3] A special report prepared at the request of the Department of State and under the authority contained in sec. 413(c) of the Mutual Security Act of 1934, as amended. The report was prepared under the direction of Ralph I. Straus.

[4] Report of the Committee on World Economic Practices, Jan. 22, 1959.

[5] Address of Vice President NIXON before the Academy of Political Science at New York, N.Y., Apr. 13, 1959.

[6] The Treasury is opposed to the extension of the 14-point tax reduction presently applicable to Western Hemisphere trade corporations.

[7] See letter dated July 2, 1959, by Colin Stam, Esq., chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to Hon. HALE BOGGS.

[8] See statement of Ralph E. Burgess, economist for the American Cyanamid Co., July 8, 1959, at p. 4.

[9] Ibid. at pp. 10–11.

[10] Letter from Colin F. Stam, Esq., chief of staff, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to Hon. HALE BOGGS, House of Representatives, July 2, 1959.

[11] Professor Solomon's estimates are explained in two exhibits appended to his statement, see pp. 8–9.

[12] See the New York Times, June 1, 1959, at p. 14; cf. also, statement by the Honorable L. J. Saccio, Deputy Director, ICA, before the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on Defense Support in the Far East (June 1959), at p. 1.

[13] See statement of Ralph I. Straus (July 8) at p. 4.

[14] Op. cit., supra, at 9–10.

[15] Statement of R. C. Ingersoll (July 8) at pp. 4–5.

Interview With British Missile Expert To Set You Straight on Russia's Rockets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following interview with Wing Comdr. Asher Lee, published in the U.S. News & World Report of July 20, is informative and something that I believe every American interested in the defense of his country should read with interest.

While we may not have been brainwashed by the Russians, our press and some of our politicians have certainly been hypnotized by them.

Once again, it is interesting to note that the people who are, literally, under the guns appraise the situation with more calm and more steady nerves.

We are not defeated in the arms race by any means, as Commander Asher points out, and fortunately the vast majority of our people have confidence in our President and Commander in Chief and will not be panicked by the voices of gloom chanting their dreary dirge.

The above-mentioned article follows:

TO SET YOU STRAIGHT ON RUSSIA'S ROCKETS—INTERVIEW WITH BRITISH MISSILE EXPERT

Question. Commander Lee, what importance do you see in the Russians' announcement that they have fired a rabbit and two dogs into space and returned them successfully to earth?

Answer. This was evidence of some progress in the field of biology and the medicine of space travel, but not in the technical evolution of rockets for military or other purposes. The Russians themselves say it was only a single-stage intermediate-range rocket carrying a payload of 2 tons, and that it reached a "great height." They did not specify the height.

The load of 2 tons is not remarkable. The Germans fired 1 ton of load in their V–2 rocket way back in 1944, and the United States of America in their long-range-rocket trials must have exceeded a load of 2 tons on many occasions.

A few weeks ago the United States fired two monkeys 1,700 miles to height of 300 miles and got them back. The Russians seem to prefer dogs to monkeys.

The general position, then, is this: Both the United States and the U.S.S.R. have at least a decade of experimental flights before them, mainly with animals, before human space travel or manned space platforms become a reality. At this stage it is, broadly speaking, nip and tuck between the two countries in both space and military rockets.

Question. How far ahead of the United States are the Russians in the field of missile development?

Answer. I would not put the gap at more than about a year. Even this gap is totally unimportant, because the state of rocket development today is roughly where the airplane was in 1914–15. The chance of successful launchings and of reaching the degree of accuracy that is required still is so extremely uncertain that you really can't talk about missiles being the top weapon in anbody's long-range-attack plans.

Neither the U.S.S.R. nor the United States of America has yet developed a reliable long-range rocket. The fact that Russia may have 50 to 100 intercontinental ballistic missiles—ICBM's—today whereas America may have only a half dozen or so is not important, since for neither Russia nor America does the missile constitute the main weapon, the main punch.

Question. But, aside from numbers, aren't the Russians substantially ahead of the United States in missile technology?

Answer. I would say not. Let's break the question down.

In power of rocket engine it may be true that the Soviet earth satellites indicate that they have more powerful rocket engines than the United States of America. But the latest statement by Wernher von Braun [chief of the U.S. Army's missile team] is that you have under development an even more powerful engine than the Russians have. Since neither of you really is worried about power, you can get the range you require. General LeMay [Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force] emphasized recently that "it is reliability which is the problem."

Question. What do you mean by reliability?

Answer. Reliability means this: When you fire a rocket, do the propellants and the engine function well enough to make it work?

Let me quote some figures on the V–2 rocket that the Germans developed in the last war. Now, the V–2 was one stage. Its mechanism was simple, and it was considered fully developed and operational. The main failing was the inaccuracy of its guidance system. Only some 30 percent of attempted firings impacted within a 50 square mile target area.

Question. But that was back in 1945.

Answer. But the Germans had been test firing that thing for years, and, with great respect, I would submit that both the United States and the U.S.S.R. are still at the stage of test firing ICBM's. The first recorded test firing by the Soviet Union was in August 1957. The first successful test firing by the United States of America was less than a year after that. We are still test firing. This weapon is still adolescent and is still not capable of giving more than 50 percent successful firings.

And this doesn't even take into account the question of the guidance system. It is reasonable to assume that the Russians have had just about the same proportion of successful firings as the Americans—about 50 percent.

Now, this means that if Russia has 100 long-range intercontinental ballistic missiles, a very popular American estimate at the moment, the chances are that not more than 50 of these would even just vaguely take off in the arc and general direction of the target.

That is why I say that the long range rocket, with its liquid fuel engines, is not yet a reliable weapon and not yet the main weapon of Soviet long range attack.

NO PINPOINT ACCURACY

Question. How accurate are the missiles that do get going?

Answer. Well, the last statement put out by the Russians themselves would indicate that when a missile is considered supremely accurate they expect it to get within a 5- or 6-mile radius of the target.

Question. Isn't that sufficient to destroy New York or London?

Answer. That degree of accuracy is sufficient for large cities, but it is not sufficient to cope with the real problem confronting Russian military planners; that is, how to destroy America's retaliatory capacity. It is not sufficient, for instance, to enable the Russians to deal with this kind of practical problem.

Say the Russians knew there was a flight of hydrogen-bomb-carrying B–52's in Alaska. They would have to know the coordinates of that airfield awfully accurately and the dispersal of that flight to hit that target. With present accuracy, you might conceivably do it. But your ability to plan to do it and to say, "We will send off three rockets, and one of them is bound to do the job"—well, I would say they would be hitting and missing in their planning. I don't think the Russians are the kind of people who would choose to go to war on that basis.

Question. So, in your opinion, the Russians still are very far from the point where they could count on destroying America's retaliatory capabilities in a surprise attack?

Answer. Yes, I think that.

Question. Do you think that Russian strategic planning is based on surprise thermonuclear attack in time?

Answer. No, I don't. Even if the Russians had accurate long-range missiles—which they haven't—I believe that they still would not be led to initiate a major war simply because they thought they could achieve surprise. The reason is simply this—they know that on any one day when they might launch this surprise attack two things could happen.

The first is that their knowledge of where your strategic bombers are certainly would be partial. Some bombers would be mobile; some would be on training flights, some might be airborne. That's point 1. Surprise can never mean 100 percent knowledge of where to hit.

Secondly—and this seems to me to be very important—there is no such thing as guaranteed surprise. The Russians have to prepare for this surprise attack by moving missiles in concentrated fashion to key points. In moving their transport aircraft through bad weather they may have to reveal unsual movements in their wireless traffic. The same applies to other preparations. The chances of American Intelligence and NATO Intelligence not being alerted are very thin.

Now, what does an alert mean? It means a high proportion of your strategic-bomber force will be airborne merely on the suspicion—not necessarily the knowledge—of possible attack. This is going to rob the Russians of a high proportion of the value of surprise.

Question. Even if the Russians had reliable and accurate missiles, you don't consider a surprise attack now or in the foreseeable future to be feasible?

Answer. That's right. Let me quote an official Soviet military view on the subject: "Surprise is no recipe for blitzkreig success even in the nuclear age." This view is expressed by the Soviet high command to their own officers, and I think it accurately sums up that situation.

Question. Commander Lee, do you see anything to justify a recent statement by U.S. Secretary of Defense McElroy that the Russians are having trouble with their missile program?

Answer. Yes, I see quite a lot of trouble there.

There is the general fact that the Russians have relied so far on liquid propellants. Soviet rockets that are in serious production—both the intermediate range and the intercontinental ballistic missiles—are all using liquid propellants.

These liquid propellants include liquid oxygen, which is difficult to store and unstable in performance. That poses serious problems when you are faced by the danger of surprise attack or the need to come to an important decision about war in a matter of 24 or 48 hours. The Russians simply cannot tolerate this. They really must go over to solid-fuel rockets I think they will have to regear their production to that.

PROBLEMS OF GUIDANCE

Question. Will solid fuels solve the problem and make the long-range missile a fully reliable weapon for Rusisa?

Answer. No, not solid fuels alone. There still is the problem of the guadance mechanism. That might be perfeoted gradually over a number of years. Or it might be perfected quite quickly. There's always the possibility of a sudden breakthrough on mechanical problems.

You see, this problem of guidance mechanism involves not only the equipment itself but very precise knowledge of two things: the exact point from which you are firing and the exact point that is your target. In other words, detailed knowledge of the earth. So the mapping of the earth, including the ocean floor, is crucial to the use of all long-range missiles, whether they are fired from submarines or fired from land sites.

We know that both America and Russia lack up to date air mapping of their respective opponents' territories on a scale necessary for maximum guidance. It's easy for the Russians to do accurate firing over their own territory. But, if you can fire a rocket 5,000 miles over Soviet territory, that doesn't mean you can do it from Soviet to American territory unless your geographical knowledge of the location of your target is as accurate as it is of targets on your own territory.

Question. That would be simple enough if their target was a city like New York or Chicago wouldn't it?

Answer. Yes. But the problem for the Russians is the retaliatory power of America, not your big cities. I don't think they are afraid of the hit-back from New York City, but they are afraid of the hit-back from the Strategic Air Command.

The first order of priority in Soviet planning must clearly be SAC and your rocket bases. And the Russians are a long way from solving the problem of guidance and accuracy to the point where they can aim at an American base with any reasonable certainty of destroying it.

Question. Earlier you said that the Russians are in some trouble with their missile program because of the need to switch over to solid fuels. Is the United States ahead in this field—the development of solid-fueled rockets?

Answer. I don't think America is ahead, but I don't think there is more than 6 to 9 months between the United States and Russia in this field.

Question. In the United States there is a lot of talk about the dangerous missiles that are supposed to be developed in the early 1960's. Some people claim that the Russians will be so far ahead of the United States that they will be tempted to exploit their advantage with a surprise attack aimed at neutralizing America's striking power. Do you think that a gap of this magnitude is shaping up between American and Russian rocket development?

Answer. It could happen—but only if America fails to maintain the speed-up on its rocket program which has been so manifest since August 1957, when we had the news of the first successful Russian ICBM test-firing, followed by the launching of the Soviet earth satellite in October 1957. Since then America has realized that she must catch up and go ahead. Now, if you maintain this attitude you could catch up within 18 months.

By the middle 1960's you could be ahead on refined guidance and long-range solid-fuel rockets as well as the development—and this is most crucial—of growing numbers of atomic submarines carrying Polaris missiles.

You can do this. Whether you will do it or not is like predicting every Senate Armed Forces Committee debate for the next few years.

AN "IDEAL WEAPON"

Question. Who has the lead in the race to develop atomic submarines equipped with long-range missiles?

Answer. I don't believe the Russians are ahead, and they may well be behind the United States. To my mind, this is getting somewhere near the ultimate weapon—the weapon that can hide its face, that has a secure base and that can fire accurately. This is the ideal military weapon—the weapon with solid fuel like the Polaris mounted on an atomic submarine.

Now, first of all I think that the Russians are behind the United States in the development of atomic-engine submarines. All know they have large numbers of submarines. Figures of 350 and more have been quoted.

But, for long-range-attack purposes, there is no point in having short-range submarines or long-range submarines in the Baltic. You want to have atomic-powered submarines, first-class crews, and stable platforms with long-range solid-fuel rockets. Now, they haven't got all those, and you are closer to having them than are the Russians.

Question. But there are reports that the Russians have been firing missiles from submarines and cruisers for a long time—

Answer. Yes. This is true. Indeed, in my first book on the Soviet Air Force in 1950 I gave eyewitness accounts of some trial firings of rockets from Russian submarines. But these are in the main tactical, liquid-propellent rockets with a range of the order of 500 miles or less.

Now, it is true that, in terms of date lines, the Soviets probably started rocket firing from submarines before the United States. But, at this moment of time in the development of strategic long-range solid-fuel rockets fired from atomic-powered submarines, the United States has the edge. It is not a big edge—not yet important enough really to matter—but it can matter and be decisive in the next 5 to 10 years.

Question. Khrushchev not long ago said that the manned bomber is obsolete. Does he really believe that?

Answer. Oh, no. I don't think he believes it at all. Less than 6 months after Khrushchev said that manned bombers and manned fighters were destined for the museum, NATO authorities identified a new Russian delta-winged six-engine supersonic jet bomber that they dubbed the "Bounder."

There is plenty of evidence that the Russians are continuing to develop faster supersonic fighters, too. Since Khrushchev made that speech, a number of technical aviation journals in Russia have said they were working on fighters of the order of mach 3 and mach 4—three or four times the speed of sound.

THE MANNED-BOMBER RACE

Question. In this manned-bomber race, who is in the lead?

Answer. At the moment, the United States has the advantage for this reason: You can attack the Soviet Union with a number of your tactical fighter-bombers that are almost looking in on Soviet territory from bases in Turkey. With their tactical fighter-bombers, the Russians can attack your advance bases in Western Europe and maybe Britain, but they cannot attack the United States with these aircraft. So, this is America's first advantage.

The second advantage is that you have a much larger and more-experienced force of intermediate jet bombers—that is the B–47. As for long-range jet bombers, I find it very difficult to choose between the effectiveness of SAC and the effectiveness of what the Russians call their ADD—their long-range bomber force.

The new Russian long-range supersonic bomber, the Bounder, has a two-way range of 10,000 to 12,000 miles, with a very small amount of local flight refueling in a safe area near the Soviet Union. So it can reach virtually any part of the United States and return. But the Bounder is not in squadron service yet and is a thing still of the future.

In the overall picture of long-range bombing capacity, the Russians certainly have no advantage. But there is no great difference between the two, because such elements as effectiveness of radar cover, effectiveness of radio countermeasures, skill in navigation, determination of crews—these could mean more than the overall number of bomber forces employed.

Question. Are the Russians building up an effective defense against our Strategic Air Command—our bombers, that is?

Answer. I don't think the Russians can develop an effective defense against SAC with present resources.

First, radar is always vulnerable to jamming, and the Russians have no means of knowing when it is jammed. It doesn't show on the screen.

Secondly, there is the standoff bomb which is being developed in the West. This is a guided bomb which a bomber drops and then guides on to its target from a range of about 200 miles.

This means that the Russian defensive guided missiles—with a range of 25 to 50 miles—cannot be effective against bombers using the standoff bomb. Fighters cannot close to fire at 200-mile range, and Russian air-to-air missiles only have a range of about 3 to 5 miles—perhaps the latest ones have a range of 7 or 8 miles. So the standoff bomb can be launched at a target at supersonic speeds before the Soviet defensive guided missiles or fighters can get into action.

Then there is the undoubtedly successful tactics of skip-bombing, in which the bombers come in low below the radar screen and then rise suddenly and drop their bombs. Defense against this form of attack is extremely difficult.

I don't mean that the Russians are not going to shoot down maybe 10, maybe 15 percent of attacking bombers, but this percentage is not high enough to produce effective defense in the age of thermonuclear weapons. Estimates of the percentage of attacking bombers that must be shot down to provide effective defense range from 50 to 90 percent. I don't think that this is feasible either for the Russian or American air defense.

Question. Khrushchev makes a lot of noise about American rocket bases that are being established in Europe. Is there any evidence that the Russians are putting their intermediate-range missiles in the Eastern European satellites?

Answer. Yes, there is. I've had it from a number of people in the Polish and Hungarian armed forces—notably Hungarians—who say they have taken part in rocket-firing exercises. There have been many other reports of Russian missile sites in Eastern Europe, and there is no reason to disbelieve these.

Question. A lot of people seemed to be impressed by the huge transport plane that carried Deputy Premier Kozlov to New York nonstop from Moscow. Does that plane indicate that the Russians are ahead of the United States in the general development of jets and supersonic transports?

Answer. No, I don't think so at all. This Tupolev 114, which carried Mr. Kozlov to New York, is certainly the largest civilian transport plane flying today. But it isn't the fastest. Your own Boeing 707 has crossed the Atlantic in much faster time. As for design, the Tupolev 114 isn't particulary modern. It derives from a Russian four-turboprop bomber called the Bear, which we saw flying as long ago as 1953 and 1954. It's really now an obsolescent aircraft.

I would like to make the prediction that the Tupolev 114 will never go into regular passenger service with Aeroflot (the Soviet civil airlines), but is simply a demonstration aircraft that recently carried Mr. Khrushchev to Albania and has now carried another leading politician to New York.

Question. Over all, how do the Russians stack up against America in this field of transport aircraft?

Answer. They certainly are not ahead of America either in the field of supersonic transport or bomber aircraft or in the field of subsonic jet bombers or jet transport aircraft. But the extraordinary thing is the extent to which they have closed the gap in the last 4 or 5 years.

In 1950, the Russians had neither a twin nor four-jet transport aircraft within years of the latest American and British ones. Now the Russians have produced five or six different long-range jet transport aircraft that are very close rivals of the Boeing 707 or the Lockheed Electra turboprop or any of the British equivalents, such as the Comet IV or the Vanguard or the Britannia. It is the closing of the gap which is extraordinary—particularly in the field of long-range jet transports.

Auto Seat Belts: Safe or Hazardous?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Health and Safety presently is considering several areas of legislation dealing with highway traffic safety.

As chairman of this subcommittee, I personally am greatly concerned over this problem and feel that one of the practical methods of reducing highway deaths is through manufacture of an automobile with more safety features.

Safety belts, it has been proven to my satisfaction, are one of the most readily available of these features.

The American Medical Association, in an issue of Today's Health, discussed seat belts, pro and con.

I think the Members will find this discussion interesting and I ask consent for it to be reprinted in the RECORD.

The article referred to follows:

SEAT BELTS: SAFE OR HAZARDOUS?

(By E. D. Fales, M.D.)

Should your family use seat belts for safety on the highway, or even when going downtown for groceries?

Two years ago you heard a great deal of talk about the need for auto seat belts. Lately you haven't been hearing as much. Does this mean that seat belts were a fad which is dying out?

A while ago one car manufacturer proposed the use of seat belts and installed them at the factory. Two others made belts available if you wanted to pay a dealer to install them for you. Some engineers said they did not believe the public wanted seat belts.

Since then there have been conflicting reports and claims. Motorists today are confused: they don't know whether they should install belts or not. You may have heard drivers say they feel safer without belts. Others say they have them but don't use them all the time. Still others say they never venture out without buckling their belts.

What can the thoughtful motorist who wants to protect his family believe? What are the facts?

Until quite recently there has been no conclusive facts. You may have heard people who favor the use of belts say: "You are 60 percent safer with a belt." "Belts keep you from being thrown from your car." "They add greatly to your comfort." "They're needed in airplanes: so they must be needed in cars."

But you also hear belt critics say:

"You are better off in a wreck if you are thrown clear of your car."

"Seat belts snap your head forward and it hits the dashboard."

"A belt can trap you in the wreckage."

A congressional subcommittee recently investigated seat belts to find out how safe—or dangerous—they really are. Fourteen of the fifteen expert witnesses favored belt use.

Only one of the witnesses, Andrew J. White, of South Lee, N.H., head of an organization called Motor Vehicle Research, Inc., believes you are better off without a front seat belt, until shoulder harness is available. His opposition is based mainly upon three points: (1) A belt can hold you in the car to be crushed; (2) a belt itself can injure you; and (3) the damage to the brain, after head impact with the dashboard or any part of the car, can be great even if not immediately apparent.

But, arrayed against White in the congressional hearings were 14 other experts, also honest and conscientious.

To a man, they favored belts. The Air Force's Col. John P. Stapp, famous for his sudden-deceleration tests, said: "I have 9,000-pound test lap belts in my car, and wouldn't be without them."

In the end the Congressmen declared in favor of belts. So have the American College of Surgeons and a special committee of the American Medical Association.

Meanwhile, a Cornell Medical College team has come up with answers about what happens to belt users. These answers are of great importance to you.

The Cornell automotive crash injury research project in the past 6 years has put no les sthan 20,000 auto wrecks under the microscope, so to speak. They have, for the first time, been able to work with careful and detailed reports, thanks to the police and doctors of 22 safety-minded States. The important thing is: 714 of those wrecks have involved seat-belt owners.

The Cornell project is sponsored by the U.S. Public Health Service, the Department of Defense, the Ford Motor Co., and the Chrysler Corp. Here is how Dr. John O. Moore, director of the project, now answers some of those questions that have worried motorists:

"Can a seat belt trap me and cause my death?"

Careful study indicates this is unlikely. You can be trapped in your car by wreckage. Or you can be trapped because you are knocked unconscious. Your seat belt reduces the force with which you hit anything—and thus tends to keep you conscious.

"But isn't it safer to be thrown out of a wreck?"

This is a a catchy idea and many people believe it. There will always be freak accidents in which people are thrown out and land on soft sod or mud or snow and live. Some survive even when thrown on hard pavement.

But the IBM machines which store up accident statistics for Dr. Moore give this answer:

You are five times more likely to be killed if you are thrown out of your car.

"But suppose a soft-top convertible upsets. Aren't you apt to be dragged under it and killed?"

One of the first deaths to a seat-belt wearer involved a convertible that upset in Michigan. Critics said: "If that man had not been wearing a belt he might have been thrown clear and lived."

This can happen, of course. You must make a mathematical choice if you own a convertible. A convertible is no different from any other car in its tendency to roll over. All cars roll over about once in every five injury-accidents, Dr. Moore has found. He adds: "A rollover in a convertible can be dangerous with or without belts. You can be killed by being thrown out, or by having the car roll over you.

The thing to remember, Dr. Moore says, is: most accidents do not involve rollover. In a convertible there is much greater danger of being pitched over the windshield or over the side. You must decide: if you don't have a belt, you may be killed by being thrown out or by being crushed under your car if its rolls. If you do have a belt, you are well protected against being thrown out and you may or may not be killed if your car rolls over.

(One solution to the convertible problem: convertibles may someday be built with rollover bars. These, plus seat belts, save the lives of many racing drivers.)

"Should children use seat belts?"

Dr. Moore has eight children. Each of them—except the baby—wears a belt.

"But can a child open a belt in emergency?"

Any child of 4 or over should be able to, Dr. Moore says.

"What do highway police, who see many wrecks, think of belts?"

Not all State patrols use them. But police in many States now are beginning to. In Maine and a few other States, use of them is optional. Most Maine troopers use seat belts on fast roads but not usually on short trips.

However, in North Carolina and a few other States, use of belts is mandatory. Carolina troopers need no persuading. Several of them have walked away from bad crashes involving their own cars. Some Texas troopers did not wait for the State to buy belts; they spent their own money to have them installed.

"Suppose your belt breaks?"

A good belt will stand 3,000 or 4,000 pounds pull from your body. Only about 2 in every 100 belts break in wrecks. In a severe crash (45 miles per hour or over) your belt may break—but it has already done its job and you land with a ton and a half less force than if you hadn't worn a belt.

In North Carolina two troopers chased a reckless driver. At 70 miles per hour their car slammed head on into a culvert—almost sure death. The trooper at the wheel unbuckled his belt and climbed out. The other trooper's belt broke. But it had done its work and he walked away.

"Is insurance really cheaper if I use a belt?"

In some areas, yes. Certain companies charge 10 percent less.

"But do people who own belts really use them?"

Of every four belt owners in an accident, Dr. Moore had found, three were using their belts.

"Let's face it; can't the belt itself injure or kill me?"

If you fail to keep it snug, you could slide down and it might choke you. Dr. Moore has found no cases in which this has happened, however.

He has found that belt wearers do suffer some lower torso injuries which may (or may not) have been caused by belts. But among motorists who don't wear belts, such injuries occur six times as often.

Some drivers think a belt pulls back across the tender abdomen. It does not. If kept properly snug, it pulls down and back across pelvis and hips, which are strong.

"I've heard a belt can send a pressure wave through the body and burst blood vessels in the heart or brain."

This idea has been put forth. Neither the Cornell team nor the Air Force (in many tests with humans) has found it happens.

"Won't my front seat passenger's head hit the windshield?"

Without a belt, your passenger may go right out through the windshield, after his head smashes into the steel "header strip" above it at, say, 40 m.p.h. With a belt, his head may still hit the header strip or windshield or dash panel, but in all these contacts his head hits with greatly reduced force because the belt has checked his forward speed. He may be injured but he stands less chance of critical injury or death, the Cornell experts say.

"If I am driving, what happens to me?"

You are helped several ways: (1) the belt reduces the force with which you hit the steering column; (2) it also helps prevent a serious injury; collision of the knees with the dashboard. If the knees hit, the femur (upper leg bone) is often driven back to shatter the pelvis. This type of injury often heals slowly or imperfectly.

Dr. Moore has made another finding: Belts sometimes help you retain control in a minor crash. Without a belt, you might be knocked away from the wheel and brake.

"Suppose my car catches fire. Can I get out in time?"

Only 2 cars in every 1,000 burn after accidents, Cornell finds. But even if yours should, tests by Connecticut State police show it only takes 1 second longer to get out of a car if you are wearing a belt. These tests were made with cars in normal, upright positions, but Dr. Moore says loosening a belt in any position takes only a second or two.

"What about those newspaper stories about drivers killed in belts?"

Now and then you read about a motorist who died while wearing a seat belt. You don't hear about motorists who lived because they wore belts. That's because the first fellow was news; the second is not. "The papers sometimes blame the belt," Doctor Moore says, "but often the man would have been killed with or without a belt."

"Do you need rear-seat belts?"

If people regularly use your rear seat, yes. In a bad head-on crash, the rear seat passenger lands harder due to a curious bit of accident mathematics. In the split second after a 40-m.p.h. crash, the front seat passenger hits while the car is still moving at 25 m.p.h. By the time the rear passenger comes sailing through the air the car has slowed to 10 m.p.h. Hitting the dashboard then is more like hitting a fixed object.

"Are belts uncomfortable?"

The feeling among many motorists is that they add tremendously to your comfort. A wife riding with her husband no longer has to shift and brace on every turn. The belt supports her.

"Is it true that you are 60 percent safer with seat belts?"

That's what the Cornell study shows: you are 60 percent less likely to have an injury of any sort. Don't let this obscure the finding that if you wear a belt you are many times less apt to be thrown out—and are 50 percent less likely to be killed. Being thrown from your car is the great killer.

"Shouldn't I wait until shoulder harness is available?"

It may be a long, long wait. Harness, says the U.S. Public Health Service's Dr. James Goddard, is better. But even harness leaves the head unprotected against a vicious forward snap; in fact, the forward snap may be far worse than with a lap belt.

Cars must be redesigned before they can be built for harness. That's because harness can't be anchored to the floor as your lap belt is. It must anchor to a strong frame at least as high as your shoulders.

"Don't seat belts give you a false sense of security and make you an overconfident driver?"

This is another catchy idea that has gained popularity. Studying accident speed reports, the Cornell team has found no evidence that belt wearers drive any faster than anybody else.

"How can I get a good seat belt?"

Use a belt recommended by the maker of your car, Dr. Moore says.

"What should one cost?"

You can get a 4000-pound belt installed for as little as $10.

"Can anyone install it?"

Any competent garage man who will obtain the drawings prepared by the manufacturer of your car. Insist that he follow these plans, Dr. Moore advises.

"How do belts work out in some real accidents?"

Here are three cases:

Case 1: Near Gallup, N. Mex., three cars collided at a fast clip on U.S. 66. In the first two, five died, two were critically hurt. Out of the third car stepped an entire family—mother, father, and two small children—unhurt. Said the official police report: "Mr. and Mrs. T. wore seat belts, which saved them and the children." The belts kept the parents from plunging into the windshield. Their children flew off the rear seat and were cushioned by the parents.

Case 2: In a western city recently an insurance man driving home from work had a head-on collision with an intoxicated driver who was on the wrong side of a curve. The intoxicated driver was badly hurt. The insurance man escaped. He wore a belt.

Case 3: On a racetrack at Rheims, France, one day the American sportscar driver, John Fitch, rounded a curve and hit a straightaway at 140 miles per hour. His car bounded end over end in four sickening crashes. Police said one bounce carried it higher than a telephone pole. Then it rolled sideways. It stopped—a pile of junk.

Seat-belted John Fitch hunched down, then blackedout in the turmoil. He came to to see a hand—his own turning off the key. Then he unbuckled his belt and ran a half-mile to tell his wife the miracle: He was safe and only bruised.

What about Andrew White's criticism of belts?

Careful experts feel that White is stressing only the negative aspect. There is no doubt about it; you can be hurt, even killed, with or without a belt if you are involved in an accident. A head-on impact, even at 25 miles per hour, between two cars is a terrible force of which few drivers have any concept. But the Cornell study shows that in almost all cases you will be far better off in a belt.

"A seat belt," says Dr. Moore, "is no panacea. It won't work in all cases, but we are finding it helps in a great majority. It is like a great new drug. What physician would discard it as therapy if it helps most of his patients but doesn't help all?"

A seat belt is a stopgap means of diminishing the damage done in accidents—until something can be done about the real problem which is eliminating the accidents themselves.

Responsibilities of State and Voluntary Agencies in Serving the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the address delivered by Dr. Wilson T. Sowder, State health officer, Florida State Board of Health, on "Responsibilities of State and Voluntary Agencies in Serving the Aged," will prove of interest to my colleagues; therefore, it is my pleasure to have it inserted in the RECORD:

RESPONSIBILITIES OF STATE AND VOLUNTARY AGENCIES IN SERVING THE AGED

(By Wilson T. Sowder)

The problems of the aged are so broad, so diversified, and so protean in their nature that probably few can claim a competency to understand or solve them all. Such problems as health, housing, employment, recreation, and counseling require the attention of specialists who have little in common and who have a very underdeveloped experience or tradition of working together on a common task. One of the first handicaps that we encounter in a determination of responsibilities is the old, old one, stated very succinctly in the saying: "What is everybody's business is nobody's business." It is for that reason that I have felt somewhat inadequate to apply my own specialized training and experience in the field of public health toward suggesting responsibilities for other State and voluntary agencies. I shall try, however, to look at the problems of the aged from the standpoint of a plain citizen, and to give most of my attention to the forest and very little to the trees.

I find, however, that I have handicaps even when I attempt to do this. In my office in Jacksonville it is a standing joke (I hope) that I am 39 years of age, and that I have been so for several years. My viewpoint, therefore, is that of an outsider. It is that of one who has never been old, alone, neglected, or unemployed. I have never lived on a welfare grant or a small pension. I have never lived in a nursing home or a home for the aged. I have never lost my children, my wife, or even my parents by death, and I do not know what it is like to be old and feeble, sick, and without the friends and family of youth and middle age. I have had little experience to help me to grasp the viewpoint of persons in these situations, and to know what they would like to have or would like to do. I can only guess from my own background and experience, and assume that I am like most other people, and that young, middle-aged, and old people have basically the same emotions, needs, and desires.

Although I have never been old, I have been sick, and I know what that is like. Although I have never been without family or friends, I am moody enough and sensitive enough to have felt alone many times and to know the misery of the feeling. Although I have always had enough money for the essentials of life, I have enough trouble paying my bills to understand at least partially what it must be like not to have money for even these. Also, as the head of a family and of a State agency, and with such authority as goes with these positions, I know the feeling of frustration when things do not go my way. I can imagine the bitterness of old people who have so little power to command either respect or obedience at a time when their thought habits are cast in the somewhat inflexible mold of age. They have little ability to adjust themselves to their new and unpleasant situation. On the other hand, I am crabbed and crotchery and irritable enough, and have insight enough to know it, to see its effect on my family and my friends. I understand, therefore, how much love and tolerance is needed of young people for old people who may be worse than I am in these respects. However, we cannot afford to be overly sentimental or fatuous in evaluating the needs of the aged. We must be realistic and consider their special handicaps and peccadillos as well as their special assets and virtues, and not expect more than human tolerance of them by others.

Who are the aged? Should we accept 65 years as the lower boundary of our problem? Is any other limit feasible in discussing services for the aged? For one I wish there were. It is common knowledge that people age at different rates, and that some people become aged prematurely, while others seem to remain youthful always. It is true that age is a state of mind. It is also true that to a great extent age depends upon the state of one's health. In considering services to the aged, the mental and physical condition is of tremendous importance in determining needs. Other possible services depend upon an evaluation of these. Furthermore, if I may depart a little from my promise to talk to you as a plain citizen, it is important to me as a public health physician to be able to consider all possible preventive measures in connecttion with health services for the aged.

Some have likened our life on this earth to a river that meanders its way through the years to its eventual goal—the great ocean of Eternity. Now if life is a river, or even somewhat like a river, perhaps what we are trying to do is to see that it is clear, attractive, and free of polluting agents in its later course; and just before it empties itself into the great unknown ocean of the Hereafter. If this is what we are trying to do, it will occur to all of us that perhaps the pollution occurs, or at least some of it, farther up toward the source. This should be investigated and if found to be true then our remedies should be applied accordingly. I am sure in my own mind that this is true to a large extent. It is obvious to us in the field of health that many diseases of the aged, such as heart disease, arthritis, diabetes, arteriosclerosis, kidney disease, and others, usually start earlier in life.

Frequently a healthier old age can be assured (note that I say healthier, not healthy) by preventive measures taken in youth and middle age. A healthy mental outlook in the aged can be produced only by the acquisition of a healthy mental attitude early in life. Certainly economic security must be built for old age during the more productive years, and recreation is easier to provide for old people who have already developed interests outside their bread-and-butter occupations. It would therefore be very unfortunate if all our thought and planning were devoted to the people who are already across the arbitrary line that we use to distinguishd youth from age, and none to the tasks of producing a sound, healthy, happy, and economically secure group of older citizens. The object we have in mind, I believe, is to remove the noxious polluting agents of insecurity, poverty, sickness (mental and physical), loneliness, and idleness from the delta regions of the stream of life. We cannot therefore afford to neglect the upper reaches and tributaries; and we must carry on a pollution-abatement program throughout the length of the river.

However, we must distinguish somehow between service programs for the aged and the many, many efforts that have been made, are being made, and must be made in the future to minimize the need for these services. All our public health programs, all medical-care programs, all mental health and child-guidance programs are aimed directly or indirectly at producing a mentally and physically healthy old person. All our retirement systems and our social security system are aimed at reducing economic insecurity in old age. We are concerned today with planning for remedies for the problems that remain in spite of all our best efforts in the area of prevention. It might be well for us to recognize that some of the troubles of older people may be due, paradoxically enough, to efforts to provide for a healthy, secure, and contented old age.

In fact, the magnitude of the problem to begin with is directly the result of the tremendous success of medical science and public health in the past few generations which has led to a sharp curtailment of deaths from infectious and communicable diseases, especially in infancy and early life. The prevention of early death and the prolongation of life have been the goals which even now occupy the major energies of all persons in the medical and allied sciences. Little thought has been given along the way to the possibility that any human misery or unhappiness might follow success in these efforts—but such results face us now. Let me hasten to assure you, however, that I do not favor high death rates in infancy and youth. Our social security system and many of our retirement programs were developed in years when economic conditions were not so good as they are now. They may have been adequate at the time to provide security in old age, but we are now finding that owing possibly to increasing prosperity these are inadequate.

Furthermore, these plans were based on the presumption that people want to retire when they reach the threshold of old age, but we now find that this cannot be taken for granted. It is definitely not true in a high percentage of cases. Furthermore, prosperity and retirement programs have expedited a change in attitudes toward older people by their offspring and other younger relatives. When times were not so good, young families often had to live with their parents. This may have been hard on the young people but it was probably good for the aged. With more prosperity and with our active homebuilding programs most young people are able to afford their own homes, and thus they feel free to let the old folks shift for themselves with their pensions and savings.

I may be very wrong in speculating that some of our past efforts aimed directly or indirectly toward helping the aged have had undesirable side effects. However, right or wrong, there is nevertheless a great need for wise planning for the future so that we do not agravate their problems instead of solving them.

One simple step that might be taken more often was suggested to me by my friend Dr. Robert Kleemeier, whose paper appears elsewhere in this book. He suggested that the old people themselves should be asked what they want before we make too many plans for them. While I hope I am not anticipating his talk too much it does seem to me that this is a very sound approach. We might very well, if it has not already been done, survey representative groups of old people and find out what they want. I think we might take for granted that they want the maximum of mental and physical health; but should we take for granted that we know whether they will be better off

with their own families, or elsewhere? We need to examine carefully a thesis that Shakespeare developed in one of his poems:

"Crabbed age and youth
Cannot live together;
Youth is full of pleasance,
Age is full of care;
Youth like summer morn,
Age like winter weather;
Youth like summer brave,
Age like winter bare,
Youth is full of sport,
Age's breath is short,
Youth is nimble, age is lame;
Youth is hot and bold,
Age is weak and cold;
Youth is wild, and age is tame,
Age, I do abhor thee,
Youth I do adore thee."

It would involve no disrespect to Shakespeare as a poet to study further the question as to whether youth and age can or should live together. Shakespeare was young and possibly biased when he wrote these words, and he never lived to be old. But we do know that he wrote his plays and poems for money and that as soon as he was able he hied himself back to his home and to a peaceful life of retirement with his wife and children. Had it not been for his premature death in middle age from a disease probably now preventable, it is very likely that he would himself have demonstrated that youth and age can live together very well.

It is very likely that if we took more care before we segregated our old people we would detect among them a high proportion of Father Williams, who could be a source of joy and entertainment to their children and grandchildren. Father William, as You know, is a creation of Lewis Carroll:

"'You are old, Father William,' the young man said,
'And your hair has become very white;
'And yet you incessantly stand on your head—
'Do you think, at your age, it is right?'

"'In my youth,' Father William replied to his son,
'I feared it might injure the brain;
'But now that I'm perfectly sure I have none,
'Why, I do it again and again.'"

And in reply to another question about his remarkable ability to chew anything, Father William replied:

"'In my youth,' said his father, 'I took to the law,
'And argued each case with my wife;
'And the muscular strength which it gave to my jaw,
'Has lasted the rest of my life.'"

Nowadays Father William would run a serious risk of being hustled off to a nursing home, or even to the State mental hospital, because of such foolishness.

While I think that there is a very urgent need for further studies to determine what services are needed by the aged and how to provide them, I am certain that we know enough already to be doing more than we are. Some very clear and basic facts are available to all of us who care to look for them. We have in our country and in the State of Florida more old people, and a greater percentage of old people, than we have ever had before. Today we have in the United States 14 million persons 65 years of age and over, and within 10 years we can expect around 20 million. The rate of increase of older people has been twice that of the population as a whole. Also one-third of these 14 million oldsters are already 75 years old or older. Women outnumber men in these age groups, more and more, and year by year. It is estimated that by 1975 there will be 40 percent more women than men alive in the ages past 65. Also most of these women are, and will be, single, usually widowed. The figures are now 62 percent for women, as compared to 31 percent for men.

Less than half of our people over 65 are employed, and most of them do not have an adequate income from any source to maintain a decent standard of living. They are poorly housed because of inadequate income, and yet a larger percentage of the income of the elderly goes for rent than is true of the general population. The aged also suffer more from chronic illnesses. About one-half of them have some chronic disease or physical disability, and although they make up only about 8 percent of the total population, they constitute 40 percent of the total of persons in the country who are disabled for 3 months or more each year.

We therefore have already a fairly clear picture of the present state of that segment of our population whose talents and energies are largely responsible for the progress made in this country during the past 40 or 50 years. Also we know enough to see fairly clearly the fate that awaits those of us in this next younger generation—unless something is done. Many of us do not have long to wait for these chill gray years—and if we do nothing to help the generation of our fathers, how can we expect help from our sons? There is no doubt, according to the facts now available, that the lot of the aged, in this most healthy and prosperous country in the world, is a sad one. It is, in the main, one of poverty, loneliness, unemployment, malnutrition, boredom, squalor, sickness, insecurity, mental depression, and unnecessary mental and moral deterioration. Is it necessary in this country of ours for our own fathers and mothers to say, or to feel, as did the villain Macbeth:

"I have lived long enough; my way of life—
Is fallen into the sear, the yellow leaf;
And that which should accompany old age,
As honor, love, obedience, troops of friends,
I must not look to have."

Could we not on the other hand in this Christian civilization of ours at least make it possible for our elderly citizens to feel as equanimous and secure about old age as did the pagan writer Cicero when he wrote: "Old age is the consummation of life, just as of a play."

And to learn with a Christian poet (Du Bartas, 1544–1590) that:

"Who well lives, long lives; for this age of ours
Should not be numbered by years, daies and hours."

I have mentioned briefly some of the facts that are well known about the aged and some of the problems, as I see them, that concern them. I will now outline a few of the principles that in my opinion may be followed in arriving at a solution. We often hear the saying these days, "I don't have any problems that money won't cure." While it is doubtful that money would cure all the ills of the aged, it is certainly true that an adequate income for all the aged would do more to help than anything else, except perhaps a cure for aging itself. The provision of an adequate income would certainly banish poverty, provide better nutrition, better housing, better medical care, and go far toward relieving the other related ills of our oldsters. In attacking this problem it must be kept in mind that some of our aged are now employed, some are not; some are employable, some are not; some could be made employable through vocational rehabilitation, and some could not; some are sick, and some are well; most are mentally competent, but some are not; and last of all while many want to work, some prefer to enjoy leisure in their old age or to work only part time. We should respect the wishes of this latter group wherever possible. Leisure is not a sin in my view if one can afford it, and the old should have earned it if any group has.

There is a general impression, however, that the aged are in general happier working than not working. Certainly it is desirable from economic and social points of view. It increases the income of the individual. It decreases the burden of the support of the elderly on the young and middle-aged groups. It relelves loneliness and boredom, prevents mental depression and mental deterioration. It is now agreed that retirement policies should be liberalized so that everybody can continue to work as long as they are physically able, if they desire to do so. It is agreed that elderly persons can be useful employees. It is agreed too that every effort should be made to eliminate laws, regulations, and policies that discriminate against the employment of older persons on account of age alone. It is well known that now not only persons over 65 but men as young as 45 and women as young as 35 find their ages a handicap in seeking employment. In seeking such changes we should, however, not fail to study and consider the problems of the employer, whether private or governmental. We must not forget the obligations now imposed upon, or assumed by, the employer to his employees. It would not be economically sound to expect an employer to assume the same obligations toward a new employer 75 years of age as toward one 25 years of age.

The young can more easily learn the intricacies of an unfamiliar job. A business can afford to invest more in a young employee with a longer expectation of employment than in an older person whose anticipated years of employment are few. The placement of older persons in jobs they already know is desirable and preferable. On the other hand, if they must be trained in a new skill, the investment in training must be correlated with the expected time of useful service.

At present there seems to be a shortage of personnel in all fields of endeavor in our country, including unskilled and skilled labor, and in all the technical and professional fields. It would seem, therefore, to be only a problem of education, organization, and distribution to provide employment for every employable person. It seems to me that one of the biggest and least tapped pools of labor, and one that is growing fastest, is that of older women. Most women over 65 are single, usually widowed, are unemployed, and need money. Furthermore, they have developed skills over a lifetime in housekeeping, cooking, home nursing, and related fields. Coincidentally some of the most urgent needs of the aged are in these very fields. Would it not be wonderful if some statesman should appear amongst us with the ability of an Augustus, who could show us that the solution of many of the problems of the aged lies within the problems itself, and among the aged themselves.

We know that governmental agencies are supporting—and must continue, and must increase their support of—aged persons, and particularly those that are sick or otherwise unemployable. We know also that governmental agencies must give supplementary assistance to other aged persons with marginal incomes. There is an increasing realization, too, that cash grants are not enough, and will probably never be enough. There is a growing realization that outright 100 percent governmental care through institutionalization is not a proper remedy in more than a minute fraction of cases. It is generally thought that old people are better off at home than elsewhere. Some think, and some States are acting on the premise, that if they have no home of their own they are better off in a foster home. It is generally agreed that it is desirable to postpone institutionalization for illness or other reasons

as long as possible. The positive side of this philosophy may therefore be stated as follows:

1. Help the aged to stay mentally and physically well; help them to stay in their own homes, with or near their own friends and relatives, young and old; help them to stay employed, gainfully if desired and possible; help them to remain self-supporting; give aid if necessary to accomplish this purpose.

2. If this is not possible, help them to stay in a home near friends and relatives.

3. Even if the aged are ill or infirm, provide home care if possible through home nursing, visiting nurses, and homemakers, with occasional visits to clinics or doctors' offices.

4. If this is not possible, and if the client is not acutely ill, mentally or physically, consider a nursing home near friends and relatives.

5. The next step (or next line of defense) is a chronic-disease hospital nearest home, friends, and relatives.

6. The next step (or line of defense) is a general hospital or medical center where medical and psychiatric studies can be made, treatment given, and the patient returned to as near the No. 1 situation as possible. If a return is not possible, then as a last resort:

7. A distant county, regional, State, or Federal institution. Here every effort should be made to reverse the process and return the patient to the lowest numbered of these alternatives that is possible.

If through professional bias I have stated this process in primarily medical terms I apologize, but I believe that each of you can translate my language into yours whether you are in the field of sociology, vocational rehabilitation, housing, or some other.

Now having dogmatically stated some lines of defense and some points of resistance to the permanent incarceration and segregation of the old; and having assumed benefits to them by these processes, I should like to return to an idea that I brought up a moment ago. I believe I listed as the all-too-common problems of old age the following: Unemployment, poverty and financial insecurity, squalor—poor housing, malnutrition, loneliness, boredom, emotional insecurity, mental depression, sickness, mental deterioration.

I suggested that money was the answer to many of these problems. This can be provided only by personal savings (retirement, and so on), by current employment, or by private or governmental aid. The latter is a sad but necessary last resort. I have suggested that old people—men and women—in general want to be employed, and that many of them can offer valuable services to our present economy which is crying for more workers. I have mentioned the fact that our biggest and most rapidly growing pool of employable unemployed is that of older women. I said that they already had special skills in the areas of homemaking, cooking, home nursing, and so on; and I have pointed out that one of the most common needs of old people is for a home. I know that much is already being done in the country to use the talents of older women in these fields, but could not more be done? Would it not be possible to mobilize more effectively the resources that exist in our aged population to solve the problems of their own group?

Would it not be possible, for instance, for our society, even through governmental agencies, to provide a more adequate income to old-age-assistance beneficiaries who are willing to devote some of their time to serving others? Would it not be possible, for instance, for Jane Doe to act as nurse's aid or housekeeper for the Smith sisters while they are ill, and prevent their removal to a nursing home or other institution? Would this not be a cheaper and more satisfactory solution than the latter alternative? Might not Uncle Jim, retired carpenter, do minor home repairs for Aunt Mathilda and the Smith sisters? Father William, you recall, is in his dotage but still happiest at home. He may be rather trying to his family and they may feel the need for an elderly baby sitter at times, or even for some sort of gerontological day nursery. These are only random thoughts and they may not be practical, but it does seem possible to me that much of the manpower to do many of the things needed by the elderly is available among the elderly themselves.

There is no doubt as to the need for more activity by State and voluntary agencies in providing services to the aged. There is a need for individual and joint action by agencies concerned with health, welfare, education, employment, development, and many other fields. About half of the States now have an official agency especially concerned with the problems of the aged. It is probable that every State ought to have some such agency, and this is recommended by the Council of State Governments. It is the recommendation of that body that such an agency be without operating or service responsibilities, and that its basic functions be stimulation, advice, and coordination. One pattern might be a commission made up of private citizens appointed by the Governor which would be an advisory body to the Governor and to an interagency or interdepartmental committee also appointed by him.

It seems to me that it would be simpler to have a mixed commission or committee of private citizens and agency heads in the first place, and it would be helpful also to have membership from the legislature. It has been my observation that public bodies with such a makeup work very well in Florida. Certainly one of the things that should be stimulated first by such a commission is further study and research on the problem. We need to know more about what to do and how to do it.

Among the other things that some State agencies are doing or can do are the following:

They can develop public awareness and interest in the problems of aging.

They can discourage mandatory retirement.

They can encourage the employment of the elderly, and assist in their retraining and replacement.

They can provide special counseling services for the aged.

They can help prevent discrimination in employment on account of age alone.

They can also take the leadership in the promotion of sound retirement plans by younger people.

The adequacy of grants for old-age assistance recipients should be frequently reviewed, and improvements in provisions for medical and nursing care constantly sought. Florida has recently made provision for the hospitalization of the acutely ill of all ages, but more needs to be done for those with long-term sickness. It would be much better if this were provided on a local level by local agencies. Every avenue should be explored that offers to provide better housing for the aged. To meet this need one State requires that 5 percent of all apartments in State-aided projects be set aside for older people, and consideration is being given to State loans for nonprofit developers, and also to State guarantees of bonds for housing developments which provide for the aged.

Health agencies, of course, have a tremendous responsibility. They usually have the responsibility for the licensing of nursing homes. It is a difficult and almost impossible task to insure the maintenance of minimum standards of care and safety when adequate funds are simply not available for the payment of the costs of these. According to a joint study by personnel of the health and welfare agencies of Florida, about $150 per month is the minimum needed to purchase the nursing-home care that is required for an elderly person. How, then, can this be attained for welfare recipients whose monthly income may be only $60 per month? Some counties are making supplementary payments to nursing homes in order to assure minimum standards of care. This practice should be extended and other avenues for solving this problem explored.

The Florida State Board of Health and its affiliated county health departments are also carrying on and steadily extending health programs for the control of chronic diseases, such as heart disease, cancer, diabetes, malnutrition, mental illness, and tuberculosis. While these diseases are by no means confined to elderly persons, they are certainly of vital importance to them. To a large extent they are all geriatric programs, although it would not be desirable or practicable to limit them to the aged. They give promise of better health to the aged of the future.

The Florida State Board of Health also has a new and unique program for the hospitalization of the acutely ill, other than welfare recipients; and this program is coordinated not only with that of the department of public welfare, but with county hospitalization plans throughout the State. It was in fact developed as a program for aiding the counties to care for their own needy sick. Studies need to be made as to how to take care of the chronically ill, and it is hoped that local governmental bodies will take more responsibility in this area.

The State board of health also has active plans for the promotion and doing of research not only in the field of geriatrics but in all fields of health. An active research coordinator is already at work, and committees have been appointed to aid him. Consultants from various parts of the country have visited Florida to help us plan an active research program. Major attention will be given to the chronic diseases and to other geriatric problems. The 1955 legislature in Florida established in the State board of health a council on research and training in mental health and appropriated funds to be spent upon the advice of this council. Dr. Kleemeier has the honor of being the chairman of this council, and his interest in the field of gerontology assures us that the problems of the aged will not be neglected. Despite these activities I must confess that even in my own agency our efforts are pitifully inadequate. We are determined, however, to do better in the future, and we are confident that our sister State agencies share this determination. I am sure, though, that we would all welcome a coordinating agency devoted exclusively to the problems of the aged, just as we welcome, and are proud of, this forum that is provided here by the University of Florida for the sharing of our knowledge as well as of our aspirations for more knowledge.

Florida has had unusually happy relationships between its official and voluntary agencies. This has been true to my personal knowledge in the field of health. There has been no such thing here as overlapping or duplication of services; or lack of contact or coordination. Many official agencies, or subdivisions of them, can in fact trace their parentage to a voluntary health agency. This is true of our cancer and tuberculosis programs in the State board of health. On the other hand, we in the official agencies have sometimes had a hand in the organization of voluntary agencies, and we certainly are consistent supporters and participants in their work. The Florida Tuberculosis and Health Association, the Florida Heart As-

sociation, the Florida Mental Health Association, and the Florida division of the American Cancer Society all have a tremendous interest in the problems of the aged, and also a willingness and determination to help work them out. The State board of health has in the past worked closely with these organizations in the areas of their special interests, and they have so divided up the work to be done that there has been no conflict of interest and no funds unnecessarily spent in duplicating the work of each other. The new council on aging shows great promise in the field of gerontology in Florida, and could very well develop the kind of coordination in the work of various voluntary agencies having an interest in gerontology that a State commission could do for the official agencies. It is my belief that the primary function of a voluntary agency lies not in the field of direct services but in public education, promotion, stimulation, legislation, and support of official agencies. All official and voluntary agencies must, however, join hands to secure the maximum of coordination of effort so that no dollar of funds from any source is wasted, and so that no erg of potential energy that may be devoted to the solution of our problems is wasted.

Also we need to join together for the purpose of mobilizing the communities throughout the State, because that is where the actual work needs to be done. We must not forget, though, to enlist the support of and make use of the specialized knowledge of our professional organizations. Our physicians, nurses, social workers, psychologists, and other groups must be asked for advice and assistance early and often. They must be asked for help not only as individuals but through their professional societies. It has been my experience that when this is done the returns are bountiful. Also our church, fraternal, and civic organizations need to be more fully mobilized, and through these processes we can gain the support of the citizens of the State for the development and carrying out of plans that should help to improve the lot of that most deserving but least privileged group of American citizens—the aged.

Our generation is deeply in debt to the one that just precedes us. We have the means, and we have the obligation, to pay this debt by doing all that is within our power to restore the dignity and serenity to the declining years of our older citizens which are their birthright. I am sure that the devoted purpose of every participant in this conference is to help all the aged people, in this country of ours and in this great State of ours, to pass their declining years in that state of peace and tranquillity which was so beautifully described by the poet William Wordsworth in his own declining years:

"The innocent brightness of a newborn day
is lovely yet:
The clouds that gather round the setting
sun
Do take a sober coloring from an eye
That hath kept watch o'er man's mortality;
Another race hath been, and other palms
are won.
Thanks to the human heart by which we
live,
Thanks to its tenderness, its joys, and
fears,
To me the meanest flower that blows can
give
Thoughts that do often lie too deep for
tears."

Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is an editorial given by Mr. Thad M. Sandstrom, general manager, WIBW Radio and WIBW-TV, Topeka, Kans., regarding section 315 of the Federal Communications Act, the so-called equal time provision.

Mr. Sandstrum is highly respected in the radio and television industry. He has many years of experience. In my opinion, his comments merit the close attention and consideration of all Members of Congress. The editorial follows:

Good evening. My name is Thad M. Sandstrom. I am general manager of WIBW Radio and WIBW-TV. I am appearing on television to state an editorial opinion of these stations.

Today I want to visit with you a few moments about a subject of vital concern to the radio and television stations in the United States and a matter which we believe should be of vital concern to you as radio and television listeners. It pertains to legislation currently pending before the Congress of the United States concerning a section of the rules of the Federal Communication Commission popularly known as section 315. This is the so-called equal time provision of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communication Commission which governs political broadcasts on radio and television stations throughout the United States.

The FCC rules say in so many words that if a radio or television station grants time to a candidate for political office, then equal facilities must be made available to his opponent. For example, if we grant 30 minutes of free time to the Republican candidate for Governor of Kansas, then under the FCC rules, we must also grant 30 minutes of free time to the Democratic candidate for Governor. I don't believe any broadcaster quarrels with this part of section 315. We believe broadcasters have a record of fairness—that outstanding public service programs such as "face the Nation," "Meet the Press," "Capitol Cloakroom," and other public service features—have a longstanding record of giving fair treatment to candidates from both major parties and to points of view of opposing sides. Section 315 relates not only to free time, but also to paid time—that is to say, if a Republican candidate for Governor is charged $100 for a 30-minute broadcast at 8 o'clock in the evening, then a broadcast for the Democratic candidate for Governor also must be charged at the rate of $100. Broadcasters find no fault with this particular item either.

The matter came to a head a few weeks ago in a case revolving around a man by the name of Lar Daly, a self-announced candidate for mayor of Chicago, on the tickets of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. Everyone knew he had not a chance to win, but nonetheless he was a candidate for office and was seeking to win the election. To quote from an editorial in the New York Times of Sunday, June 21, "One of the current nightmares of the radio and television industry is the Lar Daly case. Daly, a perennial splinter group candidate for office in Chicago, demanded equal broadcast time last winter after a Chicago television station showed Mayor Richard Daily, a candidate for renomination, welcoming the President of Argentina and supporting a March of Dimes campaign. The Federal Communications Commission held that under section 315 of the Federal Communications Act, Daly was entitled to the free time.

"Last week, the FCC affirmed its original decision. It held that under section 315 as now written, it had no choice but to interpret any appearance of a political candidate on radio or TV as use of the station. But in hearings on the issue last week before the Senate Commerce Committee, John C. Doerfer, Chairman of the FCC, suggested that the dilemma could be resolved by exempting newscasts and special events—such as political conventions from the equal time ruling. Congress is expected to make some change along those lines."

If this ruling is allowed to stay in effect, we doubt seriously if radio and television stations will be able to do an adequate job of reporting the next presidential election. It amounts to this—if we are to give time to the candidates of either of the major parties, then we would be forced to give time, equal time, on newscasts, on public forum programs, etc., to candidates from all sorts of parties. In 1952, for example, no less than 18 political parties had presidential candidates. When our station carried the acceptance speeches of General Eisenhower and Gov. Adlai Stevenson, and later the dramatic meeting of General Eisenhower and Senator NIXON immediately after the Nixon fund episode, we thereby placed ourselves under an obligation to give equal time to such candidates as Eric Haus, Ferrel Dobbs, Henry Jowaski, Don DuMont, Homer A. Tomlinson, Fred C. Proll, Edward Longstreet Boden, and Eileen Linia W. Jensen. Have you ever heard of them? They were all nonimated for the presidency by one party or another in 1952, and under section 315, were entitled to as much time free as Eisenhower and Stevenson. In 1956, there were again 18 political parties with presidential candidates. They included the New Party, the For America Party, the Mississippi Black and Tan Grand Old Party, and the American Third Party. The minority-party candidates got only 410,000 of the 62 million votes cast. One of these minor parties, the American Party, got 483 votes and one, the Christian Nationalist, was reported to have received 8 votes.

Yet, under section 315, the rules under which we of radio and television operate, we were not permitted to distinguish between Stevenson and Jensen, between the Democratic Party and the Christian Nationalist.

May I make one further quote from Dr. Frank Stanton's testimony before the committee considering this legislation. Dr. Stanton is president of CBS, Inc. Quote: "For all practical purposes, the Lar Daly decision makes it mathematically impossible for radio and television to report any political campaign in its own way and take advantage of its own technical capabilities. For example, during the 1956 presidential election campaign, the CBS Television Network devoted about 20 percent of its news time to the presidential and vice presidential candidates of two major parties. Some

time on virtually every newscast from Labor Day to election day was devoted to the campaign. And most of this 20 percent was devoted not to reports of what was said, but rather to film showing the major candidates in the course of their campaigns. Under the Lar Daly decision, we would be required to give equivalent time almost certainly on these regular newscasts to all presidential and vice presidential candidates of all parties who ask for it. There were as I have noted and as near as we can calculate, presidential and vice presidential candidates of no less than 18 parties in 1956. To furnish them all with time equivalent to that which we gave in 1956 to the Democratic and Republican presidential and vice presidential candidates would have required us to give time to total substantially more than all time spent by all our television newscasts on all the news, and of course there would be no time left for any other news." Dr. Stanton says in conclusion, "Simple mathematics establishes that we have no choice but to turn our microphones and cameras away from all candidates during campaign periods."

It seems to WIBW radio and TV that this is a matter that affects every listener and viewer of our station. If you want to see news about important happenings on the political front; if you want an opportunity to see major candidates for yourself and make your mind up as to whether or not you wish to vote for this candidate or that candidate, then there must be some relief from section 315 of the Federal Communication Commission rules and regulations. You can help by writing a card or letter to Congressman WILLIAM H. AVERY or Congressman EDWARD REES, Senator FRANK CARLSON, or Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, telling them that you believe there should be a change in section 315, that you believe the radio and television stations today are responsible and deserve the right to report news as they see fit. We assure you that if the rules pertaining to section 315 are modified that we at WIBW radio and WIBW–TV shall continue to treat news fairly as we have in the past.

Majority Leader Johnson Chooses Achievement as Democratic Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the constructive record of three successive Democratic Congresses which have served this country and our people back home well and faithfully even under the present Republican administration.

The American people have consistently expressed decisive approval of the Democratic Party's foresight and hard work in Congress in putting the interests of our country first. Ours is a record we can be proud of and ours are leaders we can support wholeheartedly.

As an example of the gratitude and appreciation of Americans for the achievements of the Democratic Party and the sound goals of our leaders, I would call to the attention of the Democratic Members of the House and Senate the following editorial from the June 25, 1959, Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise commending Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON's leadership in the advancement of a constructive legislative program:

GOOD FOR SENATOR JOHNSON

The American people should feel grateful to Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON for offering anew to cooperate with President Eisenhower on the advancement of a constructive legislative program.

"If we have a choice between political issues and achievement, we will choose achievement," said the Texas lawmaker.

It is the sort of statement that grows out of statesmanship.

Furthermore, it gives evidence of keen political perception and an awareness that obstructionist tactics in Congress can do little good to either Mr. JOHNSON or the Democratic Party; in fact, that they might harm both immeasurably.

This is especially true in light of the fact that pollsters report a new firming of the Chief Executive's popularity. And the mounting evidence that the balanced budget campaign of the White House is getting support from the public.

Aside from the fact that Senator JOHNSON has little truck with the obstructionist in Government, one must recognize at all times the Texans' amazing ability to find the pulse of the people.

It makes him something of a political genius.

Lowenstein Writes Letter on Textile Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from Mr. Leon Lowenstein, who is an outstanding figure on the American textile manufacturing scene. Mr. Lowenstein, in his capacity as executive chairman of the board of M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc., has first-hand knowledge of how excessive amount of foreign textile imports are affecting various areas in our Nation, for his firm operates mills in several sections. One of these is located in Huntsville, Ala., and, with its 143,816 spindles, employs 1,250 people.

Mr. Lowenstein has just written a letter to Mr. Robert Jackson, executive vice president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., and, believing this letter, outlining the problems of the domestic textile industry, will be of interest to my colleagues, I wish to insert it in the RECORD under leave heretofore granted:

M. LOWENSTEIN & SONS, INC.,
New York, N.Y., July 14, 1959.

Mr. ROBERT C. JACKSON,
Executive Vice President, the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: There isn't a day that goes by that I don't get at least half a dozen telephone calls from somebody regarding imports. Some of our customers, in fact a good many of them, are getting very scared, especially when they read (in the Daily News Record of July 6) that "Spain is offering worsteds, ginghams below Japan price." I imagine you read that article.

I hear from every quarter that these large buyers of soft goods are opening offices all over. I heard from a large millman (I am not going to mention his name but he is well known to you) that he was contemplating putting up a building alongside of the mill he has on cottons, and when I say large mill I mean one that would hold about 100,000 spindles. I understand he is now running 5 days but he also made the statement, in his own language, "the hell with it, I am going to run 6." Are the mills in the South going to go the way of the mills in the East?

I now see an article by Jacob S. Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Workers of America, which appeared in the Daily News Record of Wednesday, July 8. It bears the caption, "Potofsky Hits Retailers Aiding Japan Imports." What is happening? You know, in my book it is much easier to stop something before it happens than to stop something that has already happened.

I understand that as of the present time there are no quotas for any foreign countries. I am told, and I am not so sure about this, that the only country the United States has any understanding with is Japan, which has a voluntary quota.

This leaves everything in the wide open spaces in countries like Hong Kong, India, Spain, Italy. How long is it going to be before we will hear about Russia? I understand they bought $5 million of textile machinery, all new, for quick shipment. There is no question about it; a lot of other industries are going to be affected, if not already affected. I am talking about automobiles, etc.

Now let's go into this cotton area. There is going to be more and more cotton all over the world, and America has to meet this cotton competitive price. I claim that any manufacturer in any foreign country, whether he uses American cotton or cotton grown in any other country of the world, should be required to pay a compensating duty on the cotton content of the article that comes into this country. As an example, if a yard of goods comes in weighing half a pound, whatever discount we give the foreign manufacturer to buy our cloth should be added on as a tax. That's the least that textile mills in this country can expect. The same should also apply to garment manufacturers. This gives the manufacturer in foreign countries one edge, and that is labor. That should be plenty for them; and then, of course, to offset the influx, even this with one edge there should be quotas, and proper ones.

Washington talks about small business. Irrespective of what happens in this textile business regarding importation of foreign goods, the small independent mill will be the first one to be put out of business. I read in the various papers what Washington continually wants to do for the small businessman. Lending him money isn't going to do any good if he is going to lose money on his operation, because this only puts him in a worse position.

Now, as to Mr. Potofsky's remarks, I have written letters on this subject to people in industries outside of the industries that are now being affected directly. If, for example, an automobile company in Michigan that has 5,000 employees decides to increase its imports from its own plants abroad, and then lets out 1,000 of its Michigan employees, while it may give work to people abroad, those 1,000 employees in Michigan have lost their jobs and have lost their purchasing power. The retailing organizations in the community in Michigan will not have the dollars to draw on for their sales, and will, of necessity, have to cut down on their purchases. This, in turn, will affect, say, a textile manufacturer in Pennsylvania. Of neces-

sity, those two will have to reduce their labor force. This whole thing snowballs.

Why am I writing you all of the above? I know this is nothing new to you, but it alerts you and tells you how some of the people that I meet with feel about this whole situation, and it is action that we need.

You can use this letter as you see fit.

As ever, with best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

LEON LOWENSTEIN.

Straight From the Shoulder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the following editorial by Ben Field which appeared in the July 7, 1959, issue of the Orlando Star and which I feel will prove of interest to my colleagues:

STRAIGHT FROM THE SHOULDER

If we had more jurists such as Judge Dozier DeVane this country would be safe, at least from deteriorating from within. But unfortunately we have too many of the other ilk—men in key positions of Government who are setting themselves above the Congress and the Constitution—the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Judge DeVane told Orlandoans in a recent address here that if something was not done soon to stop the trend in the manner in which the Supreme Court is arriving at its decisions, the Nation will soon be ruled by a judicial oligarchy.

What the judge was really saying was that the "nine old men," though their age average has been lowered some by younger men, are making the laws of the land, when all the Constitution intended for them to do was to interpret them.

Judge DeVane asked that the people demand a constitutional amendment to correct the inroads the Court is making on the Congress and the Constitution. Here said there is now an amendment before the House, introduced by Representative SIKES, of Florida, to correct abuse, but that it takes a long time to get a constitutional amendment through Congress and on the ballot to be voted on by the people, or to have the necessary number of legislatures adopt it to make it law.

Most folks in the South look upon the decision that struck down segregation in the schools as being the Court's most damaging decision to this part of the country. But Judge DeVane says that to him this decision created only trifling damage compared to the decision which ruled children in the public schools could not be required to salute the American flag and swear allegiance to the Republic for which it stands. The other most damaging decision was that which ruled out any mention of God in the classrooms.

The judge rightly said that only under God can this Nation endure.

What we need is more jurists who will speak out as Judge DeVane has on several occasions. He is no alarmist. He was named to the Federal court for the north district of Florida. He knows his law and our Constitution.

He is one of a group of justices and jurists over the Nation who have condemned the procedure by which the Supreme Court is reaching its decisions, as a procedure which, if not changed, will mean that future generations in the United States will be ruled by the men sitting on the court benches instead of by the elected officials of the people in the Congress.

Such a government would be anything but American.

It's the People's Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. David Lawrence appeared in the July 20 number of U.S. News & World Report.

Mr. Lawrence, with his usual perspicacity, brings out some interesting points on the President's vetoes and veto power. First, the President is the only elected official in the United States who is elected by all the people, and for that reason his veto is, most probably, far more representative of the people than any acts of the Congress.

The article follows:

IT'S THE PEOPLE'S VETO

(By David Lawrence)

Political discussion lately has centered on the presidential veto. The Democratic national chairman has urged members of his party in Congress to exercise their power to force vetoes on the theory that it is politically advantageous to do so. President Eisenhower, on the other hand, has been accused of using his authority to negate the will of Congress, and there have been denunciations of this as "government by veto."

What we are witnessing today is the strange phenomenon of irresponsible government because there exists in both Houses of Congress a two-thirds majority which is opposite to the party in control of the executive branch of the Government. There have been instances where, even when the same party controlled the White House and two-thirds of both Houses of Congress, a presidential veto has been overridden. This is a reflection of public opinion—it is, in a sense, the people's veto of a presidential action.

In the 1937 battle between President Roosevelt and Congress on legislation to increase the membership of the Supreme Court from 9 to 15 Justices, he could not muster even a 51-percent majority, though the Democrats actually had elected in 1936 more than two-thirds of both Houses. The people said, "No."

The truth is, as Woodrow Wilson wrote in his book on "Constitutional Government" 5 years before he became President, the Chief Executive alone is in a position to represent the national interest, and he can derive substantial power and prestige from his hold on public opinion. This is why there is a fallacy in the oft-repeated comment that a President in his second term is a "lame duck" and that the Constitution should not have been amended to prohibit more than two terms in the Presidency.

This amendment was adopted in 1947 to some extent on the theory that a President leads by reason of the patronage or favors he can dispense and that, if eligible continually for reelection, he could win votes in Congress by virtually bribing Members with promises of presidential beneficence. But this assumes that an unpopular President could thwart the public will. It ignores the fact that every 2 years all Members of the House, along with a third of the Senate, must go before the electorate.

A President is as strong as the public opinion that he is able to mobilize. Mr. Eisenhower is in a powerful position today precisely because he is not a candidate for another term. The country feels he is not politically ambitious, and he has announced that he will not attempt to dictate the nominee of the 1960 Republican National Convention.

Whatever influence Mr. Eisenhower has over his own party or over the members of the Democratic Party in Congress comes from his accurate sensing of the national will. He himself, in discussing this point at last week's press conference, said:

"I am trying to do what will, I believe, be good for the country, and I don't enjoy vetoing bills. I don't believe that there is any validity in such expressions as 'government by veto.'

"I am part of the process of legislation and when I am the only official, along with the Vice President, who is voted into office by all the people, I think I have got a special responsibility to all the people. So, I try to tell them and explain to them what I am doing. If they approve, that ought to have some effect."

The argument is sometimes made that a majority of the people are in favor of the Democratic Party because in the 1958 election Democrats carried both the House and the Senate overwhelmingly. It is pointed out that even in 1956, when President Eisenhower was reelected, the Democrats actually polled more votes for Congress than did the Republicans. The figures, however, present a statistical paradox. For, actually, the votes for Congress are cast in individual districts or States, and, where one congressional candidate is acknowledged to have preponderant support, many citizens do not take the trouble to vote.

Recently another paradox has been noted in the Gallup polls. They show Mr. Eisenhower to have made a gain in popularity from 52 to 62 percent since last year's congressional elections. But the pollsters still find that more people label themselves as Democrats than as Republicans.

This has little bearing on what the Nation wants at any particular moment by way of legislation or action by the Executive. Each proposal or national policy has to be judged on its merits. If the President vetoes a bill and public opinion generally is on his side, it would not be good politics for members of the opposite party or of his own party to override the veto.

The President is elected by all the people. He is not supposed to bow to sectional or pressure groups.

Mr. Eisenhower is singularly free from political entanglements. He has no political ambition. He has only a little more than 18 months to serve. If he refuses to sign a bill, it's because he thinks that is what the people want. This is indeed a people's veto.

Housing Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the urban renewal agency of the city of Fargo, N. Dak., by resolution has requested the Congress to override the President's veto

of the 1959 housing bill. This legislation was of vital importance to Fargo and other cities throughout the Nation. I shall vote to override the veto if given the opportunity.

Under unanimous consent, I include this resolution, adopted July 9, 1959, in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OVERRIDE THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE HOUSING BILL

Whereas it has been called to our attention that the President of the United States recently vetoed the 1959 housing bill passed by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas it is our understanding that the bill vetoed by the President was a compromise bill; and

Whereas this commission is of the opinion that the federally aided urban renewal program is of vital importance to the cities throughout the United States; and

Whereas at the present time hundreds of applications are being held by the Federal Government pending favorable action toward the adoption of a new housing bill that will provide funds for urban renewal; and

Whereas municipalities in the State of North Dakota together with the city of Fargo are interested in participating in the federally aided urban renewal program; and

Whereas this commission is unanimously of the opinion that the citizens of the city of Fargo are benefiting from the carrying out of the North Dakota R–1 urban renewal project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Fargo Urban Renewal Agency, That we do hereby recommend to the Senators and Congressmen from the State of North Dakota and to the entire Congress of the United States that they override the President's veto of the 1959 housing bill; and be it further

Resolved, That this board of commissioners does hereby recommend to the board of commissioners of the city of Fargo, that they adopt a similar resolution; and be it further

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Fargo Urban Renewal Agency, That we do hereby direct the executive director to forward copies of this resolution to the North Dakota congressional Representatives and to the board of commissioners of the city of Fargo.

A Great American Tradition, the Timp Hike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, thousands of Utahans and other Americans visited the slopes and trails of Utah's Mount Timpanogos on the weekend just past.

This famous peak, the highest in the mountain-bound congressional district which I represent, is in a sense the Nation's most challenging and alluring mountain. Among the thousands who gathered Friday and Saturday on its slopes, hundreds conquered its 12,000-foot summit, played on its tiny glacier, drank the icy, sun-pure water from its many waterfalls, and breathed the enchanting aroma from its myriad bloom of delicately colored flowers.

These climbers were participants in the 48th annual Timp Hike, which has become one of the outstanding traditions of mountain recreation in America. To my knowledge, this hike is the largest annual organized hike in America.

The tradition began in 1912 when Prof. Eugene L. Roberts, a Brigham Young University coach, led a small party of hikers to the Timpanogos summit. The peak had been conquered by many climbers, of course, but this was the first party to propose the hike as an annual pilgrimage. The tradition has continued for 48 years—through two world wars, through mountain storms, and through rubber and gasoline rationing.

Accurate records have been kept on the climbers reaching the summit in recent years. They show the hike has become a national and international attraction. For the past 10 years no fewer than 22 States and 5 foreign countries have been represented each year.

The success of the program seems to have three cornerstones. The first and most important, of course, is the natural enchantment of the mountain itself. Its jagged, massive crest looms above the two most heavily populated valleys of my district. Timpanogos is 30 miles south of Salt Lake City at the south end of Salt Lake Valley and 10 miles north of Provo on the north side end of Utah Valley. The climbers find a great variety of minerals, plants, and animal life on its slopes. Cottontail and jackrabbits and many birds inhabit the lower mountain. On the higher reaches, the deer, mouse chipmunk, packrat, gopher, ground squirrel, marmot, and badger roam.

To the botanist, the mountain is one of nature's finest laboratories. Its range of elevation embraces every Merriam-type zone except the Sonoran zone. The rocky summit juts above the timberline which, at northern Utah's latitude, is 10,000 feet. The growing season on the mountain is short, and the flowers bloom in brilliant hues. The bright colors attract insects and speed the pollination process. In mid-July, when the hike usually takes place, the slopes bloom with one of Utah's most beautiful flowers, the primrose.

If the trees near the timberline are not entirely covered by the heavy snows, they are frozen for many months of the year. It is not unusual to find trees on Timpanogos which, judged to be 50 years old, stand only 6 inches tall.

The value of the mountain as a natural laboratory led the Brigham Young University to establish a summer school at Aspen Grove, the camp on its northeast base, where the main hike originates.

A second cornerstone in the tradition is the history and legend of the mountain. The name has an Indian origin. To the Indians, the word "Timp" meant stony, and the word "nogos" meant river. Timpanogos got its name, "Stony River," from the Provo River, which courses its southeast slopes. The stream is one of the outstanding fishing streams of the intermountain West.

Father Escalante, travelling the Utah Valley in the year this Nation declared its independence, mentioned in his notes that the Indians called the river and the mountain by the name "Timpanogos."

The most famous story of the Timpanogos legend, "Utahna and Red Eagle," was written by Coach Eugene L. Roberts—who became better known to Utahans and westerners as "Timpanogos" Roberts—in a booklet entitled "Timpanogos" published in 1922, on the 10th anniversary of the hike, by the Brigham Young University, the Provo Chamber of Commerce, and the American Fork Commercial Club.

Community cooperation has been another cornerstone of the tradition. With the strong support of every community in northern Utah County, the Brigham Young University, now the largest church-operated university in America, and the Provo Chamber of Commerce have remained the principal sponsors of the hike.

Constant attention to safety has also contributed to its success. For this year's hike, a Salt Lake County organization joined the Utah County sponsors, and assumed responsibility for the safety precautions and rescue operations on the hike. This organization, the Salt Lake County Sheriff's Rescue Posse, headed by Captain C. W. Brady, maintained radio communications and first-aid stations on the trails. Despite the growing numbers of climbers who participate, accidents have been rare.

The recent statistics show the hikers average 19 to 20 years in age—19.95 for the men and 19.61 for the fairer sex. Children as young as 4 years of age have reached the summit with their parents, and climbers as old as 79 have reached it. But the hike officials have discouraged the participation of persons at either age extreme.

Coach Roberts was inspired to organize the annual hike by his experience as a missionary to Switzerland for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. This experience gave him a keen interest in mountain climbing, and he transferred that interest to the great peak which dominates Utah Valley upon his return. He continued to lead the annual climb himself until 1927, when he left Brigham Young University to accept a professorship at the University of Southern California. Upon his departure, Dr. J. C. Hart, now chairman of the Department of Physical Education for Men, assumed direction of the hike, and continues to direct it today.

In 1930, "Summit Club" badges were offered for the first time. They have become the traditional reward for the climbers who reach the summit. The Summit Club membership in the early 1930's ran a few hundred annually. Last year 2,025 hikers claimed their badges.

A small glacier, a remnant of the ponderous ice age giants which once blanketed most of the continent, caps the popular approach to the summit. A slide down the glacier is the climax of the event for many climbers.

The U.S. Forest Service has made an important contribution to the hike tradition. It has helped BYU students, and others, build and maintain the trails. It has built and maintained ex-

cellent comfort facilities for campers and hikers at Aspen Grove.

It seems certain that the Timp hike, now nearly 50 years old, will make an even greater contribution to American recreation in another half century. It is my wish that each of my colleagues might one day visit this famous mountain and perhaps make the hike. The beauty of Timpanogos, however, is wrapped up in no one event and no single season. It probably draws more visitors in autumn than in any other season. It wears a majestic robe of brilliant leaves through early and late autumn. In winter and spring its canyons are havens for skiiers, skaters and other winter sports enthusiasts, and in summer, they are havens for picknickers as well as hikers. But I have stressed the hike because it somehow, to me, embodies the spirit which is America—the spirit of the continuous upward climb, a spirit born of freedom and challenge. I find the same feeling in the words of Dr. C. J. Hart, who said, in a recent communication to me:

We who have to do with the Timpanogos hike firmly believe that everyone should stand on a high peak at least once each year and view the handiwork of mother nature. We say, let this mountain top be Timpanogos, the wonder mountain. We firmly believe the Timpanogos hike is America's greatest community climb.

Powerplants on the Trinity River in Northern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, within the next week we will largely determine the issue of whether the Federal Government or the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is to construct and operate the power plants on the Trinity River in northern California. The Senate-House conferees on the public works appropriations bill will decide if funds shall be spent by the Government on the generators, and the House Interior Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation will decide if the company's proposal to build and run them itself will be accepted.

The issue resolves itself down to the elementary question, Should the Government decrease the Treasury by $60 million, or should we permit the company to spend its own $60 million for construction, pay $4.6 million a year for the use of the falling-water and pay $83 million in Federal taxes?

"Economy with a capital E is the outstanding advantage in the United States—P.G. & E. partnership plan for the huge Trinity River reclamation program which has been recommended to Congress for approval by Secretary Fred Seaton," states the Sanger (Calif.) Herald. "In offering to build the power generating and distribution facilities of the Trinity River project, the P.G. & E. will be saving taxpayers in California and elsewhere many millions of dollars. The utility will, in addition, be helping California to solve one of its greatest problems—developing of adequate supplies of agricultural and domestic water," reads an editorial from the San Jose (Calif.) Mercury.

The basic economic consideration governing the issue, as stated accurately by the Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press Democrat, is that, "P.G. & E., not the Nation's taxpayers, would pay the $60 million cost of installing the generators. It would pay $4,500,000 a year to the Government for use of the falling water to drive the generators. It would pay Federal and State taxes on its property investment." The Chico (Calif.) Enterprise-Record points out that, "the public power advocates object to that plan, primarily because it would mean that the preference customers would not be able to get power cheaper than the rest of us. We believe the basic principle involved here is this: Preference customers, such as the Sacramento, Redding, and Roseville City power districts, add up to about 7 percent of the population of the service area. The remaining 93 percent of the people," continues the Enterprise-Record, "are just simple citizens and taxpayers like those of us in Chico and do not rate as preference customers. Thus, does it make sense that 93 percent of us should be taxed to build the power facilities so that 7 percent can buy power cheaper? We don't think so. We think that setup would be nothing more than 93 percent of us paying part of the electricity bill for the other 7 percent." In the case at hand, this statement cannot be controverted.

The San Juan (Calif.) Mission News sums up the question more than adequately in concluding:

Throughout the Nation there are independent utility companies doing the same thing, providing power and gas to customers, and paying taxes. Regulated, taxpaying private enterprise can and will undertake any feasible job, no matter how big or costly, and can and will do the job cheaper than Government can. Why any Congressman or Senator will favor socialism over capitalism is far beyond our understanding.

Bridging the Wide Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Linton Civic Club of Linton, N. Dak., pointing out the necessity of a bridge across the Missouri River:

Whereas public interest has been directed to the necessity of a bridge across the Missouri River somewhere between Mobridge, S. Dak., and Bismarck, N. Dak.; and

Whereas two bridgees across the Missouri in South Dakota have been declared surplus since they had to be replaced by longer bridges because of Oahe Reservoir, and that these bridges have been suggested for relocation upstream from Mobridge, S. Dak.; and

Whereas the distance between Mobridge, S. Dak., and Bismarck, N. Dak., is approximately 140 road miles, and that a point on the Missouri in Emmons County west of the city of Linton would be approximately halfway between Mobridge and Bismarck, and that the stretch between these two cities is the longest stretch on the Missouri River without a bridge in either North or South Dakota, and that a public free bridge between these two points would be for the benefit and convenience of the public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Linton Civic Club, representing the merchants and professional men of the city of Linton, N. Dak., That we go on record urging and requesting the Federal Government in cooperation with the State of North Dakota, to construct a bridge across the Missouri River at some point in Emmons County west of Linton, N. Dak.; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the State highway commissioner, U.S. Representatives DON L. SHORT and QUENTIN BURDICK, and U.S. Senators MILTON R. YOUNG and WILLIAM LANGER.

PETER A. HORNER,
President.
PETER A. KRAFT,
Secretary.

More Farm Production Means Lower Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading farm newspapers for as long as I can remember has been the Wallaces Farmer, which is published in Des Moines, Iowa, in the congressional district I have the pleasure to represent in Congress. This farm magazine has printed many articles which analyze farm problems, but one which is especially well written is the one by Al Bull appearing in the July 18, 1959, issue. With controls on corn production abandoned under the new Benson corn program, corn production zoomed upward, and now the Agriculture Department admits that the Commodity Credit Corporation, at the end of this year, will have more corn than wheat; yet, farmers working harder and feeding more of that corn to convert it into protein products receive less income than if they had let some of the corn rot or never had produced it at all. I hope my fellow Members of Congress will read and absorb the contents of the following article:

MORE FARM PRODUCTION MEANS LOWER INCOME—ECONOMISTS CALL IT INELASTIC DEMAND—THAT'S WHY PRICES DROP SO FAST WHEN A FEW EXTRA HOGS ARE MARKETED

(By Al Bull)

More pigs mean lower prices. This is the same with most industries turning out products for sale.

In agriculture an increase in supply of food items drops prices so much that total income is less than from the original smaller

supply. When this happens, demand is called inelastic.

Here's a simple example:

Suppose you are making a product and that you can sell 100 units for a dollar each. If you make 110 of these units, you must cut the price to 80 cents to sell the larger output: Output 100, 110; price $1, 80 cents; income $100, $88.

Gross income is less from the 110 units than from 100 units. A 10-percent increase in supply decreased price by 20 percent.

An extreme example, some folks will say. Not so. Let's look at hogs.

Here are USDA figures for 1954 through 1956:

Year	Million head slaughtered	Average price per 100 pounds	Income from hogs (billion)
1954	66.0	$21.60	$3.5
1955	75.4	15.00	2.7
1956	77.8	14.40	2.6

If you want to do some figuring, the price drops here are about in line with the simple example given above.

Most other agricultural products not under price support can supply similar case histories. Eggs, for example, are in big supply right now—and prices are down sharply.

Broiler production under integration zoomed in recent years. And prices nosedived. This increased-production low-price route is the usual one for sections of agriculture moving under integration.

Expanding markets faster than population growth within the United States is extremely difficult. Desire for food is limited by the capacity of the stomach—which is largely inelastic.

Two factors do tend to stretch farm markets a little each year. One is rising per capita incomes. The other is a growing population.

Population has been increasing by 1½ to 2 percent a year. That's a help, but no complete solution. The same crop acres now in production will be able to supply the food for the 230 million people expected by 1975, according to USDA estimates.

The climbing income level is of limited help, too. Most folks are already eating about all they really want. So they have a choice of how to spend the extra cash.

Choices include a second car or television set, a boat, better quality food, more built-in food services, and more restaurant meals.

This gives a clue as to why agricultural demands are inelastic while demand for autos or television sets may not be.

If prices dropped low enough, you might buy a second television set or a second car.

But no matter how low prices get, you're not likely to eat four eggs for breakfast instead of two. Or to start eating a second breakfast every morning.

Desire for food is limited by the capacity of the stomach, while desire for services, better clothes, improved housing, and the like seems almost endless.

Most of the expenditures for food go toward improved quality or added services. Perhaps the homemaker buys a cake instead of a cake mix.

U.S. consumers find themselves in an enviable position. They are supplied with more food than they can eat. And money enough to buy pretty much what they choose. Food takes a smaller percentage of their income than in the past.

Most nations of the world would gladly trade their food problems for the one we face.

A little study of inelastic demand is rewarding. History shows that it also works in reverse.

That is, a decrease in supply increases prices enough so that total income is greater than from a larger crop.

If enough resources can be transferred from agriculture to other industries, output will be reduced. Then agricultural income will rise.

It isn't easy to get inelastic demand working in the price-raising direction. We have more production facilities than we currently need. They are controlled by millions of operators making independent decisions. An individual decision has no measurable effect.

With this situation, most folks tend to do what is best for them as individuals. Often this is contrary to the best interest of the industry.

The inelastic demand situation we face indicates one thing. We can't produce ourselves to riches. Adequate incomes to farm people can come only by balancing our production with demand in some way.

With adequate guidance, probably from government, decisions could be lined up in the direction of lower production and higher incomes.

Protection of Union Rights as Well as Protection From Union Wrongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, like other Members of Congress who have had no active part in the redrafting of the Senate version of the labor-management reform bill, I am somewhat at a disadvantage in answering mail and discussing this important legislation.

I do hope, however, in the very near future to have an opportunity to study the final draft when the committee completes its work. Certainly the need of corrective legislation continues to be pointed up by the McClellan committee hearings. In the public interest Congress should enact a bill before adjournment.

Meanwhile, I am getting phone calls, telegrams, and mail asking where I stand on the bill, and while, of course, the circumstances make any such declaration in detail impossible, I want to state my general views as nearly as I can at this time.

Last year I supported the Kennedy-Ives bill. My fear was, and still is, that we will fail to enact a law. I do not hope for one that will please everyone, but it seems to me it is extremely important before the subject gets cold to get a law on the statute books.

I hope after the usual compromise of conflicting viewpoints that Congress enacts a reasonable yet effective bill. I do not favor unnecessarily restrictive provisions, but it is essential to include accountability of union finances and protection of rank and file members from usurpation of their rights by their officials and officers. I am opposed to too much Government control, but rather am convinced the secret ballot and democratic procedure will cure most evils.

My preference is for reasonable penalties for errors and infringement of lawful requirements so as not to discourage ordinary members from holding union office. Also I would not require unions to accept all applications for membership such as Communists or crooks.

Now as to the much-advertised sections covering secondary boycotts and picketing, likewise as to the hot cargo provision, I would want to distinguish clearly in the language what effect any such bans or restrictions would contain. No one will be for blackmail but there must be careful protection of innocent parties in labor disputes so as not to curb legitimate union functions. Frankly, when the House considers each amendment I shall try to put each proposal to a test. If a provision would jeopardize a proper union function it should be defeated. If it strikes at corruption without impeding or diminishing established rights it should be supported. Also I might add in all cases the police responsibilities of the Government and protection of its facilities and services should be upheld as against special interests including union interests.

The members of unions have the most at stake in freeing their organizations from any racketeers, and I am confident existing improper situations can be cured. I favor a law without too much regimentation and redtape. But when I say—as a have said—I favor a stiff bill, I mean a law with a strong measure of protection of union rights as well as protection from union wrongs.

Let's pass a bill to eliminate crooks, but I intend to make sure that the long range result of my vote will not do violence to the union movement in which I believe.

Automobile Accidents Costly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the terrible toll of human lives on the highways is, of course, the paramount reason for my interest in legislation promoting traffic safety. Another consideration, also important, is that of the cost of these accidents.

Under unanimous consent I ask for the following editorial, taken from the Anniston (Ala.) Star, to be inserted in the RECORD:

ACCIDENTS ARE COSTLY

The killing of 310 persons on the highways over the Memorial Day weekend had State enforcement authorities cracking down over the Fourth of July weekend.

In Massachusetts, for example, there was a policeman on duty for every 2 miles of highway, plus 1,000 marked police cars and 500 unmarked patrol vehicles.

The crackdown paid off to the extent that the death toll in traffic last weekend was held to 276, as against the National Safety Council's prediction of 350.

Strict law enforcement is one obvious answer to highway deaths.

Another involves manufacturing standards, and these appropriately are being looked into further at this time by the House Inter-

state Commerce subcommittee on health and safety, which is headed by Congressman KENNETH ROBERTS.

If the auto makers are reluctant to incorporate additional safety features in new cars because of the cost, it would be well for them to consider the terrible toll that automobile accidents take in material wealth, as well as in lives.

In 1940 the cost of accidents was estimated at $1.6 billion; last year it was $5.4 billion.

This means that motorists would have been able to pay in excess of $1,000 more for every new car they bought in 1958, if they had not been saddled with the bill for millions of accidents.

Cities, Towns, People Seek Uncle Sam's Aid as Easy Solution to Their Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the July 15, 1959 issue of the Wall Street Journal points up the difficulty in reducing Federal spending. In a clear manner and with appropriate examples it portrays how local communities have lost the urge to solve their own problems by following the currently popular pastime of asking help from Washington for every type of local project.

The author of the article refers repeatedly to the fact that much of this problem was exposed by questions asked by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] in a Banking and Currency Committee meeting. Mr. WIDNALL should be complimented for the searching manner in which he brought to light the eagerness of local officials to run to Washington, instead of trying to solve their own problems. Those of us who are interested in reducing Federal spending and preserving government at the local level are indebted to him for his timely contribution.

The article follows:

CITIES, TOWNS, PEOPLE SEEK UNCLE SAM'S AID AS EASY SOLUTION TO THEIR PROBLEM

(By Paul Duke)

WASHINGTON.—Mayor Robert Egan of Flint, Mich., plopped a hefty briefcase on the table and opened up his big bag of troubles to congressional gaze. Flint, he proceeded to say, urgently needed help to finance water and sewage projects.

Mr. Egan had come to Washington to tell members of a House Banking Subcommittee he was all in favor of a proposed $1 billion low-interest-rate Federal loan program for public health projects. But Representative WIDNALL, a New Jersey Republican, was troubled by the mayor's testimony. Why, asked Mr. WIDNALL, was Flint running to Uncle Sam when the city already enjoyed an excellent credit rating and had no trouble selling bonds for municipal improvements? Why should the Government borrow money at more than 4 percent and then lend it to Flint at a cheaper rate?

Mr. Egan didn't lack an answer. "I am merely looking for an easy solution to the question," he said simply.

The reply spelled out the obvious. The search for an easy solution brings thousands of local government leaders, businessmen, union officials and assorted aid-seekers to the U.S. Capital every year. This parade points up a vast illusion abroad in the land—the illusion that Federal funds are somehow free funds. As Mr. WIDNALL put it: "There seems to be a tendency on the part of a lot of people to feel that when something is financed by the Federal Government it doesn't cost them anything."

But the problem goes deeper. The never-ending march on Washington is one form of response to the complexities and pressures spawned by rapid changes in American economic life today. In a nation which prides itself on its supposedly competitive society, business and farm groups frequently come hat in hand, pleading for Federal subsidies or controls or protection.

THE EASY WAY

Then there are the public officials who come seeking Federal assistance—the representatives of cities, counties, towns and hamlets. Their reasons are frequently complex: Sometimes it may be because of a sharp dwindling of local tax sources or because those sources are being taxed to the saturation point; at other times it may be because of a lack of political courage and a refusal to face up to local responsibility. Thus, officials of a conservative-minded community frequently find it more expedient to ask Federal help than to face up to the politically dangerous task of increasing local taxes or cutting back services.

The logical next step would be for the localities to turn to the States. But they, too, have shortages of adequate revenue sources and are torn by diverse political pressures. Most State legislatures still have a rural complexion that tends to make them conservative. As a result, local officials frequently feel impelled to turn to Washington when State governments give them the cold shoulder.

An eastern Democratic Congressman notes that State legislatures are under strong pressures from well-organized groups opposed to tax increases or additional State help to communities. "When a legislature buckles to these pressures, there's nothing for a mayor or councilman to do but take the train to Washington," he adds. "The result is a sort of natural alliance between the Federal Government and the localities."

The subject of State responsibility was brought into the banking panel's hearing when Herbert Bingham, of the Tennessee Municipal League, was testifying. Mr. WIDNALL again applied the needle and asked why Tennessee wasn't helping its towns and cities finance their water and sewerage needs. "They can finance things cheaper than the Federal Government—why don't they do it?" he jabbed.

Mr. Bingham reckoned he would have to give "a brutal answer to a brutal problem." State government, he said, is "basically an irresponsible level of government in this country." Not only do the States shirk their own responsibilities, but "they will not even provide authority for local governments to solve their own problems," Mr. Bingham declared in referring to State constitutional limitations on bonded indebtedness which communities may incur. "The States have not stepped forward with an adequate program in the highway field, the hospital field, the unemployment field, or any field you want to mention."

Harold K. Schone, director of public works in Oakland County, Mich., contended States have too many problems of their own to worry about bailing out localities. As for seeking State help, Mr. Schone took the view "there's no sense in walking up a blind alley."

As a result of all this turning to Washington, one fact stands out sharp and clear: The Federal Government's contribution to total government expenditures has been steadily spiraling. Fifty years ago less than one-third of all governmental expenditures were made at the Federal level and two-thirds by the States and localities. Now, this ratio is roughly reversed. The defense effort is a major reason for the change, of course. But domestic programs have been burgeoning, too. Federal aid to State and local governments now averages almost 20 percent of general State outlays.

BACK TO THE STATES

In recent years there have been various proposals to turn back some Federal functions and tax sources to the States—notably proposals fathered by the Eisenhower administration. The Joint Federal-State Action Committee has recommended that water pollution and vocational education programs be relinquished by the Federal Government. In return for assuming command of these activities, the States would receive up to about $150 million a year of the revenue from the tax on local telephone service levied by the Federal Government.

But the President's proposal is not likely to get anywhere. In fact, congressional Democrats are driving to double the $50 million-a-year Federal water pollution program rather than gradually abandon it as recommended by President Eisenhower. The Democrats advance a simple argument for doing so: The Federal program is working; and there is no assurance the States, whose record in clearing up rivers and streams is unimpressive, would continue the progress.

As the Federal Government widens its scope of operations, cries for economy tend to ring out louder—but often accompanied by a lower-pitched but.

A Midwest Democratic Congressman tells about the political wheelhorse back in his home district who keeps a steady bombardment of letters and telegrams uring support for a flock of spending proposals. Then the other day I picked up the paped and damned if he dasn't making the fieriest speech you ever saw denouncing Federal spending.

A Virginia conservative hears a lot of griping about spending in one particularly conservative stronghold of his district. Yet this same area is benefiting from sizable Federal aid for airports, water pollution work, highways, and Post Office and National Guard armory construction. Nobody was griping about these.

Similarly, business groups denounce increased Federal outlays for such things as public works projects. Yet delegations from local chambers of commerce stream into town to plead for money for dams and reclamation projects in their backyards. James K. Vardaman, former member of the Federal Reserve Board, recently told a Georgia audience he had yet to find one wholly unselfish organization, be it political, labor, industry, military, agriculture or social.

The Banking subcommittee hearings ran the customary gamut of witnesses. Local government, labor, hospital and housing groups lined up in favor of the legislation to provide expanded aid for local water, sewer, hospital or nursing home construction. Business and financial representatives attacked the bill—except for one manufacturer. His product: Sewer pipe.

SHARP DISAGREEMENT

The testimony threw a lot of illumination on Federal spending; most everybody agreed that increased construction of local public works was worthless. Some witnesses, indeed, said that more local governments, like people, should stand on their own feet. And when Spencer Smith, economics professor at the University of Maryland, said: "All economics can be summed up in the fact that there is no such thing as a free lunch," he spoke truths all the other witnesses, including Mayor Egan of Flint, doubtless would readily admit.

But the testimony also showed that one reason for the great growth of Federal aid comes because people with problems think that the easy solution is to make believe the lunch is free.

High Time for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in Il Progresso on Sunday, July 12, 1959, and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

HIGH TIME FOR ACTION

For more than a year and a half there has been an ever increasing torrent of abuse and vilification directed against Americans of Italian origin, who comprise one of the most important segments of American life. A systematic campaign of defamation has been given wide circulation through slanted articles in nationwide newspaper chains and magazines, and books, which become "best-sellers" through the artful drum-beating of modern press-agentry. But the most frequent offenders are television and motion pictures through gangster portrayals on their screens, using Italian names for the evil characters or what are easily recognized as "Italian types".

One need only turn his TV dial and lo and behold, there is one of those blood-curdling sagas in which the unsavory villain is pictured as a hoodlum with "Italian" features.

Many years ago Il Progresso spearheaded a drive to eliminate the racial identification, in news items and stories, of elements caught in the toils of the law. That campaign was widely commended by public officials, editors and publishers who agreed that the sins of the few should not be visited on the many; and for years no accused or convicted person was identified, in the public prints, as to race or color.

What has happened to change all this? In November of 1957 a group of Americans of Italian descent met in a small New York State village called Apalachin. Some of them had criminal records. The purpose of their meeting has never been explained. But if they were meeting for some nefarious undertaking, we not only do not condone them, but we denounce them and their ilk, for this tiny group of 60 furnished the pretext for bringing discredit and contempt on more than 12 million loyal, law-abiding, decent Americans of Italian origin who daily make their valuable contribution to the enrichment of our country in every field of human endeavor.

Since that day, sensation-seeking organs spawned the specter of a sinister international organization of criminals, presumably composed exclusively of men of Italian or Sicilian extraction, which they call the maffia. And they have been making a roman holiday of the terroristic activities of these men and their henchmen, attributing to them infiltration into and control of many legitimate businesses and undertakings, including labor unions. And in passing they mention Italian products and Italian communities which defer to the maffia.

If this crime syndicate exists in fact, the conclusion is inescapable that all law-enforcement authorities, city, State, and Federal, have broken down. We cannot conceive of the disintegration of the FBI, the Treasury and Immigration Departments, and we resent this inference, as much as we deplore the insinuations against our people.

Like ourselves, many social, civic and fraternal organizations, as well as many individuals prominent in industry, in commerce, in civil service and in the Judiciary, have openly decried the patently unjust association of all Americans of Italian heritage with the criminal acts of the few.

In this connection we are happy to note that two U.S. Senators, HUGH SCOTT of Pennsylvania, and KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, have taken up the cudgels against the defamation of our ethnic group and have urged a national investigation. In letters to Attorney General William P. Rogers and Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson, the two Senators ask a full report on the alleged existence of a nationwide organization of criminals; what is being done to eliminate such a conspiracy if it exists; and if no conspiracy exists, a statement to that effect. They also ask for a statement of policy of both Departments of Government to protect the civil rights of people mistakenly identified with criminal acts, and instruction to Federal agents to beware of defamatory public statements about any minority group.

The letters go even further, when they point out that "the most serious of all have been the statements issued by some law enforcement officers and Senate investigating teams" which tend to associate all Americans of Italian lineage with the unholy delegates of crime and vice. The letters also state: "This is as heartless as it is untrue".

We most heartily endorse the position of Senators SCOTT and KEATING. It is high time for action. We have been patient too long. We are aroused as never before and we want an end to the ill-founded, vague condemnation of a fine, loyal and industrious people who—since the discovery of America by one of their forebears—have given it their full measure of devotion.

Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times recently ran an excellent editorial on the subject of home rule for the District of Columbia. It is my feeling that the Congress should act favorably on the administration's bill for home rule during this session. I am inserting this editorial in the RECORD for perusal by my colleagues, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 17, 1959]

ARE WASHINGTONIANS PEOPLE?

For the fifth time the Senate has voted to give home rule to the District of Columbia. Under a bill hopefully passed on Wednesday the District could elect a mayor, a city council, and a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives. Thus its people would be almost as well off as the people of Alaska were during their territorial days. It is curious to recall that the Washingtonians were actually given more leeway a century or more ago than they now possess. As far back as 1802 they elected their own city council. In 1820 they elected their own mayor, and as late as 1874 they elected a Delegate to the House of Representatives and the members of a two-chamber municipal legislative assembly.

Under the present scheme, which has been operating since 1878, the President appoints three Comimssioners to run the city. Curiously enough, two of these are required to be legal residents of Washington for 5 years prior to their appointment—thus they spring full-panoplied from being what we might call wards of the Government to being themselves in a governing position.

This situation seems silly enough. What it implies is that except for a number of Federal officeholders who maintain legal residence elsewhere the people who really and truly live inside the District are treated as though they were Indians on reservations, criminals, or legally insane. This situation presumably would not continue if it were not for the opposition of some southern members of the lower House of Congress who are afraid that if the Negro majority of the District could vote it might not vote their way.

Nevertheless, it is considered certain that if the bill gets on the floor of the House, it will pass. Even then democracy could not run riot. The citizens of Washington still couldn't help elect the eminent citizen who is to be their White House neighbor after the next election.

Morbid Streak in Humanity Seeks Thrill From Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have been deeply concerned with problems of air and highway safety. Recently another aspect of this general subject came to national attention in the action of a huge crowd at Idlewild Airport on July 12. This mob blocked normal rescue operations and created additional hazards far beyond the extremely dangerous situation faced by those in the plane and those engaged in safety operations on the ground.

The CAB and the FAA are investigating the mechanical failure of the plane, but I hope that their investigations will also lead to suitable legislation, if need be, to prevent recurrence of the interference with rescue operations.

My good friend, Mr. James E. Fain, executive editor of the Dayton Daily News, vividly describes the situation in his column of July 16. His words are so allied with the objectives of our committee that, under unanimous consent, I place them in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Dayton Daily News, July 16, 1959]

MORBID STREAK IN HUMANITY SEEKS THRILL FROM TRAGEDY

(By James E. Fain)

The mob that overran Idlewild Airport Sunday night to watch a stricken jet airliner come to earth needed no introduction to any newsman who ever has covered a disaster.

The bug-eyed curious cluster like ants to a dead thing whenever spectacular tragedy is in the wind. Cars converge from miles around. People climb fences, stride through muddy fields, shove into almost uncontrollable mobs.

When possible, police set up fire lines, holding out the throng. In large areas, such as Idlewild near New York City, this is not always possible. The straining mob breaks

through, impeding rescue work, creating safety hazards, representing man at just about his ugliest.

Years ago, as a young reporter covering a coroner's inquest after a particularly seamy sex murder, I had a first, unforgettable brush with this sort of morbid curiosity.

A young woman, clasping the hand of a little girl of 5 or 6, came up and asked, almost breathlessly: "Will they let us see the body now?"

"No," I lied, without really knowing.

"Never mind, darling," she told the child. "We'll come back later."

The jet pilot over New York Sunday jockeyed his plane down safely, no thanks to the thousands of idle spectators who jammed Idlewild during the 4 hours he was circling overhead to burn up fuel.

Minus two wheels which had slipped off his landing gear during takeoff, he gentled the big airplane into a smooth landing on a runway that had been covered with foamite to reduce the danger of fire.

The pilot was livid with rage at the crowd and at airport officials who had been unable to hold out the curious. Who could deny him the right? Not just his life but the more than 100 in his charge were at stake.

Someday we will grow up enough to stay away when we cannot help. Meantime, we have a good bit to be ashamed of.

Address of Welcome to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of welcome to the 46th national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress by Col. Frank H. Collins, which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues:

ADDRESS OF WELCOME TO THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS BY COL. FRANK H. COLLINS, CHAIRMAN, RIVER AND HARBOR COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE, MAY 14, 1959

Mr. President, fellow delegates, and guests, on behalf of the Washington Board of Trade and the river and harbor committee of that organization, it is my pleasure to extend a most hearty welcome to all in attendance at this 46th national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress here in the Nation's Capital.

We occupants of this greatest occupied territory in the United States of America are quite accustomed to receiving and entertaining national conventions of many organizations throughout the year. Such gatherings not only assist materially in bolstering the always uncertain finances of the District of Columbia, but also make it possible to we nonvoting taxpayers to make new acquaintances and to renew old friendships with contented citizens from all the free States of the Union.

Your convention here today is of particular importance and interest to the Washington Board of Trade and the Potomac River Port Association. We both have a recognized and distinctive mutual objective, namely, the expanding of internal water facilities and resources development.

We here in the greater Washington district are primarily concerned with the expanding of such development in every way—on the most historical river in the country—the Potomac.

It may interest you to know—that our greater metropolitan area—is the only such community in the entire United States—located on tidewater—that does not enjoy major navigation seaborne services. We are now working to obtain that objective.

Many years ago—I was second clerk on the Mississippi River Packet—*Dubuque*—of the old Diamond Jo Line, running between New Orleans and St. Paul. Since then—it has been my opportunity to observe the rapid development of river traffic on the Mississippi—Missouri and Ohio here in the States—as well as the Thames in England—the Clyde and Forth in Scotland—the Rhine and Elbe in Germany—the Seine in France—the Danube in Austria—the Nile in Egypt—the Congo in Central Africa—the Ganges in India and the Plata and Amazon in South America.

Frankly—I doubt if we Americans have taken the same advantages of our great natural water resources as have the peoples of other countries.

Water was the first means of transportation—but it was rapidly succeeded by the railroads—highways and now airways. However, the last score of years has seen many great water developments on our larger rivers—as well as the Houston Ship Canal—the inland ports of New Orleans and Stockton, Calif.—the Illinois-Michigan Canal—and now the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway next month—has made an ocean port of every city on the Great Lakes.

But there are still many problems and projects—including irrigation and reclamation—industrial water use desaltation pollution abatement—conservation of wildlife and recreation—all of which are of vital and potent interest to this Congress.

You have gathered here the top assembly—that is available—of experience—knowledge—enthusiasm and initiative for our one objective—which, coupled with precision patriotism for progress—will make this convention an outstanding success for the cause to which it is dedicated.

May I assure you again—of the full support and cooperation of the Washington Board of Trade.

And may I recall the famous poem, "The Rhyme of the Ancient Mariner," and paraphrase it in this manner:

"Water, water everywhere—but not a drop to drink . . .
Water, water everywhere—to use—if only we would think."

Mrs. F. T. Raiford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 16, 1959, I called attention of the House to the death of Mrs. F. T. Raiford, cofounder and publisher of the Selma (Ala.) Times-Journal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to add two other fine editorials which pay tribute to this outstanding southern lady.

The editorials referred to follow:

[From the Birmingham News]

MRS. F. T. RAIFORD

The death early Saturday of Mrs. F. T. Raiford, 83-year-old publisher of the Selma Times-Journal takes from the newspaper business and the Selma community not only a first-rate hand in journalism but a wonderfully warm and understanding human being.

Mrs. Raiford long has been unique in her capacity for and devotion to a business which is largely dominated by men. With her husband she entered newspapering in 1914 with purchase of the old Selma Times. From a beginning with a single linotype machine for typesetting and a flatbed press that had to be fed by hand, Mrs. Raiford and her husband developed one of the State's more enterprising publications. Mrs. Raiford long served as business manager as the paper expanded with acquisition of the Journal, her husband serving as editor. On the death of her husband Mrs. Raiford became pulisher and general manager.

She was a careful worker and put out her paper with thoroughness. But her interests were far from being confined to publishing. She participated in numerous civic activities and served as a director with the Selma Chamber of Commerce.

Her interests were virtually unlimited, and she showed a warmly humble capacity for enjoyment, for an example, of sports. She kept a box at all times at the Selma ball park and it was a rare Auburn or Alabama football game that she missed.

Eddie Gilmore, the widely known Selma boy who became one of the Nation's top foreign corerspondents—and who once was a carrier for the Selma Times—wrote from London: "Tonight here in London I think about my childhood, my young manhood, and my early middle age, so excuse me for shedding a sentimental tear for one of the greatest women I have ever known—Mary Raiford."

The tribute was fitting, Mary Howard Raiford was one of Alabamas' rare citizens who lived fully and always with a deep sense of professional responsibility.

[From the Talladega Daily Home]

ALABAMA LOSES A LEADER

News of the death of Mrs. F. T. Raiford, publisher of the Selma Times-Journal, brought to the Daily Home the sadness inevitable on the passing of an old and valued friend.

But there was more to it than that.

Mrs. Raiford and Ed Field, the Times-Journal editor, formed a combination which spoke consistently and clearly for the best in Alabama and the South.

With moderation, with tolerance and with understanding, they made the Selma daily an instrument for good whose voice was heard throughout the State and beyond.

For the likes of Mrs. Raiford and those associated with her there could never be such a thing as a Pulitzer prize, for she wasn't the kind to play her heritage false in seeking approbation easily won nowadays for the turning of a coat.

Rather, she stood magnificently true to those things which formed her—and in the standing left a challenge as an example the rest of us would do well to emulate.

So far as we know, Mrs. Raiford was the State's only woman publisher of a daily newspaper.

As such, she was a credit to womanhood and to her profession. She will be missed, not only now at the time of her death, but down through the years of difficulty ahead for all southerners.

Results of Questionnaire by Young Republican Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the results of a questionnaire sent out by the First Assembly District Young Republican Club, of Brooklyn, Kings County, N.Y. I believe it most interesting to see the trend of thinking of this organization of young Republicans:

Below you will find the results of the last questionnaire that we sent out to our membership which now totals over 100. The questions were prepared by the American Civil Liberties Union but were processed and tabulated under the supervision of Larry Calia, our first vice president, with the aid of Michael Gilmartin, chairman of the procedural committee, and Joe O'Connor, acting chairman of the national affairs committee. Please take note that a score of 75 percent qualifies one to be a member of the American Civil Liberties Union. Our club would not qualify as our overall score is 65 percent.

1. Government employees accused of disloyalty should have the right to know the sources of information against them and to cross-examine their accusers. Yes, 60 percent; no, 40 percent.

2. Police and other censors should be allowed to ban books and movies such as "Ten North Frederick" or "Baby Doll." Yes, 33 percent; no, 67 percent.

3. Personal ability alone should determine employment regardless of applicant's race, religion, or national origin. Yes, 88 percent; no, 12 percent.

4. The teaching of sectarian religion should be permitted in public schools. Yes, 7 percent; no, 93 percent.

5. The character of a soldier's Army discharge should be based solely on his active duty record, rather than on his preinduction political association. Yes, 62 percent; no, 38 percent.

6. State universities are justified in using a quota system to limit enrollment by members of certain racial and religious groups. Yes, 33 percent; no, 67 percent.

7. Gerald L. K. Smith and William Z. Foster should have the same right to public speches as other political leaders. Yes, 45 percent; no, 55 percent.

8. Trade unions are entitled to restrict their membership on the basis of color, religion, or national origin. Yes, 15 percent; no, 85 percent.

9. Any private individual should have the right to criticize any government or government official anywhere in the world. Yes, 60 percent; no, 40 percent.

10. Police officials should have the right to listen in on private phone conversations. Yes, 70 percent; no, 30 percent.

11. Employers should be permitted to state their views regarding labor unions to their workers. Yes, 100 percent.

12. Movies, plays, and books should be suppressed if they present an offensive characterization of a particular racial or religious group. Yes, 20 percent; no, 80 percent.

13. Everyone who claims the privilege against self-incrimination when asked if he is a Communist must be one. Yes, 47 percent; no, 53 percent.

14. Labor's right to picket includes the right to deny access to struck plants by force of numbers. Yes, 7 percent; no, 93 percent.

15. Segregation in public schools violates the equal protection of the laws guaranteed to all Americans by the 14th amendment. Yes, 75 percent; no, 25 percent.

16. Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his own country. Yes, 25 percent; no, 75 percent.

17. Congress should investigate political beliefs and associations in order to determine whether they are un-American. Yes, 92 percent; no, 8 percent.

18. The post office is justified in refusing to deliver unidentified foreign material to certain addresses. Yes, 91 percent; no, 9 percent.

19. Test of Government employees' loyalty should be confined to sensitive positions involving military, atomic, or international affairs. Yes, 0 percent; no, 100 percent.

20. Public school and college teachers should be required to sign a special non-Communist loyalty oath. Yes, 85 percent; no, 15 percent.

C. RAYMOND RADIGAN,
President.

Time To Stop Defamation of Millions of Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Italian descent are very much incensed over the recent campaign of abuse which is being directed against them because of a few criminals who have besmirched the good name of the Italian community in this country. A whole community numbering some 12 million people of Italian origin is being blamed for the sins committed by a few. This is not in the tradition of American justice and American principles of fair play.

Organizations of American citizens of Italian descent, the Italian-American press in this country, and many distinguished citizens are now conducting a countercampaign to remove this stigma which has been placed on such a large group of decent, hard-working and loyal Americans. To associate them with the criminal acts of the few, even if only by inference, in itself constitutes a crime of no mean dimensions.

I should like to quote just a few brief sentences from an editorial in the Italian-language newspaper Il Progresso of July 12, 1959, which states:

A systematic campaign of defamation has been given wide circulation through slanted articles in nationwide newspaper chains and magazines, and books which become best-sellers through the artful drumbeating of modern press-agentry. But the most frequent offenders are television and motion pictures through gangster portrayals on their screens, using Italian names for the evil characters or what are easily recognized as Italian types.

One need only turn his TV dial and, lo and behold, there is one of those blood-curdling sagas in which the unsavory villain is pictured as a hoodlum with Italian features. * * *

It is high time for action. We have been patient too long. We are aroused as never before and we want an end to the ill founded, vague condemnation of a fine, loyal, and industrious people who—since the discovery of America by one of their forbears—have given it their full measure of devotion.

Mr. Speaker, may I add at this point that the newspaper Il Progresso has over the many decades of its existence rendered great services to immigrants from Italy in helping them become integrated in this country and in familiarizing them with the American way of life and the American concept of freedom and democracy. In fact, it can be truly said that this newspaper has helped raise several generations of devoted Americans. Today, it is in the forefront of the campaign to defend the good name of the Italian community in this country, the immigrants and the children of immigrants, against those who are casting aspersions on all Italian-Americans. For this service, it deserves our special recognition and deep appreciation.

I have forwarded a letter to the Attorney General of the United States in which I call his attention to this "campaign of defamation" against a whole people. In my letter, I have urged the Attorney General to utilize his authority "to undertake an early investigation of this situation" so that the slanderers are silenced. I am inserting the text of my letter into the RECORD and call on my friends and colleagues in the House to write similar letters expressing their opposition to these defamatory practices and calling for an investigation and verification of the facts.

The letter to the Attorney General reads as follows:

Hon. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
The Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am writing you concerning the increasing campaign of defamation which is being directed in recent months against a loyal, industrious, and law-abiding group—Americans of Italian descent.

It is estimated that there are some 12 million Americans who trace their origin to immigrants or children of immigrants from Italy. There is no need for me to elaborate on the contributions of this group over the decades—in fact, over the centuries—to the upbuilding of America, the enrichment of its culture, and the development of every phase of human endeavor in our great country. That is all a matter of historical record, as well as of facts in our own day.

And yet, because of the deplorable crimes and sins committed by a few who happen to be of Italian origin, we tolerate the torrent of abuse and outright condemnation of an entire group numbering into the millions. The different media of public information, such as the press, periodicals, movies, radio, television, novels, and the like, have succeeded in establishing in the public's mind certain criminal stereotypes which portray a whole community as steeped in crime.

The sins of the few are blamed on the entire Italian community in this country. I wonder if the spreading of such falsehoods and calumnies is not equally criminal?

I believe the time has come to put a stop to this wholesale vilification, and the way to do so is to undertake an investigation of the nature and extent of such crimes committed by persons of Italian origin, their comparison with crimes committed by other groups, the existence of nationwide criminal organiza-

tions, etc. It is time that we should have the true facts.

I urge you to utilize your good offices and the authority invested in you as head of the U.S. Department of Justice to designate the proper officials to undertake an early investigation of this situation. Your affirmative response to this request will be applauded by the millions of Americans of Italian descent who are most anxious that the true facts are established and that the slanderers are to be silenced. Your refusal to take action or your continued silence in the matter will be interpreted as condoning this deplorable situation.

I shall appreciate hearing from you in the matter at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

Resolution of Pan American Airways Executive Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the lack of control during the emergency landing of flight 102 of the Pan American Airlines the other week brings to mind a pressing problem. If more efficient ground control is not effected, the present system might well be the cause of a serious accident involving the lives of possibly hundreds of people. Perhaps most indicative of this need is a newly issued resolution of the Pan American Airways executive council. I include the resolution, which follows:

RESOLUTION OF PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS MASTER EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, JULY 14, 1959, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Whereas the pilots of Pan American Airways and the representatives of those pilots, the master executive council, have reviewed and considered the events associated with the complete breakdown of the airport security and ground control safety procedures during the emergency landing of PAA flight 102, July 11, 1959, at Idlewild International Airport; and

Whereas the complete loss of control permitted thousands of curious people to place themselves in extreme danger along the runway selected for the emergency landfng; and

Whereas the inability of the civil authorities to control the public and thereby insure to the crew and passengers of the flight, the full availability of existing safety equipment and procedures; and

Whereas there is no existing assurance that would prevent a similar Roman holiday from developing during any future emergency; and

Whereas the Air Line Pilots Association has endeavored for years to obtain from the Federal, State, and municipal authorities the installation of modern equipment, trained personnel, and procedures to establish and maintain the necessary level of safety in crash rescue and firefighting installations at the civil airports: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this master executive council, the highest governing body of the pilots of Pan American Airways, as represented by the Air Line Pilots Association, International, strongly recommends that the pilots of Pan American Airways will in the future utilize their command authority to proceed during such emergencies, to the best available air base where security control, modern equipment and crash- and fire-fighting techniques are constantly available for the protection of military or civilian personnel; and, be it further

Resolved, That the officials of Pan American Airways Corp. and the Federal Aviation Agency be requested by the Air Line Pilots Association to immediately initiate negotiations with the U.S. Air Force and Federal authorities to establish the required military-civil liaison and emergency procedures that are necessary to make the military facilities available to protect the lives of the air-traveling public, when, in the judgment of the pilot in command, it is necessary to utilize the military facilities to insure the highest possible level of safety.

Illegal Narcotics Traffic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, narcotics trafficked illegally constitute one of the most baffling and serious problems facing the country. Facts, figures, and details of the menace are currently being publicized in the Los Angeles Times in a series of excellent articles written by Mr. Gene Sherman. The public service being performed by the Times and Mr. Sherman by this series of features deserves commendation here in the Congress.

Southern California is one of the Nation's narcotics black spots. In part this is due to a lenient tendency by some judges in the area when confronted with narcotics offenders. In part it is due to decisions by the State's higher courts which have thrown roadblocks in the way of narcotics violation prosecutions and which call for State legislation to correct. In a major sense, however, this area's plaguing narcotics dilemma stems from the proximity of the Mexican border.

My own studies of southern California illegal narcotics traffic over the past 10 years invariably lead to the border stations at Tia Juana, Mexicali, and similar towns. Five years ago, I introduced and vigorously pursued legislation to close this border to unescorted minors. Facts and statistics showed hundreds of teenaged addictions first were acquired during visits to Mexican border towns and thereafter fed by the flow of narcotics from our sister Republic to the south.

Recognizing the problem, but pleading the necessity of cooperation with Mexican officials not only on narcotics traffic control, but many other international criminal operations, our State Department repeatedly stated closing the border would make such cooperative efforts between the two countries difficult, if not impossible. As an alternative, additional customs and immigration personnel were assigned along the border and the activities of U.S. narcotics agents in conjunction with State and local police and sheriff's squads were beefed-up.

For a time the border traffic slowed down. But eager pushers and the sizable, efficient production and wholesale distributors of illegal narcotics behind them have found new ways and means to circumvent border interception.

U.S. Narcotics Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger has again and again emphasized the similarity between illegal narcotics traffic and the proverbial feather pillow. Let the pillow be broken and it is almost a physical impossibility to collect together the wind-strewn feathers. Let the wholesale narcotics package be broken down into thousands of capsules of heroin and their interception and destruction becomes almost impossible.

This points to action by the Mexican Government toward destruction of the illegal plantations and narcotics refining plants that are know to exist below the border. This means just one thing: pressure through our State Department for the action by Mexican officials which they can and should take. Our California colleague, Representative JOE HOLT, has obtained commitment by the State Department for Ambasador Robert Hill in Mexico City to initiate talks to that end. The results of these talks are anxiously awaited not only by those of us in Congress, who have long been aware of the problem and demanding its solution, but by every parent in the country who knows his own child may be the next victim of the illegal narcotics trafficker.

Price Reduction To Meet Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year much time in the House was spent berating the Tennessee Valley Authority for purchasing a generator from another country at a lower price than that submitted by domestic manufacturers.

I noted an interesting footnote to this discussion in an editorial in the New York Times last Thursday, July 16, and a story on July 17. On page 27, with the other business news, comes the information that Westinghouse Electric is going to cut the price of steam turbine generators to meet the earlier slashes of General Electric. It is interesting and pleasing to see that price competition is being accepted by these companies. This is far superior to the alternative demand that we put quotas, embargoes, or tariffs upon oversea producers to protect artificially high prices of American producers.

The editorial and article follow:

[From the New York Times, July 16, 1959]

ON THE INFLATION FRONT

One of the giants of American industry has just administered some of its prices

downward. The General Electric Co. has announced on successive days reductions in prices of its turbines, both large and small.

In a nation that had become used to the ratchet movement of heavy industry prices—up, steady, up again and never down—this is to be heartily welcomed. Furthermore, the General Electric Co.'s announcements, both in what those announcements say and what they do not say, contain some hints of better days to come on the inflation front.

First, the company said the price reductions were made possible by improved manufacturing processes that have cut costs. There would be nothing unusual about this except that it has not been happening enough in the economy as a whole in the postwar period. Improved efficiency has all too often been eaten up in higher wage and other costs, with prices the same or even rising.

Second, in its announcement on the big turbines the company said it would modify the escalator clause in its contracts—a clause under which customers have been required to pay more than the originally agreed price if a certain index of costs rose.

The change is aimed to help sales, but it also may represent a shrewd hunch on the part of General Electric that costs in the future may be a lot more stable than in the past.

Finally, what the announcements did not say was that foreign competition is a large element in the decision, at least for the big turbines. The revival of Western Europe is producing a benefit that Americans had perhaps not foreseen—the infusion of an extra element of competition in parts of American industry that have been to some extent immune during most of the postwar period.

In a sense, we as consumers are getting our Marshall plan money back.

[From the New York Times, July 17, 1959]

TURBINE TAGS CUT BY WESTINGHOUSE—COMPANY REVERSES EARLIER STAND TO MEET SLASHES OF GENERAL ELECTRIC

The Westinghouse Electric Corp. has joined the growing price war in the steam turbine generator field.

This reversal of a company statement on Wednesday was made at a press conference yesterday at Lester, Pa., where the company unveiled its new production concept aimed at raising output of large turbines by one-third. The company told the gathering that it planned to spend more than $25 million to expand and modernize facilities for the manufacture of turbines, generators, large motors and related heavy apparatus.

Of the total outlay, $21 million will be spent at the Lester plant, just outside Philadelphia; $3 million at East Pittsburgh and $1 million at Sunnyvale, Calif. The heart of the Lester project will be adoption of a new engineering concept—"the development of 'precngineered' basic components for steam turbines that can be manufactured in many duplicate sets and assembled like building blocks in almost any combination."

REMAINS COMPETITIVE

The Westinghouse announcement said that the price cuts were being made on large turbines to meet the earlier slashes by the General Electric Co. L. M. Elkner, manager of the company's large and medium turbine department, said:

"We are meeting price adjustments G.E. has made. We will remain competitive."

A day earlier he denied that Westinghouse contemplated any involvement with G.E. or other manufacturers in any "white sale," such as occurred several years ago. He said at that time that G.E.'s action would "have the result of firming up prices of these large sizes (of turbine generators)."

Meanwhile, G.E. announced yesterday that it had been awarded contracts for a 300,000 kilowatt unit by the Florida Power & Light Co., and a $14 million contract for 10 87,500 kilovolt-ampere generators from the Wanapum Dam project of Public Utility District 2 of Nebraska. In both cases G.E. was underbid by foreign competitors. Company spokesmen said they had received the contracts despite this when the utilities assessed all phases of delivery and service.

Anti-Inflation Fighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, the problem of inflation is one of the most serious problems facing this Nation today. Only through an awakened public opinion can we stem the tide of runaway inflation—the people can only be awakened when they fully understand the problem.

Fortunately, we have in the Borough of Queens, N.Y., an energetic, alert chamber of commerce, and the officers and members of the chamber are doing something to educate the people not only of Queens but elsewhere on the consequences of inflation. I want to take this opportunity to commend the officers of the Chamber of Commerce of the Borough of Queens on the campaign to enroll anti-inflation fighters which commences on Thursday, July 23, 1959.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the chamber's press release which explains their campaign:

The Queens Chamber of Commerce, voice of Queens business and industry, today (July 23) launched a boroughwide campaign to enroll anti-inflation fighters in a phone-or-write assault on Congress to insure a worth-more dollar through reduced Federal spending and a balanced budget.

Chamber President Ira H. Genet, of Douglaston, announced inauguration of the broad chamber program in conjunction with its distribution of a special booklet by author-publisher Thomas G. Sabin, of Jackson Heights, entitled "Let's Quit Kidding About Inflation."

The 16-page booklet, authored by Sabin to dramatize the chamber's anti-inflation campaign, is the sixth in a yearly series on vital issues using the "baby appeal," a series with distribution by some 3,000 business organizations and boasting a readership of more than 10 million people.

In addition to the saturation distribution of its stop-inflation booklets in Queens, according to President Genet, the chamber has sent copies to chambers of commerce throughout New York State and key chambers in every State in the United States.

President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon who heads a special anti-inflation committee, and key congressional leaders including Senators Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas, and Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, also received the chamber's package appeal to halt inflation. Other recipients included Governor Rockefeller, Lt. Gov. Malcolm Wilson, State Senate Majority Leader Walter J. Mahoney, Senate Minority Leader Joseph Zaretski, State Assembly Speaker Joseph F. Carlino, Assembly Minority Leader Anthony J. Travia, Mayor Wagner, and Comptroller Gerosa.

The chamber appealed locally to Queens business and industry, some 150 civic organizations, fraternal, service, and professional groups, key civic leaders, and 31 Queens lawmakers.

Principal feature of the chamber appeal—embodied in the Sabin booklet socking readers with facts about Federal overspending, taxes, debt, deadly wage-price spiral, etc.—is its plea to anti-inflation fighters to:

Write (no postcards, please) or, still better, phone your U.S. Senator and your Congressman.

For the convenience of "phone your Congressman" anti-inflation fighters in the Borough of Queens, the chamber gives specific instructions on the procedure for phoning two U.S. Senators and five Congressmen representing Queens.

The chamber lists the Washington, D.C., telephone and extension numbers of the seven lawmakers, emphasizing that the charge of 80 cents for 3 minutes could be the most valuable 3 minutes of your day or your future.

Included with the chamber's anti-inflation material is the "Queens Legislative Family," a pamphlet listing Queens lawmakers, with their Washington, D.C., and home addresses.

"We are using this baby-appeal booklet," President Genet declared in his accompanying letter, "to arouse the people to the dangers of inflation. I strongly urge you to support us in this important campaign by starting one of your own.

"The method is simple. Begin by placing your order for these compelling booklets. Spread their factual story among your friends, relatives, fellow workers, employees, etc. Write and/or telephone your U.S. Senator and Congressman.

"Advise your representatives in Washington to vote against all nondefense appropriations that call for Federal spending in excess of Federal income. Urge them to work for a balanced Federal budget.

"Remember, there is no way for anyone to beat inflation. To survive inflation, we must stop it. You cannot afford to lose this anti-inflation campaign. On its success may rest the future of America."

Stressing that the chamber's all-out drive against inflation is "nonpartisan and directed toward anyone who will heed our advice and act," President Genet declared:

"President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, and responsible Democratic and Republican Senators and Congressmen are alarmed over the inflation crisis in this country. Something must be done to halt inflationary forces. And we can't accomplish it by sanctioning spending sprees by the Federal Government.

"That's where the people back home come in. It's up to them to let their Senators and Congressmen know exactly how they feel about inflation which is robbing them of a decent, comfortable living. It's up to them to demand a worth-more dollar.

"They should advise their representatives to help stop inflation. And if their representatives fail to carry out their wishes, they do not truly represent their constituents and are ripe for replacement. And the time to do something is right now."

Lawmakers representing the Borough of Queens with its April 1, 1959, population of 1,935,849, according to Queens chamber estimates, are: U.S. Senators JACOB K. JAVITS, of Manhattan, and KENNETH B. KEATING, of Rochester, N.Y.; and Congressmen SEYMOUR HALPERN, of Forest Hills; ALBERT H. BOSCH, of Woodhaven; LESTER HOLTZMAN, of Rego Park; JAMES J. DELANEY, of Long Island City; and EMANUEL CELLER, of Brooklyn, who represents 32 election districts in the Rockaways.

Wildcatter Benedum Has 90th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 16, 1959, Mike Benedum, of Pittsburgh, the famous oil wildcatter, celebrated his 90th birthday. Mike Benedum is an outstanding civic leader in the tri-State area: western Pennsylvania, eastern Ohio, and northern West Virginia. He has led a full and interesting life and continues his activities in business and civic affairs. On his 90th birthday we are all proud to recognize and honor such an exceptional citizen. I am pleased to be counted among his many friends.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following accounts from the Pittsburgh newspapers of Mr. Benedum on his 90th birthday:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 16, 1959]

WILDCATTER BENEDUM HAS 90TH BIRTHDAY

Oilman Michael L. Benedum celebrated his 90th birthday at his home today, insisting that "the zest of wildcatting is as strong in me today at four score and 10 as it was 50 years ago."

Confined to his home on Woodland Road, East End, for the past several months, Mr. Benedum was joined on this observance by 10 close associates in his oil empire.

His nephew, Paul G. Benedum, and the nephew's wife and son attended a family luncheon.

Congratulatory messages arrived by the hundreds. Among the well-wishers were President Eisenhower, Vice President RICHARD NIXON, and leaders of the oil industry.

Philosophizing a bit, Mr. Benedum said he faces "the reality that the twilight gathers about me.

"I am not afraid of death because I have not been afraid of life. Indeed, I would not be honest if I did not admit that the invisible has a great deal of fascination for me * * *. After all, the great unknown is the wildcatter's field of operation."

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, July 17, 1959]

OIL KING BENEDUM 90 YEARS OLD—HIS WILDCATTING ZEST STRONG AS FIVE DECADES AGO

(By Herbert Stein)

Michael Late Benedum, whose wildcat oil explorations have brought him between $75 million and $100 million, observed his 90th birthday here yesterday by mentally exploring the lure of probing the earth, the inevitability of man's reaching outer space, and why he does not fear death.

"I am not afraid of death because I have not been afraid of life," he said.

At 90, Mr. Benedum said, he faces the reality that the "twilight gathers about me" but he added that was neither a pleasant nor a foreboding state of mind.

SPENDS DAY ON PORCH

"Indeed, I would not be honest if I did not admit that the invisible has a great deal of fascination for me," he said. "Perhaps this is a natural instinct in one whose entire adult life has been devoted to exploration of one facet of the unknown in our own material development."

Mr. Benedum, who is credited with discovering more oil than any other human, spent much of the day sitting on the porch of his home, the former Greystone estate, Woodland Road, at Fifth and Highland Avenues, reading about 1,000 letters and telegrams of greeting.

His greeters included President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, Senators, Representatives, Governors, industrialists, labor leaders and, according to an aid, "lots of people he doesn't even know who said they've heard of him and wanted to wish him well."

Late in the morning 10 of his closest business associates joined him for a chat. His nephew, Paul G. Benedum, the younger Benedum's wife and son, Paul G., Jr., ate lunch with him.

PARADE AT BIRTHPLACE

At his birthplace, Bridgeport, W. Va., however, there was a parade, band concert, water show, and grand birthday ball—all at a civic center built on a $2 million gift from Mr. Benedum.

The oil king himself observed that the great unknown is the wildcatter's field of operation.

"The great risks are his companions and the sealed book of nature is the oyster shell he is determined to pry open," he said.

There is an intangible reward even in following one dry hole after another, he declared.

"My own partner of almost 50 years, the late Joe Trees, had a record of 17 consecutive dry holes when he first started to wildcat in West Virginia back in the nineties. Then he teamed up with me and our first well was a fine producer."

Mr. Benedum said he chose his partner because Mr. Trees "had the courage to face up to failure and to keep on trying" which he said is the first essential in oil wildcatting.

BRINGS OUT YELLOW

"There is nothing that will bring out the yellow in a man's backbone as quickly and as surely as a dry hole." As for himself, he said, "the zest for wildcatting is as strong in me today at 4 score and 10 as it was 50 years ago."

Mr. Benedum then expressed his views on a number of matters.

On his years: "I feel the deepest sense of gratitude that providence has permitted me * * * to have had broad and varied contacts with men and events throughout the world. I have warmed my hands before the fire of life."

On life's rewards: "The rich rewards of memory are mine and I am also blessed in the enjoyment of the priceless things of this day. Of those things, I place the highest value on my friendships."

On God: "I could not have lived nine-tenths of a century and looked upon the wonders of nature without reaching the firm conviction that the universe toils in some immense endeavor and that the mysterious energies of God labor to divine perfection."

On outer space: "The conquest of space is as inevitable as early man's conquest of rivers and mountains, and the later spanning of oceans. It is only a question of time. It is a part of the divine unfoldment of knowledge in the evolutionary scheme of things."

On life on other planets: "I am sure that if there were thought and communication among the marine life in the depths of the seas, where man cannot exist except artificially, the fish would be positive that there could be no life outside of the water."

On future challenges: "Within the 90 years that I have lived, mankind has made more progress than in all the previously recorded thousands of years in human history. And in my opinion the surface has only been scratched."

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, July 16, 1959]

BENEDUM READY FOR GREAT UNKNOWN—FAMED OIL WILDCATTER IS 90 TODAY

M. L. (Mike) Benedum said he faces his exploration into the great unknown with the same confidence that made him the world's greatest oil wildcatter.

He told friends on his birthday:

"At 90 years of age I face up to the reality that the twilight gathers about me. This is neither a pleasant nor a foreboding state of mind. I am not afraid of death because I have not been afraid of life.

"Indeed, I would not be honest if I did not admit that the invisible has a great deal of fascination for me. Perhaps this is a natural instinct in one whose entire adult life has been devoted to exploration of one facet of the unknown in our material development.

"After all, the great unknown is the wildcatter's field of operation. The great risks are his companions and the sealed book of nature is the oystershell he is determined to pry open."

On the same theme of the invisible, Benedum said he knew many wildcatters who ignored proven territory, to search for new fields, adding:

"While I have never gambled in the accepted sense of the word such as with cards or dice or anything of that sort, I suppose it is like the horse race bettors who always put their money on the long shots."

He said he teamed up with the late Joe C. Trees, after the latter had drilled 17 consecutive dry holes in West Virginia. Their first joint well was a producer.

Benedum said it might be asked why he chose a man with such a "dismal" record, adding:

"Actually, the 17 dry holes were the very reason I was attracted to Joe. He had demonstrated that he had the courage to face up to failure and to keep on trying. That is the first essential in wildcatting for oil. It is no place for quitters."

He smiled:

"There is nothing that will bring out the yellow in a man's backbone as quickly and as surely as a dry well.

"The oil business has changed like everything else. It has been caught up in the irresistible tide of evolution. But the zest for wildcatting is as strong in me today at four score and ten as it was 50 years ago. Once it gets into your blood, I guess, it stays with you always."

He expressed gratitude for the past, put the highest value on his friendships and concluded:

"I have warmed my hands before the fire of life."

He said he is asked what he feels the world of tomorrow will be like and declared:

"I am convinced it will be even more advanced and bizarre than the world of today would be to our grandparents. Within the 90 years that I have lived, mankind has made more progress than in all the previously recorded thousand years of human history. Yet only the surface has been scratched."

He said tomorrow's world will be far different than today and that conquest of space is as inevitable as conquest of the rivers and mountains.

Benedum received about 1,000 congratulatory messages, including greetings from President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON. There was a family luncheon at his Woodland Road home.

Gun 'Em, Mr. Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of the people of this country and the Members of this Congress are with you in your House

leadership of our great Democratic Party. The following editorial from the Greenville (S.C.) News indicates the overwhelming sentiment for you in my area of the country:

GUN 'EM, MR. SAM

It is becoming evident from reports from Washington that a definite attempt is being made by liberal Democrats to get House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, the able and venerable Congressman from Texas.

It seems that RAYBURN who has earned the title of "Mr. Democrat" has been much too moderate in his views and actions concerning legislation threading its way through the House of Representatives. Now they are saying he's getting old and autocratic and that he's walking in the shadow of his fellew Texan, Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON.

The talk is that his foes will start by trying to displace him in his usual role as permanent chairman of the Democratic national convention next year. After that, no doubt, pushing him out of the Speaker's chair would be comparatively easy.

All of this is somewhat reminiscent of what happened to JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, who served as Speaker when the Republicans were in power and who long had been the minority chief when the Democrats controlled the House.

But we hope the still redoubtable "Mr. SAM" won't settle for a Cadillac limousine and a chauffer as JOE MARTIN apparently felt he had to. We hope the not so gentle gentleman from Texas will strap on his political six-shooter and meet his enemies at "high noon."

NASA Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 26, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, within the past few weeks, the Soviet Union has again demonstrated her successful accomplishments in space experimentation, while the United States within this same time period has suffered several missile and rocket failures. The U.S.S.R. is at present superior to us in rocket propulsion and because of this superiority, a Russian may beat our astronaut into space. It will require great expenditures of time and effort and money for us to catch up with the Russians in that respect. All of this argues powerfully against any feeling of American complacency and especially against the $68 million cut in the proposed authorization for NASA, money which is so urgently needed for our space projects.

Mr. Speaker, on July 13, Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee. The statement he made at that time clearly and forcefully outlines the crippling effects this reduction in appropriation would have on our space program and, in my opinion, should be read by every American. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I therefore, include Dr. Glennan's statement, as follows:

STATEMENT BY DR. T. KEITH GLENNAN, ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, JULY 13, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I welcome the opportunity to appear before this committee, for the first time. I am here to discuss H.R. 7978, which is now before you. In particular, I want to discuss the crippling reductions in the budget requests of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration that are embodied in H.R. 7978. These cuts, if sustained, would have disastrous consequences, and I am impelled to point them out.

The degree of success or failure of the U.S. space effort, vis-a-vis that of the Russians, will be gravely influenced by what Congress decides in this crucial matter.

A year ago this month, the Congress passed the National Aeronautics an Space Act, unanimously in the House, overwhelmingly in the Senate. One of the chief mandates laid down in the legislation was "the preservation of the role of the United States as a leader in aeronautical and space science and technology."

During later hearings on our fiscal 1959 budget request, some Members of Congress raised serious questions about our not having requested far greater sums than we felt, after careful study, that we needed to organize NASA and initiate its programs.

What has happened since then to give anyone a sense of complacency? For I can only interpret the action of the House as an indication of a lessening in the sense of urgency which has been expressed so often on the floor and in committee.

Have we—who started serious work in the space field 6 or 7 years after the Soviets were pouring unlimited funds and their best brains into the drive for dominance in space—suddenly achieved some enormous advantage? If so, I would like to know about it. I would sleep better at night.

Or has it come about in some way that we know that the Soviet satellites and space probes, which our scientific devices have tracked and reported, were somehow gigantic hoaxes?

Gentlemen, tracking devices such as ours are not easily misled. We believe that the Russians have done exactly what they have announced they have done. And perhaps they have achieved much more that they have not revealed.

Wholesale expression of congressional support for NASA was evident until very recently. Today the situation is strangely changed. NASA is faced, not with having to decline a plethora of funds, but with the prospect that vital projects will have to be curtailed or even put on the shelf because funds for them are being denied.

I will not be challenged when I say that the United States must bend every effort to achieve a position of leadership in the space field. And we are all agreed that leadership in a race where there are only two participants cannot conceivably mean running second. I do not have to tell you that we must have the facilities to exert that leadership. Also, we must have the men, we must have the money necessary to the task.

The goal all of us seek—U.S. supremacy in space—was set by Congress last year and reaffirmed this year when Congress authorized the full NASA budget request. This authorization reflected the awareness of Congress that we cannot win the race in which we are engaged during this turning point in history should we be deprived of the all-out support of our legislators. Therefore, I request, with all the earnestness I can muster, that the cuts in the NASA budget be fully restored.

The reductions in the NASA budget total $63,225,000. They represent cuts both in the $45 million supplemental budget request for fiscal 1959 and from our $485,300,000 budget request for fiscal 1960. Actions in the House caused the reductions. First, the House Committee on Appropriations cut the combined requests by a total of $45,500,000. Second, technical points of order passed during debate in the House resulted in a further reduction of $22,725,000 in both requests.

I am urging the members of this committee to make full restoration because to sustain those cuts or to compromise them will hamstrong the U.S. space program.

Moreover, if the Congress slices an already lean NASA budget at a time when this Nation has barely begun its space effort, the world will conclude that the United States is having second thoughts about facing the Communist challenge in this field. Realistically, a research and development program of the complexity and magnitude of this one cannot be turned on and off at a moment's notice. Having made the decision to enter the race, and for many other important reasons, we must pursue with vigor an imaginative, well-planned program.

Well aware of the implications of the Russian's commanding space lead, Congress created NASA last year around the nucleus of the highly respected National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics which had been serving the military services and the aircraft industry for 43 years. Our agency became operative on October 1, 1958, 1 year after Sputnik I began beeping ominously overhead. With NACA personnel and facilities, we were off to a good—if late—start.

From the outset, both Houses of Congress have given us the strongest possible support. House and Senate Space Committees have devoted many weeks of hearings to our problems and programs. The House Committee on Science and Astronautics has heard 300 witnesses from NASA, the military services, and private industry during 70 days of hearings so far this year. The Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences has devoted a great amount of its busy schedule to NASA's program and the Nation's space effort. In connection with our 1960 budget the committee has published technical hearings of NASA work which are the most comprehensive, understandable, and educational documents on the Federal Government's aeronautical and space activities that exist today.

Both Houses of Congress have this year overwhelmingly approved the requested authorizations for our 1959 supplemental and fiscal 1960 appropriations. Consequently, I am unable to grasp the reasons for the House cut.

As Administrator, I have resisted the temptation to indulge in Sunday supplement speculation about the coming wonders of space exploration. I have been doing my utmost to see to it that the taxpayers' money is spent wisely as we venture into this new realm and reap its benefits. I have made it a point, however, to be explicit with the Congress about the inevitable costliness of space research. Repeatedly I have stressed during congressional hearings that NASA budgets will grow in the years ahead.

At the same time, I have tried to convey my deep conviction that space research holds the promise that it may soon be paying for itself many times over in tangible economic benefits. We have every right to count on developments in satellite meteorology, communications, navigation, and geodetics that will dramatically affect the lives of all of us.

Taking these considerations into account, last year we put together a budget for fiscal 1960 which we felt would get us well into space exploration. As has been said time and time again, inventions are not conceived on schedule, and vast sums of money, spent without adequate thought and plan-

ning, particularly in the early phases of a program, may hinder rather than facilitate projects.

Because space technology is an expensive, fluid affair, it requires continuous review. Since January, when the President submitted our fiscal 1960 budget request, we have found means to get considerable more space mileage per dollar in some areas than originally had seemed possible. We have also discovered that others of our programs will cost more than our original estimates.

When we prepared our first budget estimates back in November 1958, we based our space flight program upon Juno II and Thor-Able boosters. Our studies have taught us, however, that future reliance upon these vehicles would be uneconomical, in fact, that it is almost impossible to justify their use because of their limited load-carrying capacity and lack of versatility. We will, of course, use them for special purpose tasks in connection with particular projects already underway. However, building on the technology developed out of the missile program, we have initiated development of Thor-Deltas, Vega, and Centaurs which—within 2 years—will enable us to launch much larger scientific payloads far more efficiently and cheaply.

This decision required that we pare our funds for basic research and for other activities. Subsequent studies have also indicated the need for additional tracking and data reduction installations and for the immediate modernization of existing stations. To meet this need, we have again had to trim elsewhere in the budget.

Adjustments like these are by no means unusual in a research program, particularly as we work at the frontiers of a new technology. We must deal with a new order of complexity and cost. We need to build and manage systems that are more than global in scope. Organization of the myriad components into a working whole is a staggering task.

At one and the same time, we find that advances of science generate a flood of new proposals and an unprecedented rate of obsolescence, thus making appraisal, selection, and phasing more and more difficult and complex. Direction and control of technology has become one of today's most pressing and managerial challenges.

As I brought out earlier, our present budget has no slack whatsoever. As further evidence of our tight belts, I would like to state that we do not have a single backup vehicle for any of our scientific experiments. Each must be a "one shot" affair, and if the booster malfunctions, we will simply have to lay the experiment aside.

Before spelling out for you just what this cut will mean to our program, I would like to point out that or research centers, which are deeply involved in aeronautical as well as space research, account for slightly more than $100 million of our 1960 request. Actual new money for the space field is somewhat less than $375 million. Some or all of the large budget, long leadtime items in our space program, would be affected by the House action, if sustained. Here, in brief, is what the reduction could mean to our national space program in terms of time and progress:

1. The development of the Vega rocket propulsion system might have to be drastically cut back. A key vehicle in our future plans, Vega will be capable of placing more than 5,000 pounds in an Earth orbit. It will be one of the first space vehicles capable of making extensive television surveys on the Moon's surface. It will also be used for communications satellite relay experiments and will have the capacity to launch two-man satellites. It will be our first which is capable of matching the payload lofting capability of the Soviets.

2. In addition to cutting back Vega, we might have to retard Centaur, another key space vehicle which will be able to place more than 8,000 pounds in a 300-mile orbit and should be capable of soft-landing a 730-pound scientific payload on the Moon. The Department of Defense, as well as NASA, has a strong interest in this vehicle.

3. We would have to eliminate or drastically reduce the $30 million needed for the 1½ million-pound-thrust, single-chamber engine. This is a long lead-time project to provide in about 6 years time propulsion units capable of 6 million pounds thrust. Only with this vehicle will it be possible to carry our manned expeditions to the Moon and back. The budget cut will set this back at least 1 year.

4. Among other long lead-time items on which we would have to reduce the pace is Project Rover which concerns the development of nuclear propulsion for space travel.

5. We would have to delay completing additions to our tracking and data acquisition networks.

6. Even our top-priority Project Mercury, the manned satellite project, would certainly be affected if we are to carry on with any semblance of a balanced program. This, of course, would increase the probability of the Soviets scoring still another "beat" in this aspect of space exploration.

Let me assure you that I am not crying wolf. While we have not had the time to evaluate in detail the effect of the proposed cuts, it is clear that the items enumerated would be those most likely to be affected.

A final, serious matter that I want to mention is the House action which reduced NASA's request for personnel increases and supporting costs. You will recall that when the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics was absorbed by NASA, 7,699 employees were transferred to the new agency. Along with the transfer went NACA's heavy aeronautical research responsibilities. Since that time, only 1,269 employees have been added to carry the additional responsibilities.

Now, we have requested funds to employ an additional 1,027—a modest increase in view of NASA's mission. The House cut this number by 15 percent. These people are urgently needed to help make up the time that has already been lost. And the management—the sensible management—of a budget of the size under consideration is done by people in adequate numbers and of high quality. We have said that we propose to limit the size of our own staff in favor of contracting a substantial part of the space program. But we need men for planning, contracting, and monitoring those contracts. And we must have a sufficiently large in-house operation to assure that we have people knowledgeable in the field to provide the technical judgments necessary to the development of a sound program. Without the men to do the job, we will break our stride and fall even farther back.

The decision in this Nation's space exploration program is up to the Congress. Whatever the decision you make, we will attempt to carry it out with diligence and devoted effort.

The work we are now doing is an important instrument of international prestige. By utilizing their space exploits as an instrument of power politics, the Russians have convinced a large segment of world opinion that success or failure in these experiments is a valid measure of our scientific progress and general cultural status, as opposed to theirs. And there is no blinking the fact that the uncommitted nations are influenced by space achievement.

In conclusion I want to say that in my judgment, and in the judgment of the scientists and engineers who are with me here today, our 1959 supplemental and 1960 budgets as originally submitted are sound and conservative. They cannot be reduced without placing in jeopardy some of our most important programs.

Foreign Aid Can Be Cut Without Peril to Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, of course foreign aid can be cut without peril to defense. I commend to the House the following editorial by John S. Knight:

FOREIGN AID CAN BE CUT WITHOUT PERIL TO DEFENSE

Charles H. Percy, chairman of the Republican Committee on Program and Progress, is working on a statement of principles and objectives that "will help build a more dynamic America, better enabling it to meet the needs of its own people as well as discharge its responsibilities as leader of the free world."

Young Mr. Percy (40), an able and enlightened industrialist, has been amazingly successful in Republican fund-raising activities.

His new assignment, a large one, has the enthusiastic encouragement of President Eisenhower and the chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Percy has named four task forces to determine "the enduring principles by which we must guide ourselves now and in the future." Under general headings they cover "National Security and Peace," "Human Rights and Needs," the "Impact of Science and Technology," and "Economic Opportunity and Progress."

Since Percy is no orthodox practitioner of the political arts, he is seeking comment from the Nation's editors without reference to their partisan alignments.

While it is manifestly impossible to deal in a single editorial with all of the challenging subjects presented by Mr. Percy, one in particular attracted our attention.

As a subtitle under "National Security and Peace," we found that hardy perennial of the State Department thistle patch—foreign aid.

Now we all know that foreign aid is as close to President Eisenhower's heart as Mamie and the lush fairways of Augusta National.

At appropriation time, the administration always gravely warns the Congress that any reductions in foreign aid will imperil our security.

Still, cuts have been made from time to time without provoking the predicted calamities.

And a good many Americans—Democrats, Republicans and independents—are convinced that foreign aid can be reduced even more and at no substantial risk.

TEMPORARY FOREIGN AID NOW A PERMANENT POLICY

We need not remind our readers that foreign assistance began with the Marshall plan more than 10 years ago and was conceived as a temporary measure to rehabilitate Europe's wartorn economy.

Today, however, foreign aid has become a permanent arm of our foreign policy and U.S. taxpayers are subsidizing in some degree the needs of 70 other nations.

Just as a blanket indictment of foreign aid would be grossly misleading, equally untrue is the contention of Leonard J. Saccio, acting head of the International Cooperation Administration, that any changes in our present policy would be disastrous.

It is bootless to beg, as does Paul Hoffman, that the yearnings of the underdeveloped countries must be satisfied at our expense.

Or to sell foreign aid by distorting American history as did Under Secretary of State C. Douglas Dillon when he said:

"This Nation was founded, not so much for the purpose of gaining safety and material prosperity, but more to build a nation based on ideals which our founders believed ultimately would achieve worldwide acceptance."

Such a statement is, of course, the present nonsense.

The daring and resolute men who came to this country were seeking freedom from their oppressors. "Safety and material prosperity," were compelling objectives. None thought of reshaping Europe in America's new image.

It is precisely this kind of drivel that makes us suspicious of the Hoffmans, Dillons, and promoters such as Eric Johnston who are always hovering about the White House with brief cases full of pet projects for saving the world.

Johnston, the irrepressible lobbyist for the motion picture industry, sees nothing wrong in exporting Hollywood firms which pervert the picture of American life.

One such motion picture, shown in Brazil, more than offset the efforts of the U.S. Information Service to portray the United States in a favorable light.

Men, such as these, seldom speak of the alternatives by which the peoples of the underdeveloped countries could bring their own resources into play and encourage private capital investments.

They talk only of the yearnings which exist in the world, and why the United States must satisfy them at your expense.

LEADERS NOW REALIZING PUBLIC IS DISENCHANTED

Fortunately, there are a few men, in public life who realize that the long suffering American public is becoming disenchanted with satisfying foreign needs when we are unable to satisfy a good many of our own.

One such is Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana. He sees, as Walter Lippmann says, that "if foreign aid is to remain part of our foreign policy, the program will have to be reformed."

Senator MANSFIELD wants a thoroughgoing reexamination of gifts and grants as distinguished from loans. Presently, we are subsidizing large military establishments in countries which neither require such defense forces nor can ever support them.

The practice is especially questionable in Latin America. Countries like Peru need housing but get submarines and jet planes instead.

The Mansfield amendment would, within 3 years, call for a reduction in foreign aid wherever the aid is being used to maintain an oversized military establishment. The idea is to compel the administration to reexamine, restudy and justify all of the gifts which are going into guns instead of butter.

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, has suggested that Latin America could dispense with these armaments if military patrols of the Organization of American States undertook to safeguard the integrity of member states.

The proposals by these two Democratic Senators make infinitely more sense than the "don't touch, papa knows best" position of the administration.

LOANS AND GRANTS LEAD TO TROUBLE: EUGENE BLACK

On another front, let's listen to Eugene R. Black, president of the World Bank, an experienced and successful hand in the international loan field:

"When loans and grants are used, as they have been, to aid, abet and perpetuate policies in other countries which make economic growth virtually impossible, then we are asking for trouble."

Mr. Black doesn't believe, nor do we, that "you can buy people with aid." He is against political loans; building irrigation dams where the soil is unsuited to cultivation and the erection of steel mills which can stay in operation only through taxpayers' subsidies.

"The difference between effective assistance and a giveaway," says Mr. Black, "is not the difference between a loan and a grant; it is the difference between an insistence on sound financial and economic policies and no such insistence."

So we say, Mr. Percy, that your Republican task force would do well to challenge the administration's line that we shall be in dire peril unless the Congress obediently coughs up with every dollar of foreign aid that has been requested.

Time was when the Republican Party was a symbol of fiscal conservatism. The most charitable thing we can say today is that it is less reckless in its spending policies than the opposition.

If we must continue foreign aid, the program should be realistically conceived and efficiently administered.

Currently, it is neither.

Unless the foreign aid concept is radically altered, the Republicans offer nothing but an extension of previous Democratic policies.

Or, Mr. Percy, to put it another way:

On this issue alone, by what enduring principle should we vote for a Republican rather than a Democratic candidate for President in 1960?

Bring Back "Chip" Bohlen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune realizes, as set out in the following editorial, that our Government should take advantage of men who have had years of experience in dealing with Soviet double talk:

BRING BACK "CHIP" BOHLEN

Secretary of State Christian Herter says he would like to have Charles E. Bohlen back in Washington as a special consultant on Russian affairs. Some Senate Republican leaders are voicing strong opposition.

The two American diplomats probably the best informed on the Soviet Union are George F. Kennan and Bohlen. Kennan is no longer in the State Department. Bohlen is, but he is serving out his time in the Embassy in Manila and expecting to retire from the Department soon, unless he is induced to continue for a while in a Washington position.

It was costly to the State Department when it lost the services of Kennan. And it has been costly in the last few years not to have made full use of Bohlen's knowledge on Russia, instead of keeping him in the Philippines.

It doesn't make sense, when a man has become a recognized expert on a subject, for the State Department not to make use of him in that role. Assigning Bohlen to a desk in Washington will not make him the architect of our policy toward Russia, but it could keep us from making a serious error in that policy. If Herter thinks Bohlen can be of assistance to him in guiding our relations with the Soviet Union, there ought to be no question about utilizing his services.

Some Senators act as though ignorance of Russia was the prime qualification for advising on the Russian problem.

The Gordon Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, one of Oklahoma's daily newspapers carried a brief reminiscence by one of its columnists which is quite a story.

The newspaper is the Tulsa Daily World, and the columnist is a tall, soft-spoken fellow with an Irish twinkle in his eye, named Troy Gordon.

There is no need to spell out a public purpose in making the Gordon story a part of this RECORD. Every American who reads it will grow a little in spirit, in the process.

Here is the Gordon story:

ROUND THE CLOCK
(By Troy Gordon)

Thirty years ago last Sunday an 8-year-old boy fell out of a tree at Abilene, Kans. He was climbing toward a tree house and a wooden step nailed to the tree gave way.

He fell about 12 feet and landed on a concrete driveway. His right arm was fractured at the wrist and elbow—in fact, it bent backward at the elbow. All muscles, blood vessels and nerves were broken at that point, and the lower arm hung by a strip of skin.

This was followed by a long period of recovery and many operations by a Kansas City specialist attempting to rebuild the arm. The operations were fairly successful, but the arm was stiff at the elbow and wrist and he had only slight movement in his fingers.

Meanwhile, with the aid of his parents and teachers, he began learning to write left-handed, to tie his shoes, and to do the many other things a human being is called upon to do.

A cousin who was one of the stars of the Cook's Paint and Varnish basketball team sent him a basketball, and he began practicing in the backyard—shooting at a goal nailed on the tree from which he fell.

He became fairly proficient at basketball, and other sports for that matter, and he managed to make fair grades in school although he was out much of the time for surgery in Kansas City.

One day the surgeon prescribed one further operation. By this time the boy was 12 years old, and his parents decided to take him into the council which made such decisions.

"We'll go to a show while you make up your mind," his father said.

After the show the boy still wasn't ready to say, so the father, mother, and boy went to another show. After this one, the boy announced his decision.

"I don't think I ever want to go through another operation again," he said. "I'm getting along all right, and we don't know that my arm will be any better after another operation."

The parents were willing to accept that decision.

There were many key points in the boy's adolescence in which both he and his parents made crucial decisions. One came in junior high school when he wanted to go out for basketball.

"Mom," the boy said, "will you make me a glove or a stocking or something for me to wear on my right arm?"

The mother looked at him for a moment, and said, "No; I won't. If you're going out for basketball, you'll have to learn to live with your arm."

The boy went out for basketball and lettered in high school, junior college, and college.

At some point in his early teens, the boy decided to be a newspaperman. He spent hours at his dad's typewriter, learning to type with his left hand. He wrote imagined news stories and took all the journalism he could get.

In short, he became a newspaperman and enjoyed a moderate amount of success, although he wasn't any Bob Considine.

To quit beating around the bush, that boy was me. I write this, not as a bid for sympathy or praise, but because it is something I think about every time July 12 rolls around.

I write it to show that one does not have to resign himself to a limited life because of a serious injury. He can do pretty much what he pleases, if he'll make up his mind to it.

And after 30 years of living as a cripple (it's all right for me to call myself that but don't you try it—it's a cruel word), and no matter how ridiculous it may sound, I can honestly make this statement:

I am glad I feel from a tree in Abilene, Kans., July 12, 1929. I am glad of the experiences—both pleasant and unpleasant—which resulted from the accident.

It has done things for me and made me realize things which I never would have known otherwise.

And besides I am frequently flattered by little remarks which friends inadvertently drop into conversations which prove that they are not even conscious of my handicap.

There are two other things I want to say before closing this subject:

1. I wasn't really a very good basketball player—just average. But that's pretty good for a man with a stiff arm.

2. Don't ask a stranger about a handicap. It's all right for a friend to do so, but when a complete stranger brings it up, the handicapped person wants to drop through the floor. You see, you've pointed out how noticeable his handicap is.

Poison in Your Water—No. 141

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Saturday, July 11, 1959, issue of the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald entitled "Radioactive Waste Contaminates River."

Of all the frightening substances which go into our waters some of the most dangerous are radioactive wastes from mines and from experimental and industrial uses of radioactive substances.

One of the most significant instances of this appeared in the case of the Animas River which has been heavily laden with radium and other atomic wastes. This article very well shows the frightening danger to our people from this sort of waste.

It is interesting to note that the President was asked about this situation at his press conference recently. He said he intended to look into the matter.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE CONTAMINATES RIVER

(By Edward Gamarekian)

During the past decade, uranium ore-processing mills in this country have been, and still are, dumping radioactive and chemical wastes into nearby rivers with no knowledge of the extent to which they are poisoning the food and water supplies of the communities downstream, and apparently little concern.

The U.S. Public Health Service has completed a $50,000 study of one of the chief offenders—the Vanadium Corp. of America's refinery at Durango, Colo.

This plant, processing 514 tons of ore when the study was underway last year (increased to 700 tons a day since then), excretes its wastes into the Animas River, which flows through southwestern Colorado into New Mexico. The 116-page report shows that 30,000 people living downstream of the mill are unknowingly ingesting radium at a rate that is several times the maximum permissible limit.

Although officials of the Atomic Energy Commission and Public Health Service who have been following the situation have kept mum on what they plan to do about it pending further study, a PHS source yesterday disclosed that the Vanadium Corp. has just agreed to take corrective action within the next 4 months.

During the 11 years that the Durango refinery has been in operation, it has been contaminating the food and water supplies of 22,000 residents of Farmington, N. Mex., 6,000 residents of Aztec, N. Mex., and approximately 2,000 people strung out along the shores of the Animas. In addition, some 26,000 acres of farmland have been irrigated with the radium-loaded river water.

Measurements of the drinking water in the two New Mexico towns have shown that none of the radium is removed by their water purifiers.

In its detailed study, the Public Health Service stated that no measurements were made of the air pollution in the vicinity of the mill or of the radiation exposure to those who worked inside. No estimates were made of the effect of the water contamination on the boys who swim and fish just below and opposite the mill.

There no longer are any fish for a long stretch downstream of the plant because chemical wastes have killed off the insects on which fish feed.

Although public health officials have privately voiced great concern over the situation, the Public Health Service did not show too much alarm in its report and said "ingestion of any particular radioisotope in amounts somewhat higher than the allowable for relatively brief periods of time may not result in undue harm. In another part of the report, however, the PHS admitted its figures might be low for some localities and pointed with apprehension to coming developments which would make the situation even worse in the near future, namely, the increase in radium concentration that would be produced by both the increase in ore tonnage and the anticipated decrease in river waterflow. The first has already happened since the preparation of the report; the second will occur when a water diversion project upstream from Durango is completed.

Examinations of the bones of radium dial painters in the past indicate that the levels of radium in the food and water along the Animas River are already high enough to bring about structural changes in the bones of the people in the area if the contamination continues. The problem has been further aggravated by the strontium 90 in the food from the nuclear bomb tests in nearby Nevada.

The number of cases of bone cancer and leukemia that will result cannot be predicted at this point with any certainty but it is extremely probable that a number of growing children in the area will be affected.

OFFICIAL NOTICE

The primary responsibility for the public's health and safety in this matter has been placed squarely on the Atomic Energy Commission by the Atomic Energy Act. The AEC has passed it on to the mill owners, however, and has done little to keep tabs on the situation.

It was not until the Public Health Service published the results of its 1958 study of the Animas River this past May that the AEC took official notice of what has been going on during the past 11 years.

On May 22, the AEC wrote to the Vanadium Corp. and asked what was being done about the contamination of the Animas and the radioactive dust in the air in and around the mills.

With regard to the disposal of wastes in the river, the AEC said:

"Your company has caused the release of radioactive material into the Animas River in concentrations in excess of those provided by (the regulations) without having demonstrated (they) are not likely to expose any individual to concentrations in excess of the limits specified."

The AEC asked for a complete statement of the steps that would be taken to bring the operation into compliance.

On June 26, the Vanadium Corp. replied that it was not qualified to make any statement on radioactivity in the food and milk that was reported by the Public Health Service. As for the contamination of the river, it went on, the PHS figures showed that the level of radium in the water supplies at Aztec and Farmington were well below the allowable limit.

"In all of these operations," the letter read, "the company must balance the benficial results to the Animas River water against the allowable expenses to the operation."

Although the figures referred to by the company supported its argument, they were taken out of context. The figures were obtained under a set of conditions which made them appear low. They were obtained, as the report pointed out, during a period when the waterflow in the river was well above average. Adjusted for average conditions and the anticipated increase in ore tonnage now reached, the report showed that the radium concentrations in the drinking water downstream of the refinery would be several times the permissible limit.

ESTIMATES LOW

If the riverflow is average during the current 12-month period, the radium in the water as it crosses the New Mexico border will be about 3.8 times the limit. If the radium and the strontium 90 in the average diet in this region is added to the amount obtained from drinking water which comes from the river, the average person will get about 4.6 times the permissible limit of radiation, according to PHS estimates.

At Aztec and Farmington, which are further downstream, the levels will be somewhat less owing to the removal of some of the radium from the water that was used for irrigation. At Aztec (population, 6,000), the radium and strontium concentrations in the average diet will be 3.2 times the permissible limit. At Farmington (population, 28,000), it will be 2.7 times the limit.

These estimates are now a little low since the Public Health Service did not adjust the radium concentrations in the food upward to account for the recent 36-percent increase in ore tonnage at the Durango mill.

A Public Health Service official said yesterday that the Vanadium Corp. has just agreed to put in settling tanks and a filter system which will remove as much as 98 percent of the radium from the river water. The equipment should be installed within 4 months, he said, at which time the PHS will send in a team for a followup study.

SOIL CONTAMINATED

No plans have been made to do anything about the radium that is already in the soil, however. Cleaning up the river will eliminate the radium from the drinking water but foods grown in the area will continue to pick up enough from the soil to give the average person 50 percent of the permissible limit of radiation, the strontium 90 bringing the total up to 72 percent of the limit.

Although the cleanup will remove most of the radium from the total diet, this much will remain for many years to come unless the farmers take steps to reduce the soil contamination. Radium has a half life of 1,620 years and strontium 90 has a half life of 27.4 years. Some may wash out of the soil but scientists estimate it will be a slow process.

In commenting on why nothing has been done in 11 years to correct matters, the Atomic Energy Commission says regulations were not set up until 1957 and points out that the investigations started shortly afterward.

The permissible limits on which the regulations are based, however, were recommended in 1953 by the National Commission on Radiation Protection.

The Public Health Service, on the other hand, states it was powerless to act until the adoption of the Water Pollution Act in 1957.

There are about 28 uranium refineries now in operation in this country, all of which are dumping wastes into nearby streams.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, by designation of the President and by the unanimous authorization of the Congress, this week of July 20, has been proclaimed as Captive Nations Week.

It is fitting that we who represent the people of our country at the seat of government in an atmosphere of complete political freedom should reflect upon the fate of those people and nations who have been denied their freedom, who have lost it through subversion, or who have had it torn from them by armed might.

We have learned, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot relax in our own freedom. We have a direct and personal stake in assuring the freedom of others. The American people have recognized this obligation: through mutual security pacts with other free countries, through economic assistance to developing nations, and through military firmness in opposition to threatened aggression.

Nevertheless, it is a fact that many tragic lands have been enslaved as a result of communist aggression and treachery since World War II. Both as a practical matter and as a moral responsibility, we cannot forget these unhappy people. Whenever freedom is denied to some, it is jeopardized for all others.

On the occasion of Captive Nations Week, we can rededicate ourselves to the proposition that freedom is the right of all people and all nations, and we can renew our pledge that we shall do everything practicable to protect, assist, and recover freedom throughout the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely editorial from the July 20 issue of the New York Times:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

President Eisenhower has proclaimed this as Captive Nations Week. He has also signed a congressional resolution calling for a similar proclamation each year until the captive nations have regained their freedom.

This problem of the captive peoples presents many difficulties and requires the close study that the President urged. It is not suggested that we should go running into an atom war to drive out the captors. While some peoples have declared that they are willing to risk annihilation for the sake of their freedom, it is not our province to make this choice on their behalf.

At the same time, we cannot be insensitive to the monstrous things that have been done to whole nations and even races in the name of a vaunted liberation. We should be callous indeed if we could forget Hungary and Tibet, North Korea, and North Vietnam, the Baltic States, and East Germany. That we endure the temporary reign of these awful tyrannies without a rush to arms does not mean that we condone them.

The real purpose of this Captive Nations Week observation, therefore, is to keep the plight of these peoples freshly in our minds. It may help them to know that we have not forgotten them. It ought to help us, in the moral sense, if we continue to remember.

Food Costs in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that we are in a very real sense living in a subsidized society, where practically every segment of our economy is supported by Uncle Sam in some form or another, the large metropolitan newspapers appear determined to stigmatize the farmers as the only group receiving governmental assistance. The story is rarely told that dollar for dollar and item for item, the groceries we buy at the store are cheaper in the United States than in any other nation on earth. When the Queen of England came to Washington 2 years age she commented on the variety of goods in a supermarket she visited. Even Mikoyan, the No. 2 Soviet leader, visited a supermarket and gasped at the quantity and quality of food available to purchasers.

The reason why the American housewife can buy food cheaper than the shoppers anywhere else in the world is the efficiency of the farmer. Prices are not as low perhaps as they should or could be, but the cold statistics show that the average American worker has to work fewer hours each week to feed himself and family than the worker of any other country in the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am delighted to include a very enlightening article written by Jay Richter which appeared in the July 1959 issue of Country Living magazine.

The article follows:

COUNTRY LIVING NEWSLETTER

(By Jay Richter)

WASHINGTON.—You'd think that America's rural citizen owed the rest of the country an apology for living, judging by the Luce talk you see these days in Time-Life-Fortune and some of the other city magazines and newspapers.

The way this standard press pap has it, the farmer and his friends are being pampered to the point where we're all about to be ruined by it.

This correspondent holds no brief for how the present crowd in Washington is running farm programs. It may be quite true, as some say, that the Department of Agriculture has never used so many dollars to do so little.

But let's not lose our heads.

U.S. farmers and their Government, working together over the years, have built a food-and-fiber production plant that is the technological marvel of the age. Our agricultural operation remains today the envy of the world, and for some needy peoples American food is about all that keeps body and soul together.

SOFT SOAP NOT REQUIRED

Our problem—what to do with too much—is the kind of trouble other nations wish they could get into.

Apologies are due to nobody in this country or elsewhere for the condition of American agriculture.

Modern American farming practices today permit a single farmworker to produce enough food for himself and 23 others—an unparalleled production efficiency ratio that has been carefully noted by Nikita Khrushchev. In a recent talk urging his countrymen to greater efforts on the farm front, the dictator of all the Russians made some comparisons.

They were odious from the Soviet point of view.

The statistics showed that in Russia it takes something like three times more labor than it does in America for a farmer to produce a given amount of food. Approximately four and one-half times as much labor is required in the Soviet as in this country to produce a bushel of grain. It takes a Russian farmer about twice the labor to turn out a bale of cotton, and two and one-half times as much to produce a hundred pounds of milk.

MORE FOOD FOR LESS WORK

Thirty years ago it took a U.S. worker about 1 hour of his labor to buy a dozen eggs whereas today he can get them for only 15 minutes of work. Eighteen minutes of work buys a pound of chuck roast that used to cost 24 minutes of labor. The amount of working time required to earn a quart of milk has been cut in half as is the case with potatoes and also bread.

The American farmer, to sum up, is producing ever-increasing amounts of food for a growing population at an ever-decreasing

cost per unit of output. He is getting these results through use of more machinery, better management, and increased yields.

That is the story we have for the Russians. The chapter and verse includes some recent developments that are eye-poppers, and which would have been impossible without rural electrification.

PUSHBUTTON FEEDING

A case in point is motor-driven conveyors that simultaneously haul grain, silage, and protein supplement from separate storage areas, mix them in proper proportions, and finally dispense the ration to livestock by auger into long feeding troughs.

Other examples include equipment that permits a farmer to feed hundreds of animals in a few minutes with the push of a button; and a new machine that automatically bales hay, then tosses the bound bale into a wagon trailing the baler.

By hooking together a number of pieces of equipment, American farmers now may plant, fertilize, and spray on a preemergence weed killer at the same time a field is plowed. It is thus possible to harvest a crop on the second trip across the field, eliminating the need for harrowing, disking, and sometimes cultivation as well.

FARM RESEARCH HELPS EVERYBODY

You are sometimes led to believe that America's pampered farmers are the sole beneficiaries of expenditures for farm research. The fact is that farm scientists work for everybody in the Nation, and frequently their findings are of direct benefit to all peoples everywhere.

Such was the case, for instance, with streptomycin, discovered in the course of soil studies at New Jersey's agricultural experiment station. This drug gave the world its first important breakthrough in the search for effective control and treatment of tuberculosis.

Another development of a similar kind was described recently by Harold E. Myers, dean of the College of Agriculture, University of Arizona.

BENEFICIARIES INCLUDE IKE, LYNDON

"Thirty years ago," Dean Myers recently told a congressional committee, "sweetclover hay fed as the principal food to cattle frequently resulted in tremendous death losses, especially at the time of dehorning and castrating. The animals bled to death. Through agricultural research, the cause of bleeding was determined.

"A chemical substance in sweetclover called 'dicoumarol' was the causative agent," Dean Myers went on. "One research scientist asked, 'If this compound kills cattle by causing them to bleed to death, why wouldn't it kill rats and mice?' Put into a food attractive to rats and mice it was found to work. * * * Someone also said, 'This compound delays clotting of blood. Blood clotting is a serious problem in humans—why not try dicoumarol in such cases?' It was found to work.

"Today, President Eisenhower, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, and many others are living and are in fairly good health, thanks to dicoumarol and to agricultural research."

Housing Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Leader, an Indianapolis, Ind., newspaper, relates a few facts pertaining to the President's recent veto of the housing legislation:

WHAT THE VETO MEANS

President Eisenhower's veto of the Housing Act of 1959 has exposed the essential phoniness of his antispending, anti-inflation campaign.

The bill he vetoed was a compromise measure passed by both Houses of Congress with bipartisan support. It was designed as a moderate proposal to help meet America's critical housing needs, to enable our cities and their people to take a long forward step toward a better way of life by eradicating slums and providing decent housing for all Americans.

The veto comes on the heels of the President's request for lifting the interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds, a move which would force up interest rate all through the economy. The price of money and its effect on general price stability apparently does not concern the President. But the slight cost of providing decent housing for Americans is inflationary.

The net effect of the President's economic policies as revealed in the housing bill veto and the no-ceiling-on-interest-rates proposal is to build fewer houses at higher prices.

This philosophy carried over into the other areas of American economic life spells economic stagnation and a new cycle of boom and recession in the year ahead.

The President's failure to understand the problem of economic growth and his obsession with inflation and spending can only lead to more vetoes of reasonable social welfare legislation and a slackening in America's dynamic economy. It will be to the detriment of the Nation and the free world.

Massachusetts Salutes Maj. Gen. Edgar C. Erickson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished native of my home city of Worcester, Mass., Maj. Gen. Edgar C. Erickson, has very recently retired as head of the National Guard Bureau here in the Pentagon, after 45 years of exemplary military service.

The career of Major General Erickson provides an inspiration to those young men who are currently entering the military as their life's ambition.

He enlisted in the former H Company Wellington Rifles, 2d Massachusetts Infantry, in 1914 and rose from private to colonel in command of the 181st Infantry Regiment, 26th—Yankee—Division, Massachusetts National Guard; in this period of service, he took part in the Mexican border incident of 1916. He also served with 101st Infantry, 26th Division, in France during World War I.

In 1942, he entered upon active duty for World War II service accepting a demotion from brigadier general to colonel. During that war, he served with an Infantry unit with the Chinese Army in the Chinese Combat Command on special assignment. He was awarded the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal, and was personally honored by the President of the National Government of the Republic of China.

Soon after his return from oversea duty in 1946, General Erickson received special assignment as a board member of the Army Discharge Review Board in St. Louis, Mo., and a year later was attached to the National Guard Bureau, Washington, D.C. Here he served as Acting Chief of the Army Division, National Guard Bureau, until his appointment by President Eisenhower to head the Bureau in 1953. He was reappointed to a further 4 years term, by the President, on June 24, 1957, and served in that capacity until his recent retirement.

Major General Erickson is revered and respected by everyone who ever came into contact with him; the loyalty to him by those who served in the military with him is a legend.

Quiet and unassuming, but with supreme efficiency and dedicated determination, Major General Edickson was the type of soldier who lead and taught his men by personal example. He was noted for his humanitarian understanding and unique ability to encourage the highest troop morale with the projection of strict, but tempered, discipline. Throughout his life, he has been recognized for his interest in, and contribution to, youth welfare programs, and most particularly for his sacrifices of time and energy in assisting in the rehabilitation of the unfortunate and friendless boy.

We in Massachusetts salute Major General Erickson as a great patriot, a dedicated soldier, who devoted the major part of his life in unselfish service to his country and his fellowmen.

We pray the good Lord will bless him with continuing good health through many more years of richly deserved success and enjoyment in his retirement from professional military service.

More About That Housing Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the July 9, 1959, issue of the Milwaukie (Oreg.) Review:

IKE SLUGS OREGON AGAIN

Congress had made every effort to compromise the much-needed housing bill to the point the President would sign it. In defiance and pique the aging chief executive vetoed the bill. After all, he can't run again and the wishes and even the needs of the people can be flouted without a reckoning.

Oregon suffers most of any State by this indefensible veto. Not only are several of our cities interested deeply in urban renewal, but our basic industry is lumber. When housing slacks off, Oregon goes into its periodic tailspins. High interest rates (tight money) can plunge us downward; so can failure to keep up with national housing needs.

Partisan discipline will probably prevent the overriding of this angry veto. Every indication is that NIXON would have followed the same reactionary policy—an important fact to remember when we pick a new chief executive for the United States in 1960.

Traffic Safety Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in view of Congress continuing interest in the subject of traffic safety, our colleagues will be greatly interested in the remarkable record established by the township of Cranford in Union County, N.J.

Cranford, a municipality with a population of more than 20,000 people, has reduced its traffic accident rate by 58 percent by means of intelligent, fair, and persistent enforcement of its traffic regulations.

A very cogent and frank analysis of the safety situation and of Cranford's solution to it was published in the July 17 issue of the Elizabeth Daily Journal. I recommend it highly and I include it herewith, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, as follows:

CRANFORD HAS THE ANSWER

Ever since New Jersey started to get traffic religion there's been enough chest thumping going on to produce a permanent softness in the general area of the xiphoid process and heads have been bobbing like apples on Halloween. That's from taking bows. Men have viewed with alarm and called attention to results with pride, while out in Cranford they didn't do anything but saw wood.

Have you (and of course you have, because everybody ought to be talking about it) seen the new Cranford report on traffic law enforcement? Here is the answer. While other communities were talking about what had to be done and how they were going to do it, Cranford up and did it. That makes a whale of a difference in good living.

If you start to read the report with ordinary attention you'll find that Cranford has reduced its automobile accidents by 58 percent. And if you read that far how can you stop? Reduction of auto accidents is the hope of every thinking motorist and the aim of every awake town. How did they do it in Cranford? There were no mirrors involved and none of the other illusions of magic, simply the hardheaded, realistic approach to the traffic evil that can be treated correctly in only one way—that's law enforcement.

This was no invasion of home and fireside, no intrusion on the rights of motorists through traps and the old billboard trick. Police Chief Lester Powell simply deployed his university trained traffic experts to established trouble spots at periods when danger was liveliest and told them to go to work. The result was issuance of 166 more summonses for motoring violations since the first of the year than were issued over the same period last year and there were 58 percent fewer accidents; also 16 fewer arrests for drunken driving. There was one fatal accident, the first in more than a year, the victim being a pedestrian. Injuries from auto accidents were practically cut in half.

It is particularly worthy of note that in this campaign Lt. Lawrence Bonnell and his aid, Patrolman Robert Ryan, unlike procedure in so many unreasoned road campaigns, set out with only one record in mind. The numbers of summonses, the number of fines were entirely incidental to the establishment of a record for safety on the Cranford streets. It is a record toward which the erstwhile "Venice of New Jersey" is making splendid progress and a performance that will have to be imitated in almost every other town before the streets and highways become as safe as they can be.

The State and the towns are repeatedly guilty of winking at flagrant disregard for their own laws. It cannot be denied that there are two sets of conflicting laws for the private car and the public carriers on the turnpikes, parkways, and highways. There's no secret about this and it could explain laxities at local levels by police unwilling to penalize their neighbors for offenses from which carriers repeatedly are excused. Nor is the erring, often confused, stranger always afforded the same courtesy as the hometown hero.

Motor traffic control can be successful only under a single blanket code carried out with a single standard of application. Cranford appears to have laid down a challenge for the rest of us.

Panhandling Isn't the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of July 16, under the heading "Cities Have a Responsibility, Too," I pointed out that some of the criticism voiced at the recent U.S. Conference of Mayors was not well founded because there is much that can, and should, be done at the local level regarding urban renewal.

I include an editorial from the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press of July 19, 1959, which sheds further light on this matter and which I commend to my colleagues:

PANHANDLING ISN'T THE WAY

Some 300 mayors of the Nation's major cities met in Los Angeles last week to discuss municipal problems, and they had plenty of problems to discuss, to be sure.

Difficult problems are, of course, urban renewal, municipal-suburban relationships and inadequacy of tax revenues. These are problems well known in the Triple Cities.

Reports of the Los Angeles sessions suggest that the municipal executives spend far too much time in lament over the President's veto of the housing-urban renewal bill, over diversion of Federal subsidies to supplicants other than cities, and over Federal hogging of revenues.

Any fair appraisal of the situation suggests that cities have a valid complaint. But more is to be gained from doing than from crying. The amount of Federal money that cities need is unlikely to be forthcoming. But as apart from the defeatist views of the mayors, that isn't to concede that community problems aren't susceptible to solution at the community level.

As a matter of fact many communities throughout the land are moving to meet planning, financial and other problems of urban renewal with a high degree of success.

And we are not among Binghamtonians who believe that downtown Binghamton will rot on the vine if Uncle Sam fails to pour jingle our way from his all but empty purse. The community has its Valley Development Foundation. It has its people with brains and enterprise. If need be, the Triple Cities can do as much in solution of its problems as other communities are doing.

A line from Cervantes is to the effect that no one should ever stand supplicant for things he can earn himself. First comes the will to do, then analysis and planning, and finally the doing. And it is never quite so difficult as it may have seemed.

A widely embraced view that State and Federal aid taken from the people can be returned to them grown to limitless dimensions must die in simple arithmetic. The Federal Government with its Treasury emptied by commitments and subsidies to one pressure interest and another has no largesse to dispense except at a price of inflation, which is the cruelest tax of all upon the people.

Looking to the Government to solve problems has resulted in a situation wherein the Federal Government is taking 75 cents of every tax dollar. And there is scarcely a single problem passed from the individual or the community to the Government that has been really ameliorated. Any real solution will lie only in assumption of greater local responsibility for local problems.

The Nation does not lack means to meet its problems. Billions of dollars are wasted at all levels of Government. Politics and politicians stand in the way of economies that simple logic and equity dictate.

The mayors, meeting at Los Angeles, were crybabies about diversion of tax revenues, but one and all are probably unwilling to save money locally by eliminating waste and duplication.

If Government were to get all the money it demanded, it still would never have enough. No amount of money ever satisfies the tax collectors, and it never will. A limit should be put on what crazy, irresponsible Federal Government can take of the people's substance. And there is no less a need for such a limit at the State and local level.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*.....408 A St. NE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*.....
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*.....
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*.....
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*.....
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*.....
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*.....
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Engle, Clair, *Calif*.....3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*.....
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*.....
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*.....
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*.....
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*.....3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*.....
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*.....2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*.....
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*.....
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.....
Proxmire, William, *Wis*.....
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John, *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*.....
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*.....

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Missile-Satellite Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in a recent address to the Missile Industry Conference here in Washington, D.C., on the subject "Missile-Satellite Diplomacy: A New Dimension of Warfare," I presented some of the considerations which had led me to propose a Government Operations Committee study of the effectiveness of our governmental machinery in the struggle with world communism, a study approved last week by the Senate.

The address emphasizes the importance of better organization and procedures to relate crucial new scientific developments to an overall national strategy. We must not miss the psychological implications of the next sputnik—whatever it may be.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSILE-SATELLITE DIPLOMACY: A NEW DIMENSION OF WARFARE

(Address by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON before the missile industry luncheon of the National Missile Industry Conference, Washington, D.C., May 26, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to participate in your national missile industry conference and to join you at this luncheon. I have great respect for the forward-looking views of your membership.

Some of us in Congress have been working for many years in the cause to which you are pledged—U.S. leadership in rocketry and astronautics. In our efforts on the Hill, we rely heavily on the help and support of members of this conference.

To obtain leadership in missile and space technology, we have to stay ahead in the race for discovery. It took Americans a long time to accept the idea of such a race.

At the end of World War II most people thought it inconceivable that any nation could ever overtake, let alone surpass us in weapons technology. After all, we had the most productive economy in all history. And we alone had the atomic bomb.

Then the facts began to speak for themselves.

The Soviets achieved the atomic bomb—only 4 years behind us. They tested their first hydrogen bomb—less than 9 months after our first full-scale hydrogen test.

Still the lesson did not sink in. As late as 1955, some of us in Congress had to write a confidential letter to the President to induce him to obtain his first full-scale briefing on the status of our ballastic missile program.

Then, 2 years later the Soviets registered a stunning scientific first, the successful testing of the intercontinental ballistic missile.

Gradually the truth penetrated. These were not isolated victories. They were all parts of a technological contest in which the stakes were getting higher with each bid.

There was a time when the A-bomb was called the absolute weapon. Then we got the H-bomb, and that became the final weapon. Then came the ICBM, and now we think of this as the ultimate weapon.

Just as surely as these so-called absolute, final, and ultimate weapons have succeeded each other every few years, new and more advanced developments will make them obsolete.

In this sort of race one can never let down one's guard. In the competition for critical new weapons this country has to do whatever is necessary to win and to hold a decisive lead.

Self-evident as this proposition is, there are still a few holdouts in high places—and very important holdouts at that.

Four months ago, the administration conceded without contest superiority in the intercontinental ballistic missile to the Soviet Union—a margin of superiority that is estimated to become as large as 3 to 1.

We gave up the race—of our own free will. We have the talent and the resources needed to win. But, we are bowing out.

This decision is wrong. Today our total military force may still be able to deter the adversary. But will we have the deterrent tomorrow? Unless this decision is reversed, we may not.

We must broaden and accelerate our ballistic missile program. We must move as rapidly as possible to the most invulnerable deterrent now in sight—that is the ballistic missile buried in the earth, the ballistic missile mounted on mobile platforms, and the ballistic missile hidden under the seven seas and under the Arctic ice.

A great many people now accept that we are in a race for discovery. It took us too long to recognize this elemental principle of survival. Now we are in a further race, and a more sophisticated one—a race for prestige.

There is more involved in wimming the races for discovery than military hardware. Certain advances impress the world not only by the menace of an overpowering weapon, but also with the scientific and industrial strength which made them possible. The discoverer thereby wields vast new diplomatic leverage.

This is especially true where the discoverer is a so-called backward nation—like the Soviet Union—expected to be the second runner, without a chance to win. In this case the element of surprise deepens the impact of the victory.

I can speak from personal experience to illustrate how little this impact has been understood.

More than 3 years ago, I warned that the Soviets were winning the race for the ballistic missile. I said we need not assume that Moscow would actually use such missiles in atomic war. Their purpose, I argued, was twofold: First, to stockpile the missile in their military arsenal; second, to bid for the imagination of peoples by showing scientific and industrial superiority to the United States—and to use the fearful new weapon for ballistic blackmail.

Do you know how the Defense Department responded to my warning? They answered: "The ballistic missile does not kill you any deader than a bomber does with an atomic bomb." That is how well the Defense Department evaluated the diplomatic implications of the most important weapon of our age.

For over 2 years now, in one crisis after another, Moscow has rattled her missiles—in Suez, Iraq, Quemoy, and now Berlin.

Military pressure on foreign governments in peacetime is nothing new. But ballistic blackmail carries a threat of a wholly new dimension—physical extinction for an entire people.

Just this month, Khrushchev set the stage for the Geneva Foreign Ministers' Conference with his favorite conversational device—bomb-dropping.

He casually informed a West German publicist that eight Soviet H-bombs could obliterate his country.

How much consideration have we given to the fact that the blackmail value of the ballistic missile will increase as the Soviets produce more of these catastrophic weapons than we do?

True, we have fallen behind in the ICBM. But it would go a long way to hold the ground if the Soviets at least knew that we were bending every effort to catch up. When Moscow feels we are not making such an effort, they exploit their advantage in a multitude of directions.

Take now the classic case of sputnik.

You remember the absurd talk the day sputnik went up: "A mere hunk of iron," we were told, "a basketball," "a bauble."

It was a bobble all right. It was our bobble; we dropped the ball. We missed the significance of the satellite as a Soviet bid to power by capturing man's imagination.

Sputnik is a vivid advertisement of enormous Soviet scientific and intellectual progress. It is the kind of advertising victory Batton, Barton, Durstine, and Osborn dream of. It is a tangible object everyone can see—dramatic proof of Russia's latest spurt of accomplishment. It is equally dramatic—equally compelling—to the most sophisticated scientist and to the most unsophisticated member of a backward nation trying to decide which side his bread is buttered on.

With sputnik, Moscow successfully struck at the heart of America's prestige—its hitherto undisputed industrial, scientific, and technical superiority.

These days we hear a lot of talk about economy in Government. I wonder how many billions of dollars worth of prestige it has cost us—because we thought orbiting a satellite was just one more technical achievement, without special significance. This is an indebtedness for which we will make payments for years to come.

If we have learned anything from the missile and satellite debacle, it should be this: The race is not only to the swift, but to the society which can organize its human and material resources to outthink, outplan, and outperform the adversary.

The Communists are skilled at organization. They view their relation to the rest of the world as one protracted conflict. They are prepared for the contest.

We need to outdo Russia in the critical new developments. Let's face it, however, we are poorly organized for the task.

Of course, better organization cannot assure success. But good organization can

help, and poor organization hurts. Basically, we need to improve our methods in three respects:

1. We have to get all of the promising developments that might affect the race for discovery and the race for prestige out on the table, where they can be recognized. We cannot rely on some modern Einstein to resort to the extraordinary expedient of writing a private letter to the President, as was the case in the initiation of the A-bomb project.

2. We have to develop techniques within our Government to encourage the exercise of inspired judgment on which developments to push. Once the technical possibility of a project is known, we cannot afford years and years of delay before starting a serious program, as happened with the H-bomb.

3. We have to know how to relate crucial new developments to overall national strategy. We cannot miss the psychological implications of the next sputnik—whatever it may be.

The truth is we have made little progress on these problems of organization. Come a crisis we may arouse ourselves to take emergency action. We appoint a science adviser to the President. Come another crisis we may arouse ourselves again. We create a National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I do not quarrel with these changes—they may be to the good—time will tell. But they are piecemeal and stopgap. At no time since World War II have we made a considered and comprehensive inquiry into the new kind of governmental techniques we need—to meet the wholly new kind of challenge.

These are among the considerations I had in mind, in initiating a broad Senate study of the effectiveness of our governmental organization in the struggle with world communism.

The study will be nonpartisan, and will be conducted by a special Government Operations Subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman.

We shall wrestle with this central issue of our age—Can a free society so organized itself as to recognize new problems in the world and in space—and respond, in time, with new ideas?

Unlike some problems that confront us, that of organization is within the power of Congress to tackle—and to tackle vigorously At this point in our history, I believe there is no more important contribution that the Senate could make than to help the executive branch organize our Government for survival.

In conclusion, let me say this:

If this Nation had all the time in the world to work things out, complacency might see us through. But today time is the one commodity in short supply. Our only time is the present.

The commitment to freedom is rigorous.

This Republic was not established by laggards, and laggards will not preserve it.

International Race at Laurel, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the Vice President of the United States is leaving for a visit in Russia which we all hope will be successful in every way. He is carrying with him an invitation to the Russians to take part in the Washington International Race at Laurel, Md., this fall.

Last week the Vice President joined me in receiving John D. Schapiro, president of the Laurel Race Course, who is extending through Mr. NIXON the invitation to the Russians to send their best horses to take part in this year's running of the famous Washington International. This is all part of the people-to-people program for promoting peaceful coexistence, endorsed by President Eisenhower.

Mr. President, I have prepared a statement about the Washington International, and I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL RACE, A BIT OF COEXISTENCE

(Statement by Hon. J. GLENN BEALL, of Maryland)

We recognize today that people in this country and throughout the world are deeply concerned with the problem of peace. Many vehicles have been used in efforts to promote peaceful coexistence with Soviet Russia. The people-to-people program, endorsed by President Eisenhower, has been active in the area of exchange visits on the cultural and sports level.

Last year, Soviet Russia responded to an invitation from John D. Schapiro, president of the Laurel Racecourse and sent two of its best thoroughbreds to compete in the Washington, D.C., International Race at the Laurel Racecourse. This year, Vice President NIXON, on his forthcoming visit to Russia, will carry an invitation from the Laurel Racecourse to the Russian Government to again send its best thoroughbreds to compete in the race.

From its beginning 8 years ago, the Washington International, held at Laurel, Md., has captured the imagination of racegoers from the four corners of the globe. It has blended together a sound sporting idea with modern air travel to form an international spectacle ranking with the best worldwide contests. From Dublin to Rome, from Melbourne to Malta, from New York to Los Angeles, the International is a topic of conversation among sporting people.

Contenders can be flown to Laurel in less than a day from Europe or South America. Quarantine time is a matter of a few hours. Thus, the foreign participant can be on the Laurel training track within a day and a half.

The Washington, D.C., International is an "Olympic of racing." Indeed, the race was begun with the idea in mind that the best horses of each country, meeting on the turf (which is the natural footing for thoroughbreds), and at the classic distance of a mile and a half, should have the opportunity to compete for the world championship, as in other sports. This event is an invitational affair, with both foreign and American contenders handpicked by an international committee. The entrants must be winners of important races and possess outstanding records.

In the seven previous editions of the Washington, D.C., International, the theme has run to color, surprises, and excitement—a race to kindle the imagination and create racing history on a scale heretofore unknown. In 1954, the Queen of England was invited to send her horse Landau to Laurel, and Her Majesty accepted, marking the first time that the colors of the Royal Family had ever appeared outside Great Britain. In succeeding years, the President of Ireland, Sir Winston Churchill, and Prince Aly Khan, Pakistan Ambassador to the United Nations, have entered horses in the race. Among other countries represented have been Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, England, France, Ireland, Sweden, West Germany, and Venezuela. Last year, the U.S.S.R. sent two of its best thoroughbreds to compete in the International. One prominent newspaperman said: "The field may be comprised of equine royalty indeed, but on their backs will be their betters. The Laurel race wins the all-time blue ribbon for rider talent because there is doubt that such riding skill was ever assembled in one race before."

No greater tribute could be given the Washington, D.C., International than when a worldwide committee of horsemen rated it with the King George VI and Queen Elizabeth stakes at Ascot and the Arc de Triomphe at Longchamps as one of the best races in the international field. It is clear that the Washington International has the magnetism, dignity, and essence of a true thoroughbred classic. Each year the magnitude and significance of this race has increased, and the eighth running on November 11 of this year should add to its ever-growing luster. I hope the Russians will tell our Vice President that they will again accept the invitation.

Ninety-eighth Anniversary of First Battle of Manassas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a very eloquent speech made by Representative WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina, on the occasion of commemorating the 98th anniversary of the Battle of Manassas in Virginia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, DEMOCRAT, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, COMMEMORATING 98TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST BATTLE OF MANASSAS, MANASSAS NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD PARK, MANASSAS, VA.

President Martin, you and the District of Columbia division, United Daughters of the Confederacy are to be commended for observing the anniversary of this great battle. In your ceremony today, you are remembering deeds of gallantry and heroism all Americans can point to with pride. I congratulate you Sons of the Confederacy, Children of the Confederacy, and the Southern Relief Society for joining the United Daughters to commemorate this 98th anniversary of the First Battle of Manassas.

Mr. Jones, thank you for your very kind introduction. The people of America are indebted to you for your excellent work on the life of Col. John S. Mosby, "The Gray Ghost." As we approach the centennial of that tragic era, your books will contribute greatly to the proper evaluation of that important episode in our history. Your writings will be an inspiration to the youth of our land, both North and South.

I am flattered and honored by the presence of Judge and Mrs. Howard Smith. My friends, Congressman SMITH, is standing like a stonewall for constitutional government. General Jackson said of Robert E. Lee, "I would follow him blindfolded." Judge SMITH, we would follow you blindfolded in the cause of State rights.

Madam President, I dedicate my remarks to the memory of my grandfather, George E. Dorn, a 19-year-old volunteer who fought here with the famed Hampton Legion. This hill to me is hallowed ground. Indeed, all Virginia soil is sacred to me. I am sure that my grandfather never dreamed that I would be here today in this capacity to pay homage to those men and the leaders whom he followed and whom he loved. Manassas was a bloody milestone that had to be passed in the progress and unity of our country. Americans everywhere are rightly proud of the courage and heroic deeds displayed by our forefathers on this field. It is up to us, the living, to pass on to future generations the story of Bull Run. It is proper that we place wreaths today on the monuments to three men whose names will live forever in the saga of this conflict. The names of Gen. Stonewall Jackson of Virginia, Gen. Barnard E. Bee of South Carolina, and Gen. Francis Bartow of Georgia will always be associated with the deeds of valor on this field.

Gen. Stonewall Jackson was not only a great Virginian, but a great American. He was probably the greatest field commander the English-speaking peoples of the world have produced up to this hour. It was my privilege on May 19, 1957, to attend the unveiling of the bronze bust of General Jackson in the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University. The Honorable Wilber Brucker, Secretary of the Army, who delivered the principal address, said "Stonewall Jackson possessed every attribute which makes for success in war or peace."

Field Marshall Viscount Woosley, Commander in Chief of the British Army said, "The fame of Stonewall Jackson is no longer the exclusive property of Virginia and the South. It has become the birthright of every man privileged to call himself an American." Earl Frederick S. R. Roberts said of Jackson: "As a campaigner in the field, he never had a superior. In some respects, I doubt whether he ever had an equal." Von Moltke, the great German field marshall, said Jackson's valley campaign was without a rival in the world's history.

I am particularly happy to represent in the Congress that section of South Carolina which gave to the Nation Gen. Barnard E. Bee. General Bee was born near Pendleton, S.C., graduated from West Point and served with honor and distinction in the Army of the United States. With secession, he cast his lot with the South. General Bee fought valiantly here on this hill. He rallied his broken regiments time and time again. Finally he fell mortally wounded while rallying his men with the cry "Rally around the Virginians. There stands Jackson like a stone wall." General Jackson, from that day forward, has been known to the world as Stonewall Jackson.

Gen. Francis Bartow was a native of Georgia, a prominent lawyer in Savannah, member of the Georgia Legislature and member of the Confederate Provisional Congress. His Oglethorpe infantry was the first in the South to offer its services to the Confederate government. General Bartow gave his life here in the desperate fighting as the battle neared its climax.

The bodies of General Bee, General Bartow, and Lt. Col. B. J. Johnson, of the Hampton Legion, were removed to Richmond where they lay in state with a guard of honor. The wife of the president, Mrs. Jefferson Davis, broke the sad news to Mrs. Bartow of her husband's death on the field. The bodies of these three intrepid leaders were later returned to their native States for burial. The remains of General Bee lie today in St. Paul's Episcopal churchyard at Pendleton, S.C. This churchyard is the resting place of many famous Americans. Among them are Mrs. John C. Calhoun, Wm. H. Trescott, Thomas G. Clemson, and Rev. Jasper Adams, founder of Hobart College, Geneva, N.Y.

The First Battle of Manassas was the greatest battle ever fought in the Western Hemisphere up to that time. The U.S. Army under General McDowell was seeking to crush the Confederate Army here and clear the way to the Confederate capitol at Richmond. This Federal army fought valiantly and its efforts on the morning of July 21 were crowned with great success. The Confederate Army, under the command of General Beauregard and Joseph E. Johnston, was being driven from the field in disorder and undoubtedly would have been defeated but for the supreme sacrifice of General Bee, General Bartow, Colonel Johnson, and their devoted men. On the afternoon of the 21st, the battle reached a climax here on Henry House Hill. The victorious Federals were halted and the Confederates, in a great countercharge, drove them from the field. The Federal Army was routed and retreated to Washington in the utmost disorder and confusion. General Jackson and Colonel Wade Hampton were wounded, Jackson only slightly, but their gallantry and leadership contributed immeasurably to the success of the Confederates.

Wade Hampton had no previous military experience. From his baptism of fire here on this field he rose to the rank of lieutenant general and was commander in chief of cavalry of the army of northern Virginia. Following the war Hampton became Governor and U.S. Senator from South Carolina. He rendered the United States great service during the crises of 1876 by preventing bloodshed and further civil strife.

The American people are rightly proud of the heroism and sacrifice of the men and women who fought in this War Between the American States. I am glad that the Congress has created the Centennial Commission to properly commemorate, beginning with 1961, the 4 years of this conflict. The Commission is headed by my distinguished friend, Gen. U. S. Grant III. Your own able Hon. WILLIAM E. TUCK is a member and Vice President of the Commission. Thus the youth of our country will become even more familiar and proud of these traditions and heritages.

In the Revolutionary War, the American Colonies fought to be a free and independent nation. They revolted against the autocratic power of George III. Our Founding Fathers fought for free local government, dignity of the individual, and for States rights. Their successful struggle resulted in independence, our Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and a representative form of government. To many southerners, the war for southern independence in 1861–65 was a renewal of the Revolutionary War. They felt it was a continuation of the ageless struggle for freedom against totalitarianism and centralized power. The South in this war fought against what they believed to be an unwarranted usurpation of States rights and individual liberty by a powerful Federal Government.

The Confederate soldier faced overwhelming odds for 4 long years because he believed in the principles of States rights and free local government. The Confederate soldiers sacrificed everything—their homes, their lives, and their fortunes in an all-out effort against a strong central government. These men were dedicated men, courageous, independent, and self-reliant. They suffered untold hardships. They often went hungry, ragged, and barefooted. They suffered through the heat and dust of summer and the cold of winter. They endured these hardships because their firesides and homes were at stake. To them, a principle was involved, a basic and fundamental principle of government and political philosophy.

This struggle for freedom is a never-ending one. Liberty is something that has to be won, defended, and fought for over and over again. "Eternal vigilance is, indeed, the price of liberty." The fundamental principles of government as enunciated by our Founding Fathers and dignity of the individual never change. They will be the same throughout eternity.

In America and in the free world today we see a renewal on a large scale of the never-ending struggle against centralization and federalism. The same fundamental issues are involved in our country today that confronted the people of Sparta and Athens in ancient Greece. They are the same issues discussed in the Roman Senate and paramount in the Magna Carta.

This great struggle today against the forces of totalitarianism is not a sectional fight between the North and the South. It is an ideological struggle between those on one hand who believe in a strong national socialistic state and those who believe in States rights and maximum individual liberty. At stake today is trial by jury, freedom of worship, freedom of the press, the time-honored principles and ideals so paramount in previous revolutions and struggles for freedom.

We must fight today by peaceful methods just as valiantly as our forefathers fought in the Revolution and our grandfathers fought in the cause of the Confederacy. The fate of the entire free world rests on the outcome of our efforts. Federal encroachment for a while was creeping and stealthy. It was often intangible and little noticed by the average citizen, but today it is open and is moving at a fantastic pace.

Here in the United States the so-called home of the free the departments and agencies of the Federal Government are writing most of the legislation and are making rules and regulations with the full force and intent of law. The direct representatives of the people are being bypassed and subjected to propaganda by these ever-growing agencies of the Federal Government. The taxpayers' money is being spent to propagandize him of the glory of the welfare state. The American citizen is being subjected to a barrage of Government propaganda. Everyone is being promised an easy life. The people are being led into a socialistic pit of no return. The moral character of our people is being undermined by excessive taxation to support this Federal army of national and international spenders—professional spenders who have often done nothing in 20 years but spend the tax money extorted from the once sovereign American citizen.

In the name of fighting communism, the Federal Government is adopting socialistic and communistic methods. This centralized authority is pretending to stop a disease by spreading more of that disease—the plague of international socialism—while wasting billions of dollars abroad. In a futile effort to stop communism, we are adopting Marxist doctrines through the backdoor here at home. We are subjecting our people to unprecedented regimentation. The pseudo-liberals and Fascists in our own country have joined hands with the internationalists. They are even rolling out the red carpet for the bloody exponents of communistic atheism. They lend prestige and dignity to the soiled hands of those who liquidated the freedom fighters of Hungary. The high-sounding slogans and the four freedoms of World Wars I and II have been forgotten. Totalitarianism is on the march all over the

world. The United States is joining this totalitarian hayride. Mikoyan, Kozlov, Castro, and Sukarno are being welcomed with open arms as heroes. Our people are being brainwashed as individuals and collectively as a nation. If we are to halt the onward march of autocracy, we must fight as never before. Our fight must not be with bombs and bullets in this enlightened age. It must, however, be a revolution against complacency and indifference. It must be a renewal of our faith in the Constitution, in the Bill of Rights and in the free enterprise system.

Our fight to preserve freedom must not be sectional and cannot be limited to the United States. International communism and international autocracy must be fought with international freedom. However, our first effort must be right here in the United States. Our fight today must be waged on the political front with the ballots of an aroused people. The battleground will be the precinct meeting, the party primaries, the political conventions, and the national elections of 1960. All of us cannot work in the scientific laboratories or fly into space, but we can vote. We must rescue both American political parties from the federalists and exponents of socialistic welfare.

We can and must elect a Congress pledged to the Constitution of the United States, a Congress with fiscal responsibility, a Congress dedicated to preserving liberty, a minimum of taxation and government.

We can only curb the Supreme Court and prevent it from establishing a dictatorship by a political reawakening. We must have a Supreme Court who will protect our basic liberties, uphold the sanctity of our homes, save the American people from seditionists, espionage agents, and criminals; a Supreme Court that will fight with loyalty, patriotism, and love of country rather than those self-seeking proponents of un-American ideologies.

We must elect a President of the United States who is thoroughly American, one who is dedicated to the Constitution as written, one who will support the 10th amendment to the Constitution, a patriot who will lead the United States forward to a new era of governmental subservience to the individual citizen; a President whose first allegiance will be to enhance the national glory of the United States of America above all other governments on earth.

Crimes against the American people and our sacred heritages are being committed in the name of bipartisanship. There are no real issues between the great political parties or between the many political aspirants to the Presidency. We must advance candidates in the race for the Presidency who will pledge a return to constitutional government, States rights and local control of our schools; men who will take the dollar signs from international relations and substitute our time-honored slogan "millions for defense but not one cent for tribute". We cannot buy with money the friendship, patriotism and cooperation of other nations. My friends, money cannot buy real courage or determination such as that exhibited on this great battlefield. Foreign aid is an insult to nations abroad and a mockery to the American people. The Kremlin definitely favors this foreign policy of wasting our sustenance all over the world. They hope America will go financially bankrupt through our idealistic and wild spending schemes. The election of 1960 might well be our last opportunity in free elections to return sanity to our Government. It may well be our last opportunity to save the American people from a socialistic, sociological Supreme Court; to curb an empire building federal bureaucracy. It may well be our last opportunity to save our people from a Federal gestapo and save them from the crushing burden of unbearable taxation. We must examine, before it is too late, our international commitments, secret negotiations and phony summit conferences.

Federal aid to education must be rejected in any and every form. Federal aid to education is an octopus in disguise. With Federal aid eventually will come Federal control of education and the youth of our country. This is a familiar road followed by Hitler, Mussolini, Goebbels and Stalin. Every dictator since the beginning of time has seen the absolute necessity of controlling education to further his dictatorial ambitions. They were as afraid of locally controlled education as they were of the plague. If we are to remain a free nation, we must preserve local control of our schools.

Every American State in this Union today is in better financial condition than the Federal Government. Any community that builds its own schools and solves its own educational problems will grow morally and spiritually. Local government will be strengthened. Our people will have more pride in themselves and confidence in their ability to solve their own problems. This, in turn, will strengthen the Republic. Federal aid to education would strike the final blow to the United States as we know it today. Our country is great today because of its different sections, because of its different people, and because of its differences of opinion, and even diverse political philosophy. If the United States ever begins to look, act and think in a single pattern, then we will cease to be a great Nation. The American body politic will become a rubberstamp without will power or courage—a rubberstamp to be used by the Washington autocracy to further its own ambitions. My admonition today to you, my fellow countrymen, is to oppose with united effort this latest civil rights legislation, Federal aid to education, this stupendous budget and Federal encroachment.

Our struggle today is greater, more far-reaching, and more important than that waged by the Founding Fathers. If we lose America and the free world, we will be plunged backward into medieval tyranny. We should zealously guard freedom of speech, trial by jury, freedom of choice, freedom of the press, and our religious liberty. To preserve these basic freedoms guaranteed to us in the Bill of Rights, we must save our Constitution as written by the Founding Fathers of this Republic. If our Constitution is to be amended, we should amend it the legal way as provided for in the Constitution itself. To save this great document, we must first preserve the integrity and sovereignty of the several States. States' rights will preserve individual rights and individual dignity.

We, in the South, have been plagued for generations by a negative psychology. I see signs of our beloved Southland going today from the negative to the positive. We are on the offensive. We know that the freedom of our sons and daughters depends upon the outcome of our battle today. The destiny of the United States itself hangs in the balance. The southern people fought for the South in the War Between the States. The southern people today are fighting for America.

We in the South are in the forefront in this desperate struggle today to preserve not just the southern way of life, but to preserve the principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights. We are fighting not just for the South, but for every single one of the American States that flourished under that Constitution. Yes, this fight goes beyond the borders of the South, the Middle West, or the Union. It extends and beckons to the whole free world. Our fight is the battle of free peoples everywhere—Europe, Asia, the Philippines, and beyond the seven seas of the world. Totalitarianism, dictatorship, and centralization is on the march. This is no time for appeasement or compromise or for adopting just a little regimentation or a little centralization. We must draw the line. The die is cast. We must save all of our freedoms or lose all of our freedoms.

Madam President, we must fight today with the pen rather than the sword, with words, rather than bullets, with ballot, rather than roaring artillery.

A movement is underway to give you a political choice in 1960. Candidates will be offered within and possibly without the Democratic and Republican Parties who will have the courage to support the Constitution of the United States as written—men who will curb inflation and prevent national bankruptcy; men who can and will put Russia on the defensive; men who will not dignify the atheistic and bloody Khrushchev and Kozlov by conferences and love feasts; men who have the oldtime courage and moral character of George Washington and Stonewall Jackson.

The great State of Virginia under the leadership of its Washingtons and its Jeffersons amazed the world at the time of the Revolution. They struck fear into the heart of the tyrant and shook the theory of the divine right of kings. In their great struggle for independence under Generals Lee and Jackson, Virginia won the respect and admiration of the entire world. In your superb efforts today against centralization and socialist autocracy, Virginia again is in the forefront. You are fighting for the people of the United States—North, South, East and West.

We must stand firm against the conformists, the one-worlders and exponents of national brainwash. I am glad today that Virginia is in disagreement with the pseudo-liberals, the fascists and the collectivists. I am glad you believe the jet age can go hand in hand with freedom. I am glad you believe social justice and a better standard of living does not mean the surrender of States' rights and individual liberty. Atomic science does not lessen the need for States' rights and free local government. The threat of communism should be no argument to abandon local control of schools.

General Lee rallied the South Carolinians to the support of the Virginians under Stonewall Jackson. I can assure you that the South Carolinians of today are behind you in your heroic efforts to stand like a stone wall against nationalization and unconstitutional Federal control.

Wheat Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent letter to the New York Times by the majority whip of the House, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma. In the letter Representative ALBERT discusses the wheat bill which the President vetoed and, I think, places the facts on the line for all to see.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 10, 1959]

WHEAT LEGISLATION UPHELD—VETOED BILL SAID TO REDUCE COSTS, REVERSE SURPLUS BUILDUP

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Bernard Baruch once said, "Every man has a right to his opinion but no man has a right to be wrong in his facts." That sums up my reaction to your June 27 editorial on the President's veto of the wheat bill.

Leaders of wheat legislation accepted compromise after compromise in an effort to get acceptable legislation that would reverse the recent buildup in Government surpluses in wheat, reduce the Government's skyrocketing costs for the program and prevent a sharp decline in wheat producers' income.

The bill passed by Congress would have achieved these objectives. If allowed to become law, wheat program costs would have been reduced an estimated $260 million a year. Present surpluses would have been drawn down at the rate of 100 million bushels or more a year. These are not my conclusions, but are opinions expressed by competent, impartial, agricultural economists.

CORRECTING EXCESSES

Let no one blame Congress further for the excessive Government cost and excessive stocks of wheat. Congress passed legislation which, if signed by the President, would have corrected these excesses. And Congress would have passed wheat legislation even more satisfactory to the administration if the Secretary of Agriculture had not been more interested in abolishing farm price-support programs than in correcting their weaknesses.

I respectfully urge you to consider that we have today the Benson program—not the farm program which was in effect prior to 1953.

At the beginning of 1953 we had a farm program under which for 11 consecutive years farm prices generally had averaged 100 percent of parity or higher. The Commodity Credit Corporation price-support program for 20 years had cost only $1.064 billion, and this included subsidies during the war years. Programs for the 90 percent of parity-supported basic crops actually showed a 20-year profit to the Government of $13 million.

In contrast, during the last 6 years net farm income has been almost $20 billion less than in the previous 6 years. CCC losses on price supports in these 6 years have been five times the total of the previous 20 years. CCC commodities in inventory and on loan have increased from $2.452 billion on January 1, 1953, to $8.716 billion on January 1, 1959. Expenditures of the Department of Agriculture have skyrocketed from $1.8 billion in 1952 to around $7 billion for fiscal 1959.

PER CAPITA INCOME

People on farms now have per capita incomes of only one-half the incomes of nonfarm people. Farmworkers receive hourly one-third the average wage of factory workers. Average farm prices in 1958 were down 13 percent from 1952. In contrast, the hourly earnings of industrial workers in 1958 were up 28 percent from 1952 and corporation dividend payments in 1958 were up 37 percent since 1952.

Your editorial is eminently right in condemning the farm program as now being operated. No one can defend it.

But we must have a farm program. We cannot tell the farmer to find his solutions only in the raw competition of the marketplaces, usually in auction markets, while other areas of our economy rely upon Government protections, or upon concentrations of economic power, to assure reasonable levels of wages or profits.

The Government has given labor the minimum wage and the collective bargaining law. It has given industry the corporate structure, the tariff, and the many statutes that soften the perils of unregulated, unrestrained competitive enterprise. How, then, can the modern, highly mechanized farmer survive, ever selling in a free market and buying in a protected market?

We must have a farm program and it must be fair to consumers as well as to farmers. The Times would merit the gratitude of consumers and taxpayers, as well of farmers, if it would encourage sound policies.

CARL ALBERT,
Member of Congress, Third District, Oklahoma.

WASHINGTON, *July 2, 1959.*

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the July issue of the Journal on Soil and Water Conservation, the official publication of the Soil Conservation Society of America, contains an exceptionally fine article written by John T. Loucks, area conservationist, of Rapid City, S. Dak. He ably comments on the variety of problems faced in conserving the soil and water of our plains, our farmlands, and our natural mountain forests. Appropriately, Mr. Loucks makes reference to the 14th Annual Soil Conservation Society Convention which will convene in Rapid City on August 25. Postmaster General Summerfield has designated that day for the release of the soil conservation commemorative stamp from Rapid City, S. Dak.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH DAKOTA VIGNETTES

(By John T. Loucks)

RAPID CITY.—This is the once wild land of the Sioux and Cheyennes, the skilled hunters and the proud, courageous fighting men. Dakota is an Indian word meaning friend.

It is the land of the Black Hills, a 125-mile-long platter of rocks and trees, which to the red men was sacred land.

Across this land ranged the vast herds of bison—which got to be called buffalo—and the antelope and deer, feeding on the rich, strength-giving vegetation of the highly fertile plains.

Across this land roamed the Indian nomads, traveling light and living on the wild game. They built homes of skins stretched on the long lengths of the lodgepole pine, and their trailers were two poles, called a travois, dragging behind a wiry pony.

It is the land of Wild Bill Hickok, who was holding aces and eights when he died, and of Calamity Jane and the other stalwarts who may have been gilded more by fiction and fancy than by fact.

In the plains the native grasses important to South Dakota stockmen are western wheatgrass, gramagrass, big and little bluestem, green needlegrass, needle and thread grass, blue and sideoats grama and the colorful buffalograss.

In the higher hills, the useful species are little bluestem, Richardson and Columbia needlegrass, mountain ricegrass and prairie dew seed. Where the bluestems are overused, Kentucky blugrass takes over as an invader.

Windbreaks are a major conservation measure throughout South Dakota's northern plains. Varieties best adapted are cottonwood, Chinese and American elm, green ash, Russian olive, lilac, Nanking and sand cherry, plum and redcedar. The windbreaks may vary from one to a score of rows. Clean cultivation, to save on moisture, is important. Much of the fruit produced in windbreaks is canned or made into delicious preserves.

The Black Hills National Forest is 80 percent ponderosa pine, 5 percent white spruce; the balance is aspen, paper birch, with bur oak at the lower elevations.

Foresters say the ponderosa pine in this forest has the most rapid rate of reproduction of all the ponderosa forests. This is because rain usually comes in a pattern favorable to the germination of seeds.

The forest supports a rapidly growing pulpwood industry. A Wisconsin mill last year took 20,000 cords. Sawmills are thriving. Milled lumber is sold as far away as Iowa.

The porcupine is a principal troublemaker in the Black Hills forest. He climbs the tall pines and girdles them. Porcupines do not increase in numbers rapidly, but a kindly attitude toward these bark-loving creatures protects them. Settlers held they represented a square and timely meal for a man lost in the woods. There seems to be no report of anyone lost having dined on porcupine in recent years.

By the time lumbering became active in the hills, barring the logging operations of the miners, the idea of harvesting instead of mining lumber was coming into being. The hills was one of the pioneer areas in this conservation method of woodland use.

Farmers and ranchers have built 90,000 stockwater dams in South Dakota. They have used about all the available sites and still they need more water. This is why the dugout has been coming into widespread use in the State as a water-conservation practice. Dugouts are scooped-out water holes in flattish land, sometimes with diversions to guide water into them. Many a stockman has found his stock dams and dugouts moneysavers in dry years.

If you are lucky you'll run into a honey-haired bundle of conservation spirit and energy named Martha Smith. She hails from Fairburn community 25 miles south of Rapid City.

Martha Smith came home on furlough as an Army nurse one day and found her home village in a predicament. The water wells were playing out. A look-round showed the trouble—sink holes were robbing the groundwater supply that was supported by French Creek. An unrelenting campaign produced a $40,000 State appropriation to mend the trouble. A pipeline from French Creek across a fissured area was a part of the repair work.

The Custer County Soil Conservation District dedicated its annual report to Conservationist Martha Smith.

The White River Badlands of South Dakota are a fascinating area for geological study. Millions of years ago this was the home of rhinoceroses, crocodiles, and turtles, herds of ancestral horses that had several toes, small humpless camels, and deer. There were large trees and expanses of savannah and marshland.

Then the earth shrugged and its surface wrinkled and folded. Wind and water ero-

sion played their part. Now from the jagged spires and ridges one can read an absorbing story of the earth and life forms that lived here, by turning up their fossilized bones.

The Indians later called this weird land "Mako Sica," their term for Badlands. The French trappers gave it a like name: "Mauvaises Terres."

The Badlands were homesteaded in settlement days. Much of the area is grassland and some of the ranches still have good-sized herds. The Badlands National Monument was established January 25, 1939. It is 60 miles long and up to 15 miles wide.

The late Frank Lloyd Wright, world-famous architect, once stated that the Dakota Badlands were a place of great inspiration to him in his work—that here was a myriad of forms and countless color combinations.

Postmaster George Lampert of Rapid City reports requests by the pouchful have been pouring in for the new commemorative soil conservation stamp which will be inaugurated the first day of the SCSA convention. The post office will do a rushing business at stamp windows that day. Two special Washington representatives of the Post Office Department will be on hand, and Postmaster Lampert expects to add 100 extra employees for the rush.

Don't fail to send in that official first-day cover which has been distributed to each SCSA member. Its philatelic value will increase with the years. Send it to Rapid City.

Court of Claims Decision in Dixon-Yates Claim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal, a paper which has established throughout the country a magnificent reputation of integrity and insistence on honesty in Government, has recently published an editorial on the Dixon-Yates issue, in which it discussed the recent decision of the Court of Claims, by a 3-to-2 vote, in which it held that the Government must pay $1,867,000 to the Dixon-Yates combine.

As the Milwaukee Journal points out, it was a case of Mr. Wenzell working for the Budget Bureau and at the same time representing the First Boston Corp. as the financial agent for Dixon-Yates. The editorial asks, "If that is not a conflict of interest, what does the term mean?"

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT WAS CONFLICT OF INTEREST

By a 3-to-2 vote the U.S. Court of Claims has ruled that the Government must pay $1,867,000 to the Dixon-Yates combine because it canceled its controversial power contract.

Whether or not the money is properly owed Dixon-Yates is certainly a matter of opinion, and the court has delivered its opinion. Certainly the administration pushed hard to get the contract and curb the Tennessee Valley Authority. And certainly Dixon-Yates was put to some sizable expense before the contract was canceled.

But one aspect of the majority opinion of the court is open to question. The majority said that there was not the slightest conflict of interest in the position of Adolphe H. Wenzell in the contract negotiations.

Such a finding is strange indeed. Wenzell worked for the Budget Bureau on the Dixon-Yates matter at the same time that he was a paid official of the First Boston Corp. And the First Boston Corp. was the financial agent for Dixon-Yates. Here was a case of wearing two hats. Wenzell was serving two parties to a deal simultaneously.

If that isn't conflict of interest, what does the term mean?

Federal-State Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on previous occasions I have expressed my concern about Federal-State relationships. Two such occasions concerned litigation in the State of New York, in which the defendants, Arabian American Oil Co. (Aramco) and the State Commission Against Discrimination contended that the application of New York's antidiscrimination law to Aramco would affect adversely U.S. interests in the near east. The defendants argued that the Department of State concurred in this contention, notwithstanding the fact that the legal issue was whether Aramco's hiring practices within the city of New York—not in the Near East—should be exempt from the New York law.

New York Supreme Court Judge Epstein, after a thorough reading of all the documentation, including my correspondence with the Department of State on this matter, has decided that Aramco should comply with the New York antidiscrimination law, notwithstanding the desire of the Saudi Arabian Government that Aramco employ no persons of the Jewish faith. Judge Epstein found that the contention that "the security of the United States is involved" was an arrogation of "the function of the State Department of the United States which has made no such declaration." He concluded that the Department of State has taken no position regarding the hiring practices of Aramco within the State of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the opinion by Judge Epstein be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the decision was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT, NEW YORK COUNTY SPECIAL TERM, PART I—IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS, A MEMBERSHIP CORPORATION, PETITIONER, FOR AN ORDER PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 78 OF THE CIVIL PRACTICE ACT, AGAINST ELMER A. CARTER, J. EDWARD CONWAY, JOHN A. DAVIS, MARY LOUISE NICE, AND BERNARD KATZEN, CONSTITUTING THE STATE COMMISSION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION, AND ARABIAN-AMERICAN OIL CO., A DELAWARE CORPORATION, RESPONDENTS

Judge Epstein: This is an application for an order under article 78 of the Civil Practice Act to annul the determinations of November 10, 1958, and March 26, 1959, by Commissioner Elmer A. Carter of the State Commission Against Discrimination and to direct said commission to take appropriate action to credit the charges of the complaint in American Jewish Congress against Arabian-American Oil Co. (Case No. C-4296-56). Petitioner charged Arabian-American Oil Co. (Aramco) with violation of section 296, subdivision (1)(a) and (1)(c) of the Executive Law of New York State, known as the Law Against Discrimination. Petitioner is recognized by the commission as coming within the reasonable scope of a person authorized to register a complaint under section 296, subdivision (1)(c). Adhering to his prior determinations, Respondent Carter on March 26, 1959, dismissed the petition of the American Jewish Congress relative to its charges of Aramco's violations of both spirit and letter of the State's antidiscrimination law. Respondent commission voted to permit Aramco to inquire into the religion of job applicants as a "bona fide occupational qualification" and further to authorize Aramco to have applicants for employment fill out a visa application for travel in Saudi Arabia containing an inquiry into the applicant's religion. Commissioner Caroline Simon, now secretary of state of New York, dissented, stating forthrightly that "our basic documents of freedom * * * are never to be subordinated to immediate business gain." Her position was that there was no State Department policy which would dictate the subversion of this salutary New York State law to an internal policy of Saudi Arabia motivated by Arab hatred of Israel.

Under date of June 15, 1959, Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber wrote to U.S. Senator E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska, regarding this very issue:

"We assure you that the Department does not intend to inject itself in any way into the proceedings of a State court; at the same time, the Department does have an obligation, when requested to do so, to provide State authorities with information respecting the policies of other governments and of our own in foreign lands."

There is not the slightest doubt that nowhere in the history and origin of the statute under consideration is there the slightest authority for the determination by respondent that the religion of an applicant for employment is or can ever be regarded as a bona fide occupational qualification. Any such holding would undermine the very foundation of our American concept of liberty and the constitutional safeguards of that liberty. The only cases where such inquiry is upheld are those where failure to permit such might interfere with the functioning of a religious organization (see remarks of Hon. Charles Tuttle in hearings, pp. 349, 350, 670). Respondent Commission has refused to permit a help-wanted advertisement calling for a "colored worker" on the asserted ground that color was a bona fide occupa-

tional qualification for a position as a social worker (Report on Progress, 1948, p. 73). The only departure from that sound principle is the Aramco ruling by which this Commission of the State of New York flouts the principles of our Founding Fathers.

The record here under review reveals that the King of Saudi Arabia not only prohibits employment of Jews in Arabia, but also strenuously objects to the employment of Jews in any part of Aramco's operation" (testimony of Field Representative Anderson, pp. 3–4). Aramco cannot by virtue of its contract even purchase electrical equipment from Philco, a domestic corporation, because of its Jewish management. These are undisputed facts. This court does not pretend to assert that Saudi Arabia may not do as it pleases with regard to whom it will employ within the borders of Saudi Arabia. Nor does this court pretend to say that Aramco may not hire whom it pleases to conform to its Arab master's voice. What this court does say is that Aramco cannot defy the declared public policy of New York State and violate its statute within New York State, no matter what the King of Saudi Arabia says. New York State is not a province of Saudi Arabia, nor is the constitution and statute of New York State to be cast aside to protect the oil profits of Aramco. Nor will the fact, if it be such, that the employment is for possible service in Saudi Arabia permit the subversion of our State law aimed to preserve our democratic heritages. The Senate of the United States on July 26, 1956, adopted Senate Resolution 323, which reads in part:

"Whereas it is a primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no distinction among U.S. citizens based on their individual religious affiliations and since any attempt by foreign nations to create such distinction among our citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to U.S. citizens generally is inconsistent with our principles: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that it regards any such distinctions directed against United States citizens as incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations, and that in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state every reasonable effort should be made to maintain this principle."

That declaration of noble foreign policy remains today. The State Department has not sought to override the Senate of the United States and Aramco can not pretend that the State Department has done so. Aramco's witness before this Commission (Mr. Barry) frankly admitted that Aramco's employees had to submit "to this kind of interrogation with regard to their religion." Aramco has divided its employees into five categories, the lowest of which encompasses those in positions of limited promotion opportunities and who can not go to Saudi Arabia. It is a matter of record in these proceedings that out of some 887 employees on Aramco's New York payroll, few, if any, Jews are employed. If, as perhaps correctly claimed by Aramco, this must result from the necessity of possible employment in Saudi Arabia, the answer of New York State is simply—Go elsewhere to serve your Arab master—but not in New York State. Commissioner Carter admits that Aramco's policy "would appear to be contrary to the provisions of the New York law against discrimination and the rulings of the Commission." However, he seeks an escape for Aramco in the "bona fide occupational qualification" which the history of this statute reveals finds no possible application to a religious qualification for employment in Saudi Arabia. It is interesting to find that the Urban League of Greater New York and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People are on record in this proceeding for the petitioner and against the decision of the respondent commission.

If, as claimed by Aramco, a change in employment policy would obstruct American foreign policy in the Near East; or if the enforcement if the public policy of New York State would embarrass the State Department in the Near East, then it should be said that the honor of American citizenship, if it remains for New York State to uphold it, will survive Aramco's fall from Arab grace. It is the holding of this court that an administrative ruling which runs afoul of the constitution and the law must be set aside. Also, there is no longer any doubt that a dismissal of a complaint may be reviewed in an article 78 proceeding (*Matter of Jeanpierre* v. *Arbury*, (4 NY 2d 238); *Matter of Guardian Life Ins. Co.* v. *Bohlinger* (308 N.Y. 174); *Matter of Stork Restaurant* v. *Boland* (282 N.Y. 256, 274). The ruling of Commissioner Carter is unsupported by the evidence and violates the principles of the very law under whose mandate the Commissioner purported to act. This statute is protected under the 10th amendment of the U.S. Constitution (*Railway Mail Association* v. *Corsi*, 326 U.S. 88). There is no treaty, nor any Federal statute which stands in the path of enforcing the provisions of New York State's law against discrimination in employment. Informal statements of State Department underlings cannot override State laws. No foreign nation may dictate the nonenforcement of a valid State law, at least not in New York State. An engineer who is Jewish is no less an engineer by being so—and no cavalier attempt to classify him as not having a bona fide qualification because he is Jewish will be countenanced by this court. Any such holding—and the decision of Commissioner Carter is just that—destroys the safeguards of the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution of the United States. It is abhorrent to the public policy of New York State also. The Commissioner's determination also fails to meet the standard of a proper administrative decision. There is no factual basis set forth, based on the record (*Matter of Barry* v. *O'Connell*, 303 N.Y. 46); *Matter of N.Y. Water Service Corp.* v. *Water Power and Control Commission*, 283 N.Y. 23). A letter from Aramco that no applicant for domestic employment is requested to fill out an application for a Saudi Arabian visa is hardly a basis for the decision reached in this case. The record, however, even destroys this conclusion of the Commissioner (items 22 and 23). The action of the Commissioner is arbitrary, capricious and without basis in fact or law. It runs counter to sound public policy of New York State and of the United States (*U.S.* v. *Pink*, 315 U.S. 203, 230).

There is no treaty; there is no compact; there is no agreement between the United States and Saudi Arabia relating to the entry of Jews into Saudi Arabia. Aramco's contract with the Government of Saudi Arabia cannot be given the status of a treaty of the United States and not even Aramco dares make any such assertion. That was clearly decided by the International Court of Justice in the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. case (Report of International Court of Justice for 1952, p. 193). Aramco has, for reasons best known to itself, not made its contract with Saudi Arabia a part of the record. No such private contract can override the public policy or prevent the enforcement of the New York Law Against Discrimination. When Commissioner Carter declares that American interests in the Near East "outweigh the abstract vindication of State sovereignty" he makes the Commission for which he speaks the vassal of a foreign potentate. When Commissioner Carter seeks to justify his dismissal of petitioner's case on a claim that "the security of the United States is involved" (Second determination, p. 9), he arrogates to himself the function of the State Department of the United States which has made no such declaration. The film of oil which blurs the vision of Aramco has apparently affected the Respondent Commission in this case. The discrimination practiced by Aramco in New York State must cease and it is the duty of the Respondent Commission to see that it does. No treaty or statute will stand which impairs the freedom of one group of citizens because of religious affiliation. The free exercise of religion is thereby destroyed. Any such provision would clearly violate the Federal Constitution (first and fifth amendments). Surely, the Commissioner Respondent cannot do what a Federal treaty or statute would be unable to achieve (*United Public Workers* v. *Mitchell*, 330 U.S. 75, 100).

In summary—petitioner does not question the authority of Saudi Arabia to decide that no Jews shall enter that country—the Commissioner may not, however, place the policy of Saudi Arabia above the law and public policy of New York State. No agency of New York State may subordinate the law of this State to the dictates of a foreign state which violates our own public policy. There is nothing in *Salimoff* v. *Standard Oil Co.* (262 N.Y. 220, 224), nor in *Kleve* v. *Basler L. V. Gesellschaft* (182 Misc. 776), to the contrary. If, as this Commission has held, "color" is not a "bona fide occupational qualification" (Report on Progress, 1948, p. 73), then surely in 1959 "religion" cannot be so regarded, Saudi Arabia and Aramco to the contrary notwithstanding.

This court accorded respondent Commission until July 14 at its request to confer with the U.S. State Department. On July 14 respondent advises that, after conferring with the State Department, it has "nothing to add to the record."

The determination of the Commissioner is annulled and the matter is remitted to the Commission for action not inconsistent with this opinion.

Address by Winston K. Pendleton, Rotary Club Governor for Eastern Virginia

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the members of the Alexandria (Va.) Rotary Club last week were privileged to hear an address by the newly elected Rotary governor for eastern Virginia, Winston K. Pendleton. Mr. Pendleton is a long-time friend of mine. He is a past president of the Eustis (Fla.) Rotary Club, and is at present a member of the Falls Church (Va.) Rotary Club.

Rotary International is one of the great international service organizations. Its members are business and professional men who have dedicated themselves to the ideal of "Service Above Self." They have done a great work toward advancing international understanding, good will, and peace.

I feel that this address by Mr. Pendleton has in it a message which every

Senator and every reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be glad to receive. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Pendleton's address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY WINSTON K. PENDLETON, GOVERNOR, DISTRICT 760, ROTARY INTERNATIONAL, 2541 MILITARY ROAD, ARLINGTON, VA.

I want to thank everybody for being so kind and generous to me. I have never seen a friendlier group of men in my life than I have met here today. My only regret is that I won't have time to meet each of you and to become personally acquainted.

From the sample of hospitality I have seen and felt today, I have the impression that it would be mighty easy to get acquainted in the Alexandria Rotary Club.

And of course, that is the first step in the object of Rotary—"The development of acquaintance as an opportunity for service." That's what makes Rotary so wonderful. This idea of getting acquainted before we do anything else.

That is a logical way to begin any sort of relationship. That is the first step toward building a lasting friendship.

The new president of Rotary International, Harold Thomas, of New Zealand, has a word for it. He calls it building bridges of friendship.

Yes, when you are getting acquainted with the man next to you, you are building a bridge of friendship. And when you visit some other Rotary Club to make up your attendance, you are traveling over a bridge of friendship that was built before you by other Rotarians.

President Harold's message this year to all Rotarians around the world is simply this: he wants us to work hard at putting just a little more into this business of making friends. He is asking us to vitalize and personalize our work in Rotary so that we can build better bridges of friendship.

Ever since Paul Harris and his three dedicated friends met in Chicago and formed the first Rotary Club, building bridges of friendship has been a prime purpose of our great organization. When we contemplate our heritage we see how that ever-widening circle of Rotarians has spread and spread until today those bridges are truly international.

The first gap that Rotary bridged was the gap that had always separated business and friendship. What was a new idea in 1905, is today the accepted way of doing business in America. Do business with your friends.

The man who isn't friendly with his customers today doesn't get much repeat business—and Rotary started the idea.

A few generations ago the motto of business was dog eat dog—let the buyer beware. Now, throughout the world, business is done on a friendly basis—in a spirit of mutual trust and understanding.

Yes, in 1905 the idea of friendship in business was born.

And a few years later, the idea was expanded. And Rotary got a slogan—Service Above Self—suggested by a Rotarian from Minneapolis—Frank Collins. And suddenly Rotary had a purpose—a sense of purpose and direction. And today, that sense of purpose and direction is needed more than ever, because we live in a critical age. We live in a dramatic age. Nothing is done casually any more. Even the little boy who wants his mother to take him to the store. He no longer says, "Mamma, take me to the store." No, today, he rushes in like a whirlwind and shouts, "OK, Mom, let's blast off."

Everything is dramatic. In the wee space of our lifetime we have seen our world suddenly compressed from mysterious unknown distances down to the size of a neighborhood. We travel today in 9 hours the voyage that it took Columbus 9 weeks to make.

Old Andrew Jackson fought the battle of New Orleans 2 weeks after the War of 1812 had ended—because he hadn't received the news. Last week I sat in my living room and watched a prizefight taking place in California. What an age. What dramatic changes. But, dramatic changes bring dramatic problems.

Today, we are face to face with the desperate need for greater understanding between the people of the world. We need to build more and better bridges of friendship.

The fellowship and understanding and friendliness within the Alexandria Rotary Club is wonderful. But your destiny in Rotary lies beyond the city limits of Alexandria. This old world needs to wake and see a lot of new bridges of international friendship under construction.

If we agree that this is so, then we must agree that it is a job for Rotary. Because building bridges of friendship is our business. That's what we have been doing for 54 years. We're experts at it. We know the secret.

Rotary deals with people—not politics. Rotary is strong because our bridges of friendship are built between man and man—not between government and government; between businessman and businessman—not politician and politician.

Rotary reaches beyond the mechanics of the conference table. It embeds itself within the hearts and minds of men. Yes, our business is building bridges of friendship. We are members of the only truly international organization in the world dedicated to that purpose. Today as we look about us—as we look into that small neighborhood that we call the world—we see the need for the very thing that we have to offer—friendship with people, based on the ideal of service.

And what are we going to do about it? What should we do?

The fourth step in the object of Rotary says that we are dedicated to the advancement of international understanding, good will and peace through a world fellowship of business and professional men united in the ideal of service.

If that is what we are here for—let's get on with the job. We must plan beyond club service—service to ourselves. We must see beyond vocational service—service to our own business. We must work beyond community service—beyond the confines of Alexandria. We must work and live and breathe and dedicate our efforts toward that fourth evenue of Rotary service.

One of the great examples of how Rotary has helped build permanent International Bridges of Friendship lies in the story of the border dispute between Ecuador and Peru. Those two countries had been fighting for 150 years over the boundary line. They had fought three wars and were getting set for another one, when a Rotarian stepped in.

He thought the problem called for a bit of Service Above Self. He took it up with Rotary International The President of Rotary appointed three Rotarians to look into the trouble. They met in a neutral country and in four-and-a-half days came up with a solution which was agreed upon by the two countries.

Maybe we should have a summit meeting after all—but maybe it should be made up of business men—ordinary business men—instead of politicians. Rotary should take a hand in showing how to strengthen our International Bridges of Friendship. And we had better get on with the job before it's too late. I think that should be Rotary's big purpose.

This is a bold concept. In some parts of the United States today I might be criticized for advocating greater international friendship. But, I'm on safe ground here today. I'm in Virginia. I'm standing on the very ground that gave birth to the boldest and most courageous idea the world has ever seen. It was here, in Virginia, that liberty found its spark of life—a spark that grew into a flame—a flame that still burns in the heart of every loyal American.

Isn't this the time for a bold new idea? Isn't this the place—here in Virginia? And aren't we the men—the men of Rotary? Is any idea too bold for us? I don't think so. Then, how do we do it? How? Rotary doesn't tell us how to do anything. The ways are as varied as your imagination.

The first step is to recognize that the task has to be done. Next, we must realize that the principles of Rotary—if properly applied—can change the world. Then, we can begin to figure how to do it. To do it will take imagination and ingenuity, patience and understanding, boldness and courage—and, above all, determination.

What can one Rotarian do? I do not know. I only know this—that Patrick Henry was only one man. Thomas Jefferson was only one man. I only know that when George Washington traveled down the roads of Virginia it took only one horse to hold him up—because George Washington was only one man.

I do not mean to say that each of us is a George Washington or a Thomas Jefferson. I am sure that no one of us can furnish the answer to the complex problem facing the world around us. But every one of us can answer this question: "Am I going to be a part of the problem—or a part of the answer?" There is an objective here for each of us.

I hope each of us will go away today with the determination to vitalize and personalize our contributions to Rotary. Let us work at this idea of service above self with a sense of urgency, enthusiasm, faith, confidence, and eagerness. For this is Rotary at its best.

This is the time for a look around us—not hurried, not with smugness, not terrified either, but a clear look, inspired with vigor and courage and enlightened by wisdom. Yes; this is the hour for greatness—and there is no more fitting place to find that greatness than in the historic State of Virginia and in the city of Alexandria—and among the men of Rotary.

It isn't a job for one man—it is a job for all of us. Your contribution may be small, but it can be made in the spirit of the man who wrote these words: "I am only one, but I am one. I cannot do everything, but I can do something. And, by the grace of God, what I can do—I will do."

Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a fine editorial from the Milwaukee Journal entitled "Project Hope," which discusses an unusual, remarkable, foreign-aid program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROJECT HOPE

Project Hope, only a dream last February, is fast shaping up to carry medical and

nursing skills of Americans to the underdeveloped areas of southeast Asia.

Using the *Consolation*, an 800-bed Navy hospital ship now in mothballs, Project Hope will carry teams of doctors and nurses whose aim will be not only to treat those in need of medical attention but to teach medical people.

The *Consolation* will tie up in Asian harbors and open 422 of its beds to serious medical cases. In addition, a 500-bed mobile unit will tour on shore bringing help to those in need. First call is expected to be in Indonesian waters. Indonesian doctors will be invited to board the boat or to join the mobile unit to learn American techniques. In addition, teams of five to seven physicians and two or three nurses will be flown from the ship to inland areas in need of medical service and training.

There will be a permanent 10- to 15-man staff aboard the *Consolation*. But rotating teams of physicians will be flown in groups of 35 to join the ship every 4 months.

This imaginative plan to bring direct help to south Asia has attracted widespread interest. More than 1,000 doctors and nurses have applied for places in this people-to-people medical program. And, say the sponsors, they are of high quality. Some outstanding doctors have offered to join for a month at their own expense.

The project needs $1,500,000 to pay its way. Already $700,000 has been raised by public subscription, and at the rate contributions are coming in the goal will be met by October. Sailing has been tentatively set for January 22.

Dr. William B. Walsh, a Washington internist who heads Project Hope, believes that the program's reception so far opens the possibility of making it permanent. He says that some of us hope to build this into a $20 million foundation in 3 years.

Here is one of the most stirring aid programs yet conceived. It will deal directly with people, bringing them help and mercy. And it will be subsidized by Government only to the extent of the use of a Navy ship now in mothballs. What more meaningful way could there be for showing America's friendship and concern for the needy areas of the world?

Details of Johnston-Neuberger Bill To Provide Health Insurance Program for Employees of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most encouraging and farsighted actions of the Senate during recent years was the passage on July 16, by the overwhelming margin of 81 to 4, of the first bill ever passed to provide health insurance benefits and programs for Federal employees. This measure is S. 2162, which was drafted by my subcommittee, and was reported favorably by the full Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, headed by the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

In the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 19, 1959, Mr. Jerry Kluttz has written a thorough analysis of the Federal employees health insurance bill, in the form of answers to key questions. I am proud to be one of the authors of the Johnston-Neuberger bill, Mr. President; and I hope for its early passage by the House of Representatives and signature by President Eisenhower.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Jerry Kluttz be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERE ARE DETAILS OF HEALTH PROPOSAL

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Answers to a few of your questions on the Senate-approved Johnson-Neuberger bill to insure you and your dependents against health costs:

Where both the husband and wife are employees, each may participate separately and pay the maximum rate of $1.75 every 2 weeks. If there are dependent and unmarried children under 19, one spouse may enroll for family coverage.

Employees who are injured on the job and who are paid compensation could get coverage under the bill. Survivors of employees who are killed on the job also could come in under the measure.

Coverage would be voluntary with the employee, who would have a choice of two governmentwide plans, one offered by Blue Cross-Blue Shield and the other by commercial insurance companies.

Members of national employee unions could participate in approved health plans offered by those organizations and the Government would pay part of the cost. Also, Uncle Sam would pay part of the cost of employee members of prepayment plans, such as Group Health here.

The bill would have the Government and the employee share costs, generally, on a 50–50 basis. The Eisenhower administration is insisting that the employee pay two-thirds of the cost.

Benefits: Most of the questions have to do with benefits and they're most difficult to answer. In fact, most of them can't be answered specifically until the Civil Service Commission enters into agreements with Blue Cross-Blue Shield and the insurance concerns. CSC would have a degree of flexibility in negotiating the contracts.

However, the plan to be proposed by the "Blues" would provide for the full cost of 120-day hospitalization on a nationwide basis in a semiprivate room for each continuous illness.

Surgical benefits would vary sharply. Blue Shield has offered to pay full surgical fees for employees whose salaries are up to $6,000. However, it would include only about half those employees, as its coverage isn't nationwide.

The other employees would be paid flat amounts, depending on their types of operations, and the sums may or may not pay their surgical costs.

Those employees paid more than $6,000 would also be paid set amounts for surgical costs under the Blue Shield proposal. They'd have to pay any excess out of their own pockets.

The Johnston-Neuberger bill provides for both basic and major medical coverage. Unfortunately, it isn't possible to state clearly where one ends and the other starts.

No dollar limits are written into the bill but it does give CSC the authority to fix maximum benefits that can be paid employees, annual as well as lifetime.

In addition, CSC could negotiate contracts to provide both deductions (amounts to be paid by employees before benefits could be paid), and coinsurance (a device under which the employee would pay a certain percentage of costs).

The bill would limit cases of tuberculosis, nervous and mental conditions to 30 days of general hospital care. It explained that "longer treatment appears to call for a special type of hospital."

Fixed amounts would be paid in normal maternity cases. The bill says these amounts "should cover most, if not all, of the expenses of normal delivery" for employees in the lower grades.

In-hospital dental care is covered by the bill.

An example is cited of a heart patient who spent 180 days in a hospital at an overall cost of $5,500, including doctor bills, tests, special nurses, etc. The Johnston-Neuberger bill would pay $5,120 of the cost, $3,820 by basic benefits and $1,300 from the major medical provision.

Another case cited is that of a 4-year-old child with nephrosis who was in a hospital 32 days, plus heavy home costs for drugs, doctor's visits, etc. The patient, it said, would pay only $380 of the $3,054 over-all cost.

The measure, however, isn't clear on benefits to be paid to employees and dependents who are treated at home. It says CSC, to the "extent practicable, reasonable, and desirable" should provide a scale of benefits.

New Mess in Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "New Mess in Capital—Farm Problem Called Most Critical Facing United States," written by Mr. Roscoe Drummond.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 18, 1959]

NEW MESS IN CAPITAL—FARM PROBLEM CALLED MOST CRITICAL FACING UNITED STATES

(By Roscoe Drummond)

This 86th Congress has yet to get up a real head of steam to deal with the most critical perilous, unresolved domestic problem facing the United States.

I refer to the absolute necessity of doing something constructive and soon to put the present unworkable farm program on a realistic basis and to avert—before it is too late to prevent disaster for everybody, including the farmers—a breakdown of the whole price-support house of cards.

There is no doubt in my mind that Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON wants this Congress to produce a good budget of responsible, needed legislation. But if the farm issue is neglected, palliated, or postponed, he will have fallen dangerously short of his goal.

President Eisenhower has said that if Congress does not pass an adequate mutual security program—and every current sign is that it will not do so but instead cut off its arms and legs to the tune of about $1.5 billion—he wold call a special session. That is a brave and sound idea, but if Congress does not do something to repair the mess in agriculture, then a special session to do so this fall is equally urgent.

In many ways the Nation's lagging defense program and the massive, unworkable, mounting farm subsidy could well be looked at together.

The fact is that we are not spending enough on defense and are spending too much on an agricultural program which isn't doing the job—and every month is getting worse.

From Henry Wallace to Ezra Benson, every Secretary of Agriculture, with the single exception of Charles Brannan, agrees that mandatory, high, rigid price supports are incompatible with the facts of modern agriculture.

The present level of price supports inevitably encourages, lures, and pays more farmers to grow more produce which cannot be sold in the markets and which the Government (which means all of us) buys at fixed prices. And we spend $1 billion a year just to handle and store the surplus.

Under the "soil bank" plan the Government pays farmers to take acreage out of production. But does this reduce overproduction? Does this cut down the growing of crops which can't be sold anywhere but to the Government? Does this curtail the massive farm subsidy?

The answer is "no" to every one of these questions. The reason is that American farmers are so efficient, scientific, so skillful, that every time they reduce acreage they find ways of producing more on fewer acres in order to take advantage of the Government's high, fixed price supports. One single fact illustrates how this is possible. In 1940 each farm worker could produce enough to meet the needs of 10.7 persons. Today, through scientific advances, he can produce enough to meet the needs of 25 persons. Average productivity of U.S. farmers has increased more since 1940 than in the previous 120 years.

And where is this scientific skill plus mandatory high fixed price supports taking us? Well, hold on to your seats, because here is where we are heading; the Government has a current investment in farm surpluses of $8.8 billion and if something solid isn't done to rectify the policy and reverse the trend, we will have $12 billion invested in these surpluses by 1963. And by June, 1961, the yearly cost of just storing these surpluses will be $1.4 billion or the staggering sum of $3.8 million per day.

Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on July 16, 1959, the Young Democratic Club of the District of Columbia unanimously passed a resolution endorsing the position of the Congress on housing legislation. In my opinion, this resolution expresses quite clearly the position of those of us who have worked for over 2 years to obtain a decent housing bill which could be approved by the President. I congratulate these young people for their alertness, initiative, and good judgment, and I ask that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Democratic Congress has recognized that housing and urban renewal are not only vital programs in meeting the basic needs of this country, but also major forces in our healthy economy; and

Whereas the Democratic Congress has attempted to meet these needs in the spirit of reasonableness faced with the inadequate proposals of the administration; but

Whereas in a special message to Congress presented on July 7, 1959, President Eisenhower returned without approval, S. 57, the Housing Act of 1959, constituting a veto; and

Whereas the President's sharply worded veto message, which charged S. 57 with being "so excessive in the spending it proposes, and so defective in other respects, that it would do far more damage than good"; and

Whereas the result of the President's action is to block any further efforts to rid our cities of blight, or to build homes for elderly at rents they can afford; and

Whereas with the proper cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of the Government, a suitable, adequate housing act can be worked out: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Young Democratic Club of the District of Columbia strongly urges action before this session of Congress adjourns, either through enacting this measure into law, the President's lack of approval notwithstanding, or through the enactment of another housing measure during this session of Congress.

(Unanimously passed at general membership meeting of the Young Democratic Club of the District of Columbia, July 16, 1959, as presented by Sallee Woodward.)

National Baton Twirling Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this week is being observed as National Baton Twirling Week by a Wisconsin-headquartered organization representing the 1 million Americans who enjoy the hobby and sport of baton twirling.

The climax of this special week, designated to call the Nation's attention to the growth of baton twirling as one of our Nation's popular recreational pursuits, will be a series of contests from coast to coast and a national jamboree in South Milwaukee, Wis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the National Baton Twirling Association of Janesville, Wis., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL BATON TWIRLING WEEK TO BE OBSERVED JULY 19 TO 26

Statement by Public Relations Division, National Baton Twirling Association, Janesville, Wis.

The Nation's estimated 1 million baton twirlers, drum majors, majorettes, and adult leaders observe National Baton Twirling Week, July 19 to 26, by launching a unique national leadership program to acquaint Americans with the many wholesome benefits derived by children through twirling.

Today, baton twirling ranks as the second largest youth movement for girls, with twirling playing an important part in parades, school events and community celebrations across the Nation. Even in crippled childrens' hospitals, twirling is being used as an effective method of therapy.

Other physical benefits realized by children through twirling, as pointed out by officials of the National Baton Twirling Association, include gracefulness, poise, ambidexterity, alertness, teamwork, leadership, and self-confidence.

Where did it all start? According to the book "Who's Who in Baton Twirling," twirling can be traced back many decades to Siam, Arabia, and the Samoan Islands where a "far cry" form of twirling was used for ceremonial dances and celebrations. Spears, knives, and guns were manipulated in a manner that resembles many of the movements found in twirling today.

The first sign of baton twirling in America was the drum major who performed feats of balancing, juggling, and dexterity with the early circus. Until 1930, twirling was practiced exclusively by men. "Later on," as one NBTA official put it, "the girls took over and literally ran the men out of the field."

During National Baton Twirling Week, a National Jamboree will be held at South Milwaukee, Wis. A series of contests will be conducted from coast to coast. Free baton lessons will be given on the local level, in most cities, by certified instructors of the National Baton Twirling Association. Names of teachers who will be giving lessons in specific areas can be had by writing NBTA National Headquarters, Janesville, Wis.

Who Represents the Interests of the Whole of Germany in Geneva?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, Dr. Walter Becher, Secretary General of the Bavarian Landtag, forwarded on to me translated extracts from a quite unusual speech given by the the Deputy Minister of All-German Affairs of the German Federal Republic. This speech, which appeared in the German press, is entitled "Who Represents the Interest of the Whole of Germany in Geneva?" and it contains some very interesting and encouraging information with reference to the continued anti-Communist position taken by the people of East Germany.

The translated excerpts from the speech place particular emphasis on the failure of the Communists in East Germany to win over the youth resid-

ing in the Russian zone, and the message sought to be conveyed is that the representatives of the Bonn Government are actually the ones who do in fact represent the feelings of all the German people at Geneva.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO REPRESENTS THE INTERESTS OF THE WHOLE OF GERMANY IN GENEVA?

A PRINCIPAL QUESTION OF THE FOREIGN MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

(State Secretary Franz Thedieck of the Federal Ministry for All-German Problems made the following speech in RIAS on May 23, 1959 (from which the next two paragraphs were selected for translation):)

The reason for these tirades of hatred against the Federal Republic is to be seen mainly in the fact that the authorities in Pankow know only too well that the population of the Soviet Zone rests its hope in the delegation of the Federal Republic in Geneva. The leaders of the SED know just as well that the majority of the population they dominate—instead of governing—have a completely different opinion to their own.

THE YOUTH OPPOSING THE SED

Who represents Germany in Geneva? This question was answered in a very precise manner by the authorities in Pankow at the 6th Parliament of the FDJ (Free German Youth) in Rostock. In his statement of accounts the leader of the FDJ (Namokel) stated clearly that the Communists had not succeeded in making the youth of the Soviet Zone convinced adherents of this regime. If the supreme youth-leader of a state, which pretends to be the only representative of laborers and farmers, must admit, without restrictions, that—I quote word for word—"we have not succeeded in diminishing to a considerable degree the abyss between the most progressive part and the mass of the workers' youth," then this statement hits the same main problem at Geneva: Who represents Germany? The SED according to its own confession at the Rostock Youth Parliament has not succeeded in winning over even the workers' youth, much less other parts of the youth of Central Germany. The situation in 1959 is the same as in 1955, the year in which we were given to know many striking estimations of the SED concerning the situation of the youth in Central Germany.

On the occasion of the 25th session of the Central Committee of the SED in October 1955 the Secretary of the Central Committee, Albert Norden, just as Namokel in May 1959, had to state: "Today we often have the impression that there is on the one side the FDJ and on the other the youth, of which, however, a great part is organized in the FDJ itself." In 1955, Norden stated also: "The youth is advancing without us, that is bad." Four years later, in 1959, Namokel had to confess: "In our opinion there are many functionaries of the FDJ as well as sports organizers who do not understand that they should organize sports there, where the youth is spending its free time." In 1955 the Secretary of the Central Council of the FDJ, Steinke, demanded: "We, of the Central Council of the FDJ, must finally stop becoming enthusiastic in examples, we must get used to facing the situation as it is and to leading a true campaign for the winning over of the youth." In 1959 Namokel had once more to demand that a change in the program of the FDJ be brought about, in order to win over the whole of the youth "for the sake of socialism."

THE FLIGHT OF THE YOUNG PEOPLE FROM THE ZONE

The delegation of the Federal Republic at Geneva would be in a bad position, if it knew that only the elder generation in the Soviet Zone wished for free self-determination. If there were an abyss between the elder generation and the youth in this decisive question, then it would be fighting for a lost cause. In spite of the Nazi period and communism there is, however, in this youth a demand for free self-determination concerning their own life to a considerable degree. It is so strong that the authorities in Pankow must use the severest means of force, in order to hold this youth in check. The recent court proceedings of students held in Dresden and Gera as well as the high sentences of penal servitude, which were given there, speak for themselves. At least 56 students were sentenced to a total of 329 years of penitentiary in the course of the last decade.

For years the proportion of juveniles under 25 years compared with the total number of refugees amounts to 50 percent. That means that since 1952 over 860,000 juveniles have fled from the Soviet Zone. In 1955, on the occasion of the 25th Assembly of the Central Committee of the SED the Secretary of the Central Council of the FDJ, Steinke, dealt with the problem of the flight of the youth and had to declare: "All of these had no relation, no contact whatsoever with our state of laborers and farmers, or with the FDJ." This situation has not changed in the slightest up till now. Nevertheless Namokel announced boastfully in Rostock: "Whoever wants to solve the German problem, will have to sit down at the same table with the representatives of the German people, in order to negotiate and cannot do it over the heads of the German people." On this point we agree wholeheartedly with Namokel. Due to the fact that Ulbricht, Norden, and Namokel have stated themselves that there exists a wide abyss between the population in central Germany and its authorities, and since the population is in agreement with us on the question of free self-determination, we therefore claim for ourselves to be the spokesmen for the whole German nation at Geneva.

Oregon Dunes National Seashore Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon Dunes national seashore area, which I have sought to have authorized as a unit of the National Park System under the provisions of S. 1526, will have far-reaching benefits for my home State of Oregon and for the Nation. The 23-mile stretch of Pacific Ocean coastline to be included in the seashore area has unique scenic beauty and unusual recreational potential. A recent editorial written by the associate publisher and executive editor of the Coos Bay (Oreg.), World, Mr. Forest W. Amsden, describes some of the real and tangible advantages of the proposal. Mr. Amsden points out that support for the project is widespread in Oregon. I ask consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the World, Coos Bay, Oreg., July 15, 1959]

DUNES PARK IS WORTHWHILE

Dispassionate observers of strident opposition to the Florence-area dunes recreation area—proposed in legislation introduced in Congress by Senator NEUBERGER—keep reporting that most of the opposition is based on lack of facts and/or misinformation. They also persist in a belief that the opposition is a small, but vocal, minority. Both observations are probably true.

There has been so much negative thinking about the Neuberger proposal that its merits have been sluiced down the drain, so far as public thought is concerned.

Basically the merits are these: The Dunes proposal will mean a growing boom in the Florence (and entire coast, for that matter) tourist economy; it will in addition mean preservation of some of the finest dunes scenery in the United States for the enjoyment and recreation of visitor and resident alike.

The publicity involved in having a national park or recreation area, along with the good management and supervision of it by a Federal agency, will bring literally thousands of new visitors to Florence every year. It will also bring new businesses and new residents. The prosperity will trickle up and down the coast.

No—this won't happen overnight. It will be a growing thing. It is well worth the investment.

We are indebted to William Tugman, editor of the Port Umpqua Courier in Reedsport, and a member of the State Parks Department advisory board, for the "official" definitions of a national park and a national recreation area.

The Florence proposal is a recreation area, although it is often referred to as a "park." There is a difference, but mislabeling has in itself brought about some of the opposition.

A national park: "* * * is a spacious land area, essentially of primitive or wilderness character which contains scenery or natural wonders, so outstanding in quality that its preservation intact has been provided for by it having been designated and set aside by the National Government for the benefit, enjoyment and inspiration of the people."

A national recreation area: "* * * is a Federal reservation established primarily to conserve and develop for public enjoyment recreational resources of national significance, including areas of scenic, natural, or historic interest and their wildlife, under a system of management to permit other forms of resources utilization not incompatible with the protection and public enjoyment of the recreation resources. In essence, it might be said that a national park is dedicated primarily to the preservation of outstanding natural features, while a national recreation area is established to conserve areas of national significance for public recreation. Property owners within the boundaries of a national park normally have the same rights and privileges as any other landowner of the State. If, however, the State has ceded to the Federal Government exclusive jurisdiction, the Government has certain additional authority. It may, for example, make and enforce special regulations concerning zoning, sanitation, etc., which are necessary for the health and safety of the public or for the protection of park values."

There has been industrial opposition to the proposed dunes recreation area on the grounds that timber within the initially proposed boundaries is privately owned, or that potential industrial water sources beneath the dunes is needed for industry. Yet such uses are not outlawed in a recreation area, and private property is not appropriated.

Further assurance of private property rights is not out of the question, perhaps even in the enabling legislation. It can be arranged, at any rate, and there is no need to blast the whole wonderful idea because of it.

As far as that goes, the boundaries proposed in the Neuberger bill are only proposals—easily amended.

Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER, after investigating at the scene, decided he still favors the park idea but will work for a somewhat smaller area to be included in the Federal recreation area.

The idea that everyone in the area is up in arms against the proposal is patently false.

Proponents may be frightened into silence, they may be so uncertain of the facts that they prefer to remain quiet—but there are proponents. And when the facts are fully understood, it is a good wager that a considerable majority of the residents will strongly favor the park idea.

Senator NEUBERGER recently sent the editor of this paper a copy of an unsigned letter he had received from a Florence man or woman in business there. The letter said most people support the park but, like himself or herself, are afraid to take a public stand because of the possibility of a hysterical boycott.

There is much heat and little light on this situation, especially from the standpoint of the opposition.

The dunes park is a good proposal, one which should be implemented as promptly as possible, whatever the amendments. The opposition to it, although vocal, is not well grounded—except in emotionalism—F.W.A.

Man for the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, if the State of New Jersey has exhibited particular pride in the accomplishments of its State National Guard, a good deal of this pride can be attributed to the fact that from 1948 to 1955, the State guard was under the command of Maj. Gen. Donald Wilson McGowan.

A native of New Jersey, this career officer entered the military service at the age of 16. He saw service overseas in World War I with the 29th Division and in World War II he was in the front line of the historic invasion of Normandy. His battlefield exploits have been recognized both at home and abroad through the many high honors he has received.

And now at a critical period in the guard's history—when there are many who would curtail its strength and its duties—comes the glad news of General McGowan's nomination to be its chief. With such an eminently qualified officer at its head, the National Guard can look forward to a great and secure future. I hope and trust his nomination will be quickly confirmed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial on Major General McGowan from the July 9 issue of the Trentonian.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN FOR THE JOB

Although it has been regarded as virtually certain for some time now, the nomination of Maj. Gen. Donald Wilson McGowan to be chief of the National Guard still comes as pleasing news to his wide circle of friends in the Trenton area.

By any and all standards, General McGowan is eminently qualified to lead the guard at a time when the future of the organization is threatened to some degree by those who would curtail its strength and its duties. He is a career officer who entered the military service at the age of 16 to serve in the Mexican border campaign. He saw service overseas in World War I with the 29th Division. He joined the guard in 1925 and when war again came, he was in the front line of the historic invasion of Normandy. Later he was assigned as provost marshal of Normandy and won high honors from France and Belgium in recognition of his outstanding achievements. He also was abundantly decorated by his own country for his exploits on the battlefield.

Lately General McGowan has been Chief of the Army Division of the National Guard Bureau. He assumed that post after serving from 1948 to 1955 as the New Jersey guard's commander.

The President's appointee to this position of high responsibility is well known around Trenton. Back in the days before World War II, his was a familiar name in the activities of the old 112th Field Artillery Battalion which was stationed at Eggerts Crossing. Indeed, he and Mrs. McGowan maintain a permanent residence on Eggerts Crossing Road. When war came in 1941, he was assigned to command the 102d Cavalry and led that organization on to the beaches of Normandy.

But all New Jersey has a claim on General McGowan. In addition to have commanded the State's guard, he is a native of Orange. Thus he is assured of multitudinous good wishes from the Garden State. It is to be hoped that the nomination of this outstanding National Guard officer will be promptly confirmed.

If We Can't Beat This, We Are Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the current steel strike has come to be a matter of primary concern to the public. This strike has raised questions in the public's mind concerning the adequacy of laws to protect the public's interest in questions which arise in disputes between management and labor.

A most provocative editorial on this subject entitled "If We Can't Beat This, We Are Lost," appeared in the July 17 issue of the Greenville News, a newspaper published in Greenville, S.C. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF WE CAN'T BEAT THIS, WE ARE LOST

Many steelworkers, perhaps a majority of them (who knows?) are not in favor of the strike which has been ordered by their union. Like most Americans, they have debts and are living on current earnings.

Even more of their wives are against the strike, for they are the home managers and can see slim days ahead, a reduction in the standard of living and the piling up of more debts that higher pay, if the union wins it, will be a long time wiping out.

Yet the workers go along. Why?

It is one of the most alarming aspects of modern American life and the biggest reason why crooked labor leaders have been able to win power and keep it.

One of the striking steelworkers put it into these words:

"Well, I'd rather see them continue to negotiate. But I'll go along with him (President David J. McDonald of the United Steelworkers who, as much as anything else, is trying to consolidate his position by winning wage increases and higher fringe benefits) all the way. I'm letting him do the thinking."

The worker thus puts his fate and, perhaps, that of the Nation, in the hands of a union leader.

"I'm letting him do the thinking."

Those words may well be the epitaph of real freedom in the United States.

This ties in completely, and with alarming implications, with other news events of the last few days relating to unions and their leaders.

In an especially arrogant way during final hearings before Senator MCCLELLAN'S rackets investigating committee, President James R. Hoffa of the Teamsters Union once more gave Congress the back of his hand. He was more than defiant; he was downright contemptuous. His behavior was that of a man who was sure he was above the law (and who doubts it anymore?) and was confident that the men who have the power to make laws wouldn't dare to use it against him.

Hoffa was questioned about alleged misdeeds, which should send him to jail if he is guilty. He brushed the charges aside with statements to the effect that he just didn't remember (he's done that before, too), that the affairs in question had been handled by underlings and the Senators should ask them.

Then, when the underlings were called to the witness stand, he openly directed them to "take the fifth," that is to refuse to answer on grounds that their testimony might incriminate them. It was an especially crude and rude method of denying the Senators information to which they, the union members, and the public are entitled.

How long will Congress and the public put up with this sort of thing?

Indefinitely, it seems.

The Senate some weeks ago passed a watered down union reform bill. Most of those who voted for it said it was better than nothing. But businessmen have taken a second look at it and concluded that it is worse than no bill at all.

They contend that, while it has some good points relating to the handling of union funds and the conduct of union elections, other provisions would weaken the existing laws to such an extent that, overall, the power of the union leaders would be increased in some areas more than it would be limited in others.

And that is how the matter stands today. It is most unlikely that any sort of union-curbing bill will be passed this year; if any is, it probably will be innocuous.

Meanwhile, men like James R. Hoffa can almost literally spit in the eye of Congress and the public. They are free to put together labor monopolies far more fearsome and dangerous than the business monopolies the antitrust laws are intended to prevent or break up. They are free to call crippling strikes and their members follow them blindly without stopping to weigh the consequences.

If this is the best we can do, then we are a sick nation.

How United States Lives: Stage Version

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on July 20, the Washington Post carried a column by Miss Malvina Lindsay entitled "How United States Lives."

This article is one of the most penetrating and intelligent analysis of the confusing situation regarding our Moscow Fair that I have seen. I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW UNITED STATES LIVES: STAGE VERSION

(By Malvina Lindsay)

In a big country of diverse people, all having the right of free speech, a chorus of dissent is inevitable over every exhibit sent abroad to mirror American life. That is especially true if the exhibit goes to the Soviet Union.

But one does not have to be a fogy, a superpatriot, an ignoramus, or a chronic carper to wonder why these exhibits so often reveal a vulnerability to charges of phoniness or superficiality. Their reported exaggerations cause vague concern to many Americans.

One wonders if these exaggerations are not rooted in the general craze for showmanship, for attention getting, that pervades many areas of American life, and if they are not part of the whole over dramatic, over glossed picture of the United States that movies, magazine advertisements and some tourists present abroad.

This country also—like the Soviet Union—may be trying in its exhibits to picture social progress and material prosperity to which it aspires but has not yet attained. American viewers of the Soviet exhibition in New York have been quick to spot its weaknesses, such as the lack of price tags on articles. And persons who have been to the Soviet Union point out that the house furnishings and clothing shown are available to but few Russians. The general criticism is that the exhibition shows Russia as it would like to be rather than as it is.

But if they are not fooling us, why should we expect to fool them? One criticism of the fashion editors who saw the dry run fashion presentation for the American exhibition in Moscow, opening next Saturday, was that the greater part of the clothes were beyond the budget of the average woman. Also in two scenes, now removed, an attempt was made to present racial integration as having extended far beyond its present state. These scenes, while attention getting, only served unhappily to arouse racist groups and to add fuel to the racial controversy.

Also the reported emphasis in the American fashion show on feminine trousers, including fitted pants, may well reinforce foreign stereotypes of the American woman as an aggressive matriarch or as an exhibitionist of the type that parades in foreign capitals in shorts or slacks to a chorus of foreign criticism.

The ubiquitous fashion show in this country is to many women just what its name implies—a show. They expect it to be dramatic, glamorous, out of this world. But those staging the fashion exhibit to be sent to Moscow insist it is a presentation of real life clothes. Hence more realism is expected of it. Fortunately the artificial glamour girl models have been weeded out in favor of more natural looking ones.

The $13,000 average American home with its $5,000 furnishings sent to the Moscow exhibition would be less vulnerable to doubt if it were made clear to Russian viewers just how it would be financed here on the installment plan and by help of long-term Government loans.

Any country naturally tries to touch up the picture of itself presented to other countries. But the American picture has become so superslick as to cause much surprise, also disillusionment, when the real thing is encountered. Foreign visitors inevitably comment on how different American life is from what they expected. Many are agreeably surprised at its depth and substance. But many are disappointed that "Paradise" has grubby corners.

The latter reaction has been recently expressed by some forthright members of the Dutch trailer caravan that since April has toured 9,000 miles in this country. These visitors say they had a "great misconception" of the United States because it had been glamorized by Hollywood. They expected "it to be a fairyland" but found it "not as clean and beautiful as was thought." They were especially surprised by the slums, dirt, and messiness of cities.

Every Eden disappoints its visitors to some extent. But no country has had to live up to so much in foreign expectations as the United States. The Madison Avenue presentation of its culture has become a liability. The production should be toned down or the reality brought up.

New Jersey Has Long Fair Season

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, occasionally visitors to New Jersey are puzzled when they see, from their automobile windows, the great industrial plants which line many of the highways in that State.

They may even ask: "Why is this called the Garden State?"

To those who have visited many other areas of the State, the answer is obvious. From the great dairy industry of the north to the varied vegetable fields of central and south Jersey, the Garden State offers many beautiful views of farms at their finest.

One of the happiest expressions of our interest in New Jersey farms are our State fairs. To many thousands of people yearly, these fairs are fascinating and enjoyable occasions.

An editorial from the New Brunswick Home News of July 18 expresses some of that enjoyment. And, so does the message of the State secretary of agriculture, Mr. Phillip Alampi, who wrote it for a publication of the New Jersey Association of Agricultural Fairs. The association, which has Mr. Donald C. Bain as president, also offers a booklet which lists the fairs and gives further information.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the editorial from the New Brunswick Home News, the message from Mr. Phillip Alampi, and for those who may have an opportunity to be in the vicinity, a list of the New Jersey agricultural fairs to be held this summer:

There being no objection, the editorial, message, and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Home News, July 18, 1959]

NEW JERSEY HAS LONG FAIR SEASON

New Jersey's fair season opened today with the Monmouth County 4–H Fair at the Freehold Raceway. From now on, in practically every county, the State's annual round of exhibiting, midway excitement, and pageantry will get into full swing until it gradually builds up to the last and biggest—the New Jersey State Fair—in Trenton, the last weekend in September.

Fairs have been farm festooned in this State since 1781 when the New Jersey Society for Promoting Agriculture, Commerce, and Arts was organized in Middlebush. Though quietly at work just about the year around, the society's bigtime events were the annual State fairs, held intermittently until around the 1840's. With the acquisition of a permanent site at what is now Weequahic Park in Newark, the fairs became a regular event from 1866 until 1899. The longevity of New Jersey's county fairs is shown by the fact that the Flemington Fair is over a century old.

It is significant that the twin county fairs are being held at approximately the same time. Middlesex County's 5-day annual event at Dunhams Corner, East Brunswick, will convene on August 11 and continue through August 15, while slated for August 13–15 is the Somerset County 4–H Fair at Far Hills.

With 20 fairs scheduled for New Jersey this season, those who like such events could be like Sir Walter Scott's last minstrel who is pictured flying "lightly from fair to fair."

THE GARDEN STATE ON PARADE

A great many people are aware that New Jersey is known far and wide as the Garden State. There is good reason for this familiar designation. In spite of being a small State, New Jersey is important agriculturally and leads most areas in the production of a number of vegetable crops. It has long had the highest gross income per acre of any State.

Fairs are an ideal place and a captivating method of emphasizing the fine achievements of our Garden State. But more, they have helped to develop an awareness of the close relationship and interdependency that exists between industry and agriculture. Progress in the accomplishments of both agriculture and industry is well demonstrated at these traditional enterprises.

Our agricultural fairs afford a holiday occasion to which are added some splendid opportunities to view this progress at first hand. You are cordially invited to spend a day at the fair of your choice.

PHILLIP ALAMPI,
Secretary of Agriculture.

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST, NEW JERSEY AGRICULTURAL FAIRS, 1959

July 23–25: Burlington County Farm Fair, Lumberton.

July 23–25: Cape May County 4–H Fair, Cape May Courthouse.

August 4–8: Cumberland County Fair, Bridgeton.
August 4–8: Sussex County Farm and Horse Show, Branchville.
August 5–6: Ocean County Fair, Ocean County Park, Lakewood.
August 6–7: Gloucester County 4–H Fair, Delsea Drive, Clayton.
August 6–8: Passaic County 4–H Fair, Wayne Township Grange Hall, Preakness.
August 11–12: Essex County 4–H Fair, Township School, Caldwell Township.
August 11–15: Middlesex County Fair, Dunham's Corner.
August 12–15: Warren County Farmers' Fair, Uniontown.
August 13–14: Salem County 4–H Fair, Cowtown.
August 13–15: Somerset County 4–H Fair, Far Hills.
August 14–15: Camden County 4–H Fair, Camden County Farm, Lakeland.
August 14–15: Mercer County Farmers' Picnic and 4–H Show, Artillery Armory, Eggerts Road, Trenton.
August 17–22: Morris County Fair, Troy Hills.
August 19–22: Atlantic County 4–H Fair, Route 50, Mays Landing-Egg Harbor Road.
September 1–7: Flemington Fair, Flemington.
September 20–27: New Jersey State Fair, Trenton.

The Supreme Court and Its Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, certain recent decisions by the Supreme Court have stimulated violent attacks on that institution and its present members. While criticism aimed at the merits of these opinions undoubtedly serves the democratic process, the vituperative nature of this assailment can only be construed as an attempt to vilify Justices sitting on the Court and to destroy respect for this branch of our Government.

In the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 19, Charles S. Rhyne, former president of the American Bar Association, presents a cogent censure of such activities and the attitude which they represent. Mr. Rhyne states:

It is possible that the public may be misled by current criticism revolving around the Supreme Court. Too often this criticism goes beyond fair comment on decisions and disparages individual judges, thus striking at the standing of the institution itself.

Public confidence in this Court and in all courts is vital to a proper functioning of our system of government. This kind of criticism may be impairing that confidence, thereby destroying one of the three vital elements of our three-part system of government.

In fact, the Court is doing an excellent job and the great majority of lawyers are of that opinion. In the past 2 years during extensive traveling, I have talked with thousands of lawyers. Undoubtedly, some lawyers will dispute my conclusion, but most of them will agree with it.

Mr. Rhyne points out that the public and the legal profession may disagree with particular decisions and question the reasoning applied by the Court. "But," he declares, "it is extremely serious that personal insults are now hurled at members of the Court in place of criticism directed at their decisions." He states:

Disagreement is a sure sign of intellectual activity—the freedom of thought which is essential to democracy. But when the disagreement runs rampant in the form of malicious charges directed toward undermining and smearing the opponent, there is cause for freedom-loving men to become alarmed. For this type of attack cares little for the virtue of truth.

He notes that:

Never a decade has passed that some great controversial economic, political or moral issue has not been resolved. Time has proved many of the decisions to be not only correct but brilliant. Others were later seen to be shortsighted or shallow and were overruled. But would we have it otherwise?

Would it be better to have a board of nine pacifiers who would concede some basic value here and withhold a little justice there in an effort to appease, say, 90 percent of the public?

Mr. Rhyne's answer to this question is a resounding "No."

The job of the Supreme Court is to make decisions. None can be popular with all segments of society. Democracy dictates that there will be criticism. But degradation, defamation, and debasement have no place in this process.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Rhyne's excellent article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 19, 1959]

COURT CRITICS STRIKE AT AMERICA'S VITALS

(By Charles S. Rhyne)

It is possible that the public may be misled by current criticism revolving around the Supreme Court. Too often this criticism goes beyond fair comment on decisions and disparages individual judges, thus striking at the standing of the institution itself.

Public confidence in this Court and in all courts is vital to a proper functioning of our system of government. This kind of criticism may be impairing that confidence, thereby destroying one of the three vital elements of our three-part system of government.

In fact, the Court is doing an excellent job and the great majority of lawyers are of that opinion. In the past 2 years during extensive traveling, I have talked with thousands of lawyers. Undoubtedly, some lawyers will dispute my conclusion, but most of them will agree with it.

THEY CAN'T TALK BACK

Our governmental system is erected on three separate branches: the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. The system depends upon each serving as a check on the others. They create a balance of power as insurance that absolute power to form a tyranny will not vest in any one branch. If any one of the three is weakened or destroyed, the system is weakened or destroyed.

Judges of our courts speak publicly only in the discharge of their judicial function. They must bear criticism, even irresponsible and vicious criticism, in silence. These men have given up the right to criticize in order that the rest of us might be secure in that right.

We of the bar have no such restraint upon us. It is, therefore, up to us, the members of the bar, to speak up in defense of our courts as an institution of government. We cannot be content merely to note the comforting fact that an institution which has survived the petulance and displeasure of a Jefferson, a Jackson, and two Roosevelts—to say nothing of the tirades of lesser men—almost certainly has the strength and vitality to survive present attacks.

THE FINAL SAFEGUARD

We as a people boast of rights and liberties, but rights are as nothing without redress and protection in the courts. Chief Justice Marshall truly said:

"The judicial department comes home in its effects to every man's fireside; it passes upon his property, his reputation, his life, his all."

Whenever we stop and think, we must recognize that not one of our priceless freedoms—speech, religion, press, even criticism of government—would be safe without the final safeguard of the courts.

Under our system, the role of the courts is to decide justiciable disputes between man and man and man and government. No better institution has yet been conceived of by the mind of man for peaceful settlement of such disputes. Today in all civilized nations, disputes are decided in the court's under the rule of law, which is an application of reason and fairness as developed by the wisdom of the ages.

HUNDREDS OF REVERSALS

Although an aura of mystery surrounds our courts, they are fundamentally a human institution. Judges are human beings subject to all the frailties of the rest of us. They make mistakes—constantly. Many hundreds of cases are reversed yearly.

We have 50 State supreme courts, 11 Federal courts of appeals and a much larger number of other State appellate courts which review the decisions of and reverse the errors of thousands of lower courts. The Supreme Court of the United States sits on top of this hierarchy and is required to review the alleged errors of Federal courts and in some cases the alleged errors of State courts.

Some 1,300 cases a year are considered by the Supreme Court, of which about 100 are heard orally and decided by written opinion. The Supreme Court does not have complete freedom in selecting cases; it must consider those which litigants bring before it.

The cases which percolate to the top usually involve issues of great moment. There are no easy cases in the Supreme Court.

A PARAMOUNT FUNCTION

To function properly, any government, any business, any family requires that decisions be made. Oftentimes decisions are wrong, and upon reconsideration in the light of experience they are changed. But without decisions, progress is stymied and any institution stagnates and dies from inaction. So it is not as important that decisions be right as it is that decisions be made.

Our system is not perfect; after thousands of years we are still trying to perfect our society. Take traffic law and traffic courts, for instance. If we waited until they were perfect before we allowed traffic to move, no traffic would ever move on our streets.

So why do we expect our Supreme Court to be perfect? It was not designed to be perfect, it never has been and it never will be. But having said all that, I hasten to say that as an institution it is the closest to perfection yet devised by man for the type of function it is required to perform to keep our system of Government operating properly.

Sir Winston Churchill has called it the most esteemed judicial tribunal in the world. And it is.

Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and other judges, are men, not gods or even supermen. They react to human motivations. They have families and human worries, prejudices, experiences, tempers, peeves, sympathy, antipathy, compassion, sorrows, and all the other human attributes that the rest of us have.

Some are conservative, some are liberal, depending upon the definitions one applies—and again they are no different in that respect from the rest of us.

Yet when one stands up before the black-robed Justices of the Supreme Court, he would be inhuman if he did not feel a sense of almost awe. I have appeared in many courts and before hundreds of audiences, yet I still almost lost my tongue as I face the Supreme Court. When these very human judges meet as a tribunal, they meet in an atmosphere of greatness.

Lawyers vigorously argue both sides of every case in the Supreme Court. So close are many questions that the Justices split over the decisions. Sometimes they divide five to four. Again I insist that it is more important that we get a decision than that it be one which 100 percent or even 90 percent or 50 percent of our people agree is correct.

We are going through a period of transition. No matter how decided, the segregation cases and the internal-security cases would offend the views and sensibilities of some of our people. Yet these decisions must be made or our system breaks down.

Few people could be in more disagreement with a decision than Abraham Lincoln was with that returning Dred Scott to slavery. His advice on that occasion should be pondered by us all:

"We know the Court that made it has often overruled its own decisions and we shall do what we can to have it overrule this. We offer no resistance to it."

That was the position of a man willing to shelve his personal disappointment rather than lead an attack, as he said, against "our whole Republican system of government—a blow which if successful would place all our rights and liberties at the mercy of passion, anarchy, and violence."

This must be the position of our legal profession and the public. We may state why we believe particular decisions to be erroneous. We may endeavor to have them overruled. But we must not disparage the status of our courts as an institution of government by blanket attacks upon the courts, or even a particular court.

Thus, it is not at all disturbing that large numbers of intelligent persons should disagree with the legal reasoning of the Court, the authorities cited, or lack of them, or the ultimate decision. But it is extremely serious that personal insults are now hurled at members of the Court in place of criticism directed at their decisions.

Disagreement is a sure sign of intellectual activity—the freedom of thought which is essential to democracy. But when the disagreement runs rampant in the form of malicious charges directed toward undermining and smearing the opponent, there is cause for freedom-loving men to become alarmed. For this type of attack cares little for the virtue of truth.

In the decisions of the Supreme Court, one can trace most of the significant social, political and economic trends and developments of our Nation.

The Court began its role as a resolver of great national issues in the classic case of *Marbury* v. *Madison*. The majority opinion by Chief Justice John Marshall stated that conflict between a Federal statute and the Constitution must be resolved in favor of the Constitution, the supreme law of the land. Although this declaration was actually mere dictum, it was widely accepted as controlling on the power of the Court to rule on the validity of Federal statutes.

Opponents lashed out at the language of the opinion. Many eminent men, among them President Jefferson, were extremely critical. They took the position that each branch of the Government had the exclusive power to pass on its own authority. Rational grounds were advanced for this argument.

Certainly many persons must have considered the decision to be a violent misuse of judicial authority. Yet now we look upon *Marbury* v. *Madison* as the very cornerstone of constitutional law. Without this review of the constitutionality of Federal legislation, the basic rights and freedoms we prize would be unprotected. The "gross usurpation of 1803" is the "genius of John Marshall" today.

Never a decade has passed that some great controversial economic, political, or moral issue has not been resolved. Time has proved many of the decisions to be not only correct but brilliant. Others were later seen to be shortsighted or shallow and were overruled. But would we have it otherwise?

Would it be better to have a board of nine pacifiers who would concede some basic value here and withhold a little justice there is an effort to appease, say, 90 percent of the public?

There is certainly nothing wrong with responsible criticism of judicial decisions. Many great advances in our jurisprudence have stemmed from such reasoned criticism by lawyers and scholars. As Justice David Brewer said in 1898:

"It is a mistake to suppose that the Supreme Court is either honored or helped by being spoken of as beyond criticism."

But there is a vast difference between criticism stemming from constructive analysis of particular decisions and the uniformed, misleading statements and insults which are sometimes hurled currently.

The Kind of Slap That Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the newspapers of the country continue to call editorially for the correction of Supreme Court decisions which thwart the intent of Congress and the best interest of the Nation. In doing so, they not only reflect the desires of the people of the United States but emphasize the problem to those who are not fully informed on their loss of rights through court action. Such an editorial, and a very able one at that, entitled, "The Kind of Slap That Is Needed," appeared in the State, a newspaper published in Columbia, S.C., on Thursday, July 9. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KIND OF SLAP THAT IS NEEDED

The House, after a few hours of bitter debate, has again voted its disapproval of the behavior of the Supreme Court.

The Congressmen voted 262 to 138 to correct a situation growing out of the Supreme Court's action in the Mallory case. The court freed Mallory, under a death sentence in a District of Columbia court after confessing to criminal assault, because there had been a few hours delay in his arraignment following arrest.

The bill passed by the House would reverse the effect of this ruling, and allow use of confessions obtained under similar conditions—i.e., confessions could not be thrown out because of a few hours delay between arrest and arraignment.

Senators will now have an opportunity to help correct a situation which amazed and appalled judges and lawyers throughout the country. Liberals are, of course, crying about this as a threat to civil liberties—neglecting the fact that Mallory has been in trouble repeatedly since his release. It seems he has been disturbing the civil rights and liberties of several people.

It is hoped the Senate will follow the lead of the House and act affirmatively. The Court needs to be put back into its constitutional place.

Tribute to the Composer, Ernest Bloch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the great and gifted composers of our era was the late Ernest Bloch, who died last week in Portland, Oreg. Oregon was his adopted State, and he loved its majestic seacoast, where he planted his flowers and was inspired by the foaming Pacific. On July 19, 1959, the Washington Post and Times Herald paid eloquent tribute to this talented man. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Ernest Bloch," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, July 19, 1959]

ERNEST BLOCH

The death of Ernest Bloch reminds us again how rich in song this era has been, whatever its failings in so many other respects. No century which has seen such major figures as Stravinsky, Bartok, Prokofiev, Schoenberg, Strauss, and Sibelius—to name a few—need apologize for the quality of its music. Mr. Bloch, who died on Wednesday at 79, was not only an important composer, but a creator whose works reflected many of the prevailing musical currents of his time. Although he remained aloof from musical fads and cliques, his works based on Jewish liturgy sprang from the same quest for ethnic and nationalistic melody as did the Hungarian music of Bartok.

Like Sibelius and Strauss, Ernest Bloch could compose works of post-Wagnerian lushness, such as "Schelomo," his much-admired rhapsody for cello and orchestra. His "Concerto Grosso" suggested the same revived interest in 18th century music that animates so much of Stravinsky's work. He was at home with the dissonant and experimental, and his pupils included such major contemporary talents as Roger Sessions, Randall Thompson, and Douglas Moore. The Swiss-born composer spent much of his life here, and although only the future

can take full measure of his contribution, this country was assuredly the richer for his presence and the world will be poorer for his loss.

The Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the question of a summit conference is much in the minds of the public of this country and indeed all the countries of the world at the present time. Much has been said both pro and con concerning such a conference. A most provocative article entitled "The Summit," written by Gen. Charles A. Willoughby appeared in the July issue of the American Mercury. While I do not agree with all that General Willoughby has said in this article, I do feel that it is such an interesting article that it should be widely read and studied by the Members of Congress and the American public. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUMMIT

(By Gen. Charles A. Willoughby)

PART I. A DEMILITARIZED MID-EUROPEAN BUFFER ZONE

Khrushchev's drive for a summit meeting has succeeded, with Macmillan acting as the honest broker. Russian declarations, however, show no palpable concessions—indeed, they were more conciliatory in 1952.

The intrinsic value of summit meetings can be ascertained by simple, historical recollections. In the last 25 years, the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Communists, including Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom, and Geneva. The negotiators spoke 106 million words (about 700 volumes in print). These talkfests led to 52 major agreements—and Soviet Russia has broken 50 of them. It is almost boring to quote Lenin: "Promises are like piecrusts—made to be broken."

The Communist philosophy of diplomatic negotiations was stated in 1931 by Dmitri Manuilski who, at one time, presided over the U.N. Security Council—telltale index of the quality of that overrated body. Manuilski's timetable is interesting: "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, we are not strong enough. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years (i.e., in 1951 or in 1961). The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we will launch the most spectacular peace movement on record. The capitalists, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends." We suppose this cold-blooded forecast has escaped men like Cyrus Eaton and his Pugwash coterie of tax-exempt brainwashers.

The Russians precipitated the Berlin crisis for well-known, well-defined objectives in the framework of their ruthless but brilliant strategy; conversely, a study of cause and effect will place responsibility for a critical situation almost entirely on the West: (1) panicky demobilization in 1945 while Russia armed to the teeth; (2) fatuous reliance on a supposedly exclusive deterrent; (3) failure of Western Europe to maintain even peacetime armaments; (4) silence of NATO commanders on a visibly weakening shield.

Against this background of military fumbling, the Russians seek to retain the loot acquired with the help of Hitler, plus the loot handed over to them at Yalta and Potsdam. They want acceptance of the status quo at the highest level—the summit. Behind this acquiescence, the Russians anticipate even more important gains: the resulting collapse of resistance by captive millions whose only hope has been the West.

The smiling farce of hobnobbing with the Kremlin, as at Geneva, reverberates from Warsaw to Sinkiang. England, which precipitated World War II over the Polish corridor (loot of Versailles), acquiesced in the Russian seizure of eastern Poland. Russia, in turn, assuaged the Poles by throwing them the consolation of East Germany from the Oder-Neisse line.

The Czechs went unchallenged in the brutal expulsion of 3 million Sudeten Germans in 1948 and the confiscation of every stick and stone of Sudeten properties. Poles and Czechs are proposed as members of the meetings. The division of Germany (and of Korea) is expected to be legalized and become permanent.

The summit is expected to devise some sort of face-saving formula. Fantastic as the cynical conditions of the Kremlin appear, there is plenty of support for them by the habitual appeasers in New York, Washington, London, and even in Bonn; viz: Germany: Carlo Schmidt, Debates in the Bundestag; "Disengagement"; England: Denis Healey, Labor Party, "European Neutral Belt"; United States: Professor Brecht in American Political Science Review, "Cordon Sanitaire."

There were other proposals by the Belgian Van Zeeland, the British Eden and Liddell Hart, the American Kennan, the Hungarian refugee Auer, and others. Their proposals are variations of the same theme—the formation of a mid-European buffer zone, a neutralized central Europe. Macmillan has carried this scheme (among other proposals) to Washington. These proposals are based on the naive theory that current international tensions can be relaxed by reciprocal disarmament (disengagement) along a mid-European corridor or buffer-zone. The fallacy lies in ignoring the fact that these tensions have been largely generated by the Russians, themselves.

These proposals, dating back to the 1950's, are a repetition of the "cordon sanitaire" which the ebullient victors of Versailles attempted to build around Bolshevik Russia—except that the Russians have developed this time a sort of satellite "cordon" in reverse.

The Kremlin often picks up gems of Western thought and improves upon them. The Russian variant involves the neutralization of Germany; i.e., Germany's eventual withdrawal from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the perpetuation of a divided Germany (and a divided Korea). We expect some sort of package "deal," along similar lines, in the forthcoming summit deliberations.

Over recent years, there have been four or five proposals for a demilitarized mid-European zone, viz; the Pfleiderer plan 1952, Map 1: the first Eden plan, 1955, map 2; the second Eden plan, 1955, map 3; the Bulganin plan, 1956, map 4; the Rapacki plan, 1957, maps 4 and 5. [Maps not printed in the RECORD.]

At first glance these plans appear deceptively alike, which normally would afford a promising start for diplomatic action. However, there are critical differences—in the "line of departure" or "basis" and in the width of the zone. Eden and Pfleiderer (maps 1 and 2) [not printed in the RECORD] initially fixed the "basis" along the current provisional Potsdam division between West and East Germany.

Eden and General Heusinger (speaking for Adenauer) then proposed a modified "basis" (map 3) [not printed in the RECORD], the prewar German-Polish border, on the assumption that the eventual reunification of Germany would be within the old German borders. Somehow, the Oder-Neisse line crept into this scheme and raised a specter that has haunted the West ever since—and may become the single, crucial issue of the summit meeting. That line spells the occupation and retention, under Polish control, of a substantial area of East Germany, territory in German hands for centuries.

The width of the proposed zones became a factor of immediate tactical significance: it varied from 150–300 miles initially, which was a concession to conventional, obsolescent infantry but rather pointless with jet-propelled aviation or mid-range ballistic missiles. Then Bulganin came up with something rather startling. He enlarged the disengagement zone to 1,000 miles.

The buffer zone proposals were initially intramural and intergovernmental but they were tossed around violently by the tides of public opinion. The fellow-traveling scientists moved in to flash the specter of nuclear fallout, carefully masking the fact that Russia was exploding the "dirtiest" bombs in the world. It was inescapable that the West would come to grips with the problem since they are directly under the Russian guns.

More exposed than any other nation, German authorities were quoted: "It is possible that a demilitarized zone in central Europe will again be presented to the interested powers. Indeed, it has been under study (by Germany) since 1953." This was a reference to General Heusinger's views.

The German studies were predicated uniformly on the prewar frontiers of a reunited Germany. The zone ran from the North Sea to the Adriatic. It was linked to a favorite theme of Adenauer, the European Defense Community (EDC) a fairly practical inter-European security system. EDC was promptly torpedoed by Mendes-France with the assistance of the solid voting bloc of the French Communist Party. Europe lost valuable years of potential preparedness through that maneuver.

Rapacki, the Polish Foreign Minister (under instructions from Moscow) expanded on Bulganin with a neutralization plan of his own that would pull interior countries from both the Warsaw and NATO pacts, suggesting vaguely a "neutral third force," wedged between Russia and the West, atom free and with a progressive thinning out of conventional forces.

PART II. NATO AND A MID-EUROPEAN BUFFER ZONE

We have traced certain proposals for a mid-European buffer zone from Pfleiderer (1952) to Bulganin-Rapacki (1956–57); hence, the Berlin crisis did not precipitate an unknown dilemma. It has been in the making for a long time; it is covered by a phony label, "disengagement"; and it runs through the evasive verbiage of the current Washington conferences.

The tongue-in-cheek quality of the Bulganin proposals would disengage (i.e. demilitarize) all of Germany, the Benelux countries and almost half of France. It would push (disengage) the present American garrisons in Germany to a line roughly west of Paris (where they are probably not wanted) while leaving the bulk of Russian troops in the eastern half of pre-Stalin Poland with normal Russian border garrisons stationed in the Minsk-Pinsk-Kiev triangle ready to march, with 50 to 60 divisions.

It could be argued that the displaced divisions of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are free to countermarch from new garrisons in Western Europe or wherever ultimate buffer zones are permitted by the Russians. The catch is that we will have to accept abandonment of the enormously costly American installations in Germany—airfields, barracks, depots and warehouses—that have been built since 1945 at a cost running into billions of dollars.

The real purpose in all Russian proposals—indeed the essence of their calculated foreign policy, is the ultimate retention of their war loot since 1939, the Baltic countries, a mutilated Poland, a divided Germany etc. They demand the acceptance of the status quo. They seek the legalization of tht Potsdam territorial crimes (equally chargeable to the Allies) in a form of political genocide that drove millions from their homes and properties, which had been in their possession for centuries. This is the "cancer" of Europe, from which it has ailed since Versailles (1918), and American intervention in Europe created the conditions for the bacteria to flourish.

Disengagement and demilitarized buffer zones are no remedy. They are a psychological hoax, a military-political sham. They would separate the contending forces by a few hundred miles—a matter of 3 or 4 truck-days for motorized and armored units, a matter of minutes for midrange ballistic missiles from present Russian and Czech bases (the threat of which urged Macmillan on his road to appeasement), a matter of hours for a a thorough raking-over of jet-propelled aircraft. General De Gaulle has commented wryly on schemes of disengagement in the era of intercontinental missiles, "that he would not be satisfied until the Russians disengaged as far eastward as the Urals."

We accept, of course, the fact that retaliatory action is still possible for the West through the highly efficient SAC and that a balance of nuclear terror is still within our hands—and will be for some time to come. But what an index of statesmanship, after expenditures of $50 billion on mutual security and an annual budget of around $70 billion. The cynical, hardheaded Russians naturally count on the humanitarian feelings of America to prevent or delay the nuclear destruction of French, British or German areas, though the Russian satellites in Warsaw, Prague and Budapest will be equally vulnerable.

While it is too late to cry over spilled milk, as regards the immediacy of the Berlin ultimatum, the weakness of NATO in conventional armies ought to be exposed relentlessly and something done about it, instead of the one-shot gamble on nuclear deterrents. We have said before that the balance of nuclear terror must be paralleled by an appropriate balance of conventional forces with special emphasis on the crucial front: Denmark-Switzerland. The weakness of the NATO shield is a constant bait for the Russians to get tough. The story is plain to see in a comparison of military performance, over the years, viz:

The weakening shield of NATO

	1928	1950	1956	1959	Remarks
Benelux	18	3.0	4	4	(1)
United States of America	12	5.0	5	5	(2)
Great Britain	23	4.5	4	3	(3)
France	30	6.0	2	2	(4)
Germany	10	----------	3	7	(5)
Aggregate	93	18.5	18	21	(6)
Russia-central Europe	105	65.0	65	65	(7)
Russia, overall	105	195.0	175	175	(8)

The column, 1928, is significant as a yardstick of normal military capacity, the product of European annual conscription operating without American foreign aid. Emphasis is on the countries immediately adjacent to the crucial NATO front: Denmark-Berlin-Switzerland (see map 5) [not printed in the RECORD], the front where basic issues may force actual fighting—not the spurious fronts of an evasive neutralism, as in India, Yugoslavia or Indonesia. There are certain collateral factors that have a bearing on this historical tabulation, listed under "remarks" viz:

1. The heart of Benelux is the Netherlands. This faithful wartime Ally has been dispossessed from Indonesia (1948) and is still plagued with wholesale confiscation of private properties (1959). The instrument of expropriation was developed by the United Nations, the United States collaborating (1947). The Communist parallel is found in the barbarous expulsion of 3 million Sudeten Germans from Czechoslovakia (1948).

2. Since 1945, the American contingents have been the mainstay of NATO conventional defenses along the decisive front: Denmark-Berlin-Switzerland. Casual mention should be made of the presence of 100,000 women and children, dependents of these armed forces. They ought to be withdrawn from a dangerous trap.

3. Great Britain is reducing progressively, as the welfare State cannot support the armed services. Incidentally, the present precarious situation is the result of World War I and II, largely brought about by British diplomatic maneuvers and intrigues; they triggered World War I through the creation of the Entente Cordinale; they precipitated World War II by backing the Poles on the Corridor, a creation of Versailles, 1918.

4. France has been compelled to withdraw her best divisions for employment in Algiers—a war largely engineered by Russia, utilizing Mediterranean stooges like Nasser of Egypt.

5. Germany has increased her NATO contributions from zero to currently 7 divisions and will increase to 12 divisions. Currently the New York brainwashers are distributing anti-German literary and theatrical material dating back to the Hitler period.)

6. NATO commanders Ridgeway, Eisenhower, Gruenther, and Norstad have made successive estimates of required strength to balance the visibly growing Russian forces. They considered 90 divisions necessary in 1950, about what the Europeans turned out in 1928; thereafter, they scaled down their estimates to 65, 45—and now 30—divisions, though the Russian threat is no less in 1959 than it was in 1949. Until recently, largely due to increased German contributions, NATO never produced more than 18 conventional divisions in central Europe at a cumulative aggregate cost (foreign aid-mutual security) of approximately $14 billion, or $770 million annually; this amounts to a unit cost per division of $77 million each year. In the Mediterranean sector, mutual security is less expensive: Greece, Turkey, Italy and Spain have turned out a division for $12.8 million of annual foreign aid; Korea and Formosa have cut this to $8.7 million per division.

7. Russia, the archenemy, the scourge of the West, uniformly maintains superior conventional strength. On the crucial NATO front, the Russians maintain 22 divisions (East Germany); 8 divisions (Poland); 25 divisions in the Minsk-Pinsk-Kiev triangle. Satellite divisions like the Czechs (12 armor divisions) are considered reliable; indeed, this showpiece of Wilsonian diplomacy (1918) has turned into the most rabid Communist (sic) of them all. The East German Vo-Pos (10 divisions) are probably uncertain. Nevertheless, Russia has the potential of 55 to 75 ready divisions, challenging 21 NATO units in a ratio of 3 to 1, a ratio considered technically sufficient for a Blitz offensive. These facts have induced Eisenhower finally to admit (1959) that ground forces are inadequate. He must have known the obvious as early as 1950 while he was still NATO commander; it was an inescapable development coincidental with the Russians' obtaining our nuclear secrets through a British-American-Canadian spy ring.

8. The Russian standing Army, on the conscript pattern, is reported at 175 divisions; it could be stronger. Annual reserves are available to double the current figure within 30 to 60 days. In a central geographical setting, Russia can reinforce any specific front, from Turkey to North Korea, from the Baltic to the Persian Gulf. It should be remembered that Mongolian units appeared in the Hungarian crisis. In the wake of that crisis, Russian reinforcements came in via Czechoslovakia: five Soviet divisions remained there for some time: one armored division, in Moravia, two armed divisions, and two in Slovakia.

These valid considerations have been brushed aside for years in a myopic reliance on the exclusive deterrent, the nuclear bomb, airborne or missile-carried. Today, the Russians are at least equivalent (if not superior) in nuclear armament, deterrent or retaliatory. Where do we go from here?

In the NATO palaver in Washington, it is blandly assumed that the Russians will not use their deterrent. Are we to credit Khrushchev with a greater moral or humanitarian sense than Truman who did not hesitate, in his day, to launch this satanic weapon—and tipped his hand prematurely?

Can NATO afford to fight?

A One-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee of July 7, 1959, entitled "One-Way Street."

This editorial, in my view, is a timely and pointed reminder that the Russian propaganda mills are continually at work seeking advantage over the Western democracies, and particularly the United States, in every field of human endeavor. The cultural exchange of ideas is currently one of Khrushchev's favorite publicity vehicles.

Like Soviet trade, Soviet culture can be, and is, turned on at will for political purposes. This is something the Vice President and other visiting American officials might well remember during their upcoming visit to Russia's national

exhibit, which will open in Moscow July 25.

The editorial follows:

A ONE-WAY STREET

While President Dwight D. Eisenhower was on hand to pay his respects to the Russian Cultural and Scientific Exhibition the Russian press is rolling out a dirty rug of half truth and falsehoods to herald the American National Exhibition which will open in Moscow July 25.

Russia's newspapers have been going all out to vilify the United States with accounts of unemployed queued up waiting for handouts. Russians are being told only the American rich can get higher education. And Russia's Pravda leaped upon an Associated Press picture showing a desolate woman, babe in arms, and four bedraggled children standing in front of a striking Kentucky coal miner's pathetic shack.

The dregs of American life have been scavenged in an obvious effort to convince the Russian people that America's $5 million exhibit is a gross counterfeit of life in this Nation. Obviously this sort of thing is a travesty of the cultural exchange idea to which Russian Boss Nikita Khrushchev has given ardent lipservice.

Some may say the United States should be careful about displaying its seamy side. But therein lies its strength. So long as there is a shack left in which Americans live it should be a fair subject for the American press. And it should continue to be until all of them are eradicated.

It is too bad Pravda does not picture the crowded homes of Moscow and the forced labor and secret police methods of Russia.

What's Right With Railroad Labor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address which I delivered on July 20, 1959, at the 37th convention of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, in St. Paul, Minn., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH RAILROAD LABOR?

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, at the 37th Convention of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, St. Paul, Minn., Monday, July 20, 1959)

A little less than a month ago, I spoke in the U.S. Senate on "What's Right with American Labor?". Some of you have been kind enough to express your hearty approval of that speech and to tell me that you thought it had been helpful to the cause of the American labor movement.

I hope that has been the case. What helps the American labor movement helps not only organized labor but all Americans—farmers, unorganized workers, even business itself.

As I told the Senate, I am proud to be considered a friend of labor. I am proud of my friends in the labor movement, and I am proud, too, of the kind of people who stand with me as friends of organized labor.

It is too easy to forget, when headlines in the press are focused on the doings of the small number of corrupt elements which have wormed into certain parts of the labor movement, that the friends of labor are, after all, the overwhelming majority of the American people, who know that a strong and honest labor movement is an essential part of a democratic society.

I was prompted to make my Senate speech because for 2 years now we have been hearing a great deal about what's wrong with the American labor movement. It is in the nature of news that it singles out, and thus overemphasizes, the negative and the sensational.

But I strongly believe that the public should also have the full story of the American labor movement, and not merely that of a small group of gangsters and racketeers. And so I undertook to try to describe the positive side of American labor by pointing out what decent, honest, devoted trade unionists are doing day by day for their fellow workers, their communities, and their country, as well as for the cause of freedom throughout the world.

Today, I want to narrow my topic just a bit. I want to discuss briefly with you "What's Right with Railroad Labor?" I am prompted to select this topic because I am fully aware that, over the last year, the railroad workers of this Nation have been made the target for one of the most unfounded and expensive propaganda attacks that the "perfume and soap" boys of Madison Avenue have ever launched against any part of the American labor movement.

All of you in this room know—because your union is a primary target of that attack—that I am referring to the campaign to picture railroad labor as greatly overpaid and unproductive "featherbedding."

Well, what's the real truth behind this propaganda campaign?

The real truth is contained in official Government figures—figures which show that despite the fastest-rising productivity in America, railroad wages have lagged behind those in other industries.

Now, of course, this is by no means the complete picture about railroad union work rules. I am happy to note that in his opening remarks to this convention, President Gilbert declared that in your forthcoming negotiations with the railroads your work rules must be revised and modernized to reflect the locomotive firemen's current contribution to the industry.

That is a positive approach, and it puts the subject of work rules where it properly belongs—in the arena of collective bargaining, where experience has shown reasonable men of good will can always work out the fairest and most mutually satisfactory arrangements.

I must confess that I have been somewhat dumbfounded that the railroad managements today should be proposing that a Presidential Commission should settle this matter.

For railroad management to call upon the Government to step in to settle an issue, even before any honest effort has been made to reach an agreement at the bargaining table is somewhat mystifying to me. It is completely at variance with all the protestations of the railroad industry against Government interference and meddling in its affairs.

In any event, millions of dollars have been spent in an effort to convince the public that railroad workers deserve the reproachful epithet of "featherbedders." Well, as far as I'm concerned, if there are any feathers connected with railroading today, they're the horsefeathers in this campaign against labor.

So the first thing I want to say about what is right about railroad labor is that it has been responsible labor, realizing that its own advances can be made only with the advance of the railroad industry and our Nation itself.

This is in the tradition of the American labor movement as a whole, but responsibility has been particularly a dominant characteristic of the railroad unions and their leaders. This is obvious when you examine the history of railroad labor and note its readiness to bind itself to a complex legal procedure of Government mediation before it can exercise labor's sacred right to strike. The Railway Labor Act, which your unions helped to draft, has been pointed to by many experts in the field of labor-management relations as one of our most enlightened labor laws.

Unquestionably, this law imposes a great deal of self-restraint upon your actions when labor disputes arise, and it is a real tribute to railroad labor that it has recognized its peculiar responsibilities as servants of the Nation's transportation needs and has abided by this law and its admittedly cumbersome delays.

The second thing I want to say about what is right with railroad labor and that is that it has proved itself today to be probably the most productive of any group of workers in the world. Its gains in productivity in recent years have outstripped those of the workers in any other industry.

That's what official figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics tell us, and I might add that those figures were supplied to the Bureau by railroad management itself.

Actually, the output of railroad workers has been increasing at a rate approximately twice as fast as that of the entire nonagricultural part of the American economy. That's some "featherbedding," let me tell you. Railroad workers in this respect surely have set an example which management should hold up as a goal for the workers of all other industries.

Still another thing that railroad labor can be proud of is the unceasing fight it is waging to keep our railroad transportation system strong in order that it will always be ready to meet the national defense, as well as peacetime, needs of the Nation.

In this respect, railroad labor has exhibited enlightened self-interest at its best, for I have noted that on several occasions the railroad unions took their stand in support of management-sponsored legislation even though management, at the same time, was bitterly opposing legislative measures sought by the brotherhoods for the benefit of railroad employees.

In the present session of Congress, I have been particularly impressed by the efforts of the railroad legislative representatives to secure the enactment of measures designed to relieve the current freight car shortage, as well as their efforts to protect the public from the unjustified abandonment of passenger train service.

I am sorry to say that many railroads have taken advantage of the new law enacted last year which permits them to terminate passenger service virtually whenever they like. One Federal judge has called this law a strange dismaying law since it places in the hands of the railroads themselves the right to determine the extent to which they will serve the public by providing passenger train service.

Now, please don't misunderstand me. I regard myself also as a friend of the railroad industry, and I acknowledge that I voted for the Transportation Act of 1958 which was intended to help the railroads and make them stronger.

But such a situation as I have just described in regard to the elimination of passenger trains is clearly intolerable. To rectify this situation, a bipartisan group of Senators has introduced a bill which would again protect the public by requiring the

railroads, before they could take off trains, to prove that there no longer was a genuine need for these trains they propose to eliminate. I want you to know this measure has my wholehearted support.

Another thing that is right about railroad labor is its concern about railroad safety and its determination to do all in its power to halt the steady rise in railroad accidents.

Almost from the very beginning of the railroads, rail management seems to have been afflicted with a peculiar blindness in regard to accidents. I am sorry to say that the efforts of the Railway Labor Executive Association to establish a joint labor-management committee on safety were turned down by railroad management. It seems to me that by this action the railroads clearly are inviting Congress to enact new laws to force them to meet their obligations in this regard.

I am happy to see that the railroad unions, recognizing their responsibility in this area, have not been deterred by management's indifference on this issue and have set up a Committee on Safety in the RLEA.

I believe in this objective, and I will support the railroad safety measures which are endorsed by railroad labor. They are necessary in the public's, as well as the workers', interests.

Before I leave this subject of safety, I want to comment about one of the railroads' featherbedding charges which concerns the members of this orgnization directly. I refer, of course, to the claim by railroad management that firemen who tend fires no longer are necessary on modern, high-powered diesel locomotives.

What management is doing is to exploit and misuse a label that is not well suited to modern day railroading, in an effort to make the public believe it's the men and not the label who are outdated.

Admittedly, the locomative fireman, today, tends no fires. A better way of describing them would be to call them skilled diesel helpers—or, to use a term the public understands—a sort of copilot. In a sense, the fireman is another set of eyes and ears for the engineer. His duties are those of safety lookout, assistance and trainee to the engineer, and supervisor of the production of power. In performing each of these functions the fireman still remains one of the most valuable safety elements available to the railroads.

Hardly a week passes but what the newspapers report how some accident has been averted because a locomotive fireman, as copilot, has spotted some danger ahead not seen by the engineer from his vantage point on the other side of the cab, and has brought the train to a halt to avert calamity. Locomotive firemen, sitting on the left side of the cab and calling out wayside signals and speed zones, spotting obstructions on the track or hot journal boxes and other dangerous conditions, are literally one-half of the vision that guides and directs the movement of mile-long trains hurtling at ever-increasing speeds through the blackness of night or the blind spots caused by track curvature and grade throughout 24 hours a day.

Is such a man needed? Well, I suggest that every person in America be asked this question: How would you like to ride on an airplane today without a copilot? How would you like to ride a train, knowing that because the fireman had been eliminated, every time it swung around a curve to the left at speeds of 60 to 100 miles an hour it was going around that curve absolutely blind? The fact is that the airlines are now adding still a third man to insure greater safety.

And I needn't remind you that the number of lives at stake on a train is many times that on an airplane.

I want to assure you that so long as I am in the Senate I will do everything in my power to see that a copilot is maintained in the cab of every locomotive in order that the public—and the railroad companies as well—will have the protection they deserve.

Finally, and in summary, what is right about railroad labor is that it has a strong solidarity with the rest of the American labor movement and typifies the best of all the things I have said about organized labor as a whole.

Because from the outset railroad workers were able to organize strong and responsible unions in their industry well in advance of the workers in most other forms of employment, the railroad brotherhoods have been able to contribute strong leadership and significant aid to other workers in building the labor movement as a whole.

Fortunately, from the very beginning, the leaders of railroad labor have been men of integrity, and railroad labor organizations have always been clean organizations. Today, after nearly 2 years of the searching investigation of American labor organizations, not a trace of corruption has been found in any of the 23 standard railroad labor organizations affiliated with the RLEA. Even railroad management, despite its other attacks upon your unions, has had to acknowledge publicly that this is the case.

Railroad labor is clean, because railroad workers have built strong, democratic organizations, and they are determined to keep them that way.

Because the railroad unions were built and run to reflect the democratic faith of the railroad men and women who comprise them, they typify all that is right about American labor. So if I were to tell you all that is right about railroad labor, I would have to also repeat all the things I said in my June 24 speech in the Senate.

Time will not permit such repetition. But everything I said about the great contribution to our society of trade unions can be said with underscoring when it is applied to railroad labor unions like your own. You have not only brought dignity and security to workers in your industry, but you have fought for the general welfare of all Americans, to aid small business and farmers, to promote civil liberties, to advance the interests of all of our citizens.

You have joined the international labor movement in exerting a constructive democratic influence upon workers in other lands. Through the participation of the RLEA in the International Transport Workers Federation, you have helped extend the benefits of democratic trade unionism to workers in the transportation industry throughout the world, and in doing so you have done as much as any segment of the American labor movement to stem the tide of Communist tyranny and aggression.

What's right about railroad labor is that it is enlisted in a cause which is right, and it is fighting for that cause in the right way—the democratic way. That's about the highest tribute I know that can be paid to any man or group of men.

Farm Products in International Economic Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the International Economic Policy Association held a panel discussion on Tuesday, June 30. The subject used by the panel for discussion was "Using Farm Products in International Economic Programs." One of the participants in the discussion was Mr. H. Robert Diercks, vice president of the grain division of Cargill, Inc.

Mr. Diercks, personally, and the Cargill firm for many years have been outstanding handlers and exporters of grain. Mr. Diercks' many years of experience in this field qualifies him to speak authoritatively on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent that the discussion by Mr. Diercks be made a part of these remarks and printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USING FARM PRODUCTS IN INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC PROGRAMS

(By H. Robert Diercks, vice president, Cargill, Inc., Conference on U.S. Economy and International Relations, Washington, D.C., June 30, 1959)

I intend to use my allotted minutes first to sketch the mechanics under which U.S. grain is now exported and, second, to point out what I believe to be a grave fallacy in the government-to-government approach to international grain trading. I will be especially critical of barter, as it is employed today, as it has been employed in the past, and as it may be increasingly employed in the future.

As a spokesman for a major U.S. corporation engaged in the handling, processing, and merchandising of grains, my first interest necessarily is with the commercial impact of U.S. trade programs rather than with their significance as political tools. My greatest knowledge is of the procurement of grain in the countryside, its movement to terminal collection points, its conditioning and storage while awaiting consumer demand, its value as established by cash and futures markets, its dependence on skilled grain merchants and experienced transportation experts for efficient movement, and finally its sale by the grain trade to one or another of thousands of domestic or foreign consumers or processors.

I am not expert in evaluating the consequences to peoples overseas of U.S. grain programs, yet certain expressions of the International Economic Policy Association, our host here today, seem to me altogether reasonable. This group suggests that peaceful and productive nations can best be evolved, and the appeal of communism can best be resisted, by development and strengthening of broadly based, actively engaged, property-owning commercial classes overseas. To that end it suggests we discourage, or at least do nothing to encourage, government ownership of plants, distribution networks, and raw materials, or other government involvement in commercial enterprise, as not conducive to individual development.

I am convinced these are desirable goals. I am also convinced that if they are desirable when applied to other countries, they are every bit as desirable when applied here at home.

As to accomplishment of these goals overseas, worthwhile evaluations would better come from my copanelists, Senators HUMPHREY, CARLSON, or WILEY, than from me. In discussing the goals and their achievement here at home, however, I feel no need to defer.

The ideal situation for international trade is, of course, one of completely free interchange in which the sellers sell and the buyers buy independently, in large volume and each according to his need. It is also

a situation in which there is no participation or interference whatever by government. We in the United States recognize, however, that under our present crop-support program this is impossible in the trading of grains, for domestic grain prices are supported well above prices in the world markets. When prices here at home fall below government loan levels, grain is not, for the most part, sold in the free market, but instead is defaulted to the Government. If any particular grain, burdened by its inflated price, is to be exported, it must be offered at a reduced price competitive with similar grain from other countries, and our Government must absorb the difference. Thus, all rules of free trade to the contrary, our Government must involve itself at least to the extent of paying export subsidies if so much as a single bushel is to leave our shores. This role can be dominating and destructive, and has often been so. Or, if undertaken with wisdom and discretion, it can minimize damage to the economy and can allow grain trading to approximate, at least, the free and competitive ideal.

Programs for export of farm commodities, if they are to be wise programs, must recognize a number of obvious, but basic, truths. They must recognize that Government ownership of grain, except for some reasonable reserve for emergency use, is both abnormal and in the long run undesirable. They must recognize that Government merchandising or other disposal of grain is necessarily in competition with private grain merchandising efforts, is debilitating to the private economy, and should be at least minimized and at best eliminated. They must recognize that if the dual aims of export programs are to export large amounts of grain and to stimulate the economies involved, these aims can best be accomplished within the established, self-regulating channels of normal commerce.

These simple truths, I am sorry to say, went almost wholly unrecognized by U.S. grain export planners prior to 1956. The goal, up to that time, was neither to constructively increase grain exports nor to broaden and extend patterns of normal trading, but instead was to decrease the size of Government surplus stocks by channeling them at almost any cost into export. The advantage of this approach is that it is simple, easy to understand and, amazingly enough, politically palatable. Then as now, if Government ownership and storage of grain surpluses is burdensome and costly to the taxpayer—and certainly it is—let the Government sell it, swap it, or give it away, and there's an end to it. Export totals can then be shown as proof positive that something is being done. No need to mention that this something is grossly distorting to free grain marketing machinery here at home and is calculated to estrange the governments and citizens of grain exporting nations abroad.

Nevertheless, prior to 1956 it was the case that export demand, whether great or small, exerted absolutely no stimulation on free gain markets within the U.S. and not only failed to bring higher prices to farmers, but actively resulted in a tendency to price depression. Farmers faced a situation in which every bushel of grain exported from surplus stocks, no matter how well it looked as a statistic, was a bushel that would not be exported from current farm production. Thus free market prices remained below the loan and for every bushel exported at least one bushel—and probably more than one—was forthwith defaulted to the government and added to the stockpile.

At the same time, in order to control and administer all phases of export activities, our administrators deemed it necessary to bypass almost completely the marketing machinery of the private grain trade. The cost-saving efficiencies of competitive handling and transportation were lost. The cash and futures markets at grain exchanges in Chicago, Minneapolis, Kansas City, and elsewhere were not utilized. The merchandising experts of the trade, familiar as they were with oversea markets and availability of low-cost ocean shipping, were either transferred to other jobs or turned out of the industry altogether. Grain firms, instead of accomplishing the entire movement from countryside to foreign consumer, were permitted only to purchase grain from government stocks at seaboard and, after no more than a slight flurry of paper-shuffling, to ship it to the foreign buyer. The necessary subsidy was not paid directly to anyone, but was absorbed by government in the low price set for sale to exporters.

This picture of grain export, you understand, is not a picture of things as they are today. It is now understood by most knowledgeable persons in government that the effect of exporting exclusively from government stocks is more harmful than beneficial. It is also understood, at least in those circles familiar with business operation, that there is no surer way of perpetuating forever a costly farm program than to allow government to take over piecemeal the various functions of grain handling—among them the export function—and to allow the appropriate private machinery to grow rusty and useless.

At present, though very appreciable quantities of grain are still being exported from Government stockpiles, by far the largest part is drawn from the free market. The change, which I have mentioned as beginning in the fall of 1956, was introduced by Commodity Credit Corporation's subsidy-in-kind program for wheat, officially known as GR-345. This program, urgently requested by the private grain trade, formulated by CCC and vigorously endorsed by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, was a major step in returning wheat export to traditional channels. To satisfy orders from foreign buyers, grain firms were once again able to go to the countryside, bid for free market stocks, pay a considerably more healthy price, move in the most economical and expeditious way to an exporting coast and load on vessels. Only at this point in the marketing chain does government come into the picture, to reimburse the exporter for the difference between the high price at which he buys his supplies and the low world-price at which he must sell them. Under the old system, as I have noted, the subsidy was built in at the outset. Under the new, the Government hands over to the exporter certificates, called scrip, equal in value to the price difference and redeemable only in grain from Government stocks. Thus total exports of wheat, which on an average is supported at about one-third more than the world price, are drawn roughly two-thirds from the free market and one-third, as subsidy, from surplus stockpiles. This is a long way from a perfect situation, but certainly it is an enormous improvement.

Roughly a year ago the subsidy-in-kind technique was embodied in a similar, but considerably simpler, subsidy-in-kind program for the coarse grains, namely corn, oats, barley, rye, and grain sorghums. The mechanics of the new program, especially in the awarding of subsidies, were much less time- and effort-consuming than those still in effect for wheat. Also improved was the relative impact of the program on the free market, for on an average the coarse grains are supported at levels less out-of-line with world markets. Thus the proportion drawn directly from the farm is greater, and the part taken from Government stocks is less, than under the wheat plan.

Even so, though present subsidy programs for wheat and coarse grains have brought us closer to a free market approximation than for many years, there still remains a considerable amount of export that bypasses commercial channels almost entirely, and is not felt at all in farm prices. In simplest form, it is fair to say that whatever exports are actually sold, and paid for with money, be it free dollars, dollars loaned to foreign governments or local currencies guaranteed under title I of Public Law 480 or by the International Cooperation Administration, those exports move through one or the other of the subsidy-in-kind programs. Whatever exports are not paid for, however—namely grain received as subsidy, grain bartered for strategic materials, or grain given as emergency grants to foreign countries or as donations to U.S. or U.N. relief agencies—those exports continue to come entirely from Government stocks, continue to depress the free market, continue to bypass the commercial trade and continue to do considerably more domestic harm than good.

In this category barter is, in my opinion, the least desirable and the most dangerous. To be sure, it is possessed of the political advantages I mentioned earlier. Taxpayers are told we have grain we want to get rid of and other nations have metals, industrial diamonds, etc., needed to supply our strategic stockpiles. It then seems reasonable that a simple swap will serve both needs, leave everyone happy and cause all things to work out.

But, at the risk of defacing this beautifully simple picture, I maintain that it all works out about as disadvantageously to domestic and world economies as can be imagined. Barter, to all intents and purposes, is government-to-government trading in pure form. It could not be further removed from free and competitive trading by commercial interests. As a technique it is, in my opinion, a throwback to the national merchantilism of 200 and 300 years ago.

I've described how barter, like any export from Government stocks alone, bypasses both the workings of the private trade and the market place of the farmer. Exporting firms do play a role in locating and setting up workable barter contracts and in accomplishing final dockside loadings, but the role is slight and the privilege painful. My own firm, like many others, participates in barter only because we feel we must. In this instance our business is exporting grain, and we could not survive for long if we refused exporting opportunities, however distasteful they may be. But these opportunities are frustrating and destructive, not only to us but to every participant.

In the first place CCC, which has acquired considerable knowledge of grain in the past 30 years, finds itself in the market for ferrochrome, manganese, diamonds, and other commodities far outside its experience. Foreign merchants of these materials, who would much prefer to sell for cash and be done with it, automatically boost their prices to levels that would not be considered by private importers in this country. Our own grain companies, who if anything know less about strategic materials than does CCC, find themselves trying to organize one-way, two-way and sometimes even four- and five-way barters that ultimately will enable them to export a few cargoes of grain. The oversea recipient of the grain, in order to be compensated for the time-consuming burden of getting himself involved in the contract, will not purchase at the world market price, but insists upon—and receives—a liberal discount from our Government.

Unlike a simple sale, achieved spontaneously and on short notice within the sensitive structure of supply and demand, barter negotiations and arrangements are certain

to continue for weeks and may last for many months. Throughout the strategic material is overpriced, the grain is underpriced, and neither the countries nor the industries concerned are the better for it. If there is a more difficult way of getting rid of a bushel of grain and acquiring a pound of tin, I hope I never learn it.

I would not pretend to evaluate the importance of America's strategic stockpiles, or to join without further knowledge those critics who maintain we now have infinitely more strategic materials than we need. It is the case, however, that under barter arrangement we lump together and treat as one two entirely separate commercial needs.

The reasonable approach, it seems to me, is to separate the diamonds from the grain and consider each on its own merits. Thus if our Government decides it has particular strategic needs, let it buy outright whatever is necessary and deduct the purchase from the appropriate budget. In the same way, if Congress and the public decide that increased support of grain exports is desirable, let additional funds be loaned to foreign countries or additional amounts of foreign currency be guaranteed under Public Law 480 or ICA. Purchases would then come from the free market and would move tranquilly through commercial channels. Government stockpiles would be reduced in part by direct removal through subsidies and in larger part by reduction of annual takeover from farmers. More would be accomplished than is done under the barter system and with far less distress to the grain economy.

I say more would be accomplished. Yet some will tell you no, that barter results in greater total exports than could take place otherwise. They admit that in years past this might not have been so, for countless examples show that bartered grain has invaded cash markets serviced by ourselves and friendly grain-producing nations. But, they will say, Government today requires proof of additionality, that is, proof that the barter will be in addition to rather than instead of, before it grants contract approval.

But additionality, in my opinion, cannot be proved. It cannot be proved because it does not exist. Assume, for example, that France has ferrochrome admissible to our strategic stockpile and a barter is arranged to exchange U.S. soybeans. The question of additionality is answered by a statement from the French importer that he will accept an offer of soybeans from Manchuria if the barter is not approved. We call this sufficient proof, and the contract is undertaken. But what becomes of the Manchurian beans? They do not disappear. They are not magically removed from the scene. Instead, they will be offered to Holland, or West Germany, or Belgium, or some other customer of the free world, and they will be offered at a price sufficiently attractive to be sold, in competition with sales by ourselves.

Additionality is also shown on the basis of past export records. That is, if Canada, for example, last year sold so many bushels of a certain grain to England, we will hold off on approval of barter until the same total is achieved this year, then will proceed to barter with England on the assumtpion that it is in addition to Canada's market and in no way harmful. But what if England's requirements have increased in the meanwhile, as grain consumption is increasing throughout the world? Should not Canada expect to share in the increase? Does not our barter make this impossible? Where is the so-called additionality?

I do not believe that the question of additionality is quite so unprovable when grain from Government stocks is used not for barter, but instead to fill disaster relief needs or to supply grain to relief organizations. This grain does bypass the domestic free market, however, and to that extent is not reflected in farm prices. On the face of it, it would seem that this could be avoided in the same way as the barter bypass. That is, why not fill disaster relief needs by supplying emergency loans to be used for purchase of grain in the normal way? Similarly, why not make money grants to relief agencies—the Red Cross, the Catholic Welfare agency, and others—that result in subsequent free purchases of grain?

At the moment, as I have said, the portion of total U.S. exports accounted for by barter and donation is not great, though in wheat, at least, it has increased steadily in the last five years. But as domestic surplus grows, the likelihood of increased government financing of exports would seem to grow with it. This means larger budgets, higher taxes and increasing risks of attack from irate voters. The temptation to increase barter and other government - to - government schemes will undoubtedly be great. The taxpayer is unlikely to notice that bartering a dollar's worth of grain is just as costly as appropriating a dollar to guarantee an outright foreign purchase. But to the extent that the taxpayer is deceived, to the extent that legislators refuse to admit that a dollar is a dollar, no matter how it is spent, and to the extent that barter rather than normal trade is expanded, to that extent we will pay for our shortsightedness many times over in constriction of our free economy, expansion of a governmental grain industry and defection from our ideal of what a healthily economic nation and world should be.

If, on the other hand, it is decided to eliminate barter and to make use, instead, of title I or Public Law 480 or of ICA to expand export through commercial channels, this decision should be spelled out clearly in legislation and in CCC directives. At present, in the wording of Public Law 480 and dozens of other laws concerned with grain merchandising, there is to be found only weak and permissive language that makes a token gesture toward the maintenance of private merchandising machinery. For example, "facilities of the trade will be used as far as practicable," or "commodities may be sold through private channels." This phrasing leaves the decision as to whether or not entirely in the hands of government administrators, as though their convenience and whim were the ultimate goal. If we decide finally that grain should proceed through commercial channels, and if we wish to encourage private investment abroad, such wishy-washy wording should be changed from "may" to "must," and the phrase "as far as practicable" be stricken entirely. Provision should be made for policing, to be sure, for the public must be protected. But here as elsewhere, one does not solve the problems of traffic by erecting roadblocks or by destroying the highway.

Ladies and Current Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Ladies and Current Events," written by Dr. and Mrs. George S. Reuter, Jr.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LADIES AND CURRENT EVENTS

(By Dr. and Mrs. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

Current events tell of many problems in the world today. Some of these go back in history, while others are new. Fortunately there are some ladies who are making our civilization a better place to live in. In order to appreciate the present, several factors must be considered. These factors should be as positive as humanly reflected by mankind.

The importance of God must be accepted per se. It was William Penn who said: "Men must be governed by God or they will be ruled by tyrants." This is certainly true whether the ruler is a man or a woman.

The second consideration should be a right attitude toward humanity. Dr. Bob Jones, Jr. recently expressed this idea for both men and women:

"If with pleasure you are viewing
Any work a man is doing
If you like him, or you love him
Tell him now.

"Don't withhold your approbation
Till the preacher makes oration,
And he lies with snowy lilies
On his brow.

"For no matter how you shout it,
He won't really care about it,
He won't know how many teardrops
You have shed.

"If you think some praise is due him
Now's the time to slip it to him,
For he cannot read his tombstone
When he's dead."

The third consideration should go a step further than praise for today, by relating the idea to the philosophy of what guides noble ladies. This is expressed under the heading "I Know Something Good About You":

"Wouldn't this old world be better,
If the folks we met would say,
'I know something good about you.'
And then treat us just that way?

"Wouldn't it be fine and dandy,
If each handclasp, warm and true,
Carried with it this assurance,
'I know something good about you.'

"Wouldn't life be lots more happy,
If the good that's in us all
Were the only thing about us
That folks bothered to recall?

"Wouldn't life be lots more happy,
If we praised the good we see?
For there's such a lot of goodness
In the worst of you and me.

"Wouldn't it be nice to practice
That fine way of thinking, too?
You know something good about me?
I know something good about you."

While divine leadership, right attitudes, and good philosophy are important considerations, there are other factors too. History is the fourth consideration. Woodrow Wilson said: "The Constitution is not honored by blind worship. The more open-eyed we become, as a Nation, to its defects, and the prompter we grow in applying with the unhesitating courage of conviction all thoroughly tested or well-considered expedients necessary to make self-government among us a straight-forward thing of simple method, single, unstinted power, and clear responsibility, the nearer will we approach to the sound sense and practical genius of the great and honorable statesmen of 1787."

More recently another great American, Thomas K. Finletter, noted: "The question

* * * is whether means, that is the procedures of our Government, are adequate in relation to its objectives, or its ends. The usual pattern has been long periods of negative government interlarded with short periods of strong action * * * The irregular flow of power endangers representative government in the United States. * * * You cannot have a government capable of handling the most difficult problems that peacetime democracy has ever faced with the two main parts of it at each other's throats. * * * A government of fits and starts is no longer good enough for our purposes."

The fifth consideration should be economics. It was Dr. Robert M. Hutchins who recently said: "Our real problems are also concealed from us by our current remarkable prosperity, which results in part from the production of arms that we do not expect to use and in part from our new way of getting rich, which is to buy things from one another that we do not want at prices we cannot pay on terms we cannot meet because of advertising we do not believe."

The Public Affairs Institute further noted: "In the last 12 years three recessions have cost us $113 billion in direct losses and about $300 billion in retarded economic progress. No single person, no business, no public or private institution in America avoided a share of these losses." These are factors that all citizens must face.

Some teach that our leaders in economics are inferior, but there is no reason to believe this. This may be seen in the life of the late John Maynard Keynes: "His genius was manifested in his weighty contributions to the principles of economic science; in his power of securing public interest in the practical application of economics on critical occasions; and, not least, in his attractive prose style * * * to find an economist of comparable influence one would have to go back to Adam Smith."

The sixth, and major consideration in this article, is the influence of ladies in current affairs. Queen Elizabeth II visited Chicago in 1959, and it was a great event. However, the royal lady to contribute the most to world affairs in our time is Queen Frederika of Greece. This royal lady from Hanover was born April 18, 1917, and married King Paul I on January 9, 1938. This union brought three fine children (Princess Sophia, Crown Prince Constantine, and Princess Irene). King Paul almost married a commoner, and no historian knows how much the world would have lost. His queen is now beloved around the world.

Another great lady is described in the recent book "For Conscience' Sake," as follows: "I believe the answer is that a properly disciplined wife often becomes a better wife again than one who hasn't been married before. From a personal standpoint, I can testify, that no man, royal or otherwise, ever had a more wonderful wife than I do. She bore three fine sons to her first husband and he later died. We were married and she has brought much light into my life. I would put her up against any queen who ever lived as to beauty, charm, goodness, companionship, and Christian virtues." While this wonderful lady's name remains unknown to the reader of this article, she must be truly great.

Miss Hazel McCulloch of State Teachers College, Minot, N. Dak., is another rare gem. She started when the college began in 1912 and retired in 1959. We know she has no peer in that State. Not only has she been a dedicated teacher, but she is also a great leader in public affairs. She is the outstanding authority in North Dakota concerning the life of Theodore Roosevelt.

Still another precious gem is Miss Lena A. Hults of the American Federation of Teachers. The organization started on May 9, 1916, and she began on August 18, 1919. When she started, her office was in one room of the home of Secretary-Treasurer Freeland G. Stecker. There are other charming ladies of long service with the American Federation of Teachers too. These are Catherine McGourty, Bernice Blanchard, and Marie Rogers.

The American Federation of Teachers has had the following secretary-treasurers: F. G. Stecker (1916–25), Florence C. Hanson (1926–34), George Davis (1935–36), Irvin R. Kuenzli (1936–53), Clinton Fair (1957), and Paul D. Ward (1958–).

The presidents of this organization have been: Charles B. Stillman (1916–22), Florence Rood (1923–24), Mary C. Barker (1925–30), Henry R. Linville (1931–33), Raymond F. Lowry (1934–35), Jerome C. Davis (1936–38), George S. Counts (1939–41), John M. Fewkes (1942), Joseph F. Landis (1943–47), John M. Ekland (1948–51), and Carl J. Megel (1952–).

Miss Hults, the office manager, has served under each secretary-treasurer and president in an outstanding way. Yes, she is the dean of the organization.

There are some evil men and women. Father James Keller recently said: "Less than 1 percent of humanity is causing most of the world's troubles." Then there is the story of the evil woman:

"Rockabye baby
Up on a writ
Monday to Friday, mother's unfit.
As the week ends, she rises in virtue,
Saturdays, Sundays,
Mother won't hurt you."

Queen Frederika, Mrs. X, Miss McCulloch, and Miss Hults represent the very best in life. These are the kind of people who inspired Blanche Dyer Ballagh to write "Aspiration":

"Give me grace for today
To strew love along the way,
Like rose petals falling,
Winging beauty's array.

"Give me hope for today
To guide those in dismay,
Like dewdrops sparkling
In the sun-kissed spray.

"Give me courage for today
To speak kind words to allay
The burdens of sorrow
Leading someone astray.

"Give me wisdom for today
To help a brother, I pray,
Who at life's crossroads
Cannot find his way."

There might have been an age when the philosophy of the Vikings was proper, but now ladies deserve more status. Of course, there is the exception, as expressed by Playhouse 90 on Thursday, June 25, 1959, in the production "Second Happiest Day," but we hope it will always remain as a rare condition. If the world will follow the noble examples of the four ladies cited, then ladies and current events will be very important in world affairs.

On Dealing With Mr. K.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for a long time the West, and particularly the United States, will be negotiating with Mr. Khrushchev. I can say from personal experience that Mr. Khrushchev is a brilliant and tough-minded man, and we shall need all the diplomatic skill we can muster in order to deal effectively with him. We shall also have to negotiate from a position of strength.

In this connection, Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate a most thoughtful, recent comment by Mr. Walter Lippmann. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Lippmann's column, "On Dealing With Mr. K.," which appeared in the July 16, 1959, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, July 16, 1959]

ON DEALING WITH MR. K

(By Walter Lippmann)

In our dealings with Mr. Khrushchev the best rule to bear in mind is that in action he is a hard boiled and calculating realist playing without sentimentality the game of power politics. By tradition and conviction he is, of course, a Leninist. But he is of another generation, and where Lenin taught that a Communist revolution would triumph only after a cataclysm of world war, Mr. K. believes that it will triumph eventually not by war but by the example and impact of the growth of Communist states.

The aim of his foreign policy is, therefore, to avoid war, which would arrest the growth of the Communist states, and to promote the influence of the Soviet Union by a foreign policy based on measures short of war. The calculation of these measures is done in terms, not of ideology, but of the balances of power politics.

For this reason the Western statesman who is most likely to impress Mr. K. and even to do business with him is one who is competent and willing to talk to him in terms of the balance of power. If, therefore, the President when he sees Mr. K. talks about our moral and religious ideals, he will get nowhere. In fact, he will probably rekindle the suspicions of Mr. K., who is quite incapable of believing that great states ever act on anything but their interests, as rightly or wrongly they conceive their interests, and within the limits of their power.

If, on the other hand, the President talks to Mr. K. as an old soldier who knows what the last war was, who realizes what a next war would be like, there is a good chance that they would have a meeting of minds. There is no telling how far they could go toward agreement. For there has never been enough realistic talk between men in both countries who are at the top and who actually know the facts about the situation of military and economic power.

By the same token, visits like that of Mr. Mikoyan and Mr. Kozlov, though of some value, are not of any decisive importance. In these visits there is plenty of hustle and bustle and almost no real talking. The same could be true of the forthcoming visit of the Vice President to Moscow. It will not be important if, as on his other voyages abroad, Mr. NIXON acts as if he could build up the influence of the United States abroad by behaving as if he were running for office at home.

Mr. NIXON's visit will be taken in Moscow as a recognition that we regard the U.S.S.R. as an equal power. But whether it will mean more than that will depend on whether Mr. NIXON and Dr. Eisenhower can find in their

own private talks with Mr. K. a basis for useful talks later on by the President himself.

Much has been said in connection with the Berlin affair about the need to convince Mr. K. that the allies are united and are not bluffing. This is certainly desirable. Indeed, it is imperative. But if it is to be done, it must be done in language that Mr. K. understands.

The language he understands is the language of the measure and calculation of military and economic power. In these terms, he almost surely believes us when we say that we will fight back if he allows West Berlin to be blockaded. The West is capable of fighting back and, though it would hate to have to do it, it is irretrievably committed. On the other hand, when Dr. Adenauer says, as he did until recently, that we cannot allow East German officials to operate the control points on the access routes, Mr. K. knows that the West will never go to war about that. Nor will it go to war if he makes a separate peace treaty with East Germany. Nor will it go to war about measures which are short of war. To talk as if the West would go to war under these conditions is in fact to be bluffing.

The moral of this is, I believe, that we shall do better the more concrete and specific and candid we are about what we will and can insist upon and about what we are willing to compromise. In allied quarters there is considerable grumbling about the concessions which we have already made. We have made concessions. But we have conceded nothing that the West has ever been prepared to go to war about. What has been happening is that our original position is being whittled down to the hard core which the realities of power will support. What they will not support will be regarded as bluff no matter how vehemently we assert it.

The Western tactic in Geneva could, but for Dr. Adenauer, have been reversed. We might have started out with a plan for the provisional status of West Berlin, which included the concessions we have made, and was designed to reconcile the security of West Berlin with the Soviet demand and the Soviet need for a greater acceptance, to use Governor Harriman's word, of East Germany. We could then have stood by this plan, negotiating only on details, with a reasonable hope that the Russians would rather have the plan than take the risks of any alternative open to them.

In this tactic we would have made our necessary and inevitable concessions at the outset. Thus, we would have avoided the unpleasant and somewhat embarrassing effect of having those concessions squeezed out of us.

The Advance Fee Racket in Real Estate and Business Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, for the past several years I have received letters from constituents in North Dakota who have written me that they have been swindled by agents from outside of the State who claim that they can sell businesses in North Dakota to clients in other parts of the country and charge an added fee.

It turned out that these people of North Dakota did not receive any success in getting their businesses sold although they had paid a subsequent advance fee. We have taken this matter up with the U.S. attorney and the Post Office and learned that this was a problem in other parts of the country also.

Mr. President, that is why I am very happy to note an advance release of July 19, 1959, in which Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield noted a major breakthrough had been accomplished in cracking the $50 million advance fee racket in real estate and business loans, victimizing thousands of Americans trying to sell their small businesses or obtain additional working capital.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this release be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR BREAKTHROUGH

A major breakthrough has been accomplished in cracking the $50 million advance-fee racket in real estate and business loans, victimizing thousands of Americans trying to sell their small businesses or obtain additional working capital, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield reported today.

Reports from Chief Postal Inspector David H. Stephens show that in the first two cases tried in the Federal courts, Postal Inspectors in cooperation with U.S. Attorneys have established that these racketeers can be prosecuted successfully under the mail fraud statute.

This action follows a nationwide, coordinated investigative program initiated last fall under the joint direction of Chief Inspector Stephens and the Criminal Division, Department of Justice.

The "advance fee" swindle defied prosecution prior to recent cases. The racket is described by many authorities as the biggest and most vicious confidence game of recent years because of the huge "take" and its many victims—persons who can least afford it—operators of small lunch rooms, delicatessens, shoe repair shops, barber shops, and the like.

It has been of such serious proportions that the activity was recently investigated by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, Mr. Summerfield noted.

By using fast-talking salesmen, impressive looking brochures, and similar props, the advance fee fraud promoters convince persons anxious to sell property or in need of a businese loan, that they have buyers or know the sources where loans can be obtained. The fees range from $100 to $10,000, obtained under the impression that if the promoters do not sell the business or obtain the loan, the victim's fee will be refunded in full. Actually, all that is promised in the routine contract—in small print—is that the promoters will perform an advertising service.

This they accomplish with glossy, impressive looking catalogs and similar brochures mailed to some legitimate real estate brokers or lending institutions, which seldom produce actual buys or loans. By this device, Mr. Summerfield explained, they have been able to stay within the letter of the law—or at least they thought so until postal inspectors entered the picture.

Chief Inspector Stephens reports that the two cases brought to trial in the districts of North Dakota and Iowa, in which it has been established that the promoters can be prosecuted on the basis of intent to defraud—even though they lived up to the letter of the contract—resulted in the conviction of 13 persons with prison terms imposed ranging from 18 months to 5 years.

In addition to recent successful prosecutions, Mr. Summerfield commented that postal inspectors are pressing the investigations of remaining big operators in the racket, which to date has led to the arrest or indictment of 18 others. At present there are approximately 100 investigations of the advance fee racket underway by postal inspectors throughout the Nation.

Acceptance of a fee in connection with sale of businesses or securing loans has, of course, been a legitimate operation of some reputable firms over the years, inspectors note, and none of the current advance fee investigations involve firms of this type. However, persons who are approached with an advance fee proposition to sell their business or obtain a loan should investigate carefully with authorities and responsible organizations such as the Better Business Bureau before paying a fee.

Indiana University Foreign Language Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED WAMPLER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I am quite pleased to see come to a mutually favorable resolution what could have been an embarrassing situation between the Air Force and Indiana University.

The Air Force, along with the other branches of the Department of Defense, has for some time been in the process of formulating plans for the establishment, if not further expansion, of foreign language training facilities for the Armed Forces.

To this end, a verbal agreement was entered into between the Air Force and Indiana University for the foreign language training of military personnel.

After the university had expended considerable funds and effort in anticipation of fulfilling the agreement, it became known that the Air Force was actively considering cancellation of the proposal.

However, I have learned that the Air Force has now contracted for Indiana University's foreign language training facilities for the academic year 1960, and that there is a possibility that the contract may be extended for another year.

I include in the RECORD at this point a copy of a resolution bearing on the matter which was adopted by the Indiana Legislative Advisory Commission, which by law speaks for the Indiana Legislature when it is not in session.

The effective efforts of the speaker of the Indiana House of Representatives, Birch E. Bayh, Jr., I consider exceptionally praiseworthy:

RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE PROPOSED CANCELLATION BY THE AIR FORCE OF A VERBAL AGREEMENT WITH INDIANA UNIVERSITY FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRAINING OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Whereas the Indiana Legislative Advisory Commission is charged by law with the re-

sponsibility of speaking for the legislature when it is not in session, which is now the case; and

Whereas correspondence between the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, and Mr. Charles C. Finucane, Department of Defense, reveals the fact that pursuant to negotiations by the Air Force with Indiana University for language training, the latter has committed considerable time, effort and money in preparation for the Air Force training. Be it

Resolved by the Indiana Legislative Advisory Commission—

1. That all persons and departments concerned in this matter are hereby memoralized to proceed with the establishment of foreign language facilities for military personnel at Indiana University;

2. That the secretary of the Indiana Legislative Advisory Commission is hereby instructed to send copies of this resolution to Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; Hon. Carl Vinson, chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives; Mr. Charles C. Finucane, Department of Defense; the Indiana delegation in Congress; Mr. J. A. Franklin, vice president and treasurer, Indiana University.

Adopted by the Indiana Legislative Advisory Commission, July 14, 1959.

The Library of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the American Library Association, meeting in Washington, D.C., in its 78th annual conference, adopted a resolution urging that the Congress take immediate action looking toward badly needed facilities for the Library of Congress.

I include the text of this resolution as part of my remarks:

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, July 13, 1959.

To the Members of the U.S. Congress:

On behalf of the officers and members of the American Library Association, I am sending you the enclosed resolution on the requested appropriation of $75,000 for the making of plans and estimates for an urgently needed building for the Library of Congress.

This resolution was adopted by the association at its recently concluded 78th annual conference in Washington, D.C. We respectfully request your favorable consideration.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID H. CLIFT,
Executive Director.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION AT ITS 78TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 26, 1959

The American Library Association, meeting in its 78th annual conference in Washington, D.C., June 26, 1959, notes with keen interest House Joint Resolution 352, introduced by Representative BURLESON, chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, and Senate Joint Resolution 97, introduced by Senator GREEN, vice chairman, to authorize an appropriation of $75,000 for making plans and estimates for an urgently needed building for the Library of Congress.

The association urges that Congress take immediate action on this joint resolution which would provide for new facilities for the Library of Congress which, in addition to serving Congress, serves also as a great national library, complementing the resources of libraries throughout the country.

This resolution to be sent to every Member of the U.S. Congress at the earliest possible date.

Adopted June 26, 1959.

Congratulations to the Atomic Energy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BARR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today the House passed the first large appropriation bill which I could really understand. We passed the Atomic Energy Commission appropriation bill for fiscal 1960 appropriating $2,374,114,000 to the Atomic Energy Commission for their operating expenses in fiscal 1960. We appropriated $255 million for plant acquisition and construction. This total appropriation was $58,186,000 less than the President requested.

The Atomic Energy Commission is the only one of the big spending bureaus, departments or commissions that has picked up the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and placed its bookkeeping on a cost accounting basis. A good part of the credit for this achievement should go to one of the early commissioners, Mr. Paul Green, of the Business School of the University of Illinois—our sister State. Under Mr. Green's prodding the Atomic Energy Commission set up its books the way any intelligent businessman would start his accounting procedures.

The results of Mr. Green's farsightedness and the reasonable and intelligent attitude of the Atomic Energy Commission has been that when they come to this Congress for an appropriation, their requests for money are backed up by accurate statistics and facts from a good accounting system. There is no guesswork involved upon the part of the Atomic Energy Commission. The Appropriations Committee, plus the average Member of Congress, has a true picture of what the Commission has on hand, what it intends to spend the next year, and what its program will be for the following years. This is what I mean by an understandable appropriation bill.

The Hoover Commission made one further recommendation, which as enacted into law in the 85th Congress, and that recommendation and that law set up what is called the accrued expenditure method of accounting. This system of course is common to every businessman in my congressional district, but it is a revolution for the United States. So far there has been no effort to put into effect the provisions of this law. Even the Atomic Energy Commission was blocked from using this enlightened piece of legislation. While I congratulate the Atomic Energy Commission on coming to this Congress with figures based on a cost-accounting system, I recommend that they complete the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and come to this Congress next year with absolutely reliable statistics based on cost accounting and expense accrual.

The average Member of this Congress can talk himself blue in the face about budget-busting and saving money, but none of us can speak with real authority until we have the facts. The facts can only come from modern and up-to-date accounting.

Road Materials From Soft Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, when a product—even in the research stage—gives promise of being helpful in improving the durability of highways and airstrips, and, at the same time, holds forth the prospect of providing a substantial new market for coal, West Virginians are doubly interested.

Last Friday an article was published in the daily newspaper of my home city of Elkins which refreshed my memory concerning a sequence of communications which began by letter on June 1, 1959 to the Honorable Patrick C. Graney, West Virginia State Road Commissioner, at Charleston, in which I stated:

As a member of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Senate Committee on Public Works interested in the advancement of highway maintenance and construction, and as a West Virginian desirous of seeing everything possible done to bolster the coal industry and provide distressed areas of our State and others with greater employment, I call attention to apparent progress in the research and development center of the Curtiss-Wrighth Corp. which has been made known to me.

I refer to the fact that (it) claims to have developed and extensively tested in its research laboratories an improved coal based binder for hot-mix, hot-lay bituminous concrete highway and airport surfaces. It is my understanding that the Curtiss-Wright firm desires to share and has offered to share this process with the State Road Commission of West Virginia for road-testing purposes, and I urge consideration of these offers.

In making this recommendation, I am not advocating utilization of any particular firm's commercial product because the new Curtiss-Wright binder for highways is reportedly from a process in the research and development stage which is still under investigation, and, therefore, is not on the commercial market.

But any item such as the Curtiss-Wright binder material discovery which has possibilities of providing new uses for bituminous coal and improved road binding and surfacing should be advocated by those of

us interested in bolstering coal production, increasing employment, and providing better highways. It apparently has other important potential applications which conceivably could bring a real improvements to the West Virginia economy.

I am further informed that the discoverers of the product also assure that it will not require any changes in present equipment used in preparing or using blacktop paving materials because it can be combined in existing hot mix batch plants, and in actual road construction or resurfacing will be handled in the same equipment used by State and local road departments and blacktop paving contractors.

Your comments on the suggestion that this new product of coal research be given road tests in West Virginia, the No. 1 bituminous coal-producing State, would be appreciated.

A copy of the letter quoted above likewise was sent to Commissioner Ellis L. Armstrong of the Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce.

In the order listed, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the replies received from Commissioner Graney, dated June 12, 1959, and from Commissioner Armstrong, dated June 15, 1959, be published in the Appendix of the RECORD, along with the news story to which I referred earlier, being a United Press International dispatch by Carlo J. Salzano, under the headline, "Make Road Materials From Soft Coal Derivatives Is Object of New Plant," as published in the Friday, July 17, 1959 issue of the Elkins Inter-Mountain.

There being no objection, the letters and newspaper article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE ROAD COMMISSION
OF WEST VIRGINIA,
Charleston, June 12, 1959.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: I was very happy to receive your letter of June 1, 1959, and to learn of your interest in the Curtiss-Wright technique proposed by Curtiss-Wright Corp. for the utilization of bituminous coal for highway paving.

We have been investigating this process since it was first announced, in view of the interesting possibilities presented both from the standpoint of the West Virginia coal industry and the improvement of highway pavements.

Immediately upon learning of the new process, we got in touch with the Curtiss-Wright Corp. and have had several conversations with their representative. Arrangements are now being made for an inspection visit by members of our staff to the Curtiss-Wright laboratories at Quehanna, Pa. In addition, we have discussed this new development with the commissioner and chief engineer of the Kentucky Highway Department in order to insure that we keep abreast of and take advantage of the experimental work in connection with this process which is being considered by the Kentucky Highway Department.

At the present time the process is still in a more or less exeprimental phase, no highway service tests having yet been accomplished. Also, there is not yet any experience data from which to estimate the economic benefits which may be derived from the process. However, we intend to follow up this development closely to insure that we overlook no opportunities for improving highway pavements and the increased utilization of West Virginia coal.

As our investigation proceeds, I will be extremely happy to keep you informed upon its progress. Again let me express my appreciation for your interest in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK C. GRANEY,
Commissioner.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, June 15, 1959.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: This acknowledges receipt of a copy of your letter of June 1 to the Honorable Patrick C. Graney, Commissioner, West Virginia State Roads Commission, concerning the Curtiss-Wright Corp. road binder.

You may be interested in knowing that members of the staffs of our Offices of Research and Engineering recently visited the Curtiss-Wright Research and Development Center at Quehanna, Pa., to determine the current status of the development work on this new product.

Our representatives find that at present only laboratory research has been conducted. These results indicate that continued research on the material both in the laboratory and in field experiments along the lines suggested by you is definitely warranted and should be encouraged.

Field research programs are being considered in Pennsylvania and Kentucky in which test sections of pavement containing the Curtiss-Wright binder will be constructed and their performance compared with pavements containing other binders now in general use.

Our representatives learned that the State of West Virginia has been apprised of this development and has shown some interest.

Sincerely yours,

ELLIS L. ARMSTRONG,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

[From the Elkins Inter-Mountain, July 17, 1959]

MATERIAL IN EXPERIMENTAL STAGE—MAKE ROAD MATERIALS FROM SOFT COAL DERIVATIVES IS OBJECT OF NEW PLANT

(By Carlo J. Salzano)

CHARLESTON, W. VA.—Deputy State Road Commissioner George E. White, Jr., said today the commission is considering establishing a plant in West Virginia that makes roadbuilding material from soft coal derivatives.

The material, still in the experimental stage, is made through a process developed by Curtiss-Wright Corp., Woodridge, N.Y.

Pennsylvania and Kentucky have contracted with Curtiss-Wright for construction of experimental plants and use of the binder on various highways for testing purposes.

White said the commission plans to obtain some of the binder for limited testing in the Mountain State while considering establishing an experimental plant.

He said results of the Kentucky experiments were being watched closed by the State road commission.

A Curtiss-Wright representative, G. Frederick Brackett, visited Gov. Cecil H. Underwood Thursday after talking with White and Road Commissioner Patrick C. Graney. Underwood was pictured as vitally interested but said the decision on setting up a pilot plant in West Virginia rested with the road commission.

As for the cost of the binder on a commercial basis, Brackett said it could not be determined at this time. But he ventured that it would be competitive with asphalt although four times better in quality.

Brackett added a highway constructed of the new coal-containing binder would require much less maintenance and would have better resistance to skidding than asphalt.

The Federal Government also is studying the material for possible use on the Interstate Highway System, he said.

Brackett estimated it would take about 2,200 tons of coal to make enough binder for 1 mile of highway 20 feet in width. He could not estimate the cost of a pilot plant in West Virginia but said that Kentucky's contract called for a $200,000 facility which included technical help from Curtiss-Wright.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is gratifying to read the dispatch from Charleston which indicates that the West Virginia State Road Commission has reached the point of giving consideration to the establishment of a plant in the State to produce test quantities of the material discovered by the Curtiss-Wright Corp.

It is feasible that the No. 1 coal-producing State should be in the vanguard of those providing actual road tests of the suitability of this new product. This point was, of course, the central theme of my June 1, 1959, communication to Commissioner Graney as quoted in my remarks above.

Court Critics Strike at America's Vitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, I submit an article by Charles S. Rhyne, president of the American Bar Association in 1957–58, which was published in the July 19 edition of the Washington Post. Mr. Rhyne makes the all-important distinction between "fair comment on decision" of the U.S. Supreme Court and recent attempts to disparage individual Supreme Court Justices themselves and says of the latter:

This kind of criticism may be imparing that (public) confidence, thereby destroying one of the three vital elements of our three-part system of Government.

The article follows:

COURT CRITICS STRIKE AT AMERICA'S VITALS

(By Charles S. Rhyne)

It is possible that the public may be misled by current criticism revolving around the Supreme Court. Too often this criticism goes beyond fair comment on decisions and disparages individual judges, thus striking at the standing of the institution itself.

Public confidence in this Court and in all courts is vital to a proper functioning of our system of government. This kind of criticism may be impairing that confidence thereby destroying one of the three vital elements of our three-part system of Government.

In fact, the Court is doing an excellent job and the great majority of lawyers are of that opinion. In the past two years during

extensive traveling, I have talked with thousands of lawyers. Undoubtedly, some lawyers will dispute my conclusion, but most of them will agree with it.

THEY CAN'T TALK BACK

Our governmental system is erected on three separate branches: The executive, the legislative, and the judicial. The system depends upon each serving as a check on the others. They create a balance of power as insurance that absolute power to form a tyranny will not vest in any one branch. If any one of the three is weakened or destroyed, the system is weakened or destroyed.

Judges of our courts speak publicly only in the discharge of their judicial function. They must bear criticism, even irresponsible and vicious criticism, in silence. These men have given up the right to criticize in order that the rest of us might be secure in that right.

We of the bar have no such restraint upon us. It is, therefore, up to us, the members of the bar, to speak up in defense of our courts as an institution of government. We cannot be content merely to note the comforting fact that an institution which has survived the petulance and displeasure of a Jefferson, a Jackson, and two Roosevelts—to say nothing of the tirades of lesser men—almost certainly has the strength and vitality to survive present attacks.

THE FINAL SAFEGUARD

We as a people boast of rights and liberties, but rights are as nothing without redress and protection in the court. Chief Justice Marshall truly said:

"The judicial department comes home in its effects to every man's fireside; it passes upon his property, his reputation, his life, his all."

Whenever we stop and think, we must recognize that not one of our priceless freedoms—speech, religion, press, even criticism of government—would be safe without the final safeguard of the courts.

Under our system, the role of the courts is to decide justiciable disputes between man and man and man and government. No better institution has yet been conceived of by the mind of man for peaceful settlement of such disputes. Today in all civilized nations, disputes are decided in the courts under the rule of law, which is an application of reason and fairness as developed by the wisdom of the ages.

HUNDREDS OF REVERSALS

Although an aura of mystery surrounds our courts, they are fundamentally a human institution. Judges are human beings subject to all the frailties of the rest of us. They make mistakes—constantly. Many hundreds of cases are reversed yearly.

We have 50 State supreme courts, 11 Federal courts of appeals and a much larger number of other State appellate courts which review the decisions of and reverse the errors of thousands of lower courts. The Supreme Court of the United States sits on top of this hierarchy and is required to review the alleged errors of Federal courts and in some cases the alleged errors of State courts.

Some 1,300 cases a year are considered by the Supreme Court, of which about 100 are heard orally and decided by written opinion. The Supreme Court does not have complete freedom in selecting cases; it must consider those which litigants bring before it.

The cases which percolate to the top usually involve issues of great moment. There are no easy cases in the Supreme Court.

A PARAMOUNT FUNCTION

To function properly, any government, any business, any family requires that decisions be made. Oftentimes decisions are wrong, and upon reconsideration in the light of experience they are changed. But without decisions, progress is stymied and any institution stagnates and dies from inaction. So it is not as important that decisions be right as it is that decisions be made.

Our system is not perfect; after thousands of years we are still trying to perfect our society. Take traffic law and traffic courts, for instance. If we waited until they were perfect before we allowed traffic to move, no traffic would ever move on our streets.

So why do we expect our Supreme Court to be perfect? It was not designed to be perfect, it never has been and it never will be. But having said all that, I hasten to say that as an institution it is the closest to perfection yet devised by man for the type of function it is required to perform to keep our system of government operating properly.

Sir Winston Churchill has called it the "most esteemed judicial tribunal in the world." And it is.

Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and other judges, are men, not gods or even supermen. They react to human motivations. They have families and human worries, prejudices, experiences, tempers, peeves, sympathy, antipathy, compassion, sorrows and all the other human attributes that the rest of us have.

Some are conservative, some are liberal, depending upon the definitions one applies—and again they are no different in that respect from the rest of us.

Yet when one stands up before the black-robed Justices of the Supreme Court, he would be inhuman if he did not feel a sense of almost awe. I have appeared in many courts and before hundreds of audiences, yet I still almost lose my tongue as I face the Supreme Court. When these very human judges meet as a tribunal, they meet in an atmosphere of greatness.

Lawyers vigorously argue both sides of every case in the Supreme Court. So close are many questions that the Justices split over the decisions. Sometimes they divide five to four. Again I insist that it is more important that we get a decision than that it be one which 100 percent or even 90 percent or 50 percent of our people agree is correct.

We are going through a period of transition. No matter how decided, the segregation cases and the internal security cases would offend the views and sensibilities of some of our people. Yet these decisions must be made or our system breaks down.

Few people could be in more disagreement with a decision than Abraham Lincoln was with that returning Dred Scott to slavery. His advice on that occasion should be pondered by us all:

"We know the Court that made it has often overruled its own decisions and we shall do what we can to have it overrule this. We offer no resistance to it."

That was the position of a man willing to shelve his personal disappointment rather than lead an attack, as he said, against "our whole Republican system of government—a blow which if successful would place all our rights and liberties at the mercy of passion, anarchy and violence."

This must be the position of our legal profession and the public. We may state why we believe particular decisions to be erroneous. We may endeavor to have them overruled. But we must not disparage the status of our courts as an institution of government by blanket attacks upon the courts, or even a particular court.

Thus, it is not at all disturbing that large numbers of intelligent persons should disagree with the legal reasoning of the Court, the authorities cited, or lack of them, or the ultimate decision. But it is extremely serious that personal insults are now hurled at members of the Court in place of criticism directed at their decisions.

Disagreement is a sure sign of intellectual activity—the freedom of thought which is essential to democracy. But when the disagreement runs rampant in the form of malicious charges directed toward undermining and smearing the opponent, there is cause for freedom-loving men to become alarmed. For this type of attack cares little for the virtue of truth.

In the decisions of the Supreme Court, one can trace most of the significant social, political, and economic trends and developments of our Nation.

The Court began its role as a resolver of great national issues in the classic case of *Marbury* v. *Madison*. The majority opinion by Chief Justice John Marshall stated that conflict between a Federal statute and the Constitution must be resolved in favor of the Constitution, the supreme law of the land. Although this declaration was actually mere dictum, it was widely accepted as controlling on the power of the Court to rule on the validity of Federal statutes.

Opponents lashed out at the language of the opinion. Many eminent men, among them President Jefferson, were extremely critical. They took the position that each branch of the Government had the exclusive power to pass on its own authority. Rational grounds were advanced for this argument.

Certainly many persons must have considered the decision to be a violent misuse of judicial authority. Yet now we look upon *Marbury* v. *Madison* as the very cornerstone of constitutional law. Without this review of the constitutionality of Federal legislation, the basic rights and freedoms we prize would be unprotected. The "gross usurpation of 1803" is the "genius of John Marshall" today.

Never a decade has passed that some great controversial economic, political, or moral issue has not been resolved. Time has proved many of the decisions to be not only correct but brilliant. Others were later seen to be shortsighted or shallow and were overruled. But would we have it otherwise?

Would it be better to have a board of nine pacifiers who would concede some basic value here and withhold a little justice there in an effort to appease, say, 90 percent of the public?

There is certainly nothing wrong with responsible criticism of judicial decisions. Many great advances in our jurisprudence have stemmed from such reasoned criticism by lawyers and scholars. As Justice David Brewer said in 1898:

"It is a mistake to suppose that the Supreme Court is either honored or helped by being spoken of as beyond criticism."

But there is a vast difference between criticism stemming from constructive analysis of particular decisions and the uninformed, misleading statements and insults which are sometimes hurled currently.

Butler's Majority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 17, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks from the Rock Hill Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., of July 14, 1959:

BUTLER'S MAJORITY

Despite his being under fire from practically all sides, Democratic National Chairman Paul M. Butler says he will continue to express "what I feel to be the majority point of view."

Since Butler's views have alienated the South, the Southwest, and the Catholics, it would be interesting to know what he considers to be a majority.

If he keeps going, it looks like the majority is going to be Republican.

Oceanographic Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, despite the fact that this Nation is a major maritime country, our understanding of the ocean is still primitive. We have roughly accurate maps for only about 2 percent of the deep sea floor. The advent of nuclear-missile firing submarines and the prospect of nuclear commercial transport underline the need for a bold program of oceanographic research, capitalizing on the most expert talent our Nation can provide.

In this connection, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the informative and interesting article from Time magazine, June 6, 1959, entitled "Ocean Frontier." This article serves as an excellent introduction to the need for an expanded national oceanographic program.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCEAN FRONTIER

In the uneasy years before the start of World War II, a Navy destroyer nosed through the warm waters off Guantánamo, Cuba. An experimental sonar gadget pinged steadily. It had worked perfectly on other occasions. But here in the Tropics, it saw targets that were not there. It missed targets that were there. The best Navy brains were baffled. So an officer was dispatched to the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution on the shoulder of Cape Cod.

Down from Woods Hole came the United States's only full-fledged oceanographic vessel, the trim ketch *Atlantis*. Led by a tall, smiling young Harvard professor with the wonderful name of Columbus O'Donnell Iselin II, Woods Hole's oceanographers began dunking thermometers in the water, quickly spotted the Navy's trouble. It was just a question of temperatures, they explained. Tropical sun had heated the water to a depth of 50 feet. The sound waves were bent by this temperature gradient, hiding a sub as effectively as if it were behind a hill. Equipped with a gadget of Woods Hole's devising, a bathythermograph, many a U.S. sub saved itself during World War II by finding a temperature "hill" in the ocean and slipping behind it.

WARTIME ROMANCE

This momentous incident began a wartime romance between the U.S. Navy and oceanographers, whom most Government officials had until then considered a curious tribe of men messing about with sounding leads and little bottles of water samples. In the next few years, oceanographers at Woods Hole and its Pacific counterpart, the Scripps Institution of Oceanography at La Jolla, Calif., trained hundreds of Navy officers—instructing sub men in how to use the sea's geography and mobile anatomy for concealment, teaching destroyer men how to trail their quarry through the sea's jungles.

Oceanographers mapped currents, furnished charts to air-rescue ships looking for downed airmen. Others analyzed the waves coming ashore at La Jolla and at Martha's Vineyard, Mass., were able to predict surf conditions for the landings on Sicily and Normandy. By studying the biology of barnacles, they produced a new, plastic antifouling paint that cut the Navy's fuel bill 10 percent.

NEW FRONTIER

With the ocean now transformed from a barrier to a new and menacing frontier from which guided missiles could be launched upon U.S. cities, the Navy's concern with oceanography has expanded. That concern has brought U.S. oceanographers money, men, and resources they never dreamed of before the war, made their specialty perhaps the fastest-growing science in the world. The oceanographic fleet has grown to 12 ocean-going vessels backed by a swarm of small craft and expanding shore establishments full of expensive apparatus. The Russians have proved equally alert to the ocean's dangers and possibilities, have 14 fulltime oceanographic vessels roaming the seas.

What's more, other scientists have abruptly rediscovered the ocean. Geographers and geophysicists now realize that most of the world's surface lies beneath the ocean, and can now recite glibly the truism that the bottom of the ocean is not as well known as the near side of the moon. Discoveries follow every voyage. Under the Pacific oceanographers have found dep trenches, at least one of them big enough to contain seven Grand Canyons, and a 1,000-mile range of high mountains that no one knew existed until just 1 year ago.

Above its still mysterious floor, the ocean is not homogeneous but is a vast, intricate structure of separate and distinct layers, each with its own character and individuality. In some places the layers curl up and mix; in other places they do not. Through the layers mighty rivers stream on largely unknown courses, often flowing in opposite directions close to one another. Exploration of this huge anatomy is just beginning. Realizing ever more clearly that most weather originates over the oceans, meteorologists are studying its mighty motions as the key to the world's climate. A change in the direction of the flow of an ocean current can change the weather for an area miles inland, shift the course of hurricanes, bring drought to fertile lands or rains to arid deserts. The ocean as a whole is a huge heat-exchange engine carrying heat from the boilers of the Tropics to the condensers of the poles.

In a world going through the throes of a population explosion, earth scientists have rediscovered the sea, remember that the ocean contains the bulk of the earth's life, and that it is probably capable of producing more food than all of the earth's land. Says one oceanographer: "The ocean represents an inner space as important as outer space, but different."

CURIOSITY AND AVOCATION

The man who best exemplifies the growth of U.S. oceanography into a major science is Columbus O'Donnell Iselin II himself. Since the prewar days when he solved the Navy's temperature problems off Guantánamo, he has been long-time director of Woods Hole, seen its full-time staff grow from a prewar 24 to the present 300, its fleet from 1 ship to 5, is now its senior oceanographer.

Born in 1904 to a New York socialite family of Swiss origin, Columbus came to his specialty by a combination of inheritance and intellectual curiosity. The family vocation was banking, but its avocation was sailing. His great-uncle, C. Oliver Iselin, was four times a defender of the America's Cup—"He could afford it—he married two rich women," says Columbus. His father, Lewis Iselin, sailed less gaudily but no less enthusiastically, racing Star boats on Long Island Sound.

At the family's summer home in New Rochelle, N.Y., Columbus learned from the family carpenter how to use tools, built his first boat—called the *Sponge*, because it leaked—at the age of 11. When he was in prep school he was spending school vacations sailing in waters as dangerous as the Bay of Fundy.

When he entered Harvard in 1922, he concentrated at first on mathematics because he thought it had something to do with the banking business. But the sea was in his blood, and in his junior year he discovered Prof. Henry Bigelow who was then officially a zoologist but whose real interest was oceanography. Columbus gave up all thought of banking. He ordered the schooner *Chance* built in Nova Scotia, on graduation set off in her for the icy coast of Labrador with a crew of college students on his first oceanographic trip. The student-scientists fraternized with Eskimos, exploded firecrackers in one another's beds, and otherwise acted their ages, but the *Chance*, loaded with real scientific apparatus, came back with useful data on the Laborador current that chills the New England coast as far south as Cape Cod.

REPORT FOR $3 MILLION

Iselin's demonstration that the little *Chance* (length, 72 ft.; displacement, 37 tons) could do serious scientific work was useful to Professor Bigelow, who was writing a report on oceanography for the National Academy of Sciences. Relieved to find that very large yearly sums for big vessels were not necessary, the Rockefeller Foundation gave Bigelow $3 million to outfit and endow an oceanographic institute. Bigelow set up his institute in Woods Hole—a small town on a narrow strait ("The Hole") connecting Buzzards Bay with Vineyard Sound. The ocean is always a presence there, flowing around the town and through its small, snug harbors. Gray fog often drifts through the town, smelling of the sea, and sometimes hurricanes slam ashore. No better place exists to keep an oceanographer pleasantly mindful of his business.

Iselin helped Bigelow plan the *Atlantis*, which is still the only U.S. vessel to be designed as an oceanographic ship. The *Atlantis* was built in Copenhagen, and Iselin sailed her back to Woods Hole as her first skipper.

RUGGED SCIENCE

A steel-hulled, 142-foot ketch (tall mainmast forward, shorter mizzenmast aft) with berths for 9 scientists and a crew of 17, the *Atlantis* was still a very small ship to cope for months with the North Atlantic in all its ferocious moods. She had a rather feeble engine, but sails were her main reliance. Such a laboratory makes oceanography a

rugged science. While the little ship rolls and pitches, the scientists work round the clock, snatching bits of food and sleep during quiet intervals in their experiments. Dress is informal. In the Tropics, oceanographers favor ragged shorts or underdrawers; on North Atlantic cruises the men are generally cold and wet, and during the first week at sea most of them get seasick. "The best seagoing oceanographers," says Iselin, "are the result of picking over a lot of stomachs."

For the next 10 years Iselin sailed with the *Atlantis*, crisscrossing the Atlantic and doing an oceanographer's chores—trailing thermometers at varying depths, testing water for density and salinity. In 1940 he became director of Woods Hole, saw U.S. oceanography transformed into a naval auxiliary. For some reason, neither the German nor the Japanese navies ever got in touch with their oceanographers, who were excellent. "This made a hell of a difference in World War II," says Iselin.

GOLDEN AGE

War's end marked the beginning of the golden age of U.S. oceanography. For the first time in its life, Woods Hole had enough money. More Navy millions went to California's Scripps Institution of Oceanography, which matches Woods Hole in growth, and claims, with California confidence, the whole Pacific Ocean as its domain. Dr. Roger Revelle, director of Scripps, is an enormous man (6 ft. 4 in.) who looks as if he were specially designed, both physically and temperamentally, to study the Pacific Ocean. He asks such large questions as: "Where did the sea water come from? Are the oceans growing or diminishing? Are the continents growing?" He believes that study of the oceans, including their floors, their arcs of islands and their plunging deeps, will answer all these questions.

The war contributed more than money. War-developed sonar made depth measurements far more sensitive, giving oceanographers a more accurate look at the ocean's bottom than they had ever had before. The new loran, which can fix a ship's position within a quarter of a mile in daylight, night, or in the thickest fog, enabled a far more detailed and accurate study of ocean currents, and oceanographers launched zealously into new studies with their new tools.

ARTERY AND STABILIZER

Ocean currents are of interest not just to navigators. They are the arteries of the ocean; they carry warm and cold water around the earth; they churn up and interchange cold bottom water for warm surface water. The so-called deep water—comprising about 90 percent of all the ocean's water—hovers around 40° F., and acts as a huge stabilizer of the atmosphere's temperature. If, through some imbalance of nature, the earth received an extra 1 percent of heat in the course of a year, it would, applied to the air alone, raise the atmosphere's temperature an intolerable 27° F. The same amount of heat would raise the deepwater's temperature only 0.02° F. "Therefore we think that its circulation, or the rate at which its water is brought up to and taken down from the surface, profoundly affects the climate," explains Revelle.

Classic example of just how much difference a change in current can make occurs on the coast of Peru, which owes its cool, foggy but almost rainless climate to the cold Peru Current sweeping up from Antarctica. Once in every 10 years or so, a current of warm water called El Niño (because it appears near Christmas, the birthday of El Niño, the Christ child) creeps stealthily down the coast. With it come tropical rains and disaster. Floods roar through dry valleys. Buildings not designed for rain leak or collapse. Worst of all, the warm water, which is only 100 feet deep, drives cold-water fish below the surface, Peru's famous guano birds, which feed on the fish, starve by the million, heaping the beaches with their corpses.

DEEP AND NARROW

Before the war, even such well-known currents had not been thoroughly mapped in detail. For Woods Hole oceanographers, the first order of business was a new study of the great Gulf Stream, which exports tropical water to northern Europe. With the aid of loran, the new *Atlantis* surveys proved that it is not a wide, steady stream, but a jet that whips from side to side over hundreds of miles and sometimes curls into eddies. It may run fast or slow or backward, and only the general sum of its motion carries warm water to Europe.

But the major discovery of postwar oceanographers was that huge currents flow far below the surface, often these currents move faster than their surface counterparts. One such discovery come in 1951, when the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service sent a ship west of the Galapagos Islands to experiment with a Japanese technique of fishing for deep-swimming tuna. The scientists were surprised to see the fish lines drifting eastward while their ship was carried westward on the well-known equatorial surface current. The next year the Service's Townsend Cromwell established the reason, a hitherto unsuspected current, deep below the surface current and moving in the opposite direction. Later investigation revealed that the Cromwell Current is a tremendous thing. It is 250 miles wide, at least 3,500 miles long. Three hundred feet below the surface, its high-speed core flows eastward at up to 3 knots, carrying 1,000 times as much water as the Mississippi.

Years of patient measurements of water temperature, salinity, and density have begun to pay off by providing oceanography with a substructure of theory. Doubting the conventional view that ocean currents are simply streams of water pushed around by prevailing winds, Henry Stommel of Woods Hole analyzed thousands of such observations, predicted that a current would be found flowing under the Gulf Stream in the opposite direction. In 1957 the *Atlantis* and the British oceanographic ship *Discovery II* went looking for this current. Their tool was an ingenious buoy invented by British Oceanographer John C. Swallow, which sinks slowly until it reaches a level where the sea water, compressed by the weight of water above it, has the same density as the buoy. There, the Swallow buoy hangs and drifts with the deep-down water, broadcasting strong pings of ultra-sound that can be heard by listening ships on the surface. Dumped into the Gulf Stream, the Swallow buoys proved that Stommel's theory was exactly right. About 8,000 feet under the famed stream is a counter Gulf Stream carrying cold water southward at one-third of a knot.

NO QUIET PLACE

This discovery gave a wholly new look to theories about the circulation of the Atlantic. The long established notion of nearly stagnant ocean depths is now doubtful. Photographs taken of the bottom show ripple marks much like those caused by tidal currents on bathing beaches. Ocean basins with ripple marks on their bottoms must have been stirred by currents at some time in their past, and they may be stirred still.

The problem is not just academic. If the oceans are to be used for the disposal of radioactive wastes, oceanographers must find stagnant basins where wastes can be dumped with assurance that they will stay out of circulation until their activity has been stilled by time. Warns Iselin: "If you louse up the ocean with atomic waste, you louse it up for thousands of years. The British pump stuff into the Irish Sea, which can take a lot. But one day * * *."

NEW ICE AGE

Oceanographers believe that man is approaching the point where he can try large-scale experiments on the ocean. Not all of them like this prospect; they feel that tinkering with the ocean without sufficient knowledge may be extremely dangerous. They are aghast at the project much discussed by the Russians, of using atomic energy to clear the Arctic Ocean of ice to help Siberian sea transport. Dr. Maurice Ewing, of Columbia University's Lamont Geological Observatory believes that the Northern Hemisphere's comparative freedom from continental glaciers is due to Arctic ice. Winds blowing off the Arctic Ocean are now dry, but if the ice were removed, they would become moist, dropping snow on nearby lands. The snow would pack into ice, and glaciers would start creeping south. Once the process was started, it might be impossible to stop before icecaps covered large parts of Europe and the United States.

Another risky experiment with the oceans may have already been tried inadvertently. The temperature of the earth's surface depends to a considerable extent on the atmosphere's small content of carbon dioxide (about 0.03 percent), which permits short-wave sunlight to pass but impedes the escape of longer heat waves into space—the so-called "greenhouse" effect. Since 1860 modern man's furnaces and auto exhausts have spewed out 360 billion tons of carbon dioxide. Warne Revelle: "By 2005 we will have added to the atmosphere some 1,700 billion tons of carbon dioxide—about 70 percent of the amount now present in the atmosphere. We believe that most of this will be absorbed by the ocean, but this means that the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, if nothing else happens, will increase about 20 percent."

Result could be that air temperature would increase by 1° to 2° C. "Southern California might dry up completely if the temperature rose in the way we think it might—making it an impossible place to live, rather than almost impossible the way it is now." The ocean will also grow warmer, and will be forced to release dissolved carbon dioxide to the atmosphere. This will increase the "greenhouse" effect. At some point in this chain reaction, the Antarctic icecap will melt, adding enough water to the ocean to drown nearly all of the earth's great cities.

No one can estimate for sure the ocean's ability to absorb CO_2. But man's future may depend on it. Concludes Revelle: "Man is moving and shaking the great globe itself in spite of himself. We may be disastrously changing the climate."

SWARM IN SUNLIGHT

With their mounting knowledge, oceanographers are talking with new confidence of the ocean as a source of food. Life began in the sea, and most of its lives there still, grazing on the microscopic plants that swarm in the sunlit upper waters. At the end of a long food chain (diatoms, protozoa, tiny crustaceans, little fish, etc.), are the fish, lobsters, shrimps, and whales that are hunted by humans. Says Iselin: "We are not harvesting the seas. We are just hunting—catching something here and there."

Oceanographers are helping the hunters by plotting the trials fish follow, which are

mostly determined by shifting ocean currents and the consequent shift in water temperatures. But they are also thinking about the possibility of fertilizing the ocean. Some parts of it are naturally rich and boiling with life. The water of breaking waves in such areas is green and turbid because it is full of miscroscopic plants and animals grazing on them. But large parts of the ocean are deserts with hardly any life. Their breaking waves are sapphire blue, the color of clear and lifeless water. Fish migrate away like cattle from a grazed-out range.

In fertile parts of the sea, the surface water is kept supplied with nutrients by some sort of upwelling that brings rich bottom water to the surface. In far northern and far southern parts of the ocean, the surface water gets so cold and heavy in winter that it sinks and is replaced by bottom water that contains plant nutrients. Currents carry these nutrients to other seas, e.g., the Labrador Current off the Newfoundland banks, the Peru Current off the coast of South America, and produce rich fishing grounds.

Unless they are fertilized by currents from colder areas, tropical seas are largely sterile. Since the richest harvests of the sea derive from bottom water rising to the surface, oceanographers have long had the notion of creating artificial upwelling in sterile parts of the ocean. One possibility is a nuclear reactor sitting on the bottom and slightly warming the water around it. The warmed water will rise, carrying nutrients to the surface and turning clear water, admired only by tourists, into rich, turbid pastures. Another way would be to pump deep water into some closed area, such as a Pacific atoll, to make a kind of concentrated fish farm.

SERPENTS IN THE DEPTHS?

Despite the new outburst of exploration, many mysteries remain. The creatures that live in the depths of the ocean are still only slightly known, and they may include the famed sea serpents of salty folklore. Sea-serpent sightings have diminished of late, but Revelle thinks this may be because fast, noisy, modern ships make poor platforms for serpent sighting. Sperm whales dive for gigantic squid up to 50 feet long that live at great depths and have never been captured by man. Why should not the squid have companions down there?

Chief sea-serpent man is Biologist John D. Isaacs, who is working out ways to catch the inhabitants of the depths of the ocean. One under study is a disk several hundred feet in diameter, with floats around the edge and ballast in the center. When it reaches a predetermined depth, the ballast will be detached, and the floats will pull the net upward. As it rises, it will inflate with water just as a parachute inflates with air, scooping up any giant squid and sea serpents on the way.

FOSSIL VOLCANOES

Geologists and oceanographers who look to the ocean's bottom have found that the ocean is a gigantic museum, where geological specimens are preserved like flies in amber. Among the most interesting of these geological specimens are the guyots, the flat-topped extinct volcanoes that dot the Pacific floor. How did they get down there, the oceanographer asks. Did their weight force them into the earth's crust, like corks pushed into putty? Did the ocean increase in volume and rise above them?

A recent discovery is evidence that an enormous volcanic eruption may have darkened the sky when man was in his stone-chipping stage. Cruising down the west coast of South America, Lamont's *Vema* discovered a layer of clean white volcanic ash up to 12 inches thick. Other explorations have found layers of similar ash in many parts of the Pacific and Atlantic. Dr. Ewing suspects that all the ash came from a series of stupendous eruptions along the spine of the Andes, estimates the date as 68,000 years ago. It must have been a black time for paleolithic man.

MYSTERIOUS TRENCHES

An ocean-bottom problem that fascinates all oceanographers is the origin of the deep troughs that are found mostly in the Pacific. The deepest ones, e.g., the Tonga Trench, the Marianas Trench, have narrow V bottoms that are clear of sediment. They are uneasy parts of the earth's crust. Deep-focus earthquakes rumble out of them, and generally volcanoes spout nearby.

Dr. Revelle suspects that the trenches may be part of the mechanism by which continents grow. The first step, he thinks is for a slow current in the earth's plastic mantle to start flowing horizontally and then curve downward (see diagram). Where it makes the dive, it drags down a strip of the crust, forming a V-bottomed trench which after many millions of years fills with sediment. Eventually the downward current in the mantle stops flowing. Since the mantle rock at its sides is heavier, it moves in, forcing upward the dragged-down crust and the sediments in the trough. Final result is that the former trench pokes above the sea, appearing as an arc of islands set with volcanoes, like Japan, or a curving shore of young mountains, like California.

Only a small part of the ocean bed is yet known in any detail. Recent surveys have shown that large areas of the bottom are covered thickly with rounded, blackish nodules that have grown as crusts around some nucleus, sometimes a shark's tooth. They are mostly iron and manganese oxides, but they often contain considerable amounts of copper, nickel and cobalt. "The amounts are absolutely staggering," says Dr. Henry Menard of Scripps. One 10-million-square-mile area in the Pacific, he estimates, has nodules worth hundreds of thousands of dollars per square mile.

NEW IMPROVEMENTS

Today oceanography is working to perfect its tools. There are intelligent buoys, which can be anchored at sea, and queried by radio for oceanographic and meteorological data. Other buoys sink to the bottom, where they can record currents, take pictures of their surroundings. They will be brought to the surface months later by a small charge of TNT exploded near by, which triggers their ballast-release mechanism.

Columbus Iselin's pet gadget is a monstrous underwater noisemaker developed at Woods Hole. Ordinary echo-sounding devices for exploring the bottom use relatively feeble waves of ultrasound whose delicate echoes are apt to get lost in background noise. Another common system is to explode TNT and pick up the echoes of the powerful shock waves that it sends to the bottom. But explosions are cumbersome, expensive, and dangerous.

The "Imp" (for impulse generator) is a massive steel casting with two flexible hoses for high-pressure hydraulic fluid sticking out of one end. At the other end is a metal diaphragm about 8 inches in diameter. Inside are extremely powerful springs, cocked by hydraulic pressure. When the springs are released, an internal hammer hits the diaphragm and a single, enormously powerful pulse of energy strikes through the water. The Imp now at Woods Hole gives a shock equivalent to the explosion of a good-sized block of TNT, and Imps several hundred times as powerful are a possibility. They can be suspended under a ship or built into its hull, sending down waves that will strike through the bottom sediments far into the rock beneath.

PISTOLS AND TROLLEY CARS

Iselin has not forgotten that his money comes chiefly from the Navy. Though he does not say so out loud, it is obvious that a device like Imp, which simulates the effect of a controlled explosion, could be far more effective against subs than present electronic devices for echo ranging. Says Iselin: "We know that sound pushed out by explosives can go, at some levels, for thousands of miles. There isn't an ocean in the world big enough to lose the sound of a pistol fired at the right depth." He is fully conscious of what such an improvement could mean for U.S. security. "If Mr. Eisenhower could say to Khrushchev, 'We can see every one of your submarinese in the seas around us,' we would be in a far better cold-war position today." Iselin is unimpressed with present nuclear subs. The powerplants are too noisy. "Going to war in a nuclear sub is like going duck hunting in a trolley car," he says.

Oceanographers are also busy producing detailed maps of new currents, temperature gradients and the topography of the ocean floor, so that a U.S. submarine, submerged for days, can have an accurate idea of where it is when it launches its missiles. "Any future war at sea will be one between Indians and city boys," he explains. "We want to be sure our boys become the Indians. They can learn to take advantage of the terrain they live in." Even study of waves can prove useful. "On an aircraft carrier, the system now is for a guy to stand at the end of a flight deck. He feels the rhythm of the waves through the crepe soles of his shoes, and lets the plane land or waves it off depending on the feeling he gets underfoot. A machine could do this far better, perhaps also introduce balancing stability effects to make more landings possible."

Today U.S. oceanographers have a wary eye on the Russians, some of whose vessels are far in advance of anything the United States has at sea. Partly because of this pressure, U.S. legislators did not flinch at a report by the National Academy of Sciences recommending an appropriation of $58 million for oceanography for 1960, and there is a good prospect it will be voted.

But like all true scientists, oceanographers are only incidentally interested in the military overtones of their science. They hope that knowledge of the oceans will lead to knowledge of the earth, then of the solar system and the Milky Way galaxy. It may help answer such questions as: Why are we here? Where did we come from? Where are we going? "Adolescents ask these questions," says Revelle, "but grown men do not. It is not because they are unimportant questions, but because grown men have given up." The oceanographers have not given up.

Or, in the words of Columbus Iselin: "The cold war and the scientific effort run parallel much of the time. They're both geared toward our learning more. Each has a different motivation. One is survival, and the other is curiosity."

Equality in Bank Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Journal of Commerce on Tuesday, July 14, 1959:

EQUALITY IN BANK TAXATION

It is regrettable that a major split has developed between savings and commercial bankers on the issue of unequal taxation of

these two segments of banking. This split, climaxing a long smoldering feud, promises to lead to resignations of savings institutions from the American Bankers Association and a consequent closer alignment between savings banks, savings and loan associations and perhaps credit unions for a new internecine war in the banking field.

For a great many years, commercial banks, struggling to build up capital funds out of the narrow margin of earnings left after expenses and taxes, have been galled by the fact that mutual institutions have been building up their reserves and surplus without payment of income tax. Even when mutual institutions were made subject to the Federal income tax, earnings in excess of expenses and payments to depositors could be added to reserves without payment of tax if the ratio of surplus and reserves to deposits was less than 12 percent.

Since very few institutions have a surplus and reserve ratio of more than 12 percent, mutual thrift institutions in effect have generally not paid income taxes. One effect of this has been that they have been able to pay higher rates of return on savings. Another is that they have retained their earnings above expenses and interest in full to permit rapid growth of deposits.

The American Bankers Association and other commercial bank groups have united in support of the Mason bill, the latest of a series of proposals designed to tax retained earnings of mutual thrift institutions.

Since this proposal could result in disallowance in some cases of the deduction of a part of the interest return paid on savings, it sets a precedent that could prove mischievous.

But more important than the details of the Mason bill or other proposals to achieve bank tax equality is the need for formulation of a national policy as regards bank taxation that would be both equitable and economically sound.

Mutual thrift institutions have a favored position under the tax law because it is a cardinal objective of national policy to foster thrift. More savings are urgently required to finance economic growth and to lessen the threat of inflation.

Commercial banks, as well as savings banks and savings and loan associations, are major thrift institutions. Hence, a strong case exists for extending to them any favorable tax provisions that apply to mutual thrift institutions. This is already done in the case of the savings and loan associations that flourish on the Pacific coast which pay a limited dividend on investment shares, so that the rest of the earnings belong to the founders' shares that are now being acquired by holding companies.

The grievance of the commercial banks has a real basis, especially for the many institutions that are eager to build up their savings deposits. But the solution is not to be found in tax legislation that undermines and weakens the mutual thrift institutions.

A sensible and economically sound solution would be to permit commercial banks to set aside special reserves or surplus for their savings deposits out of tax-free income left after paying expenses and interest on these deposits.

Commercial banks would then be placed on a plane of equality with the mutual thrift institutions. They could build up surplus and reserves, to margin the expansion of their savings deposits, out of earnings that are not taxed, up to amounts that would be specified in the law or regulations.

The Federal Government collects its taxes on the interest received by savings depositors. Any loss of tax revenues on the additions made by savings institutions to reserves and surplus is a small price to pay for maintaining the strength of these institutions and stimulating personal savings.

So much for the real issues and what might be done to solve them. Meanwhile we cannot help noting that the Mason bill is a bad one and shows every sign of haste and lack of study in the drafting. It should never have been endorsed in its present form by an organization as important as the American Bankers Association.

You don't solve inequalities, in taxes or in anything else, by creating new ones.

Drop by Drop, They're Giving Me Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, rarely does documentary reporting have such a personal meaning that its message is universal. When such reports are made, they merit special attention. A few weeks ago, such a personal report was made by an old and good friend of mine. Leo Paulin, of Bethesda, is a friend of thousands in the Sixth District of Maryland. His Paulin Publishing Co. has conceived and sponsored many charitable enterprises. Inestimable good has resulted from his efforts. His public spirit was most recently displayed, while stricken with a serious illness, by reporting the need for blood donors. Because of its timeliness and importance, his report deserves inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

DROP BY DROP THEY'RE GIVING ME LIFE
(By Leo Paulin)

SUBURBAN HOSPITAL, July 2, 2:30 p.m.—Normally when I write I'm pecking away at a loyal Royal. But I am not typing this piece. I'm on my back dictating from a hospital bed.

Suspended from a metal pole some 3 feet over the head of my bed is a pint of blood. Drop by drop, the blood flows through a plastic tube into my veins via a 3-inch needle. Drop by drop, they're giving me life. I don't know whose blood it is that is now flowing in my veins, but to that unknown donor I'm forever grateful.

I came to Suburban last Saturday because I was losing tremendous quantities of blood. Late Saturday afternoon, I had passed the safety stage—I lost consciousness.

It's a very pleasant experience, losing consciousness. Things don't go black; they just softly disappear. It's a real peaceful sensation. It's peaceful when you go under and peaceful when you come out.

In a matter of minutes after my return to the world of the living, I got my first blood transfusion, the first of my life.

During my lifetime I have given blood many times, and through the pages of the Advertisers I have passed on appeals from the Red Cross for blood donors. I never really appreciated either act until now when I find myself on the receiving end.

Unfortunately, hospitals can't buy blood at a supermarket, or at a corner drug store (even at Discount Drug). Hospitals have to depend upon those of you in good health, with compassion in your hearts, to fill the hospital blood needs.

And believe me, those needs are great. Yesterday, here at Suburban, the blood bank issued 22 pints of the precious fluid. Only one pint was replaced.

In my own case, the good Samaritans whom I herewith proudly name replaced my take from the bank: Dick Kraft, Mary Caldwell, Harry Monroe, John Mattina, Dick Graham, Joe Fortuna and Warren Castell.

But what about those 22 pints yesterday? Only one was replaced. Who's going to replac the other 21 pints?

Suburban Hospital is trying to build its own blood bank. Will you call Suburban today (Oliver 6–6000) and make an appointment to share a pint of your life with another human?

As I lie here dictating this, I am trembling slightly, not because it hurts, and not because of fear. I am trembling at the thought of my plight, if there was no blood in that bottle over my head to give me life.

The Steel Strike—a Causative Analysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the steel strike is everybody's business because every additional day it is in progress its impact will reach out to touch more and more citizens like the expanding ripples from a stone cast upon the waters.

Today it is the worker in an industrial center like my city, Pittsburgh, who is feeling the strike. In time it will affect every citizen of the United States.

An enlightened public opinion will be a powerful force in helping to bring about a fair and just settlement.

Thus, the strike's causes, like its effects, are matters upon which as much light as possible should be shed.

We have heard many reasons advanced to explain the cause of the strike.

One such explanation is contained in the following article by Mr. Max Lerner which appeared last Wednesday, July 15, in the New York Post.

In the belief that the public will be best served in this public matter by having the benefit of many points of view, I insert Mr. Lerner's article in the RECORD and commend it to my colleagues.

Get ready for an onslaught of editorials from most of the papers, deploring the steel strike and hoping piously that each side will put the public interest ahead of its own. But this is one time when the formula makes precious little sense. If this strike proves costly to everyone, as it is bound to be, the responsibility must rest with the steel industry executives who sit in the seats of the mighty, and who feel secure enough to take on the Steelworkers Union in the kind of showdown fight the industry has had only once in more than a quarter century.

Whatever else one may think about Dave McDonald and his outlook, I don't see how anyone can deny the earnestness with which he tried to get a settlement that would avoid a strike. The one thing he could not offer was unconditional surrender—yet that was exactly what the industry negotiators demanded when they insisted on a wage freeze. When finally the steel executives—under Administration proddings that were too little and too late—did agree to discuss a wage increase, they tied it again to an impossible

condition—unconditional union surrender on the question of local job practices.

All great strikes are greatly wasteful, and generally they end up with each side worse off than it was at the start. Most of them are avoidable. But some take place because one of the parties in effect wills it, by taking a position so rigid that the strike becomes inevitable. This was one.

I know, of course, that the steel companies have been playing up their position as one of anti-inflation statesmanship. The top negotiator for the corporations, R. Conrad Cooper, says they cannot "in good conscience be party to another round of the inflationary spiral." Usually when someone puts his hand on his heart and swears "in good conscience," you suspect that he has not been on speaking terms with his conscience for some time. Cooper is in a good position, however, because the Administration has been making such a palaver over the inflation danger for months, and a large section of the press has joined it.

Thus President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon have created the perfect climate of opinion for the intransigence of Mr. Cooper and his corporate colleagues. There is some evidence that they may have felt very uncomfortable about it. They suggested (so the report goes) that the skies would not fall if the steel industry made a package wage offer which it could absorb out of its very substantial profits without passing it on to the buyers of steel. But all that Cooper needed to do was to look virtuous, talk of principle, and quote to them their own warnings about inflation disaster. They had built a gallows and strung a noose, to catch the Democrats—and now they were themselves caught in it, at least in their usefulness as mediators. It didn't do any good for Nixon and Labor Secretary Mitchell to say (through President Eisenhower) that agreement could be reached even at the last minute. McDonald, for the union, offered to sit on indefinitely at the negotiation table, but what use was his willingness when the corporate heads felt so sure?

They were sure of the inflation weapon, they were sure because they had built up a considerable steel reserve which should last them for some time, they were sure because they do not regard McDonald as a dangerous opponent. In a sense the steel barons are the bellwether for the rest of the industrial power elite, whose labor bargaining in the future will largely be shaped by what happens in steel. They would obviously rather have a showdown with McDonald than, for example, with Walter Reuther.

A book with an interesting theme has just been published—"Image of America," by a French Dominican priest, R. L. Bruckberger. He celebrates the whole American economy as an effective and clinching answer to the Marxist theories. What we have, he says, is not capitalism: In fact, it is anticapitalist, and he cites Henry Carey, Henry Ford, and Samuel Gompers as proof that we have shaped a "third way" answer to the problem of economic organization and economic justice.

He has a whole chapter on American labor, called, "Samuel Gompers and Lenin," in which he shows that the American trade union movement cares far more about the workers than do the so-called proletarian leaders of the Communists.

The book is getting a big play, and Americans of substance are so busy patting themselves on the back for their wisdom and genius that they can't keep their eyes looking straightforwardly at the steel industry and what is happening there. The fact, if you read what has been happening with a cold eye, is that the steel corporation leaders are applying the Marxist principle of the class war to their workers. But this is not a class war from the bottom up, forced on employers by revolutionary working-class leaders. It is class war from the top down.

If you read the history of the steel industry, you will find that from the first blast furnaces but a century ago, until 1936 and the CIO, the steel barons like Carnegie, Frick, and Gary waged a class war. They broke the unions, they used spies and Pinkertons, they sewed up their company towns against union meetings, they kept a 12-hour day until 1923—20 years after other industries had abandoned it.

Since 1936, when Myron Taylor and John L. Lewis reached the first great steel agreement without violence, the industry has been the scene of orderly bargaining. Do the present events mean that Mr. Cooper and and his comrades want to go back to the days of Homestead and the class war?

No Money Tree in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I append herewith a very cogent editorial from the Decatur Herald, Decatur, Ill., of Saturday, July 18, "No Money Tree in Washington." How true most of us are finding it in Washington now. The people back home understand that nothing from Washington is free:

NO MONEY TREE IN WASHINGTON

Regarding the Federal Government as the source from which all financial blessings flow has become an occupational disease with many municipal and State officials, even those who cherish local autonomy and resent Federal intervention.

Mayor Robert Egan, of the expanding city of Flint, Mich., went to Washington to tell members of the House Banking Committee of the city's urgent need for help to finance water and sewage projects.

It would be just fine, he said, if Congress would pass a proposed $1 billion, low-interest rate Federal loan program for public health projects.

However, Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican of New Jersey, after listening to the mayor's testimony, asked why the city didn't borrow money on its own when it had an excellent credit rating and had no trouble selling bonds for municipal improvements. Why should the Government borrow money at more than 4 percent he asked, and then lend it to Flint at a cheaper rate?

The mayor replied "I am merely looking for an easy solution to the question." His frankness perhaps should be appreciated. This is not to single out the city of Flint which has a good record of civic progress financed by its own endeavors. But as Mr. WIDNALL put it: "There seems to be a tendency on the part of a lot of people to feel that when something is financed by the Federal Government, it doesn't cost them anything."

Fifty years ago less than one-third of all governmental expenditures were made at the Federal level and two-thirds by the States and localities. Now, this ratio is just about reversed.

One of the reasons for the decline of the authority of State and local governments, much lamented by many who seek Federal grants, is undoubtedly this very fact. If the Federal Government disburses two-thirds of the public funds, it is not unreasonable to expect that the Federal Government will exert at least two-thirds control over how the money is to be spent.

In many cases, the Federal Government is best equipped to do the job—defense, multi-State water resource development and interstate highway development, to mention a few.

But anyone who thinks he gets these services free should be investigated by the Internal Revenue Service because he apparently isn't paying his income tax.

Mailing List Brokers Pledge Fight Against Misuse of Lists by Peddlers of Pornography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the hearings and investigations of the Postal Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service into the vast flood of pornography being distributed by mail, we quickly determined that many of the young victims of this vicious racket received the material through the mail after having been placed on the mailing lists of presumably legitimate mail order firms. It therefore was obvious that the smut publishers were buying or renting all sorts of mailing lists, and particularly those containing the names of youngsters.

Under the circumstances, I am pleased and delighted to have received a letter from the president of the National Council of Mailing List Brokers outlining the vigorous opposition of that industry to the misuse of mailing lists by having them fall into the hands of publishers and distributors of obscene material.

I congratulate the organization for taking this position and I hope their members will carry through and devise tighter controls over the use of the mailing lists which they control. The letter to me, which I think will be of interest to all Members concerned over the pornography problem, is as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
MAILING LIST BROKERS,
New York, N.Y., July 15, 1959.

The Honorable KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN,
Chairman, House of Representatives Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Washington, D.C.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: We want to congratulate you, the other members of the subcommittee, Postmaster General Summerfield, General Counsel Warburton, and Chief Inspector Stephens for bringing this whole subject of pornography out into the open and for your strenuous attack upon this evil.

On Wednesday, July 8, a member of the National Council of Mailing List Brokers called on Chief Inspector Stephens in an effort to gain an understanding of the pornography problem. Mr. Stephens was very courteous and helpful in explaining the problem to him, and showed him an exhibit of pornography that has been gathered under Postmaster General Summerfield's direction.

The council member was so shocked at this exhibit that an emergency meeting of the Council of Mailing List Brokers was called for the following day to decide on how we might support the campaign against pornography.

The National Council of Mailing List Brokers was organized in 1943 for the purpose of improving the ethical standards for the trading in mailing lists between owners and users. The members of the council handle the vast majority of mailing list rentals in the United States. Over the years the council has been a major factor in the improvement of the ethics and integrity of list handling. The council has constantly striven for high standards in direct mail, and every member has always refused to accept orders for mailings which he considered off color.

The distribution of such lewd and obscene material has a debilitating effect upon family life in the entire country. The availability of this vicious material to children undoubtedly contributes to the growth of juvenile delinquency. Every citizen, every businessman should cooperate with all levels of government to the end that pornography be stamped out.

Your subcommittee may be certain that we will do collectively what individual members of the National Council of Mailing List Brokers have done in the past: make every effort to intercept and stop the dissemination through the mails of any pornographic matter.

Feel free, Madam Chairman, to call upon us at any time if you have any suggestions as to how we might further assist your committee in its task of eliminating the distribution of pornography.

Respectfully yours,

FELIX R. TYROLER,
President.

EDITH DREY,
Chairman.

ARTHUR MARTIN KARL,
Chairman, Postal Committee.

A Report on Inside Information of Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a translation made by Stephen C. Y. Pan, Ph.D., of New York City, of a report on the inside information in Communist China, given by Cheng Chu-Yuen, an expert on Communist China's economy, at a recent meeting of the Sino-American Amity of New York City, and later appearing in the China Tribune of New York City:

During the past 10 years the Chinese Communist regime has followed these four principles:

I. COLLECTIVISM OF ECONOMY

The most important practice under this principle includes concentration on (a) farm products, (b) commercial and industrial products, as well as (c) distribution of daily necessities. The first two items are used to control all the productivity and to take away all the property from each and every individual so that they all become proletarians. The last item is for the purpose of regimenting the daily life of each person so that the livelihood of each one is made to depend upon the regime.

II. TOTALITARIANISM OF THE GOVERNMENT

The most important feature under this principle is the dictatorship of the Communist Party under which the Gestapo or intelligence service effectively penetrates every corner of society so that it can report from each of the "nerve centers" in each village or farm. During the time of the so-called land reform more than 20 million people were liquidated. According to Lo Shu Ching, Chief of Communist Chinese Intelligence Service, from June 1955 to October 1957 out of a total of 18 million workers there were 165,000 reactionaries and many of the remainder were of questionable character. From this we can understand that even these Communist workers were living under conditions of terror and fear.

III. THOUGHT CONTROL

The most important methods of achieving thought control or reform of thought, include the following:

(a) Revolutionizing Chinese literature.

(b) Reform of the Chinese language and characters.

(c) Revolutionizing the school system.

(d) Reform of all religions, including the creation of new Buddhist sects, new Catholic church, new Lama groups, new Protestant sects, etc.

Recently the Communists launched on a program to rewrite the whole history of China. Traditionally, Chinese history was written according to dynasties. But they have tried to abolish all old Chinese history books and the historical methods and have introduced a new method of writing Chinese history by emphasizing revolt—calling it a landmark in Chinese history. According to the history thus rewritten, the most notorious killers in China's history have been made heroes.

IV. U.S.S.R.'S FOREIGN POLICY IS COMMUNIST CHINA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Action in line with this principle included continual launching of anti-American campaigns. For example, the Communist regime accepted Stalin's command to start the war in Korea and the war costs were borne entirely by the Chinese Communists. Even now, Soviet advisers and technicians have complete control in the army, government, schools, factories and farms. Thus, the Chinese Communist economic system has become an auxiliary of the Soviet economy.

As a result of this practice, all people on the China mainland are propertyless. There are no more landlords. No capitalists can be mentioned. Today, on the China mainland, there are only two classes: The Communist Party (the ruling class) and the rest of the people who are the controlled class.

In 1957, Mao Tse-tung started the so-called "a hundred flowers bloom at the same time." By this he meant that anyone who had a complaint or grievance could be heard. For nearly 7 months everyone was allowed to speak from his heart and make any complaint to the Communist Party. After this, he begins to purge any opposition and call such opposers antirevolutionaries or reactionaries. As a result of this purge, secretaries of the Communist Party in 13 Provinces and Governors of these Provinces were either imprisoned or killed. Supplementing this purge the Communists imposed more rigid economic regimentation and control of the people. They launched the cooperative movement in China and have recently intensified their efforts to destroy the cooperatives and substitute the commune system. The commune system by nature is more than economic—it is also political and military. That is to say, each commune in a district is really the governing power. It has ruling power and it directs the army and economic life of the people—under its jurisdiction. This commune system has enraged all the Chinese people, including many Communist Party leaders, and even Khrushchev was not too happy to see Red China more communized than the Soviet Union. Perhaps this is one reason why Mao Tse-tung has been compelled to resign as President of the People's Republic of China. Since Mao has been succeeded by Liu Shao-chi as President of the Red regime, Chu Teh succeeded Liu to be the Chairman of the People's Congress and Chou En-lai continues to be Prime Minister. It is clear that Liu Shao-chi will become the heir-apparent and Chu is the leading middle force to conciliate between the conflicting forces of Liu and Chou.

The Chinese Commune system, together with the Communist pressure on Tibet finally brought forth the revolution in Tibet in March 1959, similar to the recent Hungarian revolt. The Tibetan revolt was only temporarily crushed by the Communists—but the people's resistance in Tibet has not ceased. The Tibetan revolt—temporarily halted—has produced tremendous effects on the Chinese people on the mainland and has "opened the eyes" of the so-called neutralists, including Prime Minister Nehru of India and others in Asia and the Middle East.

The minority people in China—such as those in Inner Mongolia, Tching-hai and Southwest China—feel insecure. The people on the China mainland live under the "iron heel" and even Communist Party members feel insecure in that they may be purged or liquidated at any time. Within the Communist Party affection for the old gods has been attacked by the younger groups and by the Army. Peasant members are dissatisfied with the members who come from the urban areas. It is possible that the Army elements may cooperate with the peasant element and younger groups and the Intelligensia may join hands with the peasants against the party brass. It is hard to predict what will happen. If revolt or revolution takes place on the mainland (as it did in Hungary or Tibet) with outside help it may prove successful—but without it success would be doubtful. While the Communist regime is rotten it is the controlling machine and functions throughout all the "nerve centers" of China.

The crackup or downfall of the Communist regime depends upon the following:

1. How and when the people on the China mainland will start their revolt.

2. Whether Free China will take a bold step and give concrete and substantial help to the revolters on the China mainland by attacking the Chinese Communists along the China coast, and

3. The policy of the United States and other freedom-loving countries.

Effects of U.S. Borrowing on Little Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the Democrat majority continues in its refusal to provide the Secretary of the Treasury with the proper tools with which to manage our huge national debt the effects will be far reaching and disastrous. Harold B. Dorsey writing in the Washington Post of Monday, July 20, 1959, has called atten-

tion to the effect upon the small business community. The following is the article by Mr. Dorsey:

EFFECTS OF U.S. BORROWING ON LITTLE BUSINESS

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

Since business and financial planning must be completely realistic, it is beginning to take into consideration the practical effects of the prospect that Congress will not pass the legislation necessary to permit the Treasury Department to sell Government bonds at an interest rate in excess of 4¼ percent.

That thinking is already demonstrated by the fact that in its current refinancing of about $14 billion of maturing debt the Treasury Department has to offer an interest rate of 4¾ percent to borrow money for 12½ months, and the same rate to borrow money for 4¾ years. These interest rates are in sharp, and unusual, contrast with the fact that Government bonds now outstanding with maturities beyond 1966 afford a yield ranging 3.77 percent and 4.17 percent.

One practical effect, then, of the Treasury Department's enforced inflexibility is this evidence that the Government's expenditures for interest charges on this single piece of refinancing alone are probably going to be something like $70 million a year more than they would have been if the Treasury Department were free to tap the most advantageous credit markets. This increased expenditure for interest charges is the result of only this one piece of current Government refinancing. The interest charges on financing of the past few months probably have been unnecessarily higher and the same promises to be true of future financing.

Thus the taxpayers are being forced to pay a few hundred million dollars of unnecessary expense for interest charges because of a misunderstanding of the problem in Congress. Just why that misunderstanding should prevail is a little difficult to see. The situation is really comparatively simple. Because the interest ceiling bars the Government from the long-term credit market, it is being forced to borrow in the short-term credit market, where it is competing with the credit needs of business and individuals for the limited supply. As an understandable result, the interest rates are forced higher. Everybody would be better off—except the lenders—if some of these funds were obtained in the long-term credit markets where the interest rates are currently lower.

The business analyst must be strictly objective in his interpretation of the facts. There is little room in such interpretations for questions why Congress may be making decisions that seem to be illogical from every practical point of view. The latest indications are that Congress is not going to lift the ceiling on the interest rate of government bonds, and if those indications are to become the actuality, then the interpretation and the business planning has to be adjusted accordingly.

The small businessman in particular should start adjusting his affairs immediately. The lack of congressional action on this particular matter is threatening him with an exceedingly difficulty problem in obtaining the necessary credit to carry his seasonally higher inventories next fall and winter. As the current situation shapes up, he is probably going to find bank after bank "loaned up" and, therefore, unable to supply his credit needs.

The small businessman may not be able to carry as large an inventory as he would like, to take care of the seasonal increase in his sales. If he, therefore, has to anticipate lower sales and earnings, his capacity to provide jobs will be reduced. If he has debt maturing between now and the end of the year that under normal circumstances would be refinanced, he may be squeezed to an embarrassing extent. He will then come face to face with the fact that Congress is unnecessarily forcing the government to compete with him in his natural credit market. It will be a brutal fact the Government's credit needs will be given preference over his own.

It must be remembered that we are entering the season of rising business needs for credit with the commercial banks' ratio of loans to deposits already at a very high level. On top of that condition we now have to envisage a continued heavy demand in that same short-term credit market by the Government. The combination threatens a credit stringency of serious proportions. As usual, small business will be hurt worse than big business, but this time it should be clear that the fault is centered in the failure of Congress to understand the foregoing situation.

Some Congressmen evidently disapprove of Treasury Department and/or Federal Reserve policies. It scarcely seems fair to let that feeling create a condition which can severely hurt the affairs of many thousands of little business people. After all, neither the Federal Reserve officials nor the U.S. Government can force lenders to invest their money in long-term bonds at 4½ percent or less if they don't want to. The lack of Congressional action on this interest rate ceiling continues to force the government to absorb short-term credit that should be left available to the little businessman. He is already paying a high interest rate, but as matters stand at the moment, he is going to be lucky if he can obtain his fall and early winter credit even at a higher rate.

Up to this point, it has been my opinion that the fairly tight credit situation would not stop sound business expansion, but would only tend to curb the excessive use of credit. That opinion had been based on the presumption that Congress would enable the Government to withdraw somewhat from the short-term credit market and tap the long-term market. If that presumption is going to turn out to be erroneous, the business analyst is going to have to start worrying about the effect on the economy of the threatened financial squeeze that seems likely to be imposed on small businesses—businesses that are small individually, but collectively are an important portion of the economy.

Developments in Educational Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, as one who has publicly indicated himself to be among the ranks of those in favor of the establishment of educational television channels, I have been watching the newspapers and periodicals carefully for developments in the ETV field. There has been little on the subject, probably because the proponents and opponents are quietly awaiting the commencement of the study by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which will be conducted following the adjournment of the present session of the 86th Congress, and which will aim toward isolating and clarifying the fundamental factors involved in the ETV question.

In spite of the noticeable lack of press coverage on ETV, I do have an article which appeared in a recent issue of the Du Pont Chambers Works News. The article brings to the reader's attention two very pertinent points. First, our great American industry is interested in the use of the TV media for educational purposes. Du Pont is to be one of the sponsors of NBC's "Continental Classroom" which met so much success last year. Secondly, Americans seem to be growing more and more aware of the value of ETV because "Continental Classroom" this year will become an hour-long program, twice the length of last year's series.

But, even though this is a fine series and our industry and commercial networks are to be commended for giving support to the development of educational television, this is no substitute for the establishment of noncommercial channels which operate under the direction of our State educational systems, colleges and universities or nonprofit educational organizations, and which telecast solely for the purpose of increasing the intelligence of our citizens. Commercial channels cannot broadcast educational programs in the evening when these programs would be beneficial to the greatest number of people. Since many of the TV watchers of the evening hours prefer to be entertained rather than educated, the educational programs must be relegated to the wee small hours of the morning. "Continental Classroom" will broadcast physics from 6 to 6:30 a.m. and chemistry from 6:30 to 7 a.m. Need I say that some people find it quite impossible to take education seriously at 6 in the morning? This seems to be borne out by the fact that although "Continental Classroom" was broadcast by 150 stations, and reached an estimated daily audience of 400,000 including 15,000 teachers, only 5,000 persons were enrolled for credit from the program in the 265 participating colleges and universities. Most of these 5,000 persons were teachers. It is truly unfortunate that more of the audience who sleepily watch "Continental Classroom" are not enrolled as true students of the courses offered, but this will not happen and cannot happen until noncommercial educational television channels, which are not interested in selling anything, in monopolizing an audience in the evening, or competing for popularity ratings can telecast these informative programs at hours when more people can watch them and when, I might add, these people are awake.

But, I do feel that NBC and Du Pont are taking steps which are making valuable contributions to the development of TV for educational use. I commend them for their effort and their program which will undoubtedly continue the excellent standards of the last "Continental Classroom."

The article follows:

[From the Du Pont Chambers Works News, July 1, 1959]

DU PONT WILL COSPONSOR TV CONTINENTAL CLASSROOM—EARLY MORNING CHEMISTRY COURSES TO BE TELECAST BY NBC IN FALL

"Continental Classroom," a pioneering television effort to help repair the critical national lag in qualified science instruction, expands September 28 to present a two-semester college-level course in modern chemistry, the first course to be televised in color. The Du Pont Co. will be one of the cosponsors of the daily NBC program which will also include a course in physics.

Modern chemistry, to be colorcast Monday through Friday from 6:30 to 7 a.m., e.s.t., will comprise half of the NBC network's "Continental Classroom," which will grow to a full hour in the new season. In addition to the 160-lesson lecture demonstrations course in chemistry, a course in atomic age physics will be repeated by tlevision tape recordings and kinescopes from 6 to 6:30 a.m.

Chemistry was selected as the new "Continental Classroom" offering because of the critical shortage of teachers in this field. It was the choice of the majority of the 265 colleges and universities across the country which are currently giving academic credit for the TV course in atomic age physics.

Nearly 300 colleges and universities throughout the Nation are expected to carry modern chemistry for academic credit, 35 more than the current total for atomic age physics. Each may utilize the network program at no cost and charge regular tuition fees for registrants. Each will have local autonomy in implementing the TV program with examinations, laboratory sessions, and seminars.

The American Chemical Society, NBC, and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education are partners in presenting modern chemistry. Providing financial backing will be E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., the Ford Foundation, the Bell Telephone System, General Foods Fund, International Business Machines Corp., Pittsburgh Plate Glass Foundation, Standard Oil Co. of California, and United States Steel.

Planned primarily for high-school science teachers, modern chemistry will be telecast from September 28 to May 27. In addition to teachers in service, a large audience of college students, gifted high-school pupils, chemists, chemical engineers, and others who wish to enlarge their knowledge of the field are expected to be regular viewers.

Dr. John W. Baxter, professor of chemistry at the University of Florida since 1952, will teach modern chemistry. Nobel prizewinning chemists and other outstanding scientists will be guest lecturers.

"Continental Classroom," launched October 6, 1958, has been hailed by Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., until recently special science adviser to President Eisenhower, as among the most noteworthy and important achievements of the past year in science education.

As outlined by Dr. Baxter, modern chemistry will be a study of the fundamental principles of chemistry and a survey of recent developments. Dr. Baxter is writing a special textbook to accompany the TV course. It will be available September 1, together with course outline, lesson synopses, syllabi, and assignments.

The American Chemical Society's 156 local sections, serving 86,000 member chemists and chemical engineers in 49 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, will participate.

The 160-lesson course in atomic age physics, conducted by Dr. Harvey E. White, professor of physics at the University of California at Berkeley, has brought "Continental Classroom" nine major awards, including a Peabody Award for the best television education program. Telecast by 150 stations, it reaches an estimated daily audience of 400,000 including 15,000 teachers. Five thousand persons, most of them teachers, have been enrolled for credit with the 265 participating colleges and universities.

Ghost Plants in Packing Towns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter from Patrick E. Gorman, international secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, and an article entitled "Ghost Plants," written by Patrick E. Gorman and Thomas J. Lloyd, which appeared in the July 1959 issue of the Butcher Workman, official publication of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America.

AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS AND BUTCHER WORKMEN OF NORTH AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., July 17, 1959.

The Honorable MELVIN PRICE,
Member of Congress, the U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRICE: On behalf of our union, I want to call your attention to the enclosed article concerning the increasing plant shutdowns and unemployment in the meatpacking industry. Although there has been an upturn in employment in many other industries, job losses in meatpacking are increasing. For example, only recently Armour & Co. announced the closing of five more plants.

As the enclosed article indicates, the plant shutdowns are blasting the dreams of thousands of workers for a better standard of living and are threatening the economic life of dozens of communities. A remedy for these shutdowns must be effected.

We would appreciate hearing any comments you may have concerning the serious problem which we discuss in the article.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK E. GORMAN.

GHOST PLANTS IN PACKING TOWNS

(By Patrick E. Gorman and Thomas J. Lloyd)

The saddest sight on the American industrial scene is a closed factory or plant. From coast to coast these sad sights are increasing. These empty buildings look like, and actually are, job morgues. Thousands of workers' jobs were destroyed when the plants closed, and most of them are closed forever.

MORE THAN ITS SHARE

The meatpacking industry has had more than its share of these graveyard plants. It is doubtful if slaughtering or production will ever resume in them again. Packing towns are becoming ghost towns. Some say that mechanization is to some extent responsible. Others blame these sad sights upon poor management. Management, very erroneously, criticizes the unions for this unhappy situation. Whatever the cause, the tycoons in the packing industry should shed a tear over their inability to cope with an industrial situation which could, and should, be remedied, thus saving the jobs of thousands upon thousands of workers who need them.

It is hard to believe that Chicago, which was once the heart of the giant meat industry, is now but a shadow of its former stature. The Swift & Co. plants which normally employed nearly 10,000 workers in Chicago, now look deserted and forlorn. In all of the Swift operations in Chicago at present, there are but slightly more than 900 still enjoying production employment with this giant concern. The ghostly atmosphere hovering about the Armour plants in Chicago is equally as pathetic. No longer does Armour slaughter or kill hogs in this once powerful metropolis of meatpacking. Wilson & Co. long since has moved out of the "Windy City," lock, stock, and barrel.

If, perchance, bad labor relations did have something to do with the situation, then there is the consoling thought that our International Union in no manner is responsible. We are proud that we have lived up to our agreements faithfully with no quickie strikes or slowdowns permitted.

Chaos, sooner or later, had to develop because only recently the shelves of our retail stores were being abundantly stocked with canned meat products labeled, "Produce of Argentina." These Argentina products came from packing plants bearing the same name as several of the large meatpackers of the United States. Recently, by Government order, all this has been remedied, at least temporarily, because of the hoof and mouth disease among cattle which is raging rampant in some South American countries.

FOREIGN MEAT

We ask the wives of our members, the next time they go to the butcher shop, to look around. What will they see? Canned hams galore from Denmark, Holland, Sweden—in fact from all countries not operating directly behind the so-called Iron Curtain. Shipload after shipload of beef from our friends in Australia are finding their way into the markets of the United States, and strangely again the same powerful names in the American meatpacking industry are operating in the land "Down Under."

It is impossible for strictly American operated meatpackers to compete with the somewhat lower quality of beef from Australia. It is dumped on the open market cheaper per pound than the American packers can produce it. There is every likelihood that our American packers who have plants in South America and other foreign countries would like to bring in more of the products produced in these foreign lands. The reason—packingplant workers in the United States are employed under good union conditions. They benefit from the American standard of living. They receive wages and working conditions better than that which is received by workers in foreign lands. If the American market can be flooded with meat from foreign countries, production here will fall off badly. If this is accomplished our unions could therefore be weakened, and a harder bargain can be exacted at the conference table.

Certainly we are proud of the wage rates we have negotiated in years gone by for the men and women in the meatpacking industry, but it has been difficult for all workers to keep pace with the high prices of all commodities.

MORE GHOST PLANTS

Now comes more ghost plants in packing towns. Armour & Co. just recently announced the closing of six more of their plants. This giant in the meatpacking industry will then have but 1,000 people in all of its Chicago operations. The jobs of 9,000 formerly employed by Armour & Co. here are in job morgues, never, except by miracle, to be revived.

NO HELP NEEDED

Two thousand Chicago packinghouse workers in this latest Armour layoff will be

walking the streets going from employment gate to employment gate of industries in which they are not experienced, and the probability is that they will face the heartbreaking sign, "No help nedeed." Other Armour plants which will close, according to their statement, will be at Columbus, Ohio; East St. Louis, Ill. (with some 1,500 employees); Fargo, N. Dak.; Denver, Colo.; and Tifton, Ga. Previous to this announcement, Armour abandoned its plant at Atlanta, Ga. Armour may also abandon their plants in Kansas City and St. Joseph, Mo.—not only abandon them, but demolish them. If this is done, it is probable that they will build a new plant, to take the place of the two old plants, somewhere in between Kansas City and St. Joseph.

DREAMS DESTROYED

In the meantime, the ranks of the unemployed in the meatpacking industry, as a result of the closing of all these plants which should be operating, will look back upon these ghostly morgues with heavy hearts. These were the places in which they earned their livelihoods. From these plants, paying good wages, they had hoped they could send their children to college. Gone are the hopes that they could buy their own homes not too far away from packing town.

All of these dreams are vanishing because, as indicated, packing towns in most cities are becoming ghost towns.

It seems that there is a responsibility on the part of management and the unions in the industry to make more frequent use of the conference table; for each to lay their cards on the table and examine carefully all of the reasons why these sad sights of closed plants are multiplying. A remedy certainly can be found between management and the unions, and when the remedy is found both should pound hard upon the door of Uncle Sam with a demand that "We have a right to live too."

We have no quarrel with our worker friends in other countries. They too have their problems. But, it would seem to us Americans that the security of workers' jobs should begin at home. Other countries, where our Nation is giving a helping hand, have no unemployment problems. They have our open door here for their products, and in some countries of our foreign friends there actually is a shortage of workers instead of unemployment and closed plants as we witness here.

Sooner or later, there will have to be regulations. Why isn't it done before closed doors will appear on every industrial scene to a greater extent than what exists today? A body can give only so much blood to save another without dying itself. Such is quite true on the world political scene. It is about time for action, because really, it's later than you think.

Petition of the American Colonies to the King of England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I commented on my experience when I was in Canada to attend the dedication of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I said I heard the Prime Minister of Canada refer to an incident in American history with which I had not previously been familiar. It was an incident which had most important potentialities. I refer to a petition which was signed on July 8, 1775.

The first signature to the petition is that of John Hancock; and following his signature are the signatures of representatives of the colonies of New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island, and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, the counties of Newcastle, Kent, and Sussex, on the Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

The petition commences as follows:

To the KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY:

Most gracious sovereign, we, your Majesty's faithful subjects of the colonies of New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, the counties of New Castle, Kent, and Sussex, on Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, in behalf of ourselves, and the inhabitants of these colonies, who have deputed us to represent them in general Congress, entreat your Majesty's gracious attention to this our humble petition.

The union between our mother country and these colonies, and the energy of mild and just government, produced benefits so remarkably important, and afforded such an assurance of their permanency and increase, that the wonder and envy of other nations were excited, while they beheld Great Britain rising to a power the most extraordinary the world had ever known.

Mr. President, the petition is of such historic value that I believe it should be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It concludes as follows:

That Your Majesty may enjoy a long and prosperous reign, and that your descendants may govern your dominions with honor to themselves and happiness to their subjects, is our sincere and fervent prayer.

Mr. President, I repeat, the petition was called to my attention by Prime Minister Diefenbaker, in connection with a statement he made before a group of Canadians and Americans at a luncheon. The petition is of particular interest at this time when we are trying to have the Nations get together, for the petition is an instance of a similar attempt. If the attempt had been successful, the course of history might have been changed materially. However, we find that in that case some British Government official, who no doubt suffered from a big head, prevented the petition from reaching the King. It is most regrettable that at times we find in government today similar persons.

Mr. President, I send the petition to the desk, and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY:

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN, we your Majesty's faithful subjects of the colonies of new Hampshire, Massachusetts bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, the counties of New Castle, Kent, and Sussex, on Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, in behalf of ourselves, and the inhabitants of these colonies, who have deputed us to represent them in general Congress, entreat your Majesty's gracious attention to this our humble petition.

The union between our Mother country and these colonies, and the energy of mild and just government, produced benefits so remarkably important, and afforded such an assurance of their permanency and increase, that the wonder and envy of other Nations were excited, while they beheld Great Britain riseing to a power the most extraordinary the world had ever known.

Her rivals, observing that there was no probability of this happy connexion being broken by civil dissensions, and apprehending its future effects, if left any longer undisturbed, resolved to prevent her receiving such continual and formidable accessions of wealth and strength, by checking the growth of these settlements from which they were to be derived.

In the prosecution of this attempt, events so unfavourable to the design took place, that every friend to the interests of Great Britain and these colonies, entertained pleasing and reasonable expectations of seeing an additional force and extention[1] immediately given to the operations of the union hitherto experienced, by an enlargement of the dominions of the Crown, and the removal of ancient and warlike enemies to a greater distance.

At the conclusion, therefore, of the late war, the most glorious and advantageous that ever had been carried on by British arms, your loyal colonists having contributed to its success, by such repeated and strenuous exertions, as frequently procured them the distinguished approbation of your Majesty, of the late king, and of parliament, doubted not but that they should be permitted, with the rest of the empire, to share in the blessings of peace, and the emoluments of victory and conquest. While these recent and honorable acknowledgments of their merits remained on record in the journals and acts of that august legislature, the Parliament, undefaced by the imputation or even the suspicion of any offence, they were alarmed by a new system of statutes and regulations adopted for the administration of the colonies that filled their minds with the most painful fears and jealousies; and, to their inexpressible astonishment, perceived the dangers of a foreign quarrel quickly succeeded by domestic dangers, in their judgment, of a more dreadful kind.

Nor were their anxieties alleviated by any tendency in this system to promote the welfare of the Mother country. For tho' its effects were more immediately felt by them, yet its influence appeared to be injurious to the commerce and prosperity of Great Britain.

We shall decline the ungrateful task of describing the irksome variety of artifices, practised by many of your Majesty's Ministers, the delusive pretences, fruitless terrors, aand unavailing severities, that have, from time to time, been dealt out by them, in their attempts to execute this impolitic plan, or of traceing, thro' a series of years past, the progress of the unhappy differences between Great Britain and these colonies, which have flowed from this fatal source.

Your Majesty's Ministers, persevering in their measures, and proceeding to open hostilities for enforcing them, have compelled us to arm in our own defence, and have engaged us in a controversy so peculiarly abhorrent to the affections of your still faithful colonists, that when we consider whom we must oppose in this contest, and if ft continues, what may be the consequences, our own particular misfortunes are accounted by us only as parts of our distress.

[1] In the printed version this word is exertion.

Knowing to what violent resentments and incurable animosities, civil discords are apt to exasperate and inflame the contending parties, we think ourselves required by indispensable obligations to Almighty God, to your Majesty, to our fellow subjects, and to ourselves, immediately to use all the means in our power, not incompatible with our safety, for stopping the further effusion of blood, and for averting the impending calamities that threaten the British Empire.

Thus called upon to address your Majesty on affairs of such moment to America, and probably to all your dominions, we are earnestly desirous of performing this office, with the utmost deference for your Majesty; and we therefore pray, that your[1] royal magnanimity and benevolence may make the most favourable construction of our expressions on so uncommon an occasion. Could we represent in their full force, the sentiments that agitate the minds of us your dutiful subjects, we are persuaded your Majesty would ascribe any seeming deviation from reverence in our language, and even in our conduct, not to any reprehensible intention, but to the impossibility of reconciling the usual appearances of respect, with a just attention to our own preservation against those artful and cruel enemies, who abuse your royal confidence and authority, for the purpose of effecting our destruction.

Attached to your Majesty's person, family, and government, with all devotion that principle and affection can inspire, connected with Great Britain by the strongest ties that can unite societies, and deploring every event that tends in any degree to weaken them, we solemnly assure your Majesty, that we not only most ardently desire the former harmony between her and these colonies may be restored, but that a concord may be established between them upon so firm a basis as to perpetuate its blessings, uninterrupted by any future dissentions, to succeeding generations in both countries, and to transmit your Majesty's Name to posterity, adorned with that signal and lasting glory, that has attended the memory of those illustrious personages, whose virtues and abilities have extricated states from dangerous convulsions, and, by securing happiness to others, have erected the most noble and durable monuments to their own fame.

We beg leave further to assure your Majesty, that notwithstanding the sufferings of your loyal colonists, during the course of the present controversy, our breasts retain too tender a regard for the kingdom from which we derive our origin, to request such a reconciliation as might in any manner be inconsistent with her dignity or her welfare. These, related as we are to her, honor and duty, as well as inclination, induce us to support and advance; and the apprehensions that now oppress our hearts with unspeakable grief, being once removed, your Majesty will find your faithful subjects on this continent ready and willing at all times, as they ever have been, with their lives and fortunes, to assert and maintain the rights and interests of your Majesty, and of our Mother country.

We, therefore, beseech your Majesty, that your royal authority and influence may be graciously interposed to procure us relief from our afflicting fears and jealousies, occasioned by the system before mentioned, and to settle peace through every part of your dominions, with all humility submitting to your Majesty's wise consideration whether it may not be expedient for facilitating those important purposes, that your Majesty be pleased to direct some mode, by which the united applications of your faithful colonists to the throne, in pursuance of their common councils, may be improved into a happy and permanent reconciliation; and that, in the mean time, measures may be taken for preventing the further destruction of the lives of your Majesty's subjects; and that such statutes as more immediately distress any of your Majesty's colonies may be repealed.

For by such arrangements as your Majesty's wisdom can form, for collecting the united sense of your American people, we are convinced your Majesty would receive such satisfactory proofs of the disposition of the colonists towards their sovereign and parent state, that the wished for opportunity would soon be restored to them, of evincing the sincerity of their professions, by every testimony of devotion becoming the most dutiful subjects, and the most affectionate colonists.

That your Majesty may enjoy a long and prosperous reign, and that your descendants may govern your dominions with honor to themselves and happiness to their subjects, is our sincere and fervent prayer.

John Hancock; Colony of New Hampshire, John Langdon; Colony of Massachusetts Bay, Thomas Cushing, Sam Adams, John Adams, Robt. Treat Paine; Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Pantations, Step Hopkins, Sam Ward; Colony of Connecticut, Elipht Dyer, Roger Sherman, Silas Deane; Colony of New York, Phil. Livingston; Ja. Duane; John Alsop, Fran; Lewis, John Jay Robt., R. Livingston, jun., Lewis Morris, Wm. Floyd, Henry Wisner; New Jersey, Will Livingston, John D Hart, Richa Smith; Pennsylvania, John Dickinson; B. Franklin, Geo. Ross, James Wilson, Chas. Humphreys, Edw. Biddle; Counties of New Castle, Kent, and Sussex on Delawar, Caesar Rodney, Tho. McKean, Geo. Read; Maryland, Mat. Tilghman, Theo. Johnson, Jun., Wm. Paca, Samuel Chase, Tho. Stone; Colony of Virginia, P. Henry, Jr., Richard Henry Lee, Edmund Pendleton, Benj. Harrison, Th. Jefferson; North Carolina, Will Hooper, Joseph Hewes; South Carolina, Henry Middleton, Tho. Lynch, Christ Gadsden, J. Rutledge, Edward Rutledge.[2]

[1] The word Majesty's is here inserted in the printed version.

[2] Endorsed: "Petition of the Congress to the King. Sept. 1, 1775—delivered to the Earl of Dartmouth by Messrs. Penn and Lee." The text is taken from the original petition, reproduced in facsimile in Stevens's Facsimiles of Manuscripts in European Archives relating to America, No. 454.

Hunting of Wild Horses on Federal Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD today a statement delivered by Mrs. Velma B. Johnston before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on July 15, 1959, in behalf of my bill, H.R. 2725, to prohibit the inhumane hunting of wild horses and burros and the poisoning of their watering holes in the grazing areas of six or seven of our Western States.

As you know this bill has received the attention of the Nation and many of the Members have received from hundreds to thousands of letters from their constituents. I am placing it in the RECORD so that the Members as well as the Nation may have a chance to read this excellent and factual report from a person who has personally accumulated the documented evidence over the last 10 years.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on the Judiciary, the fight for the mustang has come a long way in the past few years.

From a room in the courthouse of the pioneers in Virginia City, Nev., where are recorded the history-making events of the fabulously wealthy Comstock lode that changed the fate of a nation, it has come to the Capitol of that Nation—some 2,200 miles as the crow flies. From a mere handful of 50 or so firm believers in his right for survival, it has come to an awareness throughout the country of his desperate plight, resulting in a mighty plea on his behalf. Surely there is merit in this effort, or these things would not be so.

Two points I must clarify for the record:

First. Throughout my many years of work in connection with efforts to obtain legislation that will not only protect, but will control these colorful byproducts of the settling of our western country—the mustang and the burro—I have used the situation as it exists in Nevada as the basis of my statements. It is by no means because I wish to point to Nevada as the only place where this flagrant abuse of these animals is carried on—but rather because I do not have the facilities to take in as much territory as do those opposing such legislative measures, and I have confined my statements to the area about which I know. The truckloads of horses brought from Wyoming, Idaho, and other States beyond the boundaries of Nevada would indicate that exploitation of the animals is as widespread elsewhere as it is in the State that is my home.

With this in mind, I shall continue to use Nevada as the location for the account that follows. Its area is 110,540 square miles, and its population was estimated in July 1956, at 247,000, most of which is centered in and around the cities of Reno, Las Vegas, Sparks, Elko, Ely, Carson City, Henderson, Fallon, Austin, and Winnemucca. Consequently, the State is made up principally of uninhabited areas, more than 80 percent of which are public domain lands. Because of the almost negligible precipitation, the land is arid, but cattle raising, and sheep raising are important industries. For each man, woman and child in the State, there is one-half square mile of land should he care to use it. For each mustang there are 20 square miles of land, and we would like for him to be able to use some of it; for, of the hundreds of thousands of these animals that once roamed the State, there are approximately 5,000 left.

Second I use the term "mustang" throughout my material as it is set out in Roget's Thesaurus: range horse, mustang, broomtail, cayuse (all chiefly western United States), and as it comes to us from the Spanish mesteno: belonging to the graziers, strayed, wild. I use the term "wild horse" simply to get away from the overuse of the word "mustang."

There was a time in the early history of Nevada, when the mustangs overran the ranges to the extent that they seriously jeopardized what limited grazing was available. Every mouthful of range grass was needed for the growing herds of cattle and sheep, and ranchers took matters into their own hands; thousands of mustangs were captured and killed, and the remainder of the wild horses were driven into the rocky and barren desert hills where they learned to eke out a living.

However, the actual turning point in the history of the wild horse came with the rise of the canned pet food business, and the demand for fresh horse meat sold in pet

shops. Once the big slaughter got underway, the wild horse was doomed—for now his extermination served two purposes: a vast amount of range clearance was accomplished, and his carcass provided cheap meat for the processors. With this in mind, professional hunters moved in, for it was a lucrative business. In the years immediately following the end of World War II, more than 100,000 of the animals were removed from the State. The old technique of rounding up horses with crews of hard-riding cowboys was too slow and too costly, so the airborne cowboy came into being. The mustangs are driven at breakneck speed by planes from their meager refuge in the rough and barren rimrock onto flatlands or dry lake beds, where the chase is taken up by hunters on fast-moving trucks and the mustangs are pursued to exhaustion. Sometimes they are burdened with heavy and terrifying devices which are attached to them by skillful ropers operating from the trucks. Sometimes they are driven into box canyons from which there is no escape—other times into fan-shaped trapping corrals, where the violent contact with the enclosing wires have caused serious and painful injuries occasionally resulting in death from loss of blood. The horses are sometimes tied and left where they lie until sufficient are driven in to begin loading operations. Sidelining is one method of tying—a front and hind foot are tied together, and when the horse fights, because he will fight his confinement savagely, the legs are ropeburned until there is no hide left on them. To load them, they are dragged up a ramp by saddle horses, in any position in which the mustang drags best. Colts are left behind because they do not weight enough to warrant their long haul to the processing centers. They have little chance of survival. The requirements of the market are simple: the animals must be ambulatory and in quantity. The suppliers are paid by the pound—thus the more horses, the more money. Crowded into trucks for the long haul, loaded without regard to size, fighting as they will for release from their confinement, casualties are numerous, and their condition reflects the roughness of their treatment.

I have gone over the methods of operation briefly, in order to save your time, but the eyewitness stories to the preceding statements can be found on pages 20 to 24 of "Mustang Presentation: Part I," which is furnished to you for your record. Also included are pictures which you have no doubt seen, that were taken on an actual roundup in northern Washoe County, Nev., in the fall of 1951. The circumstances under which the pictures were taken are interesting, in that the photographer, Gus Bundy, went along as a truckdriver in order to obtain them. In the truck with him, was a photographer for Life magazine, Bud Gourley, who also took many pictures. The magazine did not use the material, and its no doubt still in its files. From Mr. Bundy's negatives, numbering 150 to 200, the selections were made to present the proper sequence. It would be impossible to obtain current pictures, just as it would be impossible to obtain pictures of a criminal reenacting his crime for the benefit of a jury. Favorable changes would of course be made. However, the same men who have engaged in this dubious business through the years are the same ones still operating, and there is no reason to believe that they have changed so effective a method of capture, particularly in view of the condition of the horses that they capture.

Wide scale operations were carried on for a period of years, with the clearance of the Bureau of Land Management responsible for the regulation and use of the public lands. They have been carried on with their full knowledge—in spite of protests from individuals outraged at the practice—and as an official in the Reno, Nev., area pointed out: "This program was carried out without cost to the Government except some assistance in building holding corrals and truck trails when needed, and unclaimed horses were taken by the people operating the airplanes under title from the State and sold as compensation for their work." What the officials have failed to take into account, is the fact that the humane aspect has been completely disregarded, and the public would have much preferred to have had necessary range clearance carried on at a price, provided it had been properly supervised, humanely carried out, and intelligently planned. We have no quarrel with the land agencies responsible for our public lands insofar as controls are concerned—but we do vigorously object to the manner in which the clearance has been carried on and the manner in which controls are proposed.

The most crowded course in the world is the course of least resistance, and it would appear to me that when confronted with the problem of the mustang when it was a problem, this course has been consistently followed. This bad pattern, once established, has been difficult to change.

At the stormy meeting in Virginia City, Nev., in 1952 when the board of county commissioners took the first step that had yet been taken toward the abolishing of airplane and mechanized roundups by adopting a resolution prohibiting the practice within the boundaries of Storey County, a newspaper carried the story, and of great significance is their account of the battle: "Their adversaries are a group of sheepmen in Storey County who claim that the free and uninhibited movements are injurious to grazing land. Also subscribing to this outlook are commercial rendering works officials who believe it their right to conduct wild horse chases by airplane, and corral and transport the animals to the rendering works." Permission for the proposed roundup that touched off the violent opposition had already been granted by the Bureau of Land Management for that district.

The necessity for wide-scale range clearance operations is behind us now, and the one point upon which we are all possibly in agreement is that, except in widely remote instances, the mustangs are no longer a threat to the ranges. Private interests have again won in their demands for the monopolistic use of the ranges to the exclusion of everything not commercially profitable. Because so few of the animals are left, it is now that we should not only pass legislation for their protection, but plan for their control as well, so that there will never again be an excuse for the mass extermination programs as heretofore.

Today's wild horse is not the glamorous mustang of long ago—the fiercely proud, valiant and beautiful animal that roamed our Western country when this country was young. He is, for the most part, underfed, scrubby, and inbred. Since he has become the target for wholesale mechanized roundups, he has been driven almost from the face of the earth, and has had to split up into small bands, and live where forage is scarce. He has been pushed to environments where no horse should be able to endure, yet he has adapted to that environment and, with barely a fighting chance, has survived. His habitat is high in remote areas where other livestock does not run, and he comes down only when driven to by lack of feed and water. For this, he is pursued and captured.

In the past, the wild horse bands furnished virtually the only supply of animals for ranch use, and even in recent years, many of the ribbon winners in stock horse contests have come from mustang bunches. They respond rapidly to good care, and although they do not become very large, they do become efficient, handsome, hardy all-around useful animals. They are alert and intelligent, besides being fast and strong. Their adaption to their rigorous environment has given them the ability to fend for themselves on the open range during bitterly cold winters and hot dry summers. They can and do buck hard when the occasion warrants it, but they make good cow ponies or saddle horses when treated with kindness. One of our own fine saddle horses is out of a mustang mare that was bred to a blooded stallion. Besides his beauty and good disposition, he has a rugged hardiness that none of our others have had.

In the case for the mustang, much has been said as to the benefits they bring to the ranges, and those subscribing to this belief are as strong as those who take the opposite view. This phase is discussed at length in the detailed presentation, and this report is not for the purpose of establishing their potential benefit or their potential detriment to the ranges. I, personally, prefer to believe they are indeed the benefit that many declare they are.

I have discussed at length, with a man who has done considerable work in range management and research, this matter of what to do with the mustangs. He has suggested a plan which was submitted in the original material, and which I outline here:

That the horses be placed under the strict ownership and control of the Government, with skilled custodians to periodically dispose of the inferior animals by shooting. They must know horses thoroughly and be excellent marksmen to insure humane handling and treatment of the horses. He feels that in time, a fine specimen of horse will be the result, proving to be an outstanding asset to the country. With ample feed and water, and lack of harassment, a mustang will respond remarkably fast in appearance and disposition. When the herds are built up into the fine animals they once were, before their constant harassment and pursuit by the airplanes, upon application to the agency responsible for them, individuals may acquire them for their own use—periodically the custodians to round up a number of the horses from which the applicants may make their selections. He does not feel that they should be hunted by any individual whatsoever, except under strict supervision of the professional custodians of the herds, and they should be at all times under the complete control of the Government agency responsible for them. It is his opinion, also, that it will be a long time before their numbers will increase to the point where they will present any threat to the ranges. He submits this also, for inclusion in protective legislation for the mustangs, and I heartily endorse it: That the same regulations, protection and control be made to apply to the burros of the western ranges, and that any law include horses, mares, colts, and burros. The little burros, offspring of the early-day prospectors' faithful animals which were turned out into the hills when they were no longer of use, have been the victims of widespread abuse and wanton destruction in many of the Western States in recent years. A fine editorial has appeared in the July 1959 issue of Western Horseman magazine, and a plan along the lines suggested above has been offered therein.

Because they cannot be successfully kept in enclosed areas, they will naturally roam, and it is possible that there will be individuals who, for purely selfish, financial, or sadistic reasons, will take matters into their own hands and in their own way dispose of any trespasser on the ranges. We can only hope that those individuals will be in the minority, and in any event, the abolishing of the comparatively easy means of airplane and

other mechanized methods now employed will cut down the percentage against them.

To delude ourselves with the thought that all of this is past history and won't happen again, I have this to say: Even in the past few months when mustang fever has been raging at high temperatures throughout the United States, and in the face of strong public opinion, there have been innumerable roundups—possibly in an endeavor to get all of the animals possible before the practice is stopped. Another bloody chapter was written on February 28, 1959, a few miles from Reno, Nev. Twenty-five or more of the animals were rounded up by a professional horse hunter from Wyoming, together with some local operators, in a remote public range area upon which the grazing rights belong to a prominent cattle rancher. A witness to the handling of the animals reported that the cruelty was extreme. The operators were apprehended, but the sheriff released them because there had been a permit granted by the Bureau of Land Management to the cattle rancher to have the horses rounded up in the area, and the roundup took place on public lands. The horses were kept for several days in a corral for shipment out of Reno, and one of the men from the sheriff's office, and some individual witnesses, took pictures of them for me. These pictures are included in "Mustang Presentation: Part II," handed to you today, and some of the injuries to the animals are plainly visible. No treatment for the injuries was administered. Left in the area of approximately 200 square miles where the roundup occurred, were a stallion, a colt and the carcass of a horse that did not survive the rounding up process. Three other roundups were averted by individual intervention.

A report was recently made to me by a Sparks, Nev., woman, a Mrs. Clark, who, with her husband, frequently goes into an area in northeastern Nevada where fine herds of deer have ranged the year round, and where forage is abundant. There were wild horse bands in that area, too. These are her words regarding a trip into that region in the fall of 1957: "We found the deer so frightened that they took down into the bottom of draws and ran like scared rabbits. Fawns were very scarce and we watched for hours in the brush where they hid. Even a hawk flying over frightened them into panic. We sighted about six head of wild horses which were all we could find in the area, and watched them at the watering hole. They would hardly take long enough to drink, but would just get a few sips, then run." Mr. and Mrs. Clark went into nearby Montello to see if anyone knew the cause of these conditions, so different from previous visits there, and were informed that extensive horse planing had been going on. "We think the very noticeable lack of fawns is due to the does having been run and losing their young, or possibly the terrified scattering of the herds caused abandonment of the very young and they did not survive," she added.

Nevada's laws prohibit the pursuit, for the purposes of capturing or killing, of any wild, unbranded horse, mare, colt, or burro, by means of airborne or motorized vehicles. The prohibition does not apply to Federal lands for the simple reason that had we not agreed to that amendment to our measure, as originally introduced, the bill would likely not have come out of committee. We knew at the time that it would not accomplish that for which we were striving, but passage of State legislation would be a foot in the door, and we agreed, with the full intent of later taking the matter through channels that would prohibit the planing on public lands, as we are now doing.

There are maps available from which one can easily determine the boundaries of the public lands, but there are no such clear black and white delineations either in the air or on the ground. Conflicts arise as to whether planing has been done on State or privately owned lands where it is prohibited, or on Federal lands where it is not. The law also requires that the participants in roundups obtain the permission of the board of county commissioners in the county in which the roundup is to take place, including public rangelands. Commissioners, being elected officials, are dependent for the continuation of their political careers upon the votes of their constituents. It could easily happen that in counties where the interests of the greater part of the voters are best served by mustangs annihilation, the issuing of such permits would not meet with sufficient opposition as to warrant their being withheld. County lines, clearly shown upon a map, are not as clearly established in the field.

In addition to Storey County, I know at present of another particular section in Nevada where the county commissioners have so far held the line, in spite of being besieged by as many as a dozen applicants at a time for a permit to capture horses. We watch this situation closely, for in this area, safely remote unless hunted by airplanes which would not be prohibited because they are public lands, are some bands of wild horses that have, for many years, enjoyed the protection of the cattle interests who have held the grazing rights, and hunting of the horses has not been permitted by these interests. Following a change of ownership, no such vigilant watch is kept for marauders, and opportunists in the area are eager to run those wild horses. Should this be accomplished, and the animals indiscriminately disposed of, a very wonderful chapter in the history of the West will come to an end, and nothing can ever restore it. When the mechanized age came into its own and Wells Fargo discontinued the use of horses to draw its stagecoaches and freight wagons, it was in this area that their fine animals were turned loose, and the horses in those bands today are descendants of the Wells Fargo horses. Yet their fate is dependent upon so fragile a thread as the outcome of an election which could easily put into office a county commissioner who might not be disposed in their favor.

It is not fair to these officials to place upon them the burden of decision between State and Federal jurisdiction—or local "for" or "against" factions. There aren't enough of the horses left to warrant open season on them and there is no margin of safety in the situation as it is.

The Department of the Interior has no objection to the enactment of H.R. 2725 which is proposed "to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the use of aircraft or motor vehicles to hunt certain wild horses or burros on land belonging to the United States, and for other purposes; provided the following amendment is added:

"*Provided*, That the aforesaid activities may be permitted, for purposes of carrying out Federal responsibilities, by the particular Federal land management agency responsible for management of the said public land or ranges, or such Federal agency may authorize such activities in accordance with the terms and conditions of permits issued by such agency."

Should this amendment be added to the proposed legislation, not only would the Federal land agencies be carrying on their monopolistic control of the public lands under the authority of the Taylor Grazing Act, but they would be strengthened in their position by an act of Congress, and we can not let this happen.

The Department is on record as opposing any form of cruelty, poisoning or indiscriminate slaughter of the animals and advances the opinion that the current problem arises from so-called bootleg horse gathering operations. In the first place, the legislation is not aimed solely at the bootleg operations which have played a large part in this problem. Its purpose is to stop the hunting and capture of the animals by airplane and trucks by anyone, for the numbers of the animals are so small that no longer is there any reason for the mass capture of them as has been done in the past. By removing this comparatively easy method of capture, we feel it will no longer be worth the while of the professional hunters to operate, either for themselves, for individual ranchers, or for the Government, for it has been the practice of the land management agencies which may not be equipped to carry on the operations within their own personnel to turn over the actual rounding up to private professional operators.

It may be possible for humane rounding up of the horses to be accomplished by plane, as the report states, but there has been no evidence of it in the roundups to our knowledge. Certainly the appearance of the animals after their so-called humane capture would indicate otherwise. As for proper supervision to which the Department report refers, when is it done, and by whom? We submit, for your consideration, our feelings on this matter, contained in a letter to Mr. E. J. Palmer, Supervisor, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Reno, Nev., under date of April 28, 1959:

"My colleagues do not believe that humane herding of the horses and burros can be done by aircraft or mechanized vehicles. We also feel that if they are in such rugged terrain as to preclude the possibility of horseback roundups, then surely that terrain is not usable as range for cattle and sheep. Also, running of mares with young colts, or mares in foal, no matter how carefully it is done, can result in injury or death to the animals, and from a plane is is impossible to cut out particular ones in rounding up a band." The foregoing was in response to a request by the local district supervisor to consider the addition of an amendment similar to the one proposed by the Department of the Interior.

In its report, the Department is concerned that because of the vast areas of rugged public domain land, the enactment of our legislation might leave room for doubt as to the intent of a Federal agency in employing aircraft for other necessary functions. From our standpoint, the same rugged public domain land, sparsely settled and tremendously vast, precludes the possibility of proper policing and oftentimes a roundup is not known until the horses are captured. H.R. 2725 does not prohibit the use of airplanes or airborne equipment for spotting or for any of the other uses to which they are put by the Department that are stated in the report, but specifically refers to horses, mares, colts, or burros, and the rounding up of them by airplane or mechanized vehicles for the purpose of capturing or killing. It is elementary to assume that a plane flying low, with a band of horses running closely grouped on the ground ahead of it, is not scouting fires, patrolling the range, establishing trespass, etc. It is the nature of the wild horses to seek refuge from these planes, and they will scatter in many directions, or attempt to hide in the sparse foliage that dots the Nevada hills. It is because of this characteristic that a shotgun is usually carried in the plane and frequently used to flush the horses from hiding and to keep them bunched and running in the right direction. It is commendable that humane treatment of animals is consistently required by the Bureau of Land Management, and it is right they should require it. There again, because of the vastness of the operation, and the great distance from the source of the requirements, inhumane treatment more often results than not. Remember, these

men are operating on the basis of the more horses, the more money from the processors.

It is the opinion of the Department of the Interior, as expressed in its report to this committee, that there is little danger that either the wild horses or burros will be exterminated. We take exception to the statement on the grounds that not only has the actual removal of the horses from the ranges through capture and slaughter caused extensive reductions in their numbers, but those managing to elude their pursuers have been driven into ever more remote areas where feed and water is almost nonexistant resulting in the drastic weakening of the strain and the failure of many to survive in the barren areas. It would not take long, under these conditions, for the animals to become extinct through starvation and exposure to the extremely rigorous conditions under which they are obliged to exist.

The administration of the public lands is a big job, and it is not our desire to make it a more difficult one. The ranges are in bad shape, but I do not accept any inference that their condition in recent years is due to the so-called depredations of the wild ones. It is my observation and opinion that these conditions have been brought about by the misuse and abuse of these public lands by those owners of domestic stock who have consistently overgrazed the sparse forage, and by the agencies whose responsibility it is to prevent this overgrazing, but which have somehow been unable to do so.

I can appreciate the Department's anxiety, but I wish to point out that only controls are required now, and those in a few specific locations. The Department has never tried carrying these controls out without the use of planes—so how can it be so sure there is no other way than through the use of them. Prior operations were for range clearance, and that seems to have been accomplished insofar as the mustangs are concerned. The past record of atrocities and brutalities is not conducive to any favorable consideration of methods to continue along the same lines. The fact remains that in this area, at least, Government-authorized operations have been carried on by the same outside personnel that has carried on roundups for individual exploitation, and the same brutal pattern of operation has been followed. We cannot let this continue, and nothing has been offered to guarantee that it would be changed. For the record, our objections to any amendment to H.R. 2725 along the lines suggested in the report are emphatically registered.

Respectfully submitted.

(Mrs.) VELMA B. JOHNSTON.

Statement by the Honorable John C. Dreier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement by the Honorable John C. Dreier, U.S. representative at the meeting of the Council of the Organization of American States, on the Dominican request for invocation of the Rio Treaty on July 10, 1959, as released by the State Department on that date.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JOHN C. DREIER, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, AT THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, ON THE DOMINICAN REQUEST FOR INVOCATION OF THE RIO TREATY JULY 10, 1959

Mr. Chairman, the Council is now for the third time in the last 3 months considering a situation involving a threat to the peace in the Caribbean area.

Last April, the Council was asked by the Government of Panama to invoke the Rio Treaty and send an investigating committee to that country because of an invasion of its territory by an armed force, consisting largely of Cubans, which had come from Cuba with the evident purpose of overthrowing the Government of Panama. The Government of Cuba took immediate measures to cooperate with the Government of Panama in this matter. Prompt action by the OAS was instrumental in resolving this problem in accordance with inter-American principles.

It was the hope of many members of the Council, including the representative of the United States, that the effective opposition of the Organization of American States to armed intervention of this kind would serve to discourage further efforts of that sort.

However, forces apparently exist in the Caribbean area that are determined to promote and assist revolutionary activities in other countries in violation of the principles of the Havana Convention in 1928 on the Duties and Rights of States in the Event of Civil Strife. On June 3, the Government of Nicaragua reported that its territory had been invaded by armed forces coming from another country with the purpose of overthrowing the Government of Nicaragua and that further invasions were threatened. The Nicaraguan Government requested the invocation of the Rio Treaty with a view to mainaining peace and security in the area. Again the Council responded favorably and took the steps which in the light of circumstances, seemed wise in order to carry out its responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security.

The case of Nicaragua is still before the Council acting provisionally as Organ of Consultation. The report of the Information Committee established by the Council indicates that in addition to the first two attacks on Nicaragua, at least 3 additional armed expeditions were organized with a view to entering that country. Recent information concerns a force of men which flew to Honduras a short time ago for the purpose of invading Nicaragua by its northern frontier.

At its last two meetings on July 2 and 6, the Council received further evidence that the situation in the Caribbean far from being improved as a result of the action of the Organization of American States with respect to the cases of Panama and Nicaragua had deteriorated further. The representative of the Dominican Republic charged that two invasions of his country were organized, trained, and equipped in territory of the Republic of Cuba from which they departed with the evident purpose of starting and promoting civil war in the Dominican Republic. The Dominican representative has also charged that large contingents are now being trained in Cuba for the purpose of initiating new invasions. This Council has received most categorical assurances from the Minister of State of Cuba that the charges contained in the Dominican note are without foundation.

At the same time, the representative of Cuba has expressed the view that it is his country which is suffering a threat of attack from the Dominican Republic rather than vice versa, although the Government of Cuba has not requested any assistance from the Organization of American States. The representative of Venezuela, likewise rejecting the charges made by the Dominican Republic, has also expressed his concern over the propaganda attacks from Dominican sources against the Government of Venezuela, its president, and Venezuela institutions.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Government of Haiti has informed the Council of its great concern over the growing tension in the Caribbean area which it feels constitutes a serious danger to its peace and tranquillity.

It became evident to my government some time ago, and particularly in the development of the Nicaraguan case, that the Organization of American States was faced with a very large and widespread problem with regard to the maintenance of peace and security in the Caribbean area. In many countries of the area, there are exiles seeking to overthrow the governments of their own countries. They have sought, and in many cases, have obtained, support from elements in various other countries.

In many cases, these exiles are motivated by high ideals of democracy and justice. Many of them are concerned only with what they consider to be the interests of their own countries. However, it is equally clear that some of those responsible for these revolutionary movements organized in foreign countries have either knowingly or unknowingly become associated with political elements whose interests are far removed from those of any government represented around this table. To put it in simple terms, Communists have attempted, and with some success, to infiltrate those revolutionary movements in accordance with their well-established policy of taking advantage of any sort of disturbance and unrest to promote their own sinister designs.

Under these circumstances, it has seemed to my Government that the consideration of individual controversies or conflicts between one government and another—or, as has been the case, between one government and unnamed attackers—constitutes a futile approach to the solution of a serious problem. My Government has therefore for some time considered the desirability of suggesting a meeting of Foreign Ministers under the Charter of the OAS to consider the whole problem of the current tensions of the Caribbean and how the American governments, cooperating through the Organization of American States, may restore peace and security, confidence and friendly relations among the sister republics of this important area. The United States has concluded that the time has come to proceed with an overall study of this kind. We have, therefore, been happy to join with the Governments of Brazil, Chile and Peru in proposing at this time that a Meeting of Consultation of Minister of Foreign Affairs be called under the Charter.

The purpose of the meeting of Foreign Ministers, as my Government sees it, would be to examine the present situation of the Caribbean on a broad front. The objective would not be to air or judge charges by one country against another. The task before the Foreign Ministers would rather be to review the reports and statements which have been made available to the governments and to the Organization of American States on the general subject of tensions in this area, to examine the cause thereof, and to suggest courses of action that will revitalize the principles on which the Organization of American States is based, principles which we know are essential to any system of cooperative international relations in this hemisphere.

It is evident, Mr. Chairman, that basic principles of the Organization of American States are indeed jeopardized by the present situation. One of these principles is that of nonintervention in the internal affairs of other states. The active participation of foreign elements in efforts to over-

throw the governments of states in this area constitutes a definite threat to that principle. If it is permitted to be violated in the present situation, it will be violated increasingly in the future. The foundation of our structure will then quickly crumble.

Another principle affected here is that of collective security as set forth in the clear terms of the Rio Treaty and the Charter of the Organization. The OAS has developed a system without parallel elsewhere in the world for guaranteeing the security of states against aggression. This system applies equally to all members of the Organization. My Government believes that the inter-American system of peace and security, which is flexible enough and broad enough to meet virtually any type of situation that affects the security of a member state and the peace of the continent, must at all times be supported and made effective if our inter-American relationship is to endure.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, there is a matter of deep principle affecting the Caribbean situation which has to do with the desire of people of this hemisphere for an increasingly effective exercise of representative democracy. My Government believes deeply that political democracy is the most desirable form of government for people who wish to live in freedom and dignity. We fully share the desires of those people who wish to see the exercise of democracy made more effective.

The development of democratic institutions is no simple matter, however. Revolutions against authoritarian rule do not necessarily result in perfect democracy. The achievement of effective democracy depends upon many factors of cultural, historical, economic nature which are brought together in the political complex of any given state. Above all, democracy is a benefit that every people must win for itself.

Moreover, my Government is convinced that the maintenance of international peace and security under a system of justice and law is essential to the growth of democracy in this hemisphere. We cannot conceive of democracy flourishing in an area where states are subjected to constant tension requiring the unproductive diversion of human and economic resources to military ends. It therefore seems to us that democratic progress which all of us seek requires among other factors a strict compliance with those very principles of nonintervention and collective security to which I have referred.

There are indeed other ways in which the Organization of American States can and should encourage political and democratic development. My Government believes that this problem should be frankly and squarely faced by the Organization of American States at the proposed meeting of Foreign Ministers on the Caribbean problem. We are prepared to discuss any proposals which the other member states of the Organization believe to be worthy of consideration within the principles and procedures of the Charter of the Organization.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the foregoing considerations, it is clear that my Government favors at this time the prompt approval of a resolution calling for a meeting of Foreign Ministers under the Charter of the OAS to consider in broad terms, and in the light of inter-American principles, the present serious situation in the entire Caribbean area. My delegation recommends, therefore, that the resolution that has been presented by the Governments of Brazil, Chile, Peru, and the United States be approved. The United States firmly believes that the holding of a meeting of Foreign Ministers at this stage offers the most effective and constructive approach to the serious problem of the Caribbean and the most desirable way of revitalizing and strengthening the principles of the Organization of American States.

Who Wants Farm Subsidies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Cotton Comments is a little bulletin published regularly by Robert Moore & Co. and edited by William C. Hope. The July 17 issue was dedicated to the matter of farm subsidies. It posed a basic question as follows:

WHO WANTS HIGH PRICE SUPPORTS?

With the Government sinking deeper and deeper into debt through its support of farm commodities; with the CCC surpluses expected to reach the astronomical figure of $13 billion through the influx of price-supported commodities from 1959 crops, and with Congress marking time in writing practical farm legislation, the above question elicits deep thinking on the part of every U.S. taxpayer.

After having made an exhaustive study of the subject, we believe the question can be answered as follows: he consumer does not want them because he has, at last, become alerted—through an effective editorial crusade that is spreading throughout the Nation—that these supports promote inflation and are primarily responsible for his paying more for farm produce in the marketplace, while, at the same time, being taxed heavily in order that farmers can be subsidized. During the past, astute and power-seeking politicians have led the consumer to believe that his food and clothing costs have skyrocketed due to unscrupulous middlemen. Such, however, is not the whole case because there is a built-in high first cost stemming from the effect of high price supports; this is before a middleman ever touches the commodities. This artificial first cost for food and fiber items robs consumers of their hard-earned dollars under the guise that it is necessary for a dynamic farm economy. Food and clothing take a big chunk out of every family's budget and any increase in these items means a lower standard of living for the average family, depriving it of many pleasures and comforts that it could otherwise have.

The administration does not want them. Ever since President Eisenhower took over the reins of Government in 1952, both he and Secretary Benson, who took office at the same time, have consistently fought against high support laws but they have been repeatedly rebuffed by Congress, which has followed the lead of a few so-called farm experts in its membership who have been interested primarily in perpetuating themselves in their political positions. The good men in Congress have complacently voted laws recommended by these so-called experts without ascertaining for themselves the actual damage these laws have been inflicting upon our citizenry and the Government's fiscal structure. Furthermore our voting populace are also at fault in that they have not elected men to Congress that are interested in a continuation of the free enterprise system that is the precious heritage of our forebears.

Secretary Benson has stated: "Edmund Burke once said, 'All that is necessary for the forces of evil to win in the world is for enough good men to do nothing.' Make no mistake, the pillars of our economic system are being threatened today. They are being threatened by a strange and unlikely coalition of do-gooders, self-servers and subversives. The kind of thinking we must embrace is the kind which believes in the free enterprise system, which values freedom, which accepts responsibility, which believes in the individual, and which resists the steady encroachment of an all-powerful Central Government. We have appled that kind of thinking to agriculture."

Secretary Benson has repeatedly called for a program that would take Government out of agriculture and has steadfastly promulgated and stood by the following, known as his four freedoms for farmers: "(1) More freedom to plant—so that farms can be run more efficiently; (2) more freedom to market—so that farm incomes can be increased; (3) more freedom to meet competition—so his four freedoms for farmers: "(1) more freedom from Government interference—so that farmers can again be independent and self-reliant." He has stressed the fact that farmers want Government at their side, not on their backs. The biggest threat we have today to our private marketing system is Government itself. We are permitting Government to become the dominant force in our economy when, in reality, it should play a secondary role. The free marketing system will be in danger if Government price manipulation continues to grow. Through its pricing and sales programs, Government can shrink or expand consumption. It can squeeze consumers out of the market or bring new consumers in."

President Eisenhower has given his unqualified approval to Secretary Benson's every word and action during their entire tenure of office and is reported to have said: "Ezra Benson will go down in history as one of the best Secretaries of Agriculture the Nation has ever had." There is no doubt of the fact that we would not presently be confronted with unmanageable surpluses if more people, both in and out of Congress, had heeded his advice when he took office back in 1952.

The farmer does not want them. A recent survey by the Farm Journal indicated that 78 percent of the farmers who answered believe that present farm price supports are too high, while some 55 percent said they thought the Federal Government should get out of the agriculture business entirely. Highlighting the fact that farmers are disgusted with governmental controls is furnished by the national cotton referendum held in December 1958 for the purpose of establishing quotas on the 1959 cotton crop. Out of 955,000 cottongrowers eligible to vote, only 275,000—or a mere 29 percent—exercised their franchise. Of those who did vote, 92 percent approved quotas, but this 92 percent represented only 26 percent of the total of 955,000 eligible voters. The fact that 680,000 eligible voters did not bother to vote at all readily indicates that a great majority of cotton farmers are lackadaisical about going to the polls, like so many other U.S. citizens. Chances are they are disgruntled with Government controls but do nothing positive to throw off these shackles, while allowing about one-fourth of their number to set the pattern for their participation under our price-control laws. Furthermore, could it be that the one-fourth who did vote in favor of quotas were herded to the polls by selfish interests? When the price-support program got underway in earnest back in 1938, there was a total of 2.3 million cotton farmers who were eligible to vote, with 66 percent voting and 61 percent registering a vote in favor of quotas.

The taxpayers do not want them. They are underwriting our agricultural program to the tune of about $7 billion annually, the third highest item in our Federal budget, being exceeded only by defense costs and interest on our sky-high national debt. However, as mentioned above, our taxpayers are just now becoming alerted to this vicious taxation by an alert and crusading national press.

The question is: Who, then, wants high-price supports? Is it not high income that is wanted?

ROBERT MOORE & CO.,
WM. C. HOPE.

International Lending Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following article from Banking magazine will be of interest to the Congress and the country.

INTERNATIONAL LENDING AGENCIES—OUT-OF-POCKET AND OUT-OF-HAND?

(By Herbert Bratter)

(Everybody likes a bargain. The "little guy" often feels he has a size-given right to get the better of a bargain with a "big guy"—a process that sooner or later cuts the "big guy" down to "little guy" size if he lets it gets out of hand. This situation rears its head in the international bank and lending agency situation, where the "little guy" borrower shops the market of "big guy" lending agencies—and comes home with hard cash in soft terms. What this means in terms of U.S. dollars follows.)

If you happen to be a Filipino operating a small industrial establishment and needing some equipment, materials, or services for which you have been unable to save the capital, you can get the money from Uncle Sam in the form of a dollar loan on easy terms, repayable in pesos over the years. The interest rate will not only be far below prevailing Philippine rates, but considerably less than the U.S. Treasury itself has to pay for long-term money.

If you are a Chinese in the shipbuilding business in Taiwan, you may borrow several million dollars from American banks, with the U.S. Government guaranteeing the loan, for a fee of 2 percent a year.

If you are an Iranian official with a road project in mind, a partner in a Guatemalan kenaf bag factory, a Dutchman wishing to emigrate from overcrowded Holland to spacious Australia, a Somalian engaged in fishing, the manager of a Ceylonese suburban railway, the mayor of Karachi wanting to install water and sewage facilities, Congress has made it possible for you to get the money you want from the Development Loan Fund. You will get the loan in dollars which you are free to spend anywhere in the free world for equipment or services; and you may pay it off gradually in your own currency, however soft it may be.

This new U.S. Government bank, the Development Loan Fund, provided for in the Mutual Security Act of 1957, began operations in 1958 and has already managed to get rid of some $700 million of U.S. taxpayers' money. Since the launching of this Washington financial bargain basement through January this year the DLF, according to one of its press releases, "had formally been presented with loan proposals totaling over $2.8 billion." This figure, the release omitted to mention, was achieved with the help of the active solicitation of U.S. official missions abroad, inspired by dispatches from the State Department on DLF's behalf.

While Congress ponders the DLF's request for another $700 million installment for dissemination in the vast underdeveloped nations of the non-Communist world, including Yugoslavia, which is considered to be "outside the bloc," the staff of the National Advisory Council under the direction of Secretary of the Treasury Anderson is busily preparing a brief to justify congressional investment in yet another billion dollar or bigger development bank, the International Development Association (the IDA). At the same time, in keeping with an administration promise to the Latin Americans, the President already has submitted for congressional approval the project for a billion-dollar (initially) mixed hard and soft currency institution to be called the Inter-American Bank.

The IDA, which has the blessing not only of the administration but also of Eugene Black, president of the World Bank, would be a subsidiary of that international lending agency. It is to be created by the nations which are members of the $10-billion World Bank and, as its name indicates, will operate to help the underdeveloped countries among its membership. The project gets its steam from the theory that, if IDA is not created, pressure in U.N. will be irresistible to set up the long-clamored-for SUNFED, the Special U.N. Fund for Economic Development. SUNFED, being U.N.-created, would include the U.S.S.R. in its board of directors. Mr. Black's reasoning seems to be that, if there is going to be some such body anyway, it will be better that it be subsidiary of the World Bank—as is the International Finance Corporation (IFC)—than to have a direct offspring of the U.N.

INTER-AMERICAN BANK

An Inter-American Development Bank has been proposed intermittently since 1889, and is evidently viewed by Latin Americans as another soft source of hard capital. Provisions for replenishment of the latter will be contained in the IADB's charter. It, too, will have a built-in bargain basement, called Fund for Special Operations, loans from which may be partially or wholly repayable in the borrower's local currency. Forty-five percent of the IADB's initial $1 billion is to be put up by Uncle Sam. But the Latin American countries are saying that they, of course, insist that the new IADB's management and operations not be subject to U.S. control.

We already have, of course, the 25-year-old Export-Import Bank, now a $7 billion bank, all of whose loans carry the going interest rate and all of which are repayable in dollars. Its capital was increased by $2 billion in 1958. Even though it was created to operate in areas and on projects in which private bank credit feared to tread, the EIB's repayment record has been excellent. Being a U.S. Government institution, it is bound to take political considerations into account in its operations; so that this institution, now under the presidency of Sam Waugh, formerly a commercial banker, endeavors to make loans which are not only self-sustaining but which will add to the overall dollar-earning capacity of its borrowers.

The operations of the World Bank—the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—are in general similar in this respect to those of the Eximbank. The IBRD's loans are made in hard currencies and are expected to be repaid in the same or equivalent coin. And still they are designed to strengthen the economies of the borrowers. Unlike the Eximbank, much of the IBRD's resources for lending are obtained by the flotation of bond issues. IBRD may spend the proceeds of its loans wherever it seems best, whereas the Eximbank loans are in effect tied for the benefit of U.S. exports of goods and services. Eximbank always has been much more directly interested in exports than in imports, although it must be recognized that, if Eximbank's loans actually do serve to augment ultimately the dollar-earning capacity of the borrowers, ipso facto U.S. imports of merchandise ultimately are increased due to the Bank's activity.

The tendency of Eximbank to tie its loans to exports of U.S. goods is evident in the bank's press releases and in its testimony before Congress. This relationship between its loans and U.S. exports is something Congressmen can readily see and appreciate. When the Congress in its wisdom also created the DLF and agreed to U.S. membership in the World Bank and International Monetary Fund—the Bretton Woods institutions which are now in process of 100 percent expansion with Congressional assent—it evidenced less concern with their immediate effect on U.S. exports. The motivating force at the time of Bretton Woods was less selfish and more in the spirit of helping the world recover from the war and develop. Even so, it may be pointed out that dollars lent by such a bank as the DLF while initially spent, let us say, in Europe or Japan, ultimately will be returned by some recipient to this country either for the purchase of goods and services, for gold, or for investment here. At some time these dollars come home to roost, even though the DLF loan is repaid in local currency.

EXIMBANK'S POTENTIAL COMPETITORS

This economic fact, however, can be of small consolation to the Eximbank as it sees the current multiplication of U.S. and international banking projects. The existing DLF and the projected IADB and IDA, mentioned above, loom as competitors of the Eximbank. Potential borrowers from these new institutions will have the opportunity to play off one lender against the others, as indeed has happened in the past in cases where applicants approached both the IBRD and the Eximbank. More recently it has been happening in the case of the DLF. Borrowers who ordinarily would bring their loan applications to Eximbank at 5¼ percent (and now 6 percent) have been getting money at 3½ percent from DLF with no "strings" attached. All DLF loan applications must by law be first tendered to Eximbank. Only when turned down by EIB, for reasons it considers good and sufficient, may the DLF make the loan, regardless of those reasons.

Thus, when Yugoslavia wanted a $22,500,000 U.S. loan to equip a fertilizer plant with machinery purchased in Europe, Eximbank by reason of the place of purchase, turned down the application, but DLF lent the dollars. When Eximbank turned down Spain's request for a $22,600,000 railway and irrigation loan on the grounds that Spain's dollar-repaying capacity was exhausted, the applicant, unperturbed, got the money down the street at DLF, evidently without the necessity of being able to repay in dollars.

Iran, already the possessor of $53 million EIB line of credit, sought another $279 million in Washington earlier this year, for roads, water and power, street paving, and slaughterhouses. It contacted the EIB, the DLF, and the IBRD. In the end it favored the DLF with the borrowing of $47,500,000 at 3½ percent interest—instead of the 5 percent and 5½ percent it already was paying on its earlier EIB loans. With these low-cost DLF millions, Iran is now buying low-cost equipment outside the United States.

Several applications of other countries to the United States have in effect stipulated that what is wanted is financial help from DLF, not EIB, because of: (a) the lower interest rate; (b) the longer terms; (c) the possibility of servicing the debt in local currencies; and (d) the freedom to spend the borrowed dollars anywhere in the world.

LOANS ABROAD, GIVEAWAYS

The road traveled by American Government foreign aid since the wartime days of lend lease and postwar relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction has led to the DLF of today and brought us to the threshold of such new ventures as the IADB and IDA. Loans of Government money abroad, repayable in what someone has called "soap-wrapper money, are a thinly disguised form of giveaway. Even the loans of the Eximbank and World Bank repayable in dollars have been motivated primarily by a desire to aid the world. The economic problem posed by their repayment promises to be substantial, even with alleviation of the debt burden by the dollar's creeping shrinkage. If the United States should materially diminish its annual additions to the world pool of dollars in the form of foreign aid because of increasing American concern over imports and the declining competitive power of U.S. industry, our official banks may show signs of placing some limit to the amount of sound loans they can extend abroad.

Loss of Treasury Gold Since Early 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Walter E. Spahr. Although he is executive vice president of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy the views expressed are his own and do not commit any of the other members of that committee. Mr. Spahr is also professor emeritus of economics of New York University. The article appeared in the July-August 1959 issue of American Opinion.

LOSS OF TREASURY GOLD SINCE EARLY 1958

(By Walter E. Spahr)

Withdrawals since February 19, 1958: Foreign withdrawals of Treasury gold, which have been attracting considerable attention, began during the week following February 19, 1958. On that date Treasury gold stood at $22,785 million. For the week ending December 31, 1958, the Treasury's gold was down to $20,526 million, a decline of $2,259 million in 45 weeks. For the week ending May 13, 1959, the Treasury's stock was $20,251 million, down $2,534 million during the 64 weeks since February 19, 1958.

No net exportation of gold; an increase in earmarking: There has not been any net exportation of gold during this period; each month February 1958–March 1959 (latest data available) has shown a net importation of gold—$234,600,000 for that period.

Gold earmarked for foreign and international accounts increased $2,594,300,000, February 1958, to March 1959, inclusive, standing at $8,664,300,000 on March 31, 1959—an alltime high level. Gold held under earmark for foreign account (at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York) is not included in the gold stock of the United States. Earmarked gold can arise either from withdrawals of Treasury stock by foreign central banks and governments or by certain international financial institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund; or from gold exportations to the United States with instructions that it go into the earmarked fund.

Comparison with past withdrawals: The withdrawal of $2,534 million, during the 64 weeks since February 19, 1958, amounts to approximately 11 percent of the $22,785 million of total gold stock for the week ending on that date. That is a relatively heavy percentage of withdrawal as compared with above average withdrawals in preceding years or periods. The withdrawal for the year 1958 ($2,259 million) was approximately 9.9 percent of Treasury stock for the week ending February 19, 1958, and approximately the same percentage if computed against total gold stock at the end of the year plus gold withdrawn. (Total gold stock is slightly larger than Treasury stock.) The preceding relatively heavy percentages of withdrawals (exports and earmarking), based upon total gold stock remaining at the end of the year plus gold withdrawn, were 7 in 1950; 6.7 in 1928; 6 in 1944; 5.5 in 1933. The average of the yearly withdrawals for the 36 years, 1922–57, was 1.3 percent. During 23 of these 36 years, there were additions to the Nation's (or Treasury) gold stock.

Ratios of Treasury gold stock to nongold money and deposits: The ratio of our Treasury gold stock to all our nongold money and bank deposits stood at 7.85 percent on March 25, 1959. This compares with 10.4 in January, 1953; 9.6 average for 1933, the first year we were off the gold standard; 8.6 average for the period 1915–32, a gold standard period following the creation of the Federal Reserve System, during which the range for the yearly averages was from 6.7 to 10.9 percent. The highest ratio was 24.6 in 1941.

Foreign short-term dollar claims on our gold: As of February 28, 1959, total foreign short-term dollar claims stood at $16,606 million, the peak in our history. Of these only official claims ($8,746 million) and those of international institutions ($1,541 million) are directly convertible into dollars—a total of $10,287 million as of February 28, 1959. Foreign gold withdrawals in 1958 amounted to 14.6 percent of the average monthly total foreign short-term dollar claims of that year ($15,520,330,000) or 12.3 percent of those claims at the end of the year plus gold withdrawals for the year.

Those foreign short-term dollar liabilities are potential claims on our Treasury gold stock of which only a relatively small percentage is in general ever exercised. For the 36 years, 1922–57, the average percentage of gold withdrawn amounted to 3.5 percent of foreign short-term dollar claims at the end of each year plus the gold withdrawals for the respective years. The range in yearly ratios of gold withdrawals to foreign short-term claims, so computed, for the years 1922–57, was from zero, which occurred in 23 of the 36 years to 37.1 percent in 1933. This 37.1 percent requires interpretation. In that year, foreign short-term dollar balances were at the lowest level for any of the years 1922–58—$892 million (end of year). That 37.1 percent withdrawal involved only 5.5 percent of our total gold stock for the same year. The withdrawal of gold in 1958 amounted to 12.3 percent of total foreign short-term dollar claims at the end of that year plus gold withdrawals for the year and involved 9.9 percent of our Treasury gold stock at the end of the year plus gold withdrawals for the year.

Thus we have 12.3 percent of claims exercised and 9.9 percent of gold stock withdrawn in 1958 as compared with an average of 3.5 percent of claims exercised and 1.3 percent of gold withdrawn during the period 1922–57.

The comparison involved is therefore unusually unfavorable to the year 1958 as compared with the period 1922–57. There are valid grounds for concern regarding, and for careful scrutiny of, these developments of 1958–59.

Surplus gold stock still available for withdrawal: For the week ending May 13, the Federal Reserve banks had a surplus above their legal reserve requirements of $8,560 million in gold certificate reserves. The U.S. Treasury, on May 12, had a free gold balance of $394,402,711, thus giving a surplus of gold available for foreign withdrawals equal to $8,954,402,711.

Since the Federal Reserve banks can, by paying tax penalties, go below their minimum reserve requirements of twenty-five percent if necessary, an even greater amount of gold could be paid out.

Of the total foreign official short-term claims of $10,287 million; as of February 28, 1959, which could be exercised, the principle of probability indicates that the prospects of a large percentage of such claims being exercised over a considerable period of time are relatively small unless our government persists in pursuing an inexcusable course of piling up additional foreign claims against our declining stock of gold. If we were to lose the highest percentage ever recorded, 1922–58, the 37.1 percent of total claims in 1933, and apply it to the exercisable claims of $10,287 million in February 1959, the additional amount to be demanded would be $3,816,477,000 to cover which we have a surplus of $8,954,402,711, and even more if the reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks are breached.

These facts do not mean that we could lose approximately $4 billion or $8 billion more of gold without experiencing serious consequences. Psychological reactions are important factors; and public reactions to a persistent and relatively heavy loss of gold are highly unpredictable. At some point in such withdrawals confidence in the future value of the dollar could be seriously impaired and the dollar could suffer a heavy discount in foreign exchange because of the expectation that the Federal Reserve banks and Treasury would in due course reach the end of their capacity to pay out gold at the standard rate. Placing an embargo on further exportation of gold could be expected to precipitate a sharp discount in the value of our dollars in foreign exchange; and this depreciation could be expected to bring domestic depreciation at closely-related rates. Maintenance of the value of our dollar in foreign exchange requires unhesitating redemption at par even if this involves impairment of the minimum Federal Reserve bank gold certificate ratio. There is, therefore, genuine danger in pursuing with recklessness the course now being followed by our Government. Piling up further foreign claims against our gold stock is inexcusable, particularly since there is no valid defense for permitting redemption of foreign claims in gold while our people are denied the right of redemption.

Various attempts have been made to demonstrate that our gold supply is already inadequate or presently in danger. Such attempts are not in accord with facts. Much of this effort comes from those who are attempting to obtain another devaluation of our dollar, and a common device employed by those people is to offset all foreign short-term dollar claims aaginst our gold stock and to treat potential claims as though they would prove to be actual claims. Such a procedure cannot be defended. If that procedure were applied to insurance companies or banks, for example, it could be demonstrated that all of them are in fact, bankrupt. The principle of probability based upon the lessons of experience is the only principle that is permissable if one's purpose is not to mislead. Every object of value is supplied in the light of the principle of probability; and we are faced with the principle of probability in respect to the future exercise of potential claims against our Treasury's stock of gold.

Attempts to explain the Treasury's loss of gold: The attempts frequently made to state the reasons for the Treasury's loss of gold

rest largely upon conjecture or guessing rather than upon adequate evidence. Foreign central banks and governments and international institutions which have dollars and choose to convert some of them into gold may do so; and they are not required to explain their actions and, apparently, ordinarily do not do so.

The common allegation that the gold withdrawals of 1958–59 are evidence of a flight from the dollar needs to be offset against the fact that while some dollars have been converted into gold the foreign short-term dollar claims have been climbing to a record height.

A frequent explanation, that a major cause of the conversion of nongold dollars into gold is to be found in the relatively sharp drop in exports as against imports, fares no better in the light of mounting foreign short-term balances while Treasury gold is being drawn down.

The point is that the official foreign holders of dollars may choose to convert a portion of their dollars into earmarked gold for any number of reasons that seem satisfactory to them, without explanation to us and without any official data as to reasons being available to us. We may notice at some subsequent date that a central bank's reserves in gold have increased or we may trace some other manifestation of the use of the earmarked gold; but in general we do not have access to data that would explain why the Treasury's gold stock declined and the volume of gold earmarked for foreign account increased in approximately the same amount. Gold is the most marketable monetary commodity in international exchange; and it may be utilized for an endless number of reasons. When we cash a check at our bank we are not required to explain what we propose to do with the money received. Foreign official drafts against our gold stock fall in the same general category.

Piling up of more foreign dollar claims against our gold stock and dissipating the stock itself: Our Federal Government, in various ways, continues to pile up more foreign dollar claims against our declining gold stock and is making further commitments and proposals to dissipate still more of the Treasury's gold stock—for example, to subscribe another $344 million of gold to the International Monetary Fund and to provide it with $1.375 billion, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development with $3.175 billion, additional potential dollar claims against our Treasury's gold. Foreign aid and other programs are also providing still more dollar claims against our gold stock. To these are added such proposals as that to create an International Development Association to finance projects which, apparently, good banking procedures could not support.

The picture is one of the prodigal and reckless spender and dissipator who even though his ultimate reserve is falling rapidly, and the potential claims against that reserve are relatively heavy and rising, nevertheless continues his foolish practices with unrestrained abandon.

Pursuit of this course by our Government would appear to be inviting extremely serious trouble for this Nation. It seems to reflect a remarkable degree of irresponsibility on the part of those Government officials responsible for such policies and programs, and a failure on their part to understand that it is sound fiscal and monetary practices which induce gold to flow to, and remain with, a nation. The revival of an improved quality of fiscal and monetary management in West Germany, and more recently in France, provides illustrations of this elemental principle; and our Government should heed the very important lessons which should be obvious to competent and responsible people.

Recognizing the New France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the news that the differences between the United States and France are increasing to a near alarming proportion is distressing to me. While few sovereign countries enjoy unmarred relations for so long a period, disagreement between ourselves and France is particularly disconcerting and attention commanding because of the need for interdependence and in light of our traditional 160-year alliance.

From the moment of his reappearance on the French political scene, I was among the first to hail the second era of General De Gaulle. Fortunately my not too cautious predictions of the success with which De Gaulle would meet France's problems have proved correct, and, if anything, are understatements. With amazing perceptiveness and boundless energy President De Gaulle turned his attention on every aspect of the French political, social and economic plight. In the political sphere France is now enjoying strong and imaginative leadership without sacrificing personal liberties, and on the economic scene there is a renewed confidence in the French economy and a resurgence of free competition. The people of France confident of their goals and means of achieving them enjoy renewed faith in the destiny and glory of France.

Although there were doubts in many American circles as to the policies which DeGaulle would devise, particularly in regard to her external affairs, this country realized early in his latest period of rule that we had everything to gain and nothing to lose by supporting and encouraging the reforms and programs which he instituted. Thus, we became active partners in the building of a revitalized France and in her restoration to the position of a world power. Having thus helped her achieve this position we cannot deny her the full prerogative of an equal partner in the safegurading of the free world. If we wish France to continue to be a party to the united front which which the Western Alliance meets the Russians we must treat her as at least a strong and close a friend as our British allies. Personally, I feel that we should share with France the secrets of the atom both for peaceful uses and military applications that we have so wisely made available to Great Britain. Such course will not only insure the preservation of our alliance but, in fact, might be the means of strengthening, if not saving, NATO.

Recognizing the new spirit of France, her vitality and her renewed national confidence, I suggest that an early summit meeting between the wartime comrades in arms, President Eisenhower and General de Gaulle, be held at the earliest possible date. In a spirit of humility and realization of the threat of Soviet power we should meet France under conditions which would respect the strength and sovereignty of both countries and their need for each other.

It has been 40 years since I was privileged to fight along side Frenchmen on French soil. I have never forgotten these experiences and still bask in the commendations bestowed upon me by the French Army. Ever since, I have cherished the friendship of many citizens of France and unceasingly worked in the cause of continuing our historic ties. But relations between countries are only as good and meaningful as the men who are responsible for them. Fortunately our countries are led by old friends who have successfully worked in the greatest cause of this century and to whom we look again for a continuation of the unity which is necessary if we are to meet what is probably our deadliest challenge.

France has just recently celebrated the 170th anniversary of the storming of the Bastille, and I would like to include in my remarks a speech delivered by his Excellency Herve Alphand, French Ambassador to the United States, on Bastille Day, 1959, and a very thoughtful editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of July 10, 1959.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY H. E. M. HERVE ALPHAND, FRENCH AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES, ON BASTILLE DAY, 1959

Last year, on this same day and in this same place, together we mentioned the hope for a new era.

I said then: "I believe that the French people, tired of so many crises and uncertainties and conscious of their weakening effects will say "Yes" to the reform offered to them. Thanks to this renovation, France will be in a better position to face the heavy tasks that will be hers tomorrow."

If we look back upon these last 12 months we can rejoice and see that these wishes have been granted to a large extent and that, at home as abroad, we have lived through one of the best filled years of our long history.

For many centuries, France had sought a difficult reconciliation between authority and liberty. At times the scales were tipping heavily in favor of one and dictatorships brought us disasters. At other times governmental power shared by hundreds of citizens could not assert itself anywhere and our country was made helpless.

New institutions, the wisdom and the audacity of a man have at last brought a solution approved by the overwhelming majority of the nation. In France today, the government governs, the Parliament controls and legislates; in case of conflict between the executive and the legislative, the head of state can appeal to the people, the supreme arbiter. At the same time, the constitution guarantees the fundamental liberties we celebrate today: freedom of elections, freedom of thought and of expression which remain the basis of our Republic.

This profound transformation of our institutions has made it possible for France to become herself again and to fully utilize the extraordinary resources she possesses. Last year's events give us the proof that it is so. Let me cite some of them. Our financial position has been redressed and inflation stopped. Our money has found stability and recovered its worth. Competition has been restored without which no progress is possible. We have abandoned our protectionist complex behind which our economy was starving. Our huge energy resources in France and in Africa are on the

point of changing the whole picture of our production and of our external financial position.

Without this metamorphosis of our economy, a direct result of the political changes, it would have been ludicrous to try to unify Europe. Europe cannot be built without France and a timid France without a currency worthy of her name and without a competitive industry could never have been able to apply the European treaties, however sincere the good will of her leaders. The common market which will multiply our resources and raise our standard of living to a degree that we cannot conceive as yet, has come into effect this year, it creates the framework for a political cooperation between France, Germany, and their partners.

In Africa a community of autonomous states has seen the day. It will assure for them freedom and equality within the republic. The trip of the President to Madagascar is one of its new and brilliant manifestations.

In Algeria the rebellion loses ground. Massive votes have given a proof that Algeria wants to continue living and working with France. Little by little and in spite of the difficulties of this task, the elected representatives of the people take their place in the municipalities and the assemblies.

Nothing can stop France from accomplishing her task which has no selfish aim but serves the interest of the whole free world.

These truths gradually sink into the minds. In this great country where we are living, our friends recognize with a sigh of relief this happy evolution of the French situation. They may not yet have drawn all its consequences.

In the most serious situation we both have to face, I mean the Berlin affair, France and the United States have positions very near each other and we act together in the interest of the Western World. It is a fact that very often we, together with Great Britain, hold consultations from which we draw common political points of view about many subjects. Finally it is true, contrary to what is sometimes said and written, that France, her government and the great majority of her people believe that in the face of the obvious ambitions of the Communist enterprise, the alliance of the free countries is more than ever indispensable.

But a few uncertainties still remain concerning this alliance and they will have to be eliminated if the foundations of our common civilization are to be preserved against the threats of a common peril.

First, anywhere in the world where this danger exists there must be a single strategy agreed upon and well defined. The world had known some long periods of peace. This peace was the result of an entente between the great powers upon essential problems. We must do everything necessary to accomplish that.

Second, it would seem to us normal to share between allies not only the responsibilities but also the means. It was the case in all our previous alliances as for example in 1776 and in 1917. Not only is it a question of confidence but one of efficiency in the common defense.

Finally we must practice aid and assistance to each other in every field including that of diplomacy, wherever our interests and those of the free world are at stake, in the Far East as well as in Africa and Europe. For instance we have both recognized that in Germany the true government is the one issued of free elections. Such is the golden rule of democracies. Why not apply this rule to Algeria? This is the aim of the French Government in its struggle with those who want to dictate by violence and terror. If this formula is a good one for Germany, a fortiori, it should be supported without equivocation in North Africa by all the allies of France and in all circumstances. Half measures or hesitations could be deadly for those who adhere to this same philosophy whose universal virtues we celebrate on this 14th of July as well as on the Fourth.

Too many interests, too many souvenirs, too many ideas unite us to imagine that these obstacles between France and the United States cannot be overcome. We do not have to look for compromises but to let ourselves be guided by the principles which were at the birth of our two Republics. We are sure they can only lead us to the same conclusions.

Once more and as I did it last year, I want to say that in this effort of renovation and understanding we expect much from you friends of France in the United States. Thanks to your action and your contacts, many misunderstandings can be eliminated and you will be able to show the true visage of France during this transformation and the capital interest that this evolution presents for the equilibrium of a world so dangerously threatened.

Allow me in conclusion to repeat some phrases by which General de Gaulle ended one of his speeches, more than 8 years ago, phrases which to me, seem to apply admirably to the present situation:

"The time for responsibilities has come," he said. "In the fight between darkness and light, which may bring to the weak war and catastrophe or to the strong life and peace, let America, Europe and France together accomplish their duty."

Vive la France. Vive la Republique.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, July 10, 1959]

RECOGNIZING THE NEW FRANCE

It is hoped that the United States will be able to make of the reconvening Geneva foreign ministers meeting an opportunity for more and closer talks between Secretary of State Herter and French Foreign Minister de Murville. Otherwise continuation of the conference could have some important disadvantages for the Western alliance.

Conflicts and uncertainties in American-French relations at the moment threaten the effectiveness of NATO on the one hand and the diplomacy of the Western Big Three vis-a-vis the Soviet Union at Geneva.

The conflicts concern global strategy, nuclear matters, stationing of American planes on French bases, the position of France in relation to the Anglo-American partnership in the Western defense system. The uncertainties concern American policy toward French-ruled but still rebellious Algeria, both within the United Nations and outside it.

Although specific causes of friction can thus be pinpointed, it does not follow that these must be removed before American-French relations can be improved. There is little doubt that improvement would begin the moment the United States took a notable initiative toward formal discussions with France—with a well-advertised view to according the French voice new importance in Western councils.

This would be in line with French actualities. American and British statesmen still seem to be laboring in something of the same fog that during World War II obscured from them the difference between the France of defeat and the France of De Gaulle.

This difference has now been accentuated by the enormous economic gains that France has made since the war, the new financial confidence and the revived national self-consciousness that de Gaulle's leadership has inspired under the Fifth Republic, the new outlook toward once-colonial territories which is reflected in the new voluntary French community of nations.

France is on the road indeed to becoming an "atomic power" in its own right; it is expected to explode a bomb this year. It is developing economic and political ties which assure it a new measure of leadership among European nations, and new ties with West Germany which promise to make both countries a new force for peace (witness de Gaulle's role in hastening the Saar settlement to German satisfaction).

So much for actualities. American diplomatic needs also urge a real effort by Washington to help promote the French ally.

At base the French demands on the United States represent a desire for recognition of French "grandeur," without which de Gaulle cannot conceive of France as a nation. So the handsomer the American gesture of appreciation the better.

It would be to the good if the administration—even though Mr. Herter will now be kept busy again at Geneva on projects of Soviet choosing—could set in motion discussions frankly intended to bring about a meeting of President Eisenhower with President de Gaulle. If the Geneva meeting seems to warrant an East-West summit, an American-French summit might well precede it, and become an American-British-French summit.

What is important now is that the French be convinced that their leading allies can distinguish at last between the France of Vichy and the France of the Resistance, that they can understand that de Gaulle's fight for a strong France is in line with their needs of a strong ally in a vital area of Europe.

To make real gains in this direction need not involve prescience as to just how the various problems will be solved. It does require that Washington show unmistakably an interest in their solution.

Why Does the Administration and the Federal Reserve Oppose the Metcalf Amendment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying, in the midst of all the editorial opposition and news stories giving the impression that the proposed Metcalf amendment to the administration's bill removing the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on long-term bonds is inflationary, subversive of the Fed's independence, and improper, to find at least one sane, balanced comment on this question. I commend to the Members the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on July 19, 1959:

LET CONGRESS SPEAK

We do not altogether understand the active opposition of the Federal Reserve Board and Treasury Secretary Anderson to the amendment of the interest rate bill pending in the House. This amendment would merely state that it is the sense of Congress that the Fed ought to consider some judicious purchases of long-term Government bonds, consistent with its overriding obligation to promote monetary stability. If the opponents of this mildly worded amendment persist in being too stiff-necked about it, they may well lose any chance to obtain the elimi-

nation of the interest rate ceiling, to which the House Banking Committee has agreed and which is vitally necessary if the heavy pressures on the short-term money market are to be eased.

After all, the Constitution gives Congress the power to coin money and set its value, and the Fed is a creature of Congress, set up to help discharge this important function. If Congress wishes merely to express its feelings on a vital issue of current monetary and debt management, without in any way diluting the full legal authority it has previously delegated to the Federal Reserve, the latter could well afford to let the advice be given, treat it respectfully and continue to steer by its own lights with appropriate explanations. Of course congressional advice cannot be ignored, and the Fed may feel some inhibition in even having to consider it. But perhaps this is the price the Board must pay for the basic independence which it values so highly and which we think it should have. Certainly that will not be compromised by letting Congress and other independent organs of Government have their say-so, too.

Class War From the Top

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Post, July 15, 1959, by Max Lerner entitled "Class War From the Top":

CLASS WAR FROM THE TOP
(By Max Lerner)

Get ready for an onslaught of editorials from most of the papers, deploring the steel strike and hoping piously that each side will put the public interest ahead of its own. But this is one time when the formula makes precious little sense. If this strike proves costly to everyone, as it is bound to be, the responsibility must rest with the steel industry executives who sit in the seats of the mighty, and who feel secure enough to take on the Steelworkers Union in the kind of showdown fight the industry has had only once in more than a quarter-century.

Whatever else one may think about Dave McDonald and his outlook, I don't see how anyone can deny the earnestness with which he tried to get a settlement that would avoid a strike. The one thing he could not offer was unconditional surrender—yet that was exactly what the industry negotiators demanded when they insisted on a wage freeze. When finally the steel executives—under administration proddings that were too little and too late—did agree to discuss a wage increase, they tied it again to an impossible condition—unconditional union surrender on the question of local job practices.

All great strikes are greatly wasteful, and generally they end up with each side worse off than it was at the start. Most of them are avoidable. But some take place because one of the parties in effect wills it, by taking a position so rigid that the strike becomes inevitable. This was one.

I know, of course, that the steel companies have been playing up their position as one of anti-inflation statesmanship. The top negotiator for the corporations, R. Conrad Cooper, says they cannot "in good conscience be party to another round of the inflationary spiral." Usually when someone puts his hand on his heart, and swears "in good conscience," you suspect that he has not been on speaking terms with his conscience for some time. Cooper is in a good position, however, because the administration has been making such a palaver over the inflation danger for months, and a large section of the press has joined it.

Thus President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON have created the perfect climate of opinion for the intransigence of Mr. Cooper and his corporate colleagues. There is some evidence that they may have felt very uncomfortable about it. They suggested (so the report goes) that the skies would not fall if the steel industry made a package wage offer which it could absorb out of its very substantial profits without passing it on to the buyers of steel. But all that Cooper needed to do was to look virtuous, talk of principle, and quote to them their own warnings about inflation disaster. They had built a gallows and strung a noose, to catch the Democrats—and now they were themselves caught in it, at least in their usefulness as mediators. It didn't do any good for NIXON and Labor Secretary Mitchell to say (through President Eisenhower) that agreement could be reached even at the last minute. McDonald, for the union, offered to sit on indefinitely at the negotiation table, but what use was his willingness when the corporate heads felt so sure?

They were sure of the inflation weapon, they were sure because they had built up a considerable steel reserve which should last them for some time, they were sure because they do not regard McDonald as a dangerous opponent. In a sense the steel barons are the bellwether for the rest of the industrial power elite, whose labor bargaining in the future will largely be shaped by what happens in steel. They would obviously rather have a showdown with McDonald than, for example, with Walter Reuther.

A book with an interesting theme has just been published—"Image of America," by a French Dominican priest, R. L. Bruckberger. He celebrates the whole American economy as an effective and clinging answer to the Marxist theories. What we have, he says, is not capitalism: In fact, it is anticapitalist, and he cites Henry Carey, Henry Ford, and Samuel Gompers as proof that we have shaped a third way answer to the problem of economic organization and economic justice.

He has a whole chapter on American labor, called, Samuel Gompers and Lenin, in which he shows that the American trade union movement cares far more about the workers than do the so-called proletarian leaders of the Communists.

The book is getting a big play, and Americans of substance are so busy patting themselves on the back for their wisdom and genius that they can't keep their eyes looking straightforwardly at the steel industry and what is happening there. The fact, if you read what has been happening with a cold eye, is that the steel corporation leaders are applying the Marxist principle to the class war to their workers. But this is not a class war from the bottom, forced on employers by revolutionary working-class leaders. It is class war from the top down.

If you read the history of the steel industry, you will find that from the first blast furnaces but a century ago, until 1936 and the CIO, the steel barons like Carnegie, Frick, and Gary, waged a class war. They broke the unions, they used spies and Pinkertons, they sewed up their company towns against union meetings, they kept a 12-hour day until 1923—20 years after other industries had abandoned it.

Since 1936, when Myron Taylor and John L. Lewis reached the first great steel agreement without violence, the industry has been the scene of orderly bargaining. Do the present eventss mean that Mr. Cooper and his comrades want to go back to the days of Homestead and the class war?

Inflation and Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to be able to bring to the attention of my colleagues and, through them, to interested persons throughout this great land of ours, some very pertinent and informative facts regarding the serious problem of the relationship of inflation to our senior citizens.

The Honorable Robert W. Kean, who gave the 12th Congressional District of New Jersey, outstanding representation for 20 years as a Member of this House—the district I have the honor of presently representing—and who has been named Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for the White House Conference on Aging, which Conference is to be held on January 9, 1961, made a most interesting and informative address at the Chautauqua Institute, Chautauqua, N.Y., on July 9, 1959, which is included in its entirety with these remarks.

This is, in reality, a research paper and should be studied by everyone who is interested in this very serious problem.

INFLATION AND RETIREMENT

(Speech delivered by Robert W. Kean, Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for the White House Conference on Aging, at the Chautauqua Institute, Chautauqua, N.Y., on July 9, 1959)

I am happy that here in this beautiful setting this week has been devoted to talking about our older citizens, for in this Nation bursting with progress and enthusiasm our emphasis in the past has been on youth. Perhaps this is one reason why we have been so profligate with our resources and so extravagant with our national assets. We need the mature wisdom, we need the experience of our older people.

Having reached the age of 65 myself, within the past year, I think I am needed still; and when, last year I gave up my seat in the House of Representatives, which I had held for 20 years, decided to run for the U.S. Senate, and found that the majority of the voters of New Jersey did not choose to be represented by me in the U.S. Senate, I was not ready to be put on the shelf and retire so I was happy to accept among my other activities the position as chairman of the National Advisory Committee for the White House Conference on Aging when it was offered me by Secretary Flemming.

More than 1,800 years ago a well-known Greek physician named Galen is quoted as having said: "Employment is nature's best physician." I believe that everyone who is in good health should and must have some sort of a job. That does not necessarily mean that he must have a paying job. Often this may be impossible. But in his own mind, he must have a job to do. He or she must have an objective. As Dr. Galen continued

in 172 A.D. "This is essential to human happiness."

Certainly I know there is no automatic age at which human productivity ends. Robert Louis Stevenson is quoted as having said: "Life should be full of employment and enjoyment." "For surely," added Stevenson, "life goes down with a better grace—foaming in full tide over a precipice—rather than slowly dragging to its end in sandy deltas."

Public Law 85-908 of the 85th Congress—the legislation under which the White House Conference is being planned, specifically states: "Premature retirement of middle age and older persons is depriving the economy of their much-needed experience, skill, and energy." I agree.

We hope as a result of the White House Conference in future to make better use of the talents, wisdom, and experience of our older citizens—to provide for them opportunities for service—not only for the happiness of each individual but for the good of our Nation as a whole, which can and should make use of these talents.

Let's consider for a moment why it is at this time in 1959 that we are concerned with such problems. It is not only because our Nation has matured, but the magic of medical discovery has, as we all know, lengthened the lifespan until today almost 10 percent of our population is over the age of 65, and the percentage will increase, but what is equally important is that this same medical science has made it possible in most cases not only to keep us alive but to keep mind and body active for many more years.

We also are faced with a Nation which is steadily becoming more and more urban. When most of our people lived in large, roomy houses on a farm, the three-generation family was the rule. The older people had tasks in the household and on the farm which they were expected to perform, and through which they made a valuable contribution to family life.

But now our city apartments, our small suburban homes, are so cramped that usually there is little room for the older generation, and under such circumstances living together is often not only not good for the younger people but is often not good for the older people either.

In planning the White House Conference, the advisory committee which met in Washington in June set up 19 fields for particular study by the Conference. Technical experts are even now starting to prepare papers giving all possible information and factual data in these fields, so that they may be available for State and local conferences this coming winter.

Such conferences are of basic importance to the success of the White House Conference which will meet in Constitution Hall in Washington on January 9, 1961.

These studies will cover nearly all activities of the older people, and include housing, rehabilitation, health, religion, family relationship, employment, etc.

One topic chosen is income maintenance. But what is meant by this? Is it the maintenance of mere dollars received? Should not the title of this paper be "maintenance of buying power" rather than "income maintenance"?

As we consider the happiness and the future welfare of our retired people, we cannot fail to realize more and more that it is essential to them that the buying power of the dollar be maintained. We have come to realize that though inflation may be a hardship for most of our people, it is a tragedy for our retired population.

In studying the problems which face our older people it is interesting to note just where our older people live. Most of us would assume that the greatest percentage of those over 65 would be in Florida and California, but this is not so. Florida is only the 11th State in this regard, and California is the 20th. From hearing the people of this growing State talk you would hardly believe that more than half the States have an elderly population greater than that of California.

However, the concentration of older people is greatest in such States as Vermont, Iowa, New Hampshire, and Maine. In general, farm States seem to have the greatest percentage of older people. I think this is perhaps the result of so many young men from these States moving to the cities, as per the old song, "How Are You Going To Keep Them Down on the Farm Once They Have Seen Paree?"

In all, America's population today of those over 65 is approximately 15 million, or 9 percent of our people. These 15 million are important.

But when you consider those who are over 45—those who now should start thinking about their future plans for retirement—there are 50 million souls—almost a third of our population. And what is perhaps of greater significance is that the total number of Americans over the age of 18 amounts to approximately 110 million. So that of our adult population nearly half should be really concerned with the question of future retirement—and they should be worrying as to what will be the purchasing value of that retirement income to which most of them are contributing every day that they work, by deduction from their pay now, when the day that they retire comes.

What are the resources of most of our retired people? First, 90 percent of our workers when they retire can count on social security benefits. These will be paid in a promised number of dollars.

Second, 26 percent of our retired workers can look forward to pensions paid by the business for which they have worked. And, as happily such plans are growing by leaps and bounds, this percentage will soon be much greater. These also will be paid in only a promised number of dollars.

Third, comes life insurance and annuity policies. Seventy percent of our retired people have some form of life insurance. Proceeds from this will also be paid in a promised number of dollars.

Fourth, 40 percent of our retired people have some form of health insurance. This will be paid only in a promised number of dollars.

Fifth, 48 percent of our retired people have savings accounts. This will be paid only in a promised number of dollars.

Sixth, 27 percent own United States savings bonds. These will be paid only in a promised number of dollars.

Seventh, 6 percent are entitled to veterans benefits. These will be paid only in a promised number of dollars.

Eighth, it is a happy fact that the majority of retired couples do own their own homes.

Let us look at the other side of the coin. National figures are not available, but New York City in 1958 took a survey of costs for a retired couple. Of course the cost of living may be much less in some other parts of the country than in the metropolitan area, but percentages should remain generally the same. Thirty-two percent of the expenses of an older couple represents food. With inflation this would, of course, skyrocket. Twenty-six percent represents rent which would also go up with inflation, 6 percent represents clothing, the cost of which would also increase with inflation. Seven percent represents medical care, which has risen so fast in the last few years and will certainly rise further with inflation; 5 percent represents laundry, cleaning, and other such services; and 4 percent represents public utilities—the cost of which would also skyrocket if we had inflation.

From these figures you can see why the retired person has a greater stake than almost anyone else in the stability of the dollar. Every item of income is in a fixed number of dollars. Every item of outgo would increase with inflation.

The only substantial asset held by the average older person which would increase in value with inflation is his ownership of a home.

No one can deny what has often been said in the past that certainly for the retired individual inflation is the cruelest form of taxation.

President Eisenhower in his state of the Union speech last January said:

"Inflation is not a Robin Hood, taking from the rich to give to the poor. Rather, it deals most cruelly with those who can least protect themselves. It strikes hardest those millions of our citizens whose incomes do not quickly rise with the cost of living. When prices soar, the pensioner and the widow see their security undermined, the man of thrift sees his savings melt away; the white collar worker, the minister, and the teacher see their standards of living dragged down."

During the next quarter century we will have need to provide for a greatly expanding population owing to the explosive birth rate of the last few years. We will need 30 million new homes. We will need perhaps a million new schoolrooms. We must find jobs for millions of young Americans. To do this we must have dynamic productivity and in order to provide the tools to employ these workers someone must supply the capital.

It takes, on an average, about $14,000 invested in a business to supply one job. This capital can come only through savings by someone. If the average American comes to believe that thrift is not worthwhile, that a dollar saved will shortly not be worth the same as when it is saved, sufficient capital to finance normal growth will not be forthcoming.

If we are to have inflation, why should labor continue to bargain for retirement pay, when upon retirement, the dollar that has been put aside for the worker will not purchase the retirement income for which he has planned? Why should anyone spend his hard-earned money for life insurance if we are to have inflation?

When I was a young man in the late twenties I purchased a life insurance policy. I paid for it in dollars, then worth 100 cents. Though, of course, I did have the comfort of knowing my wife had protection at that time, having lived, it is perhaps the poorest investment I have ever made—for even if we have no further inflation when the policy is finally paid—my wife will only get half the purchasing power that I thought I was contracting for when I purchased the policy.

Most of you patriotically bought war savings bonds during World War II. Though the Government, of course, will pay you the $100 upon maturity which it promised when you paid $75 for your bond, with the value of the dollar cut in half—as these bonds mature you are getting back actually less in purchasing power than you put in.

It seems to me that Government has a particular responsibility to see that individuals who have accumulated savings should not have their purchasing power impaired and that individuals should not lose their incentive for savings in the future.

Secretary of the Treasury Anderson has said: "If we ever reach the point where our people believe that to speculate is safe, but to save is to gamble, then we are indeed in trouble."

Now what is inflation? Basically it is an increase in available purchasing power which is not paralleled by a corresponding increase in the quantity of goods and services avail-

able. Inflation has been characterized as "Too many dollars chasing too few goods."

There are many causes of inflation. First, Government deficits. If the Government spends more money than it takes in, additional purchasing power will be created by the money paid out by the Government to its employees and to the contractors from which it buys goods, which is not matched by the amount of money taken from the people in taxes.

Of course inflation can be brought about by the Government just printing additional money. But in our economy by which most large transactions are carried out by check inflation may be stimulated if more and more people, who can meet the banker's requirements, start to borrow money.

When you or I go to the bank to borrow money, the bank does not put aside actual physical dollars to await your use, but when you sign the note it merely credits your checking account with the money which it agrees to give you. Thus, magically more buying power is created. That is why one of the classical controls of inflation has been the raising of money rates to make it less attractive for people to borrow.

A constant rise in wages when not met by increased production, also has inflationary tendencies. Now we all want everyone who is employed to have the highest possible pay and the highest possible standard of living. But when wages are increased all over the country—unless the workers at the same time produce more goods—the wages received will create a purchasing power not matched by the goods available which they have produced.

A very clear example of how consumers bear the burden may be seen in the utility field.

Gas companies, electric companies, private water companies, are regulated by State governments as to the amount that they can charge for their services. They are permitted to earn a certain amount to insure that they have enough earnings to make possible getting the additional capital needed for the growth of their communities. During recent times, every year there has been an increase in wages in most of these companies. This wage increase is, of course, part of the cost of doing business. And the utility then goes to the public service commission and asks for higher rates to meet these additional wage costs. When this is granted the consumer pays directly in his cost of gas, electricity or water, for these wage increases.

Let's think a bit about the history of inflation. It was an early discovery of monarchs that here was a method of getting more money to spend without annoying the people by raising taxes. Then the medium of exchange was gold and silver coins. Their method was to shave the metal off the edge of the coins and then to melt the shavings into new coins, thus providing more available currency.

In this country we have had several periods of inflation—usually associated with wars—for those in control felt that the people could or would not make the additional sacrifices needed to pay the taxes for a pay-as-you-go war. I have often wondered whether this is true.

America's first inflationary period was in our Revolution. Then issues of negotiable bills by the Continental Congress became so numerous that our currency became practically worthless and the saying still persists that something is "not worth a continental."

There was inflation during the war of 1812. There was inflation during the Civil War. There was inflattion during World War I. There was inflation during World War II. There was inflation during the Korean war. But after all these wars—up to World War II—there was a period of lower prices. The last few years was the first period in our history that prices have not gone down somewhat after a wartime inflationary period.

A dozen years ago the Congress, realizing that deflation brings hardship and unemployment, deliberately set about to prevent a deflationary period by passing a law stating that it was government's duty, as far as possible, to provide for full employment.

This is right, but if government is to fight natural economic consequences and work to prevent deflation, is it not just as important for government to fight inflation, too, and maintain that stable dollar so necessary to our peoples' welfare?

In all history, inflation has been one of the easiest ways to stimulate business activity and even now in this country many politicians are advocating that we take this course. Just a little inflation every year—say they—perhaps 2 percent—would do no great harm.

But how about the retired individual? His average life span after retirement is 14 years. Can he before he dies without great hardship stand an increased cost of living of almost a third?

Some have suggested that we should fight inflation with price controls. Of course price controls even if only temporary, to be effective must include wage controls for certainly in time of peace in our free enterprise system you cannot expect businessmen to keep prices low if their chief cost of production—wages—are constantly rising.

But price control cannot be anything but a very temporary palliative. Price controls do not affect the cause of inflation, only the results of inflation. Price controls are like trying to hold down one of the lids of a coal stove. The inflationary pressure will always be there—and will constantly try to break out somewhere. It will blow the lid off at various points. And if we do not look out, the whole stove will blow up.

I am not here to argue the methods which should be used to combat inflattion, but I do know that price control is not one of them.

There is another impact of inflation and that is the resulting increase in taxes.

It is true that most older people do not have to pay much in income taxes. With the double exemption for those over 65, with the exemption of social security benefits from income taxes, with the partial exemption of retirement income, a retired couple—both over 65—may well have an income of $4,000 with no income taxes to pay. But they do pay taxes indirectly.

Today more than two-thirds of the cost of our Government is for defense. We have enormous costs for planes, for missiles, for submarines. Through inflation, the cost of manufacturing these has gone up by leaps and bounds. And this is one reason why taxes have had to remain so high—too high in my belief for all elements of our population.

And don't you think for a minute that you are not paying the heavy corporation tax that is needed to meet these Government costs.

Taxes are just as much a cost of doing business as is labor and the cost of the goods needed to produce the products. And corporation taxes in nearly every instance are passed on to you—the consumer.

Of course, you also pay an excise tax on many products.

And to those of you lucky enough to own a home, inflation will mean a higher cost of maintaining municipal services and more costly municipal services mean higher property taxes on your home at the local level.

To move to another subject: All retired people have a vital stake in our social security system. We must see that it remains sound and that benefits are as adequate as possible—but the impact of further inflation on our social security system may well be disastrous. Perhaps it might be of interest to outline to you the basic principles on which our contributory social security system is founded. I believe they are sound.

First, benefits are paid as a matter of right—without a means test. Workers and their employers have paid the tax and the former are entitled to benefits whatever their financial situation may be.

Second, the program is financed by the contributions from both employer and employee. This insures that management, labor and the general public will take a responsible interest in the program.

Third, benefits are related to wages. This principle is in accord with our American system of free enterprise and incentive. The worker who earns more while working, gets more when he retires.

Fourth, the system is not one which can possibly provide for a comfortable retirement. It can only be a floor upon which other types of savings should be built by the individual worker.

Fifth, benefits are paid only to those who have virtually retired. The system is one by which benefits are paid upon retirement, not a system to pay annuities at a certain age.

Sixth, the program should be maintained on as sound a financial basis as is possible in any program where there are so many unknown quantities, such as how many aged people there will be 50 years from now, what will be the wage scale, what will be the value of the dollar then, and so forth.

There is now in our social security trust fund some $21 billion. It is your money. It has been collected over the years from you, from your employer, and from other workers and employers, to insure that there will be money available to pay benefits to those who retire, and to pay benefits to survivors if, unhappily, workers die prematurely.

But this money has been collected in dollars at their value at the time you and your employer paid their social security taxes. If we should have further inflation, if we should have a sharp rise in the cost of living, it is inevitable that there will be a demand for a sharp increase in benefits, and the demand would be a justifiable one.

But where would the money come from? The trust fund might soon be exhausted. The inevitable demand would be to dip into the income collected in other taxes by the Federal Government, and to find enough money all taxes would have to be raised. But to use general tax revenue for social security benefits would destroy the principles upon which our system is run and in all probability would cause our entire contributory social security system to collapse.

Why could we not just raise social security taxes to meet inflation? Under present law, as you may have forgotten the social security tax increases every 2 or 3 years until in 1969, the rate will be 9 percent—4½ percent on the employer and 4½ percent on the employee; or 6¾ percent on the self-employed.

Even at this rate of taxation, by 1969 the self-employed person if he is the average worker with a wife and two children—will pay about as much in social security taxes as he will in income taxes at present rates, for you must remember the social security tax is a gross tax on earnings to be paid without the exemptions allowed in the income tax law.

It would be a shame to destroy our social security system. It is a tremendous system. This year approximately $10 billion will be paid in benefits to almost 13 million Americans. Approximately the same amount will be paid in social security taxes by American workers. You can see how even minor changes in the law can have a profound and far-reaching effect on American life. You can see also why there is dynamite in the program for voting increased benefits has a strong political appeal, and you can see that

the fight to keep the sytem sound—both financially and socially—will be unending.

Naturally everyone would like to see his benefits increased if possible.

You might be interested to know that over a thousand bills were introduced at the last session of Congress to increase social security benefits, and you might also be interested to know that only about a half dozen of them provided for any additional tax to pay for these additional benefits. To increase benefits without thought of the cost has been a most popular cry of the irresponsible. It has been only the fact that the responsible committees in the Congress have been able to say to those advocating increases—all right we'll consider the matter but for every increased benefit we must at the same time increase taxes to pay for the new benefit—which has kept the system within bounds.

If through inflation it is necessary to dip into the Federal Treasury anyway, this restricting influence will be taken away and the irresponsible would have complete sway. You must remember a bankrupt system is worse than no program at all.

But getting back to the impact of a rise in the cost of living on our retired people. Inflation does the most damage to those least able to protect themselves. But anti-inflationary methods are in their very nature very unpopular. Inflation brings a feeling of temporary well-being among workers. They like to be able to hear the jingle of additional money in their pockets, even though their dollars cannot buy as much. Strict anti-inflation measures often make it less easy to borrow, require higher taxes, require lower Government expenditures, and the postponing of many worthwhile projects. So there will be those in public life who will continue to advocate inflationary measures.

Ladies and gentlemen, our Nation must make a choice now. Should we gird our loins and take the stern way, or should we take the easy way which may well lead to chaos?

In the past this Nation has risen to emergencies when we encountered them. I think we would again, but temporary periods of sacrifice are much easier than constant vigilance for this is an ever-present threat.

Some say we have grown soft with our national wealth and have no longer the backbone that we used to have. Many preach the easy way. That we should think only of the moment. They say, "Why worry about the future?" But I have confidence in America. I have confidence that our 110 million adult people will be thinking of the day when they must retire, and that they will say to their leaders and lawmakers, "We have helped build this Nation—you must protect our heritage." We must dare to face reality.

Proposal for the Construction of a Linear Electron Accelerator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, Stanford University recently submitted a proposal for the construction of a linear electron accelerator on university property. Thinking that my colleagues would like to know more of this proposal I submit the following editorial from the San Jose Mercury in its July 17 issue.

[From the San Jose Mercury, July 17, 1959]

STANFORD SITE A NATURAL

Congress will be making a wise investment in the Nation's future if it authorizes construction of a $105 million linear accelerator, the world's largest, on the Stanford University campus.

To date, testimony by responsible officials of the Atomic Energy Commission before a congressional committee has developed these major points:

1. The United States now enjoys an appreciable lead over the Soviet Union in high energy nuclear research.

2. The proposed linear accelerator would insure the maintenance of this lead.

3. The scientists who are largely responsible for the lead are now associated with Stanford and would be available to man the new, 2-mile-long, multi-million-dollar research facility.

The logical and inescapable conclusion is that the hills back of the Stanford farm is the best of all possible locations for this critically vital piece of atomic research machinery.

The projected savings to be realized from installing the accelerator in an abandoned railroad tunnel in the State of Washington would, it seems, be more illusory than real. This proposal by a Washington Congressman is understandable from the standpoint of local pride, but it breaks down at two critical points.

Point 1: The men who have the theoretical and technical know-how to utilize the accelerator effectively are at Stanford, not in Washington State.

Point 2: Since two parallel tunnels will be necessary at all events, the railroad proposal offers the taxpayers only an opportunity to drill another, a highly expensive bore through the rocky core of the Cascade Mountains.

It is difficult to imagine how these simple yet telling points can fail to be lost upon Congress.

The Stockpile Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from by distinguished friend the Honorable Will Clayton of Houston, Tex., who knows as much about foreign trade and foreign exchange and stockpiling of critical material as any man in America or anywhere else:

Hon. ALBERT THOMAS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ALBERT: Heartiest congratulations on the facts brought out by your committee on the stockpile.

This whole stockpile problem is bound to wind up in a horrible mess, perhaps even worse than the agricultural program.

The stockpile will become frozen with billions of dollars invested in stuff we don't need, terrible carrying charges, etc.

As you know, I had charge of the stockpiling of strategic and critical materials purchased abroad, beginning in 1940. There were certainly sound reasons at that time in stockpiling rubber, tin, and many other commodities in anticipation of war, because we knew nothing about the atomic bomb and had every reason to expect, if we got into war, it would last a long time. But even then, we ran into numerous instances where interested parties attempted time and again to take advantage of the stockpiling program to advance their own selfish interests, and we had to fight against that sort of thing all the time.

With the atomic and hydrogen bomb, etc., it just seems to me we are wasting our money and upsetting markets to lay in all this huge stockpile against the possibility of the kind of war which we know we will probably never fight again.

Sincerely yours,

W. L. CLAYTON.

States Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the collectivists, the seditionists and national socialists are the ones really concerned about H.R. 3, the States rights bill of Judge HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia. The farmers of America are overwhelmingly for this bill. It is in absolute keeping with the traditions, ideals, heritages, and sentiments of our rural people. It promotes freedom, States rights, and individual liberty.

Those of us who are really concerned about the farm problem cannot understand why Clyde Ellis joined with the CIO and the NAACP in an attempt to defeat this urgently needed legislation.

The following letter was written to Mr. Ellis by Congressman HOWARD SMITH, the chairman of our Rules Committee, the author of the States rights bill, H.R. 3:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1959.

Hon. CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ELLIS: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 9 in which you undertake to explain your unjustified and inaccurate attack on the States rights bill, H.R. 3, when it was under debate in the House. You did so in the name of the National Rural Electric Cooperative.

As the letter has done incalculable harm to REA amongst its best friends in the House of Representatives and the Senate, I have been trying to ascertain whether you spoke with authority for the National Rural Electric Cooperative or whether you were acting from some other motives. Certainly, your letter of explanation of July 9 has very little resemblance to your letter of June 16 in which you urge the defeat of the States rights bill in behalf of the NRECA. The fact stated in your letter that you permitted some other person, evidently unfamiliar with the merits of the legislation, to dictate such a letter for your signature reflects seriously on the present management of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

The REA needs no lobbyist. It is stronger with the people than you or I, or the Congress itself. Its friends in both Houses of Congress are alert to any legislation that

would in anywise handicap its legitimate purpose.

It is a serious reflection that the popularity of REA is apparently being used to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for other organizations in matters in which the REA has no direct concern.

Very truly yours,

HOWARD W. SMITH.

The Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, the above concern with offices at 100 State Street, Albany, N.Y., has established an enviable record in the compilation and comparison of tax rates in New York State. Such activities not only highlight the comparisons of the several municipalities, but in many cases tend to bring about corrective measures and direct public attention to various deficiencies which might otherwise be overlooked.

The fact that such comparisons and comments have attracted attention at the grassroots level is evidenced by a very excellent editorial contained in the Saugerties Post of July 16 which I wish to submit as applicable to Federal spending as well as at the municipal level:

A COMPARISON OF TAX RATES

The Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, Inc., of 100 State Street, Albany, has compiled a comparison of combined full value tax rates in 60 upstate cities. The rates are based on the equalization ratios established by the State board of equalization and assessment. The ratios express the State's determination of the percentage of the full value at which property is assessed on local tax rolls. The survey said its study is intended to show the extent of the variations in tax rates. It does not provide a basis for conclusions as to the causes of those variations. The figures given, showing considerable increases all along the line, do not serve a vital purpose because there is so much variation in assessment as well as in the equalization tables. However we are made newly acquainted with the fact that taxes are going up and up. The fact is that a family could buy and pay for a home and have money left over a few years ago for what they now pay in general, school, municipal, State, and National taxes. And the worrisome fact associated with these taxes is that they are contributing to inflation—and more taxes.

Do you think it does much good to talk about these things? We read a commencement address by a noted scholar a few weeks ago in which it was said that more spending and less saving was seen as sound economic policy. The people, it was stated, should have more leisure time for spending and less hours at labor. We may assume that with more leisure time the people could apply more pressure on government for aid, and cut more melons delivered to their door, prepaid, by the various levels of government. At least that is the impression we got from the address of the commencement speaker who was on the public payroll.

The Citizens Public Expenditure Survey has been preaching against such philosophy. It has tried to awaken the public to an increasingly hazardous tax situation, and so far as the majority of people are concerned this viewing with alarm hasn't penetrated deeply into the public skin. In fact, it hasn't even scratched the fellow who feels content in the fact that his assessment is lower than that of his neighbor. Nor the community favored by a higher equalization rate. Those people who think they are getting something for nothing are as happy as can be until they get to vote on a budget for a new school, or a new truck for the fire department. They are many.

It all adds up to the floodlighted need for more commonsense on the part of Mr. Average Citizen in his government, more action against processes that devaluate the dollar, more opposition to mounting expenses that lead to confiscation of homes and businesses.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities for Underdeveloped Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to include copy of my weekly column which was released today:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

WASHINGTON, *July 20, 1959.*

The Senate and House Agriculture Committes are now considering legislation to extend Public Law 480. Under this little known but important legislation surplus agricultural commodities are sold to underdeveloped countries, and the United States receives payment in the currency of the buying country.

Under this legislation large amounts of cotton, wheat and other commodities which are in surplus supply in this country are made available for use by less fortunate people abroad.

Our surplus food has proved to be a valuable weapon in the cold war. We have moved fast on occasion to see that food is sold to nations which experience floods or some other natural emergency which wipes out its food supply. Such action tends to hold down political unrest and makes it much more difficult for the Communists to gain a toehold.

Congress has recognized the value of such a program by continuing it each year, usually authorizing the sale of about $1 billion worth of these commodities. Certainly it would seem to be more desirable to sell the surplus foods, even for foreign currencies, than to let it pile up in warehouses at a cost of billions of dollars a year.

It is tragic that more attention is not given to the needs of our own people. Hundreds of thousands of people in many areas have to live on surplus commodities which the Department of Agriculture makes available. I have tried for some time to have the Department expand the list of foods made available for feeding hungry families.

As important as it is to see that our surplus food and fiber are used abroad, and not permitted to pile up in warehouses, it seems to me that it is even more important to see that our own people who are in need receive an adequate diet. I shall continue to do all that I can to expand the surplus food distribution program.

CCC BILL REPORTED BY SENATE COMMITTEE

The Senate Labor Committee has approved legislation to establish a Youth Conservation Corps patterned along the lines of the old Civilian Conservation Corps. I have pending in the House a bill similar to the measure just approved by the Senate committee.

Under this bill, young men would be taken off the streets and put to work mainly in national parks and forests and on conservation projects in other federally owned areas.

I am firmly convinced that such a program would go a long way to meet the serious juvenile delinquency problem which faces us today.

The CCC record provides that boys who are given an opportunity to work in our parks and forests learn many valuable lessons which last throughout their lives.

Not only that, the program would make a valuable contribution to our efforts to preserve natural resources.

I hope that before the end of this session the House will act on legislation along these lines. Whatever the program might cost would prove to be a successful investment in the future of our young people and in the future of our Nation.

Homage to Colombia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the independence of Colombia, one of our fine South American neighbors. Colombia's gracious people, their culture and intellectual achievements have always been oustanding. In saluting all Colombians on this occasion, I call to my colleagues' attention the following editorial from the Diario Las Americas newspaper:

HOMAGE TO COLOMBIA

Tomorrow, one more anniversary of Colombia's glorious independence will be celebrated, and for that reason the noble country of Santander, the Colombians residing abroad and all the friends of that highly educated nation, render tribute of admiration and sympathy to the heroes of that independence and to the great moral and intellectual values of that South American Republic.

The Colombians, with their culture and their civic and democratic sense, have dignified their own lives and have given great meaning to America's coexistence.

On their own merits and through many sacrifices, the Colombians have strengthened their political institutions, having overcome many obstacles, until achieving the reorganization of their democracy in a proud and decorous manner, with a government that is an example of republicanism, and in front of which is a figure of such intellectual and political brilliance in America as is Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo.

For Miami, the date of July 20 has special meaning, because here in this city there is a large and distinguished Colombian colony,

that has brought to these shores their human enthusiasm and their background of culture and laboriousness, thus contributing to fortify the prestige of the Latin Americans living in this splendid Floridian city.

On the occasion of Colombia's greatest day, Diario Las Americas renders tribute of respect and admiration to that land of thinkers, poets, and statesmen of exalted merits, and expresses its best wishes for the prosperity of that nation, for its own good and as an example for America. This newspaper also very cordially salutes all the Colombians residing in the United States, and in a very special way extends congratulations to His Excellency, Dr. José Gutiérrez Gómez, Ambassador to the White House, and to the Honorable Dr. Octavio Villegas, consul general in Miami, both gentlemen valuable representatives abroad of their country.

Tenth Anniversary, Berlin Airlift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years it has been my privilege to engage in correspondence with Dr. Walter Becher, a member of the Bavarian Landtag, who is the Secretary General of the Sudeten German Council. The Council is understandably dedicated to the reunion of those parts of the German nation which were separated as a result of war and conquest, and under Dr. Becher's militant leadership active resistance to the further advance of Godless communism is being carried on without letup.

In a recent communication the good doctor has furnished me with a translation of an article which appeared in a recent issue of the official Press Bulletin of the German Federal Government commemorating the 10th anniversary of the Berlin airlift. This was a striking example of what happens when free peoples stand up to ruthless dictators and in the light of the current bluff and bluster emanating from behind the Iron Curtain it seems quite appropriate to include the article with these remarks in hopes that our representatives at Geneva will stand firm in their resistance to aggression:

MEMORIAL DAY OF THE BERLIN LIFT—10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIFTING OF THE BLOCKADE—THE LAYING OF WREATHS AT THE MONUMENT—MEETING IN THE DEUTSCHLANDHALLE—THE FAILURE OF THE SOVIET PRESSURE

The Berlin airlift for the mastering of the Soviet blockade represented the greatest undertaking of aeronautics, which has up till now been organized. Four days after the beginning of the blockade, on the 28th of June 1948, every 8 minutes an airplane loaded with food and articles of supply landed in Berlin. On the 18th of September 1948, on the American Air Force Day, the number of American airplanes amounted to 651, which delivered 5,500 tons of coal, and on the same day 244 British planes landed in Berlin. On the 16th of April 1949, every 62 seconds an American or British airplane arrived at the airfields of Tempelhof, Gatow, or Tegel, and delivered goods of a weight of 12,940 tons into the blockaded city. The airlift was maintained, even after the official ending of the blockade on the 12th of May 1949, for some time longer as a precaution. In the 15 months during which the airlift lasted a total of 2,326,205 tons of food and articles of supply were brought to Berlin in 277,728 flights. In this undertaking 31 American and 41 British pilots as well as 5 German workmen of the ground personnel lost their lives. In their memory the airlift monument was erected in front of the Templehof Airfield, which, at the same time, has become a true sign of free Berlin.

By means of the blockade the Soviets had aimed to bring Berlin under their servitude. The blockade was prepared long before the interruptions of the Berlin traffic started as early as the beginning of 1948, when on the 24th of June the total passenger and goods traffic on the railway and the highway stretches, Berlin to Helmstedt, as well as the electric current supply from the Soviet occupied zone to West Berlin were stopped. Any supply of food or other goods to West Berlin was interrupted. The war of starvation against women and children had begun.

In fact, during the first days of the blockade thousands of babies and small children, who were getting no more milk, were in danger of their lives, until the Americans ordered their squadrons of airplanes from all regions of the world to Germany, in order to satisfy as soon as possible at least the most pressing needs of supply for the city of millions of inhabitants. The people of Berlin had to be satisfied with dried potatoes, dried vegetables and artificial coffee by candle or petrol light. The electric current was switched on only two hours a day. The Communist newspapers derided the women of Berlin, who in bitter cold had to collect wood in the Grunewald, and the East Berlin broadcasting station took pleasure in the fact, that the Berlin supply stations, hospitals and other social institutions were in danger of having to be closed as a result of the lack of material and of electric current. In autumn 1948 the Communists realized then the partition of the city after they had dissolved the city parliament, then in session in the Parochial Street. On the 5th of December 1948, at an almost 90 percent poll, the West Berlin population voted for their parliament, and on the 7th of December Ernest Reuter became lord mayor of Berlin by an unanimous decision.

In the meantime the originally improvised airlift had grown into a gigantic undertaking and even the Soviets had finally to acknowledge that their blockade had failed, firstly owing to the greatest air operation of our time, and secondly owing to the stubborn spirit of resistance of the Berlin population, who had borne the sufferings of the blockade winter 1948–49 and had shown in no way any tendency to succumb to the offerings of the Communist propaganda. The Soviets therefore ordered their Ambassador Malik to negotiate with the Americans, firstly in secret discussions, about the endings of the blockade, and on the 4th of May 1949 the decision was drawn up between the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, France and the Soviet Union, in which the Berlin blockade officially ended on the 12th of May and all limitations on traffic and trade in Germany were lifted. In July of the same year this decision was once more confirmed by a Foreign Ministers' Conference of the Four Great Powers.

Thus the Soviet attempt to force the whole of Berlin under its domination and therewith to gain a starting point for further expansions had failed in every respect.

Fourth of July Address by Hon. Charles E. Goodell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by Hon. CHARLES E. GOODELL, of New York, before the Chautauqua Institution, Chautauqua, N.Y., on July 4, 1959:

THE FOURTH OF JULY: RENDERING UNTO CAESAR THE THINGS WHICH BE CAESAR'S

Today, as I stand upon this podium, I am a humble man. Through the span of my meager years, since the age of about 6, I have been awed and impressed by chautauqua. You know chautauqua is the cultural conscience of Jamestown. My father was a doctor in Jamestown, one of those oldtime doctors. Father loved the chautauqua of Donald Dame, Josephine Antoine, Alfredo Valenti, and Franco Autori. And while his affection and enchantment with chautauqua were permeating our family outlook, an appreciation of some of the finer and subtler things in life began to sprinkle on our souls, unbeknownst to us. Aside from the plays and operas and lectures and concerts, and without intention of slighting them, I think one of the finest arts practiced on these grounds was the gentle art of sniping which used to go on every Wednesday and Saturday afternoon on the baseball diamond over here. All three of my older brothers played there before me and, as a young boy, there was no place I enjoyed watching a ball game more than right here at Chautauqua.

I remember during my latter years—when I was an oldtimer of 27 or 28 on the team (helping to season the college youngsters), I came to bat one day at an important juncture in an important game and watched a called third strike go by (below my knees). And as I was dolefully laboring back to the bench to put on my catcher's equipment, a gentleman who truly appreciated the artistic pathos of the situation, commented, so everyone could hear: "We've got a nice croquet team here, Catch, if you'd like to try out. I think even you could hit that ball."

Earlier, when I had had an opportunity to work out with the Brooklyn Dodgers before a doubleheader with Pittsburgh at Ebbets Field, I was worried about the large crowd unnerving me—and, you know, it wasn't near as bad as Chautauqua. All that the players on Ebbets Field could hear was a constant impersonal roar in the background, that they soon got used to, and the would-be tormentors were drowned out in the roar. What a frustrating thing that would be for a Chautauqua baseball fan. And now, at long last, a would-be baseball player has an opportunity to talk back to Chautauqua's fans.

One hundred and eighty-three years ago today it became necessary, in the course of human events, for one people to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitled them. And, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of their intentions, a small band of men solemnly published and declared "That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all

political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved."

So Americans are, today, for the 183d time, celebrating that memorable event when it was declared to be a self-evident truth that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights including life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And we Americans have been pursuing happiness with a vengeance, and very successfully, I might add, throughout much of our history since that great Declaration.

Because these men pronounced their unity of purpose on the 4th of July, 1776, the 4th of July has become our most prominent national holiday in the United States of America. What does it mean to us? Why do we pay tribute to these 56 men, and others who later signed the pledge? Why do we wave the flag, toot the horns, and bespangle the sky today?

About 1,929 years ago, a man was speaking out against the leaders of his day, and telling stories and parables about them. Discomfitted by all this, the leaders sought to trip him up and one of their questions was: "Is it lawful for us to give tribute unto Caesar, or no?" But this man perceived the craftiness of his inquisitors and he said: "Why do you tempt me? Show me a penny. Now tell me whose image and superscription is that?" They answered, "Caesar's." And this great man then said: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which be Caesar's and unto God the things which be God's."

I'd like to talk to you today about just how we in America go about rendering to Caesar the things which belong to Caesar.

Today is Caesar's Day in America, and I speak of it as Caesar's Day because, in at least one sense of those words spoken by Jesus, the word "Caesar" is the Nation—the loyalty we pledge and owe to our worldly ways of life, nationalism, if you will. For us today, the United States of America, and all the images that those words evoke in each of us: the flag, the Star-Spangled Banner, the Constitution, our glorious moments in history, and our dark hours of misery and pain. Patriotism rings with anthems of war—clashing armies at Bunker Hill, Antietam, Pearl Harbor, and the Battle of the Bulge. But patriotism has a soft and gentle aspect, too, the things that lonely men at war remember about home when half the globe divides them from family and friends: the lush beauty of our rolling hills and shimmering lakes; Mark Twain, Walt Whitman, Abraham Lincoln, and Perry Mason; Paul Hindemith, Gian Carlo Menotti, Li'l Abner, or Morris Graves; the Roosevelts and Eisenhower; waiving fields of grain, and bulging, rotting storage bins; supermarkets and TV commercials; model-T Fords, the gay nineties, and the roaring twenties; the wild western frontier; Oliver Wendell Holmes.

We could go on and on. Ours is a replete history, full of heroes and with no shortage of beauty, or bounce, or color. And this is surely part of the Caesar to which we pay homage on this day. An American Caesar, of many forms and moods; and it is a powerful, vibrant Caesar.

We laugh at aspects of our American way of life, at times we ridicule it, and at other times we seriously criticize and try to change it. But, taken as a whole, we cherish this part of our American Caesar as we pay tribute to it today.

When the Man of Nazareth spoke of Caesar, however, He wasn't just talking about the patriotism or nationalism of the Roman Empire, nor the mores of His day, nor was He talking just about Tiberius I, the then omnipotent ruler of Rome. He must also, and most importantly, have been referring to the authority that human government exercises over its citizens—the loyalty and the dedication that our worldly leaders extract from us in some minimal respect (or we end up as guests in the jailhouse).

These laws and these leaders are apart, in most significant respect, from God and from religion. "My kingdom is not of this world," Jesus said, "if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence."

I can't here deal with the problem of drawing the line between what today we should render to our American Caesar on the Fourth of July and what we should render unto our God, whatever we individually believe His nature to be.

In that connection, though, I remember during the years I was with the Department of Justice, one of the hardest types of cases we had was that of the conscientious objector. It was sometimes almost impossible to separate those who were using this device merely as a stratagem to avoid rightful obligations, from those who were sincere and devout in their belief that, whatever the worldly consequences to Caesar, they should never take up arms against their fellow humans. Many of the judges felt so much personal prejudice in this type of case, having fought and sacrificed in war themselves, that they refused to hear them, and every judge was particularly careful to see that a conscientious objector had a lawyer to represent him in court. One day one of the newly appointed Federal judges was hearing his first conscientious objector case. "Haven't you got counsel to represent you?" he asked the defendant. "My counsel is Jesus Christ," the man replied steadfastly. Without hesitation the new judge responded, "Yes, but don't you have someone to represent you locally?"

It is the local responsibility that we are concerned with on the Fourth of July. There may be immutable principles of religion. They are not to be found in, nor made a part of, our worldly government. Our Federal Constitution is surprisingly free of moral judgments or prescriptions, and the Bill of Rights begins in the first amendment: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; * * *." Interestingly enough the Constitution and its amendments are not so worded as to require the Government to go in and affirmatively guarantee you and me freedom of speech, freedom of the press and the right to peaceably assemble. They just bar the Federal Government, and in other instances the State governments, from denying us those rights. And amendment 10, that poor neglected orphan among amendments, says: "The powers not delegated to the United States, by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." It was the vision of our forefathers that the vast reservoir of human rights would be untapped and undisturbed by the necessities of orderly government.

If those 40 gentlemen-toilers who finally produced and subscribed our Constitution could have been transported back for a moment and could have sat beside this freshest freshman in Congress on June 2, 1959, the day I was installed, their eyes would have been wider than saucers, wider even than mine. What hath God and man wrought? A $38.8 billion budget just for the engines of war. That's what we took up as a first order of business in the House of Representatives when I arrived there. Just for perspective, it should be noted that the first budget after adoption of the Constitution was $4,269,027; and just 30 years ago, in 1929, it was $3,000,289,000. We've spent close to $81 billion in the fiscal year just ended. If you and I spent $1 million every single day it would take us 222 years to spend $81 billion.

But I picture here the surprise of Madison and Rutledge and Pinckney and Franklin, and their friends, if they could peek in the House of Representatives for a moment today, not to imply that the Congress is wrong or right, but to emphasize that the affairs of men have changed, and the affairs of Government have complicated immeasurably since 1776. Imagine these same men walking down one of our city streets, or breezing across what was then the entire unknown vastness of our continent in 4 hours and 55 minutes on a passenger jet, or watching our ubiquitous, iniquitous television commercials, or contemplating the fetching qualities of our modern ladydom, enhanced by a superabundance of the most miraculous cosmetic creations and exposed in apparel of the most incredible geometric patterns. If they were wide-eyed on the floor of the House of Representatives, I'm sure our gawking visitors from the 18th century would be rendered totally recumbent soon after an exposure outside the halls of our conservative congressional confines.

I speak of these things not in shock or rebellion. The world changes and gathers complexity, and Government either changes with it or we soon reach that stage of compressed wrong when, in the words of our Declaration of Independence, "it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

We live today in an age when our welfare recipients in America have more material wealth and comfort than kings and queens were able to enjoy two centuries ago. It is our obligation as citizens of the wondrously abundant society to recognize and appreciate the forces which have propelled us to success. In brief, those forces are: Mass production in a free enterprise, incentive-dominated economy, with every free workingman sharing a just portion of our total increased productivity.

The other day I was talking to a friend of mine who works in a shop in Jamestown and I mentioned the word "freedom" and later the words "free enterprise," and he said, "Well, I guess freedom and free enterprise are OK, but they don't mean much to me, except maybe that the big guy is free to gouge the little fella." That kind of a concept of freedom, and that kind of a concept of our free-enterprise system, is dangerous. If my friend would travel, by boat or via the local public library, to Russia, or even to our friendly neighbors in Western Europe, and then take stock of what we have, I think he'd have a little different perspective on this word "freedom."

Freedom (not license but responsible, restrained freedom) is the elixir without which our bountiful way of life would wither and unravel at the seams.

Now I don't want to be an alarmist, nor to exaggerate the situation we face in Washington today. I'm not one of those people—sincere, informed, and intelligent people, I might add—who believe that we are hovering on the brink of economic disaster because of the bloated octopus in Washington. In the first place, some of the bloat's gone out of that octopus in the past 6 years. In 1952, expenditures of $65.4 billions per year by the Federal Government represented 18.8 percent of our gross national product. As you know, gross national product is the total national output of goods and services at market prices. In 1959, expenditures of $80.8 billions per year represents 17.3 percent of our gross national product. Federal employees numbered 2.6 million in 1952; they number 2.35 million today, a drop of 244,521 at the same time that our population has increased substantially. These trends are encouraging to those of us

who believe in decisions being made, to the extent possible, in the free marketplace.

But there are people abroad in our society who think that getting something, whatever it be, is simply a matter of having our Federal Government legislate it. They want our Federal Caesar to open the throttle wide and spend us all into a wild and illusory prosperity. Their method of paying for things has to be either taxes or inflation. There is no getting around that craggy, ugly fact. And it is the person with a small income who hurts and hurts and hurts as taxes go up and the value of our dollar goes down. Yet many of these moderate wage earners have been sold a bill of goods that Government spending, especially Federal Government spending, is automatically and inevitably good for them. I'm sure we can all agree on one incandescent fact today on this beautiful Fourth of July, 1959: All of us could do with less tribute to Caesar in the form of taxes to our Federal Government in Washington. And the only way we can ever reduce taxes is to reduce the proportion of our gross national product which is represented by Government expenditures.

Up to now I've sounded pretty much like a hidebound, earthbound old conservative. And I am, in many ways, and proud of it, too. But conservatism doesn't mean negativism. I cherish the values of our great America: A man's freedom to be what he wants to be; a man's opportunity to lift himself, mentally and materially; a man's guarantee that the color of his skin or the color of his creed will not deprive him of his rightful and equal station in our society; in sum, every man's respect for the dignity and worth of other men.

President Harold Dodds of Princeton University said in September 1955: "In an age enamored of skills, techniques and mechanical shortcuts toward a competent life, we shall maintain the creative and generating power of liberal learning broadly conceived. Our position is based firmly on the rock of our confidence in the uncommon man and our conviction that without him our democracy will wither and die."

Those words impressed me so much when I read them almost 4 years ago in the New York Times that I clipped them out of the paper and kept them. They were uttered at a time when conformity was "pedestaled" high in this country.

Whether we label ourselves "conservative" or "liberal," or something else, let us conserve those true values of our Nation. Let us be imaginative and positive about this. And please don't let us be satisfied with the old methods and the old cliches in politics. We need some freshness and some vigor in our fight to conserve the good, while we at the same time attack the things about our society that are unworthy of us. We, as citizens, must render to government our time, our thought, our knowledge, and our patience. Believe me, our Caesars in Washington and Albany and Harrisburg and Columbus need all the help they can get.

Now, what can you, you people sitting here today and listening—or snoozing, as the case may be—what can you do?

1. If you ever said it, you can make sure you never say again, "My vote doesn't matter," or "He's going to win anyway." Join either a political organization or a nonpartisan movement to get out the vote at elections and to understand the issues. The most powerful bloc of votes in this country today are the stay-at-home votes. In 1956, a presidential year, only 60 percent of our adult population voted. In 1958, an off year, 46 percent of our adult population voted. You and I can do something about that in our own small ways.

2. Think and read about issues; and talk and write to your elected officials. When you have collared your Congressman, don't tell him arbitrarily what he should do. He just might know more about it than you. Ask him his opinion and then tell him where he's wrong. Your reasons for thinking what you do are more important to a Congressman than your conclusions. And a Congressman does watch his mail.

3. Get into government yourself. And urge your family and friends, the ones you know have something valuable to offer the community, to run for office. You'll find that major reforms are more easily talked about than accomplished, but you'll make some progress and you'll have some fun in the process. I'm told a recent poll revealed that 80 to 90 percent of parents don't want their children to get into politics. If you have the opportunity you might talk to my mother about this. She's sitting right over there, and I think she still acknowledges me in public.

There are more recommendations I could make as to how you and I might effectively render service to Caesar, not on the Fourth of July but when it counts: the year around. But you are the people who really know how you can best serve. If you are a factor in your community politically, that's what is important.

During my recent campaign I met and shook hands with about 20,000 people in 4 weeks. We talked about farm surpluses, about labor racketeering, and about balancing the budget—all of them critical issues. But the main theme, recurring throughout every movement of our political symphony, cacaphonous as our symphony may have been— the main theme was get the Government back to the people. All the candidates in our special election in May played that theme in one key or another, because we hear it reverberating from the hills and valleys throughout these four counties in the 43d Congressional District of New York.

There are encouraging signs that Government is beginning, ponderously and laboriously I admit, but nonetheless beginning, to respond to this swelling chorus echoing alike from the rural hills and the urban caverns of our great Nation. State and local governments have been assuming an increasing share of the load. Since 1954 the State budget in Ohio has gone up 56 percent; in Pennsylvania, 43 percent; and in New York, 49 percent. The Federal budget has increased only 6 percent in the same 4-year period. If the States will in turn pass the responsibility for these programs down to the justice of the peace and the town councilman and the mayor, together with the revenue sources to cope with that responsibility, (to use the vernacular) we'll be in business. Seventeen percent of the present Federal nondefense budget is spent for grants, not loans but grants—gifts—to the States.

Six billion eight hundred million dollars will be given to the States in 1960 by the Federal Government. In most instances the only reason the Federal Government is involved in any of these programs is that we in Congress have the tax revenue—and if we can't find enough tax money we can spend our own printed money or borrow the money, and you people can pay for it over the years in inflation and interest. That $6,800 million does a lot of wasting and eroding on its round trip from us to Washington and back again.

I welcome Federal programs which stimulate and prod our people to arouse themselves and which help them overcome their local problems. The Federal Government is a progressive instrument, which I personally welcome in our local affairs, provided it does not enlarge itself into vast programs which can only ultimately oppress and enervate our local initiative. Unfortunately, the history of our Federal Government revolves all too often around the self-perpetuation of programs of aid and control. And such programs, when they emanate permanently from Washington, soon become encrusted with bureaucratic organizations and schemes, which almost seem to feed upon themselves in growing to massive proportions. These unresponsive bureaucratic beasts are a scourge upon modern society. It is this tendency of our Federal Caesar, to which you and I must never render homage or tribute.

The rebirth of this Nation—our entrance upon the glorious age for which all the sacrifices of the past have been made—is at hand, if we don't fumble and stumble our way down the blind corridor to heavy-handed, centralization of everything in Washington. This Nation cries for a rejuvenation of local government. The imagination and ingenuity of our people are not dead. That imagination and that ingenuity will exhibit themselves in endless variety throughout this great land, if we just give them a chance.

I stand before you an optimist. If you and I consent to participate in our destiny, through all the menial means available to us; yes, if we consent to render the right things to our Caesar, we cannot fail. Let us rededicate ourselves—unremittingly—to that sacred objective on this Independence Day, 1959.

A Well-Reasoned Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., of Thursday, July 9. This editorial, entitled "A Well-Reasoned Veto," was written by the very able editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star, Mr. William R. Mathews:

A WELL-REASONED VETO

President Eisenhower performed a most unpopular, but wise and necessary act, when he vetoed the housing bill that Congress had passed to him for signature. Probably as many Democrats as Republicans in Congress are saying, "thank goodness," because most of them knew that it was a wasteful hodgepodge of homebuilding assistance. Yet many many of them probably voted for it, in order to win popularity with the building industry—with the pretty good assurance that Ike would veto it.

His reasons are excellent. At a time when he is striving to curb extravagance, he could not well allow an appropriation of $900 million for urban renewal to stand. What a gay party of real estate sales in many cities—possibly including Tucson—that would have financed. The only people that will suffer from that elimination are those in cities where the city administration shrinks from assuming its own duties in a self-reliant way.

Its provisions for housing for the elderly were nothing but a disgraceful bid for votes from numerous elderly people. As matters now stand that could be cared for by Federal insurance for loans for such people.

The authorization of 10,000 public housing units was made in the face of the fact that 100,000 previously subsidized housing units remain unbuilt.

While the veto will, temporarily, create uncertainty about the financing of numerous major housing programs, those with any merit should find sponsors on the Appropriation Committees of both Houses. The cost of these could be included in the general appropriation bill.

The veto does not stop meritorious housing projects from being financed by the FHA. It does stop some needless extravagance.

Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most aggressive young liberals in Congress is our friend and colleague, the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL from the 15th District of Michigan. In his 3 years in Congress JOHN DINGELL has established an outstanding record as a conservationist, has been responsible for the enactment of many significant pieces of legislation in that field, and has been known for his work to liberalize social security and unemployment compensation, and to improve housing and medical care for the people of this country.

He has been credited by an outstanding national newspaper columnist with having been instrumental in preventing the gas bill of last year from becoming law by his forceful opposition to that measure.

JOHN DINGELL has been one of the most vigorous voices in Congress on behalf of the consumers. His significant contributions in this field have been the support of the Federal Food and Drug Administration and enactment of legislation to require adequate pretesting of all substances going into foods, to protect our people from poisonous substances in the food they eat daily.

However, one of his most courageous endeavors has attracted little attention. An editorial appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Daily News of June 18, 1959, setting forth some of young JOHN DINGELL's efforts to defeat the highly inflationary fair trade bill, H.R. 1253, which would, in the words of responsible economists, cost the American people up to $12.4 billion annually. According to a recent Department of Justice study, so-called fair trade costs consumers 27.7 percent more for appliances and 28 percent more for drug items.

That bill would, in the words of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission mean "pro tanto repeal of the antitrust laws," enacted to protect the American people from monopoly, price fixing and restraint of trade. Reputable economists and official spokesmen for the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have all said that the so-called fair trade bill would not only not help the little businessman but would actually be hurtful to him.

Our colleague from Michigan, JOHN D. DINGELL deserves the thanks of every housewife in the country for the gallant and effective fight he has been making against a measure which would dip deeply into the pocket of every family in the country.

[From the Washington Daily News, June 18, 1959]

WHAT'S FAIR ABOUT IT?

In opposing the so-called national fair trade bill, Representative JOHN DINGELL, of Michigan, calls attention to an advertisement which appeared here recently.

The ad was sponsored by a drugstore company, having nearly 100 outlets in the District of Columbia and neighboring Virginia and Maryland.

Prices were listed for a variety of drugs offered for sale but on a number of items there had to be two prices because Maryland—but not the District of Columbia or Virginia—was operating under a fair trade law.

Some examples: Abbott Vi-Daylin, $2.99 but $4.19 in Maryland; Parke Davis Abdol with C capsules $7.23 but $9.68 in Maryland; Upjohn Unicaps, $5.65 but $6.96 in Maryland; Squib Theragran capsules $5.55 but $9.45 in Maryland. And so on down a long list.

Same drugs, same stores but prices were as much as 65 percent higher in the fair trade State.

Wide markup margins are justified for some stores, depending upon the nature of services rendered; credit and delivery policies, perishable nature of the commodity, etc. Markups aren't profit. They have to include the expense of operating the store.

But services vary widely and if a customer doesn't want the expensive kind, no law should make him pay for it. If this law, already approved by the House Commerce Committee, is passed, a manufacturer can fix the retail price of his product and no one, no matter how profitable his business, can charge less.

Fair trade is theoretically helpful to merchants who dislike to compete for business. But for others, mainly including the consumer, there's nothing fair about it.

National Insurance for Independence in Old Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my message at the 19th national convention of the Townsend Clubs of America held at Portland, Oreg., July 20 to 23, 1959:

NATIONAL INSURANCE FOR INDEPENDENCE IN OLD AGE

(Message of Congressman THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts, at the 19th national convention of the Townsend Clubs of America, Portland, Oreg., July 20 to 23, 1959)

Delegates and friends, for too many generations, the fate of old people was to live alone; on a farm, or in a single room overlooking Main Street.

There was no way for them to meet in groups with people of their own age who share their interests and their hobbies.

Then came the Townsend plan that brought you together, and gave you a new purpose in life.

The confidence and the unity that you have found in the Townsend clubs is an inspiration to the millions of retired Americans who have so much in common but have found no way to organize and make their voices heard in the determination of our Nation's policies. More and more of them will join with you as time goes on.

Social-security legislation is not only here to stay, but it will become stronger with each passing year. Eventually we shall have a system to provide full retirement benefits for all of our people when their working years are over. The fairest and most efficient way to do it is by providing benefits for the aged through a national insurance formula. When that goal is reached, the Nation can thank the Townsends Clubs of America for their forsight, patience, and work in behalf of security with dignity for all people in the harvesttime of their lives.

Wishing you every happiness and success at your 19th annual convention.

Goldwater Hits Labor Abuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial by Victor Riesel entitled "Goldwater Hits Labor Abuses," which appeared in the Phoenix Gazette, Phoenix, Ariz., on July 13, 1959:

GOLDWATER HITS LABOR ABUSES

(By Victor Riesel)

Few fight as hard for what they believe as does BARRY GOLDWATER, jet pilot, explorer, merchant, writer, Senator and one of labor's severest critics. I asked the Arizona Senator to explain in detail his sentiments and to pull no punches. The last bit of advice was unnecessary. Here is the Republican leader's reply written especially for this column:

For 2½ years, the Senate Rackets Committee, under the guidance of Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, has been disclosing abuses within the field of labor-management relations. With numbering regularity, detail after sordid detail has been paraded before the American public. The committee has issued one interim report and is on the verge of producing another.

With this background, many bills have been introduced in both Houses of Congress directed ostensibly at the basic troubles in this field. Hearings have been held at great length. The Senate itself labored long, hard, and at times bitterly, to frame a bill which its Members anesthetically believe will accomplish the reforms needed.

The astounding fact of the myriad hearings, testimony, debate, reports and bills is that in not one instance has the source of the trouble been touched. The Congress and its Members, as well as the Secretary of Labor, have failed to strike at the disease itself and have applied themselves only to the symptoms.

The result is that if the present legislation which passed the Senate becomes the law of the land, the abuses diligently spotlighted by the Rackets Committee will merrily continue and Congress will be charged with having legislated a bill which is a sham at best.

The disease I speak of is power and nothing else. Power of the nature that allows Hoffa to threaten the entire Nation and to issue this threat with impunity and the ability to carry it through without the law being able to touch him, and, in fact, protecting him.

Power that allows Al Hayes to uphold the dismissal of three of his members because they dared to speak out against a position of the union, exercising a right which the Constitution recognizes as inherent, but which the union denies.

Power that allows Walter Reuther to carry on the brutal strike at Kohler, defying the clergy, the bar, and the public and even exerting that power in another State to prevent for 3 years the extradition of a goon who beat up a nonstriker.

Power that allows George Meany to openly tell the Congress of the United States just exactly what he will permit to be written into labor reform law and extending his dictates into the corridors and rooms of the Capitol where his lawyers wrote amendments to the labor bill.

Power that allows COPE to cross State lines to engage in politics, in part with compulsory dues money taken from Republicans and Democrats alike in violation of the spirit of both the Taft-Hartley and the Corrupt Practices Acts.

Power that flaunts the laws of the land and scorns the rights and prerogatives of the people.

Power that is denied, and properly so, to other segments of our society, but which is used by labor leaders with the knowledge they are protected by law and that their strength in Congress insures the continuance of those laws.

Power, then, is the root of all this trouble in the union movement and this power is fostered by Congress, by the National Labor Relations Board through many of its decisions, and by the Supreme Court which has upheld these decisions. New laws are not the real need. The real need is repeal of those portions of the law which have created and sustained this power.

In addition to denying the uses of secondary boycott and blackmail picketing, which the Kennedy-Ervin bill does not do, compulsion should be withdrawn from the National Labor Relations Act in order to create in this country a truly voluntary labor movement. Section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act permits an employer and a union to enter into a contract requiring all employees covered by the contract to join the union within 30 days as a condition of retaining their jobs.

It is in this section of law that I feel the real trouble lies. It requires a man to join a union regardless of his desires. He may disagree with the philosophy of the union leader, or he may not want portions of his dues money to be parceled out for political purposes. But nevertheless, he must join the union. This is as much against American traditions and American rights as any act can be.

In all our society, only in the labor movement do we find compulsory membership sanctioned by law. Among all the nations of the world, the United States is the only one which establishes conditions under which it is compulsory for a worker to join a union.

In my opinion, it is this mandatory membership that has provided corrupt union leaders the opportunity to engage in activities outside the normal realm of collective bargaining, affording them the certainty that regardless of their activities, there would always be a membership to supply the checked-off money for their caprices and that this membership could never vote with their feet, or walk out on them.

It has been the timidity of Congresses and administrations which has denied injunctive relief to the public, to management and to the working people. It has been this same timidity that has allowed continued use of secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing by those who would abuse the labor movement.

If the abuses disclosed by the McClellan committee are to be stopped and further arrogant acts against our people curbed, then the source—the power—must be attacked, not the symptoms of this power which the Kennedy-Ervin bill so timidly slaps.

Is the Small Businessman at a Disadvantage Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, an exchange of letters recently made public serves to highlight the plight of the small businessman who has no legal means of redress for such wrongs as may be inflicted by unions.

I believe the letters between my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Mr. Wendell Barnes, might well be studied by all Members of Congress.

Not long ago, Lyle Wilson, chief of the Washington Bureau of the United Press International, discussed Mr. Barnes' statements in his daily column. It is an accurate appraisal and I believe of great interest.

I ask unanimous consent for it to be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE MAN THE POLITICIANS FORGOT
(By Lyle C. Wilson)

WASHINGTON, July 10.—Standard operating procedure for most politicians is to cry out in angry protest against oppression of the underdog, the little fellow, the common man.

These little fellows vastly outnumber the big fellows, especially on election day. It is remarkable therefore, that there is so little angry outcry by Members of Congress against the oppression of little businessmen by labor unions with which they must deal.

These unions are rich and allpowerful monopolies by comparison with the smalltime employer on Main Street, U.S.A. Wendell B. Barnes, in behalf of the Small Business Administration has written Representative EDGAR W. HIESTAND, Republican of California, about the plight of the small businessman oppressed by the big union. Mr. Barnes said the little fellow is defenseless against the unions without Federal action against labor abuses, especially blackmail picketing and coercive boycotting.

Of approximately 4 million small U.S. business concerns, Mr. Barnes said, at least 3 million have no legal means of redress for wrongs inflicted by unions. They lack financial resources to resist economic pressures which, Mr. Barnes indicated, are peculiarly but not exclusively exerted by the Teamsters.

"For these firms," Mr. Barnes wrote, "the rights guaranteed to employers by the Taft-Hartley Act have no practical significance. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that, under existing law, they have no rights at all."

He explained that this situation arose by reason of a jurisdictional gap between Federal and State authorities respecting labor disputes. The National Labor Relations Board cannot handle all of the labor disputes arising which affect interstate commerce. The NLRB, therefore, declines to deal with those it regards of lesser importance. NLRB, directly or indirectly, determines the importance of a dispute by the dollar volume of interstate sales and purchases transacted by the employer.

An aggrieved employer may be—usually is—denied a hearing if his dollar volume falls below the NLRB standard. Prior to 1957, such a smalltime employer frequently was able to obtain relief from State courts which assumed, according to Mr. Barnes, that they had jurisdiction. In that year, however, the Supreme Court held that, in vesting NLRB with jurisdiction over labor disputes affecting interstate commerce, Congress had removed all power of State courts to deal with such matters.

"Since then," Mr. Barnes wrote, "the 3 million small employers of whom I speak have been at the mercy of the unions with no right of recourse to State courts or tribunals for protection from illegal action."

Mr. Barnes hopes the House will improve the Senate's Kennedy-Ervin bill which now is before the House Labor Committee. He said the Kennedy-Ervin bill contained a section dealing with his little fellows but that it had "little or no merit."

Representative HIESTAND and Mr. Barnes seem not to have much company in their efforts for the small businessman despite the numbers of him who can vote.

Rivers and Harbors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure and honor to serves as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. This nationwide organization, through the cooperation of citizens who are interested in the proper development of our water resources—and this includes many of our Members of Congress—has been instrumental in guiding needed public works. I wish to present, herewith, the report of the year's work as given to the 46th national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington, D.C., on May 15, 1959:

During the 5 years which I have been president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, we have gone through great periods of change. When I came into office 5 years ago, the postwar effect on the work of our great organization was apparent to everyone. Our membership was down and the income of the organization had practically ceased. Some of our bills, including salaries, were more than 6 months delinquent.

During this time I am happy to report to you today that with your great help, cooperation, and assistance, we have been able to bring our organization from one of poverty to one of affluence. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress today finds itself in better financial shape than at any time during its entire history. As of December 31, 1958, our budget stood at $38,790.44. It has been increasing year by year in a healthy way, and should continue to increase until it reaches its full-grown strength after 58 years of

active effort and influence in the cause of water development throughout the United States.

During the course of this year I have been made chairman of a most important standing congressional committee of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Science and Astronautics. During the course of our deliberations, this committee has learned much that relates to weather reporting and possible weather control. All of this information which we are developing is of vital importance to the work of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Our convention presents to you a fascinating panel discussion about satellites, communications, weather reporting, and weather control.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of this new development. If we can predict weather accurately weeks and months ahead, we can save this Nation and its people billions of dollars in the course of time. Dr. Reichelderfer, Chief of the Weather Bureau, has told our committee that we can save the Lower Mississippi Valley $500 million per year if this can be done, and he has told us further that he can save the Nation $2 billion a year if long-range weather forecasting can be accurately given to our people.

Our Army Engineers are alert to these possibilities. They realize that long range weather forecasting and some degree of weather control together with their own engineering operations may bring about an end to floods in this Nation. Long range weather forecasting will permit them to operate their reservoirs so as to retain or release water, depending on the forecast of the future weeks and months. They can retain water for irrigation and reclamation or they can release it depending on possible needs in the future. The effect of this fact on our industries and on our increasing population will be fabulous.

Pending these exciting developments, we as an organization must proceed with our earthy problems of building dams, reservoirs, levees, improving channels, providing water for reclamation and irrigation, and developing our harbors. With this in mind I headed a committee which this year presented to the Bureau of the Budget our estimates of the needs of our water development program. We asked the Bureau of the Budget to recommend $1 billion in the overall program, and I am glad to report that the Bureau of the Budget recommended this amount as needed to the Congress of the United States. I therefore advised the Bureau of the Budget that we as an organization would stand behind their recommended ceiling of $1 billion overall expenditures for this purpose.

I am sorry however that the Bureau of the Budget did not take our recommendations for beginning of new starts. The Budget Bureau did not recommend new starts. We as an organization think that we must fight to prevent the stopping of new starts. Unless we continue to fight for new projects to be begun and to be constructed, our program will eventually dry on the vine and become as obsolete and dead as the dinosaurs that inhabited this globe hundreds of thousands of years ago.

I like to go down to the riverside and get my feet in the mud and wade near the river bank. I like to think of the tremendous boon rivers and waters bring to our civilization and like to forget the savagery of the floods and the destruction of uncontrolled waters. I am somehow reminded of a refrain from an old song: "It's a treat to beat your feet on the Misaissippi mud."

The country is rapidly filling up with population. Three million more people each year live amongst us and many of them are living in sunken, swamped, and poorly drained areas, which 10 years ago were not considered fit for human habitation. The pace of our growing population—and we will see 200 million people in this country by the year 1975—has caused us to do things which 10 years ago would have seemed foolhardy. We then pass onto the Army Engineers the increasingly acute problems of flood control and expect them to do the job which the experiences of the people have warned us should not be attempted. In spite of this fact, our Corps of Engineers does not let us down. From the days of George Washington on to the present hours the Army Engineers carry the banner of progress in water development, reaching out for victory after victory and writing across the skies of the future the great saga of accomplishment for our teaming millions of people to enjoy.

You will recall that when Russia fired her first sputnik, there was a stampede to cut off all public works programs and to get the money to develop satellites and missiles. At this critical time let the historic record remain that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress stood firm against any program that would stifle our internal development in order to buy rockets, satellites, and missiles for our defense. We thought then that both programs could be maintained and history has indicated that this is possible. We felt then, and we feel now, that there can be no sound defense which brings economic decay internally in order to meet the demands of armament.

In this connection you have seen a magnificent exhibit of the new St. Lawrence Seaway. This great navigation project has been the subject of interest for a lifetime and has had the support of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress from its founding.

Let me read from an editorial of the Washington Post of April 25, 1959. I feel this editorial gives a panoramic background and view of the significance of this project to many of our Great Lakes ports:

"HAIL THE SEAWAY

"Today the dream of well over a century will be realized when North America's great chain of inland lakes is opened to ocean commerce. The official date for the inaugural of the St. Lawrence Seaway is June 26, when Queen Elizabeth of Canada (and the United Kingdom) and President Eisenhower will participate in formal ceremonies. But today a Canadian icebreaker pushing westward from Montreal through new locks and canals will actually open the seaway for oceangoing ships.

"Since 1954 Canadian and United States projects have been underway to complete deep-water channels and works (most of them on the Canadian side) around the rapids-filled section of the St. Lawrence River in the 180 miles from Montreal to Lake Ontario. By June 1 there will be a 27-foot channel all the way to the foot of the lakes, and by 1961 the same minimum depth will prevail all through the Great Lakes system. Heretofore traffic has been limited by antiquated locks and a 14-foot canal depth in some sections.

"The organizational phase of the St. Lawrence Seaway was not altogether happy. Canada, which had the most evident immediate interest (and which proposed to do most of the work), urged Congress for years to authorize a joint development program, but to no avail. Not until Canada signified its intention of going ahead with an all-Canadian project did Congress take action over the objection of certain pressure groups. Interest was heightened concurrently with the new importance to American industry of iron ore from the developing mines in Labrador.

"Let us hope that this initial reluctance has now been forgotten in the prospect of enormous joint benefits. If anything, the United States, as the more populous country with many large cities situated on the Great Lakes, stands to gain more at first than Canada from this new access to the ocean. Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit, Gary, Chicago, Milwaukee, and Duluth will now be ocean ports and are feverishly anticipating new commerce.

"But the benefits will be many-sided. The lake route can be a vast stimulus to Canada's further development. Toronto, Hamilton, Windsor, Sarnia, Sault Ste. Marie, Port Arthur, and Fort William will also be ocean ports capable of large expansion. Sizable cargo vessels carrying up to 9,000 tons from any part of the world will be able to call at Canadian and American ports. Downbound huge lake freighters will be able to carry as much as 25,000 tons of wheat."

This dedication is the fulfillment of a dream of a lifetime and marks a major landmark in our river and harbor program.

Another matter that has been a subject of concern to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress for many years is the Panama Canal. You can recall that in 1956 a special committee of our organization reported on the advisability of building a second sea-level canal. That able committee was headed by our own member, Hon. Henry H. Buckman, of Florida.

The other day came rumblings reaching Washington that the Republic of Panama wants to seize the Canal, despite a 1903 treaty granting the United States in perpetuity the right of using and controlling the Canal Zone. As we all know, Panama has been on the verge of a revolution and Latin America generally is threatened with major disturbances. The time for building the second canal through the Isthmus is near at hand.

This organization has revitalized our program of endorsing and supporting projects through the United States. We have weeded out the dead timber and put our work on a sound, efficient basis. The projects committee has made a major contribution over the years in this respect.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has set up new committees and undertaken new functions. We have the committee on industrial water use, pollution abatement, wildlife and recreation, the committee on irrigation and reclamation, a resolutions committee, and other committees of great importance to our program. They have functioned efficiently and deserve the praise of all of us.

I wish to announce the selection of several new vice presidents of our organization. Of course, we now have U.S. Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, of Florida, and Representative JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, as vice presidents of our organization. Recently Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota, and Representative ROBERT L. F. SIKES, of Florida, as well as U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas, have been selected as vice presidents. They have done great work for our organization, and we look for even greater contributions in the future than in the past.

This marks the conclusion of my service as president of this organization. It has been 5 years of active service—service that I have appreciated and have enjoyed. I have had the pleasure of making friends with people from all parts of the United States, and I hope these friends remain with me during the remainder of my active life.

It is a privilege to be able to serve a great organization such as is the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and it gives one a feeling of worthwhileness of a nationwide development program. It gives your president a feeling of accomplishment, and when we join together on a program of an investment of a billion dollars in a year placed into the future of our Nation to make it a better and fairer land in which to live, we have a program that all of us can get behind and push

with the zeal and enthusiasm of one engaged in a righteous cause.

Let me thank all of you—officials, delegates, and friends of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress—for your loyal and active support in the past. Let me beseech of you the same sympathetic understanding and enthusiastic support of the incoming president, whoever he may be, that this organization may continue down the road to even greater achievement and success in the future.

Tobacco and Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, for the information of those interested in the controversy regarding the causes of lung cancer, I include an article from the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, of Friday, July 10, 1959:

BRITISH TESTS DON'T LINK CIGARETTES AND CANCER

LONDON, July 10.—A group of British researchers report that in 5 years of laboratory experiments with mice, rats, and hampsters they have failed to induce lung cancer in the animals by exposing them to strong concentrations of cigarette smoke.

"Our failure is a striking negative result," said scientists of Britain's Institute of Cancer Research.

An account of their experiments was included yesterday in the 36th annual report of the British Empire Cancer Campaign—a voluntary body devoted to fighting the disease.

Cancer Institute scientists reported the only lung cancer encountered during their experiments was a solitary tumor in a rat and this was not due to cigarette smoke. This tumor was associated with marked bronchitis.

TWENTY-SEVEN OF FORTY ALIVE

The report showed that at Leeds University mice were subjected to cigarette smoke and atmospheric pollution. Of 40 mice in an experiment which began 8 months ago, 27 were still alive and none had developed lung tumors.

It did not say how the rest had died.

Substances found in tobacco smoke and city smog also were inoculated at London's St. Bartholomew's Hospital into the lungs of rats and guinea pigs. So far, said the report, no definite malignant changes have been detected.

The cancer institute did report, however, that smoking apparently keeps down the weight of animals as well as human beings.

Small boys long have been warned smoking would stunt their growth, the report said.

PARTIAL INHIBITION

There was a partial inhibition of growth, said the investigators, after the animals were exposed to tobacco smoke.

"Exposure to cigarette smoke results in reduction of food the animal consumes just as in man the smoker usually eats more sparingly."

There was evidence that a smoking animal utilizes food in some manner different from normal.

The cancer campaign report claimed the prospect of prevention and cure of cancer by means of inoculation is being brought nearer by other experimental work at Leeds.

Scientists produced tolerance in rats to cancer-causing substances by means of inoculation, the experts said.

The research also pointed a way to attack on cancer by drugs, said the report. It did not go into details.

Offering People the Moon Without Price Tag Attached

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the July 15, 1959, Wisconsin Rapids Daily Tribune, of Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., one of the outstanding daily newspapers in Wisconsin. I commend this editorial to the attention of the Members of the House:

OFFERING PEOPLE THE MOON WITHOUT PRICE TAG ATTACHED

The argument among leading Democrats as to what Congress should or should not do seems, on the surface, to concern measures described as progressive.

Actually, it involves money, and where to get it.

The so-called progressive proposals call for heavy outlays for urban renewal, schools, health, and other matters.

The supporters of these programs think the Democratic leadership in Congress should dare the President's veto by passing them, and thus letting the country know what sort of action they favor.

This may appear to have substantial political advantages. But it also has a major political handicap.

The backers of the progressive programs do not include any plan for financing these measures. They would be like laws passed without enabling clauses.

In the absence of any specific financing, the Government would, of course, have to pay for the proposals out of heavy borrowings which would add materially to future deficit prospects. The alternative, higher taxes to pay the freight, is not even mentioned.

The mood of the Nation, in this time of a rising economy, seems to be against either new taxes or further additions to the deficit. Both Mr. Eisenhower and the modern Democratic leadership of the House and Senate are responding to this mood by trimming or blocking heavy expenditures and trying to keep the budget within tighter bounds.

Those who favor heavier expenditures to further their progressive aims would seem to have a responsibility to show the voters exactly how these proposals are to be paid for. It is hardly fair for them to offer people the moon, unless the bill is attached.

Promises of great social and economic advances are not sober pledges when they leave out of account the effect on the taxpayer's pocketbook. He may in any given situation be willing to pay the price, either through inflation or higher taxes, but at least he should know what it is.

He should not be deluded into imagining he can enjoy major gains at no cost to himself. The current vocal supporters of so-called progressive legislation have not yet shown that they understand the need to be utterly candid on this important point.

One More Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, members of the Republican Party and members of the Democratic Party in recent speeches have expressed great fears over the present course of the cold war. Their emphasis is placed upon the gravity of the present situation. Yet the American people appear apathetic. What is the reason? Have they succumbed to the new look of the Soviet leaders of the U.S.S.R.? Have the Russian visitors, Mikoyan and Koslov, left a favorable impression? Have the Americans forgotten the lessons of treacheries, bloodshed, deceit and violence of communism? Have we forgotten the captive peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Bulgaria, Poland, Hungary, and Red China? I hope all will pay heed to one more warning:

[From America, July 18, 1959]

SOVIET UNION: THE NEW LOOK

(By L. C. McHugh)

Russia's clever iconographers have been working overtime lately. The result is a gigantic triptych that was unveiled in New York's Coliseum on June 30. It is called the U.S.S.R. Exhibition of Achievements in Science, Technology, and Culture. No matter that the achievements are not always carefully distinguished from the stuff that dreams are made on—the show is calculated to interpret Russia's New Look to the American public. One dollar and 3 hours of rambling amid machines, models, placards, and products wil give you such a tour of the Soviet Union as you couldn't buy in Moscow for a bagful of rubles.

I will not attempt to describe this impressive display of some 10,000 items. The Soviet trade fair is carefully planned and cunningly executed. It has a powerful psychological impact on the spectator, especially if he is ignorant of classic Marxism and the realities of Soviet history. My sole concern here is to show how this exhibit uses the direct pitch and the hidden sell to project a beguilling picture of communism.

The direct pitch weaves together three simple themes: peace, technological prowess, and the proletariat. The first of these hits you as soon as you step into the lobby of the coliseum. Your eyes fasten on a muscular nude who is laboriously beating a sword into a plowshare. "Peace, it's wonderful," is the glowing thought that lightens your heart as you mount the moving stairway to the main exhibit floors. Riding the escalator is like climbing into a slice of sky that is gleaming with sputniks. Here is a master stroke of propaganda: The peaceful rockets, unquestionable symbols of Russian technical prowess, dominate the whole exhibition and condition the mind to acquiesce in the reality of Soviet supremacy in all the other displays. The third theme engages the eye almost as soon as the rockets do. Under the vaulting segment of Russian sky looms a heroic bronze worker, the obvious creator of these lush acres of technological magic.

With these three themes variously compounded and endlessly reiterated in photos, placards, production items and artful models, the desired image of the U.S.S.R. begins to jell. It is the image of a vast society

of hardworking people who are marching confidently into an automated future of goodies and gadgets. They march at a dizzy pace, but they can pause long enough to give you a glimpse of their creative dynamism. They invite you to admire their technology, envy their education, share their love of sports. They will even let you ride in their dreamboats. All they ask of the cold non-Communist world is peace—atoms-for-peace, peaceful coexistence, peaceful competition in creating the earthly paradise. Very disarming indeed. The Soviet Union would like nothing so much as "to build a house by the side of the road and be a friend to man."

The hidden sell, too, lurks in the coliseum. All the brassy clangor of classic communist propaganda is muted or overridden by loud organ tones of sweetness and light. The exhibition reveals none of the gross materialism that is essential to Marxism. The average viewer gets no impression of economic determinism, no theorizing on the bloody class struggle, no hint of the death of God and the martyrdom of His people that are involved in the march of progress. One walks out of the show without any concept of the totalitarian state and its subjugation of human dignity. There are no blaring echoes of the glorious leader motet or the sycophantic cult of personality that disgusts the decent human being when he thinks of Soviet politics. In fact, one can leave this gaudy trade show with the impression that communism is nothing more dangerous than an economic and social plan for harnessing heaven, a sort of perennial Brotherhood Week.

Against the backdrop of a happy people preoccupied with the construction of an earthly paradise, the sourness of Gromyko and the harshness of Khrushchev seem unreal. In the never-never land of the coliseum, aggression and subversion, missiles and militarism are nasty words that have been expunged grom the dictionary. Upstage and downstage surge only the Soviet masses which, as Mr. Kozlov told us when he opened this fantastic exhibtion, "cannot harbor any evil intentions in regard to other nations."

This disarming and beguiling image of the Soviet Union, calculated to put the viewer off guard, is precisely the impression that the U.S.S.R. exhibit is meant to stamp on the minds and hearts of the unwary groundlings.

The Dixon-Yates Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an editorial entitled "Two Millions for Nothing," which appeared in the July 16, 1959, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

TWO MILLIONS FOR NOTHING

The damage claim of the Dixon-Yates syndicate against the U.S. Government which the U.S. Court of Claims has just upheld leaves the Eisenhower administration in a thoroughly ironical position. Here is an economy-preaching administration, which has scrimped on resource development, public education, national defense, and many other items, called on to pay out $1,837,545 for absolutely nothing in return—a complete waste of money. Here is an administration which promised to bring business methods to Government penalized to the tune of nearly 2 million by its own bungling.

For the Dixon-Yates case has been a bungle from beginning to end. President Eisenhower ordered the contract in 1954 to produce private power to replace power the Tennessee Valley Authority was supplying to the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission—and President Eisenhower canceled the contract in 1955 when it became too hot to handle.

The administration through its Department of Justice then attacked, as against the public interest, the contract it had commanded the TVA and the AEC to sign as being in the public interest. The legal attack was based on the contention that Wall Street Banker Adolphe Wenzell was guilty of conflict of interest for serving the Government and his firm at the same time. If there was any conflict, it had been carefully arranged within the administration itself.

At the same time as his Attorney General was attacking the canceled contract in court, President Eisenhower continued to defend it at press conferences, aided by his then chairman of the AEC, Lewis L. Strauss.

What more would it take to make an opera bouffe? A musical accompaniment would be required, but it would be a crime against literature to change a word of the script.

The Equal Rights Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged this past weekend to attend a celebration at Alva Belmont House, Washington, in honor of the 111th anniversary of a historic meeting at Seneca Falls, N.Y. The celebration was held to recognize the date of July 19, 1848, when the equal-rights-for-women movement came into being in the United States.

The Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, of New York, a long-time champion of this cause, delivered a particularly illuminating speech at this celebration, and I feel it is appropriate that the speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

(By KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, Member of Congress, July 19, 1959, at the celebration of the 111th birthday of the historic meeting at Seneca Falls, Alva Belmont House, Washington)

Members of the National Woman's Party, ladies, and gentlemen, I think that before saying anything on the subject of equal rights for men and women, we all want to thank Mrs. Mesta, the greatest Washington hostess and one of the greatest hostesses of the world, to promote the cause and to assist the work of the National Woman's Party to further the passage of this constitutional amendment.

There are many of the members of the National Woman's Party here tonight but I want to pay especial tribute to Mrs. Walker, the president, who came all the way back from Florida for this occasion, and to Miss Paul, who has been a valiant fighter for the cause of equality since the days of the victorious fight that gave the women of the United States the right to vote.

All the members here are worthy of special mention, all have worked and are working for this great cause, and we are hoping, through the passage of this amendment, to achieve the final and complete victory.

A little over a century ago, July 19, 1848, the equal rights for women movement came into being in the United States at a small gathering at Seneca Falls, N.Y. This was the first equal rights for women meeting ever held in the United States and, as far as is known, the first equal rights for women meeting ever held in the entire world.

At this meeting, women demanded the vote. They demanded the right to enter schools and colleges, to enter the professions, to hold political office, to control their own property, to earn a living for themselves and their dependents, to control their own earnings. They demanded equal guardianship of their children, the right to make contracts, the right to make a will, the right to sit on a jury, the right to conduct a business. In short, as set forth in one of their "Declarations":

"We insist that they (women) have immediate admission to all the rights and privileges which belong to them as citizens of the United States."

Twelve resolutions and a declaration of sentiments were adopted at this historic meeting. A momentous declaration of independence was issued. "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men and women are created equal," they intoned; American men at that time scoffed, ridiculed, and angrily rejected this claim to equality. They called it "feminism" and firmly classified it with atheism and socialism. But today it has provoked what one writer has called the greatest American revolution: the emergence of the American wife from the status of charwoman and maternity machine to that of an independent human being with the heady power of freedom.

In 1848, when the first National Woman's Rights Convention made its declaration of independence, there were, beyond all argument, serious defects in the status of women, particularly married women, in the United States.

Is there really any need to discuss, "Why a Constitutional Amendment?" There are those who desire more of an answer, and it can be given. Following a survey of various fields of law it is revealed that, despite the great progress that has been made toward narrowing the common law gap between the sexes, there is no full legal equality for women in present-day America. The magnitude of this remaining differentiation has led to the introduction in Congress of this equal rights amendment. Some of us have become dissatisfied with the slow process of whittling away at discriminatory legislation statute by statute, and now seek to achieve absolute legal equality for our sex in one constitutional stroke.

In looking over the life of Susan B. Anthony we find that the Revolution, her magazine had as its motto these words: "Men their rights and nothing more; women their rights and nothing less." We always find any philosophy best stated briefly and the more talk and verbiage we get the less we understand and the less, to be brutally frank, we know what we are talking about. In these very simple words Susan B. Anthony and her friends epitomized what the so-called equal rights amendment would do, and also answered the objections of those who claim it would take away necessary protection and special legislation needed by women.

This amendment would protect the rights of men and women. The title reads:

"Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women."

We want both sexes to have their rights, nothing more and nothing less. These rights

we spell out as being equality under the Constitution, nothing more or nothing less. It is the fashion in some quarters to say: "Oh, I am all for equal pay for equal work." Well, you will never get it until you have full equality under the Constitution and under the law. You will never get it as long as you have second-class citizens, be they men or women, under the Constitution.

We are constantly told that the women of our country have all the money, all the power in the world, and that the American male is an unfortunate worm who toils ceaselessly for the female of the species without regard and without apparently even a kind word or a pat on the head. We are told that he will welcome the amendment, or should—this is considered perfectly hilarious—because it would give him some rights and some semblance of equality which he does not now posses.

Well, the supporters of the amendment believe in equality, nothing more, nothing less. I quote the opening sentence of the amendment:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

Medical Care for Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1959, I introduced H.R. 7154, a bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits. This bill is identical to the bill introduced by Congressman AIME J. FORAND, and which is numbered H.R. 4700.

The following is the statement which I presented to the Committee on Ways and Means in support of my bill, which remarks I believe will be of interest to the readers:

STATEMENT OF HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, CONGRESSMAN FROM THE 18TH DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 7154

This 86th Congress now has the opportunity—and responsibility—to continue the progress that has been made since the Social Security Act of 1935.

The opportunity confronts us in the form of H.R. 7154, which I have introduced, and which is identical to H.R. 4700, which this committee is now considering. Under this bill, persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits would be assured of essential medical insurance coverage.

The results of innumerable studies and surveys support my conviction that one of the most pressing problems of the elderly is how they can meet the onslaught of expensive medical care which most of them inevitably face. It is indisputable that few of them have incomes or resources sufficient to cover long and costly illnesses and surgical care. An abundance of such evidence has already been presented to the committee. Sickness often constitutes a catastrophe for our older people and for their families.

Those who experienced illness, short or prolonged, know the aches and pains which came with the night and disappear with the dawn. Sickness and illness are companions of old age, especially for persons above the age of 65 of whom there are approximately 15 million in the United States. Ask any of these senior citizens as to their health and you invite a torrent of complaint as to subjective and objective pain and agony. Five hundred and twenty-four out of every 1,000 of these over 65 are receiving old-age and survivors insurance. These would be assured of medical care under this bill.

In my State of New York, 150 million are over 65 years of age and approximately 780,000 would receive the benefits of these provisions. From the number of requests I receive in my congressional office from elderly people who seek supplemental welfare or additional medical care, one would think that the greatest percentage of these people reside in my congressional district.

In addition to the great number of people suffering from illness due to old age, we know that the illnesses of later life are not only of longer duration but are also of a more serious nature. These facts were brought home to me by a conference held in my State of New York on financing health costs of the aged. In addressing the conference which he had convened, former Governor Harriman stated:

"The costs of adequate medical care for older persons are higher than for younger persons. Hospitalization is needed more often and for longer periods of time. Prolonged care is more frequently required, because chronic disease is more common among the aged. A recent national study showed that the average annual cost of medical care for persons over 65 was $102 compared to $65 for the general population.

"At the same time that extra care is needed, the older person has fewer financial resources to meet the added cost. As medical and hospital costs have risen sharply in the past quarter century, retirement income has not kept pace."

Those meetings brought to light much information which supports my proposal. For example, our New York State Commissioner of Health, Dr. Herman E. Hilleboe, pointed out that, according to a survey made by the National Opinion Research Center in 1955, approximately 62 percent of all age groups in New York State were insured against the cost of hospitalization while only 35 percent of the population 65 years and over had such insurance. Obviously the ability and opportunity to pay for medical care or to purchase health insurance depends on age, income, and whether an individual has a job. Group insurance provided for people at work usually ends with retirement—the time, sadly enough, when most people need it the most.

The New York conference report took account of the difficulty that elderly people have in meeting hospital bills by pointing to figures developed by the American Hospital Association's commission on financing of hospital care. These statistics showed that 21 percent of those patients who could not pay their hopital bills were 65 years of age and over whereas persons in this age group comprised less than 9 percent of the overall population. The conclusion was that many older persons—perhaps as many as 80 percent—would not be able to meet medical bills, even of a fairly modest amount, from income presently available to them.

Another significant 80-percent figure concerns the chronic disease problems which face older people. As I have already said, illnesses of the elderly are likely to be more severe and of longer duration. This is documented by the studies conducted by the staff of the commission on chronic illness which show that the age group 65 and over had 80 percent more chronic cases than did the age group 35 to 64.

From these and others related studies it is clear that the health needs of older people are exceedingly complex. The situation is made more difficult because the kind of magnificent care which is becoming available through the skill of medical science is very costly. I agree with Commissioner Hilleboe that these people have "every reason to demand a bill of health rights for the aging. Enhancement of the physical and mental capacities of our older people can bring numerous rewards to society by enabling these people to contribute their share to the community good. It also will enable these aging individuals to preserve the dignity and serenity that should be their rightful heritage."

The idea of adding hospital and surgical benefits to the social security system is not a new one. But up to the present, it has received little legislative consideration. This proposal is a classic example of the concept of a government's responsibility described by Abraham Lincoln. Mr. Lincoln said that the legitimate function of government "is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they by individual effort cannot do at all, or do so well."

The problem is a growing one. Figures from the Census Bureau indicate that in 1960 persons aged 65 years and over will constitute a new high of 8.8 percent of our country's total population. Most of these people will be living on fixed retirement incomes, which often are barely adequate to cover daily needs. At the same time they will be asked to meet medical costs which are soaring far beyond their means, at a rate even higher than other items in the cost of living index. The result can only be a denial of adequate medical care to a portion of the population that needs it most, or financial calamity for those who do seek it.

I believe, however, that passage of this pending social security legislation will solve the grotesque dilemma facing our older people, in a thoroughly reasonable and equitable way. The estimated annual costs of $1 billion would be paid for through a slight increase in social security taxes of three-eighths percent of payroll for employees and employers, and nine-sixteenths percent for the self-employed on all earnings up to $4,800 a year. In this way each person under the social security system would contribute to the cost of the program in a way and at a time that he could afford.

It has been argued that the number of older people who have medical coverage under private insurance plans is growing at such a rapid rate that government sponsored legislation in this field is unnecessary. I do not believe that this argument is a valid one. In the first place, only two out of five now have this coverage, and much of that is inadequate and uncertain. Secondly, it seems clear that the point will soon be reached where all those who can afford coverage will have it, and the others will be left without protection of any kind. Thirdly, private plans, which have only limited membership, can never be in a position to offer insurance at a rate which a more comprehensive, federally sponsored system can support. The costs will inevitably be higher.

I think it must be recognized, too, that the program of coverage provided under H.R. 7154 has very specific and immediate advantages over most private systems. There would be no problem of denial of benefits because of preexisting conditions. Benefit coverage could not be arbitrarily withdrawn, but would be automatic and continuous. The size of hospital and surgical benefits would be generally far more adequate than those presently available under private insurance. Benefits to cover nursing home costs would also be provided.

This legislation to help our older people is clearly within the responsibility of the Na-

tional Government and of this Congress. It is a responsibility which, in view of the desperate need, we dare not abdicate. Delay can only mean unnecessary anguish for thousands of people. Through the social security system now in existence we already have the administrative machinery and resources to put the program into almost immediate operation. By taking advantage of this opportunity, we would be rendering our older citizens, and the country, an invaluable service.

It seems to me that we are needlessly hesitant about passing this legislation, failing to recognize that we have, after all, already admitted our responsibility in related areas of need. There is a long history of legislation relating to the elderly. Congress has also taken vitally important steps to help assure the people of this country that they will have necessary medical facilities available. I point to the Hospital Construction Act as a primary example of this.

Aside from the many questions and issues involved in the consideration of this bill, all of which will undoubtedly be discussed before the committee, I believe there is one basic consideration which must be kept in the forefront. There is needless suffering—not just in my district, or my State—but throughout the country. We cannot completely eliminate this suffering, but we can alleviate it.

The strength, health, and vitality of our people is a resource we must protect. In view of this, favorable action on this legislation is essential. Our senior citizens are entitled to a bill of rights to provide for their old age. This bill is a bill of rights for our senior citizens.

More Reasons for Partnership Development of Trinity Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the House Interior Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation began hearings on July 20 on bills to provide that withdrawals or reservations of public lands shall not affect certain water rights; to require the Federal Government to submit to state laws on control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water, and to recognize the authority of the States over its water. On July 24 the subcommittee will consider a related subject, namely, whether the Federal Government shall preclude an electric company from building and operating the Trinity River powerplants in northern California. The common vein flowing through these hearings concerns the extent to which Congress will permit the Federal Government to expand its asserted claims of paramountcy over the individual States and their citizens in the fields of water rights and water development.

In the matter of water development, the July 24 consideration of the Trinity issue will determine basically whether the Government is to continue needless spending in the face of an offer by a utility to finance the powerplants itself and thereby to "financially aid and assist" water development, as provided by the Central Valley Project Act of 1937, of which the Trinity project is a unit. As phrased by the Marysville (Calif.) Appeal-Democrat, regarding Secretary Seaton's advocating the Trinity partnership proposal, "Whereas in the original Central Valley project planning power was intended to help pay for water, the Bureau of Reclamation has sought to make water pay for power." Commenting on the plan whereby the Government, not the utility, would build the plants, the Appeal-Democrat continues, it "asks the majority of the people of the State to subsidize tax-free power facilities for a few privileged communities. It asks the taxpayers to pick up the $55 million tab for construction of Trinity power development. Worst of all, it recommends that the power phases of the project not be used for the fullest benefit of the water users of California, the very people the Trinity, Feather, and other California water projects are intended to help."

An editorial in the Santa Cruz (Calif.) Sentinel in my district, reads in part:

The Pacific Gas & Electric maintains that under the proposed partnership for the Trinity project, the initial cost will be $55 million less than under total Federal operation, that Pacific Gas & Electric will pay $165 million for water from the Trinity more than the project would receive under public operation, and that Pacific & Electric will pay tion, and that Pacific Gar & Electric will pay an estimated $135 million in taxes during the 50-year tenure of the contract.

The article also states:

If private utilities can provide adequate power for an area, it is our opinion that such an operation is far more beneficial, all things considered, than the so-called cheap power provided by the bureaucracy of Government.

The concluding sentence editorializes:

Therefore, we favor the partnership plan for the Trinity project and appeal for confirmation by Congress of the plan proposed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The San Juan Mission News, also in the 10th District, which I am privileged to represent, admonishes us:

Remember this: There is no magic or secret way by which Government can furnish goods or services at cheaper rates than private enterprise. The magic touch can only be provided by Government using its powers to subsidize the few who directly benefit by shifting the costs to all the taxpayers. And beside this important issue—look at the money angle: The Pacific Gas & Electric offer would provide $310 million in benefits to the public which would be lost otherwise. Thus, instead of being a tax burden, the project would be a taxpaying enterprise.

Again, the answer to this problem clearly is to permit the utility to construct and operate the power facilities, save the Government nearly $60 million in construction costs immediately, and save the Nation's taxpayers $175 million in additional surplus to the Central Valley project over Federal development and $83 million paid by the company in Federal taxes. The correct, proper and sensible solution is inescapable: Let investor-capital supply the construction costs, and the Nation's taxpayers and California water users will receive the square deal promised them by both political parties.

Space Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 19, 1959, the Washington Sunday Star published an editorial entitled "Mistake in Space," berating the House for cutting the funds requested by the administration for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Star, in its editorial, asks the question: "Why such economizing?"

One of the best reasons can be found in the same newspaper of the same day. On page A22, the Sunday Star carried an Associated Press story reporting that information about the administration's space program had been withheld from the Symington subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. The Symington subcommittee reported that the "exercise of executive privilege hinders the Congress from obtaining basic policy information." This is the latest instance of the administration's growing practice of hiding under the cloak of privilege information needed by the Congress to fulfill its Constitutional duties in legislating, particularly in the vital fields of space, foreign aid and defense.

Contrary to the Star's conclusion—and there is no reason to doubt the soundness of its warning—there is clearly strong reason to question the judgment of any person charged with programing the expenditure of large sums of public moneys. There is a right and a need for the Congress to receive the candid advice and judgment of public servants without their invoking specious claims of privilege.

The editorial and the Associated Press story follow:

[From the Washington Star, July 19, 1959]

MISTAKE IN SPACE

Dr. T. Keith Glennan, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, has pulled no punches in his appearance before the Senate Appropriations Committee. Speaking in somber and urgent tones, he has flatly declared that the House, in recently voting to cut $68 million from his agency's budget for the current fiscal year, has taken a step that threatens to result in "disastrous consequences," and there is no reason to doubt the soundness of his warning.

The sum sought by NASA, with the strong and unqualified backing of President Eisenhower, is $530 million. As Dr. Glennan has said, this represents a tight budget with "less than any slack in it." In other words, it is the rockbottom minimum needed to give our country, for the sake of both its prestige and its security in a dangerous world, a fighting chance to catch up with the Soviet Union in space, and to go on from there to achieve genuine leadership in the field—an unchallengeable second-to-none position.

This is the objective that the American people want to see attained with the least possible delay. It is why Congress not many months ago, after the Russians had successfully orbited the world's first earth satellite, acted with extraordinary speed and unanim-

ity in bringing NASA into being and in recommending that no expense be spared to establish our country's supremacy in space. Yet, with massive inconsistency and a certain measure of recklessness, the House now has slashed a great chunk out of the money the President has requested to do the job that must be done if such supremacy is ever to be realized.

Why such economizing? In Dr. Glennan's words, "What has happened * * * to give anyone a sense of complacency? * * * Have we—who started serious work in the space field 6 or 7 years after the Soviets were pouring unlimited funds and their best brains into the drive for dominance in space—suddenly achieved some enormous advantage?" Of course we haven't. Actually, we still lag behind in several vital respects, and so we can ill afford to pinch pennies in dealing with a situation in which "the United States must bend every effort to achieve a position of leadership. * * * And we are all agreed that leadership in a race where there are only two participants cannot conceivably mean running second."

In saying this, and in admonishing that there will be "disastrous consequences" if the House cut is sustained, Dr. Glennan has backed himself up with a chapter-and-verse documentation of what is likely to happen unless Congress restores the money that has been taken away. Among others, the "consequences" will involve a slowing down, a curtailment or a shelving of key projects—including the one aimed at sending an American into orbit in 1961—designed to make us look reasonably impressive in our spatial competition with the Russians.

Accordingly, it is good to know that space-minded Senator JOHNSON, the majority leader, is in agreement with all this. As he has put it, it would be "a great mistake" not to provide NASA with every penny it has asked for. We hope that Congress as a whole, when the issue is finally decided, will act in keeping with the warning that he and Dr. Glennan have both sounded.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, July 19, 1959]

SENATE GROUP PROTESTS SPACE PLANS SECRECY

A Senate space group said last night a Presidential secrecy decision is keeping from Congress information about the Nation's astronautics program.

In a report to its parent Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, the Subcommittee on Governmental Organization for Space Activities said this "exercise of executive privilege hinders the Congress from obtaining basic policy information."

Congressional committees have expressed similar complaints about other activities during the past few months. These have included the asserted withholding of information by the executive branch from the General Accounting Office and charges by the House Government Information Subcommittee that testimony has been withheld under White House policy.

The Senate subcommittee said there should be improvements in reports by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Federal Council for Science and Technology, and similar agencies "in order that more complete information will be presented regarding the space policies, programs, and activities of all agencies."

PRIVILEGE OF PRESIDENT

Committee members asked why information was withheld. Senator Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, excerpts from testimony showed, asked whether the theory behind that was "secret information or is it the privilege of the President?"

Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Director of NASA, said "It is the privilege of the President." And to another question he said "No; classified information was not the reason."

Some members said they thought that the only overall report made by NASA so far was inadequate.

Senator SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, subcommittee chairman, said this report was "essentially a summary of what has been done in the first year" and "really no projection beyond the current year." The subcommittee's report called the NASA account "primarily a résumé of space events" instead of the comprehensive description of planned activities provided for under the act setting up the space agency.

Senator SMITH, Republican, of Maine, wanted to know whether the space program was planned by space experts or "tailored to the budget on a year-to-year basis?"

Dr. Glennan insisted that "the Bureau of the Budget does not plan the space program."

"The validity of the program, the character of the program, is something we in the agency settle," he said.

QUESTION ON CONTROL

The Senate group said it was uncertain who had what authority in the space programs among NASA and Pentagon agencies.

However, the subcommittee decided that no changes in the law through new legislation are needed now, that these can be accomplished by executive order. Among other things, the subcommittee said there should be a clarification of the roles and missions of each of the Armed Forces—Army, Navy, and Air Force—in the space program.

Failure to act promptly to correct the inadequacies pointed out by the subcommittee, the report said, "will not only result in additional waste of time, money, and skilled personnel but also will impair both our national security and our international prestige."

Poison in Your Water—No. 142

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in Tuesday, July 14, 1959, edition of the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald.

I have on a number of occasions inserted into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD articles and editorial comment in the newspapers on the radioactive substances which have been dumped into the Animas River, in Colorado and New Mexico, and the danger to the people from that dumping there.

Contrary to what might be thought the dumping of waste into the Animas is not an isolated instance. This article entitled "More Streams Found Polluted by Radium" shows that the San Miguel River in southwestern Colorado is also polluted by wastes from a number of uranium refineries.

As in the case of the Animas the river is used for supplying nearby communities and for irrigation. In cases of use by communities the tapwater was found to have radium content 1.5 times permissible limit. Radium like strontium 90 is a bone seeker and causes leukemia and bone tumors.

The article also mentions pollution of Colorado River with radioactive wastes by refinery at Grand Junction.

I hope all will read this article.

MORE STREAMS FOUND POLLUTED BY RADIUM

(By Edward Gamarekian)

The pollution of a number of streams in the Colorado River Basin with radioactive wastes from four uranium ore refineries came to light during the past week in an unpublished 1955 report by the U.S. Public Health Service.

Concentrations of radium in the river water were found to be as high as 22 times the maximum permissible limit.

Although the report was made 4 years ago, virtually nothing has been done to correct the situation since then, with one recent exception. A few weeks ago, the Vanadium Corp. of America, under pressure by the Public Health Service, said it would stop dumping radium into the Animas River from its refinery at Durango, Colo. The Public Health Service found that 30,000 people living downstream from the plant were unknowingly ingesting radium at a rate of 2.7 to 4.6 times the permissible limit.

Radium, like strontium 90, is a bone-seeker that can cause leukemia and bone tumors. Although it is not considered dangerous to exceed the permissible limit for short periods of time, excessive amounts for extended periods can result in dangerous accumulations in the bones which will remain there.

REFINERIES INCREASE

The 1955 Public Health Service report contains brief measurements on the rivers that carry wastes away from six refineries. Four showed excessive radioactivity. There are now about 28 uranium refineries in the United States. The number has been increasing at a rapid rate—about 8 to 10 new ones during the last 18 months—yet nothing is known about the extent to which most of them are polluting the streams into which they discharge.

The Public Health Service says it does not have the facilities or money to do the job. The Atomic Energy Commission says the same, although it has been charged with responsibility for the public's health by the Atomic Energy Act.

The 1955 PHS report shows that the radioactive pollution of the San Miguel River in southwestern Colorado is coming from two sources, the uranium refineries at Uravan and Naturita.

Downstream from the Natuvan plant, the radium concentration is as much as 22 times the permissible limit for human consumption—28 micromicrocuries per liter as compared to a permissible limit of four. Below this point, the concentration gradually decreases because of the pickup of radium by fish, insects, and algae.

Downstream from the Naturita plant, the radium level is 5.5 times the limit, and this too decreases further on.

A Public Health Service scientist, E. C. Tsivoglou, yesterday stated that relatively few people live along the banks of the San Miguel.

REPORT MADE LAST YEAR

In a paper delivered at a nuclear energy conference last year, Tsivoglou reported that the river below the Naturita plant served as the water supply for a small community and that the tap water during some tests was found to have an average radium content of 1.5 times the permissible limit.

In the vicinity of the uranium mills, river water is also used for the irrigation of crop lands and grazing lands, stock watering and recreation, Tsivoglou pointed out.

The fourth case of river pollution mentioned in the 1955 PHS report, in addition to the two in the San Miguel and the one in the Animas River, was the pollution of the Colorado River by a refinery at Grand Junction.

The radium concentration in the river from this plant was found to be 10 times the permissible limit.

Portsmouth Metal Trades Council Favors S. 19, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard Wage Rate Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement from the Portsmouth Metal Trades Council, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations of Portsmouth, N.H., and Kittrey, Maine, an organization representing the employees at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, in reference to S. 19, a bill to regulate and fix wages at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, and companion bills filed in the House.

In my opinion, these employees have a justifiable complaint since their wages at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard are not commensurate with the wages of those employed at the Boston Naval Shipyard at like employment. There should be no discrimination made between these two shipyards located within 60 miles of each other since Federal workers in this area employed in one shipyard do certain types of work identical with those employed in the other shipyard, but receive more wages.

Since the bill has passed the Senate without objection on May 26, 1959, I am hopeful that the House Committee on Armed Services will program this legislation for an early hearing. This situation should be rectified and at this 1st session of the 86th Congress:

Since the year 1947, the Navy has established wage schedules for blue-collar workers at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard using a new "immediate vicinity" concept of comparable jobs in private industry. This procedure has resulted in dissatisfaction and resentment, primarily because no comparable jobs or comparable industry exist within the survey area as prescribed by the Navy. These factors were recognized during the years prior to 1947 when the wages at Boston and Portsmouth (which are less than 60 miles apart) were the same. Incidently there were no apparent disastrous consequences, as claimed by the Navy, would result by enactment of S. 19. For reasons yet unexplained, the Navy, in 1947, made two separate wage-survey areas for Boston and Portsmouth. Since that time hundreds of attempts for administrative return to the procedures used prior to 1947 have been made by our Senators and Congressmen. This the Navy adamantly refused to do, while at the same time recognizing that unfair inequities existed.

S. 19, a bill to regulate and fix wages at the Portsmouth Shipyard would correct this injustice. It was passed without objection by the Senate on May 26, 1959. It is essentially the same as S. 2266 which was passed by the 85th Congress unanimously, vetoed by the President, overridden by the Senate, and sustained by the House by a narrow margin in August of 1958.

The primary motivation to sustain the veto by the House was an Executive order by the Secretary of the Navy, inspired by the President, to invoke the "public interest clause" to meet the objections of the Congress and the employee organizations at the shipyard in Portsmouth. It is our contention that the Navy did not act in good faith, and only intended to provide the abovementioned motivation. It is a matter of public record that at the very next opportunity (December 6, 1958) the Navy proceeded to increase the disparity which was reduced by the Executive order of August 1958.

S. 19 and the companion bills in the House, which have had bipartisan support, are the only alternative to attain fairplay and justice. The facts are, we only seek to recover procedures arbitrarily taken away. The new procedures have placed Portsmouth in the unique position of being the only major naval installation located outside a heavy industrial area. The net result being no comparable industry or jobs upon which to base a fair wage determination.

We would also point out that the "immediate vicinity" concept is not the gospel as many would have you believe. As an example over 1,600 Navy employees at the Portsmouth Shipyard have their wages set by means other than immediate vicinity surveys. In fact, our complete argument is based upon the contention that people should be paid for services rendered and work performed, rather than be paid different or substandard wages only because the area does not contain heavy industry other than the Navy installation.

With these thoughts in mind, we respectfully request and urge you to actively support S. 19 and the companion bills in the House introduced by Mr. MERROW, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. BATES, and Mr. LANE.

Résumé of the Program and Addresses Delivered on Sudeten German Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1959, the Sudeten German expellees celebrated their annual Sudeten German Day in Vienna, Austria.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a short résumé of the program and the messages delivered by Dr. Ing. Julius Raab, Austria's Federal Chancellor, and Dr. Rudolf Lodgman von Auer, president of the Sudeten German Association:

At the season of Pentecost, or Whitsunday, Christians whose faith has not yielded to the acids of modernity celebrate the descent upon the Apostles of the Holy Spirit. It is not by chance that the Sudeten German expellees have chosen this sacred feast of comfort and reassurance as a time for reunion and rededication to a just solution of the problems resulting from the loss of their homes by Communist brutality and theft.

Convening for the 10th time since they were forced to leave homelands of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia—known since 1919 as Sudetenland—the expellees met 400,000 strong to face realistically but without revenge or hatred the problems linked to their return to antestral farms, trades, and industries. Numerically exceeding all former rallies, 1959 saw Sudeten Germans throng to Vienna, pregnant with historic meaning and with youthful memories for thousands of their members.

Messages rolled in from high church and civil dignitaries. Pope John XXIII wired an apostolic blessing; West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer sent "hopes that the meeting on neutral Austrian soil leads to harmony and understanding between European neighbors."

From Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives came congratulatory wires and letters. Messages were also received from the Steuben Society of America, patriotic, and anti-Communist organizations, all expressing solidarity with the Sudeten aims and their dedication to self-determination and to a future in freedom.

Key figures in this year's demonstration were President of the Sudeten German Association, Dr. Rudolf Lodgman von Auen, and Austria's Federal Chancellor, Dr. Ing. Julius Raab, to whom the Sudeten Karl's Prize was awarded. The Karl's Prize goes annually to a political leader, scientist or publicist who has made an outstanding contribution to the idea of a United Europe.

Addressing as compatriots the 200,000 Sudetens assembled on Vienna's spacious Heldenplatz (Heroes Square), with its monuments to Archduke Karl and Prince Eugene, Chancellor Raab said: "If I say 'compatriots' to you, there is good reason for my so doing. My father, too, was a Sudeten German, born in Klein-Mohrau at the foot of the Altvater, attended school in Freudenthal and later came to Vienna as a young technician to help build the Vienna University.

"The peoples of German ethnic origin were driven from their homes whether or not they were in sympathy with Hitler's policies of terror, even victims of national socialism had to go."

Praising the willingness of the expellees to help rebuild Austria's war-damaged economic structure, Raab emphasized that it was the Sudeten group who did most to restore normal economic activity. He voiced esteem for the Sudetens who, he stressed, "have come here with no thought of revenge or force. They have founded a new livelihood and are satisfied, even if their present circumstances are much humbler than they were before."

In expressing thanks for being selected as recipient of the Karl's Prize, Chancellor Raab remarked: "The awarding of the Karl's Prize might primarily be interpreted as a sign of solidarity between our new citizens and the native population. Karl IV of the House of Luxembourg, elected emperor in 1347 and crowned in Rome 8 years later, was a farsighted realist whose chief focus was on the economic development of central Europe. He was a promoter of trade and industry. With the University of Prague he created an intellectual center that shone out far beyond the borders of Bohemia and we must not forget that the University of Prague was the mother university of our own Vienna alma mater."

Referring to the role of Austria today as a small nation at the crossroads between two worlds that face each other with great distrust and enmity, Dr. Raab added: "Historical record will one day refrain from entering the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans on the page of honor of human culture of the 20th century. The expulsions are only explainable as due to the internal disruption of the war and early postwar years that seized the Czech people, otherwise so industrious and peaceful."

"If one tries to justify the expulsions by saying that under Hitler millions lost their lives or were brought to disaster, one only descends to Hitler's own level * * * Not force,

but the desire that man * * * should not become a machine, should be a human being in every possible sense of the word. I know," said Raab in conclusion, "that you have come to this demonstration, one with us in these sentiments, and I beg you to join us on this road toward the well-being of Europe and the blessing of mankind."

Dr. Rudolf Lodgman von Auen, following Dr. Raab to the speaker's stand, told those gathered on the square that a telegram had been sent to the Ministers convening in Geneva stating that the Sudeten Germans expected them to strive toward a just peace that would not be based on expulsion and expropriation.

In his address Lodgman stressed: "We have not come to Vienna as the Prague Government implied, as revengists and nationalists, to infringe on Austrian neutrality and foster feelings of hatred and revenge against the Czech people. The Sudeten Germans have come to Vienna as a national group that has abandoned any thought of retaliation and, despite the events of 1945–46, desires to hold out their hand to reconciliation with the Czechs."

"Preservation of a great heritage." "That is the motto of the 10th Sudeten German Day," continued the speaker, "and if the Sudeten Germans dedicate themselves to historic solidarity with the peoples of the Danubian area and to one folk unity, it is also a pledge to a new middle Europe in the spirit of mutual respect and self-determination of all peoples and national groups in that area. It is a day of recollection of the occidental supranational concept which old Austria represented throughout the 19th and 20th centuries as a spiritual heritage of the Holy Roman Empire."

"Ever since the Middle Ages the Bohemian and Austrian lands were dynastically and culturally linked. From 1526 to 1918 the homelands of the Sudetens were united with the Austria hereditary lands under the scepter of the Hapsburgs. The Sudeten German Day serves also to refresh these facts in our memories and in so doing makes the occasion a day for the Austrians as well.

"For the Sudeten people the treaty of St. Germain was the beginning of a patch of suffering that led them through forced incorporation into the Czech National State and to expulsion in 1945–46. It was the thorny path which today another national group in old Austria, the south Tiroleans, are forced to go.

"Of the Sudeten people, who numbered more than 3 million souls in the old homelands, there are 2 million living in the West German Federal Republic and Austria today, where they have set up an organization whose aim is to keep alive the concept of homeland.

"Citizens of these respective countries today, the Sudeten Germans have served as a positive element; their presence, that at first seemed a burden, has turned into a permanent gain."

Taking this opportunity to announce his retirement from the political field, Lodgman von Auen concluded his message with the words: "Though we are scattered throughout the world, the Sudeten Germans will remain united in spirit with Austria." Turning to the youth, to whom he entrusted the the struggle for the Sudeten cause, Dr. Lodgman bade them continue the fight for a free homeland in a free Europe.

What Is the Secret of a Successful Life?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, most of us are so busy that we have little opportunity to stop and contemplate, and take inventory of our lives.

In the rush and confusion of each day, there is so little time or opportunity to check on ourselves. We are moving fast, but in what direction? How will we find the real fulfillment that will give meaning to our lives?

There is not one of us who does not feel the need of guidelines to keep us on the right course.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I bring to your thoughtful consideration the following advice from the August 1959 issue of A Magazet:

RULES FOR SUCCESSFUL LIVING

When President Garfield was a young man, someone placed in his hand one day a slip of paper, which he carried with him all his life. The paper contained the following lines:

"Make few promises.
"Always speak the truth.
"Live within your income.
"Never speak evil of anyone.
"Keep good company or none.
"Never play games of chance.
"Drink no intoxicating drinks.
"Good character is above everything else.
"Keep your own secrets, if you have any.
"Never borrow, if you can possibly avoid it.
"Do not marry until you are able to support a wife.
"Keep yourself honest, if you would be happy.
"When you speak to a person, look into his eyes.
"Make no haste to be rich, if you would prosper.
"Save when you are young, to spend when you are old.
"Never run into debt, unless you see a way out again.
"Good company and good conversation are the sinews of virtue.
"Your character cannot be badly hurt except by your own acts.
"If anybody speaks evil of you, let your life be so that no one will believe it.
"Never be idle. If your hands cannot be employed usefully, attend to the culture of your mind."

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Surprising San Angelo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the development of the Western States has been, and continues to be, one of the most exciting aspects of this century. Overnight, cities which scarcely were on the map half a century ago, have grown to 50,000 or to 100,000 in population.

An outstanding example of how the West is realizing its rich and varied potentials is the city of San Angelo, in west Texas. Incorporated in 1903, San Angelo has grown to a city of 66,000—more than doubling its population since 1940. The city continues to thrive, and its progress is dramatic proof of what can be accomplished when men of vision set out to overcome the limitations imposed on a region by nature.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article on this west Texas city. The article, entitled, "Surprising San Angelo," was written by Lewis Nordyke, and was published in Texas Parade magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURPRISING SAN ANGELO

(By Lewis Nordyke)

San Angelo, which is out in the wide, open spaces of developing west Texas, is a surprising city. The visitor who takes the time to look around a little can happen upon many things he didn't expect to see.

As one example, San Angelo's Central High School is one of the most revolutionary public schools in the Nation. It not only is significant of the trend in education in America but it typifies the spirit of solid progress in the city.

The same civic aggressiveness shows in the new million-dollar coliseum, with almost unlimited parking space which is lighted at night. This building would be a credit to any city much larger than San Angelo.

Then there is home-grown industry that has been surprising not only to San Angelo and Texas but to much of the Nation as well. These industries are about as diversified as they can get. At last count there were 87 different manufacturing industries in San Angelo and these are listed under 74 different classifications.

The civic leadership goes all out to help industries get started and keep going. The organized effort in this direction is made through the board of city development and the San Angelo Industrial Foundation. The latter began in 1946 with $123,000 pooled from local citizens and to date it has aided more than a score of local industries which now have an aggregate payroll of more than a million dollars annually.

This leadership is interested in the total economy of the area and has sponsored a community enthusiasm for development. San Angelo College is a typical project. The college offers courses, as the need becomes apparent, for training local people for different jobs. Among such courses are specialized classes in IBM operation, moccasin sewing, and other skills and arts needed by local industries.

That area workers readily learn the skills of industry is attested by the success and growth of these homegrown industries. Take Monarch Tile Manufacturing, Inc., for example. Thirteen years ago a tile contractor decided that there should be a change in the tile situation—improved tile and a greater variety of attractive colors. He started the company which today is a multi-million dollar concern and is among the ten largest tile producers in the Nation. It does business in 28 States in middle America and has warehouses and showrooms in Chicago, Denver, Omaha, Albuquerque, Oklahoma City, San Antonio, Lubbock, El Paso, Houston, Fort Worth, Tucson, Phoenix, and Dallas. Nearly all of these warehouses are operated as individual distributorships which use the Monarch name.

Monarch whipped transportation problems by setting up its own trucking system to deliver the finished products.

When Monarch was started, there were no trained tile workers in the area. Yet the force was recruited from people living in the San Angelo region—people who were willing and able to be taught. Monarch is a shining example of how an industrial concern conceived, developed, financed and managed locally can succeed in San Angelo.

Five years ago, a luggage repairman, a watchmaker and a dentist decided to go into the moccasin-making business. At that time, a long drought had hit the ranching and farming business and agricultural workers were having difficulty in finding work. Among them were quite a few Latin-Americans. They didn't know how to make moccasins, but they soon learned. Today they are prosperous and driving late model cars. Alco moccasins are distributed almost worldwide. This summer the company will make its 9 millionth pair of washable (even in a washing machine) moccasins. The company has 300 employees. It has more than 19,000 accounts—retailers that buy and sell the moccasions. Among these accounts are a few Indian tribes out West that sew a few beads on footgear and sell them in trading posts.

Like Monarch, Alco makes a good product and has had very effective management. It has trained a force of expert workers. Alco is a remarkable example of how a worldwide industry can flourish in San Angelo, starting from scratch in the short period of 5 years.

You'd probably not expect to see it, but there is a printing plant in San Angelo—Newsfoto Publishing Co.—that is one of the Nation's biggest publishers of high school and college yearbooks.

Then there's the San Angelo Die Casting Co. which began after the war with the specialized operation of casting components of the famed York pecan sheller which, incidentally, is another interesting San Angelo industry. Growing from that, San Angelo Die Casting Co. moved into many other fields, including the manufacture of boat trailers. The company now has 67 employees.

Fitting into this pattern of home-grown enterprises are scores of other operations—each an interesting success story in itself.

Not too many years ago a photographer started Wallace Studio specializing in developing and retouching portraits. The operation now keeps up to 110 locally trained specialists busy processing film that comes in from studios all the way from Maine to California and in between.

San Angelo's biggest industry was moved in. It's General Telephone of the Southwest, a subsidiary of General Telephone & Electronics Corp., a billion-dollar concern which is the second largest telephone company in the Nation. The 5-State—Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana—headquarters office is in San Angelo, where there are more than 482 employees. The company serves 265 exchanges in the 5 States. There are more than 287,000 telephones.

The headquarters building is an out-of-this-world thing, a beautiful structure out where there is plenty of parking space. It has won high awards for its architecture. It is air conditioned. It is a sort of outdoor-indoor building. In the center of the inside is a garden with ivy and other plants growing. This garden is protected by an open roof that doesn't look to be open. But when there's rain, it comes showering down in the garden. Employees can sit at their desks and have an inside look at what the weather is like on the outside.

General Telephone sets a high standard of civic service, lending the know-how and energy of its executives to community affairs, notably in the areas of industrial and economic development for which San Angelo has several effective organizations.

There is no doubt that quite a few people outside Texas, and also many inside the State, think of San Angelo as a vigorous outpost of west Texas, a sort of shining metropolis in a land of sheep and cattle, with some oil wells thrown in. This area of Texas is often thought of as a place of wide and very dry horizons. The surprise is that it is growing rapidly into the status of a land of lakes, a sort of oasis. It already has Lake Nasworthy, 7 miles to the southwest, and Lake North Concho (sometimes called San Angelo Reservoir) at the northwest city limits. Three Rivers Dam, a firmly authorized Bureau of Reclamation project figured to cost $32 million will impound a still larger lake, Twin Buttes Reservoir, 9 miles southwest of the city. Land acquisition is now underway for the project. The three streams to be dammed are the Middle Concho, South Concho, and Spring Creek. The completion of this project will put San Angelo in the enviable position of having more than enough water.

San Angelo has all sorts of water sports and good fishing in its present lakes and also fishing in the streams, mainly the North, Middle and South Concho and Spring and Dove Creeks.

So here is a land of water and recreation. When the three rivers project is complete, San Angelo will rank with the best in the Southwest as a recreation center. On top of that, San Angelo has long been noted for its healthful climate.

Such an abundant water supply will support a city 4 times as large as the 66,000 conservatively estimated as San Angelo's population. And it should. For back in 1940 the Federal nose count showed 25,802 people. You can't find anybody in town who isn't convinced the town will grow more in the next 18 years than it did during the past 18 years.

An interesting population statistic was turned up by a survey made a while back by a major oil company. It showed that more than 1,000 people living in the San Angelo area owned or had under lease more than 1,000 acres of land each. This land and these leases were located in many different States.

Located in Tom Green County, San Angelo is 229 miles northwest of Austin, 236 miles from Fort Worth, 268 miles from Dallas, 220 miles from San Antonio, and 451 miles from El Paso. It is the center of a vast area of western Texas and the gateway to the Big Bend country and the Big Bend National Park.

San Angelo was a small, sun-drenched ranching town at the start. It was incorporated in 1903. By 1920, it was a town of 10,000. Since that time, there has been considerable oil activity in the region, and the San Angelo area has developed into the world's greatest wool-producing territory. The main trade area covers 24 counties. There are 40 counties within 100 miles of the city, and 77 additional counties within 200 miles.

From the start, San Angelo was a stable, solid town that did things in a substantial way. Always it has been a place where aggressive men could start little and grow big.

San Angelo and a very wide area of West Texas have been blessed with plenty of electric power for all the developments and also a power company that has worked diligently in helping take advantage of natural resources and native opportunity. This is West Texas Utilities Co., with general headquarters in Abilene. Today, it is in a $50 million expansion program, which will greatly increase its generating capacity and its transmission system. WTUC anticipates a 50-percent increase in demand for power by 1965, only 6 short years away, and it has made firm plans to meet this demand. WTUC serves an expanding area in the center of the Southwest. This area is in about the middle of a six-State region—Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona.

Not only is WTUC expanding and keeping ahead of demand, it is promoting its area by telling the world that here is a region with a vast potential that is developing at a rapid clip but on solid ground and minus the elements of stampede or wild-haired boom.

San Angelo and area have the main essentials for industry—good plant sites, plenty of water, adequate power, and an unlimited supply of cheaply priced natural gas. Lone Star Gas serves the city. There is adequate transportation, too. It is on the main line of the Panhandle and Santa Fe Railroad and the main branch of the Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe. Headquarters for Sunset Motor Freight lines, State's third largest motor carrier, and served by four other lines, San Angelo has exceptionally fine motor freight service. The city is served by two scheduled airlines—Continental, which recently inaugurated jetliner service through the city, and Trans-Texas. U.S. Highways 67 (the gateway to the Big Bend country), 87, and 277, and State Highway 208 give San Angelo an excellent modern-road network in all directions.

Of all the military installations over the country, the U.S. Air Force Security Service Command selected Goodfellow Air Force Base as a training center for its personnel. Goodfellow is more than a multimillion dollar annual payroll for San Angelo. It is a part of the community, its personnel taking active part in civic and cultural affairs. There is a cordial relationship between the civilian and the military at San Angelo that is rarely matched anywhere else in the country.

When you get right down to the nub of things, San Angelo is a good place to live. The climate is mild and so healthful that the State has located its major tuberculosis sanitoriums in the immediate vicinity. The climate is also the basis of a growing colony of retired people. At Baptist Memorial Hospital is the only geriatric center of its kind in Texas—a part of a planned civic effort to broaden the city's appeal to senior citizens.

For the younger citizens San Angelo has a school system that can't be beat from the first reader through junior college. San Angelo College is one of the State's leading junior institutions of learning and is geared to the specialized needs of the community. Then, of course, there is Central High School, subject of a full length article in last month's Texas Parade. The first ageless, campus type high school in America, Central High not only inspires students with a desire to learn, but it is a revealing example of the city's spirit of progress and the practice of doing things big, and with commonsensical thoroughness.

San Angelo is a city of churches and of comfortable homes. The residential sections are beautiful and well-kept. There's plenty of evidence of pride in the homes of this city.

The city has four hospitals and clinics with 392 beds, making San Angelo a medical center for a large area. There are a city-county health department, a city-county welfare department, and the county heart clinic. The clinic is supported by the community chest and memorial gifts.

In addition to its lakes, San Angelo, and the county, has a world of parks, swimming facilities, golf courses, tennis courts, an active YMCA of around 4,000 members, five flying clubs open to the public.

There's some good hunting in the region—deer, turkey, mourning dove, ducks, blue and bobwhite quail, squirrel, rabbit, javelina. Spectator sports include baseball, high school and college football and rodeo. The Fat Stock Show and Rodeo, which are held each March, are outstanding events. They are held at the fairgrounds and in the nearby coliseum. The new coliseum is equipped for indoor rodeo and for shows, concerts, conventions and other events.

Also in March the annual San Angelo Relays are held, featuring performances of outstanding athletes from eight colleges and universities, most of them being members of the Southwest Conference.

In August comes one of the big celebrations of the year. It's the National Miss Wool Pageant, a week-long show giving tribute to the area's wool and mohair industry which, until a decade or so ago, was about the sole basis for San Angelo's economy. A feature of the pageant is the selection and coronation of "Miss Wool of America." Beautiful girls from all over the Nation are sent to San Angelo to enter the contest for this title which the lucky winner holds for a year.

San Angelo College sponsors an entertainment series—six performances a year, bringing widely-known performers to the city. These events have brought to the city Charles Laughton, Van Cliburn, Montavani, the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra, shows such as "No Time for Sergeants" and other top-quality entertainment. San Angelo has its own symphony orchestra which gives at least four performances a year, usually with noted musicians as guests. The San Angelo Community Theater stages five productions each season—with local and area talent.

The Old Fort Concho Museum is one of the most engaging places in west Texas. It is at Old Fort Concho, an army post of ages ago that has been restored. Fort Concho was established in 1867 to protect the settlements from hostile Indians. This was in the period of uncertainty and general frustration just after the Civil War. The fort was a military outpost until 1889. By that time, the Indians were no longer a menace and democratic government had returned to Texas. On a June day in 1889, the garrison flag at Concho was hauled down and the last of the troops marched away, singing "The Girl I Left Behind Me." The preservation of existing buildings and the restoration of others was started in 1930.

The Concho country is rich in history, other than military. It was long on the cow country frontier, a land of carefree cowboys, outlaws, and rustlers. It is doubtful whether any other part of the Southwest has a more colorful history than the Concho country, a region of cattle, sheep, goats, farming, oil developments, and now industrial expansion.

For many years San Angelo has had industrial enterprises—oil servicing companies, shoe and women's clothing manufacturing, and others. In recent times, it has added many, including quite a boat industry and a Goodyear Co. tire-testing station. Goodyear, which has been in the city since 1941, has more than 100 employees. Among other facilities is a new 5-mile circle on which tires are tested on cars. This circle is so precisely engineered that a driver may take his hands off the wheel at 100 miles an hour and the vehicle will go around the circle without a bobble. The circle was built by a local contractor employing local people—even to the manufacture of some special equipment needed to build and maintain the facility.

San Angelo has a great variety of industries that employ from 50 to 100 persons. The city has always had plenty of good, dependable labor. One executive told me that one superior quality of the labor is the fact that the workers are on the company team. These, in the main, are first-generation industrial workers. San Angelo has had excellent labor relations and also good racial relations.

The people of San Angelo want industry; they cooperate with it. The city and county governments are highly favorable to industry.

This city, which is in easy reach of vast consumer markets, is in a developing area, with plenty of room to expand. The city has exceptionally strong banks, which are interested in bringing in industry—either the homegrown sort that has been so successful or enterprises from afar.

San Angelo is more given to doing things than to boasting. And there's no telling what may happen in the near future in this surprising city.

Americanism in Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Americanism in Danger," written by Tom Q. Ellis, and published in the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of July 17, 1959. Adjacent to the editorial is an

editor's note relating to Mr. Ellis, who is one of the great citizens of Mississippi.

There being no objection, the editorial and editor's note were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANISM IN DANGER

(By Tom Q. Ellis)

Pure and undefiled Americanism for which our forebears fought, bled, and died is today under serious and dangerous attack; not only from without but tragically and dangerously from within. It results from long-range, boastful plans formulated by communism more than 30 years ago. Swept along with its ever rising tides are multitudes of otherwise good Americans who under the misnomer of tolerance or liberalism are aiding and abetting the Godless, hell-born objective.

The Scottish Rite, the York Rite, and the Shrine are of common parentage, viz: the Blue Lodge, whence come their philosophy, their humanitarian ministry, their faculty for leadership, and their inspiration. Friendly rivalry is healthful and much to be desired. But misguided, overly enthusiastic brethren sometimes render hurtful disservice to the entire Masonic structure by overstepping the bounds of friendly rivalry and by overlooking the human imperfections of their favorite Masonic body, while holding up to ridicule and sarcasm the imperfections of another segment. United we stand because united we must stand in order to defeat the dangerous enemy who has gained such a foothold in our very midst.

The time is here for real Masons to avoid any semblance of hiding behind the cloak of refusing to engage in controversial matters.

Saving our America is not a controversial matter among real Masons and other good Americans.

It is time for us to stand up and be counted. A political court (and that is being kind to them) is freeing rapists, murderers, and Communists with alarming regularity. At the last count they have freed some 59 known Communists who were jailed for plotting the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. They have nullified subversive control laws of 41 States and they have nullified State laws and bar association regulations as to Communists. They have told State and city governments that a teacher in our schools, or a prospective teacher, cannot be questioned as to his or her associations with the Communist Party.

We Masons make no public boasts, but unquestionable records disclose that the Boston Tea Party had its inception in a lodge room in Boston. We know that George Washington was master of his lodge when sworn in as our first President; that the oath was administered by Chancellor Livingston who at the time was grand master of New York, and the Bible used was taken from a Masonic altar. We know that Benjamin Franklin, Paul Revere, and other leaders of their day were past grand masters. We also know that other leading Masons of that day were dominant figures in framing and signing our Declaration of Independence, and writing our great Constitution which Gladstone said was the greatest instrument ever struck by human hands. But that great document is being emasculated by psychological and sociological judicial decrees purporting to be the law of the land.

Yes, the time is here for all good Masons, Scottish Rite, York Rite, and Shriners to join hands and hearts with all other good Americans (and there are plenty other good Americans) and stand up and be counted in saving that brand of Americanism which is our most priceless heritage. "Mighty is truth and it shall prevail."

The truth for which united we must stand will prevail throughout all eternity. The pyramids of Egypt will sink beneath the sands of the desert; all the great masterpieces of human genius that adorn the art galleries of the world will fade beneath the still lapse of time; structures of steel and stone that kiss the skies in lofty grandeur will be leveled in the dust. But the eternal truths and principles for which all good Masons and all other good Americans must stand will be shedding forth their glorious light when stars and sun are sunk in night.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Ellis is a past grand master of Mississippi F. & A.M.; is a past grand presiding officer of every other York Rite statewide body in Mississippi; past grand patron, Order Eastern Star in Mississippi; a Scottish Rite K.C.C.H.; and in 1957 finished a 3-year term as general grand high priest of General Grand Chapter, Royal Arch Masons—a worldwide organization and the largest Masonic organization in the world, under one head.

(It has been stated many times that he has been accorded more Masonic honors than has any other man in the entire written history of Freemasonry.

(By invitation he has spoken before fraternal, civic, school, and other organized groups in practically every State in the Union and is said to be known personally by more people than any other living man. He humbly states that because of these things he feels a responsibility in speaking up in what he considers a serious crisis, for whatever of good his influence may mean.

(The above article was approved and sent out by the governing body of the Shrine (imperial council) to its 166 Shrine temples, representing approximately 900,000 Shriners in North America. By this means he hopes it will seep down to the 5 million Masons in America, and there are already convincing instances that it is doing just that. Medina Shrine Temple in Chicago, the third largest temple in America, with about 23,000 Shriners, publishes a monthly magazine that goes out to all its members. This article was featured in their recent July issue. A Shrine temple in Oklahoma City, Okla., has made a recording of the article for broadcasting purposes.

(He states that Freemasonry, being a human organization, there is a small percentage who will take issue with him and perhaps attempt reprisals in some form, but he is doing his duty as the sees it, let the chips fall where they may.)

The Corpus Christi School Board Moves To Help Its Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Corpus Christi, Tex., School Board recently announced a system which would provide a $100-a-year pay increase for teachers. This raise would be linked with a program for helping teachers to keep abreast of the latest advancements in their field.

In support of both the ideas of pay increases for teachers and for assistance to instructors to help them keep up with the latest in their fields, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Corpus Christi Caller for Thursday, June 11, 1959, entitled "Teacher Training-Pay Hike Is Move in Right Direction."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEACHER TRAINING-PAY HIKE IS MOVE IN RIGHT DIRECTION

We agree with Walter Lippmann, who said a few days ago that no one is really serious about improving education who is not willing to think about raising more money.

At the same time, however, we believe, as the Corpus Christi School Board evidently does, that more money is by no means the whole answer. Not only must teachers' salaries be increased to attract the best minds into teaching, but an effort must also be made to upgrade present teaching staffs. In other words, a well-administered school system today stimulates its teachers to stay up with new developments in their profession, to keep abreast of new fields of learning, to fill in gaps in their own education, and continually to improve themselves.

The Corpus Christi system seems to be moving in this direction with the announcement that $100-a-year increases for teachers will be linked to a new program of teacher training. This will involve a week of training before the opening of school each fall, plus a series of half-day sessions during the school year.

Guest speakers will address the teachers on various phases of education, and small groups with common interests and problems will meet for specialized work.

Neither the $100 raise nor the expanded in-service training program is going to show immediate or dramatic results. But both are sound moves in the general direction of better instruction.

Voluntary Support of U.S. Educational Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the Nation still faces a multitude of unresolved problems in the field of education. Across the country there is a real need for more and more classrooms; a larger number of teachers with better pay scales; more adequate laboratory facilities and equipment; and other efforts to strengthen the overall educational program.

Currently the big question, of course, is just where the major responsibility for education lies—that is, at the local, State, or national level.

Traditionally, education has been—and rightly so, I believe—the major responsibility of the State and local community. In the space age, however, we now find that not only domestic progress, but also national defense, may well depend upon the adequacy of our educational system, particularly in terms of its ability to train and turn out highly qualified scientists, engineers, and other technologists to create and operate the complex armaments of the nuclear-space age.

While defense is important, we also need to educate a sufficient number of individuals in industry, agriculture, the biological and natural sciences, the professions, arts, and other fields, to promote domestic progress.

Despite the national scope of these challenges, it is, nevertheless, extremely important to assure that control of the educational program is maintained in the hands of the State and local communities.

We recall that hearings have been held in both the House and Senate committees on measures to provide additional Federal aid for schools, teachers, students, and other purposes.

As Congress faces the task of determining just how large a role Uncle Sam can and should play in the educational picture, I welcome this opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to the increasingly important contributions which private individuals and corporations are making to our educational system. In the last 15 years, for example, voluntary support for higher institutions of learning has doubled.

The July 17 edition of the La Crosse Tribune carried a splendid editorial on the increased amount of private contributions to colleges and universities. Reflecting the type of educational consciousness I believe we need to a greater degree in this country, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOLUNTARY SUPPORT OF U.S. EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS DOUBLES IN LAST 15 YEARS

Americans are believers in education. They reveal this in continuing to vote large bond issues for schools and in taxing themselves increasing amounts to provide good teachers and equipment.

They go further than that.

An interesting phenomenon of our times is the large amount of money given to colleges and universities by individuals and corporations.

What's more, these contributions are increasing.

In the last 15 years voluntary support for institutions of higher learning have doubled. At present 11.5 percent of the cost of higher education comes from private sources as against 5.8 percent 15 years ago.

With the cost of operating schools greatly increased, this means that voluntary support has multiplied more than seven times in this period.

In 1957–58 private gifts and grants for plant expansion were one-fourth of the total of $700 million received for this purpose from all sources.

Private gifts are almost wholly responsible for the huge endowments of many of America's colleges and universities. Endowment principal, now totaling more than $4 billion, is more than $1 billion above the 1958 figure.

That these private contributions have continued to increase is evidence that business and industry, from which most of the contributions come, realize that only as our education system progresses can our Nation meet the challenges before it.

Frank W. Abrams, former chairman of the board of Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and chairman of the executive committee of the Council for Financial Aid to Education, says that "only as each of us individually contributes to the support of education will he get the kind of educational system we need."

Abrams argues that every American has a stake in the future of our country. Whether or not that future is one we all desire will depend on how well we educate our youth.

"And he said to them, 'Why are you afraid, O men of little faith?' Then he rose and rebuked the winds and the sea; and there was a great calm." (Matthew 8: 26.)

Our National Parks in the Year 2000—The Dilemma of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, perhaps one of the most compelling arguments for the preservation of America's many scenic areas of esthetic and recreational value for the use of future generations has been forcefully put forward by Marion Clawson in an article appearing in the July issue of the colorful and informative National Parks magazine, "Our National Parks in the Year 2000." Working with the conservative estimate that visits to the national parks of the Nation will continue to multiply at just the percentage increase they have in the past 40 years, Clawson projects a frightening picture of 60 times the number of visits now made yearly to these parks, or 1¼ billion visits.

Compound the number of cars on every crowded highway into a national park on a holiday weekend, the amount of trash and litter to be found at campsites in our national parks today, the number of people per square foot of sand on every national seashore area this summer by 60, and you will begin to get a graphic picture of just how serious a problem this need for new recreational areas and improved facilities in the present areas will become.

As Mr. Clawson points out, it is often characteristic of Americans and their leaders to "cross bridges when they come to them," to just wait to deal with a problem until it becomes a problem, oftentimes an insoluble one. It is incumbent upon us to do something about this situation now, before it becomes insoluble, and it is here that Mr. Clawson's article has special significance. His ideas on the solution of the national park dilemma grow from a realm of experience in the field; one of them is the increasing preservation of our scenic and wilderness areas as national parks, and it is here that I and many of my colleagues have endeavored to help the situation. He offers, however, several other ideas well worth the consideration of this body. At the last session of Congress, the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was formed to consider remedies such as these to this serious problem. As a member of that Commission, I am happy to report that progress is being made, along many of the same lines he recommends.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the National Parks magazine, July 1959, by Marion Clawson, entitled "Our National Parks in the Year 2000," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NATIONAL PARKS IN THE YEAR 2000

(By Marion Clawson)

What will our national parks be like by the year 2000? Will they then still resemble the great areas of unspoiled nature that they were when white man first saw them, or will they have begun to look like Coney Island on a hot summer Sunday? Will historians 200 years from now consider the national park movement to be as anachronistic as Don Quixote's attempt to revive knight-errantry?

I hasten to add, I do not expect to see the year 2000; my life expectancy is more like 1980. But I am interested in the national parks for my children and grandchildren, and I will want to enjoy the parks for the next two or three decades. Just what will there be to enjoy?

SOCIETY OF 2000

First of all, let us try to visualize the society that the United States will have become by the year 2000. There may be, in the interim, a large-scale hydrogen bomb war, in which case there may be few people left to enjoy the parks or, in fact, anything else. But ruling this out as incomprehensible, if not impossible, let us try to picture what our society will be if it continues to evolve along the lines of the past two centuries or so.

By 2000, there will be many more people in the United States. No one knows how many there will be, of course, but the best informed guesses now run somewhere around 300 to 325 million people by 2000, compared with about 175 million now. Not quite twice as many as now, but nearly.

If our economy continues to advance in the same directions and with something like the same speed as in the past, by 2000 we will have twice as high income per person, in real terms, as we have today. With individual incomes of about $3,600 and family incomes averaging nearly $15,000, trips to national parks will surely be far easier to manage then, than they are today.

In 2000, the average person will have far more leisure than now. The average workweek has dropped from 70 hours in 1850 to 40 hours today; and by 2000 it may well be down to 28 hours or less. The past reduction in the average workweek has come about from fewer working hours per working day, fewer working days per week, and longer paid vacations. All three types of reductions in working time will occur in the future. It will be the increase in length of paid vacation that will have the greatest impact on the national parks, for most people live where a longish vacation trip is necessary in order to visit a national park.

The American people today are the most mobile the world has ever known. On the average, we travel more than 5,000 miles each year. Much of this is to and from work, or to the grocery store, but much of it is also vacation travel. There is every prospect that we shall travel much more in 2000 than now, maybe twice as many miles per person annually. The superhighways will make long distance auto travel quicker and easier. Travel by plane and then by rented car will become increasingly common, making possible a visit to a distant national park over the longer weekend or the shorter vacation, or visits to several national parks during the summer vacation.

Perhaps more important than the increased physical mobility of the average person in 2000 will be his increased psychological mobility. Today young people typically go away from home for college, serve in the military forces all over the Nation and the world, take jobs in different towns from those in which they grew up, and move where the best job opportunities beckon. In this, they differ greatly from their fathers, and still more from their grandfathers. But, in the future the typical person will be still more mobile. Because he will move to find good living, industries will increasingly tend to locate where life is most pleasant. People will move freely at different periods in their lives to find the best job, the most enjoyable living. And a location where visits to national parks will be relatively easy will surely attract some people.

Every major social and economic trend points toward enormously greater use of the national parks in the future; no major trend points toward less use.

HOW MUCH USAGE OF NATIONAL PARKS IN 2000?

If we try to accommodate all the people who want to visit the national parks in the future, how many will there be? The only real guide to the future is the past; let us look again carefully at the past record of the national parks.

Everyone knows that the use of the national parks has increased in the past, but I venture to assert that very few persons realize just how much and in what ways that increase in use has occurred. Each year, or nearly every year, the number of visits has increased over the past year. Only the war years, from 1942 through 1945, when gasoline was rationed and other travel restrictions were in force, are a major exception. In those years, travel to the parks fell to one-third the prewar level. But travel to the national parks has been almost depression proof. In years of business recession, travel did not increase normally, but only in 1930 and in 1931 was it less than in the previous year. Back in the 1920's total visits to the national parks increased mostly by 100,000 to 300,000 from 1 year to the next.

By the 1930's, the typical increase from year to year was from one-half to 1 million; by the late 1940's and the 1950's, from 1 to 2 million. The increases, from year to year, in other words, have been getting larger.

In fact, there is good evidence that the year-to-year increases in use of the national parks have been constant on a percentage basis. To those of you who are engineers or mathematicians, the total visits to the national parks have increased regularly when plotted on semilog paper. The rate of increase has been very close to 10 percent annually, leaving out the war years. The more people who come to the national parks, the greater the increase in numbers who will come next year. Growth feeds upon itself, it seems. I should add, visits to the national forests, to State parks, to Federal wildlife refuges, to TVA reservoirs, to Corps of Engineer reservoirs, and other forms of outdoor recreation all exhibit the same percentage increase relationship. For some, the actual percentage is higher than for national parks; for others, lower. But all grow on relatively equal percentage bases, not by equal numbers from year to year.

Let us look at this same relationship in another way: 1916 is as far in the past, measured from 1958, as 2000 is in the future—42 years in each case. In 1916, total visits to the national park system were less than 400,000; the final figures for 1958 run more than 58 million, or roughly 150 times the figure of 1916.

Now, I freely grant that the national park system in 1958 is a far different thing than it was in 1916. Then, national parks accounted for almost all the use, with only a little to national monuments; now, national parks are less than half of the total for the whole system, with national monuments, historical areas, recreational areas, parkways, and others accounting for more than half the total. But usage of the national parks alone has risen roughly 60 times during these 42 years.

It is also true that we have more national parks today than we had in 1916. But usage of the older national parks—those established by 1910 or earlier—has risen almost 25 times since 1916. Moreover, had the areas recently added to national parks been within the system in 1916, their use in the early years would have been very low. Had the park system included all its present parks in 1916, the actual increase in use would not have been so very different from that which has occurred with the expansion of the system. Or, to look at it differently, had no parks been added since 1916, how much might usage of the older parks have increased—as much as usage of the expanded system? That is to some extent, one national park is a substitute for another, and had new ones not been added, usage of the old ones would have increased even more than it did.

Suppose you merely say the next 42 years will repeat the experience of the past 42 years. Then visits to the national parks alone will rise 60 times—from their present level of about 21 million visits to a total of about 1¼ billion visits. "Impossible," you say. But how many people in 1916 ever expected 21 million visits to the parks alone by 1958? A simple, unmodified extension of past trends in park usage leads to what now seem like impossible numbers. But, we must admit, all the forces of the past which led to increased use of the national parks—more people, higher incomes, more leisure, more travel, better roads, and the like—seem likely to continue upward in the future, and at a rate not much less than in the past.

At some point, increases in usage of the national parks will almost surely slow down. But when, and to what degree? It would help some if we knew how many different people the total visits of the past represented. Do the 21 million visits of the present mean 5, 10, or some other millions of different individuals? We can be fairly sure they do not represent 21 million different people, because the same person is counted more than once as he visits more than one area or the same area at different times. Twenty-one million visits for 175 million people is about one-eighth visit per average person, in 1958; 1¼ billion visits for 310 million people in 2000 means about 4 visits per average person. How many people will visit four different national parks each year, or the same national park four times? Since some people will not be interested at all, even if by then incomes permitted everyone to come, others would have to visit six, eight, or more parks each year. Surely there is some point of satiety for national parks, even for the most confirmed lovers of the parks and even if incomes are ample. But at what level? Will the visits to the national parks by 2000 be 300, 500, or more millions?

WHAT HAPPENS TO THE PARKS?

If we should get anything like the enormous increase in use of the national parks which the foregoing discussion seems to suggest as probable, what happens to the parks themselves?

First of all, merely getting this many people into and out of the parks will be a major feat. Where there are roads today, there will have to be superhighways then. There has recently been some controversy over the construction of a major highway in the Lake Tenaya country of Yosemite. I suggest that, in the retrospect of 40 years from now, this will look like the first raindrop of a major hurricane storm. If we are to get 300, 500 or more million visits into the parks, then we must have many, many, fast, wide highways into and through every national park. Remember, every one who goes in must also come out.

Anything like this volume of visits will create a terrific demand for opening up the back country of each park. There is some limit to how many people can be concentrated in small areas, no matter how skillfully they are managed and how fast they are hurried through. It is difficult for me to visualize how 20 times as many people as now can be crowded into the floor of Yosemite, or around Old Faithful or at Canyon Rim in Yellowstone, or at South Rim in Grand Canyon, to mention a few of the most heavily used areas today. (As a matter of fact, since 1916 usage of these popular parks has increased, not by 20 times, but by 30 and 40 times.)

Anything like this volume of visits will unavoidably cause substantial physical destruction. Mere walking, and a place to walk, and to park, will have a major impact. If areas are paved, this destroys what was there originally; if they are not paved, then the human foot may destroy it anyway.

But far more serious than the physical destruction will be the change in the character of the park areas, if people crowd into them on anything like the scale suggested. Peace and quiet will have vanished. The natural scene will have become a human scene. Some may argue that the resulting experience will be as meaningful for those who partake of it as is the present or an earlier scene; I disagree, but in any case, no one can deny that it will be different.

I need not pursue further this matter of what the national parks would resemble were there to be 15, 25, or 50 times more visits than now. Anyone who knows the parks now, and who has seen crowds anywhere, can let his imagination supply the details. Of course, long before conditions get as bad as I have pictured, many people might rebel and refuse longer to come to the national parks.

WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT?

All of the foregoing is based upon the assumption that we try to accommodate everyone who seeks to use the national parks. The picture is, for me at least, very gloomy. But what can we do about it? Are there alternatives? Might we in fact seek to keep the usage of national parks to some reasonable level—reasonable, not only in view of the physical limitations of the parks, but reasonable to preserve the emotional and psychic qualities of the parks? Is there any way use could be limited that is compatible with our democratic society? These are, after all, public lands; everyone owns a share in them, has a right to use them. How can we deny anyone that right? These are questions we must face frankly; moreover, I think we must face them now, while park usage is clearly within reasonable limits, not after it gets to impossible acuteness.

As I see it, action to preserve our national parks in perpetuity must proceed on three levels. The first two could be done independently, or together; the last, I would argue, is reasonable only to the extent the first two are carried out. Let us look at these three possible lines of action.

First, there needs to be ample opportunity for outdoor recreation in places other than the national parks. The many more people of the future, with their higher income, more leisure, and more travel, will demand vastly more outdoor recreation than today. To the extent areas other than the national parks are not available, then some of this pressure for outdoor recreation will find an outlet in the parks; to the extent that other areas are fully available, some of the pressure on the parks will be siphoned off.

Ideally, there should be ample outdoor recreation opportunity reasonably close to everyone. If there were good parks for outings within an hour's drive, or closer, of nearly everyone, many people would not care to go further, no matter how much more outstanding the more distant areas were. These more localized outdoor recreation areas might be State parks or private recreation areas. In some regions, some of the national forest areas would serve the same purpose. Some national forest lands, of course, closely resemble national parks, and the problems are very similar.

Physically, there are many sites well adapted to good, but not superior, outdoor recreation use. Rolling hills, especially if tree covered, with intermingled lakes, may be less inspirational than the Grand Tetons, but they will satisfy many users, at least for most of the time. The lakes can be artificial. Relatively low-grade farm and forest land can be converted into quite respectable park areas, given a little work and time.

During this past summer, my family and I drove to California and back, camping out nearly all the way, mostly at State parks. We camped in western Pennsylvania, eastern Indiana, central Ohio, southern Wisconsin, eastern Iowa, western Kansas, western Nebraska, and many other places. We had done the same thing in 1956, camping in still other States. We are much impressed with some of the State parks, not only for use such as we made, but as local recreation grounds for nearby people. Important as the present parks are, they are wholly inadequate to met the prospective demands of the future. But I have seen literally hundreds of sites, as I have driven and flown across the country, where equally good additional parks could be made. I am sure there must be thousands of such sites.

Where will the money come from to build the necessary State parks, private recreation areas, and other alternatives to national parks? Who is going to pay for them, and how? If built, would they actually serve the purpose of relieving the pressure on the national parks? I do not have a full answer to these questions, and it would take more space than is here available to lay out adequately such ideas as I do have. But I would like to suggest that those whose primary interest is in the national parks must begin to think about the whole recreation system of the United States in mere self-defense if nothing else. As a Nation, we are and will be wealthy enough to afford the needed areas. I think we can devise mechanisms for channeling our wealth into this usage. Maybe grants-in-aid from Federal to State Governments, and from the latter to local governments or to private landowners, is part of the answer. Maybe we must reconsider our past attitudes toward entrance fees or use charges as a source of revenue. While no one would argue that a manmade local park fully substitutes for the best national park, any more than beans are a full substitute for steak, yet I am convinced that the first step in protecting the national parks from overuse is the provision of alternatives.

The second major line of attack is, I think, to pitch the programs of the national parks a little differently. Instead of urging people to come, let us urge them to stay, once they come—not to make the national park a summer vacation resort, but to stay for more than the few hours it takes to drive through. Let us try to make the visit of the typical citizen a little richer, with more emotional and intellectual depth. I fear that many visitors to many national parks now regard them as little more than glorified parkways—see what you can from the car, park and look briefly at some of the best sites, but go on quickly. Some, I realize do far more than this now, and some are not interested in doing much more, no matter how you try to help them. But I think we could, if we tried hard, considerably change the nature of the typical visit to national parks. Of course, this would cost money, for naturalist and other specialist services, and in other ways, but the costs would not be great in terms of results.

I think we need a new attitude regarding travel toward, in, and beyond the national parks. We have tried so hard to make the roads good, safe, and quick. The safe part no one will disagree with. The quick part many wonder about. This matter of road policy in national parks in one with many angles—one that has concerned the readers of this magazine greatly. I will not attempt to go into it, except to say that I think a look really well into the future provides new perspective. In encouraging people to stay, we would, I think, be discouraging other people from merely traveling through.

My third general line of attack is more direct, more positive, and, I am sure, will be less generally accepted, at least now. I would initiate direct measures to reduce the casual visits to national parks, while at the same time trying to avoid hurting too much the really serious visitor. The first measure I would suggest is to raise entrance fees to national parks sharply—to something in the order of $25 where they are now $3, for instance. I think this would sharply discourage the family that merely wanted to drive through and to look a little. I know that many persons will immediately say, we do not want to discourage the people who really appreciate the parks but cannot afford them it you put a stiff entrance fee on. But how many really poor people now can visit national parks? Of all the studies of national parks visitors I have seen, the lowest average cost of a trip which included a visit to a national park was $125; for Grand Canyon, it was over $500. Visiting a national park means owning a car these days, usually means a paid vacation, and necessarily means an ability to spend something on recreation. A $25 entrance fee would only mean raising the cost of the trip by 5 to 10 percent, in most cases—hardly a critical margin. As it is now, a family can get into any national park cheaper than they can visit a movie.

This matter of proper entrance fees, and what one would do with the money so collected, is also a large subject. Unfortunately, it is one most people approach with strong prejudices, derived from economic and social conditions of long ago. I think it is time we looked at fees in light of their effect upon the kind, as well as the amount, of park usage.

For many of the more popular national parks, I would now or very soon initiate a system of reservations—of issuing advance permits for certain areas for certain seasons. We now, in many States, sell a specific number of deer or elk hunting licenses for a specific area or district. Why should we not, weeks or months in advance, issue a limited number of admission passes to Yosemite, Yellowstone, Grand Canyon, or other popular national parks for the second week in August, or some other specific period? I see no reason why we should seek indefinitely to accommodate all would-be users, whenever they choose to show up. Almost no other vacation activity is conducted on this basis. If entrance at the more popular seasons were regulated, this would be a strong incentive toward use at other than peak periods, which in itself would be a good thing.

FUTURE THREATS TO THE NATIONAL PARKS

From time to time in the past, the national parks have been threatened by commercial exploitation—for mining, for lumbering, or for other uses. Such threats have by no means ended, yet I think they are not the really serious ones for the future. Rather, the real threat to the parks is simply too many visitors—visitors who seek individually to do more or less what the parks were established to provide, but visitors who in mass will destroy the parks as surely as any commercial use. My argument is that we should begin to think now, while a large element of flexibility in management is yet open, how to deal with such overuse. Maybe we can head it off, not merely cope ineffectually with it when it comes.

Joseph Lucius: Pioneer and Forest Ranger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, progress in America is the story of hearty-spirited pioneers, marching fearlessly into the wildernesses—of nature, of knowledge, of spiritual understanding.

Too, it is the saga of people working together in a climate of freedom and opportunity, utilizing their God-given ingenuity and our vast natural resources for the betterment of mankind.

Today, I pay particular tribute to a hearty Wisconsin pioneer, Mr. Joe Lucius, of Solon Springs, Wis. During his fruitful 88 years, Joe has made a constructive contribution, not only to local community life, but also has pioneered in forestry and conservation work in a remarkable way that has left its mark on our State programs.

Among other achievements, he was instrumental in setting up the first State forest fire laws, to help prevent the devastation by forest fires which unfortunately destroy millions of acres of woodland, not only in Wisconsin, but throughout the Nation.

Throughout his life, Joe, as a logger, guide, fisherman, conservationist, railroad worker, and general all-around civic-minded citizen, has made an indelible impression on his community, through his constructive pioneering efforts to attack and resolve individual and local problems.

The Evening Telegram, of Superior, Wis., recently carried a splendid article entitled "Pioneer Ranger Justly Proud of Forests He Fostered," written by Sybil Weade. The story is a fine illustration of the kind of pioneering spirit that has helped to build this into a great country.

I request unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PIONEER RANGER JUSTLY PROUD OF FORESTS HE FOSTERED

(By Sybil Weade)

Few persons are living today who were more closely associated with the growth of northern Wisconsin than Joe Lucius, 88, of the Midway nursing home, particularly in the field of conservation.

Pioneer of Solon Springs, inventor, builder, trail finder and mapmaker, he is the only

surviving member of the first U.S. Conservation Congress which was established in Washington in 1904 and believed to be the only surviving member of the first State forestry department which was started a year later.

He planned and built the first State conservation headquarters and his children gathered the bushels of pine cones along the Brule River from which the first State nursery plantation sprung.

Together with his brothers, Joe rediscovered the markings of the old portage trail between the Brule and Lake St. Croix, and to the head of the Mississippi. A monument now marks that spot where the adventurous Greysolon Du L hut discovered in 1680 the route from the biggest lake to the biggest river. The trail was marked by members of the Superior Garden Club, the Solon Springs Parent-Teacher Association, the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Douglas County Board of Supervisors.

Lucius was instrumental in setting up the first State forest fire laws as well as the present system of town government used at Solon. An avid sportsman all of his life, Lucius was one of 15 young men who built the first baseball diamond at Solon Springs in 1886.

Today he recounts thrilling tales of early logging operations in the area and tells with great humor of his jack-of-all-trades work with the first railroads.

Born in Kirby, Wyandotte County, Ohio, in February 1871, Lucius came to the area as a lad of 15 when his parents settled in Solon Springs (White Birch) in 1886. From his early youth he was strongly identified with the out of doors and by the time he reached his middle teens he knew every trail and hill, the lakes and rivers in the Solon Springs-Brule area. He knew every spot in the Brule River where he could drop a line and hook from a bamboo pole and lure a wily trout to his favorite bait.

GUIDE

He became well known as a guide to fishermen and after his marriage to former Helen Rutherford of Stillwater, Minn., in 1893, he operated the Brule Lodge from 1894 to 1899, then operated the St. Paul Club on the Brule which was a recreational center for a number of prominent businessmen from the Twin Cities and Duluth.

In 1911 he left this work he so thoroughly enjoyed to become associated with the State conservation department.

After becoming a member of the conservation congress he was named to the election board and in that capacity he attended the congress session in 1910 at the St. Paul Hotel. It was at this meeting that he was selected to help locate the first State nursery and ranger station at Trout Lake near Woodruff.

Prior to the meeting of the congress, in the winter of 1904, a man named E. M. Griffith was appointed to make a thorough study of the forestation in the Brule area. Griffith was destined to become an important figure in the Wisconsin forestry work and he and Lucius met and became friends that same year.

Together the two men, so interested in the forests, explored the area and traveled thousands of miles around the countryside with Lucius' horses.

In 1905 Lucius was delegated to present to the State legislature a grant of Weyerhauser land, 5,280 acres, for a State park, the first in Wisconsin. He found, he explained, that on presentation the State would not accept the gift because of the fact that 2 years before a charter had been created for a dam in the Brule. The Weyerhauser terms stipulated that the river had to be kept open to the public forever. In case this failed, the land would revert back to the heirs.

Lucius immediately began action to have the charter for the dam revoked. He took his case to the Douglas County Circuit Court before the late Judge Vingi, Fred Seguin, clerk of courts, James Hill, court reporter, the assistant attorney general, and George B. Hudnell, State senator and personal friend and attorney for Lucius.

"After a 6-day hard-fought battle, I won single handed," said Joe, "before 13 witnesses and a half-dozen attorneys opposing the case."

"In 1907 the land was accepted and I bought other lands from lumber companies, acquired some on tax titles and from private clubs and privately owned estates.

"Now the State has full control of the Brule River from the headwaters to probably some distance below the Northern Pacific Railway crossing."

This Government-controlled area along the Brule is now known as the Brule Forest. The dam is called Joe's Rapids and is located about 200 yards above the Brule Ranger Station.

Lucius, knowing the country so well, was able to furnish Griffith with valuable information. He deplored the skunk currant bushes as harmful to the forests. He explained to the forestry chief how the Indians living all along the rivers were constantly setting fires to the brush and barren lands to produce a better blueberry crop and provide better grazing grounds for the deer.

"There were always forest fires," Lucius declared, "and some of these burned-off places never did produce again."

NAMED CHIEF

Because of his vast knowledge of the woods, when the Conservation Congress met in 1910 in St. Paul, Lucius was appointed director to prepare plans for the first State nursery. He was to do the planning together with Griffith who was delegated to pick three locations and then leave the final choice up to "Joe."

"When I looked over that place on Trout Lake," Lucius recently explained to State forestry and historical society officials, "it showed there had been no fires. The ground hadn't been disturbed a great deal. The beautiful timber was there for logs. Therefore, I picked Trout Lake, which had a wonderful gravel beach and different things appealed to me. I told Griffith, this was the best pick and then I went home."

By this time Lucius' two children were growing up. Holbrook, who was named in honor of a close friend, Dr. Arthur Holbrook of Milwaukee, was home from Superior where he attended school.

While their father got busy drawing up plans for the forestry buildings, Holbrook, then 11 years old, and his sister, Josephine, 7, were put to work gleaning pine cones for the plantation. They picked bushels and bushels of cones near the Lucius home.

These first cones to keep Wisconsin green and provide trees for tomorrow were planted by C. L. Harrington, who retired as supervisor of forest and parks in July 1958, and Holbrook Lucius.

Before he purchased materials for the buildings, Lucius asked for bids on everything needed, from shingles to cement and kerosene.

"Everyone in those days was bent on getting rich," he says, "and some favored their friends. But I did business strictly on the square and accepted the low bids if the materials passed my inspection."

The shingles, he recalls, he bought from a little mill in Ironwood, Mich., right on the banks of the river. They were the low bidders.

When his plans, drawn during the winter, were complete for the four ranger stations, three barns and four fire towers, the original drawings had to be blueprinted. In the spring Lucius shipped his tools to Trout Lake and brought his men there to do the work. Workmen were from Maple, Poplar, Wentworth, and Brule. The buildings were started in 1911 and finished in 1912. The pine cones were planted and 65,000 seedlings were sent in from Ann Arbor, Mich., and planted on the adjoining land.

OBJECTION

When time came to build the fire towers, the original plans the forestry men had set up called for wooden structures, built from native logs. Lucius insisted the tower be built of steel and declared that he wouldn't consider drawing up plans for wooden towers 60 feet high with ladders that would be safe for about 4 or 5 years.

When the officials heard of Lucius' idea, he said, "they threw up their hands and said that it would cost a fortune."

But, Lucius already had an idea for the towers. He had been buying pumps at the time from the Duplex Manufacturing Co. in South Superior and had their catalog handy. The Duplex firm, he knew, had become well known throughout the country for building windmills. They had built them for concerns in Texas and other southern firms.

Working on the basis of an 80-foot tower Lucius explained to his employers how the tower would taper toward the top to a 4- to 8-foot floor. It was agreed that the towers would be of steel.

A little later on, it was Joe Lucius who designed and built the first tower cabin which was placed on a tower near Gordon.

"Just eight pieces," he explains, "I made the sliding windows myself that worked on rollers. The forest ranger put it up there and it worked beautifully." Later the Conservation Department put cabins on all their towers.

FIRE LAWS

Lucius took a major part in setting up the early fire protection laws and while associated with the conservation department was appointed locomotive inspector. His job was to check up on the railroad inspectors to see that the law was enforced. During this time he built another ranger station at Carl Lake.

By 1880 the area was gradually filling with settlers, Lucius recalled, the bulk settling in Douglas County. Lumber companies were cutting the timber which was dwindling fast.

One of the first lumber companies was the Musser, Sauntry and Tozer Co., he said, and smacked his lips as he remembered the pies and doughnuts the camp cook made "with big holes in them."

He has a vivid picture of a load of logs handled by four horses on March 23, 1892, that moved down the first creek crossing on Highway 53 north of Solon. It scaled over 35,000 feet lumber measure. The load was hauled a distance of 1 mile and landed on St. Croix Lake and from there the logs were driven down the St. Croix to Stillwater where they were made into large rafts and towed down the Mississippi to be sawed into lumber at Dubuque, Rock Island, St. Louis, and New Orleans.

"The McLaughlin camp had the largest average for January and February," he said. "This camp had the largest sleds, each weighing about 900 pounds including the chains. The average load was 20,000 feet. The camp foreman superintended the building of the logging roads and saw to it that they were on a downhill pull to the lake or river. The ruts were 6 to 8 inches deep and 12 to 18 inches wide, cut into a bed of ice."

Joe's experiences as a railroader were varied and began as a section hand at the age of 15. In 1886 he was building railway fences. Then when the railroads were hauling gravel from a 40-acre tract near Solon Springs, and put in a steam shovel and gravel train, he served as a "jack of all things." If they needed a timekeeper, he was timekeeper, if a brakeman or fireman

quit, he filled in on their jobs. He learned many things while railroading that later led to better fire laws and saved million in fire losses.

Through the years Joe Lucius was considered one of the first and best sportsmen of northern Wisconsin. He is one of the survivors of a group who built the first baseball diamond at Solon in 1886. The men completed the project by using shovels, axes and picks, then leveled it off with a section of rail from the tracks pulled over the field with a wire cable, five men on each end. Joe believes this sparked the idea for the first bulldozer.

Lucius designed and built a number of canoes that operated on the area lakes and rivers. During the winter of 1893–94 he and his wife were caretakers for the lake boats wintering at Superior.

The Schooner *Algonquin*, first commercial trader on Lake Superior, was built in 1834 and came to Lake Superior before the Soo Locks were built. Pioneers came to Superior on the *Algonquin* in the early 1850's. Joe Lucius made many trophies from pieces of the *Algonquin* which was finally beached and demolished by people seeking historic relics.

Lucius became well known as a canoe builder and operated his little factory in Solon Springs until he was well into his 80's. Here he cut and glued his canoes by hand from finest weathered cedar and mahogany. He also made inlaid cribbage boards, marble games, notebooks, and other articles.

"I made the survey of Tomahawk Island," the pioneer builder said, "and in the winter of 1912–13 I made the original name and built some of the buildings for the Boy Scouts."

This was the beginning of Boy Scout Camp Fidelity on Tomahawk Island in Lake Amnicon.

He was a great promoter of the Boy Scout movement, and in this capacity took part in plans for the late President Coolidge's stay at Cedar Island. He was well acquainted with prominent figures, a friend of shipbuilder Alexander McDougall, who had a lodge on the Brule, and with Judge Horace Stone, Judge Adams, and others.

He served the village of Solon Springs in various capacities after he and his family settled there permanently. He served on the Brule School Board and represented the village of Brule at one time on the county board.

He built a number of homes at the Brule and built the furniture that went into them. His library, which he left behind him when he came to the Superior rest home, contains biographies of the Great Lakes, books written by author Grace Lee Nute, who sought his help in checking her materials. He owns miniature models of machines used on the ships *Monitor* and *Merrimac* and other relics.

Lucius designed and built the blockhouse and the log-top tables in the wayside on East Second Street and contributed a good deal of historical data during the city's centennial celebration, having sketched a map of old Superior in 1886. He recently gave to the John Ericsson School in Superior a hot-air engine Ericsson invented at the age of 18.

When he found he could no longer operate his little shop in Solon Springs, Lucius went to visit with his daughter, Mrs. Josephine Quam, then later on came to the rest home in Superior "to live," he says, "near Lake Superior, the Brule River, and my old friends and enjoy the Lake Superior breezes and delightful winters."

Today, although this wealth of experiences, so valuable to his town and State, are well in the background, Joe Lucius relaxes in an easy chair, his ever-present cigar aglow, and reminisces about the past.

He daydreams, too, of the future, when he hopes to complete the notes he's making daily on early forestry history for records of the State Historical Society.

Can America Compete?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Manchester Guardian Weekly of July 16, 1959, contained an editorial entitled "Can America Compete?" It raised the question as to whether the United States is pricing itself out of the market. I think it is interesting to note the comments of the British press on this question. This editorial makes what I consider to be a significant observation. I quote a sentence or two from the editorial:

What strikes the British Observer is that this alarm about the dollar and the competitiveness of American prices appears to be excessive. For one thing the United States still sells substantially more abroad than it buys from other countries. The reason why gold has been lost is that this trade surplus is no longer sufficient to cover both the massive flow of foreign aid and the considerable overseas investments which are being made by American companies.

There are those who are advocating further tax consideration with respect to American investments overseas. In one instance they advocate what is likely to bring on a condition which they deplore when they find it in another situation.

The editorial makes a further significant point which I should like to call to the attention of the Senate:

The danger is that Americans may be misled by their own propaganda. The sort of measures that are being talked about in the United States to restore a more favorable balance of payments—tighter money control, or a cut in foreign aid, or a greater restraint on imports—could not fail to damage the rest of the free world's economy.

The editorial also makes some reference to the use of these arguments as a device to keep wages low.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester Guardian Weekly, July 16, 1959]

CAN AMERICA COMPETE?

Is the United States in the process of pricing itself out of world markets? This is a thought that is increasingly troubling the minds of American officials and bankers. It is also one reason why the remarkable upsurge of American business activity in recent months has been welcomed less rapturously than might have been expected. The U.S. economy, after an initially sluggish recovery, is now leaping ahead. Industrial production, personal incomes, and business profits have all advanced beyond their previous record levels in the past month or so, and unemployment has decreased sharply. With consumers drawing freely on installment credit to finance their purchases of cars and other durable goods there are all the signs of a gathering boom. But, as the Federal Reserve Bank of New York points out in its latest monthly review, there is one major exception to the broad upswing of business. Exports in the first 4 months of this year were smaller than in the corresponding months of 1958 and a long way below those at the same time in 1957. This is in sharp contrast to the rapid growth of American imports from the rest of the world. Moreover, there has been a heavy drain of gold out of the United States in the past 18 months and American gold holdings are now at their lowest point for 20 years. It is in this context that the New York bank review draws attention to the persistent rise in American prices during and since the recession and to the upward trend of wage costs which is threatening to force prices still higher. Hence the anxiety of most American commentators about the current phase of wages bargaining in the steel industry. There is a widespread fear that the United States is about to enter on a fresh bout of inflation just as most European countries have succeeded in bringing their inflations under control.

What strikes the British Observer is that this alarm about the dollar and the competitiveness of American prices appears to be excessive. For one thing the United States still sells substantially more abroad than it buys from other countries. The reason why gold has been lost is that this trade surplus is no longer sufficient to cover both the massive flow of foreign aid and the considerable overseas investments which are being made by American companies. Even so, the gold lost is only a fraction of the vast reserves that remain to support the dollar. Admittedly the U.S. authorities could not remain indifferent in face of a persistently adverse balance of payments. But the evidence that there has been a shift against America in world trade is not particularly convincing. The greater part of the drop in U.S. exports over the past 2 years, as the Federal Bank's review shows, has taken place in only five commodity groups—cotton, wheat, coal, iron, and steel, and petroleum. But exports of most of these goods were abnormally swollen in 1957—partly because of the Suez crisis and partly because the European boom caused a heavy demand for American coal and steel. The one real sign of a lack of competitiveness has been the way in which American machinery manufacturers have been losing orders—on their home ground as well as overseas—to European rivals. There is no doubt that capital goods prices in the United States have risen rather rapidly in the past 4 years; this, together with the improved quality and delivery terms offered by European producers, has put the Americans at a temporary disadvantage. The fact remains that American industry, with its inventiveness and capacity for increasing productivity, is unlikely to go short of export markets for long. Much of the recent gloomy comment on the dollar's standing seems to have a domestic purpose: It is hoped that it may act as a curb on wage demands. The danger is that Americans may be misled by their own propaganda. The sort of measures that are being talked about in the United States to restore a more favorable balance of payments—tighter monetary control, or a cut in foreign aid, or a greater restraint on imports—could not fail to damage the rest of the free world's economy.

Labor Threat to Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very important and informative article entitled "Labor Threat to Constitution," written by David Lawrence, and published in the Washington Evening Star of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, July 22, 1959]

LABOR THREAT TO CONSTITUTION—THREE BILLS CALLED MOVE TO GIVE UNIONS HOLD OVER VOTING IN SEVERAL STATES

(By David Lawrence)

Efforts are being made by certain Members of Congress to ignore specific provisions of the Constitution by trying to enact laws that would take away from the States their exclusive right to determine the qualifications of voters.

The change, of course, could give the uninformed voters—including those who cannot read or write—the opportunity to override the wishes of the intelligent voters. Sometimes, in close elections for the House and Senate, a small number of voters—influenced by groups able to spend lots of money to mislead the uninformed citizens—can swing the result.

Already there is talk of big money contributions in the coming campaign. James Hoffa, head of the Teamsters Union, is reported to be getting ready to have about $9 million a year collected from his organization, whose membership is the largest in the country. He is quoted as saying:

"We've got to stop those guys from passing laws to destroy the American labor movement."

To raise $9 million a year is something unheard of in American politics, though in the 1958 campaign the AFL–CIO is reported to have spent many millions—far more than the regular Republican or Democratic campaign committees. Much of this was contributed directly to State committees, and hence does not appear in the national totals formally disclosed by Congress. A prominent Democratic Senator sizes up the situation this way:

"Labor leaders are flushed with the victory they won in a number of States last fall and plan to expand their activities next year. They have specifically indicated 10 Members of the Senate that they intend to purge. Two of those Members live in States that have poll taxes, and the other eight in States which have rather strict educational requirements for registration. Needless to say, if they can get Congress to take charge of that situation for them at this session, they could either win or create much confusion in contested elections in all of the 10 States in question.

"No one in Congress has ever challenged the fact that section 2 of article I of the Constitution leaves to the States exclusive jurisdiction over the qualifications of voters. But section 4 of the same article authorizes Congress to legislate concerning the time, place, and manner of holding elections, and all three of the pending bills express the pious fraud that they are dealing with the manner of holding elections.

"Of course, if the Senate passes any of these bills, it means that the States hereafter—barring relief from the Federal courts, which is not too likely—would be subject to the temporary whim of a labor-dominated Congress on what restrictions, if any, a State could put upon the election of State and local officials as well as Federal officials, because it is impractical to have two sets of qualifications. In other words, we are confronted with a very serious threat to constitutional government, as well as to the future opportunity of any State to be represented in the Senate by those who are unwilling to wear the yoke of organized labor."

Key to the problem is the qualification of voters. Some States have a poll tax, which means that every voter must pay a small registration fee to help defray the expenses of Government. Some States, moreover, require literacy or intelligence tests. One State permits 18-year-olds to vote. The Constitution says in article I:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

Another section of the same article of the Constitution says:

"The times, places and manners of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators."

Clearly the phrase "manner of holding elections" has to do with the arrangements for the elections themselves and not with the qualifications of voters. Otherwise the writers of the Constitution would not have found it necessary to specify at all that the qualifications of the "electors"—the persons who do the voting—should be prescribed by the State legislatures.

In support of this point, the 17th amendment proclaimed in May 1913, specifically says with respect to the election of U.S. Senators by popular vote:

"The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures."

If Congress could at any time prescribe voter qualifications merely by the passage of new laws, there would have been no necessity for the farmers of the 17th amendment to have repeated the language used by the Founding Fathers when they gave the States the exclusive rights to prescribe the qualifications of voters.

The Superiority of West Coast Fir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in Oregon we have more Douglas fir than any place else in the world. The best houses in the Nation are built of Douglas fir.

I want to commend Monumental Engineering, Inc., of Pasadena, Md., for pointing out this fact in their full-page advertisement in the Washington Daily News for Saturday, July 11, 1959.

In mentioning the numerous features of their home called the "Colonial," they mention:

All west coast fir construction (pine or hemlock is never substituted).

Favorable Benefits From Proposed Coos-Millicoma Navigation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in 1896, during the administration of President Grover Cleveland, the Congress authorized the construction of navigation improvements for the Coos and Millicoma Rivers project in southeastern Oregon. Two weeks ago, the Senate passed the 1960 public works appropriation bill which earmarked the sum of $23,000 for preconstruction planning of the project. I do not think I can be accused of overstatement when I say to my colleagues that the Coos-Millicoma project has encountered prolonged and unseemly delay. That fact speaks for itself. Other facts regarding the value and benefits of the project were described in a recent editorial in the Coos Bay World, and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so members of the conference committee on the public works appropriation bill may have this information available during their discussions of the measure.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World, July 10, 1959]

OLD PROJECT MAY COME TRUE

Inclusion of $23,000 in the Federal public works bill by the Senate Appropriations Committee still leaves the Coos-Millicoma dredging project a long way from a construction start. But at least it is a hopeful sign, a step in the right direction.

The Senate committee inserted the sum for the planning phase of the project. The money isn't in the appropriations bill already passed by the House of Representatives.

The Senate committee's recommendation must first pass the Senate, then must survive a conference committee between the two Houses or else be passed "as is" by the House of Representatives, and then must be approved by a veto-minded President Eisenhower. The President has apparently uttered private threats to veto the measure if it contains money for any new starts on any projects. The Coos-Millicoma planning fund is one of many new starts added to the House bill by the Senate committee.

So the odds are long that we will not get the planning money through this year. But at least, there is a chance.

As many will recall, from it having been printed here heaven knows how many times now, the Coos-Millicoma dredging project was first authorized by Congress during the administration of President Grover Cleveland. That was quite a spell back. For one

reason on another, including a number of war emergencies, planning and construction funds for it have never been authorized.

If the need for dredging of the lower streams was apparent in 1896, it is more apparent now. The need is, in fact becoming more acute each year.

Basically, dredging will permit the towing of log rafts down the two streams from woods operations on any tide. At present Weyerhaeuser and Menasha timber is brought down on only high tides. There is not enough water in the upper reaches of the river otherwise. The dredging will allow the two private corporations to even out their production schedules to a great extent. It will, in time, mean more utilization and more jobs.

But more than private—Weyerhaeuser and Menasha—timber is involved here.

The public has as great or greater a stake because the dredging project will permit the towing down of millions of feet of Government timber as well, cheapening the cost for smaller operators in bidding on U.S. timber (administered by the Bureau of Land Management), allowing them to become more competitive in their bidding.

The Government timber angle has appeared only in the past few months when it was discovered that the BLM had an old right-of-way across Weyerhaeuser land which will permit the trucking of O. & C. and Wagon Road timber to the water near Allegany for rafting down into the bay area.

When private and Government timber are considered together, the dredging project has a benefit-to-cost ratio of 4 or 5 to 1—meaning there will be a primary $4 or $5 benefit for each dollar of cost. That is an excellent ratio for Government projects of this type—so good, in fact, that immediate construction is almost a demand.

The Senate and House will do well to follow the Senate committee's recommendation on this project and appropriate the planning funds. Everyone in this area sincerely hopes they will.

Then we can hope that the President withholds his threatened veto.

Statement From Direct Mail Advertising Association on Pornographic Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a statement of policy from the Direct Mail Advertising Association on the need for greater vigilance against the small group of unscrupulous operators who use the mails for distribution of obscene material. The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF POLICY

In the light of the present publicity being circulated regarding the use of the mails for the distribution of pornographic materials, the Direct Mail Advertising Association today reaffirmed its stand against such practices.

Robert F. DeLay, president of the DMAA, released the following statement today:

"In accordance with the ethical standards proposed and maintained by the Direct Mail Advertising Association during its 42 years of existence, we again publicly detest and deplore the practice of using the mails for the distribution and dissemination of information on pornographic materials.

"The records and vigilance of our ethics committee continues to indicate that the purveyors of this material represent a few unscrupulous operators. Nevertheless, this small minority causes constant suspicion to be cast on the thousands of ethical users of the mail.

"We must constantly guard against this minority by being careful to keep the objectionable use of the mails in its proper perspective. Without public fanfare, DMAA, as a spokesman and guardian of the direct mail industry it serves, has vigorously resisted any practices which might further assist smut peddlers.

"The present publicity being waged to fight the smut battle has the unqualified endorsement of the direct mail industry. The assistance of the news media and other advertising media is a welcome addition to the self-policing actions that the direct mail industry has consistently carried on."

The Indiana Dunes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent editorial entitled "Save the Dunes," published in the Washington Post of this morning. The article strongly urges Congress to save the dunes, the extraordinarily beautiful area only 40 miles from Chicago which will shortly be destroyed by the National Steel Corp., under Mr. George M. Humphrey, and the Bethlehem Steel Co., unless Congress creates a national park or a national monument in that area. I am greatly pleased that this great newspaper of the Nation's Capital endorses Senate bill 1001, which I and other Senators have the honor to sponsor.

Mr. President, I also ask that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the editor of the Washington Post, published on July 7, 1959, written by Carl Sandburg, beloved poet, historian, and writer, urging the setting aside of the Indiana dunes as a national park. Mr. Sandburg's letter is a very eloquent plea for the saving of this unique area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD another letter to the Washington Post, urging the setting aside of the Indiana dunes as a national park or a national monument. This letter was written by Mr. Edwin Way Teale, of Hampton, Conn. Mr. Teale is a celebrated naturalist, who is probably the closest continuer of the tradition of John Burroughs that we have in this country.

There being no objection, the editorial and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 22, 1959]

SAVE THE DUNES

Around the south end of Lake Michigan is a geological phenomenon virtually unique in the United States—the Indiana dunes. There are of course many other sand dunes in the country, but few if any of them approach the distinctive grandeur of those in this brief strip of beach and border. Rising in great billows 190 feet above the lake, they contain a whole biological and geological history in the fight of forests and other vegetation against erosion. They are precious lands worth saving for the enjoyment and education of all the people; yet unless something is done very quickly some of the choicest parts will be transformed by the bulldozer.

A small part of the original dunes area is already preserved in the Indiana Dunes State Park west of Michigan City. But an essential remaining 5-mile piece of the shoreline belongs to the National and Bethlehem Steel Cos., and National has just announced plans for a huge steel plant to coincide with an Indiana port development. Already most of the dunes area from Michigan City west to Gary has been preempted by industrial and residential development.

The way to save the dunes is in enactment of S. 1001 sponsored by Senator DOUGLAS and seven other Senators to establish an Indiana Dunes National Monument through purchase of the remaining strip. Recently the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee turned down the bill, although the proposal has the strong endorsement of the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior as part of the movement to preserve a few irreplaceable areas of unspoiled shoreline. The Indiana dunes have especial appeal because of their proximity to the Chicago metropolitan area. They can still be saved if there is enough public sentiment to induce reconsideration in Congress, but the time for action before the opportunity becomes lost forever is tragically short.

FLAT ROCK, N.C., *July 7, 1959.*

To the EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON POST:

The Midwest area known as Chicagoland has steel mills galore. Some of the largest steel mills in the world are in this area. There have been poets in this Midwest who have tried to celebrate the dramatic, the picturesque, the many fascinating wonders to be seen in the making of steel.

And now an issue has arisen around the question: Is it an absolute necessity that more steel mills can't find space on which to locate without dumping themselves on the irreplaceable, priceless, and incomparable Indiana dunes?

There are masses of people in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, who love the dunes region as a wonderland for play, rest, and you might say creative art or creative pause.

Now a bill is before the Lands Subcommittee, Senate, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. It provides that the Secretary of the Interior be authorized to acquire 5,000 acres of "relatively unspoiled dunes, beaches, forests, bogs, and related landscapes suitable for national recognition."

Now I am merely one of many who salute and deeply appreciate the toils and efforts of those who seek to bring about the Indiana Dunes National Monument.

I have known these dunes for more than 40 years and I give my blessing and speak earnest prayers for all who are striving for this project.

These dunes are to the Midwest what the Grand Canyon is to Arizona and the Yosemite to California.

They constitute a signature of time and eternity; once lost, the loss would be irrevocable.

CARL SANDBURG.

JULY 17, 1959.

To the EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON POST:

A century ago when the famed English traveler and author, Harriet Martineau, visited the Indiana dunes along the south shore of Lake Michigan, she rated them as second only to the Mammoth Cave among the natural wonders of the Midwest.

As one who grew up in this area and early fell under the spell of the unique interest and beauty of the dunes, I would like to urge support for Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS' patriotic fight to make this area a national park.

For generations the Indiana dunes have provided surprises for scientists, inspiration for artists and recreation for innumerable visitors. In recent years, during the course of gathering material for books on the natural history of America, I have traveled more than 60,000 miles in 48 States of the Union, visiting national parks and wildlife areas. Nowhere have I found a more fascinating region than the dune country of Indiana.

Changing with the winds, the mobile dunes flow in shifting, fluid lines that provided an endlessly altering show of pictorial beauty. Rare plants bloom in the moist hollows between the hills of sand. The lake shore, the high dunes, the marsh beyond present varied habitats for many forms of life. All this is pathetically easy to destroy. Bulldozers can do it with dispatch.

What has taken a hundred thousand years to produce can be wiped out in a week. And once destroyed it is destroyed forever.

If the alternative to Senator DOUGLAS' plan is carried out, this will be the consequence. Construction of a harbor and steel town in the area—an industrial development that could be shifted elsewhere—will eliminate all possibility of preserving the only remaining stretch of dune country in this region. In addition, the pollution of air and water will blight the dunes of the State park adjoining.

In another age, one of the Roman writers noted that great trees are long in growing but they can be rooted up in an hour. This is, for many irreplaceable features of American nature, the Rooting Hour. Mechanized destruction is proceeding swiftly. Senator DOUGLAS' proposal offers a plan for saving one rare beautiful area which lies close to a great center of population and which can be preserved for the enjoyment of all.

EDWIN WAY TEALE.

HAMPTON, CONN.

(Mr. Teale's many books on nature include "Dune Boy, Early Years of a Naturalist.")

Tribute to Speaker Rayburn and Senate Majority Leader Johnson of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very stimulating press release signed by Representative CECIL R. KING and seven of his colleagues from California.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Following is the text of a letter sent to House Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON by Congressman CECIL R. KING, Democrat, of California, and seven other Democratic Congressmen from the State of California:

"In periods when the Government is divided, there is always the temptation for irresponsible politicians to concentrate on the division, and seek to impede, obstruct, and even paralyze our Government.

"This temptation has been resisted and fought by the Democratic leadership of the Congress, which has demonstrated its preference for constructive achievement as against destructive argument.

"We are proud of the leadership you have exhibited, and we want you to know that it meets with our wholehearted approval, and we believe with the approval of an overwhelming majority of the American people."

CECIL R. KING, HARRY R. SHEPPARD, Judge D. S. SAUND, CHET HOLIFIELD, B. F. SISK, CLYDE DOYLE, JOHN MOSS, HAROLD T. JOHNSON.

A Look at National Policy—Study by the Jackson Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Monday, there appeared in the New York Times an editorial entitled "A Look at National Policy." The editorial comments on the proposal of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] to study the national policy machinery of the Federal Government, particularly as it relates to foreign policy and national defense and national security policy.

The editorial gives a constructive message, and outlines the activities of the subcommittee which will make the study.

I now read from the editorial:

The Government is overweight, perhaps not so much with squandered money as with overlapping agencies.

Senator JACKSON's three-man Government Operations subcommittee may get somewhere if he sticks to his announced principles and resists the temptation to put on a circus. A scholarly congressional inquiry would be refreshingly new.

Mr. President, the editorial staff of the New York Times can be assured that the members of the subcommittee will conduct an objective, sound, and, I trust, scholarly review of the national security policy machinery or apparatus of the Federal Government. A number of us have for some time been deeply concerned with what we believe to be the inadequacy of the machinery of the Federal Government to coordinate such policies as foreign trade, national defense, the over-all diplomatic aspects of foreign policy and economic assistance, and a host of other activities which constitute what we commonly call—for lack of a better term—our national-security structure.

The purpose of the Jackson subcommittee is to make a careful analysis of what we currently are doing in the way of national policy machinery, and then to make recommendations for new structures or adaptations of existing structures.

Mr. President, congressional inquiries which are objective are not necessarily refreshingly new. There have been been many congressional inquiries, however, which have performed great services for the American people and the American Government, without the fanfare of television or radio, or even the presence of a number of newspaper reporters. It has been my privilege to participate in the work of subcommittees which have done good, constructive work; but since the subcommittees did not accuse anyone or abuse anyone or malign anyone or investigate anyone, the newspaper reporters seemed to think there was hardly any news value to the work of those groups, whose purpose was to ascertain what could be done for the good of the country, rather than to produce the fanfare and the circus to which reference are made in the editorial.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 20, 1959]

A LOOK AT NATIONAL POLICY

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat from the State of Washington, believes that today's "fundamental issue is whether a free society can so organized its human and material resources as to outthink, outplan and outperform totalitarianism." He has overcome President Eisenhower's original reluctance to cooperate in "a scholarly and nonpartisan evaluation of our national policy machinery."

Anyone who delves into that illuminating publication called the U.S. Government Organization Manual is likely to come out with a headache and a realization of the need for some study of this sort.

The trouble is not that we lack policy-making machinery, especially in the obvious fields of foreign programs and defense. We have the National Security Council, whose members include the President, Vice President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

We have a Planning Board to formulate "policy recommendations to be considered by the Council; we have an Assistant Secretary for Planning in the State Department, with the modest task of "evaluating current foreign policy in the formulation of long-range polices"; the Office of Defense Mobilization coordinates "all mobilization activities of the executive branch of the Government"; the Central Intelligence Agency advises the Council "concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments and agencies as relate to national security," and all the Operations Coordinating Board has to do is to "provide for the integrated implementation of national security policies."

In this set-up there are little wheels and big wheels. Senator Jackson, who is a member of the Committee on Government Operations and therefore familiar with the work of the Hoover Commissions, will understand the problems and the difficulties.

A layman might suspect that what the Government needs is a simplified structure of responsibility and command. Who does the original thinking when everybody is either being coordinated or is coordinating somebody else? The Government is overweight, perhaps not so much with squandered money as with overlapping agencies.

Senator JACKSON's three-man Government Operations subcommittee may get somewhere if he sticks to his announced principles

and resists the temptation to put on a circus. A "scholarly" Congressional inquiry would be refreshingly new.

Government Security Hearings and Procedures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, increasing discussion is heard concerning Government security hearings and procedures.

Interesting are the observations of Snow F. Grigsby, editor, in the Postal Alliance for April 1959, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS SUBVERSION?

The National Alliance of Postal Employees is opposed to communism, and to subversion in any form. This has been our position down through the years, and this continues to be our position today. We have never harbored Communists within our ranks, nor do we ever intend to knowingly. This is not, and has never been the purpose of our organization.

The alliance has always been opposed to all forms of racial discrimination and segregation. Likewise, we have opposed legislation and behavior which tends to deny to any race or group their rights as American citizens.

It has been proven time and time again that discrimination and segregation is costly. Wherever it exists, it restricts the best possible training, the full utilization of human skills and abilities, lowers the potential production output, and adds an additional burden to the already overloaded taxpayers. There is also the waste of leadership potential and special abilities.

In early 1948 the Post Office Department put the loyalty order into operation. In 1952, the administration issued Executive Order 10450 to all departments and agencies. There were post offices where Negroe employees were cited out of proportion to their ratio to white employees. At the time the loyalty order was put into effect, the alliance was faced with the problem of breaking down barriers of discrimination in many large post offices in various cities. The Negro postal employee was fighting for an opportunity to be employed by the Government on an equal basis with the majority group. In too many instances his training and ability was overlooked; he was assigned to menial jobs, and rarely promoted even though qualified for such recognition. While many of the labor unions permitted the Negro postal employee to become members, they, too, discriminated by limiting him to secondary membership by withholding rights enjoyed by other members, such as holding office and representation on grievance issues. The alliance was the only service organization which insisted on equal treatment of all employees, and equal opportunities for promotions and preferred assignments. In New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Cleveland, and other cities, Negro postal employees made strong representation against patterns of discrimination that denied them equal opportunities in the postal service.

In cases in which alliance members were dismissed for alleged activities termed subversive, the question arises, were these men who were militant in their efforts to open doors of opportunity closed to them because of their color and previous social condition, in fact, subversive? If a person, who is denied his full citizenship rights, works to secure these rights within the framework of law and order, engaging in activity which is disloyal and subversive?

The American Negro in his continuous struggle for equality has never through overt behavior or declaration defied the Constitution, nor the Government, nor the courts, even though many of the decisions handed down continued to deny him the citizenship guaranteed under the Constitution. On the scene today are any number of militant spokesmen and leaders and groups who are busily engaged in activities which are contrary to the American way which embraces the concept of equality and justice for all. This element of our citizenry has openly defied the Supreme Court, which represents the highest law of our land, and have committed acts of violence to further enforce their position. Many of these people are in sensitive positions. Yet, with all of the talk and the editorializing denouncing the southern and northern practices of discrimination and segregation, the persons who are responsible for the perpetuation of these practices continue on unhampered by loyalty orders and the like, breeding hate, lawlessness, utter ruin, and destruction, all characteristic of disloyalty and subversion. It has seldom been uttered that these people are Communists. It has seldom been implied that they are subversive and disloyal.

If the truth about discrimination and equality hurts the liberal conscience, is it fair to silence the person or group who makes this truth known, by allegations of disloyalty and subversion?

What in fact, does constitute subversion?

YOU CAN'T HAVE ONE WITHOUT THE OTHER

Justice always contains the idea of equality. So obvious is this, that even small children can recognize this concept. If you have two small children and give a large piece of candy to one child and a small piece to the other, the child who receives the small piece of candy will ask why he was given the smallest piece. Justice and equality go hand in hand. Every schoolchild salutes the flag saying, "With liberty and justice for all."

What is justice? Justice is first of all rendering to every man his due. If a prominent citizen breaks the law and is permitted to go free, that is unjust. If two men are working side by side with equal qualifications, and doing the same work, and one is given a raise in salary and the other one is not, that is unjust. Justice does not care about passing whims, uncertain emotions, or expediency of the moment; justice does not care what mood we are in, or the special group to which we may belong. Justice is rendering to every man his due no matter what our personal feelings. If we become the kind of people who consent when rights of others are denied, we become unjust, and in such an atmosphere, our own rights will not long survive.

The chief principle which should always be brought to bear on the subject of race, is justice. This is the principle on which this country stands, and it is a principle which is often neglected in situations which require tolerance and patience. To deny a person his just due because he is a member of a minority group, is unjust.

Justice means that the individual and his rights are protected. Justice is love in action in public life. Justice means that we are governed by principles and law, and not by passing whims. Justice is equality, and you can't have one without the other.

NO RIDERS

Efforts are being made to attach a security rider to the budget bill of the Post Office. This rider would grant the Postmaster General the authority to fire any employee whose loyalty is in doubt. Closed door hearings have been held on this issue, and officials of the Department have been called in to give testimony before the House Appropriations Committee. However, so far, no service organization has been invited to come in and testify before this Committee. This is a serious matter, and all service organizations should alert their membership to the potential danger of such legislation. If this legislation is enacted, the Post Office Department will be in the position of complainant, prosecutor, and judge. If such broad authority is given to the Post Office, an employee can be accused, and dismissed from the service, and all other avenues of appeal will be closed to him. There will be no recourse to the courts and all retirement benefits lost.

SNOW F. GRIGSBY, *Editor.*

Workers Are Doing Well, but Only Until They Retire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in the absence of Victor Riesel, a noted labor columnist, a number of people have been writing columns for him from day to day. One column was written by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and was published in the Wichita Beacon of July 9, 1959, under the title "Workers Are Doing Well, But Only Until They Retire." I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORKERS ARE DOING WELL, BUT ONLY UNTIL THEY RETIRE

(By Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON (pinch-hitting for Victor Riesel))

WASHINGTON.—"Our trade unions have continued to obtain substantial wage advances, while prices have remained relatively steady. * * * Real wages are showing very significant increases. This means a continuously rising American standard of living."

Republican propaganda, you say, delivered by the Republican National Committee chairman?

Not at all. The quotation is from an article written earlier this year by George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO.

The quotation sets forth the broad basic reason why the Republicans nominee for the Presidency in 1960 again is going to receive the votes of an overwhelming majority of American's workers and at least a near-majority of the votes of union members, despite whatever may be the political leanings of the unions' leadership.

The simple—but monumental—fact is that since 1953 America's workers, both union and nonunion, have made more personal economic progress than in any comparable period in our history.

Another testimonial came from a union source in February of this year, when the Machinist—official organ of the AFL-CIO

Machinists' Union—published a research study aimed at finding out whether the American worker had more purchasing power in 1958, 1948 or 1938.

The verdict was overwhelmingly in favor of 1958, the sixth year of our Republican administration.

"Almost everything is cheaper" now than in 1948 or 1938, said the Machinist, when prices are measured against the time it takes to earn the money to buy things. The Machinist cited an impressive list of examples, including these:

In 1938 it took 12 minutes of work to earn enough to buy a quart of milk. By 1958 this had almost been cut in half—the required 1958 labor for the price of a quart of milk is 7¼ minutes. In a family which uses 2 quarts of milk daily, in other words, the wage earner now works 89 fewer hours over a year to pay his annual milk bill—this is more than a 2-week saving.

For two packs of cigarettes, the Machinist reported, 24 minutes' work was required in 1938 against a required 12 minutes' work today—a 100-percent reduction required labor.

Hard facts and documented realities such as these will stand up against the flood of things-were-never-worse propaganda which is hitting workers' families from sources more interested in political power in the opposition party than in the economic status of the workers.

All measurements confirm the findings of Mr. Meany and the Machinists Union.

Personal income, factory income, savings, consumer expenditures—all are at record levels.

Prices have remained steady for about the past year—the longest period of such stability in history.

Social security has been made almost universal and benefits have been improved. The minimum wage has been increased.

Compared with 1952, more than 7 million more American families have incomes of $4,000 or more while those limited to $2,000 or less have been reduced a stunning 2 million—this is real migration upward in the income brackets for everybody.

And this is the economic record on which we will run in 1960, a year for which every indicator points to the greatest American prosperity in history, nurtured and promoted by sound Republican policies.

This is a record which needs no defense, only effective presentation.

In the U.S. Capitol in Washington today, a tremendous battle is going on which involves the security and future of every American worker. This is the so-called battle of the budget.

This battle is far deeper than most generalizations would indicate. It's not a matter of penny-pinching. It's not a matter of cold numbers on a balance sheet. And it's not a matter of partisan politics.

National security and personal security are involved and America's workers especially are involved.

The issue might be stated thus: What does it profit a man to labor his entire life if what he is laboring for becomes worthless when he is ready to enjoy it?

That is what inflation does to hard-earned savings, investments, social security payments, insurance policies, and the pension plans on which so many millions rely for retirement income. And deficit spending by the Federal Government is a definite major factor in inflation.

Consider a typical retired senior citizen. He's 76 years old now, 11 years retired. When he retired his $200 a month pension would let him live out his days in comfort.

What he didn't figure on, however, was the 50-percent price rise skyrocket sent up by the Truman administration during a Democratic era in which the value of the dollar was being halved through inflation and deficit Government spending. So today the retired gentleman is dependent on the charity of distant relatives.

This is the type of thing which the Republican Party is fighting against—it's what the battle of the budget is all about—and we've been largely successful. Since 1953, loss in dollar value has been less than a nickel and the 50-percent price rise of the Democrats has been slowed to a 6-year increase of just 8 percent. For the past year consumer prices have been steady.

This is a record, and an economic policy which deserves and will get the support of those hurt worse by inflation—those on fixed incomes, those with savings accounts, insurance policies, pension, and all other types of retirement plans.

If we can hold the spending line against inflation today—a time of rising prosperity—then the future will be more secure and brighter, both for the Nation as a whole and for each individual family.

Northern Michigan Has Lost a True Friend and Great Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, Northern Michigan has lost a great friend.

Glenn MacDonald, editor of the Bay City (Mich.) Times, was called by his Maker list Friday after a brief illness.

Few men in the field of journalism, or any other field, had a greater circle of friends, and few men have labored more diligently and untiringly for the growth, the advancement and the welfare of his particular geographic area than Mr. MacDonald. It would be difficult to enumerate all the worthwhile projects in Northern Michigan in which Glenn MacDonald participated.

The industrial and recreational growth of Michigan and particularly northern Michigan were close to his heart and Glenn MacDonald could be counted on to contribute his time and energy for their advancement.

He will be greatly missed.

His career and his dedication to his fellow citizens are set forth in an editorial in the Bay City Times and I desire to present this tribute to a fine American for insertion in the RECORD:

GLENN MACDONALD

A foremost figure in the contemporary American newspaper scene was removed Friday.

If death struck unexpectedly, it was even more untimely when it claimed Glenn MacDonald in the ascendancy of a brilliant career in the business.

Although he had given nearly 40 years in almost every capacity to the editorial division of the industry, he was still young in years. He had the capacity, the farsightedness, and the will to do the many things still to be done, which he could have done so well had he but lived the normal period of life expectancy.

It is the untimeliness of his death that is so cruel, that leaves such a great void among his fellow workers, his host of real friends in and out of the newspaper ranks.

Glenn MacDonald was the editor of the Times, but he preferred to be known as a newspaperman.

He had to work hard at the business of the editor's routine. But the hurly-burly of the city room, pushing around crowded sports arenas, in muddy sites of sudden death, in police court, through the fire lines, the down-to-earth, day-to-day job of producing a newspaper came easy to him.

Although he could assume the pontifical air of the ivory tower when that became his duty, he was more at home in the typographical department directing the mechanics of putting a newspaper together which was masterful not only in content but also in design.

There were no closed doors to Glenn MacDonald anywhere in the State of Michigan—in the world, if you please, wherever he chose to go. And to his eternal credit never was the door of his editor's office ever closed to a single person.

He was blustery, but that bluster was his only false front.

He was generous to a fault. He was unshakingly true to his friends. He couldn't keep a grudge nor an enemy.

There are few newspapermen who had so wide and diversified a circle of friends. Glenn MacDonald not only knew them in every walk of life, he cultivated them.

He had a creed that if newspaper people were to chronicle accurately the history of the era in which they lived they had to be close to the people making that history.

That kind of newspapering is hard, intense work. Hardly to be accomplished in an ivory tower. But elbow rubbing in the seething life of modern America takes its toll in a physical way, and a hard bargain it drives.

It may well have brought his early death.

But he would not have had it otherwise.

Those of us who worked with him—we never worked for him—are sure that had he been given the opportunity of a long life in the seclusion of the ivory tower, or the span that befell him in the way he wanted to be a newspaperman, he unhesitatingly would have chosen the latter.

They need not erect monuments to his memory.

His contributions to the community will long outlive his memory.

He was a great newspaperman, a fine boss, an upright husband and father, a real neighbor, a true friend.

Mr. Robert Prescott's Crusade To Free American Prisoners of Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the personal crusade of Mr. Robert W. Prescott, of Eugene, Oreg., to secure the release of American citizens now imprisoned in Red China is attracting widespread interest. For many months, Mr. Prescott has sought support for his idea that American schoolchildren, by writing to youngsters in other countries about the plight of the imprisoned American prisoners of the Peiping reternational indignation so the Communist regime would release them. Moral

sanctions often provide a powerful weapon against injustice. I hope that Mr. Prescott's enlistment of schoolchildren to help force the release of American prisoners of the Pieping regime achieves the desired result. Some of the beneficial effects of Mr. Prescott's work are described in an editorial which appeared in the Eugene Register-Guard of July 16, 1959, and I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, July 16, 1959]

WORTHY CAUSE

The Eugene School Board has referred to its administrative council and its attorney the suggestion that Eugene students take part in a propaganda campaign to get justice for Americans illegally imprisoned in Red China. Legal and administrative opinions are important.

But if there is no serious barrier to having our boys and girls take part in this campaign, we hope the school system encourages their participation. Robert W. Prescott, a Eugene real estate man, has spent countless hours and a great deal of money in promoting this expression of indignation on the part of American children. The campaign, in which private schoolchildren in the Portland area have been quite active, is beginning to show results. Replies to the children's letters are coming in from India where the plight of the imprisoned Americans had not been so well understood.

It will be a credit to the Eugene system if our children join in this selfless and worthwhile campaign. We hope that through contacts they make in other nations, they can inspire children from all over the world to register their protest—to Peiping whenever possible—over the disgraceful imprisonment of Americans whose only crime was to have been Americans in China.

Gov. Edmund G. Brown, of California, To Serve on Democratic National Advisory Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release issued by California's distinguished Governor, Pat Brown, in Los Angeles on July 15, 1959.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, July 15.—Gov. Edmund G. Brown today said he is accepting an invitation from Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler to serve on the Democratic National Advisory Council.

The Governor said that as a member of the council he will "work for the election of a Democratic president and a Democratic Congress for the Nation in 1960."

He made the announcement in a statement issued here prior to leaving for Sacramento. He had spent the last 2 days in southern California reporting on the accomplishments of the first 6 months of his administration.

"I want to help assure that a progressive and united Democratic Party stresses actual accomplishments in the record we present to the people next year," Governor Brown said.

"I believe, for example, we must help build actual houses, not just prefabricated issues," he said. "I think the vigor and vision of the Democratic Party across the country contrast sharply with the vetoes and vacillation of the GOP.

"I am confident the Democratic Congress is putting together a comprehensive record of accomplishment, and as a member of the party's advisory council, I shall consult closely with our party leaders and Members in the Congress," Governor Brown declared.

"As the basic philosophy of the Democratic Party, I believe we must seek the best the human mind and spirit can conceive," he said, "but when we cannot attain all of that today, let us accomplish all we can with the realities that confront us, then strive again for higher goals after that.

"Human progress is accomplished with hard work, not hollow words," the Governor said.

"I think the Democratic Party nationally needs a greater western viewpoint," he concluded, "and I am working with Senator CLAIR ENGLE and many others to provide that in our party's councils and convictions."

Union Shop Legitimate—Right-To-Work Laws Seen Blocking Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Union Shop Legitimate—Right-To-Work Laws Seen Blocking Rights," which was published in the Catholic Bulletin of June 19, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Catholic Bulletin, June 19, 1959]

UNION SHOP LEGITIMATE—RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS SEEN BLOCKING RIGHTS

WILMINGTON, DEL.—So-called right-to-work laws tend to interfere with the right of working people to organize effective unions, the director of the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference said here.

In the opinion of many, perhaps the majority of Catholic students of industrial relations, "right to work legislation hampers the normal growth and lessens the stability of trade unionism," declared Msgr. George G. Higgins.

And trade unions are "not merely tolerated nor permitted, but encouraged" by the church, Monsignor Higgins added in an address at graduation exercises of the Salesianum labor-management school here.

The U.S. bishops and the administrative board of the NCWC have never issued an official statement on the morality of the union shop, he said, because "the morality of the union shop has hardly ever been called into question by competent spokesmen for the Catholic point of view."

"American theologians and American Catholic experts in the field of labor relations are almost unanimously agreed that the union shop is morally legitimate," he said.

Monsignor Higgins cited a marked difference between the attitude of most supporters of right-to-work laws and that of most commentators on the papal social encyclicals.

"The average opponent of the union shop and the average proponent of so-called right-to-work legislation regards the decision—to organize or not to organize—as a purely individual decision on the part of the individual workers," he said.

"By contrast, the American bishops, the Canadian bishops and the majority of American students of Catholic social teaching place their emphasis on the social responsibility of individual workers to contribute to the common good by organizing with their fellow workers."

Monsignor Higgins described labor racketeering as a very serious problem. But the extent of labor corruption "deliberately or otherwise has been exaggerated," he said.

"The overwhelming majority of unions and union leaders in the United States are basically honest," he declared.

He said he believes the current Senate hearings on labor racketeering "are about to go out of existence."

Rightful Claims of American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the July 25, 1959, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, concerning the meritorious bill of our colleague, the Honorable J. ARTHUR YOUNGER:

WE PAY OFF EVERYBODY FOR WAR DAMAGE—EXCEPT OUR OWN CITIZENS

Probably most people believe, if they give the matter a thought, that all legitimate claims for damage growing out of World War II have long since been settled. The fact is, however, that some of the most meritorious claims by American citizens are still unsatisfied.

Many of these claims are on behalf of Americans who lost their possessions, or perhaps their health, through Japanese military action in China, Malaya, or elsewhere in Asia outside Japan itself. Some of these individuals were businessmen, others were missionaries, doctors, lawyers or other professional people. Their losses, through confiscation or military action, were as severe as those of Americans who were caught in Japan proper. The latter have been paid in full, but in our treaty with Japan the United States waived the claims of Americans in other parts of Asia who had been damaged by the Japanese. Except for partial payment to Americans who suffered damage in the Philippines, none of these claims has ever been settled. Indeed a number of Americans who emerged from Japanese prison camps with nothing but the

clothes on their backs are currently receiving bills for transportation back to the United States.

Another group of claimants suffered damage in Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Greece, and other areas attacked by the Nazis. The principal hindrance to a settlement of these claims appears to be the insistence of those who want to return the German oversea assets that were sequestered during and after World War II that Americans' claims should not be paid until the German assets are returned. This seems unreasonable in view of the fact that in 1953 the Bonn government of West Germany agreed to compensate its own citizens for these assets in return for what amounted to a reduction of reparations by the Allies. Thus it would seem logical that the legitimate claims of American sufferers should be satisfied from German assets held in this country.

The proceeds from sale of some of these German and Japanese assets have been paid to certain classifications of American claimants, but there remain a large number of claims by Americans who suffered grievously from the war, but who have up to now been left out in the cold.

Various bills, including one introduced by Representative J. ARTHUR YOUNGER of California, have been presented to correct this injustice. Mr. YOUNGER declares that "practically every nation, except the United States, which engaged in World War II has already made some provision to indemnify or rehabilitate its nationals, in every case at the expense in whole or in part of the American taxpayer. * * * No reason exists why the United States should provide funds for other nations so that they can pay their own damage and we continue to neglect the rightful demands of our own citizens."

German and Japanese individuals and corporations suffered from the seizure of their property by the allied governments, including ours. However, it seems fantastic to be so concerned over these hardships that the at least equally valid claims of Americans are ignored.

Rural Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish briefly to call attention to the fine progress that is being made in the Stevens County, Wash., resource development program. This work is part of the national rural development program, which I understand, is now going forward in more than 100 counties in all major regions of the Nation.

Washington State College has entered into an agreement with leaders in Stevens County setting up a cooperative program which will push forward the long-term economic development of the area. A rural resource development planning council was recently established in the county. Industrial and educational development are two important objectives of the program in Stevens County.

Although less than 2 years in operation, the resource development work in Stevens County has already had considerable influence in the area. According to latest reports of the State college, which is also cooperating with the U.S. Department of Agriculture in the program, two additional counties in my district, Ferry and Pend Oreille, are now organizing programs similar to the one in Stevens County. This is an extremely important development. It indicates that in my district resource development is moving from the pilot stage to the stage of established areawide cooperation, under a long-term program involving several counties and many small towns and villages.

Many difficult problems remain to be solved if our rural resource development program is to raise incomes and levels of living among our rural people. We need more industry to balance our agriculture. And our county development committees are presently handicapped in some of their projects by a lack of credit resources.

However, I believe that rural and resource development programs, modeled on those underway throughout the Nation, offer the only sound approach presently on the horizon for a long-term solution to the chronic problems of our declining rural areas and rural low income. I for one intend to exert every effort to make this work succeed and help the able, conscientious leaders in my district who are volunteering their time and talents to make the program a success.

What the Farmers and Taxpayers Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the July 15, 1959, issue of the Everett Daily Herald summarizes the results of a poll made by the Farm Journal. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the editorial, "What Nation's Farmers Want Set Forth in Farm Journal," in the RECORD.

This poll is of great interest to me because there are many farmers who reside and earn their livelihood from the land in my district of Washington State. In fact, the majority of the dairymen who supply the Puget Sound marketing area are in my district. Also, the results of the Farm Journal poll parallels the results of the one I conducted this year.

According to the Farm Journal as quoted in the Daily Herald, 78 percent of the farmers across the Nation favor plans calling for no support or for less support. Some 7,500 persons answered my most recent questionnaire. Of these, 79 percent said they do not approve the present price support program. As a group the farmers in my district also opposed the support program, the percentage of opposition being 84.

These figures lead me to the conclusion so well put in the Daily Herald: It is up to the political powers to see that the farmer gets what he wants and the taxpayer realizes his desire.

The editorial follows:

WHAT NATION'S FARMERS WANT SET FORTH IN FARM JOURNAL

Farm Journal, the leading magazine in its field, has polled its readers to find out just what kind of a Government farm plan they really want.

The results will come as a big surprise to those who think farmers as a whole want more and more Government aids, controls and supports.

Here is how the vote adds up:

Fifty-five percent want total abandonment of supports and controls, and a return to the free market.

Fifteen percent favor supports on an emergency basis only.

Eight percent want adjustment supports which could permit a gradual return to normal markets over a period of time.

In sum, therefore, 78 percent favor plans calling either for no support or for less support.

By contrast, only 14 percent say they want high price supports, of 90 percent to 100 percent of parity, and only 8 percent favor the production payment plan.

The percentages were pretty much the same in all sections of the country. Among the different commodities, farmers specializing in poultry, beef, or fruit and vegetables are the most inclined to get rid of supports. Wheat and grain processors are least disposed to do this—but even so, close to half of them consider it the thing to do.

Farm Journal has done the country a real service—and the hope is that the lesson learned will find its reflection in future policy. Farmers, like the rest of us, know past programs have been monumental failures, and that billions have gone down the drain with no return.

And farmers want to stand on their own feet.

And the taxpayers desire that no further billions go down the drain.

It is up to the political powers to see that the farmer gets what he wants and the taxpayer realizes his desire.

Statement by T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Before "My True Security" Awards Dinner, Statler Hotel, Washington, D.C., July 21, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the principal address at the national awards dinner for the "My True Security" essay contest program on Tuesday, July 21, in Washington, D.C., was T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I had the privilege of hearing this address. It was intended for the high school youngsters who were representing their States as the contest winners in each of our States. I wish that more adults could have heard it, especially Members of Congress, because there was much food for thought which we can

apply in our negotiations here as we try to legislate for the good of America and the free world in this space age.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Dr. Glennan's address in the Appendix of the RECORD. I am sure that all who read them will be as impressed as I am with the weight of these words:

My purpose tonight is to discuss with you some aspects of the security of this Nation on which, in my opinion, the continuance of the American way of life will depend. You all must have thought seriously about some of these as you prepared your papers for this contest. To say that we are threatened or that our way of life is threatened these days is but to repeat the statements of men much wiser, better informed, and more influential than myself. But security has many facets, and I want to talk about some of the important aspects of security which do not reside particularly in the military strength of this Nation.

While recognizing the need—yes, the absolute need—for military strength in these days of nuclear submarines, atomic and hydrogen bombs, supersonic high-performance airplanes, and intercontinental ballistic missiles, I want to consider more particularly what I believe to be the real strengths of this Nation in our fight for security. These strengths reside in the will, the determination, and the dedication of the individual. These are not idle words—platitudes taken from some long-forgotten essay or even from the pages of the public press. They are characteristics of human behavior without which there can be no real security—American way or no American way.

Now this is not going to be a lengthy oration. And first let me say that I count it a very real privilege to be here tonight. With you, I am anxious to see and to applaud the national award winner and the runners-up who are to be recognized for their achievement in this contest. May I congratulate them as well as the sponsors of this program—the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co.

And I'd like to say just a special word to those fifty other finalists who are here tonight and to the many thoughtful young men and women who have not had the good fortune, as you have, to visit in our National Capital during the past 2 days. This is indeed a competitive world, and not all of us can win the top honors in any particular contest. But there are many competitions in life and many kinds of awards. Each person who competes honestly and with all his heart in every contest in which he enters finds his own reward in some form.

The opportunity to think seriously and creatively about our way of life which this program has offered is itself a reward. It is a challenge that all of you have shared equally. The outward and visible sign of success is the trophy, and the person winning it has been judged worthy of recognition for superior achievement. But for all of the others competing, if they have done their diligent best, there is a satisfaction of accomplishment, a growth in knowledge and understanding, and a development of confidence in their own abilities of expression—these will become the building blocks for a useful life.

And now let me get back to this business of the national security and my evaluation of the other than military methods of providing that security. For the past year, as head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I have been engaged in the most difficult task of any that I have met. Not only does it represent a personal challenge to me as an engineer, a public servant, and an administrator—it is a challenge to our country as a whole—a double dare, tossed in the face of American science and technology by the Soviet Union. We are given the choice of competing with Russia in the new realm of space research, or else resigning ourselves to the role of onlooker in the most inspiring enterprise of our time.

For the United States, this challenge represents a real threat to our security. You will agree, I am sure, that we as a nation are not alone in this world. Never again will we experience the security of what was once known as splendid isolation. Our progress, from revolution to world leadership in a little more than a century and a half, has resulted in large part from our abilities, as freemen, to apply the new knowledge resulting from the researches of scientists to the creation of devices and processes which have lifted the burdens from the backs of our people. The rest of the world has marveled at—and envied—the results of these efforts. The image we have created is that of technological superiority in almost every field. So much so, that we came to believe it ourselves.

For several years past we have been disturbed—whenever we took the time to think about it—by the progress made by the Russians in the development and production of military devices—submarines, tanks, high-performance airplanes and missiles, and the atomic and hydrogen bomb. More recently, we have been experiencing the challenge of economic competition in various markets throughout the world. Nowhere before, however, have we seen the dramatic impact of a single accomplishment in technology influence world opinion as was the case when the Soviet scientists succeeded in placing the first satellite into orbit around the earth on October 4, 1957. I want to take just a few minutes to review the manner in which this result was accomplished, because we find ourselves in a situation so novel to us that we are hard put to it to realize the true urgency of the problem.

We had pioneered in the development of jet airplanes after World War II. Our experimental rocket-powered aircraft—the X–1, the X1A, and Skyrocket, and the X–2—had first broken the sound barrier, and had set the world's unofficial speed record of 2,350 miles per hour and the altitude record of 24 miles above the surface of the earth. We were then confident of bringing our intermediate range ballistic missiles to a state of operational readiness. We were preparing, as a contribution to the International Geophysical Year, to launch a series of small, exploratory earth satellites, as a modest preliminary to the development of space flight.

Then, on October 4, 1957, the Russians lofted their first 184-pound sputnik into orbit. They followed it up with two more, ranging in payload weight as high as 2,925 pounds. The blow to our national pride in this unexpected achievement by Soviet science was tremendous. The cost to us in prestige abroad was, and continues to be, even greater.

In effect, the Soviet Union has been able to create in the minds of the people of a very large portion of the world's uncommitted areas the belief that success in space research is the principal measure of the scientific and technological efforts of a nation and, hence, the real measure of the worth of a culture. Entering this race with a certain amount of complacency, we now find ourselves at a disadvantage that will be overcome only by a determined effort and intelligent and creative attention to the task of developing our own program in space research.

Only 2 years ago, most of us took it comfortably for granted that the United States was the most advanced country in the world in scientific discovery and application. We had no monopoly of talent or brains, although we were not as ready to admit that fact then as we are now. But we did have the finest laboratories and the most modern engineering facilities, and our vast industrial resources lent their support to scientific research.

How has this situation come to pass?

Recognizing that, to compete in this modern world, communism must be buttressed by industrial might, the Soviet leaders determined soon after their revolution that large numbers of the youth of that nation must be trained in science and technology. It was an up-hill battle—the broadening of the educational base, first, to provide for a significantly large proportion of that nation's youth the primary and secondary school training that must precede college-level work in science and engineering—and then to channel into these difficult fields of learning a majority of all students in higher education. The success of their efforts is now well known even though we may criticize some of the methods used by them to achieve that success.

Just 1 year ago, I was in Russia. In company with seven other college presidents, I was trying to understand the Soviet system of higher education. After learning something of the structure and administration of their technicums, technological institutes, universities, and institutes for research and advanced study, we visited a variety of institutions and talked to many students and teachers.

You have read, I am sure, about the stiff requirements which must be met by the Soviet student if he is to be allowed to continue his education. Incentives for superior academic performance are real and highly prized. Examinations are tough, thorough, and frequent. Education is a serious matter for the youth of the Soviet Union, and this is particularly the case in the institutions of higher education.

The most vivid impression I carried away from that brief exposure, however, was that of the dedication of the student and his teachers. As I recognized this characterized on their campuses, I became aware of its pervading presence in almost every meeting we had. People believed in what they were doing. And, quite apparently, the system of incentives, awards, and rewards provided by the Soviet Government keeps them working, producing, and believing.

It seems to me that the really important ingredient that the Soviet young people—indeed, people of all ages in the Soviet Union—possess is the pride they have in their present achievements. While by our standards, their personal and material rewards seem at times ridiculously small, it is clear to even the most obtuse observer that their progress has been very great in the past few decades.

As a nation they are second only to the United States in most fields of production, industrial development, and in military strength. As a people, they really fit the phrase—"They never had it so good." And all of this they have accomplished in the short span of 40 years. Based on this performance, they have confidence that greater achievement will come in the future, and with this conviction goes the willingness to work and to sacrifice for that achievement. These are the forces on which the Soviet leaders now can depend in their drive for dominance of the uncommitted peoples and nations of the world.

In the face of this determined and disciplined effort, what are we to do? Shall we imitate their system, which seems, for the moment at least, to have brought about these tremendous advances? Shall we bury our heads in the sands of complacency, secure in the belief that the American way will win out in the long run? Shall we withdraw from the responsibilities of leadership of the free world, preferring to en-

joy the prosperity that abounds in this land rather than facing up to the fact that there never can be a peaceful world when the majority of the population of that world lacks food and shelter and clothing—the barest necessities of life? Where does our true security and the security of this Nation really lie?

Let's stop for a moment and take stock. What are the real elements of security for each of us and for the Nation? There is security for all of us in the knowledge of past achievement—and this we have in large measure. No other nation in the long history of man has been able to distribute the fruits of man's labor so widely as has our Nation. In two world wars our industrial and technological genius provided the materiel for victory while our Armed Forces acquitted themselves as true champions of freedom.

There is security, too, in the ability to cope with present problems. This ability we have in some considerable measure, but it is an ability that we can lose very easily. We are tempted today to depend for our security on material things—armaments and superior technological achievements in the various fields of warfare even though we are aware of the fact that victory in modern armed conflict is a hollow mockery—that there is no lasting security to be gained from it.

And finally, there should be security in our democratic system of education—but here we need to face up to some hard facts—you as students and those of my generation as parents and responsible citizens. We have prided ourselves on our growth in the field of higher education. Unlike the Russians, who limit the number permitted to study beyond the high school or its equivalent according to the needs of the state, we have made it possible for ever-increasing numbers of young people to go on to college. In doing so, however, we have allowed college work to become too easy. College has become a social rather than an educational goal in all too many cases. Now we are confronted with what a dictatorial system can do while we have let down our guard. To regain the security inherent in a strong educational system we must greatly improve the quality at all levels and particularly in college level work. Quite naturally, you would expect me to stress the need for higher quality and greatly increased numbers of graduates in the sciences and engineering. I do—but I would stress, too, the great need for improved quality in all fields of study these days.

As I started this discussion, I indicated my conviction that our real strength as a nation lies in the will, the determination, and the dedication of the individual. Let me be more specific. Our strength, in my opinion, lies in our will to understand what our history has made of us, the determination to contribute something of ourselves to make the continuation of that history possible, and the dedication which keeps each of us contributing in spite of the necessity for some considerable personal sacrifice. Only with the will, the determination, and the dedication of the individual will we succeed in this contest.

To sum up—the danger to our society that disturbs me most is not the menace of Soviet spacecraft or missiles. I know that by hard work and intelligent planning we can overtake the Russian lead in rocket vehicles. What worries me instead is the possibility that we may lose the habit of individual effort that brought us our freedom and gave us our strength as a nation. Without this independence, this initiative, we will have little of value left to protect. If this deterioration proceeds, we must face up to the fact that our political and economic adversary will win this contest for men's minds—hands down.

I hear so much talk these days about the search for leisure and personal security, so little about building up our national resources and our moral influence to preserve our institutions. I hear so much emphasis placed upon possessions, and so little on the sacrifices that we need to make in order to guarantee a life of freedom for our children.

In spite of all our technical achievements in overcoming poverty, starvation, disease, and the worst kinds of tyranny, this remains a very tough and serious world—one in which millions of people do not even recognize the existence of the personal security that we take for granted. The stakes are high in this competition between our traditional view of the supreme importance of the individual as against our adversary's belief in the supreme importance of the state. The time left for our decision is growing shorter.

This is your challenge. It will be up to the generation that you represent to determine whether we sit idly on the sidelines, enjoying our leisure, while other nations drive ahead, or whether we throw all of our ingenuity, our talent, our energy, into the struggle for human enlightenment. The same qualities that give us individual strength of character also give us strength as a people, as a society. The choice will largely be yours whether all of us together win our true security.

Area Redevelopment and Automation: Potential Partners for Plenty in the Years Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, two of the most able Members in this House, and, I am happy to say, both of them my colleagues in the delegation from Pennsylvania, DANIEL J. FLOOD and JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, joined to write a letter which all of you have received by now and which I earnestly suggest you study carefully.

They wrote of area redevelopment or aid to distressed areas as it is also called.

They wrote after years of study and sad firsthand knowledge of chronic unemployment in their areas.

They wrote of need well known to Members from Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Michigan, and other States suffering from what economists call structural unemployment—the unemployment resulting from the permanent change in the structure of a community's industry rather than from general economic conditions.

It is good these two veterans of the legislative arena joined in this cause because they have the skill to convince the Members of this House that the area redevelopment bill is a bipartisan measure for the good of the entire Nation. Their's is an uphill battle. This is true because the plight of idled workers in our Nation's pockets of unemployment is all too often ignored generally in periods when the Nation as a whole is becoming more prosperous.

This would be an understandable reaction were area redevelopment of purely sectional importance. But it is not.

In the parlance of the philosopher, the whole is no stronger than its weakest part.

The same applies to economies of nations. We strengthen the whole Nation when we restore the economy of a declining coal town or rail center to vigorous health.

But there is another aspect of area redevelopment in which this proposed legislation can play a key role, along with automation, in the orderly growth of our economy to new heights.

These were my thoughts upon reading an article in the Reader's Digest recently entitled "What Happens When Machines Don't Need Men?"

Primarily, the article covered the growing use of automation in American industry and the resulting impact upon workingmen.

We need automation to compete in world markets.

Automation lifts a burden from the backs and arms of men.

In time it will create an abundance of better paying jobs for the sons and daughters of the workers it is displacing today.

But what about the interventing 10 to 20 years of wrenching economic and human dislocation in many of the Nation's labor markets?

It is all very well to tell sons and daughters with their lives ahead of them of new and distant employment fields. But these become hollow and heartless words to the 40- or 50-year-old worker you are asking to abandon lifetime roots and work patterns.

Reeducation and retraining of the workers is the answer given by the Reader's Digest article to which I have referred.

That is merely one of the answers given by the area redevelopment bill.

In addition to stimulating development of new industry in areas of chronic unemployment, the area redevelopment bill carries grants which would aid in retraining older workers and keeping them going until they can acquire new skills.

The Flood-Van Zandt letter I referred to earlier is now in your offices. Here, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article from the Reader's Digest.

I mention both the letter and the article because area redevelopment and automation can be partners.

Area redevelopment can ease the transition from our industry of today to our more automated industry of tomorrow. This is why, viewed in its proper place in relation to the whole economic picture, area redevelopment becomes far more than a parochial bill. It is a national answer to a growing national problem:

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN MACHINES DON'T NEED MEN

(By Lester Velie)

Not long ago an automobile executive proudly showed United Auto Workers president Walter Reuther through a new plant.

Pointing to a battery of automatic drilling machines, the executive asked:

"How are you going to collect dues from those fellows, Walter?"

"How are you going to sell cars to them?" the union leader shot back.

This jesting exchange underlines a historic upheaval—a second industrial revolution that has already affected millions of Americans. Automatic machines, harnessing electronic brains to mechanical muscles, are fast displacing unskilled industrial workers, and will soon displace some unskilled white-collar workers, too.

Today car makers can produce 50 percent more automobiles than they did a decade ago—with virtually the same number of workers. In 1958 the steel companies turned out as much steel as they did a decade ago, with 20 percent fewer production workers. Chemical manufacture has almost doubled in 10 years, but the blue-collar work force keeps shrinking.

Some of the big industrial unions, made up mostly of unskilled workers, reflect what has happened. The United Mine Workers, 475,000 strong in the late 1930's, has dwindled to less than 200,000. (Declining use of coal played some part in this, but mechanization was the major factor.) The United Auto Workers, which had 1,500,000 members in 1955, is down to 1 million members and sliding. The Electrical Workers, Textile Workers, and other industrial unions are losing members, too.

To see why, let's watch one of the new machines at work.

The "X-A," a kind of wizard of oxygen is a mechanical monster that works with no human assistance. Developed by Union Carbide Corp., the Wizard hums along happily 24 hours a day, breathing in air and separating it into oxygen (needed in steelmaking and other industries) and nitrogen. The Wizard takes its own temperature and pressure. When things go wrong it automatically telephones a supervisor, giving its symptoms. If the trouble is serious it shuts itself off. And the Wizard works right at the customer's site, so there is no need to haul oxygen from a chemical factory in cylinders.

The Wizard means the end of the line for workers who once produced oxygen. The 250 chemical workers who used to manufacture it for the Pittsburgh area have shrunk to 80 and will continue to dwindle as the new automatic units are installed.

Improved technology has had a similar effect in other major industries. Not long ago, at the Ford Motor Co.'s world-famous River Rouge plant outside Detroit, I watched an iron casting move down a machining line and, untouched by human hands, turn into a finished engine block. Each block is transferred automatically from one machine to another, automatically positioned before automatic drilling machines. Several attendants, policing the line for electronically signaled breakdowns, have replaced the whole crew of machine operators.

During the first industrial revolution, 150 years ago, laborers sometimes invaded the new factories and smashed the machines that replaced them. Today, laborsaving machinery is so accepted that union and employer take it into account in their contracts. Automobile workers get an annual 2½ percent wage increase, on the assumption that steadily improved machinery permits the worker to produce 2½ percent more with his hour's work. So, obligated to pay productivity increases, the auto companies must find new ways to make machines more efficient. Add to this the contribution to industry that scientists—working with the military—have made: first, they developed electronic computer devices to solve gunfire problems. Then they created machines with mechanical brains (like the guided missile) that are set to do a certain job, take note of changing conditions and automatically correct themselves. The result: industrial progress has been pushed ahead by decades.

A simple set of figures tells a dramatic story of what has happened and provides a glimpse of what's to come.

Back in 1919, when there were only 105 million of us in this country, it took some 26 million workers to grow our food, dig our fuels and metals, and make the goods we needed. Today there are 178 million of us. Yet the number of workers needed to supply us is virtually the same—26 million—and they're working a shorter week.

But if jobs in factories, farms, and mines didn't increase, where did the jobs come from for the 60-percent rise in population? The jobs came from a higher standard of living—from additional services to the American people. Back in 1919, only 14 million Americans worked in service industries: in selling goods, in moving and storing them, in nursing, teaching, entertainment, banking, insurance, government, etc. Today nearly 32 million Americans work at providing such services.

As a guide to the future, these figures mean that in the unfolding era of automation, laborsaving machines will do what they have always done. They'll lift onerous chores from men's backs and legs; they will create new national wealth, produce more things and services for more people. They'll open up new vistas of greater leisure and fuller living.

But, meanwhile, there is the transition, the birth pangs of a new era. When machines don't need men, what happens to the men?

Ex-Chrysler metal polisher John Miller (that's not his real name), a slight man of 52, is one of the displaced industrial workers. His $7,000 home in northside Detroit, bought with a GI loan, had a "for sale" sign when I looked in on him recently. In the living room Miller's wife quieted a toddler in her arms, as two other children studied me.

Miller was laid off 13 months ago. Although he had 12 years of seniority, his shop steward said, "You won't be called back, ever." Since then he has been getting a $41 weekly unemployment insurance check intermittently (it stops whenever he picks up an odd job). U.S. surplus food—15 pounds of corn meal monthly, 7 pounds of butter, rice, flour, and dried milk—helps eke out the unemployment check and keep Miller, and some 100,000 other jobless in Michigan, from hunger.

Miller uses every waking hour looking for a job. "Nights I lie awake thinking. Where do we go when we lose the house? How will we get by when the unemployment checks stop in a couple of weeks?"

The unemployed in the United States totaled 3,625,000 during April. This figure was lower than in the prior month, and Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell predicts it will continue to shrink. Yet, while industry had recovered to reach an alltime peak, only one of every two jobless factory workers had regained his job. Industry was able to surpass old output records without taking all the men back.

The perplexing result is that amid returning prosperity, higher production, and even higher wages, indigestible lumps of unemployment persist in various parts of the Nation. Most of these pockets of poverty are in old established industrial centers: in Buffalo, a steel center; in Detroit; in the coalfields of West Virginia.

The unfolding era of machines without men obviously confronts us with vast challenges. The immediate problem is a human one: the urgent need for a holding operation until the technologically unemployed can be absorbed elsewhere. Recognizing this need, President Eisenhower supported congressional action that twice helped States to extend unemployment insurance payment periods. The President has also urged all States to meet a common insurance standard: payments equal to half pay for 26 weeks.

For the long pull, large-scale programs of education and training are needed. Though automation shrinks the unskilled work force, it requires new armies of highly trained men and women.

The transformation of the Bell Telephone companies already reflects, within one industry, how automation can result in a need for more trained people. When the change-over to dial began, telephone operators made up more than half of the companies' total work force. Now they constitute about a third of the employees—thanks to local and long-distance dialing. Yet Bell System's total employment has advanced some 200,000 since 1945 to 590,000, as the country's growing wealth has increased the demand for telephone services. Advancing technology has required a much higher proportion of trained persons in the industry—more clerical help, more scientists, engineers, and craftsmen.

This is a nationwide pattern. When an electrical manufacturer introduced automatic machinery for assembling parts of television sets, many monotonous, unskilled assembly jobs were wiped out. But some surprising new demands followed. The company's industrial engineering staff doubled within several years. The company also found it needed more mechanical designers and technical writers, more salesmen and office workers.

"It's an intellectual recolution," says Prof. Gordon Brown of M.I.T. "I think the human being has to become smarter. This isn't anything to be afraid of—this is what man, intellectually, was destined to become."

In response to this challenging need for new skills, some businesses, unions and government agencies have already plunged into large-scale training programs. Consider the Plumbers' and Pipe Fitters' Union. Many chemical and oil-refining operations are already largely automatic, requiring human attention only to maintain, repair or clean out the intricate piping. This is a job for a plumber or pipefitter—but he has to be an educated worker who has mastered trigonometry, thermodynamics and many special skills. Aware of the coming golden age for plumbers and pipefitters, Peter T. Schoemann, president of the union, has opened some 34 schools across the country where apprentices train, and journeyman members retrain.

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, finding that its electricians have to be upgraded to "electronics technicians" to hold their own, is also sending its journeymen members back to school. So are the machinists.

Employers, too, are retraining. Du Pont, for instance, needs a new breed of all-around skilled craftsman for the job of maintaining the new equipment. To obtain them the company has developed intensive programs that in 400 classroom hours, plus additional training on the job, can turn a raw high-school graduate into a mechanic with fundamental skills in blueprint reading, in mathematics, in handling tools. With longer training, up to 750 classroom hours, the program turns out a "control mechanic," a combination electrician and instrument repairman who can maintain the machines' intricate electronic control devices. Any employee with aptitude, from 17 to 64, can apply, and while learning may earn full-time pay. The result is a continuous upgrading of the entire Du Pont work force.

It is clear that we are on the threshold of vast changes in the face of America. The unions, for instance, must recruit new members from the growing white-collar groups to replace the loss in industrial workers—or dwindle in power. Violent changes are already apparent in our country's industrial

landscape. New industrial life has been pouring into a great geographical crescent from the Pacific Northwest to the South as employers abandon old multi-story factories and move to more efficient, one-story automated plants, usually away from the old locality and nearer to customers or to sources of materials—or to university centers with their scientists and technicians.

At the Labor Department in Washington, Commissioner of Labor Statistics Ewan Clague paced excitedly before a favorite chart. He pointed to a downhill line that dramatized the decline of jobs from 1929 into the trough of the depression year 1932. "Do you know there were proposals in Congress then to suspend patents on laborsaving machinery, on the ground they destroyed jobs?" he asked. "But new machines went on to play their usual role of wealth-producing heroes—not villains."

Then he pointed to another line, reflecting the steep rise in service-industry jobs since the thirties. "Who would have thought, in darkest 1932, that today we would be enjoying a prosperity such as this country had never known?

"The future is terrific," Commissioner Clague concluded.

And so it can be, if we use the present wisely.

Remarks by H. Bruce Palmer at the First Annual "My True Security" National Awards Program, July 21, in Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 21, I had the privilege of attending the national awards program for the "My True Security" essay contest conducted by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce in cooperation the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co., of Newark, N.J. One of my constituents, Miss Dianne Walljasper of Salem, Iowa, was Iowa's representative by virtue of having won the contest for her State.

Among the speakers at this event was H. Bruce Palmer, president of the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co., and himself a former president of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Palmer's remarks on self-reliance on the part of the individual say something which we in Government should heed. Under unanimous consent, I include those remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

All human beings grow in dignity and self-respect by reason of accomplishment and the assumption of responsibility. The spirit of independence, or of confidence, or of self-reliance is mightily nourished by the exercise of one's own efforts. Moral stature is increased and moral fiber is strengthened by each job done with the free play of one's own ability. Ambition, which inspires men to attainment, is fed by an atmosphere of endeavor. In short, a man develops by standing on his own feet. He does not wax strong by having others do for him what he can and should do for himself.

Are we interetsed in the cultivation of these qualities in our own citizenry? Have we properly appraised the value of the spirit they create, in terms of a powerful influence for the preservation of freedom in America? If this land of opportunity, where men traditionally have enjoyed more independence than in any other, is to maintain that national spirit which has blessed it from the very beginning, it must carefully foster the dignity, self-respect, moral stature, and self-reliance of the millions of individuals which make up the integrated whole.

Too much coddling, too much paternalism, too much recession from personal responsibility can have a decidedly weakening effect upon the aims and purposes of man. With the possibility of lapsing into a false feeling of security provided wholly by others, whether in financial matters or in business and social relationships, one of the spurs to maximum effort becomes inoperative. We should take thought, then, serious thought, that in our overall approach to this matter of planning security we do not adopt methods which will wither the spirit while catering to the needs of the flesh.

Individual security is the product of a man's continual growth toward the ability to meet the changing conditions of life and to adapt to them whatever they may chance to be. It is the ability to size up a situation properly and correctly—and to handle it competently and confidently. It is maturity. It is man's doing as much as he can for himself, and wanting as little done for him as possible.

The mature man, the secure man, plans. The immature, the insecure man has to have things planned for him.

For the infant cries for his mother: The adult plans for his family. The boy plays in today, but the man works for tomorrow. The child sees what he has and wishes somebody would give him more, but the man foresees what he will need, and plans so that he will have it. To the child, it is always now. To the man, now is only the beginning of what can be.

The grown man, the mature man, plans for his security. He knows that neither his personal nor business security can be donated from without. He knows it can only be created from within himself. He knows that the planning of his own moral, physical, and economic development are more than his democratic right. They are his democratic right. They are his personal duty. And so—he plans. By himself, for himself, to the very best of his ability.

This, too, I believe. A great many people share with me a growing concern that as more and more is done for the individual, more and more this stifles in him his initiative to do things for himself.

I believe that the man who knows his security is of his own making is armored against attacks upon his security of others' making.

I feel that a people collectively yields to demagogery or isms because the individuals composing it are lured by the promise of having more and bigger things that they want done for them.

I know that this ends in human beings having things done to them that they do not want.

This, finally, I most earnestly believe:

The man who has learned to speak for himself will not quickly yield to being told what to say.

The man who has learned to think for himself will not supinely succumb to being made a slave. And the man who has learned to plan for himself so that he can stand on his own feet will never agree to plans for himself or fellowman that would drive them to their knees.

Never before in our history have we so needed individual maturity and self-reliance among the great body of our citizens and the sense of true security which it brings.

Farmers Not Concerned With Carrots on the Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader has sent me a clipping from the Boston Sunday Globe of July 19, 1959, containing an article on the farm problem by James H. Powers which I am taking the liberty of extending in the Appendix of the RECORD. This article looms like an oasis of fact amid the desert of untruths and half-truths that are appearing in most of the metropolitan press on the subject of agricultural legislation.

I hope our friends from the great urban areas of our county will read this article. I hope also it will be read by those among our Republican friends who seem inclined to follow the Pied Pipers of the Department of Agriculture. There are those who seem to believe that all we have to do to solve the farm problem once and for all—all that is necessary to insure a strong and healthy agriculture—is simply to revert to the do-nothing policies of the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover administrations, which were followed by the most serious economic depression in the history of American agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, a copy of the article to which I have referred follows:

FARMERS NOT CONCERNED WITH CARROTS ON MOON—BUT ARE LIKELY TO SHOW RESENTMENT AT POLLS IN 1960 OF BENSON'S POLICY THAT INDUCES BUMPER CROPS IN THE FACE OF VAST GRAIN SURPLUSES

(By James H. Powers)

The farm problem which emerged like a djinn from the magic bottle to plague the Nation's economy through the twenties and thirties, and harass Congress, appears to be preparing a return visit—and with a vengeance. With an election year looming, this may prove politically awkward.

Storm signals are flying already in this paradoxical situation, wherein abundance spells woe alike to husbandman, politician, and taxpayer, and above all to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson.

One such alert is Mr. Benson's own recent prediction that net farm income in 1959 will fall still another billion dollars. In the wake of a billion-dollar drop in 1958, this will mean that the net earnings of more than 6,800,000 farm families have nosedived close to $5 billion in the past 7 years. When consistently falling farm prices face further steep declines, while the prices the farmer pays for his necessities edge steadily upward in an economy industrially flourishing, the mixture becomes explosive.

WARNINGS MULTIPLY

Other storm warnings have been multiplying. The Nation's cattle herds now exceed 100 million head—a record. That

presages a beef deluge on the winter and spring markets, and a swift sag in growers' prices. Hog raisers have similarly bred up their stocks to huge dimensions to bolster falling incomes. The prospect has so alarmed the Agricultural Committee of the National Planning Agency that it urged, this past week, a 1-year-only Government subsidy on hogs. There are now no price supports on livestock.

Meantime, a super corn crop, 14 percent above all previous records, is pouring into midwestern bins. This follows from a policy Mr. Benson urged last winter, when he induced corn growers to abandon acreage controls in return for a relatively strong price support program of $1.12 a bushel paid by the Government. Now he is moving to do the same for wheat—though the Government already has $2.2 billion tied up in wheat surpluses.

Mr. Benson's basic policy seeks removal of all Government intervention through planting restrictions, and retention of a flexible, moderate, price-support program. Experience with corn this year suggests that the plan is gravely defective. Indeed, the Secretary's foes in Congress accuse him of a deliberate plan to wreck the Nation's basic price support, acreage-control policy in an effort to impose free farm market ideas on one of the most vital sectors of our economy.

OUR TREMENDOUS STAKE

The charge is doubtless exaggerated yet if anything is clear from 30 years of experience, it is that the country's stake in a sound farm policy is tremendous. Our agriculture is only partially symbolized by the number of farm families and by the fact that farming covers only about 11 percent of our population. More than half of all raw materials used in the country come from the land. Farmers also represent a multibillion-dollar market for American industry. Continued agricultural convulsions are no negligible matter.

President Eisenhower's recent warning, that, unless the $9 billion surplus problem is dealt with resolutely, our entire agricultural policy faces collapse, is a simple statement of truth. That Secretary Benson's ideas have not restored health to this ailing sector of our economy in the past 6 years, is equally obvious. Nor can Congress escape its share of the blame for our farm policy failures.

PROBLEM 38 YEARS OLD

How did this costly riddle develop in the first place? Before 1919, our agriculture expanded by 8 percent in productivity to meet demands of World War I. Thereafter, productivity remained high while markets declined at home and abroad; but the successive administrations of Harding, Coolidge and Hoover offered no constructive lead to put the distorted picture in order. The farm problem had appeared.

The impasse between our floundering agriculture and tight conservative orthodoxy in the White House produced the farm bloc in 1921, precipitating political war in Congress in both parties. The great depression brought matters to a head. In the Agricultural Adjustment Acts of the thirties, the Roosevelt administration sought to extricate the farmers from the economic swamp through a policy of price supports and acreage controls designed to bring the farmer's dollar into balance, in buying power, with the industrial dollar. This was the famous parity idea translated into policy.

But World War II repeated the history of World War I. Huge wartime expansion of American agriculture was followed by collapse of markets. The technical revolution in farming forced by the war had literally made two blades grow where there was once but one. New farming science, new machinery, new techniques, all spelled rising production, even as the number of people on the land declined, and markets shrunk abroad. The depression-born system of farm price supports and planting controls became distorted. Its difficulties have increased since the Korean war.

SNAP BEANS ON THE MOON

The answer to the riddle is unlikely to be that of Mr. Benson, whose vision of agriculture is tinged with a belated 19th century nostalgia for a free farm market in a nonexistent laissez faire economy. Nor will solution be found in politically rigged farm price-support policies which ignore the preposterous trends illustrated by the present $9 billion surplus, and more bumper crops on the way.

A nation experiencing the second phases of the 20th century industrial revolution cannot afford much longer to act as if American agriculture were but an indigent rural relative. In the 1958 elections, opposition to the Benson philosophy devastated traditional Republican strongholds in most of the 17 major farm States.

Portents suggest clearly that in 1960 the primary concern of the farm voter in the economically distraught congressional districts of those 17 States will be not with projects for growing carrots and snap beans on the moon (as an economist proposed last week) but upon getting our enormously important farm policy put in order.

Journal Star Editor Reports on Tour Into Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles L. Dancey, editor of the Peoria Journal Star, has just returned from a month's tour of the Soviet Union. He is presently writing a series of articles which will appear daily in his paper, and I should like to read into the RECORD at this point, the first article of the series. It will be my intention to ask for permission to print the entire series from time to time and assure Members of the House that they come from one well known in our area for his objective reporting of the news. The series will, I am sure, be very good editorial reading for all of us:

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 19, 1959]

JOURNAL STAR EDITOR REPORTS ON TOUR INTO RUSSIA

(By Charles L. Dancey)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It is unwise to make general statements about the Soviet Union. Many writers have done so, but it is unwise because it is a big country made up of many millions of people of all kinds.

If a reporter is both honest and industrious, he will find a goodly share of happy, contented people—and he will also find people who are bitterly unhappy.

He will find aggressive people with a high morale and driving purpose—and he will also find cynical people and apathetic people.

He will find great accomplishments and examples of amazing efficiency—and he will also find great failures and examples of scandalous waste and inefficiency.

He will find confidence—and he will find almost unbelievable fear.

In short, a reporter can find and report what he wants to find. And since there is no Gallup poll available, who can judge the degree of loyalty to the Communist regime, for example, or of love for America, or of hate for America?

Therefore, a writer ought to tell his readers under what conditions he received his information and as much as possible an account of facts, and let the reader interpret for himself—or at least evaluate the interpretations that are offered.

It should be understood, first of all, that a newsman can get into Russia in only two ways—as a journalist, or as a tourist. If he enters as a journalist, he is subjected to strict controls, with rare exceptions including confinement to the city of Moscow.

If he enters as a tourist he may travel but he is required to travel deluxe at a level where any contact with ordinary citizens is difficult, and accompanied by a Russian guide and interpreter who prevents effective contact with unauthorized persons. As a tourist, one has no status or rights as an investigator or reporter.

I traveled as a tourist but, thanks in part to the flood of U.S. tourists into Moscow at this time and to my position that it would not be seemly by American standards for me to travel alone with a young woman guide, I was permitted to travel completely alone (although guides met me at every city and stayed with me for varying amounts of time).

In this manner, I entered Russia on one of their fast jets to Moscow, converted to an ancient relic similar to a DC-3 and flew to Odessa, spent a few days, proceeded alone by ship to the Crimea, thence by ship to Sochi on the Caucusus mountain coast, thence by train to Rostov, and then enjoyed a 3-day trip up the Don River, through the canal into the Volga to Stalingrad, thence by air from Stalingrad to the great oil center of Baku, from Baku into the heart of the Caucusus and to Stalin's home city of Tbilisi, and finally by plane over the Caspian Sea into Trans-Caspian areas of Tashkent and Samarkand in Central Asia.

During this journey I visited not only Russia but the Ukraine, Georgia, Azerbaijain, and Uzbekistan, besides a "weather stop" in the Ural mountains at Sverdlovsk.

I had long and intimate conversations with many Soviet citizens in the middle management and worker classes without benefit of interpreter, and with the aid chiefly of Berlitz' remarkable book on the Russian language and a dictionary—plus the Russians' own insatiable curiosity about the United States.

Among those I talked to were Russians, Ukranians, Jews, Georgians, Armenians, Azerbaijanese, Uzbeks, and Tartars, not to mention East Germans, West Germans, and Czechs.

Among them were two librarians, a school director, an electrical engineer, a radio engineer, a local union official, doctors, sailors, collective farmers, the director of a state farm, two police officers, a number of students, a few teachers, a former partisan unit commander, a former major of a tank battalion (who fought at Stalingrad) and a former Baltic fleet sailor—plus many who were not clearly identified as to occupation.

These are the people veteran correspondents with long service in Russia told me I could never talk with effectively.

And on one occasion I was able to enter a Russian home, spontaneously and without warning, the one thing which was emphasized above all as impossible for an American.

The interview technique which finally evolved was quite simple. Let the Soviet citizen lead with his many questions about

the United States. This gives time to establish a rapport both personal and also in the matter of language—understanding one another in a sort of simplified pidgin Russian.

Then with rapport established, and some obligation on his part, you simply turn around and ask him the same questions but about his country. Actually, his selection of questions is often as illuminating as his later answers to your own.

The only way to fairly report what happened is to refer to my three notebooks full of notes and simply offer extracts of actual incidents in a daily log form, and the reader can judge for himself how the people feel about Americans, the economic level of their existence, and what sort of people they are plus a good bit of how they live.

Unfortunately, some of these people are frightened. I do not know if it is with reason or not. Some obviously are not frightened. However, out of respect for those who are, it is necessary to report some information in a general way without clearly indicating in what place and from what sort of persons this information was obtained. (Most of it was piecemeal anyway).

These reports will be separate from the log, but the astute reader will also be able to do a good deal of reading between the lines.

Some readers may figure that some of these contacts were planted by the Russians, and others not. I don't know myself. I do know that there were some of whom I was particularly careful.

Such a trip is definitely an adventure, and I returned having lost enough weight that my clothes fit badly, with a rather heavy facial tan, and my hair in the same condition as that of the western actors on TV.

But I tried to reach the Peoria area of the Soviet Union, and came closer to it, I think, than I really expected would be possible.

U.S.S.R. Visitors Oppressed; Editor Discovers Why

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Americans, by and large, even those who are deeply impressed and enjoyed themselves in Moscow or at the Black Sea resort area, are glad to leave and feel an indefinable atmosphere that is oppressive to them.

I think I know what this is.

In a manner of speaking, there are no civilians in the U.S.S.R. There are only classes that can best be compared with military classes. There are the troops (workers and peasants), the NCO's (foremen), the officer caste (middle management) and the high brass.

Inside these classes in the next to the top are also the "West Pointers"—party members—who theoretically have no advantages or privileges but have a tendency to take better care of one another than of the nonparty folks.

The people live a barracks-type life, even those in the new apartment buildings which resemble our own housing projects (Government). They fill the streets after working hours, just wandering around, standing on corners, sitting on park benches, like soldiers in the city from camp.

Their entertainment, while some of it is excellent, has the unmistakable flavor of the USO.

Their stores are all post exchanges.

Their newspapers are house organs run by the company or like a camp newspaper.

And last but not least, every noncommissioned officer and officer in the Soviet Union is necessarily a career man with his finger on his number.

In short, the whole country has an institutional odor about it which is very depressing to an American used to our own free and often spontaneous way of living.

It should be said, however, that to many Russians this is the height of efficiency, and our own way of life seems loose, inefficient, even frightening.

"How can you locate a friend or relative that has moved if everyone doesn't carry a passport and isn't registered wherever he goes with the authorities?" is a sample of their attitude about freedom.

"But what do you do if * * * ?" keeps cropping up. Many of them would be lost without Big Brother over their shoulder.

Dictators in Our Colleges?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the June–July 1959 issue of the Steuben News, official publication of the Steuben Society of America. I commend this article to the attention of my coleagues:

Dictators in Our Colleges?—Some Reactions to the National Defense Education Act of 1958

(By Albert E. Reitzel)

Students, though citizens, are being prevented by some college authorities from obtaining loans from the U.S. Government to pay for courses of study in the colleges. The loans are authorized by the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This law passed by the 85th Congress provides that students at a college may borrow up to $1,000 a year to a total of $5,000 directly from the funds allotted to the college. Under this law the funds are allotted by the United States to the college and the college must match not less than one-ninth of the amount of the fund allotted to it.

The newspapers say that seven colleges have returned to the Government at Washington the funds allotted to them for loans to students under the law. The reason given is that the authorities of the colleges disapprove the requirement of the law that a student seeking a loan must file an affidavit with the U.S. Commissioner of Education that "he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

The colleges which have returned the funds are Amherst, Antioch, Bennington, Goucher, Reed, Sarah Lawrence, and Wilmington College in Ohio.

Princeton, Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore have refused to apply for the funds either because of the affidavit or the oath of allegiance which is also required by that law. Either one or both requirements are objected to by the Association of American Colleges and the Association of University Professors. Similar objections have been made by other organizations.

The law represents the overwhelming judgment of our Government. It was passed by the Senate of the United States on August 22, 1958, by a vote of 66 to 15; the next day by the House of Representatives by a vote of 212 to 85, and a few days later was signed by the President.

PURPOSE OF THE ACT

The law declares that it is "the purpose of this act to provide substantial assistance in various forms to individuals, and to States and their subdivisions, in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States."

The reason stated by the law is that "the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women," because "the present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available" and "the defense of this Nation depends upon the mastery of modern techniques developed from complex scientific principles."

So the law requires that in the selection of students for the loans, special consideration shall be given to "students with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools" and to "students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language."

AFFIDAVIT AND OATH REQUIRED

The exact language of the affidavit required by the law from the student seeking the loan is that the applicant "does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods." And the exact language of the oath which the law requires the applicant to subscribe to is: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic." The law makes these affidavits, if false, a crime subject to severe penalties.

No information of how the requirements of affidavit and oath got into the law can be found, except that they first appeared in the bill offered in the Senate. They were among certain provisions of that bill that were incorporated in the bill introduced in the House of Representatives (H.R. 13247) that became the law of the land.

The wording of the affidavit suggests that it was in recognition of certain influences which may affect some students entering college.

One influence is pointed out by a report of January 2, 1953, of a Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act. The report was to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and said: "Despite the unquestioned loyalty and self-sacrificing devotion to duty of the preponderant bulk of America's teachers, there are yet many hundreds of teachers who are Communists" and "Communist teachers radiate an influence much greater than their proportionate number."

And a law of Congress of 1954 declares that the Communist Party of the United States, which claims to be a political party, is in fact an active part "of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States."

Already a law of Congress of 1950 had stated that "the nature and control of the Communist movement itself, present a clear and present danger to the existence of free American institutions." And the Communists make use of teachers, as Georgi Dimitrov, a Russian official, has said: "A university professor, who without being a party-member lends himself to the interests of the Soviet Union is worth more than a hundred men with party cards."

This statement is quoted from a report of 1958 of a special committee of the American Bar Association on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives.

In the face of this background and the purpose of Public Law 85–864 to help students to take courses that will be of aid in our defense, who can have reason to say that Congress was not justified in requiring the applicant for a loan under the law to make the affidavit that he does not believe in or

support groups advocating the overthrow of the Government by force or illegal methods?

And what convincing reason can a patriotic student give for refusing to take the oath in connection with his application for a loan under the law?

STUDY OF FACTS

The further requirement of an oath of alegiance from the applicant for a loan under the law must be looked at in the light of several facts. Among the students may be many who have dual citizenship, in these ways. Some of them, though American citizens by birth in this country may be citizens also of foreign countries through their alien parents. Other students may be persons born abroad of American parents and so have American citizenship but continue to be citizens of the country in which they were born.

Even persons born abroad of one American parent may under certain conditions be American citizens as well as citizens of the country in which they were born.

Also, the law does not expressly require that an applicant for a loan must be a citizen. Many students in our country are aliens. Some of them are lawful permanent residents here. Many others are here temporarily as students. Some of these students have come from countries, in which they grew up under traditions and principles of government different from or even hostile to ours.

No law prohibits any class of students to depart from the United States at any time, even after obtaining loans under the law to aid them to take courses at our colleges or universities, or to depart after completing their courses in colleges here.

So it is reasonable that Congress wished to confine the loans to students with special attachment to our country and Government that would cause them to wish to remain here.

Only in that way could we be sure to have the benefit of their training resulting from the loans under the act of 1958, instead of their department to live in some foreign country that then would get all the benefit of the student's training in the United States of America.

The oath is obviously required only for the special purpose of the law and is not a law relating generally to the acquiring of American citizenship. Under such circumstances, the oath could not have been intended to confer American citizenship on an alien student. And if an alien student wishes to avoid any possible effect on his foreign citizenship, he is free to refuse to take the oath and do without the loan.

PERMANENT ATTACHMENT

So the requirement of the affidavit and oath of allegiance are reasonable means to confine the loans to those beneficiaries of our Government who are students that show a permanent attachment to our country and its traditions and future, hence likely to remain here and stand by our country in any crisis.

The requirements can be easily enforced by having the student under oath sign the affidavit and the oath in the application for the loan. False swearing to either would be the basis for prosecution for that offense or for perjury.

Nothing in the law or its spirit prevents any student from refusing to sign the affidavit or take the oath of allegiance, and thereby give up the opportunity to obtain the loans.

But no information is available or indicated that the great majority of students desiring the loans are not ready and willing to sign the affidavit and take the oath of allegiance required by the law. But such students are being prevented from obtaining the loans in cases in which the college authorities are returning to the Government the funds allotted for such loans or are even refusing to apply for such funds.

SPIRIT OF DICTATORSHIP

That attitude of the college authorities is not in the spirit of liberalism or of conservatism, but in the spirit of dictatorship, in that the authorities are using their personal notions to prevent any students from exercising their individual rights to comply with the law and obtain the loans, and such notions of the college authorities could seriously cripple the defense program of our Government.

That dictatorship of personal notions is in thoughtless disregard of the defense purpose of this particular law, in the face of an international Communist conspiracy against us that causes every year hundreds of thousands of men to be drafted by our Government from their homes and chosen pursuits to serve in our Armed Forces anywhere in the world.

Bills have been introduced and are pending in Congress to eliminate the requirements of the affidavit and oath of allegiance.

The bills are hardly worthy of serious consideration, but the law ought to be amended in such a way as to clearly confine any loans under Public Law 85-864—the National Defense Education Act of 1958—to such students only who are either American citizens or who are aliens legally residing here permanently under our immigration laws.

Anti-Communist Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe the unselfishness and eagerness of Dr. Leon F. Nadrowski in his efforts to fight communism on our homefront deserve the attention of my colleagues.

Dr. Leon F. Nadrowski is a physician. He has devoted his life to fighting disease. He is now launching a move to fight the greatest disease of all—communism. He suggests that everyone be thoroughly educated, beginning in the classrooms, as to what the Communist doctrine and threat means to all of us. Dr. Nadrowski believes that Americans should be as aware of the Communist menace as they are of cancer and polio. Periodic medical checkups are advised to catch the cancer cell early—but we have no checkups to alert us to the budding Communist cell. We have the Salk vaccine as a precaution against polio—our only vaccine against the evils of communism is education.

Ignorance and apathy are the great allies of the Communists. To overcome these, the free world must arm with a new weapon—enthusiasm and interest. Dr. Nadrowski has suggested an Anti-Communist Week—a week devoted to alerting and educating the peoples to the great disease of communism.

Early this year a successful anti-Communist rally was held in Greenpoint, sponsored by the St. Stanislaus American Legion Post. It met with such enthusiasm that it was suggested that an Anti-Communist Week should be promoted on a national scale, starting appropriately enough on the 23d of October each year, the anniversary of the Hungarian uprising. This week should be spent by all Americans to further their knowledge of communism and its grave threat to our existence. This should not, of course, substitute for our daily vigil against communism, but serve as a special reminder of our alertness against communism.

The So-Called Maffia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, increasing protests are being made with respect to the unjust attempts to discredit the more than 12 million loyal, law-abiding, decent Americans of Italian origin because of the acts of the few. Since the discovery of America by one of their forebears, Americans of Italian lineage have made great contributions to the growth and welfare of our country and have proven their loyalty both in peace and in war. Thinking people everywhere decry the efforts being made to erroneously portray the place in our society of millions of Americans of Italian origin who comprise one of the most important segments of American life.

In connection with this subject, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the following excellent article by George E. Sokolsky which appeared in the Washington Post of Wednesday, July 22, 1959:

THE SO-CALLED MAFFIA

(By George E. Sokolsky)

When anyone generalizes from the particular, his logic gets twisted. To assume therefore that all Italians in the United States and their descendants are criminally organized in a body called "the maffia" is to accept not only guilt by association but damnation by birth and nationality.

The maffia was a criminal society organized in Sicily at the beginning of the 19th century and maintained a reign of terror until it was reputedly suppressed by Mussolini. One of its principal activities was kidnaping. The first record of the existence of the maffia on American soil was in 1890 in New Orleans when a chief of police was killed and 11 Italians were lynched because of it. At the turn of the century, kidnaping scares were attributed to the Black Hand, which was reputed to be an American emanation of the maffia or the Camorra, its counterpart in Naples. During the era of bootlegging, the genius of the business was Al Capone, although not all bootleggers were of Italian origin. Nor was the entire Capone organization of Italian origin. Nor is there evidence that Capone belonged to the maffia.

It is roughly estimated that about 12 million Americans are of Italian origin. Many of them have intermarried with Americans of other origins. The relationship of a few persons engaged in marginal and criminal enterprises to the entire Italo-American population is infinitesimal, but even a small criminal element should be suppressed by police action.

What has happened in this country after each wave of immigration is that the process of adjustment to a new environment produces a residue of persons who do not adjust and others who are able to take enormous and sometimes illegal advantages of their opportunities. To say that the large population of Italo-Americans are all marginal operators is obviously untrue and adds another unfortunate quarrel among our people.

Each wave of new immigrants developed a discrimination against their kind. Perhaps no immigrants to this country had as difficult a time as the Irish who came here after the great famine of 1846 and encountered the sign, "No Irish need apply." The antipathy toward the Irish was complicated by an anti-Catholicism which was general and which still persists in many parts of the country. The Irish have become ubiquitous and in many places powerful. In fact, now like their predecessors, the Germans, they are becoming thoroughly assimilated into the American population and no one any longer questions their right to be.

As one speaks of waves of immigrants, he refers to periods of intense migration. The fact is that immigrants of all stocks have been here since the beginning of the white man's presence in this country. After all, Christopher Columbus, an Italian, discovered the Americas; and John Cabot, an Italian, discovered the coast of North America for the British. Cabot was probably born in Genoa but was a citizen of Venice, although his name sounds English.

The meeting at Apalachin, N.Y., in November 1957, of 60 men, all of Italian origin, stimulated renewed interest in the Mafia. Whereas there is no testimony to establish that this was a meeting of the Mafia, it is generally assumed that it was. While nobody has been able to ferret out the facts of this meeting, it is generally assumed that it had to do with laying out the areas of operations in dope, prostitution, etc., of the criminals who attended.

Out of approximately 12 million Italo-Americans, 60 were present at Apalachin. They were all Italians, it is true. But does this prove, for instance, that Italians do not make good citizens? Do we have to balance Enrico Fermi against Vito Genovese? Do we have to balance Frank Sinatra against Lucky Luciano? What does such balancing out prove? It really proves nothing at all. Some men are useful citizens and some are not. It would be like denying Einstein's achievements in science because there was also a Julius Rosenberg.

The ad hominem conclusion can lead one far astray in his thinking. The Italians are a comparatively young strain in our population. They follow the general pattern of other immigrants in putting their roots deep in the country's soil. After all, the largest and one of the most progressive banks in the United States, the Bank of America, was founded by an Italo-American, Amadeo Giannini.

National Indian Encampment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in celebration of her 100th birthday, Oregon has planned many spectacular events for your enjoyment. One of the most outstanding, in my opinion, is the National Indian Encampment to be held in Pendleton, Oreg., from July 18 to 26, 1959. The Umatilla, Walla Walla, and Cayuse Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation and the Nez Perce Indians will cohost this memorable gathering. Invitations have been issued to 2,300 tribes in North America to take part in this encampment.

It will be an all-Indian show with members of many tribes competing at their games, working at their native crafts, and displaying their handiwork. On display will be priceless heirlooms handed down from forefathers and historical items never before displayed.

It is fitting that the encampment be held in Pendleton inasmuch as it is located in the home territory of the Umatilla, Nex Perce, Cayuse, Walla Walla, and Yakima people. Perhaps no other city has done more to preserve the traditions and culture of the past than Pendleton. The Pendleton roundup is famous throughout the world and it is now hoped that the National Indian Encampment will become an equally famous annual affair.

It would provide an excellent way to preserve knowledge of authentic Indian music, arts, crafts, and ceremonies and insure the perpetuation of these basic American traditions.

The Indians of my district join with the townspeople of Pendleton in urging you to visit this encampment. Mayor Norman Gorfkle spoke for all of us when he welcomed centennial visitors, saying:

We possess an asset that can only be earned. It's hospitality, and you'll be aware of it during your every moment as a visitor. We like people; we don't just tolerate them.

Canadian Experience With Respect to the Export of Forest Products to Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have advocated on the floor of this House and I still advocate the sending of a trade mission to Red China to discover the potential and conditions of trade with the United States.

Naturally I have been interested in the prospects for our exporting forest products, considering that men and women in the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon, which I have the honor to represent, are chiefly concerned with the harvesting and processing of forest products.

The Canadian experience, according to their Embassy in a letter dated July 13, 1959, is not encouraging.

The letter states:

No forest products were exported in 1955, 1956, 1958, or the first half of 1959. It has been the experience of Canadian businessmen visiting China that it is most difficult to obtain any idea from the Chinese of their requirements for various commodities including forest products.

I do not underestimate the difficulties to be faced by such a mission, but these difficulties are small compared to the benefits to be derived in terms of world peace and the trade which certainly can be developed in due course.

Under unanimous consent I am including the entire text of the letter sent to me by the Canadian Embassy:

CANADIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1959.

The Honorable CHARLES O. PORTER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PORTER: May I refer to your letter of June 25, and my interim reply of June 30, about your interest in Canadian exports to mainland China.

I have now received some comments from the Department of Trade and Commerce in Ottawa which indicates while Canadian exporters of forest products in the Pacific Northwest have been interested in the possible market in mainland China for their products and in some instances have visited China, there have been very few enquiries or orders received from the Chinese. Moreover, as far as the Department is aware, the latter had given no indication as to what their requirements might be. In 1957 Canada exported $78,237 of pulp sulphate kraft, $50,000 of pulp sulphite and $296,795 of kraft paper. No forest products were exported in 1955, 1956, 1958, or the first half of 1959. It has been the experience of Canadian businessmen visiting China that it is most difficult to obtain any idea from the Chinese of their requirements for various commodities including forest products.

I hope that this short report will be of use to you. If there is anything further which we may be able to do for you, please do not hesitate to get in touch with us again.

Yours faithfully,

WM. JONES,
First Secretary (Commercial).

Prayer of Dr. Frederick Brown Harris at Launching of the NS "Savannah," Camden, N.J., July 21, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, except the Lord build a ship they labor in vain who build. On yesterday, Dr. Harris invoked Almighty God to protect, guide, and direct the forces of America to dedicate the power of the atom to the relief of want and woe. He has reminded us as other men of other days have been reminded, "I have set before you life and death, the blessing and the curse, therefore choose life."

To be sure, Mr. Speaker, we all pray with Dr. Harris that the *Savannah* undertake her world mission and speed "to the seven seas, and our Nation answer to God's challenge."

Mr. Speaker, it was no accident that the Almighty God gave America the power to harness the atom. Mr. Speaker, it is no accident that the atom has been dedicated to peace by this peace-loving, God-fearing Nation. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris spoke with an unanimous voice of 180 million Amer-

icans on yesterday when he invoked God's help and mercy in a solemn dedication to His work and our application of the mightiest force on earth—the application of the harnessing of the atom. I commend his prayer to those who are fortunate to read it. His prayer follows:

PRAYER OF DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS, THE CHAPLAIN, U.S. SENATE, AT LAUNCHING OF THE NUCLEAR SHIP "SAVANNAH," CAMDEN, N.J., JULY 21, 1959

Our Father God, who hath made and preserved us a Nation, Thy sea is vast. Our boats are small. Yet, there is a wideness in Thy mercy like the wideness of the sea. We are grateful that across the boundless expanse of that infinite mercy our little barques of faith and compassion propelled by Thy constraining love may reach, with cargoes of good will, needy lives half a world away.

Upon the waters of this storied river which saw the birth of the Nation, we come to commit a vessel our frail hands have fashioned. In this epochal hour we fervently pray that to a fear-haunted world this deed may be a prophetic symbol of potential destruction, being harnessed as the willing servant of the gentle and benevolent forces that uplift and relieve and make to blossom wildernesses of want and woe.

We come conscious that the eyes of the Nation are upon this scene, over which is arched a rainbow of radiant hope. With the keys of awesome power now in the hands of erring and wilful men, we beseech Thee for the restraining grace of moral control and the passion for a fairer world to be shared by all Thy children, lest the awful instruments of terror and havoc, ignited by human hate, shall scourge the planet which is our home and melt into brittle glass the fruitful earth.

As this historic ship glides down its destined way, to join those that go down to the sea, who do business in great waters, to be propelled by mystic power that could incinerate the globe, we witness before man and before Thee, our God, that a vow is registered in heaven, to utilize this force—which could destroy us all—to serve us all as with potent energies it may carry food and clothing, help and hope, to the uttermost parts of the earth.

Above all other voices, louder than the tumult and shouting of these violent days, we would hear Thy voice saying to us even as it spoke to men of old, "I have set before you life and death, the blessing and the curse; therefore choose life." Dear God and Father of us all this ship, destined to carry blessing, now to be speeded to the seven seas, is our Nation's answer to Thy challenge.

In these days when the tempest still is high, we implore Thy guidance for those by the people called to steer the ship of state in mountainous seas, especially upon the President to whose heart this project is so dear, upon his coadjutors, and the Congress, that they may be given wisdom from on high regarding the things which belong to our peace.

May this ship be a sign to all the world of human wills bent to Thy control, and dedicated to the great causes that concern our human family, to the selfless ministries that will help to heal the sad world's open sores and burn away barriers to a brotherhood of goodwill where mouths shall not cry for bread, where hands and feet shall not be shackled, where speech shall not be silenced, where eyes shall not be bandaged, nor minds darkened by distorting falsehoods which hide the light of truth and where there may be poured out under all skies, upon Thy children the myriad benefits for titanic good, locked in the tiny atom.

We ask it in that Name which is above every name. Amen.

Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Passaic, N.J., Herald-News, of June 26, 1959, entitled "Drug Lobby Pushes Fair Trade":

DRUG LOBBY PUSHES FAIR TRADE—TERRIFIC PRESSURE FOR BILL TO FIX HIGH PRICES

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—A costly and dramatic demonstration of consumer helpnessness in the face of an organized lobby may soon be staged on Capitol Hill through passage of a so-called fair trade bill.

Although bitterly opposed by the White House and every affected government agency (the President's Council of Economic Advisers, State, Justice, Agriculture, Commerce, and Federal Trade Commission), as well as by many members who support it publicly, the National Assaciation of Retail Druggists' powerful lobby appears to be more effective than Uncle Sam's united opposition.

Two other influential lobbies—the farm organizations and labor unions—oppose the measure, but even they were unable to prevent the House interstate and foreign commerce committee from reporting it favorably by more than a 2-to-1 vote.

The Senate committee of the same name is now holding hearings on the proposal, and the drug lobby's pressure in that chamber is terrific.

House Resolution 1253, which was introduced by Chairman OREN H. HARRIS, of the House Committee, provides that, once a manufacturer has fixed a price on a brand-name article shipped in interstate commerce, it shall be a violation for any retailer anywhere in the United States to sell at a lower price.

Enforcement would be in the hands of the Federal Government through civil suits.

In a minority report blasting the Harris scheme, which received almost no publicity, Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, of Detroit, exposed the obvious fallacies of the bill's very title and principle—"fair trade."

He introduced an advertisement run in Washington's newspapers by a large drug chain. It gave the prices on 17 items in Maryland, which has a fair trade act, and in the District of Columbia, which has no such law. The articles were mainly medicinal or of the health-building kind.

The housewife in Maryland paid a total of $100.22 for the 17 items, as against only $71.43 for the same purchases in the Capital.

The only factor responsible for the $28.79 discrepancy was Maryland's fair trade legislation.

Representative DINGELL reported on the vast spread between manufacturers' charges to retail druggists and the prices which fair trade outlets impose on consumers.

The list contained 22 nationally sold brand products. They ranged from razor blades and vitamins to home permanent liquids and baby powder.

The retailers paid $40 for the 22 articles and the customers paid $88, a markup of 120 percent.

The druggists' lobbying on behalf of the Harris bill becomes understandable after a reading of these profit incentives.

Robert A. Bicks, acting chief of the antitrust division, declared before House-Senate committees that the bill would be unenforceable, requiring an "army of Federal agents."

Despite the provision for enforcement by civil suits in courts already clogged, Bicks said it would increase other Government expenses.

"General Electric," he continued, "estimated that its cost of enforcing fair trade ran to $900,000 a year. I think the result (from the Harris bill) would be pressure to appropriate more money for the Federal Trade Commission to enable them to enforce it.

"Then, you would really have the Federal Government ramming a principle down the throat of 16 States that have held that principle (fair trade) to violate their fundamental law."

Gov. Price Daniel, of Texas, enlarged on this point in a letter to the committees. He said:

"The proposed legislation would, as I understand it, permit a New York manufacturer to dictate and enforce its retail price in Texas, notwithstanding the antitrust laws of this State. This will cost Texas consumers millions of dollars each year."

Atomic Arms Pacts Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the letter written to the editor of the New York Times by David R. Inglis, which appeared in this morning's issue of that paper.

Dr. Inglis is the chairman of the Federation of American Scientists, and knows whereof he speaks. He presents the case against the proposed nuclear agreements so completely and so intelligently that I feel it points out the absolute necessity for the rejection of such pacts at the present time.

I urge my colleagues to read his letter most carefully, and to give most serious consideration to his recommendations.

The letter follows:

ATOMIC ARMS PACTS OPPOSED—IMPLICATIONS OF AGREEMENTS FOR OUR FUTURE SECURITY DISCUSSED

The writer of the following letter is a physicist at the Argonne National Laboratory and is chairman of the Federation of American Scientists:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In view of the crucial diplomatic and military problem of avoiding nuclear war both now and in the future it seems irresponsible for the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy to have endorsed the NATO atom arms pacts (Times, July 14, p. 1) without giving adequate warning to Congress of the dangers for our future security implied by this decisive step.

It is clear from the remarks quoted that the committee recognized as the sole argument the need to give more firepower to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization armies in an attempt to counter the numerical superiority of Soviet manpower. The policy endorsed is based on an unproved and essentially unprovable proposition (probably a myth) that a small nuclear war could be

fought in Europe without very great danger of growing into the big nuclear war that must be avoided.

MAINTENANCE OF FORCES

The policy also rejects the alternative that we should adequately maintain in NATO the relatively small U.S. forces that would be required to deliver nuclear firepower, an alternative which would make less likely the degeneration of NATO capabilities to wage a nonnuclear war against the Eastern satellites. Such capability is needed because the big nuclear deterrent is too big to be plausible against brushfires but still must be relied on to discourage nuclear attack by Soviet forces. Nuclear capabilities for West German troops are not necessary against either of these contingencies.

The dangers in going ahead with the pacts lie not in what the pacts themselves will do this year or next but in the next steps which will almost inevitably develop from them and in their negative effects on other aspects of diplomacy. As has been pointed out in subcommittee testimony to belittle the dangers, the pacts themselves do not guarantee delivery of anything, but merely establish a channel for communicating information and nonnuclear parts. They nevertheless do imply an important commitment, incompatible with a possible future agreement, for example, to establish a nonnuclear zone in central Europe.

VETO POWER

The pact with West Germany (as with three other countries) has the remarkable provision that it can be terminated (as long as NATO lasts) only by agreement of both parties. This provision does give our recurrent former enemy, Germany, now our strong partner in NATO under a friendly government, a veto power over our future diplomacy. This might be a serious infringement of our freedom if a future administration, in the light of future developments, should find it important to negotiate a European atomic settlement.

The pacts could be just as effective in their primary purpose without the remarkable provision of giving away a veto power over us. At the very least, Congress should by prompt action this week hold up the pacts long enough to have this provision removed.

Delaying the pacts until the next session of Congress would have a further advantage. It would give more time for the Geneva negotiations to explore all possibilities of agreement for a controlled cessation of nuclear tests as a means of preventing the proliferation of nuclear-weapons techniques to many nations of the earth. In spite of the precaution confining the material now transferred to "nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons systems" these pacts do constitute an important step in the diffusion of nuclear information and capability incompatible with our diplomatic efforts to solve the many-nuclear-nation problem before it is too late.

DAVID R. INGLIS.

WESTERN SPRINGS, ILL., *July 16, 1959.*

The Money Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Levittown Times of Levittown, Pa., on Thursday, July 16, 1959, which discusses with great clarity the problems attendant to, and the inevitable consequences of, Government spending. The editorial follows:

THE MONEY TREE

The argument among leading Democrats as to what Congress should or should not do seems, on the surface, to concern measures described as progressive.

Actually, it involves money, and where to get it.

The so-called progressive proposals call for heavy outlays for airports, urban renewal, schools, health, and other matters.

The supporters of these program think the Democratic leadership in Congress should dare the President's veto by passing them, and thus letting the country know what sort of action they favor.

This may appear to have substantial political advantages. But it also has a major political handicap.

The backers of the progressive programs do not include any plan for financing these measures. They would be like laws passed without enabling clauses.

In the absence of any specific financing, the Government would, of course, have to pay for the proposals out of heavy borrowings which would add materially to future deficit prospects. The alternative, higher taxes to pay the freight, is not even mentioned.

The mood of the Nation, in this time of a rising economy, seems to be against either new taxes or further additions to the deficit. Both Mr. Eisenhower and the moderate Democratic leadership of the House and Senate are responding to this mood by trimming or blocking heavy expenditures and trying to keep the budget within tighter bounds.

Those who favor heavier expenditures to further their progressive aims would seem to have a responsibility to show the voters exactly how these proposals are to be paid for. It is hardly fair for them to offer people the moon, unless the bill it attached.

Promises of great social and economic advances are not sober pledges when they leave out of account the effect on the taxpayer's pocketbook. He may in any given situation be willing to pay the price, either through inflation or higher taxes, but at least he should know what it is.

He should not be deluded into imagining he can enjoy major gains at no cost to himself. The current vocal supporters of so-called progressive legislation have not yet shown that they understand the need to be utterly candid on this important point.

Textile Import Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the domestic textile industry continues to try to cope with the problem of giving the American people quality goods at prices which can compete with imported goods produced in lands of low wages and cheap cotton.

One of the outstanding textile manufacturers in this country is Avondale Mills, of Alabama, and its president, J. Craig Smith, has written an article which appeared recently in the Avondale Sun, entitled, "Tell Them Before It Is Too Late."

I urge every Member to read this splendid article:

TELL THEM BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE

Every underdeveloped country in the world aspires to have industry. The first industry that these underdeveloped countries think of attracting is textiles. This is true for a number of reasons, the principal one being that the textile industry provides more jobs in relation to investment.

Japan has a rebuilt textile industry. India is in process of expanding hers. Korea, Formosa, and Pakistan are building mills. Mexico, most of the countries of Central and South America, and even parts of Africa have plans of becoming industrial areas and propose to take the first step in this direction by building textile mills. A portion of this development has been financed, and is still being financed, with American tax money.

The identical machines that we use in this country are available to these underdeveloped countries. Their wage rates are a small fraction of ours and they have a 25 percent lower cotton cost. Eventually, the American people are sure to demand that at least a part of the American textile industry be kept alive. It can only be kept alive by limiting the amount of textiles which these low-wage areas of the world can ship here.

Many of these underdeveloped countries are our friends. If we permit them to go ahead and build up their textile industries with the expectation of supplying this market and then later, after they have trained their people and built mills to supply this market, take the market away from them, we will make bitter enemies around the world. How much better it would be for our Government to take preventive action now before thousands of additional textile jobs in this country have been liquidated, and before underdeveloped countries around the world have geared their economies to supply a market in this country which sooner or later the American people are going to demand be taken away. I can think of nothing calculated to build more international ill will than, for example, to let our neighbor, Mexico, build textile mills, employ thousands of people in them, ship the product of their low wages and cheap cotton here, and then have this country create economic chaos in Mexico by placing an embargo on Mexican goods.

Up to now, our State Department has not shown much interest in saving American textile jobs. If they can be convinced that they are doing the underdeveloped countries a grave disservice by permitting these countries to build an industry on the expectation of supplying a market which they will later lose, the State Department may be willing to spell out now just how much of the American market is going to be given away.

Drinking and Serving of Alcoholic Beverages Aboard Air Carrier Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my letter addressed to Mr. James T. Pyle, Acting Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, with

comments, suggestions, and recommendations relative to the proposed amendments of section 40.371, 41.135, and 42.65 of the civil air regulations:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1959.

Re proposed amendments sections 40.371, 41.135, and 42.65 of the civil air regulations.

Mr. JAMES T. PYLE,
Acting Administrator,
Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PYLE: Pursuant to the notice set forth in the Federal Register, page 5424, Friday, July 3, 1959, my comments, suggestions, and recommendations, relative to the foregoing matter (drinking and serving of alcoholic beverages aboard air carrier aircraft) are set forth below:

It is obvious to all that the common carriage of passengers by air entails certain risks and dangers peculiar to that form of travel. It is therefore incumbent upon every one and especially your agency, which is concerned with safeguarding the lives and safety of passengers, crews, and others, to discover, eliminate, and prevent wherever and whenever possible all hazards to safe air travel.

The foregoing duty is required not only as to known hazards but also for the elimination of potential dangers, dangers which are obvious and apparent to people of ordinary and reasonable prudence. Any failure to eliminate such potential dangers is not only inexcusable but also culpable should injury or loss of life or damage to property result therefrom.

An intoxicated persons is irresponsible and his behavior is unpredictable. Space on board an airplane is limited and confining and there is no room to avoid him, no policeman to restrain him and opportunities for imperiling the lives and safety of all aboard and on the ground are varied and many.

The mischief he can do and the tragedy that can ensue is irremediable and inexcusable.

The hazards and dangers to which all are exposed by the presence of an intoxicated person on board an airplane is clear and obvious and incidents have been testified to and your agency is cognizant thereof.

A drunk on board an airplane is a clear and present danger to the lives and safety of everyone, everywhere, whether the inebriety is brought on by liquor carried onto the plane and there consumed or by liquor purchased on the airplane from the carrier by one who does not appear to be intoxicated.

I feel that in recognizing the dangers that flow from intoxication aboard an airplane your Agency should adopt regulations that eliminate them by eliminating all possibility of intoxication on board the airplane.

The effect of the proposed regulation is not to eliminate the risk but simply to place the responsibility, in the event tragedy flows from it, onto the shoulders of anyone other than this Agency.

As long as you can regulate you can eliminate. There is no actual need for intoxicating beverages during flight nor is there a demand for such. All airlines would gladly discontinue serving such beverages provided the discontinuance would be complete for all airlines.

The Air Lines Pilots Association and the Stewards and Stewardesses Association have brought this subject up at their national conventions. Each has called for regulations forbidding the serving of alcoholic beverages on planes because it is a potential nuisance to passengers and crews alike and a threat to the safety of all.

In the opinion of those who serve and in the opinion of those being served there is no place for liquor in airplanes during flights.

The language of the proposed regulation could easily imply that: only airlines can serve non-intoxicating alcoholic beverages, the airlines derive a sizable revenue from the sale of intoxicants, and you encourage the consumption of intoxicants sold by airlines.

The proposed regulation places an unfair and unjust burden on the airline personnel by requiring them to determine if a person requesting service is or appears to be intoxicated.

I fail to see how the proposed regulation eliminates the possibility of tragedy that can arise from a drunken act by one made drunk from being served intoxicants by the airline although he did not appear to be intoxicated when served.

To avoid an anomalous situation created by this Agency I recommend that the regulation be amended to read as follows:

"No person shall drink any alcoholic beverage aboard an air carrier aircraft while in flight within the United States."

The actual amount of time in flight is so short that the total prohibition of the use of intoxicants during flight will create no hardship on anyone, even the habitual user.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. LANE.

DRINKING AND SERVING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ABOARD AIR CARRIER AIRCRAFT

Notice is hereby given that the Federal Aviation Agency has under consideration a proposal to amend parts 40, 41, and 42 of the Civil Air Regulations as hereinafter set forth.

Section 43.45 of the Civil Air Regulations forbids a pilot to permit any person to be carried in the aircraft who is obviously under the influence of intoxicating liquor. However, there is no regulation dealing with the problem of alcoholic beverage consumption by passengers aboard an aircraft.

At hearings conducted before subcommittees of the House and Senate Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to consider bills to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages aboard air carrier aircraft, witnesses described a number of instances in which the intoxication of passengers aboard air carrier aircraft had led to disorderliness or other conduct which may have endangered the safety of the aircraft. These instances, however, appear to have been caused by the passenger's consumption of a personal liquor supply rather than by consumption of liquor served to him under the control and supervision of the air carrier.

Under the provisions of section 601(a)(6) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the Administrator has the power and the duty to prescribe regulations governing such practices as he finds necessary to provide adequately for safety in air commerce. In the exercise of this power and duty the Administrator now finds that the drinking and serving of alcoholic beverages aboard air carrier aircraft must be controlled to the extent necessary to provide adequately for safety in air commerce. Accordingly, in order to provide such control, it is proposed to adopt a regulation which would prohibit (1) the drinking of any alcoholic beverage aboard an air carrier aircraft unless the beverage has been served by the air carrier operating the aircraft, and (2) the serving by the air carrier of such beverage to a person who is or who appears to be intoxicated. Under this regulation, a passenger who drinks an alcoholic beverage aboard an air carrier aircraft without being served such beverage by the air carrier will be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed $1,000. Correspondingly, an air carrier which serves an alcoholic beverage to an intoxicated passenger will also be subject to such a penalty.

Interested persons may participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views or arguments as they desire. Communications should be submitted in duplicate to the Docket Section of the Federal Aviation Agency, room B-316, 1711 New York Avenue NW., Washington 25, D.C. All communications received within 60 days after publication of this notice in the Federal Register will be considered by the Administrator before taking action upon the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of comments received. All comments submitted will be available for examination by interested persons in the Docket Section when the prescribed date for return of comments has expired.

This amendment is proposed under the authority of sections 313(a) and 601(a)(6) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 752, 775; 49 U.S.C. 1354(a), 1421(a)(6)).

In consideration of the foregoing, it is proposed to amend parts 40, 41, and 42 by adding new sections 40.371, 41.135, and 42.65 respectively, each to read as follows:

Drinking and serving of alcoholic beverages: (a) No person shall drink any alcoholic beverage aboard an air carrier aircraft unless such beverage has been served to him by the air carrier operating the aircraft.

(b) No air carrier shall serve any alcoholic beverage to any person aboard an air carrier aircraft if such person is or appears to be intoxicated.

JAMES T. PYLE,
Acting Administrator.

TVA, Coal, and Electric House Heating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to make a statement relating to the actual benefits which coal miners, coal producers, and the coal industry in general will derive from the TVA self-financing bill, H.R. 3460, which is scheduled to come before the House for final action soon.

I especially commend this statement to those of my colleagues who are particularly interested in expanding coal consumption.

TVA, COAL, AND ELECTRIC HOUSE HEATING

More and more sections of our Nation are beginning to discover a simple fact that many of us who live in the Tennessee Valley have known for many years. I refer to the fact that electricity can provide the most satisfactory and satisfying way to heat one's home. Or to heat one's store or shop or factory, for that matter. And furthermore, that electric heating can be a boon not only to the user, but also to the electric systems and the coal industry.

These are facts which some of us in the Tennessee Valley and in the Pacific Northwest have known for many years. We are happy that others too are now discovering the advantages of electric heat.

The gentlewoman from West Virginia [Mrs. KEE] is one of my colleagues who is looking forward to great benefits to

her district and State from a growing use of electric heat. She placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 5 a statement entitled "Coal by Wire." With this statement she introduced us to a series of articles on electric heat that have been appearing in the United Mine Workers Journal. I am happy to help the gentlewoman from West Virginia put in the RECORD some of the encouraging facts about electric heat. Let me begin by joining her in quoting the United Mine Workers Journal. Its issue of May 1, 1958, said:

> If you, as a consumer, want ulramodern, ultraconvenient and ultraclean heat, electricity is the answer. And here coal stands ready to serve the Nation by producing the electricity to heat your home or other buildings.

The great value of electric heat to the coal industry is fairly obvious. To supply electricity today to the average home, the average power system burns about 1½ tons of coal a year. However, if the home is heated electrically, the power system will buy about 10 tons of coal to supply its annual power requirements. This reflects not only the energy used for electric heat, but the almost inevitable fact that a family which heats its home electrically will also use electricity for cooking, water heating, and any other purposes for which it might otherwise use some other fuel. Ten tons of coal, instead of 1½, multiplied by any number of homes in each utility's service area. No wonder the coal industry is interested.

But the curious question is, Why has this not happened in more areas sooner? Only now is electric heat beginning to be used in widespread areas. In January of this year, the lead editorial in the magazine Coal Age contained the following:

> The good news is that electric coal for home heating—and cooling—has reached the snowballing stage, meaning in turn a major increase in electric-power generation in the years to come. Most significant is the fact that this means that coal, since it is the premier powerplant fuel, is staging a reentry in the home-heating field.

Why wasn't this snowballing stage reached 10 or 20 years ago? By then both gas and oil were rapidly displacing coal as the usual home-heating fuel. Why didn't electricity then enter the heating field on a large scale nationally?

I am afraid the answer is only too simple. The coal and electric industry were not as alert to their opportunities as the gas and oil industries. The only exceptions were the public power systems in the Northwest and particularly in the Tennessee Valley. Elsewhere one found among the electric utilities not only an absence of any considerable interest but quite often active discouragement of electric heating—even outright refusal to allow its use.

Now, finally, with the rather late encouragement of the coal industry, the President of the Edison Electric Institute, the utilities' trade organization, can be quoted as saying:

> I firmly believe that we should view electric house heating as a principal means by which our rate of growth can be dramatically increased. (J. W. McAfee quoted in Electrical World, Apr. 28, 1958.)

I am glad that the electric industry is finally, though lethargically, awakening to its opportunities.

Let me give you an interesting statistic. The area served with TVA power includes only 3 percent of all the homes in the United States, but it includes half of all the electrically heated homes.

Again the reason is simple. Congress did not ask TVA to supply power only to loads that were sure to be highly profitable. Congress told TVA to encourage the abundant use of electricity at the lowest possible rates. TVA operates on the basis that the consumers are entitled to use electricity in new ways if they want to.

TVA takes its public service obligations seriously. Why do not the private utilities? They are given the exclusive right to serve an area. Regulatory commissions guarantee them a 6-percent return on their investment. Are they not obligated to furnish their customers all the electricity they want to buy?

What is happening now is this. With the benefit of the long experience of the public power systems of the Tennessee Valley and the Northwest, the utilities have become convinced that electric heat can be a profitable load. So now they have become interested in providing this service. Now they are interested in building up this load.

Some of the utilities are now even beginning to offer electricity for house heating at a little lower rate than before. The Wall Street Journal stated on December 16, 1958, that 105 utilities in various parts of the country have reduced their rates to electric heating customers. This is in interesting contrast to the steady upward trend of nearly all of the other rate schedules of the private utilities.

Why utilities should even have special rates for electric heating, I do not know. Homes served by the distributors of TVA power buy electricity under the same rate schedule whether they use electricity for heating or whether they do not. This simple rate policy has worked to the eminent satisfaction of all concerned. The distributors and TVA have covered their costs, and the consumers can buy electricity for heating, as for other purposes, at an attractively low rate. Experience has demonstrated the soundness of the TVA determination that it was unnecessary to establish special rates for this, that, or the other residential use. Many of the private utilities, on the other hand, set up prohibitively high rates for electricity used for space heating. Now they are gradually reducing those rates.

I hope it will not take the utiilties as long to learn that electricity for heating can be supplied at a low price as it has taken them to learn that heating is a desirable load. Here, too, they need to apply the lessons they can learn from the TVA demonstration.

The UMW Journal's series on "coal by wire" and the remarks on that subject by the gentlewoman from West Virginia presented ably some very pertinent information. I would protest mildly, however, that the reader might assume that electric home heating was invented by certain private utilities. The utilities and the coal industry would not appear to be the fountainhead of knowledge on this subject. Perhaps some of my colleagues or their constituents would like to learn more about the advantages of this most modern form of home heating. If so, may I suggest that they turn to the area where more time-tested experience has been developed than in all the rest of the Nation put together. I refer, of course, to the Tennessee Valley—to TVA and the distributors of TVA power.

It will be a blessing if the use of electric home heating multiplies rapidly throughout our Nation. Our homes will be cleaner and more comfortable. The coal industry will find a needed market for many millions of tons of coal. We will conserve some of our exhaustible supplies of gas and oil. The electric industry can profit from a much expanded residential load. It can, that is, if it seeks for a volume market and is content with a low profit per unit. I fear, however, that the electric utilities may hope that many consumers will heat their homes electrically even if they have to pay 2 or 3 cents a kilowatt-hour for the electricity. If any of them think that, I can assure them that the oil and gas industry will continue to outcompete them. As each new home is built, the builder and owner, however reluctantly, will nearly always decide against electric heat. However, if the power industry follows the example of the Tennessee Valley and puts its customers' interest first, then, as in the Tennessee Valley, many new homes fill be electrically heated. Then power use will multiply as it has in the Tennessee Valley. Coal use will multiply as it has in the Tennessee Valley. I wish all success to the mine workers, the coal producers, and the power companies in pursuing that goal.

The Challenge To Preserve Our Wilderness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a significant editorial on the wilderness bill appeared in the Washington Post for Monday, July 20, 1959, and on the following day a national conservation leader commented on the editorial in a letter to the editor of the Post that both commended and supplemented the editorial. The editorial and the letter were both entitled "Preserving a Refuge."

The refuges referred to by the Washington Post, Mr. Speaker, are not merely places where we can protect wild creatures. Rather they are the unspoiled natural areas where man himself can find a freedom from the tensions and

strains, the noise and confusion, and even the luxuries and protective agencies with which we are all surrounded in our way of living. And I mean "surrounded."

I believe, of course, that our civilization is the best that man has yet developed. I would change it for no other in the world. But I do maintain, nevertheless, that it is always good to get away from our own crowded mechanized cities occasionally to quiet our minds and refresh our spirits while we use and develop our muscles in the simple life of the out of doors. In fact, this too is part of our American way of life. For some people, especially young people, these excursions can best be realized in the wilderness, away from the crowds, where a man or woman or boy or girl can come close to being on his own and practicing self-reliance.

The places where this can still be done are the refuges for human beings of which the Washington Post writes, describing them—and I quote—as "a haven of escape which will be all the more desired as the growth in population increases the hunger for the forest's peace."

Mr. Speaker, these places will continue to be available to us as wilderness only if we protect them as such. That is why we have been working to establish a policy and program to protect them. As Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton said in reporting to Congress on the wilderness bill:

> It is time that wilderness and allied values be given greater recognition—their rightful place—in the statutes relating to management, development, conservation, and use of Federal lands and associated resource.

As this national wilderness policy and program are now being set forth in a revised and amended bill we should move forward to enact the measure promptly. That is what the Washington Post urges in its July 20, 1959, editorial and what Executive Secretary Howard Zahniser, of the Wilderness Society urges in his letter to the editor on July 21. After quoting Secretary Seaton as urging Congress "to give serious consideration to taking action now to initiate the establishment of a wilderness system by granting existing wilderness areas statutory protection," Dr. Zahniser pointed out:

> That is what the wilderness bill will do—in some 20 refuges, 4 dozen national park system areas, and 8 percent of the national forests.

He said:

> It is a reasonable measure and will be a great credit to the 86th Congress, and that it should pass promptly.

I heartily agree. The Post refers to "the merits of this modest innovation," emphasizes that "the program would operate within the present land agency jurisdictions," and maintains that its object "could hardly be less controversial." The editorial's immediate purpose was to encourage favorable action in the Senate committee, but its arguments apply all along the line, and I trust that it will not now be long before we can see the wilderness bill enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the editorial entitled "Preserving a Refuge" in the Washington Post on Monday, July 20, 1959, and the letter to the editor with the same title in the Post for July 21, 1959, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 20, 1959]

PRESERVING A REFUGE

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has a rare opportunity to win the gratitude of not only the present, but of many generations still unborn. Before the committee is a measure which would create a National Wilderness Preservation System, and at any time this bill may come up for a vote. That vote will assuredly be favorable if the merits of this modest innovation are given fair-minded consideration. What the bill would do is to make it explicit national policy to preserve forever a corner of our national forests which would remain inviolable, shielded by law from the litter of civilization. It goes without saying that once these virgin forests were gone, the loss would be irrevocable.

Extended hearings have been held to accommodate all possible commercial objections. The bill envisages no new bureau, and the program would operate within the present land agency jurisdictions. All it would do is set aside certain areas—amounting to only 8 percent of total acreage of the national forests—as areas which would be wholly unspoiled in perpetuity. It would guarantee a refuge from man's dominion, a haven of escape which will be all the more desired as the growth in population increases the hunger for the forest's peace.

Surely this object could hardly be less controversial. Eighteen Senators of both parties are sponsoring the legislation; the administration has endorsed the measure with qualifications that leave the bill's objectives unimpaired; conservationists have long sought such legislation. The committee ought to give it the warm endorsement it deserves.

[From the Washington Post, July 21, 1959]

PRESERVING A REFUGE

Conservationists who are concerned with saving some areas of our American wilderness, and the public in general, have good reason to appreciate highly the support that the Washington Post has given the wilderness bill. Your July 20 editorial "Preserving a Refuge," is one of the most timely expressions—an endorsement that should encourage the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to take promptly the favorable action for which the way has already been so well prepared.

The case you so forcefully present will be recognized by those who have been urging this legislation as a succinct statement of a very simple, modest purpose. That is to preserve for the American people such areas of wilderness as can still be preserved without damaging other interests or interfering with other programs. The purpose is to fit wilderness preservation into a sound overall program for the wisest possible management of the Federal lands in our custody.

The lands thus available for wilderness preservation by the Federal Government include the portions of the national forests to which you make specific allusion, and also the back country of national parks and monuments and portions of some of our national wildlife refuges and ranges.

Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton, under whose jurisdiction the wilderness in parks and refuges would continue to be protected, has endorsed the wilderness bill in an excellent report, even as Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has approved the bill's application to national forest areas. Their suggested amendments, as you point out, "leave the bill's objectives unimpaired."

"It is time," said Secretary Seaton in his report, on June 17, "that wilderness and allied values be given greater recognition—their rightful place—in the statutes relating to management, development, conservation, and use of Federal lands and associated resources." He urged Congress to "give serious consideration to taking action now to initiate the establishment of a wilderness system by granting existing wilderness areas statutory protection."

That is what the wilderness bill will do—in some 20 refuges, 4 dozen National Park System areas, and the 8 percent of the national forests on which you have commented. It is a reasonable measure and will be a great credit to the 86th Congress. It should pass promptly.

As Secretary Seaton said in closing his letter to Senate Committee Chairman JAMES E. MURRAY: "Our children's children should be assured of the opportunity to enjoy the magnificence of the natural beauty of these wilderness areas."

HOWARD ZAHNISER,
Executive Secretary,
The Wilderness Society.

WASHINGTON.

Joint Development Proposal for Trinity River Power Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of this week the House Interior Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation will consider the joint development proposal for the Trinity River power facilities. At least 80 California newspapers have supported Trinity joint development editorially.

The proposal's origin is accurately described by the Sacramento Union:

> The Trinity River project was authorized by Public Law 386, approved August 12, 1955. This law specifically instructed the Secretary of the Interior to continue to a conclusion negotiations with a private company to determine the feasibility of constructing the power phases of the project with private capital, and arranging for the sale of falling water. The Secretary was instructed to report his findings within a specified time, and to submit his recommendations to Congress. A proposal was made by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., and this was approved in turn by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Secretary of the Interior, after an 18-month exhaustive study.

The San Jose News relates:

> The private utility offers initially to build and pay for the project's powerplants and related transmission facilities for the purpose of obtaining use of the falling water in development of hydroelectric power. In addition, it proposes a schedule of payments to the Government for the falling water amounting to an estimated $4,600,000 each year.

The News concludes that—

> Secretary Seaton and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. have worked out an ideal partnership for Trinity. It should be implemented with full support of our legislators in the interests of the public's need for water and power.

In reviewing the situation, the St. Helena (Calif.) Star states:

Actually there is no such thing as cheap Government power. The same costs of producing power must be paid, whether Government makes power, or private enterprise does so. Water does not fall for the Government any more cheaply than for the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. All that Government can do is pass the cost along to the taxpayers as a whole, while providing lower rates for a few. We don't think that's fair.

On the contrary—

Continues the Star—

with the Pacific Gas & Electric, in partnership with the Government in developing Trinity power, the Pacific Gas & Electric will not only pay the Government for use of the falling water, but will pay taxes amounting to some $300 million. Moreover, the Pacific Gas & Electric, as are all other utilities in California, is soundly regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission, so that the company is limited to a reasonable profit, while paying taxes even as you and we.

And what is the company? It is a great mass of small stockholders, who put their earnings into its stock, on the assumption that it is right and proper for them to earn a reasonable return. For Government to compete with these small stockholders merely to give lower power to a favored few, seems like the rankest kind of discrimination.

The company, a taxpaying organization—

States the North Sacramento Journal—

is justified in asking that Government not engage in the direct business of distributing power to preference customers. With the advent of the Eisenhower administration's popular partnership policy with private enterprise, the development of this and other like programs will benefit our State and the taxpaying citizens of all other States.

The conclusion of the Bakersfield Daily Report is that—

In any event, partnership points the way to obtaining maximum power development at the least cost to the taxpayers, in the shortest possible time, and without resorting to the un-American practice of pitting Government against private citizens in commercial activities that should be reserved to taxpaying investor-owned enterprises. The record proves that.

To accomplish the dual purpose of cutting out the needless Government spending of $60 million construction costs and, at the same time, of increasing Government's revenues by $320 million, the House Interior Committee would be doing the taxpayers no small favor by reporting out the Trinity joint proposal.

What Is the Price of Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest an article on the editorial page of Southern Advertising and Publishing magazine, for July 1959. This magazine is published in Atlanta, Ga. The article is entitled "What Is the Price of Freedom?"

The entire article merits reading and consideration. The last paragraph deals with the habit of the Nation's press in slanting news stories against the South, and poses a question which deserves an answer. The writer says:

Readers of the press have had further evidence of this partisan distortion of the news in recent weeks. Who did not read that "no white man ever had been executed in Florida for the rape of a Negro," during the Tallahassee trial? Why pick on Florida? There has never been such an execution in the North either, or anywhere in the Nation. What price freedom?

I have obtained unanimous consent to insert this article, and I attach it herewith:

WHAT IS THE PRICE OF FREEDOM?

Yesterday was the Fourth of July. Today we start another year in the wake of that glorious Fourth of 183 years ago. On that distant date there was tension and turmoil in the land; although there have been years of peace and calm and years of storm and strife during these intervening years, today we still have tension and turmoil.

Perhaps this is the destined lot of mankind. It could be that the nature of life is struggle. But on this continent we have felt for 183 years, and for some before that, that men should be able to regulate their lives and their ambitions in orderly manner. This is the ideal of the peaceful citizen. Unfortunately there are others who refuse to play the game that way. Even in our Nation we have some who prefer to pillage and to kill.

And the Nation as a whole faces a similar condition on the global scale. Make no error about it: the Communist world does not believe in the peaceful, the live and let live, the truthful way of life. Has there ever been a powerful Communist that kept his word when it paid him to break it?

In our own Nation, therefore, it is of paramount importance to play the game close to our vests. As Benjamin Franklin, one of the great patriots of that 1776 era, said, "We must hang together or we will hang separately." There is an awful burden resting on the press of the Nation, on the political leaders of the Nation, not to divert attention from the major dangers by trying to capitalize on sentimental news and politics at home.

The Nation's press must forget that the South is a whipping boy every time a racial story breaks; and it must be fair in seeing the racial problem in its own frontyard. Readers of the press have had further evidence of this partisan distortion of the news in recent weeks. Who did not read that "no white man ever has been executed in Florida for the rape of a Negro," during the Tallahassee trial? Why pick on Florida? There has never been such an execution in the North either, or anywhere in the Nation. What price freedom?

Poison in Your Water—No. 143

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post Gazette of April 21, 1959, entitled "Cleanup Won't End River Slop":

CLEANUP WON'T END RIVER SLOP—LABOON CITES OFFENDING UP-RIVER COMMUNITIES

Thirty or more up-river communities will continue to pour the slop of pollution into Pittsburgh district's drinking water supplies even after the Allegheny County Sanitary Authority sewage system begins operating.

Also, thousands of tons of mine acids will continue to pour into our rivers, John F. Laboon, executive director of the county sanitary authority revealed yesterday. Dr. Laboon addressed the bicentennial conference of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers in the Penn-Sheraton.

ONLY FIRST STEP

Mr. Laboon also declared: "There are industrial plants which will continue to pour tons of corrosive acids into Pittsburgh rivers with the permission of State authorities."

The collection and treatment of sewage is only a first step to clean up our rivers, he warned.

Mr. Laboon, in an interview with the Post-Gazette, named some of the offending communities which will dump their raw pollution into Pittsburgh's water.

They include: McKeesport, Duquesne, Clairton, White Oak, and surrounding towns, New Kensington, Arnold, Brackenridge, Tarentum, Springdale Borough, Springdale Township, Harrison Township, Oakmont, and Cheswick.

"Even those who are building their own sewage-treatment plants will continue to drop sewage into district water supplies for about 2 years after we are taking ours out," he said.

Mr. Laboon revealed that the $100 million sewage-treatment system—with 69 miles of interconnecting sewers serving Pittsburgh and 69 other communities—will begin operating next week or within 10 days.

MINING INDUSTRY WORSE

He stressed the public health aspect of cleaning up the district water supplies. Other considerations such as support of fish life and recreation are assets but "secondary in importance," he said.

Industry generally, he said, has dumped "sewage and industrial wastes untreated" into the streams of the commonwealth.

"The coal-mining industry has been the worst offender," he said.

Earlier, Adolph Schmidt, president of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, estimated that smoke losses in Pittsburgh's former period of smoke blight would be $81,600,000 a year, equivalent to servicing a debt of $1.6 billion. So far, Government, industry, and private cost to control the smoke evil is about $275 million. "Control is a good investment," he concluded.

And John Grove, assistant director of the conference, said that since homes were also brought under the smoke ordinary, since October 1947, Pittsburgh is on its way "to becoming the cleanest industrial city in America."

This Fellow Is Really "For the Birds"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD,

I include a very interesting article which has been released by King Features Syndicate about Walter R. Koe, the kindly Massachusetts man who daily feeds huge flocks of ducks which would otherwise die before summer. Mr. Koe is a most high type citizen, whom I have known all my life. He is held in high respect and admiration by thousands of people, especially due to his interest in the plight of wild birds.

THIS FELLOW IS REALLY "FOR THE BIRDS"—KINDLY MASSACHUSSETTS MAN DAILY FEEDS HUGE FLOCK OF DUCKS WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE DIE BEFORE SUMMER

(By J. Rodger Darling)

BOSTON, MASS.—Twenty thousand loaves of bread * * * 38,200 pounds of corn * * * that's this winter's menu for a daily duck dinner really "for the birds." Every day, snow or subzero, one man acts as waiter (and pays most of the check) for a king-size handout that keeps hundreds of waterfowl from starving.

This winter, as for 16 years, a thousand ducks depend on Walter R. Koe, whose humane hobby makes him the "great white father" of the famed ducks of Norumbega park, largest domesticated flock of wild ducks in the country.

Come summer, you and thousands of sightseers may stop to admire the spectacular flock of ducks in this riverside park at the Boston end of the superhighway from Chicago, New York State, and the Midwest.

For 40 years the colorful Norumbega ducks have shared sandwiches with motorists, picnickers, birdwatchers, students from nearby colleges, and couples canoeing on the placid Charles.

However, when winter armors the river with foot-thick ice, to which ducks sometimes freeze in the 20-below cold, people forget the now-dependent ducks * * * that is, all do except Koe. Daily he drives 15 miles from Wayland, Mass., to distribute hundreds of pounds of lifesaving feed, and rescue crippled and frozen birds.

"Sixteen years ago Mrs. Koe and I stopped one winter afternoon with a loaf of stale bread to feed the ducks," he recalls. "It was awful. The starving birds climbed over each other three deep struggling for food. Some were lying dead on the ice. We went home, got all the bread we could find, and came back. I've been coming back ever since."

Saved from winter starvation, the permanent flock now numbers about 450, with this month's population reaching 1,200 as migrating ducks recognize a good thing. Mostly mallards and blacks, there are occasional baldpates, pintails, sheldrake, teal, coot, grebes, Canada geese, etc., plus seagulls and pigeons on shore patrol.

Koe, a self-employed painter, has spent $10,000 on the ducks, but now others share, thanks to a "Buck for a Duck" plea by local press and radio. Contributions from 5 cents up come from as far as India and Australia, many addressed to "Potey Noah," and other duck favorites that Koe describes in a yearly newsletter sent to friends of the flock.

School and Scout groups are faithful visitors; while the fourth grade from a school for blind children recently came to see the quacking, splashing, fluttering birds, later sending a thank-you note in braille to Koe.

Although the State has erected a duck feeding area highway sign, the flock receives no official support. However, every day a stocky, pleasant, white-haired man happily hauls sacks of grain and bread across the ice as ducks waddle to meet him. Next summer thousands of persons will enjoy hand-feeding these birds, unaware how one kind-hearted man helped them survive the winter.

Representative Evins Urges Amendment to Small Business Investment Act To Protect Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is generally recognized that the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 probably was the most important piece of small business legislation enacted during the 85th Congress. This measure, as all of the Members will recall, is the one that provided a source of equity capital and long-term loans for small business concerns needing such assistance for their normal growth and expansion.

Last month, Representative JOE L. EVINS, chairman of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Small Business Committee, held a series of hearings respecting the operations of the Small Business Administration and during the course of these hearings emphasis was placed upon the manner in which the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 was being implemented by that agency and by the investment companies. Yesterday, in response to the invitation of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Representative EVINS appeared before that committee and testified concerning his views on the Small Business Investment Act and the various amendments that have been proposed, including the provisions of those bills which he himself has introduced.

In view of the high degree of authority with which Representative EVINS speaks on this subject, I believe his testimony will interest the entire membership of the House and for that reason have caused it to be inserted in the RECORD. His statement and proposed amendment (H.R. 8096) follow:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOE L. EVINS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE THE SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, JULY 21, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and to testify in regard to amendments to the Small Business Investment Act which the committee has under consideration.

I have the honor to be the chairman of a subcommittee of the House Select Committee on Small Business, which is charged with the responsibility of reviewing the operations of the Small Business Administration. Some weeks ago our subcommittee held extensive hearings on the operations of the Small Business Administration, with special reference to the administration of the Small Business Investment Act. Our hearings have indicated some areas in which amendments are needed and necessary. Accordingly, I have introduced in the other body bills to amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act, and I should like especially to refer to these proposed changes to the Small Business Investment Act which I consider needed and desirable.

For the sake of convenience I will discuss these changes, not necessarily in the order of importance, but in the order in which they would appear in the act itself.

1. As the committee knows, the Small Business Investment Act limits the operations of the act to the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

The act should be amended to provide that the geographical limits of the act will include the territory of Guam. The desirability of this was clearly pointed out by the testimony of the Hon. A. B. Won Pat, Speaker of the Legislature of the territory of Guam, in which it was shown that for some reason the wording of the act precluded an investment company from being organized in Guam although this territory is within the jurisdiction of the Small Business Administration under the Small Business Act. The evidence indicates that the financial and economic conditions of Guam are such that a small business investment company could very well perform a worthwhile mission there. At least I know of no logical reason why citizens of Guam should not have the privilege of filing a proposal and having it passed on by the Small Business Administration if they so desire.

This could be provided for by an amendment to section 103(4) of the Small Business Investment Act to provide that the term "United States" includes in addition to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, the territories of the United States.

2. Subsection 302(a) and 303(b) should be amended to provide that the funds advanced by the Small Business Administration to small business investment companies should be furnished at a rate equal to the rate charged the Small Business Administration by the Treasury for said funds plus a fraction of 1 percent for overhead costs.

The funds furnished under 302(a) are advanced by the Small Business Administration for the purpose of creating the minimum capital requirement of the investment companies. At the present time, the act does not set out what his rate should be and the Small Business Administration is charging 5 percent per annum. I am advised that only 9 of the 18 companies licensed have utilized this fund and only $282,000 has been disbursed to date.

Subsection 303(b) is the provision whereby the Small Business Administration is given authority to lend funds to the investment companies up to one-half of their capital and surplus. At the present time the act provides that the Administration shall set the rate of interest on these loans. The Small Business Administration has also set this rate at 5 percent. Indications are that this fund will be utilized very little by the investment companies. In fact, to date there has been no application for a loan under this section.

These proposed changes concerning the interest charged for Small Business Administration funds have been widely recommended.

As the committee knows, this is wholesale money and there is very little administrative cost in the processing of this type of loan since the Small Business Administration already has complete records of, and almost day-to-day control over the small business investment companies. These loans are not be to compared with the loans made to small business concerns by the Small Business Administration under its financial assistance program wherein it is necessary to process and investigate each loan application through a complete analyses of the financial condition of the applicant from the very beginning. A small business investment company would not be licensed by the Small Business Administration unless it would be eligible for loans under 302(a) and 303(b).

It should not cost them much to process these loans.

The testimony at our hearings indicates that these investment companies are not going to be very interested in making direct loans to small business concerns unless they can receive their wholesale money at a more reasonable rate. Of course, it is hoped and expected that these companies will obtain most of their funds from other sources, but it is also felt that if they could get these Federal funds at a reasonable rate that it will help get them off the ground and will attract other capital.

There may be a time in the future when the 5 percent rate set by the Administration will be realistic but at the present time it is thought by some to be out of line. At the time of the drafting of this statement, the Treasury Department had not yet informed the Small Business Administration as to what the cost of these funds would be during the current fiscal year of 1960. The cost of these funds to Small Business Administration during the past fiscal year of 1959 was 2⅜ percent. The cost of these funds to Small Business Administration is determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States of comparable maturities, pursuant to section 4(c) of the Small Business Investment Act. I am advised that the determination is made in the first month of the fiscal year and the rate so determined pertains throughout the year.

This change is recommended both on theory that Small Business Administration should not lose money on these loans and also that the small business investment companies should receive these funds at a rate that would promote the making of small business loans to small business concerns.

3. The next proposed change is one which should certainly be approached with caution but which has much merit. It is felt that section 304 of the act should be amended in such a manner as to give the investment companies more flexibility in supplying equity capital to the small business concerns. At the present time, as the committee knows, it provides only one method by which equity capital can be provided to small business concerns by the investment companies. This is by the purchase of debentures from the concerns. These debentures may be convertible at the option of the holder, but are subject to call by the concern on any interest payment date, with 3 months' notice.

There was much testimony in the hearings before my subcommittee to the effect that, in addition to convertible debentures, the investment companies should be allowed to purchase from the business concerns debentures with detachable stock warrants and perhaps even preferred or common stock. I understand that there are bills before your subcommittee which would amend section 304 to delete the portion concerning convertible debentures and provide that the investment companies could supply equity capital to the small business concerns "in such manner and under such terms as the small business investment company may fix with the approval, by regulation or otherwise, of the administration." This would place the matter of equity financing on open negotiations between the investment company and the business concerns. This would provide for greater flexibility and marketability.

But when considering this important change I think there are other things to be considered, more especially the interest of the small business concern and its attitude toward giving up partial ownership and perhaps control of his company. At the present time, under section 304, the business concern can at least cause the investment company to make a decision as to whether it will convert its stock now rather than holding it over the head of the business concern for a number of years. This can be done by calling in the debentures on 3 months' notice. Under the proposed change this would be deleted from the act and would be left to open negotiations. Of course open negotiations in the marketplace are always a desirable feature. Many feel that when a concern must have money and there is but one place to get it there is no real open market and the negotiations are onesided.

It would seem advisable to put some provision in section 304 which would assure that, somewhere along the line, the small business concern would have an opportunity to reacquire its equity if desired. It is also felt that there should be some protection against the investment companies' obtaining control of the small business concern through stock purchase and subsequent refinancing.

It is suggested that if section 304 is amended provision should be added whereby the small business concern would have the opportunity to repurchase their equity at sound book value from the investment company as long as the investment company has control of the stock. This would in no wise prevent the investment company from obtaining a secondary market for the stock since this repurchase option would not follow the stock into the secondary market but it would provide that as long as the investment company holds control of the stock the business concern could buy it back. Of course, if the stock passed out of the hands of the investment company into the open market it could be reacquired by the business concern at market price and it would also assist in diluting the ownership of the stock passing out of control of the investment companies.

A re-purchase provision would be desirable and evidence indicates it would be acceptable to the investment companies. One witness testified—and I quote—"I think something should be in the act if you want to keep the company from gobbling up the small businesses."

The primary concern of banks and investment companies entering this field is that of the investor and that of making money.

And, of course, it is recognized that they must be able to make money for this program to work. But we must also look to the side of the small-business concerns. Will they be willing to give up equity in their businesses without the hope that they may be able to reacquire it? We do have the testimony of one small businessman who appeared before the House Small Business Subcommittee and who referred to the problem briefly. Mr. Gary E. Lilly, of Des Moines, Iowa, appeared before the subcommittee to testify concerning the direct-loan program of the Small Business Administration. During his testimony and while discussing his attempts to obtain financing, he stated:

"We did subsequently investigate the possibility of a loan through one of these small-business investment firms, but we did not wish to give up the control of our company or stock interest in the company to such a concern, which we were advised would be necessary."

I have spent so much time on this proposed change because I consider it to be of paramount importance. I think that perhaps the success or failure of this program will turn on section 304 of the act. Certainly we would be contradicting our very purpose if, in our anxiety to make small-business investment companies attractive, we set up a system that might exploit small business instead of serving it. Whatever we do about these amendments, in my view, we must keep in mind that the purpose of these small-business investment companies is to serve small business and to help small business. In other words, we want to harness this system of small-business investment companies to work for small business. We do not want to set up a system that would result in small-business investment companies harnessing small business only for their profit and advantage.

4. Section 304(c)2 should be amended in order to provide that the small business concern will agree not to incur any additional indebtedness except open account or temporary short term indebtedness without first securing the approval of the company and giving the company the first opportunity to finance such indebtedness. The only change that this entails would be the insertion of the word "additional" and the phrase "except interim or short term." Our hearings developed that there is a possibility that section 304(c) 1 and 2 of the act could be used as a yoke to keep the small business concern harnessed to the investment company's sole financing sources.

Of the 20 companies licensed to date, at least 4 are owned by banks, bank holding companies, or have common ownership with banks. At least two others are interlocked with banks through common top officials. One is completely owned by a finance company and at least one other is closely connected by interlocking officials with a finance company. This means that at least 8 of the 20 companies licensed are tied in with established lending institutions.

This suggested change would assure the business concern that, if desired, it could refinance its indebtedness at another source and could obtain open account or temporary short term credit without returning to the same company. This is in line with regulations of the Small Business Administration now in effect (regulation sec. 107.304–1(g)), and should be enacted into law.

5. Section 304(d) of the act should be amended to provide that the small business concern will have the opportunity to become a stockholder-proprietor of the company by investing in the capital stock of the company in an amount equal to not less than 2 percent nor more than 5 percent of the amount of capital received from the investment company. At the present time the act makes it mandatory that the small business concern do this, but the proposed change, herein mentioned, would make it optional. There is much merit to the arguments in favor of doing away with this requirement and there is also some merit to the theory that the small businesses should be encouraged to invest in the investment companies. It has been stated by Mr. Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, in testimony before our subcommittee that this "theory of compulsory stock purchases by the small business concerns was to reduce indebtedness of the investment company to the Government and thus gradually to lessen Government participation until the program ultimately rests solely on private capital." This is perhaps true, but it is also felt that there is another reason; that it was the intent of Congress to set up a program whereby the ownership of these investment companies would be on the broadest base possible and that the small businesses themselves would have an interest in them and in their operation. By this same method, of course, production credit associations all over the country are becoming home owned by the farmers themselves.

A majority of those testifying on this subject stated that the small business concerns do not want to be compelled to purchase this stock—and that it is the small business concern that objects to it. As a result, I believe it to be advisable that this portion of the act be amended to make this stock purchase optional rather than mandatory. I would hope that the investment companies would not discourage the small business concerns from purchasing this stock but

that in many suitable cases would encourage them.

6. Section 304 of the Small Business Administration Act provides that it should be a "primary" function to provide equity capital, and section 305 of the act, which provides for direct loans, failed to indicate that this was a "primary" function of the act.

Subsection 305(a) of the act should be amended in such a manner as to indicate that the making of loans to small business concerns is also a "primary" function of these investment companies.

It is noted that proposed legislation before this committee would eliminate the word "primary" from section 304. I believe it would be preferable to leave it in and add to section 305 that it would also be a "primary" function to provide direct loans.

The act should be amended to provide for assistance to both incorporated and unincorporated business concerns.

7. There is strong argument for the suggestion that some provisions should be made whereby the investment companies would be excluded completely from the Investment Company Act of 1940. It is recognized that the Security Act of 1933, with its disclosure mandate is a necessary control over the investment companies. But, the Investment Company Act of 1940 is essentially a regulatory act and it was not the original intent that it should apply to the investment companies which are created under the SBIA. The constant day-to-day control that the Small Business Administration has over the investment companies should be sufficient regulations, the type which would be provided by the Investment Company Act of 1940.

In other words the Investment Company Act of 1940 should not apply to the small business investment companies and an exemption should be provided.

It is recommended that subsection (c) of section 307 of the Small Business Investment Act be deleted and a provision inserted therein which would make clear that these small business investment companies are not to be construed by law as being subject to the Investment Company Act of 1940.

Before closing, I would like to make one further observation relative to the financing of these investment companies. There exists a need or will exist a need, as more companies are chartered and their business expands, for a secondary market. The committee may well look now to providing a means of guaranteeing an adequate supply of wholesale money for these small business investment companies.

H.R. 8096

A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1959".

SEC. 2. Section 103(4) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"(4) the term 'United States' includes the several States, the Territories and possessions of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia;".

SEC. 3. Section 302(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Any debentures purchased by the Administration under this subsection during any fiscal year shall bear interest at a rate equal to one-half of 1 per centum plus the rate charged the Administration, under the last sentence of section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, for funds obtained during such fiscal year from the revolving fund established by such section 4(c) for the exercise of its functions under this Act."

SEC. 4. The first sentence of section 303(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "To encourage the formation and growth of small business investment companies, the Administration is authorized to lend funds to such companies through the purchase of their obligations which shall bear interest at a rate (with respect to obligations purchased during any fiscal year) equal to one-half of 1 per centum plus the rate charged the Administration, under the last sentence of section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, for funds obtained during such fiscal year from the revolving fund established by such section 4(c) for the exercise of its functions under this Act, and which shall contain such other terms as the Administration may fix."

SEC. 5. Section 304 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"PROVISION OF EQUITY CAPITAL FOR SMALL-BUSINESS CONCERNS

"SEC. 304. (a) It shall be a primary function of each small business investment company to provide a source of equity capital for incorporated small-business concerns in such manner and under such terms as the small business investment company may fix with the approval, by regulation or otherwise, of the Administration: *Provided,* That if a company obtains stock in a small-business concern in exchange for equity capital either by direct purchase, conversion of debentures, exercise of stock options, or other means, the terms of the transaction shall include a repurchase provision whereby the small-business concern shall have the right to repurchase such stock from the company at the option of the small-business concern as long as the stock is held by or remains in the control of the company. The repurchase price shall be the sound book value of the stock, determined at the time of the exercise of the repurchase option.

"(b) Before any capital is provided to a small-business concern under this section—

"(1) the company may require such concern to refinance any or all of its outstanding indebtedness so that the company is the only holder of any evidence of indebtedness of such concern; and

"(2) except as provided in regulations issued by the Administration, such concern shall agree that it will not thereafter incur any additional indebtedness, except interim or short term indebtedness, without first securing the approval of the company and giving the company the first opportunity to finance such indebtedness.

"(c) Whenever a company provides capital to a small-business concern under this section, such concern shall be given the opportunity to become a stockholder-proprietor of the company by investing in the capital stock of the company in an amount equal to not less than 2 percent nor more than 5 percent of the amount of the capital so provided, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administration."

SEC. 6. Section 305(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "Each" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "It shall also be a primary function of each small business investment company to make loans to small-business concerns and each".

SEC. 7. Section 307(c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Section 3(c)(3) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-3) is amended by inserting 'small business investment company,' after 'homestead association,'."

The Paul Barton Report: Forced Labor in the U.S.S.R. Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD T. FLYNN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent Soviet visitors to our country and their good will tours of all segments of American industry, I feel that this report is must reading for every Member of Congress—lest we forget for one instant the essential difference between what these delegates say to our leaders, our statesmen, and our workers—and the actual conditions which they encourage and perpetrate.

The so-called corrective labor institutions, the concentration camps of the U.S.S.R., should remind us, in the face of Russian protestations, of the dreadful human cost of their factory productivity and their slave labor work camp efficiency—a forced labor work capacity geared solely to the life spans of unfortunate men, women, and children.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an article appearing in the AFL–CIO Free Trade Union News of July 1959:

FORCED LABOR IN THE U.S.S.R. TODAY

(By Paul Barton)

On Sunday evening, May 17, 1959, Radio Moscow broadcast the message addressed to the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by the participants in an important conference which had gathered together a large number of state security officers, in the presence of representatives of the government and of the party. The following is a significant excerpt from that message:

"The 21st Congress of the Communist Party fully defined the role and the position of state security in the Soviet state, as well as the tasks which it is to carry out in the political service of the Communist Party. The resolutions of the congress emphasized the need for a continued reinforcement of the state security services. The congress also specified that numerous Government functions are gradually to be transferred to the jurisdiction of social organizations and that the repressive functions of the state are gradually to be reduced. We fully realize, however, that the reduction of repression in our country does not in the least mean that we shall have less to do or the machinations of our enemies will decline."

LEGEND SHATTERED

It would be difficult to imagine a more shattering contradiction of official propaganda which, especially with the help of credulous foreign visitors, would like to make the outside world believe that the horrors of the Stalin era belong to an irrevocable past. And since, by being constantly repeated, this legend becomes increasingly widespread, we should be grateful to the officials of the political police for having drawn up their message to central committee in such characteristically clear and straightforward language.

This is not the first time that the lies of the Soviet Government, so obligingly repeated by some Western experts and tourists, have been shattered by its own servants. In

fact, the same thing happens each time when experts in the subject of repression begin to discuss the problems of their trade.

For example, there has been a great deal of talk about the so-called reform in the carrying out of the penalty of deprivation of liberty: In the prisons and camps, it has been claimed, attempts would henceforth be made to "reeducate" the detainees rather than punish them. But B. S. Utevski, one of the Soviet experts best qualified in this sphere and the author of a handbook which was an authority in the thirties, "The Soviet Policy of Corrective Labor," Moscow, 1935, simply states that there is no such thing. This is what he writes in his article "Fundamental Problems of Soviet Legal Theory Relating to Corrective Labor," published in the review Soviet State and Law, in March 1957:

"Even the consequent carrying out of the task of reeducating the convicts does not mean that the task of punishment disappears from the work of corrective labor institutions. * * * The very fact of seeing any contradiction between punishment and education constitutes on error."

Utevski returned to this theme in a report which he presented to a conference on the corrective labor law, which assembled in Moscow in May 1957 and of which the same review published a detailed report in its December 1957 issue. And it is by no means Utevski's personal opinion only. Other experts who took part in this conference expressed an identical point of view. The following is an excerpt from the report:

"G. Z. Anashkin, S. S. Studenikin, and B. S. Nikiforov emphasized in their contributions the idea according to which the task of reeducating the prisoners should play the principal part. The proposal was made that during the first period of their punishment, the various categories of criminals should be obliged to perform heavy manual labor, and should then, at the end of a specified period, be transferred to more skilled work. * * * B. S. Nikiforov showed that in the work of the corrective labor institutions there are always present, independently of the character of these institutions, certain elements of punishment which achieve the educational aim only in the last resort and particularly by means of coercion. * * * B. S. Niriforov emphasized, in this connection, that there is no question of opposing the penalty to punishment, but of determining the significance and the position to be accorded to the latter which is, like education, one of the elements of the penalty."

Thus although some of the policies of A. Y. Vyshinski, the infamous prosecutor in the witchcraft trials, have been treated with reserve for some time, his doctrine that education is best practiced through punishment and that, consequently, the more severe the punishment, the more effective is the education, are fully maintained.

DECREE NEVER PUBLISHED

Another example: official propaganda has often spoken of the government's resolution, dated October 25, 1956, finally to do away with the concentration camps and to replace them by two systems of detention: prisons and corrective labor colonies; in pursuance of the same decision, prisoners would, henceforth, be confined within the district in which they normally lived, instead of being deported to distant areas.

No decree containing provisions of this kind has ever been published in the Soviet Union. Former inmates of the camps of Vorkuta, Inta, and Potma, whom I questioned on this matter after their repartiation in the West, had never heard of a transformation of the concentration camps in which they were imprisoned into corrective labor colonies; and some of them were still in the camps in autumn 1957, that is, a year after the alleged reform was adopted.

Still more important, the report of the conference of May 1957 once more provides proof to the contrary. The Minister of the Interior declared at the conference that, since the number of "corrective labor institutions" had diminished, "more favorable conditions have thus been created for an effective control of the distant institutions." There is thus no question, for the minister in charge, of liquidating the great complexes of camps set up in various God-forsaken places, at Kolyma, Norilsk, Vorkuta, and elsewhere, but only of organizing matters in such a way that they should cease to be states within a state, escaping more or less from the authority of Moscow.

Furthermore, certain participants in this conference specified that the term "corrective labor institutions" means prisons, camps, and colonies. This is what the report has to say about it:

"The speakers maintained that the steps taken by the party and by the government to improve the work of the institutions within the jurisdiction of the Ministry of the Interior have contributed in many ways to the consolidation of socialist legality in the work of these institutions and especially in that of the corrective labor camps and colonies."

And further:

"Considerable attention has been paid to the system of detention in the prisons and the practice of transferring the inmates of corrective labor camps and colonies to prisons, and vice versa."

SENT TO DETENTION CAMPS

Moreover, since the supposed abolition of all such camps, a certain number of verdicts sentencing the accused to detention in a camp, have been reported in the Soviet provincial press, for example in Bakinski Rabochi for November 14, 1956, Zarya Vostoka for December 2, 1956, Pravda Vostoka for February 24, 1957, Turkmenskaya Pravda for April 14, June 11, June 25, July 17, and July 24, 1957.

There is certainly no question of denying that the concentration camps and forced labor have undergone important changes in the last few years, and especially since the strikes and uprising in the years 1953–55. But it is necessary first of all to clear away the confusion created by official propaganda and by naive observers, and to state the basic fact that camps and forced labor still exist in the Soviet Union. For only on this basis is it possible to understand the changes of these last few years.

In the last 10 years or so, the Soviet forced labor system has been going through a serious crisis. A glance at the data concerning the population of the country will suggest the reason for this. In 1940, the U.S.S.R. had between 193 and 196 million inhabitants. Under normal conditions, it should by now have had more than 250 million. But the census carried out last January showed less than 209 million (Izvestia, May 10, 1959). The 200 million mark was not reached until spring 1956.

The loss of some 40 million inhabitants which these figures reveal cannot be wholly attributed to military casualties or to the low birth rate during the war years. Mass deportations have also played an important part in bringing about this situation.

This is demonstrated most clearly by the data relating to the numerical disproportion of the two sexes, which is very serious even when one considers the country as a whole.

According to the census of last January, the total number of women exceeds that of men by 20 million. But this figure is trifling in comparison with Naum Jasny's estimates, based solely on official data. In 1955, there were, in the kolkhozes (collective farms), only 3 adult men to every 10 adult women; so that, perhaps for the first time in human history, the birth rate is, at present, lower in rural areas than in cities.

On the other hand, in the vast regions covered by enormous concentration camp complexes and peopled mainly by convicts and ex-convicts, there is a disastrous lack of women. For example, in the town of Norilsk, which forms the center of one such complex at the western extremity of eastern Siberia, the Japanese prisoners have collected, with admirable patience, all the data which it was possible to obtain. From this it appears that the numerical proportion of the sexes there was eight men to one woman.

In the face of so alarming a demographical situation, it was no longer possible to carry on the mass deportations at the same rate without causing irreparable damage to the national economy. After having drawn abundantly on the reserves represented by the satellite countries, the authorities, around 1950–51, were forced to recognize the fact that the sources of recruitment for the camps had dried up and that it was necessary, henceforth to make more efficient the exploitation of those prisoners who were already available.

It was at last realized that the use made hitherto of the prisoners was not only inhuman but also uneconomic. By way of illustration, we cite the Vorkuta conditions where there was one dead per sleeper in the construction of the railway; in the mines, there were two dead per every meter sunk in depth.

The first steps toward greater efficiency aimed at a reduction of the death rate. Common-law prisoners were separated from political prisoners and subjected to less harsh conditions; food, clothes and medical services were gradually improved; the enterprises attached to the camps, which had always worked with the most primitive installations and tools possible began to get better equipment. Beginning with the summer of 1953, they were transferred from the authority of the MVD and entrusted to specialized economic ministries (mines, nonferrous metals, forest exploitation, etc.).

As the capital invested in these enterprises increased, the employment of physically unfit men and the generally low output of the prisoners' work became increasingly more burdensome economically. The release of invalids, the stimulation of productivity by offering inmates the hope of release before completion of their sentence, and the transformation of as many prisoners as possible into deportees became increasingly urgent. It is, however, typical that the government did not decide to adopt these reforms—desirable from a strictly economic point of view—until the prisoners extorted it from them in a bitter struggle, through the strikes and uprisings which had broken out in the camps beginning in the spring 1953.

What is the status of the concentration camps and of forced labor following these reforms? The total number of prisoners has decreased considerably. But the overwhelming majority of those who have been released from the camps have not become free citizens (if this term can be applied to any of the inhabitants of the Soviet Union); they are obliged to remain in the district where they were imprisoned and to continue to work in the same enterprises as before. Thus, what has happened in most cases was merely a transfer from one category of forced labor to another.

The decrease of actual prisoners in the camps varies from district to district. Very marked in the western part of the U.S.S.R., it grows less so as one travels eastward. The Japanese repatriated from Kolyma at the end of 1956 estimate that the number of prisoners in this vast system of camps in

northeastern Siberia has actually remained the same. The fact remains that many prisoners have been transferred from camps in the west to those in the east.

INCREASE OF FORCED LABOR

At the same time, there is an increase of forced labor in the prisons. In 1955, construction was started on a whole series of large new prisons—for example, at Kotlas, at Sverdlovsk, and at Novosibirsk. On the other hand, a report on the well-publicized prison of Butyrki in Moscow, published in Izvestia of September 13, 1956, shows that the prisoners are henceforth obliged to perform forced labor, organized in a way similar to that practiced in the camps. This fact is confirmed in a study by B. S. Utevski, published in the review Soviet State and Law in March 1957. This author also states that the detention in prison should, after the reforms of the camp-system, be inflicted on men who are to be punished with particular severity. This proposal was made into law by the new penal legislation, adopted December 25, 1958.

Finally, there is the extension of forced labor without detention. During 1957, most of the Soviet Republics passed a "law aiming at the intensification of the struggle against antisocial and parasitic elements."

This law authorizes the banishment of a citizen for a period of not less than 2 and not more than 5 years, without any judicial process, by a simple vote of a citizens' meeting—if the verdict thus passed is confirmed by the executive committee of the soviet of the district or of the city.

One can get an idea as to the application of this new law by reading in Pravda Vostoka of July 13, 1957, that a kolkhoznik was condemned to be banished for 5 years for being too preoccupied with his individual garden-plot and for having neglected his compulsory work in the fields of the kolkhoz.

On the whole, the present situation regarding the concentration camps and of forced labor is clear enough. Because of the serious demographic crisis, and in consequence of the prisoners' uprisings, the whole system is gradually falling to pieces.

But the authorities are not, because of present difficulties, losing sight of long-term prospects. While throwing ballast overboard, they do what is necessary to safeguard the essence of the institution throughout this critical period. Thus, they preserve the possibility of developing the institution in another direction, if a more favorable situation should arise.

The Crisis of a Continent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a very timely and interesting address by a leading Mexican statesman, Dr. Exequiel Padilla. Dr. Padilla is a former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mexico and at one time was a candidate for President of Mexico.

Dr. Padilla's views, especially what he has to say about his countrymen whom he knows so well, and Latin American affairs generally with which he is so familiar, should be of considerable interest to us at this time. I commend his address to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to the leaders and policymakers in the administration. The address was delivered on June 25, 1959, at the Lions Club in Mexico City. It is entitled "The Crisis of a Continent," and reads as follows:

THE CRISIS OF A CONTINENT

I am delighted and thankful for this very cordial reception with which the distinguished Lions Club honors me, and for the generous words of my friend Gen. Juan Felipe Rico. His sincere expressions have thrilled me, above all because they come from a great soldier of the Republic. I am also delighted to be in the company of the Ambassadors of our sister Republic.

This continent is passing through a grave crisis of disunity. Nevertheless, the purpose of my discussion is not to deal with pessimistic considerations, but better still, to make certain that the growing disorders, the violences, and the discords have pressed our nations to concentrate in discovering and eradicating the causes which are producing them.

Many times the darkness that surrounds us is but an indication of the coming of dawn. At present, there is one fact of luminous evidence. And that is, that while the tyranny of totalitarianism tries to crush the disquiet of the common man by the use of tanks, machineguns, and cannons, our democratic doctrines answer with attitudes of understanding and justice.

Here, in the West, we have the conferences of Lima, of Caracas, of Buenos Aires, of Washington. There they have Hungary and Tibet bathed in innocent blood. In fact, our international calendar of the Americas is full of conferences, conventions, agreements, and meetings that rapidly unfold in the security of equality and in the respect of the sovereignty of nations. What is most interesting, however, is the passionate participation of our Latin America. Latin America has taken a new step of leadership. Already the propositions and the initiative no longer come solely from the United States. But now, what is most important is the proof that the justified aspirations of our peoples are encountering cordial, decided, and ardent support of the entire continent. The rule and flood of words has ended. We have arrived at a level of accomplishments. We must disarm the subversive minorities, with irrevocable reality. Looking back, is a reactionary and destructive policy. The oracle of wisdom should be to look forward to the future.

If we should search for a dramatic demonstration of the idea that man and multitudes are what they believe and think, we would find no more appropriate one than the convulsive situation of our Latin America. The tragedy of our people is being written from Moscow. And is the bankruptcy of our intelligence so advanced, the capacity of our people and of our statesmen so limited that we do not have the ability to close the door against the powerful Soviet propaganda, that day to day, is poisoning the mind of America? The answer is to urgently mobilize the defensive spirit of our continent.

And the first thing we must understand is that neither Mexico, nor any other country of the world, can live in solitude or isolation. Let us turn our eyes, for a moment, on this Mexico of ours. What is the fundamental problem of Mexico? One day, while I was President of the Congress of the Union, so many years ago I have not the desire to remember the exact date, a group of Congressmen and I presented ourselves to the National Palace to report certain electoral irregularities. President Calles listened to us attentively. I spoke effusively, frequently mentioning the "people" and the "rights of the people." The President interrupted me saying: "The people? What people? We have no people. We are making a people." These are the words of a statesman. Throughout our Revolution, from our agrarian laws that destroyed the feudal system of the large landowners, from our labor laws, from the emancipation of fanaticism, from the education of the masses, from the banking revolution, we have been constructing a country of free men, masters of their own destiny. But in spite of our remarkable positive advances, we have only come half the way. Who of us can ignore the degrading situation of the immense majority of our workers, living on ruinous wages? High salaries are the product of modern technology; the worker today, thanks to machinery, produces twice of that which he produced in 1939. It is only fair and just, then, that the worker should share in the benefits of modern industrial techniques. But, this does not happen among us. Our incipient industrialization can scarcely absorb a small part of our population. Lacking industries, capital, investments, techniques, and economic virility we can only count on a phantom market because of the lack of purchasing power on the part of the masses. And who of us can ignore the tragedy of our peons? Our farmers, disillusioned, ill-fed, fight an uneven battle with the indomitable earth; they need machines, fertilizers, insurance, disinfectants, credits, education; and because they do not have these things, they wander through our national and even foreign paths in search of opportunities for work, or they stay and vegetate in their little parcel of land, forever beaten by an impious hierarchy of entrepreneurs and iniquitous agents who exploit them.

We have had and we still have patriotic statesmen, but all their efforts crash on the poverty that gnaws at the entrails of Mexico.

Let us consider for a moment the prices obtained for our exportable products. Neither the investment, nor the technique, nor the loans could serve us greatly if the products created are to be sold at prices of enslavement. With good reason our Government and the governments of Latin America strive tirelessly for just prices. It is a fact that we have received gigantic investments in the course of our history. In the period of 15 years after the war, tourism alone—not counting loans, nor foreign investments, nor money brought back by braceros—tourism alone has given us an average of $200 million annually, that is to say, $3 billion totally or 40 billion pesos. This figure is about equal to the value of our total national industrialization. But has the lot of the real Mexican people been improved by this? Certainly not. These enormous incomes have contributed to build for a minority some fabulous incomes whose privileges constantly menace the security of the Republic. And our people continue their way in the same heartbreaking poverty, with the ruinous prices and slave wages.

We must then, insist that the United States, which is our principal buyer and our natural ally in continental prosperity, in the same spirit of justice with which its masses of workers have found remunerative prices for their productions, cooperate cordially in the effort to find a formula, difficult but by no means impossible, for prices that will guarantee to Latin America a level of income worthy of the liberty of America. The enlightened opinion of the United States will not accept to purchase advantages for its economy at the price of permanent misery of the Latin American masses. Solidarity is not a vain word.

But how can we speak this language of justice in this and our other vital problems from a platform of provocation, animosity, and discord? That would be to ignore human nature.

Let us look reality face to face: All of our great problems stem from the lack of money and we lack the necessary resources and

the indispensable basis for a just economic interdependence. To erase the miseries of the people there is no substitute for the cordial union of the material and spiritual resources of the two Americas. Otherwise, our nations will continue living in a gloomy and vicious circle of misery, disquiet, subversion, and dictatorship.

The threats surround the people like an ever-increasing tide. It is then, the time now for true patriotism, which does not consist of sterile, arrogant, or suicidal attitudes but with decision to confront realities with a worthy and constructive spirit and to guard the vast horizons of the future generations.

The present-day examples are marvelous. Let us look at Germany: Where would this great nation be if it would have lived these last years only remembering the destruction, the ruin, and the sorrow of its homes caused by the allied bombardments during the war? Far from such an attitude of paralysis, Germany only thought of the new generations that had to be saved, in the rehabilitation of its forces and of its spirit, and moved to make a strong friendship with its victors. And Japan? Hiroshima and Nagasaki still maintain their horrible imprints and there are still living beings with the scars of their disasters. Japan has not nurtured in its torn heart a sterile hate. But like Germany, rising above resentment and the dark clamor for vengeance, it has sealed a friendship with its enemy of yesterday. And both, Germany and Japan, have risen above the ashes, have given the world a wonderful example of recuperation and their new generations march with a high heart, defying destiny.

We have other dramatic examples: France and England have maintained a traditional enmity for years. During the war De Gaulle bitterly complained of the unjust advantage England took of a wounded France. And you remember Winston Churchill, declaring with his marvelous ingenuity, that "of all the crosses that bowed him down none weighed as much as the Cross of Lorraine"? Well then, only a few months ago many could have contemplated the tearful eyes of Churchill, when at the Hotel Martignon in Paris, the President of France put on the breast of the glorious ex-Prime Minister of Great Britain the Cross of Liberation. And, also only a few months past in the little French City of Colombay, two men were found together: De Gaulle and Adenauer cancelling in an embrace of friendship the hate that had existed and appeared inextinguishable in the hearts of their nations since 1870.

Now then, we too have difficult compromises to make: the one, is to save the generations that follow us from a future full of darkness and shadows. We recall that annually 400,000 citizens leave our country to look for work. While each night—tonight—millions of children are trying to sleep and appease their hunger, and each year 900,000 new human beings in a growing proportion present themselves at the table where the fatherland cannot serve them a confident subsistence. And, this is happening to a glorious race, of proven civilized power, to the builders of the pyramids of Chi Chen Itza, to the creators of the colonial art, to the Mexicans who have made in 1910 a just revolution, before which, no other people of this earth had attempted.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, we must not forget that America has the duty to cooperate in this dramatic fight to free the world, to make liberty triumph over tyranny. Latin America cannot abandon to its adversary, the citadel of its great destinies.

Anti-Americanism in Canal Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is a rising tide of anti-Americanism beating against our Isthmian lifeline in the Canal Zone.

Panamanian politicians are now renewing their threats to "take the United States before an international tribunal"—The Hague or the United Nations. One of their currently re-avowed objectives is to have set aside, as allegedly "contrary to international law," that part of the 1903 treaty which established "in perpetuity" American rights in the Panama Canal Zone. The long-range aim of these agitators is "nationalization by the Republic of Panama" of the U.S.-built and U.S.-owned Panama Canal. Pending such expropriation, they clamor for another vast increase in the annuity paid by the United States to Panama, now $1,930,000.

Two of the most vocal Panamanian politicos have this month publicly proclaimed a plan to stage on Panama's next Independence Day, November 3, another riotous flag-planting in our Canal Zone. They called their 1958 invasion of our Canal Zone "Operation Sovereignty."

Day-to-day developments at the Isthmus now re-emphasize the need for broader public knowledge within the United States of the forgotten, and to a large extent never told, history of our rights and obligations at Panama.

One brief, informative summary has come to my special attention. It is from a constituent in Brooklyn, the widow of my late friend John F. Stevens, Jr., whose distinguished father, as Chief Engineer, was the "basic architect" of the Panama Canal.

The book review which I am calling to your attention says that "as Latin American Communist danger mounts, an understanding of the American position in threatened Panama becomes imperative." With this I agree; and so I am including in extension of my remarks the following complete text from the book review section of the August, 1959 issue of the American Mercury:

WILL PANAMA BE NEXT?

(By John Lines)

With the grave current news from Panama shouting at us from the headlines, this background book comes with unusual timeliness.

Mr. Harding has been a close observer of Panama events for over 50 years. In 1908, while on the editorial staff of the old New York World, he was given the assignment to secure the facts concerning alleged misuse of money in the involved intrigues which preceded the setting up of the Republic of Panama. He uncovered a sordid story, pointing the finger of guilt at William Nelson Cromwell, the legal counsel for the French company which originally attempted to build the canal. The story cast a serious reflection upon some of the decisions of President Theodore Roosevelt.

Joseph Pulitzer, publisher of the World, published the story. Its repercussions were serious. In the final weeks of his administration, President Roosevelt was instrumental in securing a criminal libel indictment against Joseph Pulitzer, as well as against the editor and publisher of the Indianapolis News, which had reprinted the story. The indictments came to nought, but in defending himself, Pulitzer opened the lid on the closely guarded story of a group of top American financiers who had profited richly from the $40 million which the United States paid to the bankrupt French company which sold its canal rights to us. The list included J. P. Morgan & Co., James Stillman, I. Seligman, Clarence H. Mackay, Douglas Robinson, Senator Chauncey H. Depew, H. H. Rogers, and others.

The story of Mr. Harding's search for the real Panama story a half century ago is still a thriller. We will not spoil it for the reader by disclosing where some of the trails led him.

In the intervening years, Mr. Harding has continued to watch the Panama situation with an alert eye. Today, he sees enemies of America's basic interests scheming to bring about internationalization of the canal. He is equally opposed to the current billion-studded proposal to convert the canal into a sea-level passage.

As the Latin American Communist danger mounts, an understanding of the American position in threatened Panama becomes imperative. Mr. Harding's book, with its hitherto untold history of the secret forces which have shaped events on the isthmus, is a valuable addition to our source material. It answers many questions which have hitherto baffled Americans.

John Nance Garner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE M. KILGORE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, my illustrious predecessor in the Congress, John Nance Garner, will celebrate his 91st birthday on November 22 this year.

The Texas Legislature paid homage to this outstanding Texan by a resolution. As the third Representative the 15th District of Texas has had since John Nance Garner's retirement from this office in 1932 to serve as Vice President of the United States, I am privileged to have the opportunity to insert the language of Texas Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 9 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the Nation may see what the Texas Legislature has to say about our State's senior leading citizen.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

Whereas John Nance Garner is the only man in American history who presided in uninterrupted succession over both Houses of the Congress, first as Speaker of the House of Representatives, 1931–33, and as Vice President of the United States, 1933–41; and

Whereas this distinguished Texan, born in a humble cabin in Red River County on November 22, 1868, 3 years after the close of the War Between the States, and deprived of the advantages of formal education, removed to Uvalde County, became a self-taught lawyer and held his first public office in 1893 as county judge of Uvalde County; and

Whereas John Nance Garner was elected to the Texas House of Representatives in 1898, and beginning in 1903 he served 30 years as U.S. Representative from the 15th Congressional District of Texas; and

Whereas in 1932 the people of the United States, on the basis of his achievements in national affairs, elected him to the office of Vice President; and

Whereas in addition to his other public duties, Mr. Garner has made great contributions to the preservation of the Texas heritage, having served as chairman of the U.S. Texas Centennial Commission and assisted in founding the University of Texas Memorial Museum; and

Whereas after serving as a leading American statesman for half a century, John Nance Garner has become a legend in the legendary Lone Star State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the State of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That we join with his friends and admirers throughout Texas, the Nation, and the World in extending our grateful salute and best wishes to Mr. Garner, private citizen, now in noble retirement at his home in Uvalde as he approaches his 91st birthday.

Hardeman; Crump; Aikin; Baker; Bradshaw; Colson; Dies; Fly; Fuller; Gonzalez; Hazlewood; Herring; Hudson; Kazen; Krueger; Lane; Martin; Moffett; Moore; Owen; Parkhouse; Phillips; Ratliff; Reagon; Roberts; Rogers; Secrest; Smith; Weinert; Willis; Wood; Lieutenant Governor Ramsey.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.
WAGGONER CARR,
Speaker of the House.

Dispute Over Moscow Exhibit Points Up Need for U.S. Arts Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the conflicting views of President Eisenhower and some of his fellow artists as to the kind of paintings the United States should exhibit in Moscow, U.S.S.R., focuses new attention on the importance of establishing a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, and, indeed, on the touchy question of the relation of the Federal Government to the arts.

This is the conclusion of Thomas W. Ottenad, Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. He finds, in an excellent and comprehensive article published in that newspaper on July 19, 1959, that—

There is a surprising amount of support for the view that the time has come for the Government to take a hand in efforts to raise the artistic and general cultural level of American society.

Among those supporting this view are: Mr. Eisenhower, an amateur Sunday-type painter whose taste in art tends to the classic and photographic; Nelson A. Rockefeller, a bountiful patron of the arts; Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, who is scarcely ever on the same side of a political fence as the President or Rockefeller; Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, an advocate of culture by legislation; Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming, and nearly every major artistic organization in the Nation.

I am very happy to be in this company on this issue. In fact, I am very happy to have had my bill, H.R. 7656, to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, favorably and unanimously reported by the Special Education Subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] on June 10, 1959. Everyone seriously concerned with the cultural status of our country is deeply indebted to the members of this subcommittee for their devoted and painstaking work in this field. Due to their efforts this legislation, which has been before the Congress since early in 1955, will likely become law in this 86th Congress.

As to the Moscow Fair, and the art we display there, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and I have declared that if we are going to have a cultural exchange program with the U.S.S.R. and other countries then let us conduct it in an orderly, logical and mature fashion—in a way that will gain for our Nation the respect of artists and intellectuals throughout the world, rather than subject us to ridicule.

It does little good to appropriate substantial sums of money for State Department and U.S. Information Agency programs of cultural exchange if the advantages of these programs are to be thrown away by hasty and thoughtless comments by high public officials.

Legislation to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts which Senator HUMPHREY and I have sponsored would, if enacted into law, create a vehicle to channel into governmental policy on the arts the balanced and mature judgment of many distinguished educators, artists and supporters of cultural activities throughout our Nation—judgment which would tend to keep our country free of the scourge of "foot-in-mouth-disease" insofar as art and cultural activities are concerned.

I include here the text of my press release pointing up the need for a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, as well as the article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch to which I have referred.

CITE PRESIDENTIAL COMMENT ON ART AS ARGUMENT FOR FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat of New Jersey, said today that President Eisenhower's recent statement on the American art exhibit going to Moscow is "an example of why we ought to have a Federal advisory council on the arts."

The coauthors of the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 termed the President's remarks at his last press conference (that in the future he would see to it that Government art juries would include one or two people who know what America likes) most unfortunate.

"If we are going to have a cultural exchange program with the U.S.S.R. and other countries," they pointed out, "then let us conduct it in an orderly, logical, and mature fashion; in a way that will gain for our Nation the respect of artists and intellectuals throughout the world, rather than subject us to ridicule."

"It does little good," they said, "to appropriate substantial sums of money for State Department and U.S. Information Agency programs of cultural exchange if the advantages of these programs are to be thrown away by hasty and thoughtless comments by high public officials."

The two Democrats have introduced legislation in the House and Senate this year which would create a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts—legislation which was favorably reported by a Special Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee on June 10.

"Such legislation," they said, "would create a vehicle to channel into governmental policy on the arts the balanced and mature judgment of many distinguished educators, artists, and supporters of cultural activities throughout our Nation—judgment which would tend to keep our country free of the scourge of 'foot-and-mouth' disease insofar as art and cultural activities are concerned."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, July 19, 1959]

DISPUTE OVER MOSCOW EXHIBIT STIRS HOPE FOR U.S. ART BODY—SOME FEEL THAT FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL WOULD HAVE PREVENTED TROUBLE OVER SELECTION OF PAINTINGS

(By Thomas W. Ottenad)

WASHINGTON, July 18.—The conflicting views of President Eisenhower and some of his fellow artists as to the kind of paintings the United States should exhibit in Moscow focus new attention on the touchy question of the relation of the Federal Government to the arts.

There is a surprising amount of support for the view that the time has come for Government to take a hand in efforts to raise the artistic and general cultural level of American society.

Among those supporting this view are: Mr. Eisenhower, an amateur Sunday-type painter whose taste in art tends to the classic and photographic; Nelson A. Rockefeller, a bountiful patron of the arts; Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, who is scarcely ever on the same side of a political fence as the President or Rockefeller; Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, an advocate of culture by legislation; Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming, and nearly every major artistic organization in the Nation.

To a man, they all favor bills pending in Congress to create a new Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. The council would have two major purposes: to suggest ways for increasing interest and participation in the creative arts and to advise other Government agencies on artistic matters.

The council's powers, while broad in scope, would be advisory only. It would have no authority to hire artists, commission works or conduct competitions. Cost is expected to be nominal at first, perhaps no more than $50,000 a year.

It could open the door eventually to Federal financial support for the arts, a highly controversial proposal that has failed repeatedly in the past.

HUMPHREY and THOMPSON, cosponsors of the pending legislation, feel that the still-smouldering dispute over the Moscow exhibit might have been prevented if the pro-

posed advisory council had been in existence. It would have provided "the balanced judgment which would keep our country from continually getting in hot water where the arts are concerned," they said in a joint statement.

The dispute over the Moscow exhibit arose after Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, charged that half of the artists whose works were selected for the exhibition have records of affiliation with Communist fronts and causes. The committee then conducted hearings on the matter.

When Mr. Eisenhower was questioned about the controversy at a press conference, he said he would not censor works selected for the exhibit, but might take a hand in similar undertakings in the future.

He described one of the works to be exhibited, a somewhat unflattering portrayal of an Army general, as a lampoon rather than a serious work of art. Those who had selected the paintings defended their choices, but later several paintings traditional in style were added to the exhibit. The explanation was that they were intended to give balance to the exhibit.

The pending legislation has had a strong bipartisan background. Rockefeller, a potential candidate for the Republican nomination for President next year, is credited by some people with initiating his party's interest in the subject.

Rockefeller helped draft legislation of the type now pending when he was an Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It was he who interested Mr. Eisenhower in the matter.

The President first proposed creation of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts in his state of the Union message in 1955. He told Congress at that time:

"In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities."

Despite the President's support, the plan did not get very far. In 1956 a bill embodying his proposal was passed by the Senate, but it died in the House. In 1957 a similar measure failed to get out of committee.

This time supporters of the plan think they have a better chance.

"Prospects for the bill are better than ever before," remarked Representative THOMPSON. "Chances are excellent that the bill will be enacted."

He explained that there is no substantial opposition to the measure and added: "Furthermore, the idea of voting for Federal action in cultural fields has become more widely accepted than it was in previous years."

The need for Government action was stressed by Secretary Flemming recently at hearings by the House subcommittee on special education.

Asserting that there is "inadequate recognition of the fundamental importance of artistic endeavor in our national life," Flemming pointed out:

"Our Nation has a rich tradition of achievement in the arts. We take justifiable pride in our great museums, art galleries, and orchestras.

"Yet millions of Americans know painting and sculpture only in reproductions and hear great music only by recordings. We are proud of the creative vitality of our theater, yet living theater is never seen in vast areas of our Nation."

The projected Federal council would seek ways to remedy these deficiencies, Flemming noted, adding that increased development of cultural and artistic interests "serves a dual purpose in that it contributes to the well-being of the individual by developing his creative abilities and, at the same time, it enables the individual to further enrich our civilization."

Artistic organizations strongly endorsed the pending legislation. Elihu Winer, secretary of the National Council on the Arts and Government, an organization with members in all fields of the arts, told the House subcommittee that artists want the Government to give simple recognition to the contributions they have made to American life.

"Art, like anything else," he warned, "flourishes best when its worth is recognized and its practitioners encouraged. It is false to assume that great art can only be created in adversity.

"Individual works of art may be created under adverse circumstances, but it is a fair assumption that these are created despite, rather than because of, circumstances."

Only a scattering of artists has expressed opposition to the proposed legislation. They have voiced concern that governmental activity might infringe on their artistic freedom or lead to socialized art.

The pending legislation would throw the weight and influence of the Federal Government into the fight that a few, dedicated private citizens and philanthropic organizations have been waging to improve the cultural tone of American society.

The proposed Advisory Council is charged with making studies and proposing methods "to maintain and increase the cultural resources" of the United States and to encourage "creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts and participation in and appreciation of the arts." One of its primary objectives would be to seek ways of expanding "private initiative" in the arts and of bringing about cooperation of private interests with local, State, and Federal agencies in cultural programs.

Recommendations by the Council would go to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for comment and transmittal to the President.

Composed of 21 members appointed by the President, the Council would be assisted by an executive secretary and could call on experts for additional aid. Council members are to have broad knowledge, experience or interest in one art field or more. Major art categories listed by the bill include radio, television, and various crafts along with painting, music, literature, and other traditional art forms. The Council membership is to provide an appropriate balance of representation among these fields.

Some supporters of the pending bill hope that eventually the Council will propose a program of Federal aid to the arts. With the weight of the Council behind it, they feel it may be possible to overcome Congress' usual antipathy to art subsidies.

About the only time the Federal Government has given direct assistance to the arts was during the depression years of the 1930's, but the purpose then was relief rather than art. Congress has denied to artists the subsidy assistance it has given to farmers, railroads, airlines, shipbuilders, and other elements of the American economy.

While Federal activity in the field of the arts has increased markedly in the last decade, the United States still lags far behind many European countries in assisting cultural activities. Emphasizing the importance of expanded artistic and cultural programs, THOMPSON remarked:

"It is certainly true that civilizations are remembered as much for their contributions to the fine arts, to literature, to painting, to sculpture, and by their architecture as they are by the battles which have reshaped the course of human history."

Senior Citizens Annual Outing at Salem Willows, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my remarks as the principal guest speaker at the annual outing of the Senior Citizens and Associates of America, Salem Willows, Mass., on July 19, 1959. Among the other speakers were Charles C. O'Donnell, president and legislative director of the Senior Citizens and Associates of America; State Representative Michael J. Carroll, of Lynn; and Attorney John J. Tobin, counsel for the Senior Citizens.

My remarks at the outing follow:

Greetings: Although I am neither a teenager nor a senior citizen, I am reminded that the one becomes the other in the course of a long and productive life.

Many of the young people who are enjoying themselves at the beach today have started on jobs that are building social security accounts that will provide for them in their old age.

Perhaps some of them will look back across the milestones to this day, and be grateful for your determination to broaden and strengthen our national old-age pension system.

You worked hard during the many active years of your lives to develop our Nation and its wealth, and to love and care for your children until they grew up and were able to support themselves.

Now it is their turn to help you through the group effort that we call social security.

Eventually, when this program is complete, workers and employers, and the Government which represents all, will cooperate to provide a comprehensive plan of benefits to all retired Americans.

But that program is not complete today.

Social security itself is in the process of growing up.

Born in 1935, it is only 24 years old, and it has much to learn, and to accomplish before it reaches full maturity.

The United States was the last of the established nations to recognize the need to provide for the wants of our elder citizens in their retirement.

We started off cautiously, on the basis of old age and survivors or old age assistance checks sent each month to those who were 65 or older.

But as the cost of living increased we found that upward adjustments of the benefits rates were required, even before we could improve on the program.

With progress in public health, and medical science, and in nutritional values the life span of our people is steadily increasing.

Experience in the field of social security revealed serious deficiencies.

We discovered that the monthly checks, such as they were, did not solve the whole problem.

There were other needs, such as proper housing for the aged and provision for hospital, medical, and nursing home care, that were overlooked in the beginning.

Since your able and faithful president, Charlie O'Donnell, first organized the Senior Citizens and Associates of America, retired Americans have been campaigning for

a national old-age pension. This would be at the rate of $150 per month to insure a decent and comfortable standard of living at today's prices.

The aging veterans of World War I are seeking a pension at the same level, and with both groups working toward this objective, the prospects are improving for a general pension that will apply to all who reach the eligible age of 65, or possibly, 62.

The increasing number of older people, in proportion to our total population, means that their influence on national policy and legislation will gain in strength year after year.

Meanwhile, however, there are other benefits that can be won before the major goal comes into view.

First among these is the enactment of legislation to provide the elderly with hospital surgical and nursing home care.

This past week I submitted a statement to the House Ways and Means Committee in Washington supporting H.R. 4700. This is Congressman FORAND'S bill to amend the Social Security Act by adding health insurance to the benefits.

If, and when, this bill passes, it will mean that 60 days of hospitalization will be given in any 12-month period to those eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits. The cost will be paid from the Federal OASI Trust Fund to the hospital, physician, and nursing home which provides the services.

A duly qualified physician or dentist must verify that such hospitalization is medically necessary. Such referral shall not be required in an emergency where delay would be impractical. Where surgery may be needed, the individual may freely select the surgeon of his choice.

If the patient is transferred to a nursing home from a hospital, and if the services are for an illness or condition associated with that for which he received hospital services, an additional 60 days of nursing home care will be paid for from the Insurance Trust Fund. In no case shall the combined total exceed 120 days in any 12-month period.

This would cover those persons now receiving benefits, as well as those who would be eligible if they applied.

This proposed plan of health benefits would be of great assistance to aged persons, and to widowed mothers of young children who now have difficulty in acquiring private insurance, and are too often crushed by the expense of illness.

Social security is not doing the job when it forces many of its so-called beneficiaries to seek public assistance with its degrading means test and when it fails to provide for hospital and surgical care.

The Consumers League of New York reports that over 1,600,000 residents of that State are 65 years of age and older. More than 900,000 of them are currently receiving OASI benefits. Too large a proportion of these retired citizens must apply for public relief to supplement their undernourished checks, even when these combine OASI payments and other private retirement benefits.

The league found that the relief costs to New York State can be reduced and much unnecessary suffering for the older citizens can be avoided if the earned retirement benefits of the program are increased so that they are more nearly in keeping with changes in the cost of living which have occurred during the past few years.

This reinforces our contention that a national pension of $150 per month is the only fair solution to this problem.

Even when the Social Security Act was being formulated back in 1935, there was an awareness of the fact that health insurance should be provided in addition to monthly benefit checks.

After 24 years it's about time that we made some progress as a Nation toward filling that void.

The mounting number of the aged in our population, and the steady rise in the cost of medical care, will not permit the national conscience to evade its responsibilities to the older citizens.

As so many people must turn to public relief to meet their daily living requirements, it is apparent that the present system of providing for the aged does not meet their needs, or fulfill the Nation's duty to them.

For most of the aged, private purchase of medical care is impossible.

And this financial problem occurs at a time when the infirmities of age require increased medical attention.

Social security is not only a program to provide for the material needs of the aged. It must ever bear in mind their rights to human dignity.

The aged rightly resent any questions by officials as to the resources of their children. They do not want anyone to contact their sons and daughters, and ask what they can contribute to the support of their parents.

This is a matter of personal pride that should never be violated.

With this in mind, social security, pensions, and health insurance for the aged must be a right to which they are entitled because of the Nation's obligations to them.

Through organizations like the Senior Citizens and Associates of America, the general public is never permitted to forget that so much remains to be done before we develop a social security system that is worthy of the name.

Not every one upon retirement can pack up and move to Florida.

Most of us prefer to live in Massachusetts among the scenes and the people that we know best.

After health insurance for the aged becomes an established fact, Congress will then face the responsibility of providing more special housing units for the aged, where they can enjoy peace and quiet among those who share their interests and their hobbies.

It is a pleasure for me to be a guest at your annual outing.

I wish you every joy at this outdoor social, increased by the knowledge that Congress is working on further improvements to social security legislation. At times, the rate of progress appears to be slow.

But of this you can be sure: Social security is developing.

Thanks to your efforts, it will become a bigger and better program in the not too distant future.

Health insurance is the next forward step in promoting happiness with security for our senior citizens.

Table Rock Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. BROWN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a whole new era is beginning in the picturesque Ozarks. Table Rock Dam is initiating a new growth and development unparalleled in our history; and it could not happen to a finer group of Americans or to a finer, more beautiful areas.

Many words have been spoken in this House about the tourism and recreational values of flood-control projects; but the Table Rock story is a case history that is worthy of study. No one has told this story more vividly than the reporter who wrote about it in the Springfield Leader and Press under the heading "The Table Rock Land Story: She's a Big Ol' Girl."

I include this article in the RECORD today for the consideration of those who are interested in the dollar values of recreational facilities that accompany flood control projects like Table Rock Dam:

THE TABLE ROCK LAND STORY: SHE'S A BIG OL' GIRL

The big boom of Table Rock is on.

From Blue Eye to Branson, Cape Fair to Cassville, Hollister to Hideaway Golden to Gobbler's Mountain, a new era—the Table Rock era—has been born after a gestation period of almost half a century.

And neither the land nor most of its people will ever be the same.

All across its 837 miles of shoreline, sweeping its thousand arms like a friendly monster across the I-told-you-so faces of Barry, Stone, and Taney Counties, Table Rock Lake has become the most talked-about new reservoir in America.

A dozen years and several million dollars from today, it stands a good chance of being one of the most popular.

In the eyes of many, the development so far has been "absolutely fantastic." Early activity certainly has been feverish.

Real estate prices have sky-rocketed; some 50 resorts and numerous recreation areas are currently being carved out of lakeside property; hundreds are buying land for retirement homes or weekend cottages; speculators and promoters have latched on to other desirable tracts with an eye toward the future; complete new towns have been mapped out.

Despite it all, only the surface has been scratched.

"She's a big old girl," said one old timer last week at Cassville. "You come back in 10 years and you wouldn't know where you were."

Everywhere you go in the vast reservoir area, there's talk of a new residential or commercial development, or swank resort. When the lake is full—probably late this year—more of the talk is expected to erupt into the reality of construction.

"Folks are just waiting for the water," is the word over and over again. When the lake finally rises to power pool stage, many will lead you to believe a combination of the Florida land boom and the California gold rush will be on, Ozarks style.

The boom will be there—is there—but in a more subdued manner, other observers allow.

Real estate salesmen, promoters, developers are almost as numerous as the natives. In fact, most of them are natives, some of whom are still sitting on land farmed by their granddaddies and just waiting until the right opportunity—or price—comes along.

Outsiders are flocking in by the hundreds. Wichita residents are buying building lots hand over fist, as are individuals and combines from Kansas City, Oklahoma City, Tulsa, and St. Louis.

Roy Chaffin, Branson real estate broker whose firm probably has handled more Table Rock property than any other company, recently sold lakeside lots to five persons from Caracas, Venezuela.

And a woman now living in Caracas, Mrs. Barnard Houghen, has purchased 176 acres to develop a boys' camp on the Indian Creek arm of the reservoir.

Recent buyers in other areas have included Chicagoans, New Yorkers—and, of course, a great many Springfieldians.

"Outside of Missouri," says Howard Foster, who runs a grocery store at Cape Fair and owns 160 acres near the new Cape Fair boat

dock which he hopes to develop, "I'd say most of the buyers are coming in here from Kansas."

Added another central reservoir resident: "Why, you see more Sedgwick County, Kans. (Wichita), cars here than you do Missouri cars."

What are people paying for their property, a good deal of which still remains undeveloped?

You can pay your money and take your choice.

"Prices," says Leon Fredrick, publisher of the Stone County Republican, at Galena, and a former Springfield and Monett resident, "range from reasonable to ridiculous."

Puts in Means Ray, wily old editor of the Cassville Democrat: "Some of that land—why, you couldn't have got that kind of money for it if you'd scattered gold nuggets on it."

Most real estate people claim prices aren't out of reason—yet.

However, Glenn Hall, Cassville theater owner who has leased the commercial boat dock at Campbell's Point from the city of Cassville, points out that Corps of Engineers officials at Little Rock told him recently that "they'd never seen a lake where land values had increased as they had here."

It's no secret that some of the rocky land, which might have brought $5 to $25 an acre before the $66 million dam was built, is now bringing as much as $2,000 to $3,000 an acre—in large tracts.

Single lots can be bought for anything from $250 to $3,500 each, the higher ones usually offering better roads, easier access to the lake, and sometimes electricity or water.

Earl Hood, who grew up in the Viola area, site of the new central crossing for the reservoir, is one who is selling his land—300 acres of it—in big packages to developers. One tract went for $100 an acre ("I just about give that one away"); and another for $200 an acre.

"Nobody was harder again the dam than I was. We couldn't hardly understand it," Hood says. "It ruined us old boys—our old native way of life is gone—but I've tried to be sensible about it. I'm boosting it now instead of cussin' it. And most of the other boys is, too."

"Besides," he laughs, "I don't give a damn what they do with the land. I bought me a farm up near Cassville."

Actually, one Branson realtor believes the land is harder to sell now than it was a few years back.

He figures it this way: Before the dam was built, land could be sold to speculators who were willing to gamble that there'd eventually be a dam and water in front of the property.

"Now," he says, "we're selling mostly to individuals who want to buy homes or build resorts themselves. They're more conservative with their money, and they don't want to gamble with it. They want to be sure that water is going to be there before they give up their hard-earned cash."

A Cassville man, who has handled scores of transactions involving lake property in the western and central part of the reservoir, believes that only the best bait must be offered before people begin to bite.

"Buyers want water and they want access. By grab," he says, they've got to have good roads if their property is going to move."

Most are happy with the type of development so far. Says Ted Durbin, who runs the Durbin Realty Co. at Cassville and is pushing property in the Shell Knob-Viola area: "We've got some of the finest people coming in here. Real substantial people. And they're planning on building nice homes, too."

Durbin and others agree that a "good lot—one that folks would be happy with" is selling for a minimum of $1,000, with most going for $1,250 to $2,500. Few fishing shacks are going in; most are substantial homes or cottages.

Lyle Chamberlin, whose Hideaway development on the James River arm south of Cape Fair is probably the oldest (13 years) on the new lake, has more expensive lots (up to $3,500), but also is throwing in electricity, water, and roads in the purchase price.

Within a few years, they figure, total investment in reservoir residences and resort property could be $25 to $30 million—possibly even $50 million.

"I certainly don't think all this is a flash in the pan," says investment broker Eiserman.

Adds his partner, Chaffin: "I'd like to live another 20 years just to see how this thing turns out."

There are now 42 homes and weekend cottages in Chamberlin's development, 8 others under construction, 2 motels proposed and a business district laid out.

"Lots aren't moving too well right now," he admits. "The lot season really hasn't opened up yet. And folks are still waiting for the water to come up." Eventually, he hopes to develop Hideaway in an area similar to Rockaway Beach.

You can throw a rock in almost any direction, or from any arm of the giant reservoir, and hit a proposed development. Some of them are fabulous proposals—including hundreds of thousand-dollar lodges, landing strips, private clubs, etc. But only a few actually have homes on them now.

Most of the bigger developments carry colorful names. There's Gobbler's Mountain, Shore Acres, Kimberling Cove, Kimberling Heights, John Q. Hammons' Kimberling Hills, Coombs Ferry, Vista Haven Beach, Valley View Beach, Indian Hills, White Rock Bluff, Coney Island, Trail's End, Sportsmen's Club, Lakeland Addition, W. W. Johnson's Table Rock Heights, Buttermilk Springs, Hideaway, Royle Point, Park Crest, High Dive, Rainbow Shoals, Flying Hoot Owls, Ants Creek Arm, Lakeview Acres, Nichols Heights.

Rainbow Shoals is proposed as a model community of 1,500 homes bordering on White River just below the dam. A group of Kansas City businessmen is developing this tract, although only one home is now under construction.

Other developments are planned in the Eagle Rock, Golden, Shell Knob, Viola and Blue Eye areas, with the Long Creek arm proving to be a popular spot.

In addition to the residential developments, many of which propose shopping centers and a resort area with them, "a world of small resorts is going in," says Bethel Eiserman, a partner of Chaffin's in a Branson development company (Valley View, Vista Haven, with interests also in Rainbow Shoals).

Most activity seems to be centered from the dam down the Long Creek Arm and up around Kimberling Bridge on Route 13. But everywhere on the reservoir, the signs are there: That the boom has started.

Bulldozers are busily scraping off hilltops and carving roads into the development areas. Scores of home are under construction, ranging from fishing shacks of $1,000 or others to sprawling residences costing up to $35,000 and $40,000.

Galena, seat of Stone County (in which about 75 percent of the reservoir lies), is bustling, as are Reeds Spring, Crane, Cape Fair, and other communities.

In a Galena abstract office, two more persons had to be hired, doubling the staff, to take care of the flood of abstracts brought about by land transactions.

"It's just beginning to catch on here," pointed out a Cape Fair resident. "And when it does, it'll really go."

"It's just in its infancy here in Cassville," adds Bob Mitchell, "but activity has picked up a lot in recent months."

Others say, with a twinkle in their eyes, that several people are moving in from such established resort areas as Bull Shoals, Lake Norfolk, and Lake of the Ozarks because of the Table Rock potential.

Courageous Action by Members of Congress Needed To Pass a True Labor Reform Bill

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, labor finds itself in a most peculiar position. In its fight to keep punitive outright antilabor legislation from being passed it finds itself stymied by two significant factors: The charge of the McClellan committee on abuse of power, racketeering, and union leader corruption and the brakes put on normal wage contract negotiations by employees who are getting tough with labor because they feel that the Senate committee and the Kennedy bill have put labor behind the public opinion eight-ball.

This is reflected by the scared to move attitude of a great number of Congressmen. Many of the present Members of Congress, started their political careers as candidates sponsored, endorsed and in some cases, financed by the unions or their political arms, COPE, PAC, or the NPL.

These same Members of Congress find themselves on the proverbial "horns of a dilemma." Do they support labor's opposition to the Kennedy-Ervin Senate passed bill or do they follow the NAM-chamber of commerce lines of "attacking the leaders" and "protecting" the rank and file? They know that the attacks on Hoffa, the Teamster officials by the Senate committee and other racket witnesses is not truly indicative of the normal climate within the ranks of union officials.

They also know that the rank and file can be easily led to believe that, union officials without designating their own particular local and international officers, are crooked and arbitrary, and thus keep the political favor and support of their local area labor groups.

However, it comes down to a basic principle and one that each Member must answer before he votes on labor-reform laws. He must decide whether the bill is one that actually reforms the known evils, or does it, by using reform as a blind, really aim at the destruction of unions as economic as well as political powers.

If it is determined by the majority of the honest and worthy union leaders that the legislation is bad for the future of the labor movement, the politician will have to decide in some cases between loyalty to the union movement which contributed much, in both work, time, and finances to his success or to gamble on the antiunion public opinion of the

moment to insure his own personal success at the polls.

This does not mean that all the votes will be either labor controlled or corporation controlled. There are some Members who will try to do a good and honest job, to evaluate the legislation on its merit and in all probability, this group would decide the issue if labor's friends and enemies stayed in their respective camps.

None of the congressional Members whose allegiance is to the NAM, corporate interests, and chamber of commerce viewpoints, will sway over to labor and give the unions a vote if the legislation is punitive but it looks like a number of labors' friends are ready to walk arm in arm with the group who always opposed labor legislation designed to help labor.

The real answer of course rests in both the House Committee on Education and Labor and the action of Congress as a whole when the bill comes up for a vote.

If an honest effort is made to pass antirackets legislation it should pass overwhelmingly, but if this same antirackets reform bill is made into an antiunion bill, then it should be defeated.

Many of the politicians, especially on the Democratic side, are excusing their lack of courage in the face of this simple issue by saying one of two things; either, "Oh well, I can win without labor," or "I am sorry to do it, it's my first vote against labor, but the people back home demand it and I cannot be elected without the independent voters."

These two statements are heard every day without solicitation. You will note that both statements are made in the interest of the politician with no regard for the interests of labor. Their own elections come first and I guess, that is the right attitude, but one cannot help but think that if this attitude causes bad legislation to be passed, the harm to labor will eventually effect the whole economy, not excluding the weak-livered, spineless politician.

Today labor is on the receiving end of bad publicity, bad public press, and bad public opinion.

Industry has gone through that phase and in the process learned to know its friends, labor will do the same. It will not be too long, if wages freeze or are lowered, if unemployment becomes static for 5 to 7 million production workers, if nonproduction workers find their earning getting lower, if profits continue to soar, if foreign imports keep climbing, and American investors put their money in foreign competitive enterprises, if nonunion workers find out that union efforts benefit them directly in proportion to union contracts, if money becomes tighter and loans more expensive, if all these things happen, on the next swing of the pendulum, the time will come when the "get labor" programs will again become the "get industry" programs.

It is the job of Congress to avert these periodic antisomebody swings. In the interest of present as well as future domestic peace on the labor-management front, this Congress should turn its back on both the hate-labor groups that want to destroy labor as well as the hate-management group that refuses to acknowledge the need for remedial reform legislation in the field of labor laws dealing with racket influences, personal gain and conflict of interests.

Speaking as a Member supported by labor for over 25 years and yet not at odds with management, respecting both the viewpoint of labor as well as industry, I believe the following guide lines should be adhered to:

First. A true reform bill aimed at curing the abuses found, not alone in labor unions, but in almost all other endeavors of a public or semipublic nature.

Second. All union constitutions and bylaws to contain all guarantees as granted by our national Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Third. Give all members the same rights in elections, complaints, right to sue with proper cause and justification union officials with costs of suit to be paid by union if member's case is won in court.

Fourth. Leave all internal handling of union meetings to the locals and any violation of member's constitutional or civil rights to be proper cause for complaint and investigation by the Secretary of Labor and removal of officers found guilty of such behavior.

Fifth. Leave labor-management sections of the Taft-Hartley dealing with picketing, boycotts and hot cargoes within the NLRB and amendments to same to be part of separate legislation.

Sixth. Make reporting of finances, conflicts of interest, and election results mandatory to the Secretary of Labor.

This kind of a bill could pass and stay somewhere within reason as to size, interest and, especially enforcement. Why pass legislation that, as Dean Dugan of the Graduate School of Law, Georgetown University says, "could well create a democracy of minorities in the union hall and anarchy on the building site." The Taft-Hartley Act has been called a "full employment act for lawyers," he continued, but "if this act passes, the cup will runneth over. You'll need a lawyer in front of you, one behind you and one at each side of you every moment of the day."

"What I'm really afraid of," said Mr. Dugan, is the possibility that the bill's complex criminal provisions "will make responsible members of unions afraid to run for office."

Walter Lippmann, well-known columnist, warned that political demagogs had stampeded the Senate. In his view the Kennedy-Ervin bill as it emerged from committee was in no sense a soft or timid affair. Furthermore, "it is not often that a powerful special interest" supports laws to regulate itself and invites public disclosure of its intimate and internal affairs.

"When such an extraordinary thing occurs," continued Mr. Lippmann, "one might fairly expect Congress to seize the opportunity to get the agreement signed, sealed, and ratified."

Responsible labor has supported reform legislation at all stages. However, this is not what happened because on the Senate floor numerous attempts were made to amend the measure, culminating in the McClellan amendment.

It is interesting to note that it only took 4,323 words to make up the Constitution of the United States, but the Kennedy bill requires better than 6,000 words to give labor a so-called constitution for rank and file.

If the Congress wants to create a real issue for the future, let it pass the masquerade bill that came from the Senate. "The Senate through its ill-considered and ill-advised amendments changed the bill into one which we sincerely believe would do grave and irreparable harm to the U.S. trade union movement."

There are forces seeking to capitalize upon the corruption issue and determined to use it as a vehicle for the passage of legislation which would, under the guise of labor reform, do damage to legitimate trade unions and legitimate trade union activities.

"This is exactly the situation today."

The principal objections to the Senate version of the Kennedy bill are as follows:

First. If enacted, this legislation would require unions to accept every person who applies for membership. As a result it would be impossible for unions to deny membership to Communists, crooks, or company spies who might try to infiltrate union ranks.

Second. The bill presumes to guarantee equal rights for members. In practice it would mean that the Government would decide who was eligible to run for union office, since the bill invalidates provisions of union constitutions which prohibit Communists and other destructive elements from becoming candidates.

Third. Federal courts are substituted for normal, democratic trade union procedure, thereby exposing unions to repeated lawsuits by company agents, Communists or disgruntled candidates rejected by their fellow-members.

Fourth. Local union officers are threatened with 2 years in prison and $10,000 fines for such reasonable rulings as denying a drunk the right to speak at a meeting. An entire local union can be jailed for disciplining a worker who led a wildcat strike.

Fifth. Employers are permitted to conceal antiunion expenditures. For example, an employer could maintain a regular, full-time labor spy on his payroll and never have to report it.

Sixth. Federal courts would be given the power to decide for what purposes union funds may be spent. Union officials are exposed to civil and criminal prosecution for carrying out a membership vote to extend strike aid to another union. A single company spy could keep a union or its officers in court all year, every year.

Seventh. New bans are imposed on peaceful picketing. There is an open invitation to unscrupulous employers to escape legitimate union organization by signing back-door, sweetheart contracts with corrupt locals.

One must, of a necessity, keep before him the goal of doing the greatest good for the greatest number. One of the weaknesses of the present Kennedy bill gives the minority power intended by all constitutional law to be reserved to the majority.

The American Legion in its latest bulletin had this to say:

A democratic principle permits free speech * * * the sounding off on ideas, etc., but the majority also rules. In considering resolutions at department and national conventions, let's be sure that majority rule is well founded.

No union can have an agenda, its rules cannot be enforced at a local meeting and a union official is not given a copy of charges against him nor is he allowed any financial support for legal help against unfounded charges, while the accuser remains in secret, but can call upon the union to pay for his costs and expenses.

It is the most cockeyed unreasonable and idiotic approach ever advanced by intelligent lawmakers, and one wonders, if they were actually motivated by a sincere desire to really write reform laws.

There has been so much printed in both the public as well as the private press including the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that I believe the viewpoint of labor, as expressed by the following editorial from the Allied Industrial Worker's magazine, may be helpful in keeping our balance in this most important issue to be debated soon by Congress:

Free trade unions are a bulwark of democracy. They extend political democracy into economic life by assuring us rights as citizens of industry as well as citizens of the community, the State and the Nation in which we reside.

Dictators have understood this fact well. They have always found it necessary to destroy free trade unions as a first step in ascending to power Yet, while dictators have come and gone the free trade union movement still lives on.

This fact needs to be reasserted now more than ever. There are those today who would have us believe that American unions, rather than preserving democracy, are engaged in wholesale denial of the rights of union members. This is simply not true.

While any aggregation of 18 million men and women will have its Judas Iscariots the facts clearly indicate that unions are still democratic organizations whose members and leaders are devoted to the democratic way of life.

Will the proposed labor reform legislation improve on the existing rights of union members or will it merely put a megaphone in the hands of loudmouths?

Do the authors of a so-called bill of rights for union members seek reform or revenge? Are we supposed to have confidence in Senator MCCLELLAN'S alleged concern for the rights of union members when he showed so little concern for the rights of citizens of his own State during the Little Rock crisis?

Some Senators have described the final Senate version of the MCCLELLAN amendments as "watered down." However, public reports indicate that southern Senators voted for the amended version because they felt that their enthusiasm for the rights of union members might be misinterpreted, not because they were in disagreement with the original measure. Their constituents might think that they supported universal application of the rights sought for union members. This, of course, was not the case.

There is some corruption in the labor movement. There is also corruption in business, industry, politics and other walks of life.

Do we pass one set of laws dealing with corruption in business, another set dealing with corruption in industry and yet another dealing with corruption in politics? Of course not.

We pass laws against corruption, period.

Violation of the law is violation of the law regardless of who the guilty party is. If violators have gone unpunished then there have been failures in law enforcement, not in lack of law.

The MCCLELLAN committee hearings have destroyed out perspective. The committee's parade of witnesses alleged to be guilty of some evil act has led many to conclude that unions are dominated by corrupt officials.

Let's set the record straight. Senator MCCLELLAN has interrogated an infinitesimal fraction of the leadership of American unions. He has revealed nothing more profound than the fact that a fraction of union leaders are abusing their position of trust.

Unions are still living examples of democracy in action. They will remain that way. Proposed legislation will add nothing to this fact. However, if enacted, it will take away by making it difficult, yes, even impossible for responsible union officers to perform the duties of their office.

Our entire system of Government is based upon rights, and rights of majority, rights of minority, but each must respect the other in their true prospective. Under the Kennedy bill provisions a majority, no matter how great it may be, will be subject to the whims and desires of even a single disgruntled, drunken or just a troublemaking member.

Let us see the will of Congress in action. Shall it be the will of Congress to reelect itself at any cost or shall it be the will of Congress that right shall prevail?

It will be interesting especially to watch the four divisions of Congress operate on this delicate political subject. The divisions as I see them are as follows:

First. Republicans. For political reasons, vast majority for real tough law against unions.

Second. Democrats. Natural leanings to soften approach with punitive features left out.

Third. Southern block. Strong leanings toward GOP position for a tough bill going beyond racket control and getting into Taft-Hartley labor-management features.

Fourth. Ultra-Liberals, and so forth. Want any bill, good or bad, prefering good, but will take bad since their interests are all contained in the fight for self preservation in the political arena. They want labor support, but not the label.

In this atmosphere the danger to labor is serious and one not to be discounted by any slogans or catch phrases.

No one wants to protect the crooks in or out of labor, but all fair-minded persons in or out of labor recognize the danger in the present situation. It will take hard, courageous action and work by the Members of Congress to undo the Senate action and to pass a true reform bill protecting all the people no matter what their fields of endeavor and activity may be.

The Shield of Privilege

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Boston Globe on July 15, 1959.

The editorial follows:

THE SHIELD OF PRIVILEGE
(By Uncle Dudley)

Attorney General Rogers has warned Federal officials that they have not been licensed to libel and slander people, despite recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

In these cases Government executives were declared invulnerable to suit for statements made in line of duty. An admiral was accorded "absolute privilege" in circulating a letter which explained why he had withdrawn recognition from a union at the Boston Naval Shipyard. So was an agency head for issuing a press release denouncing two discharged employees.

The Attorney General has reminded officials that statements, to be protected, must be in the discharge of their duties. Mr. Rogers added that any who might make irresponsible use of the privilege could be disciplined, even discharged.

The right under certain circumstances to publish or speak without fear of civil or criminal action is essential to the functioning of society. That is why privilege attaches to certain statements, which can be safely made, repeated and printed. This protection is broadly extended in Massachusetts.

Here, as elsewhere, no damages can be collected for speeches in the legislature, though members can be disciplined by their fellows, even expelled, if what they say violates the rules. Privilege covers not only legislative committee hearings, but also meetings of religious societies, and, within certain limits, those of corporation stockholders.

As everywhere, what is said in court is protected, though any statement which disturbs the propriety of proceedings can bring punishment for contempt. But charges contained in a suit filed with the clerk are not privileged; they become so only when there is action on the case before a judge.

Like Federal executives, State officials can speak and publish without fear of being sued in carrying out their duties. Protection extends down to a fire marshal's statements, but not to remarks of police officers, which can be safely repeated in New York.

The broad coverage of privilege in the Commonwealth has not resulted in widespread abuse of immunity for purposes of defamation. What deters most people from libel and slander is not fear of court action, but respect for public opinion.

Like the gossip in private life, the public man who specializes in slander gets a bad name. Whatever initial successes he appears to achieve, he is almost always caught up with eventually. Wild accusations are seldom believed. "I don't mind them making charges against me," said an old-line political boss. "What I object to is when they prove them."

When an officeholder uses his immunity as a shield against suit, that fact is called to public attention. Once challenged on

this point, after he had made charges in Congress, the late Fiorello La Guardia repeated his speech on the unprivileged steps of the Capitol.

Public officials need certain protection. The Supreme Court's decisions should produce no widespread abuse of speech, but the Attorney General's word of caution is of value, just the same.

Calvin Leichtman, of Hazleton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Hazleton Plain Speaker of Monday, July 20, 1959, which reports the passing of one of Hazleton's leading businessmen at the age of 91, Mr. Calvin Leichtman.

CALVIN LEICHTMAN, 91 TAKEN IN DEATH—FOUNDED ICE CREAM FIRM

Calvin Leichtman, founder of the Leichtman Ice Cream Co., of Hazleton, died yesterday in his apartment at the Hotel Altamont, this city, at the age of 91 years. He succumbed to a heart attack.

Mr. Leichtman was born in Austria-Hungary, November 25, 1867. He came to the United States when he was 15 years old. He traveled West and located in Spokane, Wash., where he established a general store. It was in Spokane that Mr. Leichtman founded the first B'nai B'rith lodge, an organization with which he was actively associated during his entire lifetime.

He came to Pennsylvania in 1895 and settled in Freeland where the groundwork was laid for the ice cream manufacturing business that carried the Leichtman name far and wide. He located in Hazleton in 1905. The modern plant in Hazleton is the result of over a half century of growth under the guidance of Mr. Leichtman.

In recent years, the business has been conducted by members of his family with Mr. Leichtman acting in an advisory capacity.

ACTIVE IN B'NAI B'RITH

His civic and fraternal associations were numerous. Outstanding were his services to the B'nai B'rith.

In June 1958, Mr. Leichtman was honored by the 400,000-member Jewish service organization during its annual convention at Lake Kiamesha, N.Y. Mr. Leichtman was cited at the convention for a "lifetime of unselfish devotion to his community and fellow men."

Mr. Leichtman was a past president of B'nai B'rith District 3; vice president of the Eastern Pennsylvania Council of B'nai B'rith; he was a life member of Local Supreme Lodge, which honored him by changing its name to the Calvin Leichtman Lodge No. 887. Since he entered the organization's work 70 years ago he helped to establish 15 lodges, all but 1 of these in Pennsylvania.

The local manufacturer was president and founder of the Anthracite Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and a honorary member and director of the Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.

When the Leichtman Ice Cream Co., celebrated its 50th anniversary two golden jubilee celebrations were held in honor of Mr. Leichtman. The first was staged by the Hazleton Kiwanis Club, which dedicated its meeting to the man who was a charter member of the club. The same evening the Ice Cream Manufacturers Association of Pennsylvania honored Mr. Leichtman and his two sons, Milton and the late Alfred at a banquet.

MEMBER OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. Leichtman was a past-president of the Hazleton Chamber of Commerce and a member of the board of directors for many years.

He served as a member of the Hazleton Public Library Board and as a director and active member of the United Charities of Hazleton.

He was a charter member of Beth Israel Temple and served as a president of the Temple.

In May 1956, Mr. Leichtman was honored by the Hazleton community through the Hazleton Unico Club as a naturalized citizen for his philanthropic deeds and his great contribution to the economic life of Hazleton for over 50 years.

WIFE DIED IN 1951

He was married to the late Mamie Gross, of Philadelphia. She passed away in 1951. A son, J. Alfred Leichtman, died last December.

Surviving are a son, Milton J. Leichtman, president of the Leichtman Ice Cream Co.; daughters: Mrs. Elsie Marlin, Sharon, Pa.; Mrs. Ruth Alexander, Hotel Altamont, city; Mrs. Lucille Neuman, Bethlehem; and one sister: Mrs. Rose Leichtman, Cleveland, Ohio. Nine grandchildren and 10 great grandchildren also survive.

FUNERAL ON WEDNESDAY

The funeral will be held Wednesday at 11 a.m. from Bachman Bros. funeral parlor. Interment will be made in Beth Israel Cemetery, Laurel Hill, with Rabbi Martin S. Rozenberg officiating.

Friends may call Tuesday afternoon and evening from 2 to 4 and from 7 to 9 p.m.

Women's Page Editors and TV-Radio Commentators on Homemaking News Should Alert Consumer to Proposed End of Federal Grading of Lamb and Mutton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that so little has appeared in the newspapers' homemaking sections, or has been used over radio and television, on the proposal of the Department of Agriculture to end its present program for quality grading of lamb and mutton carcasses. The St. Louis newspapers, I am happy to say, have carried news stories on this matter, but I have not seen a word on it in any other newspaper, or heard a thing over the air about it.

It is, of course, not the most serious issue facing America—that I will grant. But I do think it is important to the homemakers of the Nation to know of the proposal and what it will mean to them in shopping for lamb. And if lamb grading is now eliminated, at the demand of the sheep raisers and the big packers, many of us wonder how long it will be before the Federal grading program for beef is also killed. These grading programs are voluntary—they are paid for by the processors wanting the service—so they do not cost the taxpayer a cent. And they are intended to help the consumer to get fair value—to know the quality of the meat she buys.

The women's sections of most newspapers are full of food advertising and recipes of all kinds, plus some information on foods in good supply, but I seldom see any news in them which could possibly be considered critical of any part of the food industry, and I think that is a mistake. I am proud that our St. Louis papers do not hesitate to include in the sections containing articles primarily aimed at women, news which is of importance to them as consumers, such as information on the food-additives law we passed last year, or on use of color additives containing coal tar colors of doubtful safety, or, in this instance, of the proposed elimination of Federal grading of lamb. I suggest that other metropolitan newspapers would similarly do well to put news about food where it can readily be seen by the food buyer of the household in skimming the papers.

Only a few consumers have apparently raised their voices in opposition to the end of lamb grading, and the reason for that, I am convinced, is that most housewives just do not know about it.

The Department of Agriculture made the original announcement late in May of its intention to end lamb grading by August 1, but it was the end of June before it came to my attention. I never saw a word in any newspaper about it up to that time. On July 1 I wrote to Secretary Benson, urging that the proposal not be adopted, and further urging that the July 6 deadline for comments on the proposal be set back to a later date to give the consumer a chance to learn about the issue and register her views on it. I released my letter to the St. Louis newspapers which carried news stories on it. In the meantime, other Members of Congress have written or spoken on it, but very little, if anything, has appeared in print about it.

This does not mean there is any conspiracy of silence. I certainly do not charge that. All it seems to mean is that most newspapers apparently have felt there is very little public interest in the matter.

Yesterday, on July 21, I received a reply from the Department of Agriculture to my letter of July 1. It informed me the Department had set back to July 20 the deadline for receiving comments from the public on its proposal to end lamb grading, and had delayed the effective date of the proposed suspension to September 1.

Outside of the fact that it took the Department 3 weeks to inform me of an action decided upon the day after I wrote to them, and outside of the fact that I was advised on July 21 that comments would be accepted from the public up to July 20 on this issue, I congratulate the Department for at least holding off on its final decision.

I now urge, regardless of the July 20 deadline set by the Department of Agriculture for comments from the public, that the women's editors of the newspapers of the Nation, and the radio and television commentators on home issues, alert the housewives to this proposal and encourage them to write to the Secretary of Agriculture in opposition to the proposal to end grading of lamb.

Mr. Speaker, my letter of July 1 to Secretary Benson on this subject is as follows:

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am very anxious to go on record in opposition to the proposal now being considered by the Department of Agriculture to end the voluntary program for grading of lamb and mutton carcasses as urged by the National Wool Growers Association. I would like to think that there will be widespread public protest over the proposal, but, frankly, I am afraid very few consumers have heard of it.

It is my understanding that protests on this suggestion must be received in the Department by July 6. Is there any reason for such an early closing date on such an important matter when the suspension of grading—if carried out— would not go into effect before August 1? May I urge that the decision be delayed until the public can be heard from?

While it is true the proposal was inserted in the Federal Register, I have not seen a word on it in any newspaper and I have not heard from any of the consumer groups, so I assume they are just not aware of it. One meat packer in the St. Louis area has written to me about it and he makes these excellent points in opposition to eliminating the grading program:

1. The grading program is self-supporting, in that users of the service pay all costs.

2. The Department in earlier years went to much trouble to educate the public on the value of selecting graded meats, and now that the public looks for and wants this protection it is to be withdrawn at the demand of producer interests unable or unwilling to "put the proper finish to their animals."

3. Instead of discontinuing grading because so many carcasses fail to qualify for "Choice" grading, help the producers to do a better job of raising lambs. "With the proper buying and handling," this firm's spokesman adds, "we have approximately 90 percent Choice." He believes discontinuance of grading would be detrimental to the smaller packers and a definite disservice to the consumer.

Sincerely yours,
LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Third District,
Missouri.

Dr. Ahmed Benabud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS F. JOHNSON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered on April 24, 1959, at a testimonial dinner in Baltimore, Md., honoring Dr. Ahmed Benabud:

Mr. Toastmaster, my good friend Dr. Benabud, ladies and gentlemen, I am privileged to laud a young outstanding diplomat who recently served with distinction as Minister of Morocco to the United States. Dr. Ahmed Benabud's talents, his devotion and loyalty to his King and country merited his appointment as Minister Plenipotentiary of Morocco to the United States. Almost 3 years ago, Dr. Benabud came from Morocco to establish his nation's first Embassy in America. His friendly and forthright manner, his knowledge of and friendship for the people of our country did much to facilitate the beginning of diplomatic relations between his nation and ours.

Dr. Benabud worked diligently to present Morocco to the United States and the United States to Morocco, and his efforts have created a strong bond of friendship and understanding.

Morocco, one of the first countries to recognize the independence of the United States in 1778, has maintained friendly and cordial relations with our Nation. In this trying period of history when our country is confronted by many international crises and problems, Dr. Benabud tactfully advises that we cannot turn our attention entirely away from the problems and needs of nations like Morocco which has recently regained its independence and is laboring to reconstruct the country on a stable foundation. Morocco, during the past 3 years, has been working quietly, but diligently, to achieve stability and realize its national aspirations. Through its own inspired national effort, Morocco has covered its expenditure budget and contributed from its own resources 60 percent of its development budget. I say Morocco deserves and should have our continued cooperation in her praiseworthy endeavor. It should be noted that Morocco has recently passed an investment law encouraging and welcoming foreign investments. This law offers unusual facilities, opportunities, and protection for the foreign investor. Already a number of American companies have started working in Morocco.

For almost 3 years Dr. Benabud has ably represented his country. Dr. Benabud has pointed out that there are two outstanding problems between our two countries: (1) The presence of American military establishments on Moroccan soil; (2) the Algerian war. The Moroccan diplomat feels that negotiations between our two countries with respect to American military bases on Moroccan soil will produce a satisfactory settlement. The Algerian war is having a devastating effect on all the countries of north Africa and Dr. Benabud hopes that our Nation will use its influence to find an early and equitable termination to this conflict.

Morocco is working hard at home to build a nation on the solid foundation of a strong and expanding economy. In the field of foreign diplomacy, men like Dr. Benabud have displayed outstanding leadership in establishing amicable relations with other nations.

Dr. Benabud labored in our Nation for nearly 3 years to bring us an accurate picture of his country's purposes, its needs, and its determination to meet its goals. His talents, his courtesy, and understanding have elevated the stature of Morocco in the eyes of the family of nations. We have found him a valuable and worthy friend of the United States.

Recently Dr. Benabud was appointed Ambassador to India. Our Nation wishes him success in his new post. India's gain is our loss.

Reduction of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent statement represents the thinking of a majority of the American taxpayers:

STATEMENT BEFORE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE RE FOREIGN AID, APRIL 27, 1959, BY MRS. M. D. LEETCH, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, AMERICAN COALITION OF PATRIOTIC SOCIETIES

Mr. Chairman, the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies by resolutions adopted in annual meetings of 1958 and 1959, urged a reduction of annual foreign aid appropriation, so that our existing commitments may be terminated at the earliest possible date. In support of the resolutions and in respect of the question of appropriations for fiscal year 1960, we urge you to consider the nature of the program itself and determine if it is justified upon its merits in its present form and management.

The foreign-aid program at its inception shortly after World War II was an emergency operation, first to feed and then to rehabilitate Western Europe. It was restricted to economic assistance extended to 14 or 15 countries in Western Europe, plus Greece and Turkey. In 1950 as a result of the NATO Conference, foreign aid became a mixture of military and economic assistance, which was divided between the original Marshall plan countries and certain countries of southeast Asia and Korea. Since that time, the program has extended and expanded to a great number of countries and in the total amount of aid that has been granted by projects.

As of January 1, 1959, a total of some $70 billion has been expended on military aid and economic assistance in over 70 countries and their dependencies. The total amount expended is equivalent to approximately one-quarter of our total national debt. The interest on this large sum at present rates averages about $2½ billion a year. Current expenses are estimated by the Department of Commerce to run to approximately $5 billion a year. Therefore, the total present and past cost of foreign aid is $7½ billion annually, which in turn is equivalent to 20 percent of all personal income taxes collected by the U.S. Government.

Because of the conflicting views of proponents of the program, it is fair to say that it is doubtful if we have any definite policy regarding foreign aid which is understood by the people who are paying the bills. Taxpayers do know that to borrow money to give away, when our public debt exceeds the combined public debts of all other nations of the world, will wreck the economy of this Nation; in which tragic eventuality freedom will have been lost to all people.

ON THE ECONOMIC SIDE

What are we supposed to be doing?

We are carrying out a series of projects, over 2,000 in number, in 70 countries which attempt to do a little something of everything in almost every conceivable field of human activity. We build steel mills, we finance fertilizer plants, we have projects to instruct the Iraq ladies in industrial sewing, we grow pigs, we have kindergarten classes—as a matter of fact there is nothing you can think of that we have not done something about in at least one of these countries.

Thus committed we are faced with the problem of building up a staff of competent people to run these programs successfully. We have failed to do this, in part, because enough competent technical people are not available and in other cases because it is impossible to plan, manage, and run from Washington, a vast number of individual undertakings going on in 70 or more countries by remote control.

WASTE AND EXTRAVAGANCE

The result has been a history of waste and extravagance unparalleled in the records of American Government operations. The defenders of the program say that those instances of waste are only exceptions and that by and large the programs have been highly successful. The evidence fails to bear this out. There are thousands and thousands of pages of testimony taken by Government commissions, congressional committees, private investigators, and other responsible observers that show very clearly that these stories, this record of bad management and extravagance is the rule rather than the exception.

CONGRESS SHOULD LAUNCH AN INQUIRY

In 1956, seven out of the nine members of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Overseas Economic Operations petitioned Congress to set up a joint committee or Hoover-type commission to make a 2-year survey to determine these things to which we have referred. This was not done. Today Congress is being asked to appropriate $4 billion of new money on top of all the money already spent. Today Congress knows just as little about the way past appropriated funds have been spent as it did in 1956 when the Hoover Commission task force attempted to bring this matter to light.

What justification is there, then, for Congress to accept at face value the self-serving presentation submitted by the executive agencies in support of this fantastic amount of money which is being sought from the Congress this year?

In 1956, the Hardy subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee conducted a study of the management and planning of foreign aid in Iran. They examined witnesses and took over 1,200 pages of testimony. At the conclusion of the hearing, the committee prepared and drafted a report, the substance of which was that we had spent approximately $250 million in Iran over a 3-year period and that it was impossible for the committee, in view of the slipshod and loose operation of this program, to tell where all the money had gone and who had received it, not to say what good it had done to anyone. The committee recommended that the Department of State and the International Cooperation Administration make a complete investigation of the persons who were charged with the responsibility of the management of the Iranian program and that when responsibility was fixed, the persons in charge of the program be deprived of ever occupying any other post of trust and confidence in the U.S. Government. Unhappily, both State and ICA ignored this recommendation and the Director of the Iranian program was promoted and sent to Korea where, until recently, he has been directing foreign aid in that country. Others responsible for the Iranian waste were transferred to better posts, or confirmed in their old posts which seemed to amount to a vote of confidence.

Another instance of the same story was in the little Kingdom of Laos, one of three independent countries carved out of Indochina after the armistice of 1954. In 4 years the United States poured in almost $200 million in military and economic aid. This primitive little country of about 2 million people, 85 percent of whom are illiterate, could not absorb the amount of money we poured in. It was impossible to put the money into the country in conventional form, that is to say through the exportation to Laos of commodities which would then be sold and the local currency resulting from the importation being made available for domestic expenses. So in order to make up for our inability to put commodities into Laos in ordinary form, we added huge cash grants of dollars, which were converted into local Laotian currency at an artificial rate of exchange imposed upon us by the beneficiary country at a rate that made it necessary for us to spend three times as many dollars as we should have spent in order to accomplish our objectives. When the money was made available to the country, it fell into the hands of speculators, politicians and local merchants and virtually none of it filtered down to the poor people in the country whom it was designed to assist. This was accompanied by a public works program, heavy roadmaking machinery, etc.

The Hardy subcommittee has been examing into the Lao program. At the recent hearing, the Chief of the Industry Division of ICA confessed under pressure, that he had accepted over $12,000 in gifts from a favored contractor who had been made responsible for building a road which is now passable only 2 months of the year and for the care of machinery and equipment which upon investigation proves to be only about 15 percent usable at this time. The Director of the ICA in Laos, after being recalled to Washington, was appointed Deputy Assistant to the Director of ICA for liaison with the National Security Council, a post of trust and confidence.

These illustrations are mentioned because they do establish a pattern which runs through the program all too often and which illustrate the manner in which funds are badly planned and wasted and in which graft is all too prevalent. Obviously what has taken place in the past indicates that before we commit more money, we should take stock of what we have done and insist on getting a degree of control and the installation of new policies which will prevent a repetition of such disastrous performances.

HAVE WE CONTAINED COMMUNISM?

Far from saving a large number of countries from communism as has been alleged, we have too often only strengthened unpopular governments or enriched an already privileged group of people thus widening the margin of well-being that exists between the upper crust and the submerged classes in each one of these countries. An excellent example is Iraq where we put in some $18 million of economic aid and over $50 million in military hardware, all of which is now lost to us as a result of the revolution. But the fact is that we were held responsible for giving all of that military equipment to an extremely unpopular government and when that government was overthrown, the onus fell upon our shoulders. We were accused of having done things that assisted tyranny to continue.

We believe that what we are attempting to do by way of foreign aid is something that is beyond the capacity of any government to do. It is impossible to administer this vast number of programs with any degree of efficiency. What we are doing does not really help people to help themselves. What it does do is to impose upon these backward countries a huge local bureaucracy of Americans who are trying to make other people over in their own image and to plan and organize the lives of everyone all over the world.

GROWTH OF THE BUREAUCRACY

In 1948 at the inception of the Marshall plan, ICA had a total of 458 employees. Today, 13 years later, there are over 13,000 employees, Americans and nationals of other countries scattered all over the world who are on ICA payroll. In addition there are over 9,000 people employed in the military program which is administered by the Department of Defense. Naturally these people can only justify their existence by finding more projects upon which to spend money which will perpetuate their jobs and promotions over the years.

INDIAN PROGRAM HIGHLY CONTROVERSIAL

Responsible Indian sources question their own second 5-year plan, taking exception to many phases of it, yet we have stepped in to underwrite a large part of the foreign exchange cost for its completion. Last year we advanced by way of Export-Import Bank and development loans, over $200 million. Apparently we made these loans, not on the basis of preengineered projects, but often we picked up checks for machinery and equipment that had already been ordered abroad by the Indians in fulfillment of this program without looking into the basic facts related to the plants in which this machinery was to be placed and the sufficiency of the equipment that had been ordered. It is said that some of these plants are badly designed and never will be efficient producers. Yet we are committed to follow this program to its conclusion, regardless of what the bottomless pit may be, or be accused of welching and bringing about the failure of the 5-year plan.

APPROPRIATION REQUEST FOR 1960

With regard to requests for appropriations this year, it should be remembered that there are presently between $6 and $7 billion of previously appropriated funds that are now in the pipeline, unexpended. It is alleged by the Department of Defense and by ICA that most of this money is already obligated. It seems clear that a great deal of the money in the pipelines of the military program is not validly obligated in the sense that it has been committeed under contracts between the Department of Defense and manufacturers for the actual delivery of specified items. On the contrary, we think Congress will find that under the existing regulations, a great deal of that money is merely earmarked under a reserve clause, but has not yet been converted into final contracts, and could, therefore, be deobligated and used for current expenses without any great prejudice to the program as a whole.

MILITARY PROGRAM

We support a realistic and reasonable type of military aid for countries like Korea, Nationalist China, Turkey, etc., but the time has come when a prosperous Western Europe, especially the United Kingdom, which has recently reduced its taxes by 8.6 percent, France which uses our military equipment in a costly Algerian war and West Germany with one of the world's largest gold reserves, should carry the load of their own military expenses without further contributions from the overloaded American taxpayer. Our willingness to assume a heavy defense role in Western Europe has encouraged our allies to rearm reluctantly. The time has come to let them know we do not intend to garrison Europe forever. Their populations—50 percent larger than those of the United States, must provide replacements for American troops.

Incidentally, the waste in the military program has been as bad, if not worse than in the economic program. This is borne out by many illustrations and the question was thoroughly ventilated by a subcommittee headed by Congressman FASCELL, of the House Government Operations Committee, only a year ago. The General Accounting Office has also written some very scathing reports that had to do also with the way money was obligated and the way in which it was actually spent.

MUST CONTRACT PROGRAM OR IT WILL SWAMP US

What we must do at once as a first step in contracting these wasteful and inefficient programs, is to cut down these appropriations by at least one-third and force the planners of both military aid and economic assistanec to develop some degree of efficiency in the use of the funds. Instead of voting increased administrative funds each year, let us reduce those administrative funds and thus get rid of some of the useless bureaucracy now creating more projects that will require expenditure of more money.

DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

The Development Loan Fund makes possible loans for projects in all parts of the world that would not be eligible under the strict banking requirements of the World Bank, the Export-Import Bank, or private banking institutions. It provides also that the loans may be repayable in soft currencies. Mr. Benjamin Fairless, former chairman of the United States Steel Corp., who headed a committee appointed by the President to investigate the future of foreign aid, criticized the soft-currency loan program and recommended that the scheme be dropped and no soft-currency loans be made.

It is our understanding that virtually all of the $700 million made available during the last 2 years, has been obligated or loaned. Some 30 percent of these loans are repayable in dollars, the remaining 70 percent are repayable in foreign currencies. Another $700 million is now requested and the suggestion is voiced that the Fund be sweetened each year to the tune of between three-quarters of a billion to a billion dollars. In payment the United States will receive local soft currencies which cannot be reconverted into dollars. The question then arises, what happens to this money? Are we laying ourselves open to charges of economic imperialism as we build up economic power over a country with a large fund of local currency? On the other hand, if the United States does not attempt to use the money, it does no good to anyone. The alternative seems to be inevitable, that the United States, when the loans come due, will either relend the soft currency on an ever-revolving basis, or make an outright gift to the borrowing country. This would seem to be in violation of the legislation which created the Fund and authorized the loans and would amount to the creation of a device for making concealed gifts. However, it is figured, the American taxpayer is going to be left holding the bag.

INFLATION

The greatest danger to our country is inflation. The heart of the matter is waste and extravagance in the foreign aid program. So long as we condone waste and extravagance abroad, we are never going to get the people to support an austerity program at home. Our people say to their Congressmen, "You build a public powerplant in India, why not in your own district?" We must first control inflation through a restriction of foreign aid, then perhaps we can get some control at home.

If we continue to borrow money to give away, when our public debt exceeds the combined debts of all other nations of the world, we will wreck our economy and with it the last hope of freedom for all people.

RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) We recommend that Congress create a bipartisan congressional committee or Hoover Commission Task Force type of committee to make a comprehensive field check over a period of 2 years, of the manner in which appropriated funds have been spent and what the result of those expenditures has been in terms of effective programs and benefit to the United States received. This committee should also be a sort of watchdog with responsibility over current operations until all foreign aid can be terminated.

(2) We recommend that until such a postaudit is completed by a joint committee so that Congress is really in a position to understand intelligently what funds are needed, Congress should reduce actual appropriations of new money by at least one-third of the total asked.

(3) We recommend that all lending facilities be consolidated in a single banking agency, preferably the Export-Import Bank and that loans should only be made on a dollar basis.

(4) We urge the Congress to take steps to supervise, reduce, and control foreign aid until finally terminated in the interest of survival of this Republic.

Centennial of the American Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES H. BROWN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we in Missouri are vitally interested in the Civil War centennial celebration which is scheduled for 1961–65, and we hope to be permitted to contribute our full measure to its success.

Now pending before the Congress is proposed legislation to preserve the Wilson Creek battlefield near Springfield, Mo., as a national memorial.

And in conjunction State and community leaders are trying to memorialize other historical sites in our area. State Representative Robert Young tells me great effort is being made by citizens of Carthage, Mo., to commemorate the Battle of Carthage, July 5, 1861.

This is a great thing these people are doing, and I call the attention of the Congress to a resolution passed in the recent session of the Missouri State Legislature, commending their efforts, cosponsored by Representatives George Young, of Howard County, and Robert Young, of Jasper County.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the years 1961–65 will mark the centennial of the American Civil War, the supreme experience in our history as a nation; and

Whereas the sacrifice of our people in that great ordeal was severe in Missouri and all sections of the land; and

Whereas the farreaching events of the Civil War established that the United States would remain permanently one Nation; and

Whereas the Civil War, the greatest internal crisis through which this Nation passed, forged the unity of this country and the sons of both the Union and the Confederacy have subsequently fought side by side for human freedom, justice, and the dignity of the individual among people everywhere; and

Whereas Public Law 85–305, 85th Congress, House Joint Resolution 253, September 7, 1957, established the Civil War Centennial Commission because it is incumbent upon us as a nation to provide for the proper observance of the centennial years of this great and continuing force in our history; and

Whereas the Honorable James T. Blair, Jr., governor of Missouri, has established by proclamation the Civil War Centennial Commission of Missouri to develop a program to commemorate the significant role of Missouri in the Civil War; and

Whereas the Carthage Chamber of Commerce, in cooperation with the Carthage City Council and the Jasper County Court, has created the Civil War Centennial Committee of Carthage in honor of the late Col. Ward L. Schrantz, noted Missouri writer and Civil War historian; and

Whereas Colonel Schrantz suggested the erection of memorials at Carthage to honor the officers and men of both the Union and the Confederacy; and

Whereas these memorials will be dedicated on the 100-year anniversary of the Battle of Carthage; and

Whereas the Battle of Carthage July 5, 1861, was an important military event in the struggle for Missouri; and

Whereas the memorial to the Union will be a statue of the late Maj. Gen. Franz Sigel, formerly of St. Louis, who was a distinguished leader in many Civil War battles including the Battle of Carthage; and

Whereas the memorial to the Confederacy will be a statue of the late Claiborne Fox Jackson, distinguished public servant from Howard County, who was speaker of the Missouri House of Representatives, member of the Missouri Senate, Governor of Missouri, and champion of the Confederacy; and

Whereas the Carthage City Council has appropriated $1,500 toward the expense of the memorials; and

Whereas the memorials will be the work of the Honorable Carl Mose, of St. Louis, a sculptor of great fame; and

Whereas the Civil War Centennial Committee of Carthage will conduct a public subscription campaign, plan a Civil War memorial dedication program, and arrange other suitable commemoration; and

Whereas the Honorable John Flanigan, Jr., a distinguished Missouri attorney, is committee chairman, and the Honorable Robert N. Eddy, mayor of Carthage, is honorary chairman: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Missouri House of Representatives, That the citizens of Carthage be commended for conceiving and supporting a magnificent program in splendid cooperation with the National Civil War Centennial Commission and the Civil War Centennial Commission of Missouri;

That members of the Carthage City Council and members of the Jasper County Court be commended for launching this program as proposed by the Carthage Chamber of Commerce;

That all citizens of Missouri join in appreciating and understanding the Civil War efforts of Governor Jackson and General Sigel as symbolic of all the officers and men who fought and sacrificed in Missouri and other States between 1861 and 1865;

That the Honorable Robert Eddy and the Honorable John Flanigan, Jr., be especially commended for their leadership on behalf of the program of commemoration at Carthage;

That the late Col. Ward L. Schrantz be gratefully remembered for his contribution to the content of the program and his scholarship on the Missouri role in the Civil War;

That all citizens direct interest to plans and programs of other Missouri communities for commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Civil War;

That Missouri citizens make available books, manuscripts, miscellaneous printed matter, memorabilia, relics, and other Civil War materials to the Civil War Centennial Commission of Missouri for permanent preservation in libraries and museums within the State; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution be furnished by the chief clerk of the Missouri House of Representatives to the

following officers of the National Civil War Centennial Commission, 700 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.: The Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, honorary chairman; the Honorable Richard Nixon, honorary vice chairman; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, honorary vice chairman; Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant III, chairman; Mr. Karl S. Betts, executive director; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution also be furnished to Dr. Bert Maybee, of Kansas City, Mo., chairman of the Civil War Centennial Commission of Missouri; the Honorable Carl Mose, of St. Louis, Mo.; the Honorable Byron Fly, of Joplin, Mo., presiding judge of the Jasper County court; Mrs. Ward L. Schrantz, of Carthage; Col. Robert S. Dale, president of the Carthage Chamber of Commerce and assistant publisher of the Carthage Press; the Honorable John Flanigan, Jr., chairman of the Civil War Centennial Committee of Carthage; and the Honorable Robert N. Eddy, honorary chairman of the committee.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Sesquicentennial of Giles County, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, last week the fine people of Giles County, Tenn., whom I have the honor to represent in this body, celebrated the sesquicentennial aniversary of the establishment of the county by the Legislature of the State of Tennessee.

During the week-long observance of this anniversary, Giles County was visited by the Governor of Tennessee, the Honorable Buford Ellington; the two Senators from Tennessee, the Honorable Estes Kefauver and the Honorable Albert Gore; our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Evins; and many other distinguished personages including former Governors Browning and McCord, many of whom also made addresses to the people of the county.

The remarks of our colleague, JOE L. EVINS made on Friday, July 17 were particularly apt and well received. Prior to 1954 Giles County was apportioned to the old Fifth District of Tennessee, represented at that time by our colleague [Mr. EVINS] and he spoke, therefore, from a personal and intimate knowledge of Giles County and its progressive residents. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address as follows:

REMARKS AT GILES COUNTY, TENN., SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION BY HON. JOE L. EVINS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, JULY 17, 1959

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, friends of Pulaski and Giles County and ladies and gentlemen, I am certainly pleased and delighted to be present on this significant and historic occasion—the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the establishment of Giles County.

I have received several invitations from your celebration chairman, John R. Stephens, and other citizens of Pulaski and Giles County, to visit and to be in attendance at some part of your celebration. I have read with interest the many newspaper and magazine stories surrounding this great occasion and certainly have looked forward with great anticipation at being able to be with you.

I am pleased to be able to get away from Washington and return again to Tennessee and Giles County to be with friends—to meet old friends and new friends—and join with all in enjoying this feast of friendship and fellowship.

Occasions such as this, such as you of Giles County have been participating in throughout this week, are not only occasions for renewal of friendships; but the celebration holds forth even greater purposes and far-reaching effects—namely, that of renewing and refreshing in our minds the growth of many of our traditions and ideals.

The growth of our democracy.

The progress and well-being of our citizens.

The growth and progress of our agriculture, our commerce, and the development and sense of dedication and devotion of our people to preserving, promoting, and perpetuating the heritages of our past—the ideals and liberties of our citizens.

I want to commend the members of your centennial committee, your county and city officials—and all of your citizens—all whom have had a part in promoting and furthering this most worthwhile, historic and significant celebration.

Each year on July 4, we as a nation celebrate Independence Day as the birthday of our freedom and independence, and appropriately so, to recall to our minds and to instill into our youth the trials of our forefathers and the sacrifices they made that we might enjoy in prosperity, the blessings of freedom, independence and liberty of this the greatest Nation on earth.

Just 2 years ago this summer we, as a Nation, celebrated the 350th anniversary of the settlement of our first pioneers at Jamestown, Va. This was a great occasion in which the citizens of the immediate area locally, together with State and National Officials and representatives of our allies, significantly marked the founding of the first permanent English settlement in America.

We as a nation have grown from 13 weak, insecure and loosely connected colonies on the eastern seaboard of this country and with less than a million people to a nation today of 50 States, strong and united, reaching across the width and breadth of this land to the ice and snow caps of Alaska to the balmy climate of Hawaii in the Pacific with 177 million people.

In this growth and in this progress, Pulaski and Giles County, to my mind, stand out as typical and representative of the heart and growth of America. The spirit of cooperation, of friendship and of helpfulness have been expressive of the character of the people of Giles County—from its early beginning—throughout the years and even until this very day.

I have never forgotten how warmly the people of Giles County received me in 1946 when I first ran for Congress—when Giles County was a part of Tennessee's great Fifth District. I came in your midst unknown and unacquainted and you people received me warmly and were exceedingly nice and gave generously of your friendship and support and we carried the county and won my initial campaign for elective office. I still feel indebted to you for the support you gave me in that first campaign—and for the warmth of your friendship over the years.

I not only remember with pleasure how kind you were to me, but I also remember that I met for the first time two men whom I have grown to respect and admire while visiting in your county some 10 years ago. Both of these men were also running for elective office at that time. One of these men was in his first statewide race—I believe I met him at Prospect—or maybe at Elkton. But anyway, he won that race and was elected to the railroad and public utilities commission. I have admired Andrew "Tip" Taylor through the years and have watched with interest his fine record of public service as commissioner and judge and soldier—since our first meeting.

The other young man was just out of the Army, and I think he was wearing his veteran's service button when I first met him up near Lynnville. He was a fine, clean-cut young man and ambitious—in fact so ambitious that he was making his first bid for elective office against one of the most beloved and respected citizens of Giles County, Gilbert Abernathy. The voters returned Gil Abernathy to the courthouse and his job as county court clerk. However, I liked this clean-cut young man and you people of Giles County seemed to like him; and when there was a vacancy in the office of postmaster here in Pulaski, I was happy to nominate and recommend Ross BASS for the position.

This young man not only served as an efficient postmaster, but was so energetic and ambitious that he went to the State legislature in Nashville and had this great county moved into another congressional district so he could run for Congress. And, of course, you know that in 1954 Ross BASS did run for Congress and was elected—and since then he has been one of my highly respected and esteemed colleagues in the Congress of the United States.

Ross, I sure hated to lose Giles County from the district I represent, but it is certainly good to have in Washington such a distinguished and capable colleague with whom I can confer and work together for Tennessee.

As a former Representative of this county, I share with you the glory and joy of this celebration. The history of Giles County glows with stories of rugged pioneers, courageous soldiers, energetic farmers, and hardworking friendly citizens. We are proud of this past because these people worked for the things they wanted; they were not easily discouraged and didn't hesitate to fight—whether it be with gun against the Indians or with plow and hoe against the forest and cane brakes. Yet the early settlers of this area did not work and fight only for the betterment of themselves, they helped their neighbors and were interested in the betterment of the community as a whole. James McCallum, who came here in 1809, and is apparently Giles County's first historian, has written how all the neighbors would assemble and help build houses for newcomers in the early Giles County community, and how if the new settlers happened to arrive late in the spring and were not likely to get enough ground cleared to raise enough corn, the neighbors would all work a few days chopping or making rails for them, as McCallum wrote. From the very beginning this county has been endowed with the spirit of helpfulness, cooperation, and friendship, on which our great democracy has been built.

This fine county was named after a man who shared these ideas of helping others for the betterment of the Nation as a whole. Senator William B. Giles was a freedom-loving Virginian who helped Tennessee in its fight for statehood. This distinguished gentleman had nothing to gain personally by his efforts except the joy of helping others and of contributing to the strengthening of the democratic tradition. He realized that a healthy and properly functioning

democracy must grant self-government to peoples as soon as they are ready and able to govern themselves. He also knew that freedom-loving people must rise to help their neighbors and friends in securing and protecting this freedom and the privileges it holds.

Count Casimir Pulaski, the noble Polish general after whom this city is named, is one of our greatest examples of an individual willing to work—and to fight for the ideals he believed in wherever the call for liberty might be heard. This young aristocrat fought well for freedom in his native Poland and realizing that tyrants must be opposed whenever and wherever they raise their mighty hand to challenge liberty, he joined this Nation in its struggle for independence and freedom.

Had not such noble patriots as young Pulaski come to the aid of this Republic and the democratic principles upon which it was founded, we might never have known the complete and individual freedom we share today.

Each year in Congress a special day is set aside for debate and eulogy of the life and character of Count Casimir Pulaski, and on several occasions I have participated in these programs, advising our colleagues that in Tennessee we have a fine town named for this great patriot.

It has always seemed appropriate to me that the people of Giles County should have Pulaski as the name for its county seat. For the name Pulaski has increasingly grown to symbolize the spirit of strength, of character and purpose—for which this patriot gave his life. We all know the story—Hawthorne's story—of the Great Stone Face—the boy continued to look upon the image in the mountains in his midst—until he became to look like the great stone face himself.

Giles Countians have also looked upon the mountain, as it were, and have acquired the strength of character which distinguished Senator Giles, General Pulaski, and their pioneer ancestors. They are among our finest stock of Tennessee folks—rugged individuals and patriots to the core. Like Pulaski and Sam Davis of a later day, they fight for what they want and believe in as right.

Pulaski is a milestone in the TVA story for this was the first Tennessee municipality to utilize TVA power. I mention TVA as Giles Countians have not only been pioneers in this field but constant and present-day fighters to preserve and perpetuate TVA's principles.

The fight for TVA was not over when it was established. We in the Congress and those of you on the homefront have had to fight to preserve it again and again over the years. We have been recently successful in steering the self-financing bill through Congress during this session and we hope it will become law within the next few weeks. However, there are always those who are willing and waiting to sabotage this project. But with constant vigilance, and continued support from our friends, TVA will be of even greater benefit to our people and the Nation.

The actual preserving of TVA was a work of democracy in action in itself. When the enemies of the TVA began their devious planning to thwart and eventually destroy TVA, we found friends all over this great Nation. They were willing to fight for an agency they knew would benefit the people and in whose purposes they believe even though it offered no direct benefit to their particular area. As Senator Giles came to the aid of Tennessee in its struggle for statehood, and as Pulaski left his native country to fight for freedom in a strange and faraway land, these people came forth in defense of an idea and were vital in winning the victory.

But this has not been a one-way street. We who represent the TVA area have supported the principle of development of our natural resources in projects throughout the Nation—the St. Lawrence, Great Lakes Seaway, the upper Colorado, Columbia River basin, the Bonneville Power Administration, and other great resource development programs.

Here we have heard the call of an ideal in which we believe and have answered with firm support, helping other areas develop their resources and in return receiving their help on the TVA. In a great Nation such as ours we cannot take a regional or provincial or selfish attitude but must support those ideas which we know to be good and of benefit to our country throughout the country.

Today we are faced with an even broader problem—that of supporting our ideals of democracy and freedom on an international scale, and helping other people throughout the world to obtain and retain their freedom against the threat of Communist tyranny.

In this task, too, we need the same spirit of helpfulness and cooperation—of helping others as the people of Giles County have always exhibited.

We must help our friends and neighbors throughout the world defend themselves against the cancer of communism. We cannot be provincial. When a fire is spreading in a neighbor's house or field—we all must join in to put it out before the fire spreads to engulf us all.

I am confident that just as working together has built up this fine county and this fine city, so working with other nations for the ideals in which we believe will in the end result in a triumph of democracy over the spread and onrush of communism and tyranny.

So we see, my friends, here in the history of Giles County we have an example of the way in which our democratic processes and ideals can work successfully to bring us a better life. We also have a wonderful example of how dedication to these ideals and the willingness to work together and with others will contribute to preserving and furthering our ideals and our way of life.

I am sure that continuing in this great tradition, Giles County and Pulaski will continue to move forward, will continue to grow and to build a progressive, forward-looking community—that expresses the best features of our way of life. Certainly, the best advice that we can give the coming generation of residents of Giles County and indeed the entire Nation is to continue in the same traditions that have made Giles County what it is today. That is the best road not only to a better community but also to a better nation and a better world.

I salute you all, my friends, of a great county, a grand citizenship; as you celebrate your 150th anniversary. I wish for you another 150 years of growth and progress—and more.

I congratulate you—all those who have helped to make Giles County the great county that it is—and commend your noble heritage as we salute those who will in the future, defend, promote, protect, and perpetuate your great heritage and the ideals of freedom, liberty, and democracy which your county represents and her citizens cherish.

New World Markets for Grains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the problem of finding new and expanding markets for this Nation's production of farm products constitutes one of the great challenges of our day.

The search is being pressed on many fronts for new markets for farm products both at home and abroad.

A timely discussion of this vital phase of the Nation's economy is presented in the magazine, West Texas Today, in an article entitled "New World Markets for Area Grains."

In view of the importance of this problem, I ask unanimous consent that this article by Bill Nelson be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW WORLD MARKETS FOR AREA GRAINS

(By Bill Nelson)

The great challenge of our era is to find satisfactory markets for farm products—markets commensurate with the capacity of the American farmer to produce food and fiber. The roots of agriculture that have gone deeper and deeper into improved production practices, soil and water conservation, new technologies and improved efficiencies now are going even deeper and reaching for expanded markets for farm products at home and abroad.

New outlets may be developed for grain sorghums and other feed grains as the result of a market development agreement executed recently between the Grain Sorghum Producers Association and the Foreign Agricultural Service. Producer-directors of the three-State Amarillo based organization for research, market development, and service authorized the signing of the agreement at their December 1958 board meeting.

Since then things have happened fast: A four-semi-trailer mobile "Balanced Feed Exhibit," featuring grain sorghum, has started its tour of Italian agricultural fairs; several west Texas county agricultural agents have served as feed grain consultants to the exhibit and held feed conferences relative to the use of grain sorghums; a west Texas banker and the executive officer of the association have conferred with financial and agricultural leaders in several European countries relative to potentials for further expansion of markets for grain sorghum and other feed grains; over 300 individuals from 14 States and three nations participated in a grain sorghum research and utilization conference in west Texas; and a west Texas industrial firm has prepared the conference papers presented by internationally recognized grain sorghum authorities into a booklet which has been distributed to 52 countries and will be translated into several languages under the sorghum producers program.

Even with all this activity under way Frank Moore, the Grain Sorghum Producers Association president, emphasizes that foreign market development is not the answer to the current feed grain situation or certainly is not a substitute for workable farm legislation, but rather it is one available tool which will permit us to share our continuing productive abundance with other nations while lessening the effect of adjustments in price and production facing us now and in the future. Moore is a Hale County farmer and agricultural leader.

GRAIN EXPORT

Feed grains represent one of the brightest spots on the horizon as regards U.S. exports of farm products. Of course, as is true of most foreign trade movements in any agricultural commodity, Government policies in both the importing and exporting countries affect the situation tremendously. But, if we go on the basis of trends and indications as of the moment, we are inclined to

believe that world feed grain trade may become much more important over the next few years.

Since the United States is both the world's largest producer and largest exporter of feed grains, we have every reason to think that much of the benefits of this increased world trade stand to be incurred by the United States—and particularly west Texas. Historically only about 40 percent of the total U.S. feed grain production is sold off the farm which produces it. In the case of grain sorghum nationally about 74 percent is sold off the farm and it has been estimated that in some west Texas areas over 90 percent of the local production moves into the commercial market channels. Percentagewise then, grain sorghum producers have a larger stake in developing and maintaining markets for their product than any other grain group, based on present market patterns.

Signing of the market development agreement by the area grain group paves the way for extensive promotional and educational programs relative to gain sorghum in Western Europe and other areas. Such programs are made available by the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954—Public Law 480. The law provides for the use of foreign currencies derived from the sale of agricultural commodities under the act to help develop new markets for other agricultural products. Efforts are being directed toward developing permanent demands for grain sorghums rather than a surplus disposal or sales campaign. Grain sorghum producers are administering the program providing personnel, goods, and services which may involve "dollar expenditures." FAS is making available the necessary foreign currencies to carry out the projects within the individual countries.

Grain sorghum association funds for this as well as a balanced program of research, market development and service are derived from voluntary deductions of 2 pounds per 1,000 pounds from farmer deliveries of grain sorghum at local elevators.

The first project promoting area grain sorghum has been initiated in Italy. Grain sorghum producers and several segments of the feed grain industry and USDA have cooperated in assembling an elaborate mobile display depicting "balanced feeding" and the proper use of grain sorghum. After a recent showing at the 61st International Agricultural Fair in Verona the Italian Minister of Agriculture cabled this message: "U.S. exhibit is most impressive, interesting and original. It will have maximum impact with our farmers and farm groups. Appreciate opportunity for our farmers to learn of latest techniques in planned feeding of poultry and livestock."

ITALIAN EXHIBIT

Reports indicate that 15,000 Italian farmers, feed manufacturers and grain trade people viewed the exhibit on its opening day. Similar crowds have been on hand during 2-week showings at Bologna and Trieste. Further exhibition will be made at Cremona and Foggia in Italy, and at Solonika, Greece, and Lima, Peru.

Provisions were made for a conference room and a library of American farm publications to be available at the exhibit. In addition a feed grain consultant familiar with fairs and shows, used to working with farmers and livestock producers and aware of diplomatic responsibilities were needed to accompany the exhibit.

The association arranged for local west Texas county agents to staff the exhibit on approximately 30-day assignments at its various showings. In accepting this privilege and responsibility and in authorizing the assignments of the agents, V. G. Young, State extension agent said, "It is felt this opportunity not only will benefit Texas agriculture and the agent, but will be of a most worthwhile benefit to the extension program. It should broaden his knowledge of world agricultural and social conditions and at the same time give him a deeper appreciation of the opportunties in his own country and area."

Agents assigned to the exhibit to date have included: Gene Southall, Potter County agent of Amarillo; Joe Jones, Parmer County agent of Farwell; Lee McElroy, Lubbock County agent; and Robert Sheets, Texas County agent of Guymon, Okla. Other agents and area agricultural leaders are expected to be named for similar assignments during the coming months.

In order to establish working relationships with U.S. foreign office officials, representatives of other American commodity groups and with local government officials in selected areas, a grain sorghum team went a calling in Europe. Team members were John McCracken, grain marketing specialist of USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service; Frank Arnold, vice president, First National Bank of Amarillo; and Bill Nelson, as executive officer of the association.

The assignment took them to England, Germany, Belgium, Netherlands, France, Switzerland, Greece, and Italy. In addition to conferences with the agricultural attaché staffs in the many countries relative to the feed grain situation and the use of grain sorghums, other U.S. agricultural group representatives abroad were contacted included Great Plains Wheat Market Development Association, Soybean Council of America, Cotton Council International, American Farm Bureau, and Institute of American Poultry Industries.

INTEREST SHOWN

It was encouraging to find agricultural and trade groups in most of these countries eager to assist in benefit from grain sorghum market expansion activities.

To launch a worldwide (or local) program nothing is needed more than facts—authoritative facts backed by research and experience of recognized leaders in their fields. We have such facts relative to the utilization of grain sorghum—they were assembled in March of this year at a gigantic conference in Amarillo, attracting sorghum production, marketing and utilization authorities from 3 nations and 14 States. Papers presented at the conference have been assembled into a 60-page booklet by the Agricultural Development Department of the Southwestern Public Service Co. and made available for distribution in connection with both domestic and foreign market development activities for grain sorghums.

The conference and resulting availability of concentrated information might not have been so timely except for the action of the agricultural and livestock department of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce which called the initial meeting, planning such a conference over a year-and-half ago. Conference sponsors and planners included Texas A. & M. College, Texas Technological College, West Texas Chamber of Commerce, and the Grain Sorghum Producers Association.

A representative of the producer's organization will establish European market development offices in the near future. It is then expected that action programs dealing with trade and tariff practices, research and education programs, and promotional activities in interest of grain sorghum and other feed grains will be working full time for area farmers.

Yes, new markets may be developed for grain sorghums—if we work at the job. We are after permanent markets for a permanent, sound west Texas grain economy for farmers and businesses and industries serving them. The job cannot then be temporary or haphazard. It will demand continuing aggressive programs of research and information by our colleges and universities, and strengthening of organized efforts by farmers, businessmen, and industrial leaders.

An article in this magazine just a year ago was ended with the following paragraph—it is even more timely today.

"We are reminded that 'the roots of agriculture are not founded in the soil alone—but in the vision and attainment of men.' This same vision, that has attained production beyond that ever dreamed of, can create new demands and lead to an ever more prosperous west Texas agricultural economy and further development of grain sorghum as an economic resource.

Eulogy on the American Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, a very distinguished former Senator, the Honorable Albert W. Hawkes, recently delivered what I regard as a great eulogy on the American flag.

This was delivered at the opening of the first session of the Imperial Council of the Shrine at Atlantic City on Tuesday, July 7.

I ask unanimous consent to have this eulogy printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Imperial Sir, Imperial Sirs, and representatives to the imperial council, fellow nobles, and ladies and gentlemen, I salute our beautiful American flag, emblem of each of our citizens and symbol of liberty, justice, and human dignity.

In this dark hour of history, when the ungodly, brute forces in man are seeking to impose their evil will, on people of good will, thereby destroying life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and equality under a rule of laws—your stars and stripes shine out more beautifully than ever.

Your silence is golden—you do not speak in words, but in the deeds which created you. Your 13 stripes of red and white, with a star in the blue background for the sovereignty of each State, stand for decency in human relations, unity and strength, honor, loyalty, and courage to make the supreme sacrifice whenever necessary to preserve the principles announced in the Declaration of Independence and recorded in our Constitution, then guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

Our flag, speaking as it waves aloft, says to each citizen:

"I represent you all in honesty, justice, and the spirit of the golden rule. I can be no more, than you, by your deeds, make me. Remember, up to date all nations which have ascended to leadership have ultimately failed and their governments have disappeared on the horizon of history. Perhaps, because they put the mad race for money, place, and power in first place, and relegated character, morals, adherence to principle and their trust in God to second place.

"I will remain with you always, if you keep faith with the principles under which I was born, and if you and each succeeding generation teach the next to do the same. Teach

them never to forget the little white markers all over the world, and to keep faith with those men, and the millions of others, who offered to make the supreme sacrifice. Teach them the only way to keep faith with those who created our blessings and freedoms is to exercise their right of suffrage intelligently and have eternal vigilance, coupled with action on time.

"You will survive to do good on earth in perpetuity, only if you follow the rules of equity that flow from God's Commandments and the Golden Rule; only if you make our way of life good enough to impel any fair-minded citizen to make the supreme sacrifice, when necessary to preserve it.

"Never forget individual freedom and opportunity, and the acceptance of individual responsibility are inseparable. Failure to perform duty on time permits freedom and opportunity to perish.

"We have been blessed with fine neighbors to the north and to the south, whose announced objectives are similar to ours.

"God grant us, and others, the power to put first things first—avoid temptation—and in His name help humanity to rise to higher levels and better standards in freedom's institutions here on earth."

Botch of a Botch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial under the caption "Botch of a Botch," which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on July 17, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOTCH OF A BOTCH

The ruling of the U.S. Court of Claims that the firms participating in the ill-starred Dixon-Yates contract are entitled to damages is an unsatisfactory remedy for an impossible situation. The Dixon-Yates contract was concluded in 1954 between the Government and the Mississippi Valley Generating Co., which had been set up by two private utility groups in order to furnish power to the Tennessee Valley Authority and thus enable TVA to continue to serve Atomic Energy Commission plants without construction of new TVA facilities. The present decision is unsatisfactory in our opinion not because it orders restitution to the Dixon-Yates firms of money that no doubt was spent in good faith, but because it makes altogether too little of the conflict of interest involving Adolphe H. Wenzell. In this it sets a thoroughly unwholesome precedent.

Much of what the three-man court majority says about the ambivalent role of the Government in the case, to be sure, is all too pertinent. The Government undertook to prosecute the guests after inviting them to partake at the table. The Dixon-Yates firms were, if not innocent bystanders, at least victims in part of the Eisenhower administration's own ineptitude. There is something decidedly malodorous—the court calls it cynical—about the performance of the administration which devised the idea of the contract, persuaded the private firms to participate, and then after protracted harangue when the affair went politically sour in 1955 attempted to deny them recovery of funds they had spent, on the ground that as a consultant to the Bureau of the Budget Mr. Wenzell had a potential interest in the financial arrangements.

Thus when we criticize the decision, we think at the same time that the Dixon-Yates firms are not the major targets. By general consensus there was nothing illegal about the form of the contract itself, however convoluted may have been the administration's maneuver. The case of Mr. Wenzell, however, is something else.

As vice president of the First Boston Corp., a large investment banking concern, Mr. Wenzell had been "borrowed" by the Bureau of the Budget at the suggestion of the First Boston president to make a study of TVA subsidies. Later he was asked to serve as a consultant to the Budget Bureau, while still drawing his salary from First Boston, in working out the background of the Dixon-Yates contract—even though First Boston was a potential and even probable participant in the financing. The possibility of a conflict of interest was called to the attention of the Dixon-Yates firms as well as of Mr. Wenzell.

From his own standpoint Mr. Wenzell's role may have been entirely guileless. But the conflict of interest statute is explicit, and an otherwise valid contract entered into a violation of this statute is void. In our view the court majority dismisses Mr. Wenzell's involvement much too lightly. More impressive is the dissenting conclusion of former Supreme Court Justice Stanley Reed, who sat on the case: "If the statute in question is to perform its intended function in the protection of the Government against prohibited actions that might influence contracts by public agents with private connections, courts must carry out the legislative purpose."

As Chief Judge Marvin Jones observed in his own forceful dissent, "the conclusion of the majority seems to stem from an understandable desire to avoid a harsh result." Probably the decision will be appealed to the Supreme Court. Meanwhile, however, it is too bad that there is not some way in which to reimburse the Dixon-Yates firms without sanctioning a violation of principle. The real blame in this affair in which the Government looks very bad indeed belongs to those top officials of the Bureau of the Budget who ignored warnings and bulled ahead with their eyes open, seemingly as indifferent to propriety as to the political liability they created.

Losses to the Government Because of Overcharges on Defense Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently the Milwaukee Journal published an editorial—as a matter of fact, it was the lead editorial in the edition of last Sunday—which was most alarming, because it pointed to the findings of congressional subcommittees and of the General Accounting Office in regard to overcharges made to the Government in connection with defense contracts. In connection with just a dozen or so contracts, approximately $12 million of overcharges were made.

The editorial quotes a statement by Representative HARDY, of Virginia, that in constrast to this sorry record by the Defense Department "in private indusary a contract negotiator who lost even $100,000 for his firm wouldn't last a week."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY LOSE YOUR MILLIONS

Wherever they look they find it—incomprehensible carelessness and waste in defense contracts. The house Armed Services Subcommittee and the General Accounting Office (GAO) have been teaming up to show how the Government is losing money in overcharges.

Latest GAO reports to come before the subcommittee have to do with audits of Navy contracts over the last 2 years. It is just a partial audit. But GAO uncovered $2,596,000 in overcharges. In a dozen or so other defense contracts, GAO has revealed, the Government has paid out more than $12 million more than it should have.

Yet when GAO informed the Navy about excessive costs its investigators were told that present procurement procedures are adequate.

If the procedures are adequate, then certainly the officials using them aren't. As Representative HARDY, Democrat of Virginia, says, "In private industry a contract negotiator who lost even $100,00 for his firm wouldn't last a week."

But our Defense Department contract negotiators lose millions and stay right on the job. And they'll keep right on losing our tax money unless the taxpayers—who in the end are certainly "the boss"—protest enough.

When the Chips Are Down, You Can Count on Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by A. L. Valencia, Director, Philippine Information Agency, Washington, D.C., entitled "An Open Letter to America: When the Chips Are Down, You Can Count on Us," which appeared in the July issue of Bataan magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO AMERICA: WHEN THE CHIPS ARE DOWN, YOU CAN COUNT ON US

(By A. L. Valencia, Director, Philippine Information Agency)

On this Fourth of July, 23 million free citizens of the Philippine Republic join 178 million Americans in commemoration of Independence Day—the 13th anniversary for the Philippines and the 183d for the United States.

The fact that our independence day coincides with yours throws the strongest possible light on the relationship between our two countries.

We Filipinos think there is a singularity about those relations. Most Americans probably also think so, although they take their own and our goodwill so much for granted that they hardly give it a thought.

Perhaps it is just as well for both of us. You don't go around every day proclaiming that you love your brother or sister. You take it for granted as the natural, normal thing and you come to the rescue without palaver or hesitation if it is needed.

There have been numerous reports of a rising feeling of anti-Americanism in the Philippines in recent months. These reports are exaggerated and should be discounted. There will be ups and downs in Philippine-American relations. There will never be any major cleavage between our peoples.

The Filipino loves freedom, as you do. That is our unbreakable bond.

We of the Philippines have long placed our confidence in the American concepts of decency and fairplay—and in your strong right arm—and we have not been disappointed.

PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP

Our two countries have stood side by side in the face of gravest perils and have come through our ordeals with a heightened appreciation of the friendship which binds us.

When the chips are down, you can count on us. And we know that we can count on you. Remember Bataan. We fought for you, as well as for ourselves.

You can count on us to stand firmly with you in resisting the menace of Godless communism which is so alien to all the ideals shared by our two peoples.

We have no illusions concerning the wily enemy we face. Our campaign which eliminated the Communist-led Huks in the Philippines bears witness to our determination to resist the siren song of peaceful coexistence which is trapping many of the unwary in our part of the world.

In the broader struggle against Red expansionism you have found us firmly with you in debates at the United Nations and other international forums. And in Korea you found us among the first to heed the call to stem the Red tide that threatened to engulf the entire peninsula.

Bataan and Corregidor are hallowed names which testify to our solidarity against overwhelming odds in the past. This solidarity, we are certain, will never change.

You can count on us, in the military and strategic sense, as a key point in the far-flung defense system thrown up to hold the lines against the Kremlin and Peiping.

Our mutual defense arrangement with the United States is a valued and sacred relationship which provides the sinews of our defense and, at the same time, affords you valuable bases near the territory of the enemy. We may argue, question and negotiate the details of the arrangement but we will never question the necessity for the close partnership.

You can count on us, too, because our two countries share the same political, cultural, and social institutions. We live under the same type of constitutional guarantees. We both believe fervently in a completely free press.

MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING

Our two peoples and governments share the same approach to the solution of any problems which may arise between us. We believe in sitting down in friendship and frankness to explore the field of misunderstanding in full confidence that men of goodwill, in a free society, can always work out their differences without hurt or harm to either side.

One of the greatest and healthiest things about Philippine-American relations is that we are not afraid of you. We have no chip on our shoulder as far as you are concerned. We have no inferiority complex. We do not believe that we are going to be pushed around. We want the same things—peace, freedom, and prosperity. We know we can get them better and sooner working together than we could working separately.

Our past relationship shows that such attitudes are well grounded on both sides. We had you as our guests for some 48 years. We learned that you really did want to promote our interests, that you were devoted to good government, to the promotion of health, welfare, education, and economic well-being for all. We found that you really meant what you said about individual and national freedom.

You can count on us, too, in the field of economic cooperation. We need you and at the same time we are able to offer you something.

MARKET FOR U.S. PRODUCTS

We offer, as the Philippines achieves greater prosperity, an ever-expanding market for American products, which will always be preferred to those of other foreign countries.

And we offer, too, a huge field for venture capital under more favorable conditions than you can find almost anywhere else. We even amended our Constitution to make certain that American nationals would find a most hospitable climate for business ventures in the Philippines. This was one way of showing our gratitude for the relationship which has been so mutually beneficial.

However, we shall need your friendly hand in the future, too. We must count on America's wise assistance if we are to go forward along the road to real economic stability and self-sufficiency.

We believe that the independence, economic well-being, and intense loyalty of the Philippines constitute one of the greatest assets of the United States in the Far East. They are evidence to the teeming millions of Asia—many of them groaning under the Communist yoke—of the advantages of the partnership of freemen under God and democratic institutions.

You can count on us to bend every effort, through the long years ahead, to preserving what we consider a priceless heritage from the past—a partnership in war and peace between two proud and sovereign states.

Eleventh Annual Upper Missouri Basin Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter I have written to Mr. Harold Lorenz, president of the Chamber of Commerce of Sidney, Mont., on the occasion of the 11th Annual Upper Missouri Basin Conference on July 23, 1959. I also insert a copy of an address to the conference by Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy on that occasion.

These insertions reflect my views with respect to reclamation in Montana, and I call attention of the Senate to the urgency of continuing the reclamation program with such examples as the lower Yellowstone project before us.

There being no objection, the letter and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 17, 1959.

Mr. HAROLD LORENZ,
President, Chamber of Commerce,
Sidney, Mont.

DEAR MR. LORENZ: On the occasion of the 11th Annual Upper Missouri Basin Irrigators Conference at Sidney on July 23, I extend my congratulations to the participants and especially to the water users of the lower Yellowstone project, as well as the good folks of Sidney who are so closely associated with this reclamation development.

You are indeed fortunate in having as your principal speaker the Commissioner of Reclamation, Floyd E. Dominy. No man in the active service of reclamation today is better qualified to handle this important job. I have so told Secretary Seaton of my views when he promoted Mr. Dominy.

I have read advance copies of the Commissioner's speech and I thoroughly agree with his recognition of the contribution the lower Yellowstone project had made to the economy of eastern Montana. The example it has set should be the forerunner of other reclamation developments.

Just now we are pressing for appropriations to start the East Bench unit in the Beaverhead Valley and the Yellowtail power and irrigation unit in the Big Horn. We are pressing for favorable action at this session of the Congress to provide funds to start these two units.

We do not propose to stop there. We will press for reclamation developments elsewhere when justified.

In our efforts we appreciate the fine cooperation from persons such as the water users of the lower Yellowstone project, who realize the great value of this important resource development.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
U.S. Senator from Montana.

THE GOLDEN YEAR OF GOLDEN WATER

(Address by Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy before the project tour session of the 11th Annual Upper Missouri Basin Irrigators Conference at Sidney, Mont., Thursday, July 23, 1959)

The opportunity to join with you in celebrating the golden anniversary of the lower Yellowstone project is an honor which gives me great pleasure. We are here today to commemorate "the Golden Year for the Golden Water," a slogan very appropriately selected by the Sidney Chamber of Commerce.

The Yellowstone was once the thoroughfare of the explorers, the fur trappers, and the fur traders. It was on a summer day, like this, more than 150 years ago, that Captain Clark, of the Lewis and Clark expedition, visited this valley. He wrote in his journal on July 24, 1806, when a short distance upstream, "* * * for me to mention or give an estimate of the different species of wild animals on the river, particularly buffalo, elk, antelope, and wolves, would be incredible. I shall therefore be silent on the subject further."

But on July 31, as his men descended the Yellowstone—the area that is now the lower Yellowstone—the captain could not be silent as he watched the immense herds of buffalo. "I was obliged to let the buffalo cross over, notwithstanding an island of half a mile in width over which this gangue of buffalo had to pass," he wrote in his journal, "* * * the herd stretched as thickly as they could swim, from one side to the other,

and the party was obliged to stop for an hour." Below their night's camp, "two other herds of buffalo, as numerous as the first, soon crossed the river."

The wilderness, with its incredible number of wild animals that Captain Clark observed in 1806 disappeared many, many years ago. The fur traders and fur trappers have become only pages of western history, and the hundreds of thousands of cattle that trailed northward from Texas to Wyoming and Montana, the era of the open range, are but a remembrance. Today we are recalling another later era in the history of the Yellowstone. From sagebrush to green irrigated fields is the accomplishment we are celebrating on the occasion of this golden anniversary.

There are many milestones associated with the growth of the 56,000-acre lower Yellowstone project. There is a story of its own in each and every individual farm within the project. There is an equally interesting story in the establishment and growth of the business communities serving the project area.

Irrigation, with its intensive development and use of the land, has been an important factor in creation of thriving urban centers built on the increased need for services for the rural areas.

All that we see today as we view this pleasant valley has taken place because of the availability of water. "Golden Water" is the story of reclamation throughout the West, and it is particularly true of the Yellowstone River Basin which has pioneered much irrigation development. There are 10 Bureau of Reclamation projects within the Yellowstone River Basin, with a total irrigable area of about 280,000 acres. Last year, the water users of the Shoshone project, in Wyoming, celebrated their 50th anniversary; the year before, the irrigators of the Huntley project, near Billings, commemorated their golden birthday, and today we are observing the Golden Year of the Golden Water for this project.

In celebrating this important observance we are, in part, commemorating the efforts of the thousands of men and women who developed the irrigated lands of the Yellowstone Basin. Your prosperity is not solely the result of the efforts of these dedicated people, but irrigation has perhaps been the most important single factor in the economic growth of the valley.

The lower Yellowstone project has provided one of the most fascinating chapters in the history of the Yellowstone Basin. I realize you are well acquainted with your project but, if I may, I would like to recall very briefly some highlights of its past.

The Reclamation Service, as the Bureau of Reclamation was then known, began its investigation of the lower Yellowstone Valley in 1903, only a year after passage of the original Reclamation Act of 1902. A board of consulting engineers examined the proposed project and submitted a report on April 23, 1904. This report served as basis for the authorization of the project by the Secretary of the Interior on May 10, 1904. An organization known as the Lower Yellowstone Water Users' Association was formed during the fall and winter of 1904 and 1905, and, on May 30, 1905, members of that organization entered into a contract with the Secretary of the Interior to repay the entire cost of constructing the project. Construction activities began in the summer of 1905 and first irrigation water was available April 30, 1909.

Expansion of the project was relatively slow for several decades. One of the reasons was a widespread reluctance to forsake the saddle and cowboy boots and take up work on foot, with long-handled irrigation shovel and a pair of rubber boots. Then, too, during the second decade of the new century there was a great opportunity to homestead larger acreages of dryland which seemed more attractive to the man seeking a farm of his own. At that time there was little knowledge of the advantages of irrigation farming, including greatly increased yields under irrigation and the insurance against occurring drought.

Many of the irrigators and dryland farmers were starting a new life in agriculture. They had been laborers, clerks, white-collar workers, and even professional men. But all had a single goal. They were seeking new opportunities in the West. They were ambitious and eager but they lacked farm know-how. The land was there and the water was available for the irrigation of that land, but there were no tractors, trucks, or automobiles, or the other equipment that has made modern mechanized farming considerably easier on the man's back and a woman's patience. There is still a lot of hard two-fisted work connected with farming today, but when the lower Yellowstone project was started it was all hard work, as I am sure you pioneers who are seated at the table with me can testify.

The 1,800 residents who live on the 322 farms of the 56,000-acre lower Yellowstone project, the 6,000 or 7,000 people who live in Sidney and Fairview, and their predecessors on the farms and in the cities have made this area the self-reliant and confident community that it is today. To these people go the honors for the success the project has enjoyed and is enjoying. And just what is this success? What are these positive accomplishments?

During half a century of operations, the project has produced crops having a cumulative value of $75,515,000, or about 21 times the net cost of constructing the project which was $3,585,928. And I might add, with great gratification, the project's success is also typified in another manner—the landowners of the project have repaid nearly 83 percent of the reimbursable irrigation allocation.

As all of you know, the cumulative gross value of crops grown on the project is but a portion of the full production that has occurred on the project. The lower Yellowstone project has become widely noted for its production of sugar beets and its large and expanding livestock feeding operations. The project and the concomitant sugar factory operation are a solid base for permanent success and prosperity of this thriving and progressive community.

The fattening of lambs and beef cattle, which contributes so greatly to the success of the project, is one of the principal occupations on the lower Yellowstone project. It is a remarkable story. Tens of thousands of feeder lambs and feeder cattle, grown on rangeland extending from western North Dakota to near the Continental Divide in Montana, and into northern Wyoming, are fattened on this project. The complementary use of irrigated land with dry-farmed land and ranged land, even as far as 300 miles away from the irrigated farms on the lower Yellowstone project, is one of the significant agricultural developments in the Missouri River basin.

A study made recently by the Bureau of Reclamation, entitled "A Half Century of Progress, Lower Yellowstone Project," provides some interesting information regarding the project, and particularly the facts concerning the livestock feeding activities of the project. The report shows that the total numbers of livestock fed for the market in the last 5 seasons were 41,000 cattle and 539,000 sheep.

In 1956, the American people ate 83 pounds of beef and 10 pounds of lamb and mutton per person. The lower Yellowstone project shipments of fat beef and lambs in 1956 therefore provided sufficient beef that year for 74,000 persons and enough lamb and mutton for more than 1 million Americans living in many States of the Union. The production of sugar beets on the lower Yellowstone project in 1957 was 160,830 tons on 11,198 acres, producing enough sugar that year for 523,000 persons, on the basis of 100 pounds per person.

The fattening of lambs and beef cattle surely has contributed to the success of the lower Yellowstone project. This operation provides a local market for the subar beet tops and most of the sugar beet pulp. The beet tops and dried and pelletized beet pulp are supplemented by alfalfa hay, grown mainly on the project, and by feed grains grown both on the project and on dryland farms within a wide radius of the project. The nutrient content of the crops, and necessarily the food product made from them, is a direct function of soil fertility and is dependent on the annual restoration of vital plant nutrients in the soil. More than $60,000 worth of manure is hauled from feedlots to field annually to help maintain fertility and organic content of the soil, thus making for permanently successful agriculture.

While the expanding livestock feeding operation, with its allied activities, is such an interesting success story that it is difficult to stop, it would be well to emphasize other positive accomplishments of the lower Yellowstone project. For instance, the study made by the Bureau of Reclamation shows that:

The irrigated land of the lower Yellowstone project outproduces adjacent nonirrigated land by about six times.

Irrigated land values are 12 times the value of grazing land and 4 times the value of dry cropland.

The more intensive use of resources, and concentration of population, both brought about by irrigation, have improved community development through expanded hotel and motel facilities for the convenience of travelers, construction of a good hospital which serves ranchers and project farmers, and better schools.

Retail sales are four times as great in Richland County, Mont., in which two-thirds of the project is located, as in the nearby nonirrigated county, an area of equal size.

The lower Yellowstone project has increased local employment in business and professions twentyfold.

Personal income in the irrigated area is three times greater than in the nearby county of equal size. Residents of the irrigated area enjoy a higher level of living than in the comparison area and pay one-third less non-Federal taxes per capita, because of the much wider tax base provided by the agricultural economy.

The project is responsible for providing employment to many persons residing in other parts of the country in the manufacture, transportation, selling, and servicing of project-produced commodities and in those industries that produce goods and services to meet the needs of project residents, such as farm machinery, automotive equipment, furniture, clothing, to name only a few. Merchandise shipped into the area comes from 32 States.

Federal tax revenues from the project area since 1940 alone equaled nearly twice the Federal cost of project construction.

The story of this project has been repeated, of course, over and over elsewhere all through the West, and each project has a success story of its own made possible through the efforts of each and every water user.

Today, irrigators and prospective irrigators from Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming are gathered here to take part in a project tour session of the 11th annual meeting of the Water Users' Irrigation Conference, an organization spon-

sored by region 6 of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The water users attending this conference represent about 2 million acres of irrigated land within the northern tier of the Missouri River Basin States. Within that area there are 17 projects constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation, serving nearly 500,000 acres, or about one-fourth of the total.

They are, in the main, managers and irrigation district officials who operate and maintain one of the largest and most important businesses in this area. Annually, they spend millions of dollars to operate and maintain the irrigation systems that deliver water to these many large and small projects, the most productive agricultural land in this region. The problems they discuss, the solutions they obtain as the results of their discussions, are the ends whereby full and needed production can be reached. I am sure this conference will be as useful and productive as the past 11 meetings have been.

It is appropriate that this conference is being held here during the golden anniversary of the lower Yellowstone project. This project has a particularly interesting history in the field of operation and maintenance. An operating agency known locally as the board of control, not only operates and maintains the two irrigation districts of the lower Yellowstone project but also the nearby adjacent Intake project and the Savage unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

During today's morning session, officials of the lower Yellowstone project explained to you the mechanics of their operating agency, and how such an organization is designed to serve you and your neighboring water users. The operating agency concept, whether you call it a board of control, the water users' round table, or any other name, is not some superagency dictating to the irrigation districts.

It is a servant of the districts, created by them and holding no power and no authority not granted by them. It has no hard and fast organizational structure but can be tailored to the individual needs of a given group or area. And in these days of rising costs and the attendant need for skillful, qualified personnel, it offers an opportunity for savings and improvement.

As water users, you have a full realization of the overwhelming importance of water in our lives and the necessity of taking positive steps to conserve it and use it wisely. Today's national demand for water—250 billion gallons a day—will be double that amount in 20 years. As you know, a possible remedy close to you is the urgent requirement for reducing water loss attributable to seepage, weeds and other growths, as well as any other water wastes that may take place. To the water user, the conservation of irrigation water and the production of needed food are inseparable subjects.

We can anticipate that the irrigated acreage in Montana, Wyoming, South Dakota, and North Dakota will increase in years to come. Completion of the mainstem storage system on the Missouri River and the continuing construction of storage reservoirs on the tributaries will insure the availability of water.

During recent years, hundreds of future potential water users of the proposed mammoth 1 million-acre Garrison diversion unit in North and South Dakota, have visited here and have become acquainted with the accomplishments of the lower Yellowstone project. There are, no doubt, many of you here today from these same areas, and we are glad to have you with us. Your observations of the lower Yellowstone project will be important in determining the value of irrigation in your communities. The Garrison diversion unit, with its prospect of intensive irrigation farming, feedlots, and service and processing industries, will provide opportunities far beyond the fondest hopes of the western homesteader of half a century ago.

Over and over again, reclamation projects have developed and prospered in all parts of the West and the miracle of opportunities, such as shown on the lower Yellowstone project, will happen again as the Garrison diversion unit and other potential irrigation projects throughout the Missouri River Basin are developed.

Golden water is the wand whose touch brings golden harvests. Golden water is the creator of homes, farms, and industries. The creation of future irrigation projects within the basin, similar to the accomplishments so definitely emphasized by the water users and other businessmen of the lower Yellowstone project, is a challenge that must be met.

Democratic Crisis Growing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very stimulating article that appeared in the Washington Evening Star, on July 22, 1959, written by Mr. William S. White.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC CRISIS GROWING—BUTLER'S ATTACKS BELIEVED INVOLVING PARTY MEMBERS OUTSIDE CONGRESS

(By William S. White)

The amazing venom of Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler's continued campaign against the Democratic congressional leadership is raising a crisis within his party.

For the fire upon his own party troops, which he had heretofore centered upon that leadership, has now fallen upon other powerful, and noncongressional, Democrats. Some of these are those whose help he had most sought.

In a word, his behavior has become unexampled in national politics. The Democrats thus for the first time are being reluctantly forced to consider an ugly and destructive washing of their own linen in public only a year ahead of a climactic national convention.

In spite of recent Butler intimations to the contrary, no faction—least of all the moderate faction he has been discrediting—has wished thus far to move for his ouster. If for no other reason, none wanted to give him opportunity to play again his consistent role of a querulous martyr.

Now, however, Mr. Butler's dismissal is being demanded by some voices quite outside the ranks of the moderates. These, instead, are within the liberal group whose favor he has particularly attempted to court.

The point is this: Everybody in the party knows that to fire Mr. Butler would be a messy affair, probably beneficial to the Republicans. But things have reached such a pass that some believe he must go anyhow, lest he simply wreck the party.

For Mr. Butler has now been shown to have adopted a technique of distortion quite similar in principle to that used by a few violent rightwing Republicans in the past. This sort of thing was repudiated by the bulk of the Republicans, specifically in 1950. Mr. Butler's use of it is being repudiated now by the bulk of the Democrats.

Mr. Butler is revealed to have wholly misrepresented Gov. Edmund (Pat) Brown, of California, as a Butler backer in his long denunciation of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON and the rest of the congressional leadership.

The full text of a Brown statement, angrily hurried here by the Governor to put the record straight, shows that on the central issue between Senator JOHNSON and Chairman Butler, the Governor supported Senator JOHNSON instead of Mr. Butler.

This has been the Johnson-Butler argument: Should Congress get such half-loaf liberal legislation on housing, for instance, as it can, rather than invite Presidential vetoes and get nothing? Or should Congress simply invite a series of such vetoes and thus create issues for 1960 but no legislation in 1959?

Governor Brown's own comment on this basic question, a comment never mentioned by Mr. Butler in proclaiming that he had a Brown ally, was this: "I believe, for example, we must build actual houses, not just prefabricated issues." This is almost word for word what Senator JOHNSON and many other congressional chiefs had already been saying to Chairman Butler.

The first responsibility of a Democratic national chairman is to raise funds for the party. The present committee is $600,000 in the red. But Mr. Butler has so far always turned discussions away from such affairs and onto himself. Specifically, as liberal committee members from the North have privately said, he has answered objective criticism of his work by suggesting that it all must be a southern or a pro-Johnson plot, even when the critics have been nonsouthern and anti-JOHNSON.

His presumed aim in all this is to force the 1960 convention to choose a presidential candidate who is adequately liberal, in his personal definition. But the effect of what he is doing is to hit at far more than the despised moderates. It is to hit at the essential unity of all his party. And his methods can hardly be called, in any definition, very liberal methods.

Development of Sulphur Springs, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, unity of spirit, determination to do a job, are factors that have made this Nation great.

A prime example of this achievement at the community level is being displayed at Sulphur Springs, Tex., where citizens have united in a civic improvement and beautification program.

The success of this program is detailed in a story carried July 20, 1959, in the Greenville Herald Banner, and I ask unanimous consent that it be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"NEW LOOK" SHINES IN SULPHUR SPRINGS

(By Herman Scott)

SULPHUR SPRINGS.—It's taking a while to get the job done, but gradually the fronts of the business buildings in this county seat

of Hopkins County are springing out with a "new look."

Property owners and tenants alike are falling in line with a unique program of store front beautification that was launched just about a year ago. Many of the fronts have been improved to the extent that a hometowner coming back home after a year's absence might be astonished.

DAIRYLAND

In this "dairyland capital of Texas," there are more than 200 business buildings of importance. It is estimated that the fronts of approximately fifty percent of them have been improved since what was known as the Downtown Improvement Association endorsed the program.

Latest building fronts to be improved include the City National Bank, Foster's Dry Goods, and Daniels Ready-to-Wear.

As a result of the well-planned program which had the attention of expert engineers, the business district of Sulphur Springs is getting the "shopping center" appearance. Buildings that once were sort of drab looking—and every town has them—are showing up bright and fresh.

The redecorating program is moving along in accordance with a carefully mapped plan prepared by the color engineering department of the Cook Paint & Varnish Co. Whacker Barton is the company's representative here.

STORE FRONTS

When Mr. Barton came up with the idea of brightening Sulphur Springs store fronts it was accepted by the steering committee of the Downtown Improvement Association. Now that group is the beautification committee of the Hopkins County Chamber of Commerce.

Phil Sartin was chairman of the committee, and for his service in this connection he got the chamber of commerce award as the outstanding citizen of the year.

FREE SERVICE

The city planning service offered by the Cook Paint & Varnish Co. is free for the asking, and leaders here were quick to take advantage of the offer. A company representative came here, took pictures of the buildings and streets, and planed a varied color scheme for each street, with the idea of making all buildings on the same side of a street appear as nearly alike as possible.

In Sulphur Springs everything above the awnings of buildings is being painted with the color known as Raleigh peach. Below the awnings the store fronts themselves are painted a different color (all the same, if possible). The colors that have been used include Raleigh peach, brown orchid, butterfly yellow, beige, green, huron blue, stone gray, turquoise, arctic green, mesa coral, and morocco brown.

TALL BUILDINGS

"The color scheme has a tendency to shorten tall buildings and heighten the shorter ones to provide a one-elevation look," said Mr. Barton.

When the improvement plan was adopted an all-out campaign was launched. Block meetings were held with the merchants to explain the idea, and at least 95 percent of the businessmen were not only on hand but accepted the program.

Although one company drew up the beautification plans and designs, all paint dealers in Sulphur Springs have access to them. Painters bid on the projects as they come up.

When the program first started 30 building fronts were painted in 24 days. That was in August 1958 when a hot sun was beaming. Some of the painters avoided the heat by working at night.

STEERING COMMITTEE

Members of the steering committee of the Downtown Improvement Association, who adopted the plan were: Phil A. Sartin, chairman; Raymond (Wacker) Barton, Billy Jones, Jr., Mrs. Claude Milligan, Harold Arnold, Bob Forte, Burt Weits, J. W. Pratt, Jr., E. L. Ashcroft, and F. W. (Bill) Frailey.

Cooperation of the merchants in following the program is fairly equally divided, however the improvements seem to be more uniform on the north side of Connally Street. Some of the larger buildings have been sand blasted, giving them a more modern looking appearance.

Also designed by Cook, but not acted on officially, is a handsome parking lot planter for the square which would claim very little if any parking sections. The entire redecorating scheme takes in light standards, parking meters, traffic markers, mailboxes, trash containers, and stoplight housings.

Balanced Budget, Mutual Security, Less Farm Control Win Top Support in Completed Second District Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, over the last 3 months, I have mailed out a questionnaire to many of the residents of the Second Congressional District and the tabulated results show some very significant trends, which I now call to the attention of the Congress.

The Second District of Minnesota is one of the most prosperous in the State, and the citizens have a fine reputation of being sound, sensible and progressive. The 14 counties involved make it a big District. In 1950, our population was 321,397. By the census of 1960, it is expected to exceed 375,000 and to approach 400,000. Following the 1954 census of agriculture, the Second Congressional District emerged as among the 15 richest districts in the Nation in the value of farm products sold. Today, with the farm population decreasing nationwide, the Second District is showing one of the lowest percentages of decrease in farm population anywhere in the State of Minnesota.

The active interest that the residents of the Second District have taken in answering this poll shows that they follow very closely the decisions and the actions that we take here in the Congress of the United States.

I personally believe strongly in public opinion questionnaires. It helps the people back home and it helps those of us they have elected as representatives. The voters have an easy way to inform their Congressman of their thinking on some of the more important issues facing Congress. At the same time, it enables us to have the views of a wide cross section of the voters on the issues we discuss. Certainly, each Member of Congress has the vitally important obligation to inform himself of the many views of the people whom he strives to represent.

There are, however, several pitfalls in interpreting opinion questionnaires. First of all, since the replies are not taken from a scientifically selected sample, they cannot be touted as foolproof measures of opinion. Only general trends can be regarded as significant.

Secondly, it is not the sole duty of a Congressman to pile the "yes" answers on one side and the "no" answers on one side and vote for the biggest pile. The citizens always expect a Congressman to do more than find out which way the wind blows and vote accordingly.

The Second District questionnaire was mailed early in this session to all the rural boxholders in the district, and several months later to the townspeople who have boxes in their post office. As a result, a breakdown of opinions by rural people and townspeople has been possible. Many of the newspapers in the District also cooperated by printing the questionnaire for their readers. A total of approximately 50,000 questionnaires went out. Among rural residents we had exactly 1,200 replies; from townspeople there were 1,243 replies for a grand total of 2,443 responses.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that these replies are very noteworthy. The extremely high percentage of support given for example to the President's emphasis on a balanced budget is, I believe, highly significant.

On the question, "Do you agree with the President's pay-as-you-go emphasis on having a balanced budget," 82 percent of the respondents answered "yes," 6 percent said "no," and 12 percent "not certain."

I also call your attention to the questions on farm legislation, where the replies from rural boxholders only represent the point of view of the rural people themselves.

The questionnaire asks whether Federal farm policy should take the general direction of lower payments of farmers, with fewer controls. Of 1,200 replies from rural boxholders 66 percent answered "yes," 10 percent answered "no," and 24 percent were "not certain."

When the question was turned around to ask whether Federal farm policy should tke the direction of higher payments with more controls, the answers were 17 percent "yes", 40 percent "no", and 43 percent "not certain."

With respect to education 68 percent of the voters thought the Government should consider it a local and State problem, 16 percent did not think so, and 16 percent were uncertain.

Asked specifically about Federal aid to school construction, 31 percent said they favored it, 42 percent opposed it, and 27 percent were uncertain.

There was less support for Federal aid to help pay teacher's salaries. 12 percent were for it, 59 percent opposed it, and 29 percent were uncertain.

The principle of mutual security won a solid endorsement. In answer to the question, "In general, do you favor continued U.S. assistance to other countries in the free world's struggle against Communist aggression and subversion," the results were, 70 percent "yes," 15 percent "no," and 15 percent "not certain." I must add, however, that there were many who wrote in comments on this question,

expressing concern for the number of abuses of the program.

On small business, the opinion expressed by the townspeople deserves attention; 51 percent believe the Federal Government has not given sufficient attention to the problems of small businessmen; 18 percent think it has; and 31 percent are uncertain.

Regarding an increase in the gas tax to provide necessary funds for Federal highways, 36 percent favor it, while 50 percent are opposed, and 14 percent uncertain.

Regarding amendments to the present Federal minimum wage law, there was general opposition to raising the minimum from $1 to $1.25 per hour; 23 percent were for it, 60 percent were against it, and 17 percent uncertain. On extending coverage to more workers, 42 percent said "yes," 30 percent said "no," and 28 percent were "not certain."

The following tabulation shows the complete replies, by percentage, first for the full 2,443 returns, then for the rural people in the district, and finally for the townspeople:

The Second District questionnaire

Questions	Percent Yes	Percent No	Percent not certain
1. Do you agree with the President's pay-as-you-go emphasis on having a balanced budget?			
Total	82	6	12
Rural	82	7	11
Town	82	4	14
2. To provide necessary funds for Federal highways it is suggested that the Federal gas tax be increased from 3 to 4½ cents per gallon. Do you favor?			
Total	36	50	14
Rural	38	51	11
Town	35	48	17
3. With respect to education, should the Federal Government—			
(1) consider it a local and State problem?			
Total	68	16	16
Rural	72	15	13
Town	64	17	19
(2) aid school construction?			
Total	31	42	27
Rural	29	46	25
Town	32	38	30
(3) help pay teachers' salaries?			
Total	12	59	29
Rural	10	64	26
Town	14	54	32
4. Has the Federal Government given sufficient attention to the problems of the small businessman?			
Total	19	48	33
Rural	20	45	35
Town	18	51	31
5. Please check the general direction which you believe Federal farm policy should take:			
(1) lower payments with fewer controls?			
Total	69	8	23
Rural	66	10	24
Town	72	6	22
(2) higher payments with more controls?			
Total	13	39	48
Rural	17	40	43
Town	10	37	53
6. Do you favor amending the present Federal minimum wage law to—			
(1) raise the present $1 hourly rate to $1.25 per hour?			
Total	23	60	17
Rural	19	66	15
Town	27	53	20
(2) extend coverage to more workers?			
Total	42	30	28
Rural	37	36	27
Town	46	24	30

The Second District questionnaire—Con.

Questions	Percent Yes	Percent No	Percent not certain
7. In general, do you favor continued U.S. assistance to other countries in the free world's struggle against Communist aggression and subversion?			
Total	70	15	15
Rural	71	15	14
Town	69	15	16

Hog Men Determined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, forecasts of national agricultural economists predict lower prices for processed pork in the very near future. Naturally, this is good news for the American housewife and her family. However, the depressed hog market is not good news for the hog producer, who must of necessity start to figure out his loss on this year's pig crop Since the hog market may be unstable for some time to come, he must also plan to see what he might salvage from his present holdings that is not quite ready for the market.

The hog farmer is a man blessed with a certain grain of philosophy that enables him to take the good years with the bad. Above all, he is more concerned with the quality of his product than the quantity. He is equal to the task of adjusting his production to the market trends and is willing to accept his loss while waiting for the more favorable day. While waiting for that day, he will devote his talents and energy to better breeding, better quality and improvement of his lot.

This could not be better illustrated than in the editorial entitled, "Hog Men Determined," as printed in the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman issue of July 20, in this year and period when the fortunes of the hog producer are at a low ebb.

[From the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman, July 20, 1959]

HOG MEN DETERMINED

Probably never before has a turn in a livestock production cycle been as widely publicized and expected as the present numbers buildup phase of the hog production cycle. This was obvious to us from a recent Corn Belt Farm Dailies survey of stockmen in which practically all of those interviewed spoke with a knowledge of the overall situation, forecasts of leading economists, and factors accounting for market changes.

This is very encouraging in itself, of course, but what really impressed us was the reaction of leading stockmen to what is expected to be an unfavorable price situation on hogs in months to come.

Determination to accept the problems of the industry as they come is the most prevalent attitude of established hog producers. Like the good businessmen that they truly are, the majority of sound producers believe that adjustments in production are warranted, but no comprises with established principles of good management are possible.

One prominent hog man has decided to reduce his operations by 50 percent. By far the largest number of established stockmen we interviewed have decided to stand fast for the most part, reducing operations only slightly. Others who have invested large amounts of capital in farrowing and feeding equipment and facilities, feel that good business methods require them to use those facilities to the fullest. They are relying on average prices to keep them solvent until the next favorable cyclical change.

But whatever adjustments they make in the size and timing of their operations, all emphasized these points: (1) Swine improvement will be more important than ever with lower prices; (2) sound rations for greatest feed efficiency are more of a must with cheaper hogs; (3) sanitation and disease control measures may well mean the difference between profit and loss when margins are close.

It hardly needs saying that we agree with these businessmen-stockmen who think conditions call for adjustments, but that principles of good breeding, good feeding, and good management will be more important than ever in coming months.

Political Blackmail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Tuesday, July 21, 1959.

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, July 21, 1959]

POLITICAL BLACKMAIL

It is open season again locally on candidates for public office and incumbents by countless groups seeking handouts through programs and the sale of tickets and chances.

Rarely a day passes that these men in public life are not besieged by individuals with outstretched palms. It is becoming increasingly burdensome to satisfy their demands.

For some reason, individuals, who would not think of holding up a business place or neighbor with a gun, do not hesitate to blackmail men in office or aspiring to posts in the county or community. For that is what they actually are doing under guise of raising money, no matter how worthy the cause.

The man in politics seems to be regarded as legitimate prey by these unthinking and ruthless opportunists who drop hints, often none too gently, that their members can account for a lot of votes on election day.

Now the average candidate or officeholder might not object seriously if he were asked to buy one ticket for himself, but that rarely is the case. The unscrupulous peddler tosses 10 or even 25 at him, knowing full well the purchaser will shove them in a desk drawer if he can find the room; otherwise, they will have to go in the wastebasket.

Many an individual in public office or campaigning for one winds up with a terrific financial headache for his efforts to serve the public because of the invasion of these chiselers.

Both major parties ought to get together and call a halt to this practice by refusing

to make any purchases or to set up a clearing house for this purpose, so the individual will not be made a sucker.

It is not only unfair, but it is dishonest in the sense that these sales and contributions are forced, not voluntary.

Unemployment in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, lest we in the Congress forget that there still are economic trouble-spots in America, despite all the cheering indications of improving times, I should like to call attention to the July 15 issue of the Charleston Gazette, of Charleston, W. Va.

On page 1 of that edition of the newspaper there are two adjoining headlines regarding unemployment. One of them is: "Greatest Number in U.S. History Had Jobs in June." The other headline is: "Unemployment Claims Spurt Upward in West Virginia."

In order that we of the Congress may see the entire picture—which shows that America still has nearly 4 million out of work, despite a record-breaking number of people working—I ask unanimous consent that the two adjoining articles from last Wednesday's Charleston Gazette be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, July 15, 1959]

GREATEST NUMBER IN U.S. HISTORY HAD JOBS IN JUNE

WASHINGTON.—The greatest number of Americans in history had jobs in June. Quickened factory, farm and building activity pushed civilian employment up to 67,342,000.

The employment gain was 1,326,000 in the month, the Labor Department announced. It climaxed an unprecedented spring upsurge which opened up 4,600,000 jobs in 4 months.

Unemployment rose, too, as it always does when the school year ends. Two million young jobhunters hit the labor market, and not all of them found work.

Joblessness rose by 593,000 to a total of 3,982,000. This was still about 2½ million below the recession level of a year ago. After allowing for seasonal factors, unemployment remained at 4.9 percent of the civilian labor force.

The outlook for the rest of the year is for some additional decline in unemployment, Labor Department officials said.

It appeared therefore that Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell won't have to eat his hat this fall. In April he promised to do so publicly if joblessness had not dropped below 3 million by October.

The Department's unofficial guess is that there will be 2,600,000 unemployed in that month. This forecast is based solely on the usual seasonal pattern. Officials said it could be upset by an economic setback, such as the effects of a prolonged steel strike.

The gain in employment was largely seasonal, reflecting the pickup in farming, construction and other outdoor occupations. Mitchell noted with satisfaction continued recovery in the manufacturing industries, which were the hardest hit by the recession and the slowest in rehiring.

Employment in hard goods manufacturing—such as metals, machinery, autos, and appliances—gained 120,000 in June, a month when it normally does not rise. The glass, stone, and clay industries also added to their working forces.

The previous high mark of employment was 67,221,000; it came in July 1957 shortly before the onset of the business recession.

During the recovery period, employment did not pick up as rapidly as production and income until early this year. But, since February, the rapidly expanding economy has made room for more than 1 million jobs each month.

The average factory workweek rose by one-tenth of an hour in June and stood at 40 hours and 36 minutes. This was the highest level for June since 1955.

As a result of the comparatively small increase in the workweek, average earnings of factory workers rose by 22 cents to a new record of $90.54 a week in June. Hourly earnings remained unchanged at $2.23.

Dr. Seymour Wolfbein, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower, said the increase in unemployment in June was concentrated in the younger age groups—young people of 14 to 24. Joblessness among adults actually declined, especially among the adult male breadwinners holding factory jobs.

There was a decline also in long-term unemployment, that which has continued for 15 weeks or longer. The number of long-term unemployment dropped by 200,000.

UNEMPLOYMENT CLAIMS SPURT UPWARD IN WEST VIRGINIA

Claims under the State's regular unemployment compensation program spurted upward again last week, with initial filings numbering 2,770 against 2,395 in the period ended July 4.

All claims, including those of a continued variety in which filings are required only each 2 weeks, numbered 17,480.

Government Secrecy To Hide Imprudence, Mismanagement, and Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Comptroller General Joseph Campbell has complained that executive agencies are withholding information expressly required by law to be made available to his auditors. He has pointed out that to conceal substantive evidence of waste and extravagance, improvident management, poor procurement practices, and other adverse conditions can result only in loss to the taxpayers.

The Milwaukee Journal has emphasized this situation in an excellent editorial which was published on July 18. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFRAID OF EXPOSING WASTE?

President Eisenhower grew visibly angry when he was asked at his news conference whether he had taken any steps to end Government secrecy that has been used "to hide imprudence, mismanagement, fraud, and in same cases material that has later resulted in indictments."

The President asked the reporter to put the question in writing "because you start right off the bat with the premise or implication that someone is guilty of fraud, and I don't believe it."

Yet the charge is being made. And it is based in the main part on the complaint of Comptroller General Joseph Campbell that executive agencies are withholding information "expressly required by law to be made available to his auditors. He has protested that refusal to make such information available brings the opportunity "to conceal substantive evidence of waste and extravagance, improvident management, poor procurement practices, and other adverse conditions."

The General Accounting Office which Campbell heads has managed to show enough waste and bad management with the limited information it does get to justify the suspicion that refusal to give him more information could very well prevent uncovering even more scandalous matters.

A recent executive witness told a House committee that his agency feared giving information to the Comptroller General because it would get to Congress and into the public prints. Why shouldn't legitimate information get to Congress? The Comptroller General is watchdog of Congress. Congress has to pass upon policies and appropriations and should have all the proper information on which to base judgments.

And why shouldn't information get to the public unless it would damage national security?

We trust that the President, when he gets the question in letter form, will realize that this is not a matter for anger at the question being asked. It is a matter of waste of the tax dollar and the public's right to know.

Liberia Celebrates 112th Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I returned from the Bandung Conference I announced that I would address the U.S. Congress each time there was an anniversary of one of the 29 nations participating in the Asian-African Conference who are on friendly terms with the United States.

Today it is my pleasure to pay tribute to one of our stanchest friends on the continent of Africa—the Republic of Liberia which celebrates the 112th anniversary of its independence on Sunday, July 26. I wish to extend greetings to President William V. S. Tubman, to the Government and people of Liberia and to His Excellent George Arthur Padmore,

Liberia's Ambassador to the United States.

Founded in 1822 by freed American slaves under auspices of the American Colonization Society, Liberia declared her independence as a free and sovereign state on July 26, 1847, thus becoming one of only two republics in the world governed by Negroes.

Since then she has quietly and thoroughly engaged in the great task of nation building, erecting what was until a few years ago the lone Republic in all Africa.

In many respects, as Ambassador Padmore has said often, Liberia is an extension of America onto African soil. Founded by Americans, her political, social, and economic systems follow closely those of the United States.

In war and peace she has been our unquestionable ally in Africa.

Over three-fourths of her exports are shipped to us. The United States, in turn, has aided materially in Liberia's economic development.

To repeat what I said in a previous salute to this valuable ally: "The Republic of Liberia—land of great contrasts between the primitive and the modern—may be the pivot on which will swing the future of Atlantic Africa."

Under the courageous, dynamic leadership of President Tubman, Liberia stands today as a monument to free world achievement.

Seeking investments, not alms, the country opened wide its doors to foreign investment with a liberal policy that has brought vast benefits to both investors and Liberia alike.

With its great store of natural resources being developed by some of the world's largest and most respected businesses, including our own Firestone Rubber Co.; B. F. Goodrich Rubber Co.; and Republic Steel, the country is afire with industrial activity.

New roads, harbors, airfields, communications lines, businesses, hospitals, and schools are rising throughout the land. National income has multiplied. Social legislation has been enacted protecting the weak. Its diplomatic missions stand majestically in the major countries of the world.

With industrialization underway, the country embarked upon a program of national unification—uniting in firm, amiable bonds the Republic's estimated 2½ million people, including 23 tribes with 23 different tribal dialects.

Of these programs, President Tubman has said:

> Because of the success of the unification and other development programs, Liberia has become a place where all Liberians and foreigners alike can live freely under the law without discrimination, fear or hindrance. While these programs have brought to our shores persons of all races and nationalities, I am happy to state that side by side we have worked to achieve satisfactory results. Over the years this nation has made progress in health and sanitation; transportation and communication; agriculture; education and other related fields. But there is yet need for greater, more extended and expanded development.
>
> We are not content with our accomplishments; for until the whole of Africa is linked by first-class roads, bridges and other means of transportation; until there are hospitals, clinics, schools and hotels fully equipped and staffed by trained personnel; until our communications system spans the entire continent and world making contacts easy and speedy; until cheap and modern power is made available to attract and encourage more large-scale industrial activities; until our agricultural products are sufficient not only for local consumption but also to reach the world markets and yield adequate returns; until the peoples of our continent are free and independent to enjoy their inherent rights in common with the peoples of other continents, we of this continent cannot be contended. Neither can be relax our efforts.
>
> This is therefore a great task which requires hard work and earnest strivings. It requires patience, tolerance and understanding, not rash and hasty actions. We must learn to work and live together with all races and people as brothers.

Liberia's program of domestic industrialization and unification referred to by President Tubman is now bearing fruits. So is her insistence on freedom and independence for the whole of Africa.

When Liberia was the lone African republic she consistently voted for and sponsored resolutions and measures in the United Nations condemning the oppression and subjugation of her fellow Africans under colonialism and imperialism. Liberia sponsored resolutions for the liberation of Libya, Morocco, Tunisia, the Sudan, and Ghana. She recently welcomed into the community of nations the Republic of Guinea and is ready to extend the same welcome to Nigeria, the Cameroons, Togoland, and Somalia.

Though, as Ambassador Padmore has put it, "Liberia's century-old vigil as the lone sentinel of African freedom is ended," not so her African leadership.

In free Africa, where the cry for independence has been replaced by the cry for unity, Liberia is playing a leading part in achieving this solidarity. The Liberian Government has proposed an immediate beginning of cooperation in all fields where cooperation is possible now. It feels that the precise political framework within which this cooperation can be strengthened and continued should be left for later discussion.

President Tubman has said that his aim is cooperation without controversy. He does not wish to see the aspiration of the masses for united action foundering in a sea of argument over sovereignty, leadership, frontiers, and constitutions.

A stanch advocate of African unity, President Tubman was the only chief of state to attend the conference of independent African states at Accra, Ghana.

Because of certain artificial barriers which have kept African nations apart, Mr. Tubman has said, economic, cultural, social, and political intercourse between Africans has been negligible.

As a start toward rectifying this forced estrangement, he has proposed the formation of the Associated States of Africa, an organization in which each nation will be free to retain its autonomous status and its peculiar identity, but in which all of them will be bound together by a single convention of friendship, commerce, and navigation, workable for the common good of all concerned.

In a signal tribute to President Tubman and his government, the Liberian people recently went to the polls and almost unanimously reelected him to an unprecedented fourth presidential term—an honor befitting so great a servant of his people.

While the Liberian people were in the midst of honoring their servants, they themselves were being honored in a Nigerian newspaper—as the silent servants of Africa.

On this, Liberia's 112th independence day celebration, I too salute President Tubman, his government, and people—for endurance as a nation under adverse circumstances, its lone star beaming a ray of hope to all Africans—for developing and offering to the free world indispensable raw materials that are rapidly becoming depleted in other parts of the world—and for aiding the continent of Africa to regain its inherent and inalienable right to freedom and independence.

I salute Ambassador Padmore for outstanding performances in representing so creditably the Republic of Liberia in our country.

May Liberia continue to enjoy God's blessings of progress and prosperity.

Federal Preemption in the Field of Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting of the Labor Law Institute sponsored by the North Carolina Bar Association and the law schools of Duke University, the University of North Carolina, and Wake Forest College, an address was delivered by Hon. Whiteford S. Blakeney, an attorney of Charlotte, N.C. Mr. Blakeney is a practicing attorney in my State, giving his special attention to matters relating to labor law.

It is my feeling that the scholarly address of Mr. Blakeney will be of interest to all Members of the House, regardless of their views on labor legislation. I, therefore, insert it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as information to all who are interested in this important subject.

LAW

(Address at Labor Law Institute—Sponsored by North Carolina Bar Association and the Law Schools of Duke University, University of North Carolina and Wake Forest College)

In the labor field the law pertaining to damage suits in both State and Federal

courts and the law pertaining to injunctions in Federal courts is susceptible of being outlined in a fairly clear-cut way. The law relating to State court injunctions in the labor field is, however, in a state of uncertainty and complexity due to the increasing impact of a doctrine which involves fundamental problems of law and Government—the so-called doctrine of Federal preemption.

Before coming to this vexatious subject last mentioned, let us first sketch out those matters which are more clear and definite.

As to suits for monetary damages in the labor field, both the State and Federal courts are entirely open to private litigants—upon the ordinary principles governing torts and breaches of contract and subject to the usual rules of State and Federal jurisdiction. (Note—Even this is no longer true since the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *San Diego Building Trades Council* v. *Garmon*, 3 L. Ed. 2d 775 (1959), which holds that State courts may no longer award damages for infringements of State labor laws unless the offense is accompanied by violence.)

As to injunctions in the labor field, we find the Federal courts largely closed to private litigants. The Norris-LaGuardia Act virtually disqualifies Federal judges from issuing injunctions in private litigation involving labor matters.

If I may digress for a moment—it has always seemed to me unwise legislation to declare that in certain fields courts shall not be trusted to judge or to wield the normal and traditional powers of a court. Today there is a considerable hue and cry to deprive the U.S. Supreme Court of jurisdiction to handle certain types of cases. I doubt the wisdom of such action for the same reason that I think the Norris-LaGuardia Act unwise. I notice, however, that a great part of the present opposition to the circumscribing of the Supreme Court's jurisdiction comes from the same sources which sponsored and supported Norris-LaGuardia's circumscribing of the injunctive power of the Federal courts in labor disputes.

At any rate, this we can set down as a definite feature of the picture we are now outlining, namely, that in private litigation in the labor field, Federal court injunctions are, with a few exceptions, unavailable.

As to proceedings in the labor field initiated by Federal Government agencies, however, Federal court injunctions are, of course, the normal and prevailing means of enforcement. Thus, the National Labor Relations Board regularly seeks enforcement of its decrees by petition filed directly in the U.S. courts of appeals, and is authorized to seek enforcement of special sections of the Labor-Management Relations Act by petition for injunction in the Federal district courts—for example, coincident with the issuance of an unfair labor practice complaint or in cases of alleged violation of the secondary boycott provisions of the act. But again, private litigants may not seek to obtain such injunctions in the Federal courts.

We come now to the more difficult problem of State court injunctions in the labor field. It is not only the U.S. Government which has laws and statutes in the increasingly important realm of labor relations. The States which make up our Federal Union also have their respective policies and laws in this field—both court declared and legislatively enacted. The Supreme Court of the United States, however, in ever-widening degree is ruling that the State courts may not by injunctive decree enforce their own laws and statutes in this field—even though the State law be in no way contradictory of or in conflict with Federal law. The doctrine upon which the U.S. Supreme Court rests these rulings is called, as you understand, Federal preemption.

There is, of course, nothing new in the proposition that on any matter as to which the U.S. Congress has the constitutional power to legislate, its acts prevail over and oust any contrary or conflicting State laws or statutes. This, to be sure, is conceded on all sides.

Legal problem is held to arise, however, even when harmonious and nonconflicting Federal laws and State laws exist in the same field. Though the Federal and the State laws be mutually complimentary and serve a common end or purpose the question nevertheless, says the Supreme Court, is whether the State law must depart from the field, leaving the Federal law alone and exclusive.

Upon such question it would seem that the primary inquiry is: What was the intent of Congress? For if Congress in fact did not intend to take over the field exclusively nor to eliminate the operation of harmonious State law in that field, there would seem to be no ground upon which the Supreme Court could take it upon itself to say that the State laws must nevertheless get out of that field. Ever and again the Supreme Court avows that it has no authority to shape policy on such matters but that it seeks only to discern the intent of what Congress has enacted.

This being so, it would further seem that a congressional intent to rid a field of State law, which is entirely harmonious and nonconflicting, should not lightly be presumed. Since Congress can so readily make clear such an intent, should not the presumption or implication be against such an intent in the absence of its being expressed? Just as in construing, for example, a contract of insurance, the interpretation in case of ambiguity is against the draftsman who had the power and the opportunity to express, if he desired, a contrary intent.

The justification generally presented by the Supreme Court for holding in a given case that State law has been preempted, though Congress has in that case expressed no clear intent to preempt, is that the subject matter is such that it ought to be uniformly dealt with over the whole Nation and that varying State actions in different States would be undesirable. But is this not a consideration for Congress? Is this not a decision of policy which the Supreme Court elsewhere emphatically declares not to be within its province?

Nevertheless, the Supreme Court moves at accelerating pace and with widening sweep to rule that where the Federal law is anywhere present in a field, the enforcement of State law in that field is preempted—no matter that the Federal and State laws do not conflict and no matter that Congress has expressed no intent to preempt.

Now it must be noted that this doctrine is not by any means a new conception with the Supreme Court. It has a long history. Discussion of various aspects of this theorem may be seen as far back as the landmark case of *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, 9 Wheat. 1, 6 L. Ed. 23 and it has been applied in a number of fields through the years, for example, in the field of railway safety appliance regulation, *Southern Railway Co.* v. *Indiana*, 236 U.S. 439; in matters of extradition, *Innes* v. *Tobin*, 240 U.S. 127; in cases of alien registration, *Hines* v. *Davidowitz*, 312 U.S. 52; in pure food and drug regulations, *Cloverleaf Company* v. *Patterson*, 315 U.S. 148; and most recently in cases of subversive activities, *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson*, 350 U.S. 497.

But it is in the labor field that this doctrine has had its greatest flowering. Even in the labor field, however, the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court have been on both sides of the fence. In fact, the Supreme Court decisions, on the issue of permitting State action or striking down State action in the labor field, cannot truthfully be described as anything other than intricate, inconsistent and confusing.

Justice Frankfurter stated this more euphemistically when he observed in the recent case of *Teamsters Union* v. *Vogt*, 354 U.S. 284 that "examination of these adjudications" discloses "an evolving, not a static, course of decision." An equally apt phrase might have been "revolving" instead of "evolving."

On this subject of the Supreme Court's invalidating State action, on the one hand, and permitting State action, on the other hand, we might outline and tabulate some of the principal decisions as follows—commencing about 1940 and taking them in chronological sequence:

U.S. Supreme Court decisions invalidating and striking down State action in the labor field: *Thornhill* v. *Alabama*, 310 U.S. 88; *AFL* v. *Swing*, 312 U.S. 321; *Teamsters Union* v. *Garner*, 346 U.S. 485; *Weber* v. *Anheuser-Busch*, 348 U.S. 468; *Guss* v. *Utah Labor Relations Board*, 353 U.S. 1; *Meat Cutters Union* v. *Fairlawn*, 353 U.S. 20; *San Diego* v. *Garmon*, 353 U.S. 26; *Electrical Workers Union* v. *Farnsworth*, 353 U.S. 969.

U.S. Supreme Court decisions permitting or affirming State action in the labor field: *Drivers Union* v. *Meadowmoor*, 312 U.S. 287; *Carpenters Union* v. *Ritter's Cafe*, 315 U.S. 722; *Bakery Drivers Union* v. *Wohl*, 315 U.S. 769; *Algoma Plywood Company* v. *Wisconsin Employment Relations Board*, 336 U.S. 301; *Giboney* v. *Empire Storage Company*, 336 U.S. 490; *Hughes* v. *California*, 339 U.S. 460; *Teamsters Union* v. *Hanke*, 339 U.S. 470; *Building Service Employees* v. *Gazzam*, 339 U.S. 532; *Plumbers Union* v. *Graham*, 345 U.S. 192; *Construction Workers Union* v. *Laburnum*, 347 U.S. 656; *Teamsters Union* v. *Vogt*, 354 U.S. 284.

Now by way of studying Federal preemption and its operation a little more in detail let us consider this doctrine in relation to the so-called State right-to-work laws. In the Supreme Court adjudications regarding these State right-to-work laws and the application of Federal preemption to them, we find graphic example of a basic trend in the evolution or devolution, according to your viewpoint—in the Government of our country.

The right-to-work laws exist in almost 40 percent of the States, North Carolina being one of the States which have such a law. North Carolina's statue is typical. It provides that neither membership or nonmembership in a labor union can be made a compulsory condition of employment within the bounds of this State. The validity of this law has been expressly upheld, both by the North Carolina Supreme Court and by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The statute has two fundamental purposes and justifications: (1) To assure freedom of choice to the individual in the matter of joining or not joining a labor union, (2) to prevent labor unions from acquiring monopoly control over employment in the State.

Now all of the State right-to-work laws have been expressly overridden by Federal statute in the field of railway and airplane transportation. In 1951 by amendment to the Railway Labor Act, Congress specifically enacted that employees could be required to join and pay dues to labor unions in order to work in these industries—and that any State statutes providing otherwise should be, to such extent, invalid. In *Hanson* v. *Railway Unions*, 351 U.S. 225, the U.S. Supreme Court held this Federal enactment to be valid and effective for purposes of overriding the contrary State statutes.

There is, however, no Federal statute expressly overriding State right-to-work laws in any other industrial areas except that of railway and airplane transportation. But the labor unions point to the fact that there is

Federal statute, namely, the National Labor Relations Act which deals with the subject of coercing employees. Upon this they raised the argument that State courts should be barred, that is, preempted from issuing injunctions to enforce State right-to-work laws whenever there is alternative recourse of a Federal nature, that is, before the National Labor Relations Board under the National Labor Relations Act.

Since the U.S. Supreme Court has held ever since the middle thirties that whatever affects interstate commerce is within the "commerce" power of Congress and since the Supreme Court has also ruled for the last 25 years that practically everything affects interstate commerce, it follows that in virtually any and every situation there is, theoretically, access to the National Labor Relations Board. Therefore, under this argument, State court issuance of injunctions to enforce State right-to-work laws would be preempted or barred in practically all cases.

In the group of cases commencing with *Teamsters Union* v. *Garner*, 346 U.S. 485, about 5 years ago, and culminating, last year, in the case of *Electrical Workers Union* v. *Farnsworth*, 353 U.S. 969, the U.S. Supreme Court accepted this argument and made the ruling that where there can be recourse to the National Labor Relations Board, there can be no injunctive enforcement of State right-to-work laws. And this year our North Carolina Supreme Court bowed to this ruling in the case of *Douglas Aircraft Co.* v. *Construction Union*, 247 N.C. 620.

I would like to present for your consideration a few thoughts which occur to me with respect to this ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court. In the first place, I submit that since there is in the National Labor Relations Act no expression by Congress of any intent to override State law, as there is for example in the amended Railway Labor Act, and since the central purpose and theory of the National Labor Relations Act and of State right-to-work laws is the same—namely, to assure to the employee freedom of choice in the matter of belonging or not belonging to a labor union—that these things being true, there should be no presumption that Congress intended to preempt the States' enforcement of their own right-to-work laws.

Another aspect of the matter is this. In other U.S. Supreme Court decisions, for example, the Laburnum case, it is made clear that although State court injunctive enforcement of right-to-work laws is preempted, still such laws may be invoked by way of damage suits and criminal indictments. These, to be sure, are often too laggard to be of any practical value. It seems ironical that in cases of labor controversy the U.S. Supreme Court should preempt the State courts of their effective process and leave to them their ineffective process.

The Supreme Court says that it must declare such preemption, for otherwise there might be too much variation in the remedies fashioned by State court decrees as compared to the remedies extended by the National Labor Relations Board. As to this it might first be observed that there is often more virtue in variation than in conformity. Moreover, is this not a consideration of policy which is by all means within the province of Congress, not the Court, and on which Congress had ample opportunity to express preemption if it intended such—as it plainly did, for example, in amending the Railway Labor Act?

Here is another inconsistency—the Supreme Court holds, though over dissent, that State courts may still issue injunctions in situations where riots or danger to safety exists, even though there be access to the Labor Board in such situation. Yet where one is deprived of liberty and property in violation of a State right-to-work law, the State court can issue no injunction to protect them. In the situation of danger to safety the traditional power of the State is involved, says the Supreme Court. Yet the policy and law of the State are just as truly set forth in a right-to-work statute. Is State sovereignty any the less present in a positively enacted statute than in the police power? And is liberty any the less to be protected than safety—whether the citizen invokes a statute of the State or the general police power of the State?

Here is a further irony—in the days of yellow-dog contracts, that is, the agreement which made it a condition of employment that an employee should not join a labor union, the States enacted statutes against such contracts, and the U.S. Supreme Court struck down such statutes. Now in the day of the yellow-dog in reverse, by which it is made a condition of employment that an employee must join a labor union, the States enacted statutes against such contracts, and the U.S. Supreme Court, having swung full circle, now emasculate these statutes and prevents their effective enforcement. In each instance it has been the States which have sought to insure freedom of choice for the individual. In each instance it has been the U.S. Supreme Court which has blocked this road to freedom.

Nor have we yet recounted all the incongruities of this matter. The theory of the preemption doctrine, as we have seen, is that the State courts may not issue injunctions because there is access to the Labor Board. But the Labor Board has the discretion to set its own jurisdictional standards and it may choose not to accept jurisdiction over a given case. Even so, says the U.S. Supreme Court in *Guss* v. *Utah State Labor Board* (353 U.S. 1), the State court is still barred from issuing injunctions. At this point the litigant finds himself in a legal vacuum—with no injunctive protection whatever available to him in any direction whatever—no matter what the crying needs or complete merits of his case may be. This is preemption with a vengeance—indeed, it would seem, to the point of judicial stultification.

We come now to the final and perhaps most amazing aspect of this subject. I have called your attention to the fact that in the National Labor Relations Act there is no expression of intent to preempt State right-to-work laws as there is, for example, in the amended Railway Labor Act. I have tried to show why the situation is, therefore, not one calling for a presumption of preemption—but rather the opposite. I now show you this crowning aspect of the matter. The National Labor Relations Act, as amended, actually contains a provision, its section 14(b), affirmatively specifying and stipulating that State right-to-work laws shall not be overridden. But the U.S. Supreme Court does not note or mention this section 14(b). Thus, it is finally to be seen that not only is the case one in which an inference of preemption is unjustified. In substance, the case is one in which Congress has expressly declared that it intends no preemption—that preemption is forbidden. Yet, nevertheless, the Supreme Court preempts.

This whole matter, I submit, presents a conspicuous and revealing example of an ominous trend in this country today—a widening and accelerating trend toward the expansion of Federal authority and the shriveling of State power. The chief architect of this process is, and for the past 20 years has been, the U.S. Supreme Court. For it is the U.S. Supreme Court which expounds the Constitution.

The men who wrote that Constitution had personal knowledge and a deep apprehension of an all powerful Central Government. The States which established that Constitution did so only upon the condition that it should specifically stipulate that the Central Government would have no powers save those expressly given to it and that all other power should remain and abide in the respective States and their citizens.

Whether that solemn covenant is being violated—whether that Constitution is being miscontrued—is for each man to form his own opinion. For my part, I am deeply of the conviction that the trend toward the expansion of Federal power is inflicting vital harm upon the destiny of this Nation.

The Recent U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. Dual Track and Field Meet at Philadelphia, Pa., Sponsored by the Philadelphia Inquirer Charities, Inc., in Cooperation With the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States Is a Splendid Example of the Unceasing Efforts Being Made To Promote International Good Will Through Athletic Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. track and field meet held at Philadelphia on July 18 and July 19, 1959, and sponsored by the Philadelphia Inquirer Charities, Inc., in cooperation with the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States is another fine example of the AAU's people-to-people program in action.

For more than 40 years the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States, which is the national governing body of 19 sports in the United States, in carrying out its people-to-people program has sent many thousands of track athletes, swimmers, boxers, wrestlers, weightlifters, basketball, and other teams to all parts of the world. At the same time the AAU has brought hundreds of foreign athletes to the United States for athletic contests such as the U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. track and field meet last week in Philadelphia.

It is of interest to state that in the program to encourage international relations and promote peace and good will among the nations of the world, the AAU in 1958 sent more than 300 athletes to over 30 different countries, several of which are behind the Iron Curtain.

At the recent U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. track meet in Philadelphia President Eisenhower in a message extending his warm greetings sounded the keynote of the international contest between United States and Russian athletes. The message which was printed in the official souvenir program is as follows:

Last summer I followed with interest the competition between the track and field teams of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of the United States at Lenin Stadium in Moscow. As these teams meet for their return match at Franklin Field in Philadelphia this July, it is a pleasure to send greetings to each contestant.

A common interest in the field of sports helps form a bond of understanding among athletes throughout the world. Meetings of

this sort provide an opportunity for strengthening that bond through travel, observation and the hospitality of host nations. As this understanding among individual citizens is increased, we can hopefully assume that better international relations will also result.

I am delighted to add my best wishes for a fine meet and for the success of every effort to promote the ideals of good sportsmanship and good will.

Sincerely,

(Signed) DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Following the recent U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. track meet, in Philadephia, Dmitri Postnikov, director of the Russian team expressed the Russians' sentiments when he said:

We believe this track meet and other cultural and sports exchanges between our two nations contribute to friendship and understanding. We hope such exchanges will continue.

Philadelphia, the host city for the international event, fully lived up to its traditional role as the "City of Brotherly Love" by sparing no pains in providing a hospitable and friendly atmosphere.

The Amateur Athletic Union and the Philadelphia Inquirer Charities, Inc., responsible for the 2-day track and field meet added to their laurels as a result of the successful and enjoyable programs which attracted thousands of athletic-minded enthusiasts from all over the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be in attendance at the two-nation competition in Philadelphia at which time some of the world's outstanding athletes gave convincing evidence of their ability and skill. The event was heralded as a warmup for the 1960 Olympic games to be held next summer in Italy and judging from the performance of individual stars at Philadelphia, interest in next year's Olympics is certain to increase as a result of the highly enjoyable Quaker City program.

Mr. Walter H. Annenberg, editor and publisher of the Philadelphia Inquirer, who plays an important role in the successful operation of the Philadelphia Inquirer Charities, Inc., deserves a large share of the credit for the fine contribution the 2-day program made in promoting international friendship through better understanding among the peoples of all nations and especially the United States and Russia. Mr. Annenber, who for years has been a stanch supporter of all forms of athletics, has a special fondness for track and field meets with the result that he never misses an opportunity to witness such events regardless of time or distance.

From the vantage point he enjoys as editor and publisher and as the moving spirit in the Philadelphia Inquirer Charities, Inc., Mr. Annenberg saluted his home city of Philadelphia for its traditional hospitality in the following article titled "Thank You, Philadelphia," which appeared in the July 21, 1959, issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer:

THANK YOU, PHILADELPHIA

As host city for the United States-Russian track and field meet sponsored by the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States and the Philadelphia Inquirer Charities, Inc., Philadelphia has displayed again its traditional warm hospitality.

The thousands who crowded Franklin Field on Saturday and Sunday naturally had the Americans as their sentimental favorites, but they cheered individual performances on their merit. They were rewarded by close and thrilling contests; not even a heavy downpour of rain could keep most of them from staying on while a great athlete, the Russian team captain, Vasily Kuznetsov, sought valiantly against handicaps to break his own decathlon record.

Sports events like this can be most helpful in promoting better understanding between peoples, and out of better understanding can come improved international relations, and mutual trust in place of tensions.

The friendliness shown the visiting Russians in Philadelphia, the sportsmanship demonstrated by spectators as well as participants at the meet, will surely not be lost upon these young men and women. The dividends in goodwill can be very great.

To Philadelphia for its generous hospitality, I wish to extend my personal thanks. To all those who made our vsiitors' stay here pleasant and agreeable, including particularly officials of the AAU and the University of Pennsylvania; the management and staffs of the Warwick, Sheraton, and Barclay Hotels; and my associates in Triangle Publications, Inc.: "Thank you."

WALTER H. ANNENBERG,
Editor and Publisher, the Philadelphia Inquirer.

Mr. Speaker, the following interesting article, titled "U.S. Youths Pays Off," also appeared in the July 21, 1959, issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer and reveals the ages of the winners in the men's running and field events at the Philadelphia track meet. It discloses that American winners had an average age of 23.6 years while the Russian winners averaged 26.3 years. The article follows:

U.S. YOUTH PAYS OFF

Youth paid off for the American men's track and field team in its 127–108 victory over the Soviet Union at Franklin Field. America's 11 individual winners (including sprinter Ray Norton who scored a double) had an average age of 23.6. The Russian winners averaged 26.3.

The full list of men's winners in running and field events:

Event	Winner	Age	Performance
100	Ray Norton (United States)	21	0:10.3
200	Ray Norton (United States)	21	0:20.7
400	Ed Southern (United States)	21	0:46.2
800	Tom Murphy (United States)	24	1:48.5
1,500	Dyrol Burleson (United States)	19	3:49.4
3,000	S. Rzhishchin [1] (U.S.S.R.)	26	8:51.6
Steeplechase:			
5,000	A. Artynyuk (U.S.S.R.)	24	14:17.8
10,000	A. Desyatchikov (U.S.S.R.)	24	31:40.6
110 hurdles	Hayes Jones (United States)	20	0:13.6
400 hurdles	Josh Culbreath (United States)	26	0:50.5
Pole vault	Don Bragg (United States)	24	15–2¾
High jump	R. Shavlakidze (U.S.S.R.)	27	[2] 6–9
Broad jump	Greg Bell (United States)	28	26–7
Hop, step, jump	K. Tsygankov (U.S.S.R.)	28	52–4
Shot put	Parry O'Brien [1] (United States)	27	[3] 63–2½
Discus	Al Oerter (United States)	22	188–9
Javelin	Al Cantello (United States)	28	262–5
Hammer	Vasily Rudenko (U.S.S.R.)	28	219–0
Decathlon	Vasily Kuznetsov (U.S.S.R.)	27	8,350 points.

[1] Won last year in Moscow.
[2] Decided on number of misses.
[3] Broke world record.

New White Fleet Is Sound Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENVER D. HARGIS
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. HARGIS. Mr. Speaker, I was very favorably impressed by Comdr. Frank Manson's proposal for a new White Fleet, as outlined in the July 27 issue of Life magazine, and I am happy to endorse and support such a potentially worthwhile venture. Life's graphic and dramatic presentation of the idea should capture the imagination of a great many readers, and thus assure widespread popular approval.

Certainly the relatively low expenditure required for preparing and operating such a fleet should be a sound investment, not only from the standpoint of invaluable services rendered to people in distress, but as a means of boosting American prestige abroad. The use of inactive Navy ships and stored surplus foods for this purpose would, in my opinion, be an extremely practical approach to the problem of assisting the needy peoples of the world. I am in full agreement with the quoted comment of my Oklahoma colleague, Congressman ED EDMONDSON, that this "makes a lot more sense than some parts of our foreign aid program."

I intend to do my full share in helping to make the new White Fleet a reality.

Executive Privilege: A Convenient Device

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, the frequent resort of the executive branch to the theory of "executive privilege" in denying public information to the public—and to the Congress as the representatives of the public—should be a matter of genuine concern to all citizens.

It is recognized, of course, that, in this period of extreme world tension, certain matters bearing on national security should not be discussed openly in detail.

On the other hand, bureaucrats should not be permitted the easy refuge of "executive privilege" to avoid the annoyance or embarrassment of public disclosure of their activities.

In this connection, and under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial appearing in the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of July 20, 1959:

Somebody is going to have to explain to President Eisenhower that the "executive privilege" dogma, which originated during his first term some 5 years ago is being perverted into a device for "covering up" and denying the public the facts concerning the government.

The President showed indignation when questioned at his latest press conference as to whether "imprudence, mismanagement and fraud" might not be concealed through the use of "executive privilege." Yet the fact remains that there are real perils here, as exemplified in the recent concealment by the International Cooperation Administration, through this same device, of corrupation, profiteering and mismanagement in Laos.

Mr. Eisenhower would never knowingly condone dishonesty in his administration, but the fact remains that "coverups" are made relatively easy through the use of "executive privilege."

Under it, a Federal official can withhold information concerning practically any of his official acts, whether or not they have any relation to national security. He can not only withhold such information, from the public and the press, but also from Congress and the General Accounting Office.

As an example of how dangerous this is, it has been pointed out that if "executive privilege" had been dreamed up at the time of the Teapot Dome scandal of the 1920's, the late Senator Thomas J. Walsh who uncovered that sordid deal would have been practically helpless in getting the facts.

So it would be advisable for Mr. Eisenhower to look into this "executive privilege" thing much more carefully than he has done so far. He will find that it carries within itself the seeds of scandal, and offers needless temptation to department heads.

It should be abolished.

Chairman Paul Butler's Criticism of Congressional Leadership and Attacks on Southern Democrats Is Resented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, on July 16, to be exact, our esteemed colleague from Tennessee, the Honorable CLIFFORD DAVIS, wrote a letter to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the Honorable Paul Butler, regarding the latter's attitude toward the Democrats in the Southern States, and particularly with reference to his recent attacks on the leaders of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the sentiments so ably expressed by Mr. DAVIS is shared by many of us who feel the injustices of Mr. Butler's actions. I personally wish to associate myself with Mr. DAVIS in serving notice on the Democratic chairman that his criticisms of the leadership in the Congress and his unjustified attacks on southern Democrats, is resented to the fullest extent.

Mr. Speaker, with the consent of my distinguished colleague, Mr. DAVIS, I include in my remarks his letter referred to:

JULY 16, 1959.

HON. PAUL M. BUTLER,
Chairman, Democratic National Committee, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR PAUL: I have been shocked at your continued attacks on those of us in the Democratic Party who live in the South. Over all of these years you know full well what southern Democrats have meant to the party.

You have gone a long way in reflecting on Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Senator LYNDON JOHNSON. You have never heard Speaker RAYBURN publicly criticize you, but on the contrary you know how he has been your friend in the past.

I work hard at this job and believe I am a sincere Democrat. You know that my wife, Carrie Davis, has given much time assisting Katie Louchhein.

In the last campaign I asked Carrie to remain in Washington, which she did. During all that time I was doing everything I could in my own State and in my part of the country.

With your repeated attacks on the South, I must state with all frankness that my wife will no longer be interested in spending her time, talent, and money helping you.

Very sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD DAVIS.

Labor's Support of Our Position in Regard to the Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of this body to the following text of a letter with enclosures which I recently received from Mr. Jay Lovestone, Department of International Affairs of the AFL–CIO. I know this strong reaffirmation of American labor's support of our position in regard to the Berlin crisis will be of interest to all Members of this body:

AMERICAN FEDERATION
OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF
INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1959.

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENTLEY: Thank you very much for your letter of July 14. I received it with much appreciation, especially the tearsheet of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contained a reprint from the AFL–CIO Free Trade Union News.

Because of your interest in American labor, I am enclosing for your information a letter written on July 14 by Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, to U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and President Eisenhower's reply to the same.

In his letter, Mr. Meany refutes the glaring distortion, concerning the position of American labor and its support of the American Government's policy in regard to the Berlin crisis, which Soviet Premier Khrushchev presented to Averell Harriman during the latter's recent trip to Russia.

I am sure that both letters will prove worthy of your attention.

With kind regards, I remain.

Sincerely yours,

JAY LOVESTONE,
Department of International Affairs.

AFL–CIO President George Meany today released the text of the following letter to President Eisenhower, dated July 14:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: According to press reports, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev has told Mr. Averell Harriman that, though the leaders of both parties supported your position in regard to the Berlin crisis, the American workers did not.

"In view of the reconvening of the Foreign Ministers' Conference at Geneva, I deem it necessary, Mr. President to write you regarding the above.

"Mr. Khrushchev's statement is a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts rather than a mere misconception concerning the United States. Khrushchev knows very well that several months ago, American labor publicly pledged its support of every effort by our country and its NATO allies to save the freedom of West Berlin. On February 20, 1959, the AFL–CIO Executive Council considered the Berlin crisis and unanimously adopted a statement declaring in part:

"'The Executive Council welcomes the fact that the United States, Britain, France, the German Federal Republic, and the other NATO powers have rejected unequivocally the Soviet ultimatum that the Allied Forces get out of Berlin. * * * Neither the freedom of West Berlin, nor the freedom of the 50 million people of West Germany, can be objects of international bargaining. In the interest of their own security and self-preservation, the democracies cannot accept any reunification of Germany which is not reunification in freedom, through U.N.-supervised free elections.'

"In line with this assessment, the AFL–CIO Executive Council presented a 6-point program and called for 'the strongest Western unity and preparedness for any eventuality * * *' to 'preserve world peace, save Berlin's freedom, and hasten the day when the German people will be united in freedom.'

"Arrogance rather than ignorance also explains the Soviet dictator's telling Mr. Harriman that the American working class had no voice in the political affairs of the United States. Only last November, the Soviet press recognized the important part played by American labor in the last U.S. congressional elections. Khrushchev knows that through its independent political activities American labor has become increasingly influential in the political life of our Nation—not only in regard to social and economic legislation but also in respect to foreign policy. Surely, Khrushchev has not forgotten that it was American labor which prompted the United Nations–ILO condemnation of forced labor behind the Iron Curtain. Nor has he yet forgotten the vital role played by American labor in the U.N. condemnation of the savage Soviet aggression against the Hungarian people.

"When Khrushchev speaks of the American working class he thinks of the Communist Party in the United States. Despite its enjoying all the privileges and rights of democracy, the Communist Party in the United States has been declining and is of no

serious consequence in the American labor movement or political life of the Nation. When Khrushchev made the above false assertions, he undoubtedly had in mind the insignificant Communist organization in the United States and not the American working people.

"Furthermore, no American citizen or organization has authorized or requested Mr. Khrushchev to speak in behalf of labor or any other section of the American people. In fact, we are completely convinced that free elections in the U.S.S.R. would show that Mr. Khrushchev does not speak even for the workers of his own country.

"Mr. President, it is not so much ignorance or misconception of our democratic way of life and its free institutions which prompts the Kremlin to wage the cold war against us and to threaten humanity with an atomic conflagration. Khrushchev and his Communist regime fear and hate democracy, because they know and understand it is to be the obstacle to their drive for conquering the world and remolding it on the Soviet pattern.

"In this critical situation confronting our country and all mankind, I assure you, Mr. President, that American labor is solidly with you in seeking to rally our own and all other liberty-loving nations for joint all-out efforts to preserve the freedom of the people of West Berlin, to promote the reunification of Germany in freedom, and just and lasting world peace.

"Sincerely yours,

"GEORGE MEANY."

Following is the text of a letter received today by AFL–CIO President George Meany from President Eisenhower:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 15, 1959.

Mr. GEORGE MEANY,
President, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MEANY: Thank you very much for your letter of yesterday. For a long time I have been keenly aware and appreciative of the firm stand taken by the AFL–CIO in support of the Government's refusal to abandon either the free people of West Berlin or our rights and responsibilities respecting that city.

Your present letter should convince everyone, including the Soviets, that in the United States labor is free, and because it is free, it is part of the decision-making process in our country. When free citizens form their conclusions and convictions on matters that affect America's international position, they cannot be divided on the basis of vocation, creed, or partisan politics. The efforts of any outsider to divide America are bound to fail when the basic beliefs and the vital interests of this Nation are at stake.

I am grateful for your letter, because even though I have had no doubt in my own heart or mind of AFL–CIO solidarity in this matter, I salute your entire membership for reaffirming this solidarity before the entire world.

With warm regard.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

Mrs. Alice W. I. Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Paterson Evening News, Paterson, N.J., on the recent passing of Mrs. Alice W. I. Williams:

MRS. ALICE W. I. WILLIAMS

The grandeur that was traditional of the America of our forebears and of the Paterson of the pioneer days of strength and stability was an innate characteristic of Mrs. Alice Winslow Ingham Williams, who passed away last night in her 90th year.

A native of New Jersey whose family was part of early America, Mrs. Williams was a gracious and charming lady whose life was steeped in Americana and who throughout the years, held unwaveringly to a strict code of refinement, gentility, and courtliness. To her sons she strove always to communicate the same high idealism which she and her late distinguished husband, Robert Williams, had followed in their social and business activities.

For many years, Mrs. Williams had continued to participate actively in the policy-making of the Call, which her late husband had stewarded, but in recent years, because of waning health, her interest had naturally diminished while her principal divertissements revolved around her grandchildren. A severe blow to her had been the passing of her two sons, Robert, who had been publisher, and Henry, former State senator, who had been editor of the newspaper.

Mrs. Williams traced her family lineage back to early Revolutionary days and in the true tradition of the 18th century, she was a member of the New Jersey Society of Colonial Dames of America, and the woman's branch of the New Jersey Historical Society among others.

A grand lady of Paterson has been called to her last reward after a life rich in fulfillment of her own family traditions of sturdy uprightness and rectitude. Her passing marks a sad closing to a rich chapter in the history of the Paterson of Alexander Hamilton and those who followed in his pioneering path.

Trinity River Power Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the editorial page of the July 21 issue of the Washington Daily News, under the title "$12,540,700,139," includes these words:

That's the amount of dollars—$12,540,700,139—that the Federal Treasury went into the hole in the fiscal year that ended last June 30. That's the Federal Treasury deficit for fiscal year 1959, just announced. That's the excess of money the Government spent that it didn't have—$12,540,700,139. Somehow, through inflation, through taxes—maybe higher taxes—and less spending, or all three, that deficit will have to be met. It can only be met through your pocketbook.

The Manteca (Calif.) Bulletin points out that—

The Government has no money and creates no wealth—it has only your money to operate on, and it should be apparent to every taxpayer by this time that for every $4 you send to Washington, you are lucky to get $3 back. All of which leads up to the myth of cheap power, as offered by the Federal Government. When the Government builds a dam and power facilities, it does not have to have any particular formula for establishing power rates—and, in fact, could give it away if it chose to do so. Obviously, however, there is no such thing as something for nothing so somebody must pick up the tab—in all cases it is the taxpayer.

The Bulletin editorial continues—

This power has a certain market at its source, and maximum profit can result only when this power is sold at market value. In this Trinity River project, the Government proposes to sell this power to preference customers at less than market value. A preference customer means those few cities in northern California which own their own power systems, and constitute about 5 percent of the population. Perhaps you can think of a good reason why the other 95 percent of us should pay our own electric bills, and then also pay a little more in taxes so these few cities can enjoy lower rates. We can't think of any sound reason.

The joint development proposal providing for construction of the Trinity River power facilities by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., with its own money, will be considered Friday by the House Interior Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

The Manteca Bulletin then explains the company's offer, as follows:

The Pacific Gas & Electric proposes to build this powerhouse, thus saving Uncle Sam some $56 million capital outlay immediately. The Pacific Gas & Electric will also pay the Federal Government some $165 million in extra revenue for use of the falling water over the 50-year life of the project. In addition, during the 50-year period, the Pacific Gas & Electric will pay the Federal Government $83 million in taxes, and $62 million more to State and local governments. This totals up to $310 million in revenue to government at various levels. * * * The only question here is which method will be of the greatest benefit to the greatest number? We think the partnership plan is the answer.

The same sentiments are voiced by the North Sacramento Journal:

Partnership is a good deal for the Government, good for the individual citizen and good for the power and water users. It is the logical and businesslike way of getting a big job done.

The Caruthers (Calif.) Gazette, near Fresno, states—

We are convinced that the public interest best will be served if the committee gives its endorsement to Secretary Seaton's recommendations and speeds them on their way to approval by the whole Congress.

From the Colfax (Calif.) Record:

The partners in this case would be the Federal Government and Pacific Gas & Electric Co. The project has been endorsed in strong terms by both the California Farm Bureau and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (CIO–AFL), as well as by a long list of other groups.

The Dixon (Calif.) Tribune adds:

As taxpayers feeling the pinch of Government spending, we can only give our blessing to the proposal of letting a private concern handle the power and give us downtrodden taxpayers a welcome respite from the left hooks and jabs of a government opponent that swarms and smothers without letup. Here's a chance to save a few dollars on our tax bills, and at the same time see something flow into the public coffers instead of out.

We believe that the development and distribution of electricity—

States the Humboldt Times, of Eureka, Calif.—

is the job of private industry. We feel it can, does, and will do the job better and cheaper than Federal agencies which all of us, already burdened with heavy taxes, will have to dig still deeper in our frayed pockets to pay for. We submit that the Trinity project, which Congress has decided to be a program urgently needed to promote the general welfare of our people, should also be the handiwork of cooperation and teamwork—for therein, we feel, lies the real meaning of democracy.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these excerpts are representative of the many newspapers which have supported joint development of the Trinity River power facilities. Over 230 organizations of water useres, irrigators, labor, business, and taxpayers groups have also endorsed the partnership proposal, whereby the utility would put up the money, construct and operate the generators. The hearing tomorrow, on whether the company's offer to save the Government $60 million in building costs while adding some $230 million to the Federal Treasury in water payments and taxes, will be of major importance in trimming the public works appropriatons bills of the next 3 years.

For a Regional Market in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN V. CARTER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, 1959, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I included an item entitled "How We Stand From Tiajuana to Tierra Del Fuego." This item included an editorial by William S. White and pointed up the ever-increasing complexities of inter-American relationships.

I submit as self-evident the fact that there can be no lasting political solution in Latin America until her economic ills are remedied. In this connection, I found that the following article from the latest edition of Foreign Affairs entitled "For a Regional Market in Latin America" makes a very constructive analysis of this problem. I might add that its author, Dr. Galo Plaza, is preeminently qualified for comment in this particular field. I have sent a reprint of this article, which I sincerely believe contains the first step in any real solution to the Latin American problem, to the leadership of both Houses and to each member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I urge the remainder of my colleagues to read the article that appears here in the RECORD.

The increasing frequency of political crises and the success of Soviet economic and political penetration in Latin America makes it imperative that Congress institute corrective policies in that area. To borrow Churchill's term, this is the "soft underbelly" of our hemisphere, and Soviet activities there indicate they are acutely aware of this vulnerability. Our efforts to stem political unrest and Communist expansion in Europe and Asia are indeed admirable, but certainly what can be more important than tending to this same problem right at our very back door? I feel the Congress should immediately provide the initiative so that a program such as is proposed in Dr. Plaza's article will be brought into existence before our losses in Latin America cease to be recoverable. The article follows:

FOR A REGIONAL MARKET IN LATIN AMERICA
(By Galo Plaza)

We are on the threshold of a new era in the economic development of Latin America. The newly awakened aspirations for a better standard of living of a fast-growing population cannot be satisfied by our inadequate economic system, which today is as dated as the Model T Ford. In order to make more efficient use of our natural resources we must apply technicology to agriculture, develop sound industrialization and create a common market, without which any program for development of agriculture and industry would have very limited possibilities.

To understand why a common or regional market is an essential part of a master plan for the acceleration of our economic growth we must look backward for a moment. After World War II the economic development of Latin America was progressing at a highly satisfactory rate; overall production, income and consumption showed a constant upward trend. Economic growth during the decade 1945–54 exceeded the U.S. performance for the same period. In the United States the gross national product increased about 30 percent, while that of Latin America rose 50 percent. Although the population of Latin America increased by 24 percent in the same decade (compared to 16 percent in the United States), nevertheless the availability of goods and services grew substantially even on a per capita basis.

We were able to attain this remarkable rate of economic development in spite of the fact that we are mostly producers and exporters of raw materials and foodstuffs. There were two principal reasons: first, with the war came a tremendous demand for our raw materials at prices unheard of in the past; and second, we were at last—through education, sanitation and better communications—breaking away from retarding factors of a social and cultural and geographical nature that for centuries had kept our economic growth at a painfully slow pace.

Unhappily, we have not been able to maintain this rate of development beyond the first postwar decade. In 1956 the rate of economic growth slowed down and gross income increased no faster than the population; since then the trend has been downward. The extremely favorable conditions for our exports have gradually changed as prices of metals, foodstuffs, and other raw materials have dropped substantially. But there are other factors of greater significance that will retard our rate of development if we are to remain chiefly producers and exporters of primary commodities.

There is every reason to believe that the present rate of 2.4 percent yearly growth in population will continue. A parallel increase in gross national product will be necessary just to maintain present levels of per capita incomes. But treading water will not be enough. The postwar prosperity which made possible the enjoyment of better living conditions for a growing middle class hardly touched the great underprivileged masses, which are awakening to the fact that there is a better life and that they have a right to enjoy it.

The rapid increase in population, plus the upgrading of living standards for a very large segment of it, will make greater demands on an economic system which, even with much greater efficiency, would still be a low producer of goods and services. I have frequently asked myself this disturbing question: How can we improve the lot of all our people if there is not enough production to go around regardless of how it is distributed?

Nearly 60 percent of the total population in Latin America is dependent on agriculture, which in most cases is primitive. We could increase our production substantially by opening up new lands to production and by introducing better farming practices. Modern technology could bring us greater yields per acre, per machine and per man. Doubling our production with half the labor force would be quite feasible. Greater efficiency in agricultural production to serve a larger population would release an important segment of our labor force that would have to seek gainful employment elsewhere. The process of industrialization will be the only way to absorb this excess manpower. The following figures give a vivid picture of the problem: In 1955 the population of Latin America was about 175 million and it is estimated that this figure will have increased by a further 100 million by 1975. Of this number, approximately 38 million will be added to the labor force. If the trends registered in the last 20 years continue, we can estimate that only 5 million of these will be absorbed by agricultural activities—and fewer still if, as is greatly to be desired, technical progress in agriculture is expedited. Thus, about 33 million workers will have to seek productive employment elsewhere.

Industry in Latin America must therefore fulfill the dynamic function of absorbing surplus manpower from primary producing activities. The second task of industry is to supply all those manufactured articles which the underdeveloped countries cannot afford to import because exports of primary commodities and foodstuffs tend to increase at a much slower rate than the demand for imports.

The problem of Latin America is therefore to import what it can pay for abroad with its own resources and to meet the remainder of its growing demand for manufactured goods from domestic production. This is already being done to a limited extent. And as long as this process involved only staple consumer goods for which there is a large national market, the industrialization of Latin America in 20 watertight compartments caused no great concern. But now that our countries are entering the more complex fields of producer goods and consumer durables, involving heavy capital investment, we must have markets of wider scope than those offered by individual countries. The need for a Latin American common market is thus evident.

The establishment of the European Common Market has stimulated our thinking on this subject because we feel it will have important repercussions on the Latin American economy. While closer economic integration in Europe should increase the demand for Latin American products, the preferential measures which the European Common Market may establish for overseas territories and the technological revolution to which this project will give rise in Europe, both in agriculture and in the synthetic production of raw materials, will probably have unfavorable repercussions on our economies.

However, there is no intention on our part to imitate what is going on in Europe. Although our goals are similar, there are different conditions peculiar to each region which should be handled in different ways. The idea of a Latin American common mar-

ket actually preceded the European plan. For a long time many Latin American countries have been aware of the weakness of trade between them as compared to their trade with other nations. Moreover, they realize that, besides the European Common Market and the British Commonwealth, the United States, the Soviet Union, China, and India are in fact regional markets of enormous magnitude. Only Latin America remains divided into 20 separate economic units.

We believe that by breaking down these watertight compartments through economic integration we will accelerate productivity, give the whole region free access to raw materials, and enable the resources of the continent to be better utilized for economic development. There are indirect benefits that may be equally important. Many governments today are aware of the unpalatable remedies needed to cure the economic infirmities of their countries, but for political reasons they are unable to put them into effect. A common market would demand from all member countries certain commitments, and the necessity of abiding by the rules of the economic community would strengthen the hands of individual governments in making needed changes in their fiscal and monetary policies.

What effect will the Latin American market have on the economies of countries outside the region? We believe that they will be favorable, because an increase in per capita income in Latin America will mean a greater demand for products—especially industrial commodities—from the other countries. Undoubtedly, world trade will benefit from the expansion of Latin American production and the new demands to which the common market will give rise. Certainly, at the beginning there will be difficulties of readjustment, but the powerful flow of international trade will eventually receive a new tributary which will swell its volume to incalculable proportions. Only the type of goods purchased will change. Latin America will cease to acquire some goods in order to buy others, which it is in no position to buy today.

Most of the great advances in international trade have followed the exchange of manufactured goods among the industrialized countries; by contrast, the share of less developed areas in total world trade has registered a continuous decline, not only as compared to the prewar period but also to more recent times. Between 1950 and 1956, it dropped from 41 percent to 31.5 percent, and the decline continues.

The Latin American countries must export manufactured goods to one another. However, in my opinion and in the opinion of well-known economists, it is quite possible to imagine Latin America competing in the industrial market with the rest of the world. It can be done through modernization and specialization of our industries.

Another argument in favor of the common market is the stimulus which it would give to foreign and domestic investment. Investors would be greatly attracted where today they are discouraged by narrow markets that are rapidly saturated. Thus the common market would not only provide opportunity for large-scale investments but investors would have better confidence in the future of their enterprises. Such incentives are essential in order to attract foreign capital in sufficient volume.

Present conditions are not conducive to a greater flow of foreign capital to Latin America. In recent years the average of foreign investment has fluctuated annually between $400 million and $500 million. Most of this money is made up of private investment from the United States and part of it is not new capital but the profits of former investments which have been plowed back. About 30 percent of this investment is designed to promote export activities, mainly mining and petroleum. This amount is quite inadequate for the normal economic development of Latin America. Investments designed to develop transportation, energy and other services which form the major part of public expenditure are very low, yet they are essential to pave the way for private investment. This is one of the most serious obstacles impeding economic development in Latin America today. Of course, it is recognized that the development of this region has to depend basically on our own resources, but they are not enough. Foreign capital is urgently needed, until national savings are adequate to sustain a significant rate of growth. We hope that the common market will lead to much more attractive conditions for investment.

The national governments concerned will have to decide on the structure of the regional market but it will be for private enterprise to give it life. The economic development of Latin America depends to a large extent on the action of the private "entrepreneur." It is essential that the Latin American entrepreneur should be given access not only to the sources of international capital but also to international technical knowledge on a footing comparable with that enjoyed by others. International technical assistance should be given to Latin American industry on the same scale that it is being extended to our agriculture. We Latin Americans realize that the main effort will have to come from ourselves. But countries which are now advanced and prosperous should remember that not one of them has been able to develop without the help of foreign capital and technical knowledge during the initial period of their economic growth.

Economic integration within the hemisphere could be a realistic possibility once the Latin American common market is in operation. I believe that breaking down economic barriers within Latin America does not necessarily mean raising barriers around the perimeter. On the contrary, a successful Latin American common market should be able to lower barriers with the rest of the hemisphere and eventually with the rest of the world.

II

The idea of closer economic association among the countries of Latin America is not new. It has been present throughout their history, but it had little practical significance because our economies have been geared toward Europe and the United States. When World War II cut off our traditional sources of imports, the establishment of several consumer-goods industries was encouraged. This in turn served to create a consciousness of the benefits of industrialization.

A renewed and more realistic interest in integration started to germinate in 1949 when the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) began to explore its possibilities. In 1952 the governments of Central America, with the close cooperation of ECLA, began working on a five-nation system of economic integration which has achieved a large part of its goals. In November 1956 the member governments of ECLA, at the first meeting of its Trade Committee, requested that studies be made of the possibilities of much broader integration embracing the whole continent. The following year the Secretariat of ECLA was requested to appoint a working group[1] to conduct these studies and to submit recommendations to the member governments. The working group held its first meeting in Santiago, Chile, in February 1958 and agreed on certain fundamental bases for a common market. At the group's second meeting in Mexico City last February, it planned the overall structure the common market should assume in accordance with the basic principles that had been set down the year before.

All the members of the group were aware of the tremendous problems involved, of the very real limitations that exist and of the need to develop a broader and more diversied economic base with a reasoned balance between efficient agriculture and sound industrialization. With these conceptions in mind we set forth the following tentative principles for a common market.

First and foremost, membership in the common market must be open to all the Latin American countries. It is therefore essential that conditions acceptable to all of them be established from the outset. This does not mean that countries closely linked by geographical proximity or common economic interests many not enter into direct negotiations among themselves. But these negotiations must be effected within the framework of a general agreement and along such lines that the reciprocal concessions involved are not exclusive and may be automatically extended to other member countries, or to such countries as may become members in the future if all do not accede to the initial agreement.

The same principle of universality must be observed as regards the products to be covered by the common market. The ultimate aim is the inclusion of all the goods produced in Latin America, although the regional market need not become effective for all such goods immediately. What is required is an agreement that will stipulate procedures and time limits for the progressive abolition of those customs duties and restrictions which nowadays hamper or prevent intracontinental trade. In other words, the agreement must be immediate but its implementation gradual.

An essential feature of the common market is that the less advanced countries must be accorded special treatment to enable them, through progressive industrialization and the overall strengthening of their economies, to share fully in the benefits of the regional market. If this were not the case the more advanced countries would be at a considerable advantage compared to the others and in the end would achieve a favored position.

A serious problem is that of the tariff system of the common market vis-a-vis the rest of the world. It is generally desirable to establish a single external customs tariff, but in some countries the tariff has been deprived of its protectionist role and has been superseded by restrictive measures of various kinds. Hence, an interim system will have to be established to ensure the progressive abolition of such restrictions to an extent equivalent to the tariff reductions effected by other member countries.

---

[1] The members of the working group invited by ECLA, besides myself, were José Garrido Torres, Brazil; Rodrigo Gomez, Mexico; Flavian Levine, Chile; Eustaquio Mendez Delfino, Argentina; Juan Pardo, Peru; and Joaquin Vallejo, Colombia. For the second meeting, in Mexico City, Carlos Lleras Restrepo replaced Joaquin Vallejo and Prof. Raymond Mikesell from the United States was added to the group.

The specialization of industry and other activities, which is one of the objectives of the regional market, must be the outcome of the free interplay of economic forces within the market area. The arrangements would not preclude national investment policies that would further the aims of the agreement. In some cases, it may be wise to give specific countries the right to establish certain industries even if this entails some restriction of free competition. Since the Central American countries already have an integration program they should be considered as a single unit, if they so desire.

In the interest of greater efficiency, the regional market must have a special system of multilateral payments which will encourage the highest degree of reciprocity in trade within the continent. It is essential that the member countries be protected against all exchange risks. The working group foresaw that, although basic adjustments must come through monetary, fiscal and economic policies, member countries must also have the right to impose temporary import restrictions, in accordance with agreed rules. Such measures may be necessary, for instance, to combat a large and persistent disequilibrium in the balance of payments of one country with other members of the common market. Temporary import restrictions may also be needed to reduce unemployment resulting from the adjustment of each national economy to changing conditions. If the maintenance of normal agricultural production requires it, countries may be given the right to restrict imports of some commodities, perhaps by limiting them to a certain share of the increase in consumption.

To promote the smooth functioning of the regional market, steps must be taken to avoid unfair competitive practices in exporting. Members must also refrain from discrimination and offer their exports at prices that are the same regardless of destination. The regional market must have an effective credit system and must provide technical assistance, both to stimulate intraregional exports and to help in the establishment and development of industries. Provision is also made in these recommendations for the creation of an advisory body constituted by the member governments, as well as a system of arbitration.

Once the members of the group had set down the basic principles which should govern the operation of the common market they proceeded to crystallize their ideas on its structure, so that nations which are already proceeding with subregional markets will all play the game according to the same rules, facilitating integration into one great common market in the future. Agreement was reached on 11 points which should be briefly stated in order to complete a sketch of what has been done to date.

"The agreement setting up the Common Market is designed [the statement of objectives reads] to help expedite a balanced economic development of Latin America, its progressive industrialization and the introduction of improved techniques in its agriculture and other primary activities with a view to promoting higher levels of living for its peoples, through: (a) the establishment of a preferential system for trade between Latin American countries; and (b) the growth of its foreign trade as a result of the expansion of industrial exports and the promotion of exports of agricultural and other primary commodities, both within Latin America and the rest of the world."

To administer the agreement and facilitate the attainment of its ends, a Committee on Trade Policy and Payments will be set up with all member countries represented. The judicial form contemplated in the agreement is that of a free trade zone to be transformed gradually into a customs union. In order to establish the common market gradually and progressively for all products, the agreement will be carried out in two stages. During the first stage, lasting ten years, a substantial reduction of customs duties and other taxes will take place and other restrictions will be either converted into terms of customs duties or eliminated. Intermediate steps have been contemplated during this first stage so as to reach the established goals gradually. During the second stage the reduction will continue until the organization of the common market will be complete. The rate of progress during the first stage will determine the program to be followed in the second stage.

Products are to be classified in three categories: (1) primary goods; (2) capital goods, durable goods, and other manufactures for which there is a rapidly growing demand; and (3) manufactured goods for current consumption which are in less immediate demand. During the first 10-year period duties and taxes for goods in the first category will be abolished, with certain exceptions (primarily agricultural) to be agreed upon. For products in the second category the tagret will be to reach the lowest possible levels in order to intensify regional trade. Reductions for products in the third category will not be as large or as rapid, so that adaptation of existing industries to the new conditions can be carried out with as little difficulty as possible.

Countries have also been divided into three groups in accordance with their development, so that they may be given differential treatment; this will serve to encourage and accelerate industrialization. The least developed nations will thus gain more rapidly the benefits of the Common Market that the relatively advanced nations will enjoy from the outset. Group A is composed of those countries which are the most advanced economically. Group B consists of those countries which are relatively advanced in the manufacture of consumer goods and whose production of capital goods is incipient or nonexistent. Group C is made up of countries with an incipient capacity for manufacturing consumer goods but undeveloped in respect to the manufacture of capital goods. Procedures were outlined to establish preferential treatment to countries of incipient development in groups B and C. It was feared that if these concessions were not granted, the Common Market might have a harmful effect by making the poor countries poorer and the rich richer.

With certain exceptions, the most-favored-nations treatment will be in effect. Hence all the reductions in customs duties, taxes or other restrictions which a country may make unilaterally, bilaterally or multilaterally will be extended to all.

All the studies carried out so far have been submitted in the form of recommendations to the eighth session of E.C.L.A. held in Panama in May 1959. After approval by this body, the next step for the E.C.L.A. Secretariat is to prepare, in close collaboration with the governments concerned, a draft of an initial agreement for the Common Market in an effort to put into effect as soon as possible.

This concludes what has been done up to now toward the creation of a common market. Latin America is experiencing the beginning of a social revolution as the needs of a growing middle class and the expectations of the masses exert tremendous pressures on an economic system which is not up to the task. Unless we can bring about an economic revolution to satisfy the demands of this social revolution, our problems will overflow into the political field, with serious consequences for the whole hemisphere. Only economic integration through a Latin American Common Market can make more efficient use of our resources and meet the challenge successfully.

Report for Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a proposal on the subject of Federal aid to education which was adopted by the board of directors of the Rochester, Minn., Chamber of Commerce following a general referendum of the membership on the program. It will be noted that in this proposal such aid would be limited to those States which lack the ability to provide adequate financing from their own resources:

REPORT ON FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION, NATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ROCHESTER, MINN., JUNE 1, 1959

INTRODUCTION

The past several years have seen a Nationwide study and evaluation of America's educational goals, accomplishments, methods, resources, and financial needs, both current and projected. This committee has been concerned with these studies as they relate to Federal legislation in the field of education. As a statement of conditions for this report, we quote from the introduction to the President's Science Advisory Committee's report on "Education for the Age of Science":

"No one in the United States denies that we should have a first-class system of formal education. But not everyone realizes that the strength and happiness, even the survival, of our democratic society will be determined primarily by the excellence and the appropriateness of our educational patterns. Nor is everyone aware that learning, though it begins during the school years, is a lifelong venture; that education is a part of life, not merely a preparation for it.

"A modern educational system should not only sharpen the intellectual capacities and curiosities of each new generation; should not only extract the essential core from ever-accumulating stores of knowledge; should not only find ways to produce new leaders equipped to add to these stores and create all the new tools that the civilization requires; it must also produce citizens and leaders who will know how to use the knowledge and tools to advance social and cultural life.

"We ought not speak of our educational tasks solely in terms of buildings or budgets or even curriculums. These, indeed, are necessary means to the end. But we must think of the end itself. The end is clear: to introduce the growing child, the youth, and the adult to the best and most essential elements of the intellectual and cultural experience of previous generations; to do this in such a way that we stimulate curiosity and encourage each individual to look forward, not backward, to develop his own talents to their maximum, and to continue this development throughout his life.

"No social activity is, therefore, more important than education. It is right and it is necessary that we should expend great effort and resources in order that every American child shall have the opportunity for the 10, the 15, or even the 20 years of formal educational experience required to give him full command of his intellectual powers and enable him to live a rich and fruitful life, both as an individual and as a citizen. It is right, too, that we should take stock of our educational achievements from time to time, and especially that we should measure them honestly and objectively against our ideals and ambitions."

This committee concurs with this statement of the importance to our Nation of an adequate educational program. In keeping with our duties to study and recommend a course of action on current legislation in the field of education, we have considered the Murray-Metcalf proposal for Federal aid to education. We have also considered a proposal of a different nature which has been advanced by members of this committee. It is with these two proposals that this report will deal.

PREMISES OF THE AMERICAN SYSTEM OF FINANCING AND DIRECTING EDUCATION

In considering the following proposals, we have kept constantly in mind the fundamental policy that the control and financing of education has always been, and must continue to be, the prime responsibility of the individual States. We recognize the fact that the increased educational needs of a rapidly growing school age population require that many States find new or expanded sources of taxation to support education. The thesis that the States have exhausted their sources of tax revenue and that the Federal Government must provide Federal funds for education is, however, manifestly in error since all Federal funds must originate in taxation of local resources. Any proposal for Federal aid to education must, therefore, meet the following tests:

1. The program must meet a specific need of overriding national significance for the welfare of our Nation and its citizens.

2. The States which would receive aid under the program must be unable to meet the need from their own resources. The same test should apply to individuals for any program of direct aid to students.

3. The program must further the American principal of equality of opportunity for all of its citizens. This must not be construed to mean that every student can attain the same level of educational achievement, but they must have the opportunity to receive the best education that their individual talents will permit.

4. The program must be able to be administered in such a way that there will be adequate safeguards so the funds are spent to achieve the purpose for which they were appropriated. At the same time, and we wish to emphasize this point, the program must be completely free of any Federal regulation of curriculum, course content, and educational policies.

With these premises in mind, we present the following conclusions and recommendations on the two proposals under consideration.

THE MURRAY-METCALF PROPOSAL FOR FEDERAL SUBSIDIES FOR EDUCATION

The Murray-Metcalf bill, as originally presented, wold provide Federal subsidies totaling $11,400 million over a period of 4 years, to be used for teachers salaries and school construction. This aid would be allocated to the States on the basis of $25 per pupil the first year, $50 the second year, $75 the third year, and $100 in the final year of the bill. It has since been changed to maintain the $25 level of aid throughout the 4-year period which would reduce the total cost of the program for the first 4 years to $4.5 billion. It is obvious that either program, once in effect, would have to be continued indefinitely at its maximum level. The result of such a program would be to shift an important part of the responsibility for education from the States to the Federal Government. This shift would be permanent and would, in the course of time, entail a like shift in the control of education from the States to the Federal Government. The proponents of the bill say that the States have exhausted their sources of revenue, but approximately 80 percent of the funds allocated under Murray-Metcalf would return to the same States which provided the tax revenues in the first place. Expenditures under the bill are not made on the basis of need and would perpetuate existing inequalities among the States.

For these reasons we find that the Murray-Metcalf bill would serve to deaden local initiative, waste money on more Federal bureacracy, and provide an open door for the gradual growth of Federal control of education. We, therefore, urge that the Rochester Chamber of Commerce be recorded as being opposed to the passage of this bill and that our Representatives in Congress be so advised.

PROPOSAL BY THE EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE FOR FEDERAL EQUALIZATION AID FOR EDUCATION

While it is apparent, as noted above, that a broad per student program of Federal aid is highly objectionable, a study of the efforts on behalf of education and the results obtained by the various States does reveal an area where we believe the Federal Government could justifiably grant equalization aid to education. The following conclusions and proposals will outline such a program.

We have assumed, in formulating this report, that the ability to pass the selective service mental test is a reasonable measure of the educational level of the male population of high school graduate age. While this may not be the ideal measure in this field, it is the only one available on a nationwide, all inclusive, basis. Results of these tests for 1957 reveal that an average of 18.9 percent of those tested failed. In the 12 States which ranked highest in percentage of failures, an average of 35.5 percent failed, while the average for the balance of the States was 10.8 percent.

This high concentration of inadequate educational achievement is clearly incompatible with the objectives set forth in the introduction to this report. Moreover, we believe that these figures reveal the source and a partial answer to some of our most pressing social problems, i.e., race relations, unemployment, and marginal or low income workers, and these problems, in turn, have a direct effect on our Nation's well-being and security. Obviously, a high percentage of those who fail the classification tests are southern Negroes. Completely apart from the issue of racial segregation, it is clear that an uneducated person lacks both the opportunity and the ability to achieve a decent social and economic position, regardless of any legal decisions or legislation which may grant the right to such a position to him. It is likewise apparent that in our increasingly complex society, technological advances have steadily decreased the source of employment for uneducated workers. This trend will continue, and those who lack a basic education must become a burden, rather than an asset, to the Nation. When 49.9 percent of the selective service registrants from Mississippi fail to pass the mental test, it is obvious they are not receiving even the most basic education.

A review of the educational expenditures, in these States which have failed to provide an adequate education for all of their citizens, reveals that, as a group, they are spending well below the national average per pupil. Thus, there would seem to be a definite correlation between expenditures and results in the field of education. Money is not the only requisite for a good educational system, but is clearly an important one. When put to the test of the percentage of personal income spent on public education, these same States rank equal to, or above, the national average in 10 out of 12 cases. It would seem, therefore, that there are some States which do not have sufficient tax base to provide adequate educational opportunities for all of their citizens.

In view of these considerations, we submit the following proposal. The specific percentages and levels of aid are determined somewhat arbitrarily and are subject to more thorough study. It is the basic philosophy of this plan which we recommend for consideration.

1. Any State which provides public education funds amounting to at least 4 percent (national average 3.3 percent) of the States personal income payments would qualify for Federal equalization funds.

2. These funds would be allocated on the basis of a weighted count of pupils in an average daily attendance, multiplying the count of pupils in average daily attendance in each grade by a factor for that grade which increases as the grade increases (i.e. one-half point in grades 1–3, three-fourths point in grades 4–6; 1 point in grades 7–9; 1½ points in grades 9–12), in an amount sufficient to bring the average expenditure per pupil unit to 90 percent of the national average (currently $340 per pupil).

3. The funds provided under this proposal would be entirely free of Federal control. The average daily attendance formula would, however, make it mandatory that the student count used to determine the amount of aid due be based on actual attendance in specified grades and not on school age population.

5. Total annual expenditures under this plan would be approximately $400 million.

The foregoing proposals are presented as a basis for more detailed and authoritative study in the area of Federal participation in a program of equalization aid to the States for education. We recognize that the students, whose selective service mental test scores served as a basis for this report, entered the school system some 14 years ago and that significant changes in school facilities have taken place in the intervening years. Current expenditures by the affected States would indicate, however, that the situation has not been corrected. We further recognize that the time and research facilities available to this committee are limited and there are undoubtedly some errors of degree in the material presented. We believe, however, that the basic premise of this proposal is valid; that there is an existing need for Federal equalization aid to the States for education and that the plan presented would meet all of the tests which we set forth to justify such a program.

CONCLUSION

The United States today faces a grave challenge in meeting the educational demands of an age of soaring population, exploding technology, and vastly more complex governmental and social responsibilities. In 1916 Alfred North Whitehead said:

"In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute: The race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated."

The prophecy of 1916 faces us squarely today. We must provide a thorough basic education for all of our citizens and an extended education of excellence for those capable of attaining the goals of higher education. To accomplish these ends we must dedicate to the cause of education a greater measure of our understanding, effort, and financial resources. The report of the President's Science Advisory Commission states that "doubling our current annual investment in education is probably a minimal rather than an extravagant goal."

The attainment of these goals will entail extremely difficult problems of State and local taxation and planning. We strongly urge that the State affairs, civic affairs, and education committees of the chamber of commerce give the highest possible priority to consideration of these matters. It is essential that State and local authorities assume the responsibility for developing these expanded programs if we are to maintain our traditional separation of the Federal Government from the general support and control of education. At the same time we believe, that in certain limited areas, the Federal Government can and should act to implement these programs.

We have endeavored in this report to give a sufficiently broad picture of the problem confronting our educational system to emphasize the fact that the statements and recommendations contained herein deal only with one facet of the problem. We believe, however, that it is a significant part of the overall problem and one for which a solution is long overdue. We believe the enactment of a program, such as we have outlined, would benefit the entire Nation and would strengthen both its defense against communism and the institutions which make it worthy of that defense. We, therefore, request that the board of directors affirm this report as a policy recommendation of the Rochester Chamber of Commerce and that our representatives in the national chamber of commerce and the State and Federal Government be so advised.

Respectfully submitted.

NATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
ROCHESTER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

Flag Raised on Mount Cadillac Presented to Alaska's Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. On July 4 I had the privilege of participating in the sunrise flag-raising ceremony conducted on Mount Cadillac in Maine, and there was a note of real drama associated with this event that saw our flag with a new star rise to greet the dawn of a new Independence Day.

As an aftermath to this truly inspiring occasion, this flag raised on Mount Cadillac was presented to the Governor of Alaska, and the following article contained in the July 16 issue of the Bar Harbor Times gives an account of some of the details of the presentation:

FLAG RAISED ON CADILLAC JULY 4 PRESENTED TO ALASKAN GOVERNOR BY 11-YEAR-OLD BAR HARBOR BOY

Completing the official ceremonies for the Fourth of July celebration, the new 49-star flag, which was raised at 4:43 a.m. atop Mount Cadillac, July 4, was presented in Juneau, Alaska, this week, to William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska, by Robert Ryle, Jr., the 11-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert W. Ryle of Bar Harbor.

The flag, the first official 49-star flag to be flown over the United States at dawn, was raised on Mount Cadillac by Commander James Markley of the Charles J. Loring Post, AMVETS, of Portland, who has done praiseworthy work with poor and blind children, qualifying him to be selected to raise the historic flag.

Following the ceremonies in Bar Harbor the flag was taken to Portland where blind Robert W. Branscombe presented the Old Glory to Mr. and Mrs. Ryle Saturday morning at Portland municipal airport.

The Ryles flew to Juneau, Alaska, the capital of the 49th State, and their son, who is partially blind, presented the flag to Governor Egan.

A Crucial Opportunity in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have received from Hon. Whiteford S. Blakeney, Charlotte, N.C., a copy of a memorandum entitled "A Crucial Opportunity in Congress," which he has written. Mr. Blakeney is an outstanding practicing attorney in my State, and his memorandum is of particular interest because of its endorsement of the provisions of H.R. 3 recently passed by the House of Representatives.

I feel certain that the Members of the House will be interested in reading the views expressed by Mr. Blakeney.

A CRUCIAL OPPORTUNITY IN CONGRESS

There is now pending before Congress a bill which, if enacted, would constitute a major step toward maintaining the role of the States in our governmental system. This bill has already reached the floor in the House of Representatives and it is expected to be voted on there within the very near future.

For 25 years we have witnessed an ever-widening and accelerating trend toward the unbalancing of our form of government—a trend toward constant enlargement of the power of the Federal Government and corresponding disappearance of rights at all levels below the Federal Government. During most of this time Congress and the Federal Executive have been the source of drive behind this trend, with the Supreme Court upholding their moves. In more recent years, however, the Supreme Court has itself taken the lead and become chief architect and proponent of the trend.

In a large measure the Supreme Court has accomplished this through what is known as the doctrine of Federal preemption—a legal doctrine which the Court has been rapidly expanding to an extraordinary degree. In the name of this doctrine the Court is now ruling that where both Federal and State laws exist in a given field, though there be no contradiction or conflict between them, the State law is nevertheless preempted, that is, the State law must get out of the field and leave it to be controlled entirely by the Federal law.

It is, of course, a familiar principle that in an area where the Federal Government can constitutionally enact legislation, its enactments prevail over any contrary or conflicting State laws. And where there is doubt or ambiguity as to whether there may be conflict between the Federal and the State law, it has long been held that Congress has power to resolve the matter by declaring that its enactment shall occupy the field to the exclusion of State law.

Now, however, under its new expansion of Federal preemption, the Supreme Court is repeatedly ruling that where Federal and State laws are to be found in the same field—though entirely harmonious and nonconflicting and though Congress has expressed no intent to oust State law from the field—still the Court will presume that Congress intended to drive State law out of the field.

For example, practically all the States in the Union have enacted anti-Communist statutes. Congress also has enacted such a statute, called the Smith Act. This Federal statute and the State statutes in this field were not in conflict with each other. Instead, they were concurrently driving toward the same purposes and objectives. Certainly the Members of Congress who enacted the Smith Act had not the faintest intention to destroy the State anti-Communist laws. Yet the U.S. Supreme Court rules that it will assume that such was their intention and that so assuming, it will henceforth deny enforcement to all the State anti-Communist statutes.

Another example of the extreme to which the Supreme Court is pushing Federal preemption is to be seen in the labor field. Approximately 40 percent of the States have right-to-work laws, which declare that an employee can neither be compelled to join or stay out of a labor union in order to work in these States. But, says the Supreme Court, since the Federal Taft-Hartley Act also contains provisions against the coercion of employees, State courts will henceforth not be allowed to issue injunctions to enforce their own right-to-work laws.

The bill which is now before Congress is short and concise. It reads as follows:

"Be it enacted by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no Act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of any State laws on the same subject matter, unless such Act contains an express provision to that effect. No Act of Congress shall be construed as invalidating a provision of State law which would be valid in the absence of such Act unless there is a direct and positive conflict between an express provision of such act and such provision of the State law so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together."

If this bill is enacted, Congress will in effect be saying to the Supreme Court:

"When this Congress in enacting legislation intends to preempt a field and to oust State law from that field, we will say so, and the Court shall not presume such an intent on our part unless we express it. Thus, an enactment by this Congress shall not override State law in the same field unless we express the intent that it shall do so or unless our enactment is otherwise in direct and positive conflict with the State law."

This proposed legislation is known as H.R. 3. There is a companion and identically worded bill on the other side of Congress known as S. 337, which is, however, still pending in the Senate Judiciary Committee. H.R. 3, as pointed out above, is already on the floor of the House and will soon be voted upon.

This legislation is of vital import to the future of our country. The men who wrote the Constitution of the United States had personal knowledge and deep apprehension of an all-powerful central government. The

States which established that Constitution—and which alone had the power to establish it—did so only upon the condition that it should specifically stipulate that the central government would have no powers save those expressly given to it and that all other power should remain and abide in the respective States and their citizens.

It is difficult to avoid the conviction that this solemn covenant is today being violated and this Constitution miscontrued. As the power of the Federal Government is indefinitely expanded, the framework of our Republic—and the bulwarks of liberty—are being steadily and massively pushed out of line. There is not much time in which to arrest this fatal trend.

To all who so believe, the proposed legislation, H.R. 3, presents a crucial opportunity.

Direct Tax Gifts to Colleges and Universities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the country's leading educators, Dr. Clifford C. Furnas, chancellor of the University of Buffalo, recently proposed that a tax credit be given for contributions to higher education.

I have developed legislation along the lines suggested by Dr. Furnas, legislation which is of interest to such great national educational organizations as the Association of American Colleges, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science whose president, Dr. Paul E. Klopsteg, has been a leading exponent of such a tax credit plan.

My bill provides for $1 of tax credit for each $1 given to institutions of higher education within the present limits of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Dr. Furnas estimated that such legislation would yield $2 billion compared to the $411 million raised in 1958 by private contributions.

I include here for the information of my colleagues, and all others interested in American education, the text of my new bill together with the New York Times report on Dr. Furnas' proposal and an excerpt from his speech at the 43d annual meeting of the American College Public Relations Association.

TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES BY PROVIDING INCREASED INCENTIVES FOR PRIVATE GIVING THROUGH THE ALLOWANCE OF A TAX CREDIT FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

That (a) part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 39. Credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education.

"(a) Allowance of credit: At the election of the taxpayer there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter (subject to the limitations contained in subsections (b) and (c)) the amount of the taxpayer's charitable contributions to institutions of higher education during the taxable year.

"(b) Individuals: In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, the maximum amount allowable as a credit under this section for any taxable year shall be—

"(1) in the case of any individual who has elected to take the standard deduction provided by section 141 or to pay the optional tax imposed by section 3, 10 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, computed without regard to any net operating loss carryback to the taxable year under section 172, or

"(2) in the case of any other such taxpayer, 30 percent of his adjusted gross income, computed without regard to any net operating loss carryover to the taxable year under section 172.

"(c) Corporations.—

"(1) General rule: In the case of a corporation, the maximum amount allowable as a credit under this section for any taxable year shall be 5 percent of the taxpayer's taxable income, computed without regard to—

"(A) section 170,

"(B) part VIII of subchapter B (except sec. 248),

"(C) any net operating loss carryback to the taxable year under section 172, and

"(D) section 922 (special deduction for Western Hemisphere trade corporations).

"(2) Corporations on accrual basis: In the case of a corporation reporting its taxable income on the accrual basis, if—

"(A) the board of directors authorizes a charitable contribution to an institution of higher education during any taxable year, and

"(B) payment of such contribution is made after the close of such taxable year and on or before the 15th day of the third month following the close of such taxable year,

then the taxpayer may elect to treat such contribution as paid during such taxable year.

"(3) Carryover of corporate contributions: Any contribution made by a corporation in the taxable year which, but for the limitation of paragraph (1), would be taken into account in computing the credit under this section, shall (at the election of the taxpayer made for the taxable year) be taken into account in computing the credit under this section in each of the two succeeding taxable years, but only to the extent of the lesser of the two following amounts:

"(A) the excess of the amount of charitable contributions to institutions of higher education which may be taken into account in computing the credit under this section under the limitation in paragraph (1) over the amount of the charitable contributions to institutions of higher education made in such year; and

"(B) in the case of the first succeeding taxable year, the amount of such excess contribution, and in the case of the second succeeding taxable year, the portion of such excess contribution not taken into account in the first succeeding taxable year.

"(d) Institutions of higher education defined: For purposes of this section, the term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given to such term by section 103 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

"(e) Special rules.—

"(1) Amounts taken into account: The determination of whether or not a charitable contribution to an institution of higher education may be taken into account under this section, and the amount thereof, shall be made under section 170; except that in the case of an individual any such determination shall be made without regard to any election to take the standard deduction provided by section 141, or to pay the optional tax provided by section 3.

"(2) Correlation with section 170: No amount taken into account under this section shall be allowable as a deduction under section 170. Any amount taken into account under this section shall be taken into account in computing the limitations provided in section 170(b)(1) (but not those provided in section 170(b)(2)). For purposes of provisions of law relating to amounts allowable as a deduction under section 170, any amount taken into account for purposes of this section shall be treated as an amount allowable under section 170; and any reference in any provision of law to a specific provision of section 170 shall, where appropriate, be treated as including a reference to the corresponding provision of section 39. An amount shall be treated as taken into account for purposes of this section only to the extent that, but for such amount, the amount allowable as a credit under this section for any taxable year would be decreased.

"(3) Credit not to result in refunds: The credit allowed by this section shall not exceed the tax imposed by this chapter, reduced by the sum of the credits allowed by this part (other than this section and section 31).

"(4) Elections: Any election provided by this section may be made only at such time, in such manner, and subject to such conditions designed to insure the effective correlation of this section with section 170, as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe."

(b) The table of sections for part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"SEC. 39. Credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education."

SEC. 2. (a) The second sentence of section 170(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to charitable, etc., contributions and gifts) is amended to read as follows: "A charitable contribution shall be allowable as a deduction (or taken into account in computing the credit under section 39) only if verified under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate."

(b) Section 170(c) of such Code is amended by striking out "For purposes of this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "For purposes of this section and section 39".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall apply only with respect to charitable contributions made (within the meaning of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) during taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this act.

[From the New York Times, July 14, 1959]

DIRECT TAX GIFTS TO COLLEGE URGED—EDUCATOR ASKS NEW LAW TO LET TAXPAYERS DONATE UP TO 5 PERCENT OF FEDERAL BILLS—PUBLIC SUPPORT SOUGHT—UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO HEAD ASSERTS PAINLESS PLAN COULD RAISE $2 BILLION IN A YEAR

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

FRENCH LICK, IND., July 13.—An educator proposed here today that Federal taxpayers be allowed to deduct a certain amount from their tax bills and donate the money directly to private and public colleges and universities.

An immediate national campaign to effect the necessary changes in the tax laws also was urged by the educator, Dr. Clifford C. Furnas, chancellor of the University of Buffalo.

His plan would permit both corporations and individuals to contribute up to 5 percent of their tax bills to institutions of

higher education approved by the U.S. Office of Education.

On the simplest level, Dr. Furnas said, his proposal meant that a person with a Federal tax bill of $100 could give $5 to a college or university and pay the remaining $95 to the Internal Revenue Service.

Dr. Furnas said that this would be a relatively painless way to meet the Nation's rising costs of higher education. He estimated that his plan would yield $2 billion, compared to the $411 million raised in 1958 by private voluntary contributions.

Dr. Furnas, a member of the New York State Council on Higher Education, presented his program to 500 members of the American College Public Relations Association. They are holding their annual meeting here in the Sheraton-French Lick Hotel.

CONGRESSMEN GET PLAN

Dr. Furnas said that he had also sent his proposals to the two New York Senators and to some U.S. Representatives in New York.

With college and university enrollment bound to rise in 11 years from 3,585,000 to 6,376,000 students, Dr. Furnas said, the operating costs will rise even faster, from $3,500 million to $9 billion a year.

To meet the bills by 1970, he said, estimates have indicated that private gifts and grants to higher education would have to jump 450 percent to $1,890 million and that tax support would have to rise 257 percent to $4,500 million.

Dr. Furnas said he also hoped that States would adopt a similar policy permitting the direct donation of some tax money to education.

Under the present Federal tax law, Dr. Furnas noted, individuals can deduct 20 percent from their adjusted gross income for charitable and educational contributions. Also under the law, corporations get a partial tax credit on similar gift deductions of 5 percent of their taxable income in any one year, he went on.

Such deductions do reduce an individual or corporate tax bill, but they are partial rather than full tax credits, he said. As an example, he said that $1 given to education or charity by a person in the highest income group still costs that person 9 cents.

Dr. Furnas conceded that his plan amounted to letting individuals and corporations distribute what would be tax money to education as they saw fit. But he said that this was in the spirit of private enterprise and would lower the direct tax burden for education.

YOU CAN'T FLY ON ONE WING

(Address at 43d annual meeting of the American College Public Relations Association, French Lick, Ind., July 13, 1959, by C. C. Furnas, chancellor, University of Buffalo)

THE THESIS

I. You can't fly on one wing. It is extremely important that American maintain a reasonable balance and cooperative pattern between private and tax-supported institutions of higher education.

II. Enrollment in institutions of higher education will almost double by 1970.

III. By 1970 the cost of higher education will be at least $9 billion per year.

IV. In order to pay the bill, it is going to be necessary to open the valve for voluntary support much more than it is at present. This is vital for tax-supported as well as private institutions. It can be accomplished by easing the tax burden. It would be feasible to revise the Federal tax laws to give both individuals and corporations tax credit up to 5 percent of the tax bill for contributions to colleges and universities.

THE DEFENSE

In the early days of America all higher education was privately financed and privately controlled. For good and sufficient reasons a trend was started well over a century ago for the establishment of tax-supported public colleges and universities. One impelling reason was to increase educational opportunities for all geographical areas and all economic levels. Public colleges and universities also served as a valuable antidote to some innate smugness and excessive ivory-towerishness of the private institutions. The dual pattern which has evolved is most appropriate and entirely in keeping with the American political theory of checks and balances in public affairs. It is unfortunate that the two types of institutions often operate in conflict rather than in harmony. This has been particularly true when there have been struggles for obtaining appropriate shares of inadequate funds.

For at least a century a reasonable balance was maintained between the two types of institutions, as measured by attendance. Recently, however, the trend has been toward a preponderance of public institutions. A survey of this matter has been made by the U.S. Office of Education. Dr. E. V. Hollis, of the Division of Higher Education, reports as follows. Before World War II the percentage ratio of enrollment between public and private institutions was approximatly 50–50. Today 56 percent are in attendance in public colleges and 44 percent in private. Dr. Hollis believes that within 10 years two-thirds of all students will be attending public colleges and universities. He says, "This is a very unfortunate trend. We need our private colleges." Other observers have predicted that within 20 years, 80 percent of all students may be attending public institutions.

If one believes in the virtue of the private, or independent, colleges and universities, this will be a very sad situation, indeed. But how is one to judge the virtues? Inevitably, personal opinion enters into it. In my own case, as student, teacher and administrator, I have been closely associated over the years with two State universities, a private college, two private universities and one university that was half-public and half-private. Hence, I think I am in a position to judge the virtues of each. I am convinced that both are needed, and in a balanced pattern.

Personal convictions, however, by themselves are not necessarily convincing to others. In the long run, how really important is it that private institutions maintain their vigor and cover a substantial portion of the field of higher education? There is no black and white answer. In America there are great tax-supported institutions and great private ones. There are also poor ones of both varieties. The criterion of immediate eminence is hardly sufficient to judge the matter. There are others, subtler aspects.

Foremost in the minds of the proponents of private colleges and universities is the maintenance of intellectual freedom. Thoughtful persons realize that the progress of mankind depends on such freedom. It cannot be absolutely guaranteed under any organizational form or structure of support, but some patterns are more favorable to its growth than are others.

The tax-supported institutions are far more vulnerable to the forces which can destroy intellectual freedom than are the private ones. This is true, almost by definition, for "Who pays the piper calls the tune." When political bodies pay all or the major part of the bill, they inevitably exert control. This control usually is appropriate and beneficial, but there are cases when it is not, particularly when political units fall under the domination of demagogues or dictators. Witness the prostitution of academic ideals and the destruction of freedom in universities in Nazi Germany and in present-day Russia. Although there have never been such gross fatalities in this country, the unwise domination and subservient reactions of an occasional state university occurs just often enough to keep us reminded of the hazards. It is not even necessary to have a dictator in charge to arrive at sad results; a tyranny of uninformed and unsympathetic electorate can be just as stultifying and damaging.

Private institutions are also needed as a modest antidote to bureaucracy. Every organization, of course, has its own brand of bureaucracy, but the larger and the more impersonal it becomes, the greater the cloying effect particularly in the matter of discouraging new approaches to new problems. Governmental units at all levels, from the small village to the octopus at the apex in Washington, work best when there is close collaborative effort between private, public-spirited organizations and the formal governmental units.

This is a matter of experience—not merely of theory. It is probably most evident in Washington where the quasi-public institutions, such as the Academy of Science, the National Research Council and the Smithsonian Institution, which depend for their existence on nongovernmental personnel, play a vital role in our national life. It is also very evident in the mammoth structure of the Department of Defense where a large proportion of thinking, research and the production involved in military materiel is based on the work of private, often voluntary, individuals, institutions and industries. America, as we know it, can hardly survive unless we keep a balanced structure of maximum total strength. You can't fly on one wing. The task which faces the educational world is to find ways and means of keeping both types in a flourishing and healthy condition. The problems of supporting them are joint problems, and joint and mutually satisfactory solutions must be found.

ENROLLMENT WILL ALMOST DOUBLE BY 1970

In the academic year 1958–59 the enrollment in institutions of higher education was 3,585,000. Based on projections made by the U.S. Office of Education, the enrollment in 1969–70 will be 6,376,000.[1] These figures are based on projections made by the U.S. Office of Education on fall enrollments to which are added 10 percent for each total regular session enrollments. Summer school enrollments would be in addition to this.

Various predictions have been made by many organizations and individuals, with different assumptions. However, they all come out with approximately the same answer—somewhere between 6 and 6½ million individuals will be seeking enrollment a decade from now. Hence, considerable confidence can be placed in this approximate figure.

As is well known, there are two major reasons for this remarkable upsurge. The first is that there are many more young people than there used to be. This is a population trend which was unexpected and has not been entirely explained. The simple fact is that, beginning about the end of World War II American families began having substantially more children than they had had previously. In 1955 there were in the United States 11,300,000 persons in the age bracket 18 to 22, inclusive, which I am arbitrarily calling the college age. The statistics show that by 1970 there will be almost 19 million in this age group. The data can hardly be disputed for these young people are with us now.

The second major factor is the increasing proportion of those of requisite ability who

---

[1] Reported in "Where's the Money Coming From?" Council for Financial Aid to Education, Inc., February 1959, p. 12.

desire and demand higher education. The long-term trend is revealed by the experience of the 1st half of the 20th century. Between 1900 and 1950 the population of the country increased by 93 percent, but during the same period the enrollments in the colleges and universities increased by over 1,000 percent. The trend still continues. The tendency for an increasing proportion going to college is now slowing down but there is no indication that it will completely level off or reverse itself within the next decade or so. We must be prepared to handle this greatly increased number.

There are those who contend that we should simply ignore the figures and only provide for the number in higher education that we can conveniently handle. This is an unsocial and naive point of view, not only for national, but for individual, welfare. Since the need and the desire is there, public pressures, political and otherwise, will certainly be brought to bear to see that some sort of higher educational opportunity is afforded for those 6½ million. The basic question is how good an education will the country as a whole, in both public and private institutions, be able to provide?

Address by Hon. Herbert C. Bonner at the Launching of the NS "Savannah"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. BOYKIN. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein what I consider a wonderful speech made by our distinguished chairman, the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, Democrat, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, at the launching of the NS *Savannah* at New York Shipbuilding Co., Camden, N.J., July 21, 1959. I thought our great Chairman BONNER made one of the best speeches made on this famous day, where our First Lady, Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, christened this unusual and fabulous ship that is not only the United States, but the entire world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship.

How I wish every Member of this House, who represent every human in America, could have been there and not only heard Congressman BONNER'S speech, but so many other great talks by great men; and Mrs. Eisenhower was truly in all of her glory when she so graciously and beautifully christened this the greatest of ships just as it slid down the ways into the waters at Camden, N.J. The men and the women and the boys and the girls all were so thrilled and so happy. In all of my long years in attending similar occasions in many places all over this country and foreign countries, too, I do not believe we have ever had anything just like this.

The President of the United States message said this, and I quote:

I am confident that the ship will be the forerunner of atomic merchant and passenger fleets which will one day unite the nations of the world in peaceful trade. (President Eisenhower, Oct. 15, 1956.)

Not only did this gracious, smiling, wonderful, friendly Mrs. Eisenhower do such a beautiful job, but she was assisted by another great lady, Mrs. Henry B. Sayler, of Savannah, Ga., as matron of honor. Then, too, we had a very unusual and fabulous fellow from way down in the Deep South, the one and only Louis E. Wolfson, chairman of the board of the New York Shipbuilding Corp., that built this ship, and in Mr. Louis E. Wolfson's and Mr. Edward L. Teale's messages they said, among many other inspiring words, to the great group that was gathered there, they quoted what President Eisenhower said about the *Savannah* when announcing plans for its construction, and I quote: "This ship will demonstrate to people everywhere the peacetime use of atomic energy, harnessed for the improvement of human living." And I think we could have had it for the happiness of all mankind.

The master of ceremonies was Mr. Harry W. Pierce, vice chairman of the board of the New York Shipbuilding Corp.

I thought that the Honorable Clarence G. Morse, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administrator, as well as Senator Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico, also made great speeches, and we certainly could not forget Miss Elaine Malbin, who inspired us by singing "God Bless America."

Again I want to say there were great speeches by our old friend, Congressman OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, and many other famous people, but to me, Chairman HERBERT BONNER'S speech was the best and I believe made the greatest impression on the multitude of people that attended this great event. I believe when you read this message you will agree with me, but I thought Congressman BONNER delivered it so well, and every one of us—and there were acres on acres of spectators—could hear distinctly every word that you will read in this speech, and we on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, as well as the entire Congress, I am sure, are very proud of Chairman BONNER and the great work he did there where we had people gathered from the four corners of this earth.

Again I will repeat, I only wish all of you could have been there and have witnessed the entire proceeding that was so inspiring and which I believe means much to peace and prosperity and will truly be a real help to all mankind.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE HERBERT C. BONNER, DEMOCRAT, OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, AT THE LAUNCHING OF THE NS "SAVANNAH" AT NEW YORK SHIPBUILDING CO., CAMDEN, N.J., TUESDAY, JULY 21, 1959

Mr. Teale, our most gracious sponsor and First Lady, Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Mr. Secretary, Mr. Morse, Mr. McCone, and representatives of the governmental departments, my distinguished colleagues in the Congress of the United States, members of the Diplomatic Corps, friends of the American merchant marine, ladies and gentleman:

It is with the greatest pleasure and pride that I am privileged to be here today to take part in the launching of the NS *Savannah*, the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship.

It is inspiring, indeed, to stand here—a little more than a year since the laying of the keel of this great ship—and witness the fulfillment of a dream made possible through the imagination, the skills, and the energy of Americans from all walks of life. It is incredible to contrast this magnificent work of the mind and hand of man with the single steel assembly that was laid in place on this shipway on Maritime Day, 1958, to mark our first step into the nuclear age on the Seven Seas.

The dynamic development of the idea of adapting peaceful use of the power of the atom to merchant shipping is equally incredible.

We have known that nuclear energy could be adapted to ship propulsion ever since the submarine *Nautilus* proved to be such a tremendous success. But many were skeptical about moving ahead with a merchant ship prototype until years of experience with shore-based plants might indicate immediate efficiency and economy.

The first proposal to build an atomic-powered merchant ship gave no thought to the advancement of our merchant marine. It would have been a floating showcase of nuclear devices demonstrating peaceful uses of atomic energy in other fields.

As the idea grew, those of us responsible for the maintenance and development of an adequate American merchant marine under our national policy urged that we take the idea a step further and build a brand new vessel, especially designed in both hull and machinery, to secure the maximum advantage from this promising new source of power and from which we could learn how to build and operate efficient, working ships for the merchant marine of the future.

Thus, it was, that the authorizing legislation passed by the Congress and approved by the President in 1956 directed the construction of a practical merchant ship, powered by an advanced type of reactor, especially designed for the purpose. The President, the Congress, the Government departments, and the maritime and atomic energy industries, have every right to feel great pride and satisfaction in the part they have played in the construction of this new vessel. Already, lessons learned in the creation of the NS *Savannah* are showing the way to the design and production of fully competitive merchant ships many years earlier than ever thought possible.

Last year, standing in this same spot, I reviewed the unfortunate history of the old steamship *Savannah*, which more than 100 years ago was the first steamship to cross the Atlantic Ocean. I pointed out at that time how this country had ushered in the age of steam on the seas, and then, through failure to follow up what we had developed, and by continued adherence to sailing ships, we were soon left behind and for a half century fell to the status of a third-rate maritime power.

I repeat my admonition of a year ago—"Let us be sure that the lesson of the old *Savannah*—for which this new ship will be named—will be well remembered and studiously observed."

The record is clear that it is not premature to proceed with the next steps in the development of nuclear-powered vessels for peaceful purposes.

Our pioneering here is already being seriously studied by a number of other nations who are proceeding vigorously toward the development and construction of advance nuclear merchant vessels of their own. Under our open policy of sharing nuclear "know-how", these other countries are able to start with all the knowledge we have gained from our our first ship.

Therefore, we in Congress realize that if we do not press forward now with a progressive program we will again be guilty of willful blindness of incalculable cost. We

cannot afford to forfeit the promising progress that has been made to date.

I pledge that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will do all within its powers to help retain our initiative in the field of nuclear energy on the oceans with its unbounded possibilities.

With this ship, and with those which I hope will follow soon, we are casting our bread upon the waters, and I am sure the return will be a thousand fold.

God speed to the *Savannah* when she receives the magic of life with the blow of the christening bottle, and the surge of the water beneath her hull.

Thank you.

Secretary Kits Upset Russian Custom Official

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks I would like to submit herewith the second in a series of articles written by the editor of the Peoria Journal Star, upon his return from a recent trip to Russia:

SECRETARY KITS UPSET RUSSIAN CUSTOM OFFICIAL

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Moscow.—The Russian TU–104, their famous jet, took off on schedule from Paris, swooshed to Moscow, came down low under a heavy cloud cover and made a full circle over beautiful open country before landing.

An officer in uniform stood at the plane door and took everyone's passport before anyone could even go down the ramp.

Customs inspection was perfunctory in most cases, but a declaration is required particularly of how much money you are carrying. (You'd better not have more when you leave!)

The customs official who looked at my stuff inquired about a batch of pocket secretaries with ballpoint pens that I brought along from the Journal Star's stock of circulation prizes. I told him I just brought them to give away, which was true, and this did not unduly bother him. Then, he looked in the secretaries which happen to have one of these compartments for cards including a form for normal identification—a place for name, address, telephone number, etc. This upset him a good deal.

He wondered what I wanted with all this information on people. I told him it was just part of the kit and I personally never expected to see what was written there if anything ever was. He dragged over one of the brass hats, a smart young man, who took one look at the setup and laughed like the devil. We all laughed then, and off I went.

About this time, another uniformed gent picked his way through the crowd, walked up to me and without a word handed me my passport. I guess the picture in it is identifiable at that.

They sent me to the Hotel Nationale, across the street from one of the Kremlin walls and within sight of Red Square and St. Basil's Cathedral, where the manager promptly relieved me of my passport again plus all my documents regarding paid for travel, meals, and such.

I exchanged $10 in travel checks, at the hotel, for 400 rubles, 3 of the bills were 100 ruble notes which are about the size of a large blotter.

The first impression of Moscow is a good one, with many modern-looking buildings, a good deal of busy auto traffic (all driving on the right side) and bustling crowds of people not too different from a large U.S. city, except that the people are not as well dressed. The men wear their overcoats, long, and although it was only comfortably cool in Moscow, almost everyone wore coats. The women are not well dressed and apparently never heard of Playtex.

The result is pretty sad.

I only had time for one walk around Red Square, being in Moscow only to change planes.

In due time, the manager handed me my passport, a book of plane tickets, and my other documents, and advised that they were flooded with U.S. tourists in Moscow and proposed to put me on my plane—alone. This was fine with me.

They put me on a plane as different from the Paris to Moscow jet as can be imagined. Our own Ozark airlines would never have put this ship in the air in 1940, much less today. It was old, weatherbeaten, small, with beat-up seats and no safety belt.

We took off for Kiev and Odessa. I found myself on an aircraft where not a soul spoke English and there was no stewardess. A man sitting near me inquired in Russian and I told him I was an American. He smiled and was very friendly, offering me chocolate cookies, pictures of his family, and such. He was dark skinned, dark mustached, in a shirt and trousers, with a great deep voice.

He offered me a cigarette and said it was made in Tashkent. I told him I hoped to go to Tashkent and might get there by July Fourth.

Then I said to him in broken Russian—"July Fourth is a very big day in America."

"Da," he said. "Ya Znayoo." (I know.)

He sat through a long pause with his arms dangling between his legs and head down, and then deep down in his throat said softly, "Svoboda."

It is a touching word in any language.

The English equivalent is "freedom."

What Is Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, each of us is aware that inflation is an economic evil, but too few of us are acutely aware of the precise nature of its negative effects.

The following article from the editorial section of the Packer, a popular agricultural trade paper, serves very effectively to pinpoint this problem of inflation:

WHAT IS INFLATION?

(The Packer, July 18, 1959)

Inflation is spending $2 to do a job $1 would do before World War II.

Inflation is the reason a farmer, who paid $1,000 for a piece of equipment several years ago (and even though he depreciated it properly over the years) must pay $2,000 to buy a new one to do just about the same kind of work as the old did for him.

Inflation in ages gone by occurred when governments indulged in clipping coins. Today even though the methods are more complicated, the results are the same. When the Federal Government goes into the red for $10 to $15 billion it covers all or part of this deficit with new money and issues a statement—something to the effect that "this action is necessary to provide the bank reserves for the Nation's growing monetary needs."

Inflation is the reason fixed incomes from insurance policies, government bonds, pension plans, and social security buy less at the store than they did 5, 10, and 15 years ago.

Inflation has been the compelling force for Congress to raise the debt limit twice in 1958. First to $280 billion; next to $288 billion, and then this year to $295 billion for the period ending June 30, 1960. We are therefore handing an unpaid bill of $1,695 to each member of the on-coming generation as of right now, and the situation is getting worse each day.

Inflation is the reason a person who earned $5,000 in 1946 would have to earn $7,343 today (50 percent more) simply to be as well off as he was before.

Inflation demands that a man work 12½ hours of his 40-hour work week to pay for Government; or, expressed in terms of an 8-hour day, the average $4,500-a-year man must work for his Government 2 hours and 29 minutes, but by contrast to pay for his food he must work 1 hour and 39 minutes, for housing 1 hour and 25 minutes, and for clothing 37 minutes.

Inflation is the condition which keeps some boys and girls from going to college because of the $4,000 parents had saved several years ago to pay the costs has now been inflated to $8,000 on today's standards.

Inflation is the money disease which affects everyone—not just a few, but in particular the 106 million owners of life insurance, the 50 million savings account depositors, the 20 million savings and loan subscribers, the 40 million U.S. bond holders, the 14 million retired folks with private pensions, and the millions of employees not covered under cost-of-living adjustments.

This is inflation.

In a country such as ours—rich in a history of meeting and defeating serious obstacles—we cannot concede that our fiscal problems are insoluble. Inflation, like sleeping sickness, will destroy the economy little by little over the years keeping us unaware of the pain, unless we turn our full attention to the problems of demanding a sound fiscal system and stable economic policies.

This is how to stop inflation.

Americans Should Know the Answers to Communists' False Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, people who have talked with Communists are struck by their ability to uphold the false doctrines of communism. They seem informed and dedicated, and are able to support their side of an argument.

Unfortunately, many Americans are singularly deficient in upholding their beliefs in the ideals and principles of America. They seem to have only hazy

ideas about the American heritage. They are unable to voice their beliefs convincingly.

Americans will surely support and applaud the initiative taken by Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, to correct this deficiency. In a television address in Boston on June 21, 1959, he urged that schools should teach about communism and about the answers to its false doctrines. This address appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 24, 1959, at page A5468, as an extension to the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

Since then Cardinal Cushing has made a further significant statement on the subject. He quotes a chaplain in the U.S. Armed Forces stationed in Berlin, who gives impressive corroboration: "Americans over here in Europe have not the slightest idea of why they are Americans or what a democracy actually is," he said. "Most of them cannot say a word against communism."

The cardinal's statement is in a letter to the Boston Herald, in its issue of July 16, 1959. I believe it should have wide publicity, and include it as part of these remarks. He wrote as follows:

Please permit me to commend you for publishing that excellent letter from Mrs. Pattee that appeared in your esteemed paper on Monday morning concerning the fundamental tenets of communism and the necessity of teaching these to our children. If our school systems refuse to approve such teaching let us never forget that the home is the first, foremost, and greatest school for the presentation of truth to our children.

If the letter from Mrs. Pattee is read by all your readers among the fair sex we have reached the end of the dark road of apathy and indifference toward the mounting threat of communism.

Where the men folks have failed the women will succeed. They have always been effective in every political and moral crisis.

If space permits, you may be interested in the following paragraphs from a letter sent to me by a chaplain in the U.S. Armed Forces now stationed in Berlin:

"I read with great interest your proposal to have communism taught in high schools and colleges. I can certainly add that half the Americans over here in Europe haven't the slightest idea of why they are Americans or what a democracy actually is.

"If you could convince them that tomorrow the Communists could equal or better our American material living standards, the party couldn't handle all the new members they'd have. Apart from parroting a few labels like "freedom to vote" (most of them don't themselves), "dictatorship," "totalitarian," most of them can't say a word against communism, as we have found out time and again with the American lads in character guidance talks here. It's clear that the American schools, while putting out a lot of nonesense, have really missed the basic issues with all those silly civics courses they used to give.

"Your proposal is timely and hopeful. It could start a movement all over the country and maybe the world. The courses should be basic and positive. With statistics available from the State Department and other governmental agencies, communism should be shown in as clear, fair a light as possible, then the conclusions should be drawn in such a way that the student can really be convinced that he is a hundred percent better off living in the poorest democracy than in the most successful Communist utopia.

"One reason why people lost interest in communism in the United States is that it has been hit over the head too often with more heart than head. Intellectually it hasn't a leg to stand on. We are told over here that the only person the Communists really fear is one who thoroughly understands the system. This type can never become convinced or converted. Your proposal certainly can be effective. I for one hope that you will make it a crash project in Boston and set an example for the weak sisters elsewhere."

RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING,
Archbishop of Boston.

How To Be More Successful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, Bernard Haldane, career development specialist at Fairleigh Dickinson University, School of Business Administration, in Rutherford, N.J., delivered a very fine address on "How To Be More Successful," before the Society for the Advancement of Management at Albany, N.Y. on May 12, 1959.

Mr. Haldane, who has distinguished himself in the career and executive development field, founded Executive Job Counselors, Inc., in 1947. He has been a consultant on placement for the U.S. Naval Academy. He also founded and directed the first counseling and placement service for war veterans with professional and management abilities; directed personnel development study for the Air Research and Development Command, USAF; testified before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the shortages of engineers and scientists. These are but a few of his many activities in the career development field.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include these important remarks by Mr. Haldane:

HOW TO BE MORE SUCCESSFUL

(Address by Bernard Haldane before the Society for the Advancement of Management, Albany, May 12, 1959)

All things in nature either grow, or die. Man's search, your search, is for growth, for improvement. There is an evident trend throughout the Nation and the world to seek peace and security through establishing the status quo. Static security leads only to stagnation.

Growth and improvement call for willingness to change, willingness to accept the risks of change. America was established, her greatness was founded by men who were willing to take great risks in order to make great changes for the better.

Now we find ourselves threatened by the cold war. But our greatest enemy is not Russia and the Communists. The greatest threat to our continued national growth is the organization man. He is carefully unexceptional, an inconspicuous contributor to national mediocrity. He is a conformist for safety's sake.

The organization man sees himself in the littlest canoe on a big lake, and he doesn't want to make waves; he's afraid to rock the boat.

Our continued greatness as a Nation depends on individual men, lots of individual men. It depends on our recognizing—and using—the spirit of individual excellence which lies within each of us.

What's stopping us? And what can we do about what's stopping us? In particular, I intend to demonstrate tonight how you can recognize the best that is within you, how you can know your best self, and be your best more often.

First I'd like to ask you a question, and get your response by a show of hands. How many of you have ever made a mistake, just one mistake, or more?

Most of you are laughing, and all your hands are up. Mine is up too, so that means we have all made mistakes. We'll understand each other better for this knowledge.

Now another question. And please answer the same way. How many of you have had an experience you would call a success or achievement?

Your response seems very slow. Over 60 here, and only 2 or 3 hands raised—raised weakly at that. Everybody has a serious face.

Because you are here, you will believe what I now have to say. If you were not here, you would find it difficult to believe. If you were a relative stranger to me, I wonder if you would believe me if I said—most people find no joy in success, and great fun in making mistakes.

You participated in a demonstration of this condition. It happened just a few minutes ago. You were one of those who demonstrated the reality of the condition that is stopping us.

I'll give it a name: false modesty.

The cult of false modesty—which is very different from humility—has served to enthrone mediocrity and its partner, conformity.

Centuries of habit have erected a taboo system against the admission of one's own successes and achievements. Yet the fact of a mistake is no more and no less than the fact of a success. If we are strong enough to face the facts of mistakes, surely we should be strong enough to face the facts of successes.

But we have that taboo system. So we are supposed to learn from our mistakes, and we are not supposed to learn from our successes. In order to learn from our mistakes, we are supposed to study them. And since we learn about what we study—when we study spelling, we learn to spell, when we study arithmetic, we learn arithmetic, etc.—when we study our mistakes, we should learn about how to make bigger and better mistakes. But since a mistake is something we do not like to think about, let alone study, our efforts to study mistakes are made unwillingly and inefficiently.

Let's examine another result of the taboo system. Because it has been made socially wrong to study our successes, to learn from our successes, to learn how to repeat our successes, we have been forced to develop statistical measuring processes that will be socially acceptable as indicators of potential success. These statistical processes have come to be known as psychological tests, aptitude tests, and personality tests. No psychologist who uses them is satisfied with them as reliable measuring indicators. I have used them, too, and I am satisfied that they have usefulness, at the same time as they have the limitations of statistical tools used to measure a few segments of a large whole.

If we get rid of the taboo system, we can study successes directly, instead of indirectly through such statistically removed techniques as psychological tests. I am sure we can agree that when a man does some-

thing he considers successful, he has applied many of his best talents to accomplish the result. In addition he has put his heart into the task.

Since we all have greater and lesser successes throughout our lives, we have somewhere in our memories several experiences which have called for application of many of our best talents.

It should therefore be possible to analyze each of these experiences, break them down into parts or factors, and find out which factors are most consistently repeated in the different successes.

This is the process we call success factor analysis. The factors which are most consistently repeated are called dynamic success factors, and these form what we call your success pattern. Your dynamic success factors are the ones which probably will be found in your future successes and achievements. Accordingly, if you will look for experiences or opportunities which require application of your dynamic success factors, you are most likely to be successful again and again.

Let me repeat this. If you want success again and again, at higher and higher levels, look for experiences that will require the application of your dynamic success factors. I shall demonstrate how you can do this a little later. First I wish to deal with some possible shortcomings which may come to your mind.

First, why study successes alone, and not mistakes? I believe it is more practical to try and get what you want, than to work on avoiding what you don't want. It is true that if your goal is the avoidance of mistakes, you might achieve success; but that would be only by accident. The goal should be growth, greater accomplishment; consequently the study should be of successes, and how to increase them.

In any case, the study of your successes or, perhaps a more acceptable term, your achievements, does reveal potential weaknesses. For instance, if your success factors include sociability and word power, you might find your greatest progress as a politician, hotel manager, or some other activity which uses these and other qualifications. At the same time, the strength of these two success factors could lead to others complaining that you talk too much. I could give more examples, but this will suffice, I believe.

Another possible criticism is that you can never know when a man is telling the truth about his experiences. Consequently, how reliable can you expect the answers to be when you ask a man to talk about his achievements or successes? And associated with this is the question, "Once you get a man started along this line, isn't he likely to show personal bias in favor of himself, and really start to brag?"

There are built-in protections against such forms of exaggeration or bluffing. The success factor procedures I have taught to my associates reveal whatever conscious or unconscious attempts a person might make to deceive himself, as well as the analyst or counselor. In addition, there is a safety factor in the number of successes analyzed, and the span of time covered by them. Two or three should be studied for each 5 to 10 years of a person's life, and more where it seems possible or desirable.

Of course, people are subjective when speaking about themselves. But unless you can get a man to speak about his achievements, how else are you to know what he feels is an achievement? You cannot guess how he feels. Even his closest friends cannot guess, for sure, how he feels about certain experiences. So you have to ask him. If you want to get the best out of a man, you must look for the best that is in him. You have to ask him what he believes is his best.

Incidentally, this is called by some psychologists a nondirective biographical technique. It is also similar to some of the very subjective methods called projective techniques, those which use ink blots and pictures for the client or patient to interpret.

Another question that often is raised relates to the possibility of training others to analyze achievements and successes. I have trained others, and they do it effectively. One of the advantages of success factor analysis is that it requires commonsense and good judgment, rather than a trained psychologist, to use it effectively. Good executives and supervisors can use it themselves in regard to selection, personnel development, and performance appraisal. It is particularly helpful to those self-effacing people in such occupations as engineering, science, and other professions; success factor analysis helps them to know themselves, and gain the recognition and opportunities they should have.

Executives and supervisors can be trained to use this technique, for their purposes, in about 14 hours—in small groups. Top executives can learn enough about this technique in a single morning or afternoon seminar, with the aid of a manual, to be able to improve their judgment of people substantially. Psychologists, who must go deeper into motivations, will require much more time and study and practice. I include personnel men among executives and supervisors; however, if the technique is to be used for deep counseling of employees, considerable practice—almost internship—is necessary.

On occasion, I have been asked about the validation of success factor analysis. My reply on such occasions has been, I am more concerned with the fact that the system works, than with its statistical validation. I have many thousands of files on people with whom the system has worked, and I have interviewed more than 40,000 people over the last 21 years. If you want to validate it, I will be happy to help you; but in order to do this, you must study the system, then test it.

Actually, we have found that success factor analysis works so simply and reliably, that we have not felt it necessary to validate it. The specialists in validation can take care of that, while we concern ourselves with helping people to be more successful by application of the system. This does not sound scientific, of course. But then, gravity was not scientific until after Newton's theory; gravity existed before the apple dropped on his head. We do have a scientific principle we follow, however, so perhaps we are scientific after all.

I have trained some 20 specialists who are known as success therapists. That is because we concern ourselves with the treatment of a wide variety of obstacles to individual progress and success. A success therapist is concerned with helping a man to be his most effective and successful self, more of the time. Before I close, I would like to tell you how you, each of you, can give yourself a limited form of this success analysis treatment. There are three major steps to success factor analysis, and here they are:

1. Think about your achievements of all kinds, things you have done well, and enjoyed, at different times of your life—back to early childhood. These may have meaning only to you, personally, and may seem insignificant to others.

2. Write descriptions of six or more which have meant most to you, perhaps your six greatest achievements. Then, if you haven't already written them, describe a couple of your earliest childhood achievements. If you are to analyze them, you must write them down.

3. Study the descriptions. Look for the qualities of talent and personality that reveal themselves repeatedly, and most conspicuously. These repeated qualities probably are your dynamic success factors. It is difficult to see these clearly, clearly, for yourself; but you can have a good sense of what they are. If you will look for opportunities to apply this combination of your best qualities, you are most certain to find greater and greater success and progress.

When you know your best qualities, you will seek to make them better. In order to know your best qualities, you should study the experiences that have required you to use them. Stop studying your mistakes. Stop yielding to the taboo which blinds us to the facts of progress and greatest success. For your own sake, if for no other reason, study those experiences that have given you happiness and success in order that you may find the ingredients that will bring you more success again and again. These ingredients are your God-given talents. Recognize them, and use them well.

TVA Bond Bill Now on Third Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as we once again take up the TVA self-financing bill, it may be helpful to review the circumstances which have brought on the necessity for taking up this matter again, and accordingly I include in the Appendix of the RECORD my newsletter, Capitol Comments, for last week, which reviews the situation.

The newsletter follows:

TVA BOND BILL ON THIRD BASE

Following passage by the Senate of the TVA self-financing bill, this much-needed and battle-scarred measure has reached, in baseball parlance, third base in the legislative game. The bill, however, has again run into hurdles set up by the diehard opponents of the TVA. When consent was requested in the House this week to accept the Senate amendments to the bill, the minority leader of the House objected and blocked action on the bill. As a result it will be necessary to take the amended measure through the Rules Committee again and on the floor of the House for further debate and another vote. Friends of the TVA are confident that the House will again approve the measure; but there will be a delay in its enactment as a result of this last-ditch effort to block the bill.

Meanwhile, the minority leader of the Senate has reportedly urged the President to veto the TVA measure. Your Representative expresses the hope and the belief that the President will be fair and approve this legislation. There are many reasons why this bill should be approved in the public interest, among them:

First. The President himself first proposed this legislation to the Congress in his budget message on January 17, 1955. The President has repeated his request for self-financing legislation for TVA in his budget messages of 1956, 1957, and 1958, and again in January of this year—on five separate occasions.

Second. Committees of the Congress have worked for 4 years to write a reasonable and workable bill.

Third. Extensive hearings have been held—five sets of hearings—on this legislation in both Houses of the Congress.

Fourth. Both the House and the Senate have acted favorably on this bill and there has been 5 years of debate on this measure, both inside and out of the Congress.

Fifth. Both Houses have passed the bill by decisive majorities. Two years ago the Senate passed it by a vote of 61 to 20; this year the House passed it by a vote of 245 to 170, and the Senate by a vote of 73 to 17.

Sixth. The bill represents a reasonable compromise of many views. It is considered satisfactory in the main, not only to the TVA, but also to the private utility companies bordering on the TVA area.

Seventh. The Secretary of the Treasury has expressed his approval of desirable features of the financing phases of this bill—and indeed all approved the measure except a limited few who want TVA destroyed and dismembered.

Eighth. The bill puts a fence around TVA—a territorial limitation is prescribed—and not a kilowatt of power can be sold outside the area.

Ninth. The TVA will make a far greater return of payments into the Treasury than under the present law.

Tenth. TVA is a creature of Congress—will remain under the control of the Congress. The President can make recommendations for changes at any time and the Congress can enact changes at any time.

Eleventh. All three members of the Board—Chairman Vogel, former Congressman Hays, and former Deputy Director of the Budget Bureau Jones, have all been appointed by the President, and surely they can be depended upon to carry out the provision of this legislation in a responsible manner.

With the territorial limitations, with Treasury Department control, and congressional control, and Presidential control through the naming of the Board members, no further control should be desired.

When we are appropriating millions for the development of water resources throughout the country—and billions throughout the world—surely it is just and fair that the citizens of a great area would be given the privilege of voting bonds for self-financing, bonds that are taxable, and bonds that are not included, but outside, the national debt.

I express the hope again that the President will be objective and fair and not disapprove this needed and meritorious legislation. Such approval would permit the TVA to operate in a businesslike fashion, but without undue political and partisan influence and to a large degree eliminate the annual congressional fight over TVA's operations, and would be in line with statements and assurances of the President of his friendship and support for this great agency of the Government.

Full Disclosure in Urban Renewal Project Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, during debate on the omnibus housing bill recently vetoed, I offered as an amendment a measure which would require full disclosure of the details of any proposed redevelopment of an urban renewal project before any commitment could be made by the local authority and the proposed redeveloper. The House saw fit to adopt that amendment; but unfortunately, it was stricken from the bill in conference.

The new omnibus housing bill recently introduced, H.R. 8181, I am pleased to note, includes a modified version of my disclosure amendment. I should like to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared on Monday, July 20, 1959, in one of New York's great newspapers, the World-Telegram and Sun. The World-Telegram has been in the forefront of the movement in New York City seeking to review the procedures by which urban renewal projects are brought into being. I am especially happy, therefore, to note its editorial endorsement of my amendment:

ADVANCE FACTS ON TITLE I

With Congress putting together a new housing bill to replace the mishmash measure vetoed by President Eisenhower, it has another opportunity to include an important feature sidetracked last time.

We refer to the amendment by Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, 17th District Republican. It would require advance disclosure of all salient facts on a prospective title I project before any contract or commitment could be made by a local authority—facts such as the names of all persons having a financial stake in the development, proposed financing, and estimated cost, rents, and profits.

This amendment is something New York badly needs—and it was inspired by scandals here.

In the last housing go-round, the House passed the Lindsay amendment, the Senate did not and it was knocked out of the final compromise version, reportedly as a result of lobbying pressure by lieutenants of Robert Moses, this city's title I maestro.

The Lindsay amendment is now in a new omnibus housing bill in both the Senate and the House. We hope this time Congress sends up a bill the President can sign—and that it contains the Lindsay amendment.

Massachusetts Labor Relations Commission Favors Legislation To Extend Jurisdiction of State Labor Relations Boards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the comments and arguments of the Massachusetts Labor Relations Commission in support of legislation to extend the jurisdiction of State labor relations boards, as presented by Stephen E. McCloskey, chairman of the commission:

Supplementing my letter of July 17, 1959, relative to the Washington press release that the House Labor Committee had tentatively voted to insert in the Senate approved version of a union regulation bill, a provision that the National Labor Relations Board assume jurisdiction over all labor cases, I have the following to offer:

When the constitutionality of the old National Wagner Act was sustained in 1937 by the U.S. Supreme Court, various industrial and forward-looking States set in motion the machinery to enact State labor relations acts which, in the main, were substantial replicas of the Wagner Act. Up to the present, there are 13 States thus equipped. Among these States are New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Michigan, Wisconsin.

The adoption by these States of a State labor relations law was no empty gesture but was of a vital significance.

Some of the first States who got in line foresaw a dangerous and disturbing situation which would ensue; i.e., a "twilight zone" or "no man's land", to use the common terms, would develop where labor disputes would be unresolved due to the fact that the business or industry involved was local in nature or that its impact on interstate commerce was trivial and unsubstantial and hence should have its problems and controversies processed and adjudicated by State agencies.

These States foresaw also that Federal handling of these matters, where dispatch was obviously all-important, would become unwieldy, productive of distressing delays and generally unsatisfactory.

By the peculiar character of these small businesses, it is eminently desirable that State boards be in the picture. By this is meant that they have a more intimate, comprehensive and interested stake in the matters in question and a closer knowledge of local setup.

Need it be stated that they can act with vastly greater speed which is always essential?

Under the Federal machinery, long and costly delays are inevitable because it allows and provides for appeals to the Supreme Court of the Nation. This is not met with if the matters are processed by the State boards.

The lawyers tell us of a so-called de minimus concept of the law, often mentioned in opinions of the U.S. Supreme Court. We understand this to mean that the law is not concerned with "trifles" or literally to translate (according again to the lawyers) "the very small things." Thus the Federal provisions not concerned with small matters or businesses could provide for State intervention to handle them.

The Guss case decided by the U.S. Supreme Court in March 1957, put it squarely and unequivocally up to Congress that it (Congress) was the agency or instrumentality to remedy by legislation the current undesirable state of affairs relative to the assertion of jurisdiction as between the Federal and State agencies.

The main functions of most State labor relations—at least ours is the prevention of unfair labor practices and the supervision and investigation of certification of bargaining petitions with a view to certifying bargaining agents to insure industrial peace.

A very simple solution to us seems to incorporate in the new labor law a provision directing the National Labor Relations Board to transfer to the control or supervision of the many State labor relations boards the functions of processing labor disputes in their respective States involving only the prevention of unfair labor practices and the certification of bargaining representatives after investigation, where the effect or impact on interstate commerce would be slight or unsubstantial or where it would be feasible because of the peculiarly local nature of the business involved or because State jurisdiction would effectuate speedily an amicable adjustment. It appears also of simple solution to have embodied in the new legislation an amendment that empowers and directs the State agencies to apply the provisions of the national act if their own provisions governing unfair labor practices and certification procedures are inconsistent with the national ones or have been construed differently.

Such legislation seems absolutely begging to be passed and would be of incalculable

benefit in eradicating the present vexatious conditions that obtain.

Let me assure you that labor and management are wholeheartedly in accord with these sentiments. I have for many years been in close contact with both and I know whereof I speak. Almost invariably they prefer to do business, as the phrase is, with the State agencies.

Mr. Justice Burton, in delivering the minority opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court in the Guss case (mentioned above), deplored in a masterly feat of logic and commonsense the taking over or preemption by the National Labor Relations Board of almost the entire area of labor relations. We believe that a stronger word is usurpation, even though some might find its use intemperate.

So we have as an ally in our opinions expressed above, the said Justice Burton, a brilliant jurist, and the part of the Court that dissented from the majority. We are proud to be in his company.

Is the whole field of labor relations to be made a laughing stock of? Is it to be stultified and hamstrung?

We are not atttempting to be humorous when we state the following might happen:

Let us picture a sturdy and God-fearing citizen. He is imbued with the idea of buying a farm and growing peanuts. He harvests a rich and abundant crop. He hires another citizen to assist him in peddling his peanuts a mile away in the village square. An argument arises between the two over certain aspects of their labor relations. The National Labor Relations Board moves in and takes jurisdiction.

Please accept our deep appreciation for giving this matter your attention.

We earnestly request you to oppose any attempt by legislation to deprive the State agencies of the right and power to process the appropriate labor cases before them.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
LABOR RELATIONS COMMISSION,
STEPHEN E. MCCLOSKEY, *Chairman.*

JULY 21, 1959.

"Zach" Wheat, Longtime Great Brooklyn Outfielder, Enshrined in National Baseball Hall of Fame at Cooperstown, N.Y., During 20th Annual Ceremonies, July 20, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the great events in the Nation, both from the point of view of our own history and from the point of view of the whole sports world, are the annual ceremonies conducted at the National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum in my district in Cooperstown, N.Y. Enshrined in this hall are the great baseball figures of all time.

Here, too, in this beautiful community on the shores of Otsego Lake, where the great American game was invented 120 years ago, is held each year at Doubleday Field a Hall of Fame baseball game between a team representing the American League and one representing the National League. This year the American League Kansas City Athletics and the National League Pittsburgh Pirates played to a 5–5 tie, when the game was called in the fifth inning because of rain. But the highlight of the whole occasion was the ceremony that led to the inclusion of Zachariah Davis "Zach" Wheat, longtime great Brooklyn outfielder, as the 84th baseball immortal to be included in Cooperstown National Baseball Hall of Fame.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a newspaper article from the Oneonta Star of Tuesday, July 21, describing this historic ceremony, and also a background sheet about the Hall of Fame prepared and published by the Cooperstown Baseball Committee:

[From the Oneonta (N.Y.) Star, July 21, 1959]

TWO THOUSAND WATCH "ZACH" WHEAT BECOME 84TH HALL OF FAMER

COOPERSTOWN.—A light rain fell intermittently on some 2,000 persons yesterday as Zachariah Davis "Zach" Wheat, longtime great Brooklyn outfielder, became the 84th baseball immortal enshrined in the National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum here.

The festivities, staged on a platform erected at the front of the national shrine, opened with a brief introduction by Rowan D. Spraker, Sr., Cooperstown, a vice president of the Hall of Fame, who brought to the rostrum Les Biederman, president of the Baseball Writers of America.

Mr. Biederman, of the Pittsburgh Press, "emcee" for the ceremony, then introduced Cooperstown Mayor Alva C. Welch, Sr., who welcomed the crowd, telling them that a formal speech of welcome was too "stilted."

WELCOME HOME

Rather, the mayor said, this is "a welcome home to help us honor this baseball immortal. All of you are here for a purpose," he said. "I'm glad you are here."

Others introduced by Mr. Biederman included Warren Giles, president of the National League; Will Harridge, chairman and former president of the American League; Stephen C. Clark, Sr., president of the Hall of Fame; Baseball Commissioner Ford C. Frick, Joe Cronin, new president of the American League.

One of the more impressive introductions of the day was made by Mr. Biederman, who asked spectators to bow their heads for a moment in silent prayer for Hall of Famers dead within the year, including Mel Ott, Larry Lesieur, Tris Speaker, and Ed Walsh.

Then Mr. Frick took the stand to introduce the two living members of the original 11 players to be inducted into the Hall of Fame back in 1939 in the initial ceremony. Speaking with feeling, Commissioner Frick called to their feet George Sisler and Ty Cobb.

IMMORTALS RETURN

Other baseball immortals on hand for the event included John Franklin "Home-Run" Baker, Mr. Cronin, Frank Frisch, Joe McCarthy, and Harold J. "Pie" Traynor.

Another brief ceremony was the presentation of the Hall of Fame cup to Ozzie Bluege of the Washington Senators for their American League triumph in the 1958 Hall of Fame classic.

Then Mr. Frick opened the initiation ceremony for Mr. Wheat, saying "during his major league career, Zach Wheat got a great reputation as a thief * * * he stole more bases than anyone else in baseball."

He went on to relate some of the records set by the great outfielder who began his career in 1909 with the Brooklyn Superbas. Among them were a lifetime batting mark, covering 29 years, of .317; leading the National League in 1918 with a .355 average, and falling only 116 hits short of the coveted 3,000-hit mark.

ZACH SPEAKS

Coming to the microphone at the front of the rostrum, Zach Wheat shook hands with the commisisoner, then said, "I never experienced anything like this. This is my first view of the Hall of Fame and the things I have seen have brought back memories.

"Thanks to everybody for everything," he said, then seemed lost in thought for a moment while a silent crowd hung on his words and drops of rain began to fall after a brief letup.

After the momentary pause, the baseball immortal grinned at the crowd, said, "I guess I forgot what I was going to say. I goofed," then went on to offer his thanks once more.

Others recognized by Emcee Biederman included the widows of two Hall of Famers, John J. McGraw and Christy Mathewson; Arnold Johnson, president of the Kansas City Athletics; Lou Brissie, American League baseball commissioner; Charles Grimm of the Chicago Cubs; Clarence Rowland, Chicago Cubs; Tom Meany, public relations for the New York Yankees.

OTHERS ON HAND

Joe L. Brown, general manager, James A. Herron, treasurer, and Robert T. Rice, of the Pirates, as well as Manager Danny Murtaugh; Ozzie Bluege, Washington Senators; Cal Hubbard, American League umpire in chief; Harry Simmons, manager of the International League Service Brueau, and many others.

The introduction that drew the biggest ovation from the crowd was that for Harvey Haddix of the Pittsburgh Pirates. Introduced from the rostrum, Haddix was speechless over the roar of applause that swelled as he was commended for the famous 12 innings of perfect ball he pitched this summer.

Throughout the ceremony newsmen and photographers crowded the fenced-off area at the front of the rostrum, television cameras buzzed, flash bulbs popped, and once the photographers gave voice to hold it higher, higher, as Commissioner Frick presented the plaque to Mr. Wheat.

NATIONAL BASEBALL HALL OF FAME AND MUSEUM, INC., COOPERSTOWN, N.Y., JULY 20, 1959

This is the 20th anniversary of an historic event in baseball. On June 12, 1939, the National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum, Inc., was dedicated and, thus, the village of Cooperstown, N.Y., became the focal point of the entire universe.

An elaborate program that started on May 6 and terminated on September 4 featured the summer's Cavalcade of Baseball. No expense or effort was spared to make the celebration, a century of baseball from 1839 to 1939, nationwide in its implications. How successfully this was accomplished is shown by the fact that players participated from every State in the Union and many points in Canada, and that fans from foreign countries were there to watch at some time during the summer.

The active baseball athletes ranged from amateurs to semipros to high schools to military academies to colleges to universities to each of the 38 minor leagues, and, last, but not least, the all-stars of the two major leagues.

At Doubledady Field where baseball was played by a group of Copperstown boys in 1839, is the imprint of stirring scenes. During the process of the Cavalcade of Baseball, Babe Ruth shouldered his bat at home plate on the historic field and waited for the pitch. In contrast, a lad from Georgia sandlots—away from home for the first time, having his try at amateur honors—reverently, and with bare head, cautiously slid a foot across that sacred spot.

Vieing with Doubleday Field in interest for visitors at the centennial celebration was the dedication of the National Base-

ball Hall of Fame and Museum, Inc. The idea for this historic edifice originated with Ford C. Frick, then president of the National League, now baseball commissioner. Mr. Stephen C. Clark, native of Cooperstown, responded to the plan with deep enthusiasm, giving the entire project his civic and financial support.

The National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum was sponsored with the view of establishing a shrine for baseball's immortals. Here the fans, young and old, men and women, boys and girls, could live for a brief moment with the legends and the lore of baseball, and with their heroes of the past.

Here would be the lasting monument to the greats of baseball and here also would be inscribed their deeds to remain forever an inspiration and a challenge to all who come after them, and especially to those youngsters from all walks of life who aspire to follow in their footsteps.

In recognition of their contribution to baseball, bronze plaques would be awarded the game's immortals. Five players were enshrined in the first election. They were: Tyrus Raymond Cobb, George Herman (Babe) Ruth, Christy Mathewson, Walter Johnson, and John Peter (Honus) Wagner. Then, year by year, with a lapse here and there, followed other players, plus executives, managers, umpires, and those whose efforts contributed largely to the progress of baseball.

Zachariah Davis Wheat, an outstanding player as outfielder with the Brooklyn Dodgers from 1909 to 1926, was elected in 1959, thus becoming No. 84 enshrined in the Hall of Fame.

The National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum building was dedicated in 1939. No one believed at that time that the structure would be outgrown within a short period. Baseball memorabilia of every kind began to arrive at Cooperstown. Former stars sent their long unused equipment and cherished trophies; libraries, newspapers, and universities gave books, pictures, and records; many private collections were donated. Attics were invaded in private homes and many trophies came to light—the first catcher's mitt, the first factory-made mask, the bat used by George Wright of the Cincinnati Reds in 1869, etc.

To meet the need of more floor space for the display of baseball's rare relics, an addition, doubling the size of the original building, was dedicated in 1950.

Then, on August 4, 1958, the third unit of the Cooperstown shrine, was formally opened. This distinctive Baseball Hall of Fame became a reality when the directors realized the necessity of an exclusive Hall of Fame for the display of the bronze plaques, carrying a bas-relief likeness of the immortals and a short summary of his achievements in baseball. Heretofore, those bronze awards appeared on pylons in the original building that also contained numerous other baseball exhibits.

The wing is one story and basement, measuring 85 feet, 6 inches, by 43 feet, 6 inches. It is of brick and marble construction, with marble columns supporting lofty ceilings. The central gallery is lighted by clerestory lights. Along either side are raised aisles with alcoves designed to display effectively the plaques of the immortals. These are lighted by sky domes, and special lights bring out details of the plaques.

Special provision has been made for the display of the Baseball Hall of Fame Cup for which a representative of the American League plays a representative of the National League in the annual Major League Hall of Fame Game at Doubleday Field. This series originated in 1940, following the all-star game spectacle on June 12, 1939. The Pittsburgh Pirates, of the National League, and the Kansas City Athletics, of the American League, meet in the 1959 classic.

A record of the teams and scores of these games are inscribed on special panels as a part of the background of the Hall of Fame Cup.

The enthusiastic response of the public to this national institution is indicated by the annual increase in patronage. Over 1,300,000 have visited the National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum since its doors opened, starting with 25,332 in 1939, and increasing to the high year of 151,388 in 1957.

FACTS ABOUT COOPERSTOWN, N.Y.

Cooperstown is renowned for its scenic setting. Its main industry is selling history. In making history its main business, Cooperstown of late years has evolved into a village of notable museums.

Besides the Baseball Museum, there is Fenimore House, home of the New York State Historical Association, which fascinates visitors with its paintings of the "Hudson River School," and its collection of folk art; while the Farmers' Museum reflects the pioneer way of life. Here are old farm tools and appliances, and a group of buildings assembled in a replica of a crossroads community of a century ago, with its coutry store, one-room school house, village blacksmith shop, printing office, lawyer's office, doctor's office, and so on.

ABNER DOUBLEDAY

Abner Doubleday was descended from an old Otsego County family. Cooperstown is the county seat. Doubleday was born June 26, 1819, at Ballston Spa, Saratoga County. He received a private school education in Cooperstown and was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in 1842.

General Doubleday was an engineer and in 1870 obtained a charter in San Francisco, Calif., for the first cable railway ever built. He published "Reminscences of Fort Sumter and Fort Moultrie, Chancellorville and Gettysburg," and wrote numerous articles on army matters, engineering problems, etc.

COOPERSTOWN BASEBALL DATA

In 1905 a commission was appointed by major baseball interests of the United States to inquire into the origin of the national game. The commission was composed of U.S. Senator Morgan G. Bulkeley, A. G. Mills, Nicholas F. Young, Alfred J. Reach, George Wright and James E. Sullivan—names prominent in the baseball world of that day. The commission conducted a careful investigation and its findings were reported in Spalding's Official Baseball Guide of 1908.

The decision was that the present game was invented by Abner Doubleday in Cooperstown, N.Y., during the Harrison Presidential campaign in 1839.

It was stated by the commission that young Abner Doubleday had laid out the diamond-shaped playing field for a game he called baseball for the students of a private school in Cooperstown in which he was enrolled as a student, and that this was the beginning of what we now call the national game.

Doubleday's game varied from other games of that era in that he placed an equal number of players on each side.

The field where Abner Doubleday and his fellow students played over a century ago was a cow pasture with a brook running through the middle. The townspeople stirred by baseball's official announcement that the game started there, decided to transform the land into a public playground with a baseball field and stands now seating 8,500 as a permanent memorial to Abner Doubleday.

The annual Major League Baseball Hall of Fame Game is made possible by cooperation of the major leagues, each of which appoints a club and selects a day for the contest.

Major league pennant winners, world series champions, and the game's top stars play in this annual diamond spectacle.

State Taxation of Business Income Derived From Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to terminate a tax evil that is threatening West Virginia's most important industry. My objective is to establish some uniformity in State taxation of business income derived from interstate commerce.

Under prevailing conditions, the rash of State laws imposing taxes on businesses operating thousands of miles away could become confiscatory. The coal industry is particularly vulnerable because a very large part of all coal output moves in interstate commerce. West Virginia mines ship more than 90 percent of their production out of the State. Being typically small business, the coal industry faces grave economic injury if the present trend toward burdensome income taxation is not blocked.

My legislative proposal has been prompted by the stampede toward the voracious State income taxes on interstate commerce that has followed the Supreme Court decision endorsing the strange and insidious tax innovations of Minnesota and Georgia. My bill provides that no State shall have the power to impose or collect taxes on income derived from the conduct of interstate commerce if the person conducting such commerce maintains no permanent or established stock of goods, plant, office, or warehouse within the State. The purpose of the words "permanent or established," which do not appear in other bills with the same objective as mine, is to distinguish and eliminate from possible taxation the situation where a person sets up a place of business of a temporary or transitory nature, such as a display room in a hotel.

I should like to point out at this time that the inclusion of "permanent or established" was recommended earlier this week by one of West Virginia's very distinguished lawyers, Rolla D. Campbell, of Huntington, W. Va. On July 21 he appeared before the Senate Finance Committee as representative of the National Coal Association's Tax Committee to testify in favor of legislation that would promote uniformity in State taxation of business income derived from interstate commerce. On reading over the colloquy developed during cross-examination, I have come to the conclusion that members of the Senate committee present at the hearing were unanimous in concurring with Mr. Campbell's views on this particular provision. For this reason, I think it would be remiss of the House to consider legislation lacking this specification.

I should like to advise my colleagues at this time that I have today written to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee requesting that hearings be arranged as quickly as possible to act on my legislative proposal. I emphasize

that immediate action is necessary to halt the hodgepodge of restrictive taxes that States across the Nation are at liberty to impose on coal operators and other West Virginia producers and manufacturers. I am sure that few Members of Congress represent districts in which mining companies, manufacturers, or processors are not faced with the same dilemma. Too many State legislatures have adopted this fanciful approach to their budget problems. Despite the inherent repugnance and unsavory implications of such obstacles to business between the States, serious attempts are being made at enforcement—often at administrative and bookkeeping costs in excess of actual revenue.

U.S. business will suffer progressively unless Congress acts to bar the pirate toll charges imposed by the various States. I ask your support of the bill that I have introduced today.

To Honor the Adamses, Father and Son, Who Both Served as Presidents of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 30, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, fortunate is the nation that has great traditions and forever honors them.

Massachusetts, the most historic area of our country, has no national highways or parkways to perpetuate the memory of the patriots and the stirring events that inspired the birth and the growth of our Republic.

John Adams was our second President.

His son, John Quincy Adams, served as our sixth President.

No other family in the history of our Nation has equaled this unique and distinguished record of service to the Nation.

It is time for us to properly honor their magnificent contributions to our independence by voting in favor of H.R. 7125, to provide for a study of the feasibility of establishing the President Adams Parkway, a connecting link of 8 miles from Faneuil Hall in downtown Boston, past the old statehouse in Boston, Paul Revere's home, the old North Church, and the home of the two Presidents.

Boston is the shrine of the American Revolution.

Hundreds of thousands of visitors come to this area each year, seeking the famous landmarks that they learned of in their school days, in order to be near and identify themselves with the spirit of those brave and freedom-loving days.

Frequently they have difficulty in finding and parking near these historic spots.

It is our purpose to facilitate their pilgrimage by inquiring into the feasibility of establishing this patriotic parkway.

Some technical objections have been raised, questioning both the precedent and the procedure, but I believe that most Members will agree that this is an honor that is long overdue.

I am happy that this measure will not be considered in the routine and anonymous manner. It deserves to have every Member stand up and be counted by name so that the Nation will know how deep is our gratitude and our reverence for two leaders who helped to win for us the priceless heritage of independence and liberty.

This is a reasonable bill, proposing a survey.

In view of all the circumstances, I cannot see how anyone can object to that.

I am confident that it will clarify the picture, and dispel all doubts, so that the Members will be encouraged to approve the recommendations of this survey when it has been completed.

In the meantime, the proposed memorial in honor of two Presidents is at least entitled to this preliminary consideration as to its feasibility.

A Commencement Address by the Very Reverend Richard H. Wilmer, Jr., at the Graduating Exercises at Prospect Hill School, New Haven, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a thoughtful address by the Very Reverend Richard H. Wilmer, Jr., dean of the Berkley Divinity School, Yale University, given at the graduation exercises at Prospect Hill School, New Haven, Conn.

The address was called to my attention by former Congressman John A. McGuire who served with many of us in the 81st and 82d Congresses and whose daughter Lois was a member of the graduating class. The address follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS, PROSPECT HILL SCHOOL, NEW HAVEN, CONN., JUNE 10, 1959, BY THE VERY REVEREND RICHARD H. WILMER, JR.

There is a story to the effect that once upon a time there was a college commencement speaker who had the unfortunate habit of mixing his metaphors. He was a very intense and earnest man, and urged his listeners to strive upwards and onwards, and to do everything in their power to fulfill their high calling and purpose in life. Finally he reached the climax of his address, and delivered the punchline:

"Members of the graduating class, I have this final word to say to you: If you have a spark of genius in you, always water it."

To me there is something haunting about this story. All too often this is just exactly what happens in life. The spark of genius gets watered, the idealist of today becomes the cynic of tomorrow, the dream becomes hope unfulfilled. Many would-be realists say: Don't set your goals very high; don't expect much of life or of yourself. Then you won't be disappointed.

Yet something inside us rightly rebels at that. The spark of genius, the flame of life itself, doesn't want to be watered. Certainly life involves disappointments and suffering: all of us know that and we know more of it the older we get. But this is not the last word, and certainly this is not what you are primarily concerned about this afternoon. You who are members of the graduating class are preparing for the next advance: college, marriage, a job. You and your families are deeply appreciative of what Prospect Hill has done for you, and what your associations and friendships here have meant; but you want to get on to the next step. So we have these few moments of ceremony and reflection together, and then the present is over and a new life is yours. Things can never be quite the same again. You will always be members of the school, but you will be alumnae. Others will take your place, just as you will take the place of others in your next step.

Already you have felt the tension between authority and freedom, between dependence and independence. Soon such independence as you have never known before will be yours. Here is where we need to pause and take a good look around. In the next few years the spark of genius has its greatest chance: all of you have it, in some way or other, or you wouldn't be where you are today. One of you may be an artist, another a musician, some of you must be extremely capable in handling people (particularly parents); and somebody has to be the best cook in the class. Each of you has her own special talent and group of talents. What are you going to do with them?

So much of your joy in life, so much of your contribution to life depends on how you solve the problem of authority and freedom. Basically of course this is a religious problem, and perhaps the most vexing of all. St. Augustine said "Love God and do as you please." He was talking about a God whose service is perfect freedom; but the freedom was integrally related to the service. So here is the paradox: freedom under authority, service, discipline. What authority do you believe in? In whose service are you enlisted? What discipline claims you and molds your life?

The tragedy of so many lives is the failure to solve this problem: To recognize the paradox of authority and freedom and to work out our own solution of it. None of us is perfect and will ever solve the problem perfectly; there is always a surd in the equation. But we see all about us the evidences of failure. There is the dominated personality, too much under authority, too little free, unable to think creatively, decide clearly, act decisively. Until this soul can somehow be freed from whatever it is that dominates, its life cannot be fully its own. Too many influences are at work to impede it; its spark, if not watered out burns very low.

At the other extreme of the spectrum is the freed soul which is not really free. It is so undisciplined, so lacking in any sense of structure, that it cannot make its proper contribution to life. For a while its spark may seem to burn brightly and high; then come the days of responsibility and mature decision; and the light suddenly fails. Where did it go? What put it out?

Between the extremes, we try to work out our salvation with fear and trembling. Life with all its joys is precarious and threatening. Those who solve best this deepest problem are not all of one type; one

race, nation or creed. They are all sorts and conditions of men and women. We learn from the experience of others how attempted solutions go wrong: We see about us the closed and rigid mind that permits no change, no new ideas, lest the threatened citadel of self be forced to surrender. We watch the passage of the mind that couldn't care less; the uncommitted, the apathetic, for whom living is really commitment to indecision. We check the vapor trail of the mind that refuses any authority or discipline, and shoots off into unreality, whatever its brilliance. And so we come back home to the problem that must be faced and worked on if we are to be ourselves as God intended us to be: How to handle our dependence and our independence.

Thus far you have been largely dependent on your parents, and deeply influenced by them and your teachers. Each of you has felt the tension of growing up, of becoming yourself, of rebelling against authority, of wanting to express your own personality, of choosing your own way of life. This is as it should be, because without the tension we never do grow up; yet if we choose to break radically with all authority we are just as immature as the person dominated by authority.

In the years ahead you are going to be encouraged at college all along to make your own choices, form your own opinions, think for yourselves. There will be the structure of college life with its schedules and curriculum, hours and examinations, basic courses and departmental major system. Within all this will be the freedom of what you do with your time, how you choose electives, your friends, your extracurricular activities, your weekend dates and the man you marry. So you are free, and yet some authority, some set of values, helps you make your choices. What authority, what set of values, what structure, what world view? It is not fair to demand an answer of you now. Already your principles are pretty well formed. They are a mixture of what you have received from your parents and what you have determined for yourself, with the emphasis on the former. The next several years will be the crucial ones in which your principles of choice will take clearer shape. On the basis of these—intellectual, spiritual, and emotional, you will make the most important decisions of your life.

Involved in all of this is your own growing faith. What do you really believe in? What are you prepared to live and die for?

You are being graduated at a time when it was never more important to have a deep and decisive faith. This is the age of the edge of terror, when man's sharpest anxieties and darkest fears are aroused, and when his very existence on this planet can be snuffed out in a fraction of time. The President of the United Nations General Assembly, Dr. Charles Malik, put it this way in a speech in Washington last week:

"So far as the Western World is concerned, the deepest thing at stake is its faith in its values and its ability to justify and defend them.

"Free representative government, the primacy of the human person, the moral law, the continuity of history, freedom, truth and God—it is these things that are at stake today. They are all rejected and opposed from without and some of them are doubted or compromised from within. Is life worth living without them? And yet if people do not wake up, life will not be worth living.

"A mighty spiritual revival therefore is needed. For much more than peace is at stake. The revival must take hold not only of individuals here and there, but of whole institutions; not only of the leaders, but of the grassroots."

I congratulate you all on your graduation; I wish you and your school and your families well in the years to come. My prayer for you is that you solve creatively, each one of you, the problem of authority and freedom, of discipline and independence, and that through your solution the world will be that much closer to realizing the possibility of freedom under God.

Without Depletion, the "Little Man" Might as Well Give Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following article, "Without Depletion, the 'Little Man' Might As Well Give Up," by Marion Cracraft, oil editor of the Tulsa Tribune. This article was written by the Tribune's oil editor at the request of North American Newspaper Alliance:

[From the Tulsa Tribune, July 18, 1959]

WITHOUT DEPLETION, THE "LITTLE MAN" MIGHT AS WELL GIVE UP

(By Marion Cracraft)

While some congressmen talk about reducing the 27½ percent depletion allowed the big rich oil companies, thousands of little producing companies or individuals out here in the oil country argue that without this provision they couldn't exist.

They outnumber a thousand to one, literally, the major companies which receive most of the attention in the press and legislative halls. And they find most of the oil which keeps the Nation's reserves at a safe level, from the standpoint of future supply and national security.

One fact which the general public doesn't know is that comparatively few companies or individuals actually are allowed 27½ percent depletion for tax purposes. A second fact is that the depletion provision is not a tax concession or allowance, it is simply the Government's method of determining how much of an oilman's income is actually income and how much is consumption of his capital.

A third fact is that depletion is not a provision exclusive to oil; it also is applied (though not at the same rate) to other extractive industries such as coal, iron, and various quarried minerals.

Not long ago the writer persuaded a Tulsa oilman—an independent producer—to let him have a peak at his books. An example was made of one well—what it cost, what the oilman may take out of it, if he's lucky, and how it will work out for him as far as taxes are concerned.

Here are some of the results:

No effort was made to find an extra good, or an extra poor well. A shallow well was studied, because the little man usually can't afford to drill the deep ones. This man is a veteran operator; he has been pounding away at underground formations for 30 years, sometimes successful, sometimes not.

This well was drilled to 1,866 feet and he struck oil. The drilling cost was $5,816. That comes to $3.12 a foot. If he had been going to as much as 10,000 feet depth, the cost per foot would have quadrupled, at least. A heavier rig would have been necessary; likewise heavier drilling power and more equipment.

Before he ever started, the operator paid a leasing cost to the farmer who owns the land. This was probably $1 per acre for the whole farm, 160 acres. Had it been in "hot" territory—closer to other production—this cost might have run to as much as $50 an acre. For this story it's immaterial, since the lease cost is not included.

Neither is there included a fee paid to a geologist, who told the oilman in the first place there might be oil there, and on whose advice he purchased the lease.

Once he had a showing of oil, the operator spent an additional $687 for development costs. These were incurred in treating (with acid) and/or "fracturing." The latter is a method of loosening the oil sand so the oil will flow. These two items, $5,816 and $687, come to $6,503 and fall into a class by themselves, as they are the only cost items which can be deducted as a whole from the well's income.

Next expense came in well equipment and lease equipment. Altogether, this totaled $6,426. It cannot be deducted; it must be depreciated at the rate of 10 percent per year. Depreciation: $642.60.

Finally, someone must operate the well. This came to $100 per month, or $1,200. This was cheap, because the same man was tending other wells on the lease and only a portion of his pay is charged to this well. Thus the operator was out-of-pocket first year expense of $14,129.

Our operator was lucky. This was a flowing well. Had it been necessary to install a pump, the equipment cost would have been much larger.

Now, how about income? From this well the operator may take, under State regulations, 14 barrels per day. Assuming it is top-grade oil, it brings him $3.05 per barrel—total, $42.70 daily. Again he was lucky—there was a pipeline handy, to take the oil from his tanks. If there hadn't been, he would have had to have the oil trucked to a pipeline, at a cost of 35 cents per barrel.

Something usually goes wrong—the oil deposits paraffin and this chokes the flow through the tubing; the well flows for a while and then begins to decline, etc. But we'll assume nothing went wrong and this well produced the whole 365 days of the year for a total of $15,585.50.

Of this the State takes a 5 percent gross production tax—$779.82. The landowner gets the customary one-eighth royalty—$1,948.18. The operator's revenue thus is $12,858.04.

Against this he can charge off the drilling and development cost, $6,503, and his lease attendant's salary of $1,200. And, he can charge off that 10-percent depreciation on the equipment, $642.60.

That leaves him $4,512.44. Most steelworkers, plumbers, or bricklayers make more than that, without risking a dime.

Right here is where the proponents and opponents of percentage depletion collide head on.

How much of that $4,512.44 is actual income, and how much is depletion of capital?

To replace the 5,110 barrels of oil he took out of the well, he must find 5,110 more barrels—or, in a few years be out of business. The only way he can find more oil is to drill more wells. The oil he discovers is his capital. He doesn't know how long the well will last or how much oil is in that sand 1,866 feet below ground.

More than 30 years ago Congress decided an oilman could be presumed to take out of the ground the first year 27½ percent of the oil in a given well or on a given lease. The second year, 27½ percent of what was left, and so on.

This depletion was allowed, to leave the oilman something with which to replace his capital—that is, to find more oil. The rate is higher than in other extractive industries because there is more risk.

The oilman may drill one well, or even two or three, all with the foregoing items of cost,

before he again strikes oil, even in "proven" territory. If he goes into "wildcat," or unproven territory, his success rate is likely to be one out of eight or nine.

But there is a joker in the depletion clause. Our producer cannot take 27½ percent of his $12,858.04 gross income. The law says 27½ percent of the gross but not to exceed 50 percent of the net income from a given property. So, this operator may charge off 50 percent of his $4,512.44 net, or $2,256.22. That leaves him an equal amount on which to pay income taxes.

That $2,256.22 chargeoff will save him tax money, but it's a long way from getting him another oil well with which to replace the capital he has exhausted.

This is no attempt to make it appear the great American oil industry is virtually on relief. We all know it isn't.

Even little oilmen make money, if they're smart enough and lucky enough.

How? In the first place, there is always the second year. If that well keeps on flowing, and there is no trouble, we can presume the operator again takes out a $12,858.04 gross income, against which he charges only $642.60 depreciation and $1,200 attendant's salary.

That leaves him paying income tax on half of $11,015.44.

It never works that way in practice. The well needs cleaning out, the machinery breaks down, or the pipeline company gets more oil than it can take and the well is shut down for several days. But assuming nothing like this happens, the second year income can be pretty good, providing the well doesn't give out.

(That phrase, "providing the well doesn't give out," is an extremely important one. The public hears much about the big gushers of the old days, which made men rich. It never hears about the wells which make 3, 4, 9, 10, or 12 barrels, on which thousands of little oilmen actually make their living.)

In the second place, having once found production, the little man can go to the bank and mortgage it for enough to drill another well. The more successful wells, the more income. If, in his search, he happens to drill a dry hole or two, that takes a big chunk of the profit from the first, or maybe all.

Seldom, however, can any oilman charge off the full 27½ percent the law allows. That is because of the 50 percent net income provision of the depletion law.

Depletion applies only to the income from a producing property or lease. It does not affect in any way the large, integrated companies' income from other sources, such as refining, pipelines, marketing.

These other activities' income is taxed at the regular corporate rate. The little man doesn't have these other revenue sources. His money comes from successful oil wells, or not at all.

So, while percentage depletion means something, of course, to the big, rich oil companies, to the little man it often means the difference between staying in business or being forced out.

TVA Self-Financing Legislation, H.R. 3460

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. MILLIKEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I am firmly opposed to the proposed so-called TVA self-financing legislation H.R. 3460.

It is not $1.2 billion of taxpayers' money we are concerned with but $1.6 billion, less upward of $250 million which TVA has paid back.[1] The bill in question concerns itself with provision for payment of principle and interest on but $1 billion of this amount and interest payment on an additional $200 million. No provision is made for repayment of the $200 million of appropriated money supplied by the taxpayer. Nor is any provision made for interest to be paid on the balance of the $400 million derived from the use of money provided by the Congress and due the taxpayers, far less the repayment of the principal involved, $400 million in power revenues which was reinvested by TVA for purposes of increasing the power potential of TVA facilities.

On those moneys with which the bill does concern itself the existing legislated obligation of TVA to pay up within a 40-year period is canceled out by providing legislative authorization for an extension of the payment period to 54 years. In substance, it is proposed to partially allay the past criticism that TVA pays no interest on the taxpayers' money by requiring interest payments on part of the money advanced to TVA and apparently in return it is proposed to authorize the extension of the time period for payment of a reduced amount of principal repayment by 14 years.

The argument that more money would be required to be paid by TVA in the next year or so than TVA is now paying does not stack up against the current firm obligation of TVA to pay up a bigger principal in full within the shorter 40-year time period.

I do not believe Congress is safeguarding the best interests of the people when it deliberately sets about to abrogate its powed to initiate annual appropriations for such a controversial and socialistic operation as that of the TVA. Although the bill provides the Congress may disapprove, I do not need to tell you that such disapproval is seldom exercised in other instances where back-door-type financing is permitted. Nor probably do I need tell you that this minor prerogative is a far cry from the direct control over TVA we have constitutionally exercised in the past through the accepted manner of carrying out the people's business by direct annual appropriations.

As you well know many of us believe it is high time that less rather than more loopholes be provided for bypassing the Appropriations Committees of the Congress in funding the carrying out of operations and programs of the executive agencies. This bill will not only abrogate the exercise of our full powers but will legislatively enact a continuing back-door operation in the management of a public enterprise well heeled with some $1.3 billion of the taxpayers' money.

The language in the Senate bill does not effectively close the door to the further expansion of TVA. The Vinson amendment attempted to close the door to further expansion by stipulating that unless specifically authorized by the Congress, the present power facilities and those subsequently acquired by TVA shall not be used for the sale or delivery of power for use outside the service area of TVA as it existed on July 1, 1957, with the one exception that, when economically feasible, it is permissible for TVA to provide service for interconnection with other utility systems for exchange power arrangements which were in effect on July 1, 1957. This amendment has already been abridged in the Senate-approved draft of H.R. 3460 by permitting exceptions in a number of instances. This immediately raises the question, Why just these? Why not others? Believe me, if not now, the pressure will really be on for others in the future if we give the TVA $750 million bond-issuing authority.

Furthermore, the language in the Senate version of H.R. 3460 limits only the "making of contracts" by TVA and does not purport to place limitation or restriction whatever upon the resale or use of TVA power by its distributors. Consequently, insofar as transmission, distribution, and use of TVA power by its distributors and not by TVA itself are concerned, no limitation whatsoever is placed upon the transmission, distribution, resale, or use of TVA power outside of its existing service area. I believe the only effective way to keep TVA from unlimited expansion is to continue to require all appropriations to be made by the Congress.

It is probably safe to say that no Congress is going to be willing to give TVA $750 million or more in additional appropriated funds. A willingness on the part of Congress at this time to give TVA authority to issue up to $750 million in bonds in the face of our lack of enthusiasm for providing additional appropriated funds over a number of years is indicative of the extent to which the Congress would be abandoning its direct control over the scope and direction of the TVA power-producing and distribution system.

While I am willing to concede that there may be some justification for the Government to generate electric power as a byproduct of its flood-control projects in the Tennessee Valley, I am firmly opposed to the further encouragement and uncontrolled expansion of TVA's power-producing activities through steampower production facilities. It is for the expansion of these steampower facilities that we are being requested to authorize the issuance of up to $750 million in bonds and in so doing to relinquish our direct means of control over the activities of the TVA through the exercise of the annual appropriation process.

[1] TVA had paid into the U.S. Treasury, from power revenues, a total of $250,131,519.36 as of June 30, 1958.

Today's Tight Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the "high interest" and "tight money" policies of the Federal

Reserve System, concurred in and with the approval of the administration, is a matter of widespread interest. The people generally are becoming more and more aware of the implications involved in connection with effects upon their own economic life.

I include in my remarks an interesting article by Sam Dawson appearing in the Boston Daily Globe, Boston, Mass., of July 21, 1959:

ARGUMENTS WAXING HOT ON TODAY'S TIGHT MONEY

(By Sam Dawson)

NEW YORK, July 21.—It's harder and costlier now to get the money to build a house or buy a car or run your business. The same goes for running the Government or building a school where you live. And it's also true if you want a loan from your banker to take care of pressing and maybe unexpected bills.

It means that maybe some homes won't be built and some car purchases will be put off and some businesses will wait before starting or expanding.

The U.S. Treasury has to pay the higher price for money because it has payrolls and other obligations to meet. But some school boards and local governments will put off improvements they'd like to make. And some common stock buffs fear that the higher yields on bonds now may lead you out of the common stock market into the bond market.

How serious will all this be to the economy? Will it throttle a healthy growth? Or will it in the long run stave off more inflation—which to most of us simply means will it keep prices from taking off again on a sprint of just a slow, creeping pace?

The argument on this is hot—all the way from Washington where it is taking on ever louder political tones to Main Street where those pinched by rising interest rates live and work.

Even the effects so far are in dispute. Some say they've felt the squeeze already and expect it to get more painful. Others insist that the overall economy has been the gainer and that the majority of citizens also will be gainers, if the purchasing power of their dollars can be bolstered.

In the financial marts the visible effects of tight money are plain. The U.S. Treasury has to pay 4¾ percent on 12½-month notes to keep holders of maturing issues from demanding cash. It's the highest rate since 1928. Only a little while back Uncle Sam could get that kind of money for 2 percent.

Corporations have had to offer 5 percent or more to sell new bond issues. Yields on the best quality of tax-exempt municipal or State bonds have 1 to 4 percent or more, when 1½ percent once did the job.

Businessmen seeking loans at the bank pay from ½ to 1 percent more than a few months back—many now pay 6 percent.

In the consumer section of the economy—installment and mortgage debt—carrying charges on time-payment loans have risen and interest ceilings on Government-backed mortgages have had to be jacked up because builders couldn't find lenders willing to put up funds at the old rates. Six percent is now common in the nonguaranteed market.

To the ordinary citizen this means that monthly payments on what he might like to buy on the cuff are higher now than a year ago. Rising mortgage rates mean that home buyers pay more in the long run for a new house.

Increasingly of late would-be borrowers have been told the bank just was loaned up and couldn't help them.

All of this adds up to a curb on spending.

The money managers say this is necessary, that too easy money at the start of a boom would lead to speculation and an inevitable bust.

Those who think there should be more consumer spending and more outlay by new and growing business firms protest that tight money will keep the economy from reaching the level it should and kill prosperity rather than protect it from the risks of boom and bust.

S. 2014 and H.R. 7391 Should Not Pass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in several recent sessions of the Congress, I have introduced a bill proposing to remedy a defect in the Capper-Volstead Act which was adopted on February 18, 1922. This year, my bill is numbered H.R. 200 and as always it proposes merely that "jurisdiction for determination of undue enhancement of prices by cooperative associations monopolizing or restraining trade" shall be transferred from the Secretary of Agriculture, who might understandably be prejudiced, to the Attorney General, who has jurisdiction in all other matters involving monopoly or restraint of trade.

I have never urged immediate action on this bill, for to the best of my knowledge only one cooperative has willfully taken advantage of the Capper-Volstead Act of 1922. That cooperative, the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers' Association, has on several occasions defiantly entered a defense that the law urges cooperatives to become monopolies and offers them full protection if they do so.

It may have been, I suppose, in the thought that the protection of this law, which had worked so well before, might work again, that the Maryland-Virginia Milk Co-op bought, 5 years ago, the Embassy Dairy, one of the bigger suppliers of milk to the city of Washington and the District of Columbia. There was loud public complaint at the time, as I recall, for flagrant monopoly is not well thought of when it threatens the welfare of babies by control of their principal food. In time, complaint was lodged by the Department of Justice and eventually, hearings having been held, Judge Holtzoff of the district court declared that the Embassy purchase was in violation of the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts and ordered the Maryland-Virginia Milk Co-op to divest itself thereof.

But, Mr. Speaker, as you probably know, the managers and leaders and attorneys of farmers' cooperative associations do not easily give up the advantages and special privileges that they have been given. Having grown to corporations that rival many big proprietary companies, they still have the colossal nerve to say that they are little, struggling partnerships. Admitting that the rank and file of their farmer members get less than $10 a year in patronage dividends, they still have the effrontery to ask Congress to tax those little farmers on paper that the courts have found without value now or in the foreseeable future. And on fat earnings they pay little or no Federal income tax, though parasitically they expect and demand service and protection and subsidies from the Government of the United States.

You may wonder why I have brought this matter up at this time. Let me tell you.

About 2 months ago similar bills proposing to put farmer co-ops into wholesale and retail business were introduced in the House and in the Senate. The Senate bill, S. 2014, was blindly titled "A bill to clarify and amend the Capper-Volstead Act (42 Stat. 388, 7 U.S.C. 291–292), and for other purposes." The House bill, H.R. 7391, was "to authorize farmers and other producers of agricultural products and/or their associations to own and operate agricultural sales outlets, and for other purposes." Strangely, both bills were referred to the Agriculture Committees—not, as would have seemed much more proper, to the Judiciary Committees.

S. 2014 was considered—God save the mark—by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. No hearings were held, though the matter was one of considerable national importance. And the bill was reported to the Senate, though some members of the full Senate committee had never even heard of the proposed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, to tell most of the rest of the story, let me present the news account which was printed on Monday, July 20, in the Washington Daily News, and, I hope, in all other Scripps-Howard papers from coast to coast. The headline, significantly, read, "Committee Acts Secretly: Retailers Here Fight Co-op Bill."

The article read as follows:

Manager Joseph Cotter of Hyattsville's Harvey Dairy said today his company and other local milk retailers are fighting a bill which might save Washington's big dairy farm cooperative several million dollars.

It sneaked through the Senate Agriculture Committee last week without hearings.

It would virtually wipe out District Court Judge Alexander Holtzoff's ruling of January 30, 1959, ordering the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers' Association to sell Embassy Dairy of 1620 First Street NW.

Judge Holtzoff held that the big co-op bought the Embassy Dairy in 1954 to eliminate competition from farmers who supplied Embassy under its previous ownership.

The co-op paid about $4 million for Embassy, and according to other retailers here, have not been able to make it earn a profit.

Forced sale (ordered by Judge Holtzoff within a year after January 30) might mean a big financial loss to co-op members, who financed the deal.

But the bill reported July 14 by the Senate Agriculture Committee would get the co-op off the hook.

The co-op appealed Judge Holtzoff's ruling to the Supreme Court, which agreed to review the case promptly. The Senate bill would be retroactive, wiping out Judge Holtzoff's ruling and making Supreme Court action useless.

It would give all farm co-ops almost complete freedom to buy and operate retail outlets for their products with exemption from antitrust laws.

Justice Department opposed the bill in a seven-page letter referring to the Embassy case.

Deputy Attorney General Lawrence E. Welsh wrote the committee that this legislation would "have the effect of legitimizing an acquisition held to have been in violation of sections of Federal antitrust laws. * * * If acquisitions such as this are legitimized, cooperatives can deny actual or potential marketing facilities to other cooperatives or farmers simply by buying the facilities."

Acting Agriculture Secretary True D. Morse also opposed the bill.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Report 528, which was submitted when S. 2014 was reported out of committee, confirms the statement in the Washington Daily News that this proposed legislation is primarily for the benefit of monopolistic action by the Maryland and Virginia Milk Cooperative, though it sets the stage for widespread co-op acquistions.

The decisions of the court—

Says the report

cast doubt upon past and prospective acquisitions of facilities by many and varied farmer cooperatives. * * * The bill would make it clear that they may acquire facilities to carry out such activities from whatever source and would remove any question concerning past acquistions."

The report further states—

It does not appear that enactment of the bill would result in any additional Federal expenditure.

But you may note that no mention is made of the loss from Treasury revenues of taxes heretofore paid not only by the Embassy Dairy, which used to be a big taxpayer, but all other wholesale and retail outlets that the cooperatives can acquire, by fair means or foul.

Mr. Speaker, S. 2014 will presumably come before the Senate for action very soon. It should be defeated: First, because it is iniquitous legislation; second, because it was sneakily offered and was reported in hopeful secrecy; third, because it proposes to set up a monopolistic system under which the Federal income tax rolls can be raided again and again and again; fourth, because it would be at least unseemly for the majority party in this 86th Congress, which is so violent in its objections to even the least approach to monopoly among taxpaying companies, to condone and foster monopoly among the cooperatives.

H.R. 7391 is still in the hands of the House Agriculture Committee. I hope that it will be quietly shelved and forgotten, as the Justice Department and the Department of Agriculture have recommended.

Milwaukee Sentinel Says Factfinding Board Is Needed in Steel Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is significant that, across the Nation, there is growing recognition of the need for some kind of impartial factfinding and fact-reporting agency to help bring about a settlement, in the public interest, of such disputes as the present steel strike.

The following editorial, from the Milwaukee Sentinel of Tuesday, July 21, 1959, expresses the view that a factfinding board is needed in the steel strike, so that the public can be given the true facts, evaluate them, and let public opinion influence the settlement of the dispute:

STRIKE THOUGHTS

In an atmosphere of deepening pessimism Federal Mediator Joseph F. Finnegan resumes this week his efforts to bring about a settlement of the steel strike.

Prospects are dismal. The strike is piling up huge losses for the industry and workers. It is already biting into railroads, coal mines, trucking, river barges, and Great Lakes carriers, and causing layoffs of thousands of men.

Public opinion in this country can exert tremendous influence in settling any dispute. In order to exert it fairly, it is important to know the facts. In a matter of this kind, obscured by technological, economic, and financial considerations, it is important not only to know them but to have an impartial evaluation of them. What we have now are two sets of arguments, one supporting the position of the industry, the other that of the union.

For these reasons we disagree with the attitude of President Eisenhower that a factfinding board is not necessary. We think it is.

We also disagree with the suggestion of Steel Union President McDonald that Chief Justice Warren name an impartial chairman of a three-man board, the others to be chosen separately by union and industry.

Justice Warren is a controversial figure, which would limit public confidence in any choice he made, supposing he agreed to make one. In addition he sits on the Court to which litigation in the strike might be appealed and, therefore, he should not be even remotely connected with it.

A reasonable solution would be for the union and industry to name their members of the board and then for these two, each with a veto power over the other, to get together and select an impartial chairman. If one or the other used the veto to stall, it would soon become a matter of public knowledge and rebuke.

It is our opinion the chairman should be outside Government, experienced in labor-management affairs and with a record of fairness in which the public could put their trust. It would be an ordeal—there is no doubt about that—but one undertaken in the service of us all.

Mr. Speaker, while I perhaps might use a different method of choosing a factfinding board, I heartily agree with the Sentinel's basic premise that an impartial agency should be created to get the facts on prices, wages, profits and other factors involved in the steel dispute, and to give the facts to the public so that the weight of an informed public opinion can be brought to bear in this difficult situation whose outcome will affect every citizen of our country.

Furthermore, although the steel strike is today's main matter of economic concern, tomorrow's may be quite different. Clearly there is a need for a continuing, meaningful anti-inflationary policy of which a major ingredient must be an impartial, continuing factfinding body which can give the public the full facts, and let the weight of public opinion be brought to bear, in cases of price increases, and associated wage increases, which may tend to be inflationary or to otherwise disrupt our national economy.

This is a major feature of my bill, H.R. 6263, which has been reported favorably by the Committee on Government Operations and is pending in the Committee on Rules. A companion measure by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK is before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. The need for this legislation becomes more evident as each day passes.

Are These Men Doomed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Times News, published at Twin Falls, Idaho, and dated July 15, 1959.

The editorial follows:

ARE THESE MEN DOOMED?

COPE has fired its opening gun in the 1960 campaign. The AFL–CIO's Committee on Political Education has issued its first blacklist of seven Senators it says must not be reelected.

Their sin was voting against plugging what COPE calls some tax loopholes and against some increases in welfare payments from the U.S. Treasury. The loopholes proposals would have put an arbitrary ceiling on expense accounts regardless of the actual expenses, and disposed of some of the highly technical depreciation allowances.

COPE continues to insist that no one should be allowed to sit in Congress unless he is willing to help spend the Government into bankruptcy and help tax business enterprises into bankruptcy. Meanwhile, the unions it represents follow in their own business dealings the principle that you trim your budget to fit your income. They jealously guard unlimited expense accounts for many of their officers.

And COPE is getting ready to wage its biggest political fight so far when the country is making up its mind about the 1960 candidates, reserving its support for the taxers and spenders. COPE has learned nothing from the great public outcry against Government spending that has forced Congress to cut back many pet giveaway projects. It has ignored the several polls which have shown that union members are much concerned about inflation.

All things being equal, we doubt whether the condemned seven have much to worry about as the result of being slated for purging by COPE. The list, bipartisan, contains the names of several senior Senators of considerable distinction.

COPE's blacklist:

WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, CARL CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, THOMAS MARTIN, Republican, of Iowa, KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, and ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, Republican, of Kansas.

We think the voters of their States will prove that other factors weigh more heavily than COPE's condemnation of careful spenders.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite the attention of Members of this body to my remarks of Tuesday, July 8, 1958, appearing on pages 13178 and 13179 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning the activities of this same COPE in my State and the fact that a union member was told by COPE to withdraw from a congressional race because he had not conformed with COPE's constitution.

In view of this latest political activity by COPE, I believe it is of increasing importance that the Members of the Congress acquaint themselves with COPE, its constitution, and its purposes.

Mr. President in Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article by Frank L. Remington which appeared in the Columbia Knights of Columbus magazine for July 1959.

MR. PRESIDENT IN RETIREMENT

(By Frank L. Remington)

Upon the occasion of the dedication of the Truman Library not long ago in Independence, Mo., the only two living ex-Presidents of the United States were exchanging views. "What," inquired Harry Truman, "is the role of a former President?"

Mr. Herbert Hoover pondered the question thoughtfully for a few moments. Then he replied in half-serious levity: "The only thing for an old President to do is take pills and dedicate libraries."

It is true that Messrs. Truman and Hoover have each dedicated a library in his name, and also both doubtless gulp pills on occasion. It is equally true, however, that these two former White House residents maintain enthusiastic interests during their retirement.

In January 1961, President Dwight Eisenhower will join the ranks of the exclusive ex-Chief Executive of the United States fraternity. He is probably already wistfully contemplating settling down permanently on his Gettysburg farm.

Over the years many ideas have been advanced about what former Presidents should do. Recommendations have ranged all the way from making them nonvoting members of the Senate to relegating them to "dignified decrepitude." Actually, an ex-President's knowledge and know-how are valuable and his abilities should be put to use for the good of the Nation.

Up to President Eisenhower's administration, 25 of the 32 men who occupied the White House have lived an average of 11 years after laying down the reins of Government. This is somewhat longer than the average man has carried on in retirement.

Some of the ex-Presidents have experienced difficulty in stepping from the country's highest position to relative obscurity. Others have made the shift with surprising adaptability. An ex-President faces all the duties of a private citizen without realizing many of his privileges. He is constantly hounded by the public. So many pilgrims beat a path to former President Andrew Jackson's door to obtain autographs and locks of his hair as cherished mementos that "Old Hickory" saved barber's clippings for this purpose.

Souvenir hunters continually dog Messrs. Truman and Hoover. Mr Hoover reports that the avidness of memento seekers reaches ridiculous proportions. "They ask for doorknobs, old socks, spoons, old pipes, even my old spectacles."

At a conservative estimate Mr. Hoover figures he's signed some half-million autographs. Now he gives them only to children. One of his favorite stories, which he likes to tell on himself, concerns a youthful autograph hunter. The youth accosted the ex-President as he stepped from his New York residence in the Waldorf-Astoria hotel and asked for two copies of his autograph.

Mr. Hoover was glad to oblige, but asked, "Why do you want two"?

"Well, sir," the youngster replied rather sheepishly, "a friend of mine said if I get two of yours he'll trade me one of Ted Williams'."

Awhile back ex-President Truman facetiously avowed his intention of running for President again when he is 90. Actually, a number of former Presidents did return to politics. John Quincy Adams served in Congress for 17 years after his presidential tenure.

After the White House, Andrew Johnson—the only impeached President—vindicated himself by his election to the U.S. Senate. In his bid for reelection, Grover Cleveland was so disappointed in his defeat by Benjamin Harrison that he ran again 4 years later and was elected. He remains the only President to serve two nonconsecutive terms.

After the years of preoccupation with politics that usually precede a President's election, he finds it almost impossible to return to his profession or business. Most of the ex-Presidents had their fill of politics and followed other pursuits. Some became best-selling authors. Both Hoover and Truman are widely published writers.

Calvin Coolidge wrote little pieces for the newspapers, though he seldom could be prevailed upon to speak. When asked about his well-known reticence for public utterances, "Silent Cal" replied: "If you don't say anything, you can't be called upon to repeat it."

Some of the ex-Presidents turned to education. Ex-President Millard Fillmore became the first chancellor of the University of Buffalo. Rutherford Hayes was elected a trustee at Ohio State University. Harry Truman regularly lectures at various colleges. William Howard Taft in his 17 years after the White House taught at Yale for a period. Later he assumed the duties of Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

A former White House resident who attempts to take an active role in private business is usually charged, however falsely, with exploiting the high office he once held. Ulysses S. Grant, is the only ex-President who seriously tried to make a go of it in private business. His efforts met with dismal failure. Grant was left penniless.

To satisfy creditors, the Civil War hero and two-term President pawned the mementoes of a lifetime: his swords, souvenirs, and gifts. His greatest battle was his final one. Struggling against the ravages of cancer, he wrote two volumes of memoirs to provide his family with funds. He drew his last breath 4 days after reading the last page proof. The memoirs brought close to half a million dollars to his heirs, but Grant died in virtual destitution.

Other ex-Presidents, too, were financially hard pressed in retirement. After leaving the White House, scholarly James Madison lived for 20 years in genteel poverty. Ex-President James Monroe sadly abandoned his debt-ridden plantation in Virginia and lived on the bounty of his son-in-law in New York.

Andrew Jackson left the White House with barely $90 in his pocket. Swallowing his pride, he accepted loans pressed on him by close friends. Haggard and crippled, Woodrow Wilson retired to a debt-free home only because admiring friends paid the mortgage.

Completely dedicated to public service, Thomas Jefferson neglected his private affairs. The generosity of a wealthy widow enabled him to meet the demands of Washington shopkeepers, who might have thrown him into debtor's prison when he left the White House. In retirement, he sold land and mortgaged Monticello, his estate, to the hilt. To obtain additional funds, he sold his priceless collection of books, which became the foundation for the Library of Congress.

Fortunately, neither of the two living ex-Presidents is a candidate for the poorhouse. Mr. Hoover has a tremendous net worth built up in the years when he was the world's No. 1 engineer. Mr. Truman's memoirs and other writings assure him a competence.

Never again will an ex-President of the United States know the grinding, shameful poverty of Ulysses S. Grant or Thomas Jefferson. Federal legislation that went into the statute books in 1958 guarantees an annual pension of $25,000 to all former Presidents.

Some of the ex-Presidents were plagued with bitterness and sickness, while others enjoyed surprisingly good health. For a spell, post-presidential problems so overwhelmed Franklin Pierce that he became an alcoholic. His overindulgences made the former President a frequent spectacle as he wandered about the streets.

Despite his financial difficulties Thomas Jefferson remained in excellent health until death overtook him in his 85th year. He attributed his remarkable physical condition to his daily ritual of soaking his feet in a tub of ice water.

Benjamin Harrison enjoyed a robust physique throughout his life. In retirement, the dignified ex-President frequently pedaled his bicycle along Indiana roads. At the age of 70 he gave the following key to his health: "I have taken but one dose of medicine in 30 years and that was forced on me unnecessarily. * * * I never smoked or chewed tobacco. I never knew intoxication. Throughout all my public life I maintained the same regularity and systematic habits of living to which I have previously been accustomed. I never allowed my usual hours of sleep to be interrupted."

Ex-Presidents Millard Fillmore and Benjamin Harrison, both widowers, found romance and married after the White House. Nearing 63, Benjamin Harrison wooed and wed the 38-year-old niece of his first wife. They had one child, a daughter, born the year after their marriage.

Some of the ex-Presidents have indulged in feuds with their successors, like the familiar animosity now existing between President Eisenhower and Harry Truman. Perhaps John Adams, the second President, set the pattern for this petty pastime when he wrathfully called George Washington, his predecessor, an "old muttonhead."

Ex-President Theodore Roosevelt barraged his successor, William Howard Taft, with letters of advice on every conceivable subject—even to tell him not to allow himself to be publicized as playing golf. Taft usually ignored Teddy's gratuitous counsel.

At an age when many men would choose slippers and the rocking chair, the two living ex-Presidents continue to live busy and fruitful lives. They are retired, but only from the field of active politics. Mr. Truman's office is in the Truman Library in Independence, Mo. At 75, he retains a consuming interest in politics and is much in demand as a speaker. He also writes articles for a newspaper syndicate and carries on a voluminous correspondence.

Halfway through his eighties, Mr. Hoover has slowed down a bit, but carries on a program that would stagger the average man of half his age. Writing, making an occasional speech, and directing work for a host of philanthropic organizations, he still puts in a good 12- to 15-hour workday.

As he plans for his years after the White House, President Eisenhower—or anyone else who faces retirement—can well emulate the leads of Messrs. Truman and Hoover. Mr. Hoover is a prime example of his own philosophy of retirement: "There's no joy to be had from retirement except some kind of productive work. Otherwise you will degenerate into talking to everybody about your pains and pills and income tax * * *."

Mr. Truman continues to live by the formula that has guided him most of his life: "Work hard, walk fast, sleep light, and relax."

Integration in the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Morton Puner, editor of Bulletin, a publication of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. Mr. Puner's article appeared in the New Leader, January 12, 1959, issue.

INTEGRATION IN THE ARMY

(By Morton Puner)

One of the great dramas in the American race relations dilemma has been staged thousands of miles from the United States. Since 1948, the Department of Defense has been integrating installations throughout the world. In the past five years, virtually every single problem, fear and specter concerning integration has been coped with by the Army, Air Force, and Navy:

How can segregated units best be broken into combat-ready integrated ones? Is an integrated force more effective?

Does integration mean forced social mixing of the races; does it lead to such things as interracial dancing, interracial sexual relations, interracial marriage and "mongrelization of the races?"

How does integration affect basic attitudes? To what extent does a law (or in this case, a Presidential order) help whites and Negroes to work together, play together—and like it?

Does officially-imposed integration mean an end to the right of privacy, an end to a man's choice—and his children's choice—of friends?

To find answers to these and related questions, I recently made a two-month, 9,000-mile trip to some 25 U.S. Army bases and their surrounding communities in Europe. Europe, I felt, offered a better laboratory for this kind of study than the United States or other areas of the world where we have troops. For in Europe, while the society about them is white, Americans are relieved of regional stresses and restrictions: they are freer to act as conscience, not just custom, dictates.

All the Americans I met are, in one way or another, affected by Presidential Executive Order 9981 which, 10 years ago, set the policy of equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the armed services without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin." In the early 1950's, integration was completed in Defense Department installations throughout the world. Today Negroes, who make up about 10 percent of our uniformed population, eat, sleep, and train with white troops, and attend the same service schools and clubs. About 2.7 million Americans are in uniform; 1.3 million civilians work for the Defense Department. In addition, wives, children, and other dependents have been subject to integration in their education and social lives.

The Army bases I visited in Germany, Italy, and France comprise nearly a tenth of all Defense Department personnel. In Germany, where the bulk of American troops and their families are stationed, the bases I visited were Heidelberg, headquarters of the U.S. Army in Europe (USAREUR), and Stuttgart, Seventh Army headquarters. In Italy it was Verona, headquarters for the Southern European Task Force (SETAF); in France, Orleans, headquarters for the Army's Communications Zone (COM-Z).

I had free access to all unclassified Army facilities, to training fields, and barracks, service clubs, and post exchanges. A large percentage of Army families manage to keep intact overseas; nurseries, schools, hospitals, restaurants, and garden-apartment developments are important Army facilities abroad too. I also had access to all these—and to the emotions and responses of Americans to integration.

Social problems: How does the Army handle interracial dancing, which seems about as disturbing to partisans of segregation as most other social aspects of an integrated society? Officers' clubs are open to all commissioned men regardless of race. At an officers' club dance, is a white officer's wife—no matter what her own feelings—under compulsion to dance with every Negro officer who asks her to? Is a Negro officer compelled to dance with, say, his white colonel's lady?

Colonel Quirey was formerly commanding officer of the now deactivated 88th Airborne Anti-Aircraft Battalion in Southern Germany. Because it included an old segregated unit, almost a third of its officers were Negroes. At the battalion's first dance in Germany, the colonel assumed that all his officers would ask his wife to dance—an Army custom at the first dance at a new base. But not a single Negro officer came up to Mrs. Quirey.

"My wife and I knew what had happened," the colonel said. "She's from Georgia, I'm from Kentucky. The Negro officers had not asked her to dance because they were afraid of embarrassing us." But before the second dance, one Negro officer asked the colonel, in private, whether it would be all right if he asked Mrs. Quirey to dance. "I said certainly, and he did. They danced together and the Negro officers had their cue."

A few white officers who discussed the dance with Colonel Quirey felt that he had imposed a burden on them. Wouldn't their wives now be obliged to dance with Negroes too? Colonel Quirey said there is no such compulsion; each man and his wife are free to do exactly as their taste dictates. This principle seems to apply generally among officers and their wives. Of course, this leaves room for prejudice to operate, but prejudice plays less and less of a role as whites and Negroes serve together longer.

Nevertheless there is no pell-mell, mass social mixing of the races. The pattern of off-duty integration in the Army is directly related to the cultural and social level of each soldier, and to what he is looking for in the way of after-hours fun.

In Paris, GIs rarely integrate when they go to the honky-tonks of Montmartre. At the level of the German gasthaus—where, in venerable tradition, GIs do full-scale research on the quality of German beer—there is little or no integration. Moselstrasse, near the Frankfurt main railroad station, is a street filled with bars with such American names as City, Dolly and New York. At one end, it has three bars whose clientele consists solely of Negro GIs. The rest of the many bars along the street are filled with white soldiers only.

On higher social and cultural levels there is much more off-duty integration. Together white and Negro GIs listen to the summer opera in Verona, together they play soccer against the still-superior European teams, together they walk in Frankfurt's exquisite Palmengarten on a Sunday afternoon.

Such contacts between white and Negro in the Army abroad are far more frequent than in civilian life at home. They develop naturally from extensive association at work and in barracks life. "More and more, these days, you find that a white family will come to a Negro family, a Negro to a white, for help in times of emergency," Colonel Quirey told me.

The last-ditch argument of the segregationist is that integration leads to interracial sex and marriage. "How would you like your sister to marry a Negro?" has become almost a classic rhetorical question. Does integration in the Army—on and off duty—lead to intermarriage between whites and Negroes? The question was much discussed when integration first went into effect, but today it is hardly an issue. To find out why, I sought to determine Army practice and experience with interracial marriages.

I asked Col. Wayne L. Hunter, chief chaplain of the 7th Army, how he and his staff counsel Negro soldiers and white girls who intend to marry. Basically, he said, they treat interracial marriages the same as interfaith marriages, in which the chaplains counsel on matters of baptism, circumcision, and other rites. The Army informally tries to provide Negro chaplains to counsel Negro soldiers when possible. Chaplains, white or Negro, neither encourage nor discourage such marriages. But the white girl will be told about various hazards to successful interracial marriages, for example, laws against miscegenation in Southern States. (The Department of Defense abides by State laws on miscegenation; a Negro soldier returning with a white bride will be assigned to a base in a State where his marriage is permitted.) Then the couple has to wait 6 months before marrying.

During and immediately after World War II, many white European girls became brides of GIs, some of them Negroes. But with European economic recovery, such marriages have become less frequent. In Washington, a Pentagon official, a Negro, told me that interracial marriages in the Army abroad are now rare. "And often there is something sociologically extreme about them—they seem to be end-of-the-road marriages for both parties and they usually don't work out," he said. "In many cases, the girl cuts loose as soon as she gets her bearings in the States. It often becomes clear to the soldier that she married him just to get away from a miserable life."

Formal integration, the records show, has little bearing on the type or number of interracial marriages. For one thing, equal opportunity in education and jobs, as offered in the integrated Army, has given the Negro soldier a new pride in himself and in his race. The question, "How would you like your sister to marry a Negro?," becomes two-edged. In a barracks discussion on the subject, I overheard one Negro sergeant say to another—with only a bit of irony—"How would you like your sister to marry a white man?"

In turn, the white soldier, under integration, has come to accept individual Negroes as his friends. This does not mean that he has any newly awakened desires to marry a Negro or any preference that his sister marry one. It does mean that he has a new understanding of Negroes and is able to put unwarranted fears in their proper place. He is apt to answer the rhetorical "How would you like your sister to marry a Negro?" with

the just as rhetorical "She can say no, can't she?"

Negro observations: I found that Negro soldiers are the best barometer of social changes brought about through integration. They are most affected by it so they are also most sensitive to the attitudes of the majority around them. The observations of two Negroes, Lt. Col. Lester McCants in Germany, and Louis Outlaw in Italy, are representative of what I was told by almost every one of the Negroes to whom I spoke.

Colonel McCants, who has been in the Army since 1941, has gone through the whole desegregation process. Today he commands the 7th Army Air Field base near Stuttgart. More than 470 officers and men, white and Negro, serve under him. Colonel McCants piloted the six-seater L-23 which took me from Germany over the Alps to Italy. His crew consisted of a warrant officer and an enlisted man, both white. The three men had flown together many times and there was no awareness of race. Colonel McCants was clearly the responsible person aboard the plane, the most experienced, and the boss.

Colonel McCants lives in Stuttgart with his family; integration has given them all a new kind of life. He enjoys his tour in Germany and believes that the German attitude toward Negroes is "pretty good, contrary to the effect that Hitler intended."

He had to think hard to recall recent incidents concerning race in Army life. He finally thought of one. Army families often join in songfests. As white and Negroes sing along together, they frequently come to songs like "Old Folks at Home" with its words: "Oh, darkies, how my heart grows weary, far from the old folks at home." He knows that some of his white friends are embarrassed when they realize they are using the offensive term "darkies." An officer's wife once apologized for it. Colonel McCants told her that he knows the song is basic Americana. "No need at all to be embarrassed," he said.

Louise Outlaw is the tall, stately wife of Warrant Officer LeRoy Outlaw, Quartermaster at SETAF in Verona and the only Negro officer stationed there. Inevitably, she says, the subject of race relations in the United States crops up in her talks with Europeans: "Some people say to me, when they learn that I'm an American Negro, 'Oh, I'm sorry for you.' I tell them not to feel sorry for me. I'm glad I'm an American, proud of my race and of the progress we've made in the United States. I try to tell them that the problems of desegregation they read about—if they think them through—are really symptoms of that progress."

Mrs. Outlaw feels that being a Negro gives her an opportunity both to help Europeans understand Americans and help other Americans understand Negroes. One of her best friends in Verona is a white woman from Texas who told her, "Honey, I could hang my head in shame when I think of the things I thought and said about Negroes in the past." She believes that such candor is an American virtue, a basic help in getting Europeans to know and like us. "I visited the World's Fair at Brussels and saw the American exhibit," she said. "I think that one of our smaller displays there was most effective, the one called 'America's Unfinished Business,' which faces up fully to our problems in democracy. This kind of honesty affects Europeans deeply."

The Outlaws have been married 15 of Warrant Officer Outlaw's 17 years in service. They lived in Tennessee and Washington, D.C., before coming to Europe. The integrated Army years have been the best years of their lives. "Now there are no longer the initial barriers and hostilities in making friends," Mrs. Outlaw said. "People have known Negroes before; they're most apt to judge each Negro, to be friendly or not on the basis of his character and personality—not his skin color."

Integration doesn't mean forced and indiscriminate mixing, she pointed out. "I keep an eye on my children's choice of friends; I want them to be with people of certain standards of honesty and goodness. But we just don't judge by the prejudiced values of religion or color." She understands the thousand ways and hurts of prejudice. "Sometimes, I hear a friend refer to the Italians as 'guineas.' I tell her not to, that such terms hurt me as well as the Italians."

Mrs. Outlaw herself offers a case study of the influence of integration on social attitudes. She is the mother of three children, and a member of the SETAF Parent-Teachers Association for the American grade and high schools, consisting of 240 pupils. This spring, the PTA members—almost exclusively white—elected Mrs. Outlaw as their president.

The consequences of integration can be both touching and ironic. A young Negro soldier, on his way from Vicenza to Milan to meet his wife who had just arrived from the States, told me of his concern: In Italy, American soldiers with their families live "on the economy" in apartments or homes alongside Italians, and they share in community living. As a single soldier, the Negro had previously lived only in barracks, sheltered by the benign atmosphere of the integrated Army. Now he would be housekeeping with his wife and living with Italians. He asked me, very earnestly, "How do you think they'll take to a Negro couple?"

Negroes appear to be aware of the educational lag from which they suffer and seem eager to lessen it. They are the most persistent and hard-working students at the various Army schools, technical and general. Above 14 percent of the Army's Negroes are now taking courses with the U.S. Armed Forces Institute; the figure has more than doubled since integration went into effect. The percentage of whites taking such courses is about 9 percent.

Negroes have also achieved a degree of rank and service barely envisaged during World War II. When the war ended, the percentage of Negro officers was 0.99 percent. Shortly after the war as more Negro than white officers chose to stay in service, it rose to 1 percent. Today, under integration, the figure is 3 percent. In the Seventh Army in Germany—our largest peacetime force ever assembled on foreign soil—Negroes represent 4.8 percent of all officers, 10.24 percent of all enlisted men.

There have been cases in the past of a white officer smarting under orders from a Negro and trying to avoid carrying them out. Today, almost universally, there seems to be quiet and complete accepance of the idea that if a Negro officer reaches a command rank, he has earned it thoroughly and is entitled to all its privilges and authority.

Negroes make up about 10 percent of all Armed Forces personnel, but they represent about 15 percent of all noncommissioned officers. To achieve and keep these positions they must attend service schools, diligently and in large numbers. This they do, particularly in the guided missile and other technical fields.

These and related figures on whites and Negroes, incidentally, are hard to come by. Bookkeeping by race is becoming rare in Defense Department installations, and military orders are less apt to make use of racial designations. There has been much Pentagon discussion of the use of records by race in the integrated services. Generally, the attitude is that no basic rights are lost simply by reference to race in service documents; the damage or gain is in the way such references are used. Racial designations are no longer used in reporting statistics of civil or military crimes. But sometimes personnel officials need to know the racial composition of troops in order to institute a form of benign quota; otherwise a unit might be assigned a preponderance of Negroes—or an insufficient number of them—and so take on the character of a segregated unit.

Military performance: How does integration affect military performance? During the Korean war, the Army sponsored studies in depth of the battle performance of mixed units. Nine out of ten white officers in Korea rated integrated units equal to or better than all-white units in morale, courage, and teamwork in combat. Korea was the first great testing-ground for Negroes fighting in the integrated Army and they passed their test superbly. Now, 5 years after the armistice, I found that the veterans of the Korean war decidedly favor integration as a practical necessity. Sometimes, officers are almost evangelical about the military gain of integration.

Maj. Gen. Harvey Fischer, a West Pointer who comes from California, commanded SETAF in Italy. He expressed surprise at the question, "How do you rate integrated units in combat?" "I had the privilege of serving in Korea," he said. "I've seen integrated troops in action. What's the difference if a man is black or white? Heart is heart, blood is blood, muscle is muscle. Of course integrated units are at least as good as all-white ones in combat."

Lt. Col. Wiltz Bethancourt, who comes from Arizona and is now with the Seventh Army in Stuttgart, declared: "Unquestionably, integrated units are better in combat than segregated ones. Because of their environment, many Negroes had to grow up physically tougher, better able to stand combat conditions. Now, under integration, we can pick our noncoms from the best of all races and make up better cadres."

The military being the military, integration in the Armed Forces is a fact and not a matter for controversy. But of 75 officers who had served in Korea, not one doubted the quality of integrated units in combat.

Our allies' reactions: I visited Europe almost a year after the Little Rock school desegregation crisis. The photograph of a Negro being beaten to the ground near Central High School by a mob of howling whites had been featured prominently in most European newspapers in September 1957. A year later, that image still remained in many minds, giving an ugly, distorted picture of American life.

Integration in the Army clearly helps to correct this image in many ways. Many Germans respect the American Army as an efficient, well-disciplined fighting force. But they learn something else about America when they see two American officers—one white, one Negro—descending together to the basement of their Army apartment building, huge bundles in hand. Their Saturday afternoon mission: The week's wash for their families in the basement laundry machines.

In Paris, a woman writer, an anti-Communist intellectual, told me she would never visit the United States because she would be uncomfortable amid "the evidences of the bondage of second-class citizenship in which you keep your Negroes." One day she traveled with me to Orleans to the Army's COM-Z headquarters. She toured the post exchange and snack bars, service and officers' clubs. She saw the easy friendliness among Negro and white soldiers, the casual acceptance of equality on both sides. She was astounded. An intelligent woman, she acknowledged that she had judged without real evidence.

In Italy, SETAF published an Italian personnel manual for its 4,000 Italian employees. It provides identical privileges for Italian and American civilian workers, including maternity leave, a 6-hour day, 13th-month bonuses—and an antidiscrimination clause.

Printed in Italian and English, the manual makes U.S. Army—and Government—policy clear: "In accordance with the policy of the U.S. Government of nondiscrimination for its citizen employees, this same policy to the extent legally possible is extended to Italian employees of SETAF."

The manual sets up machinery for investigating complaints and satisfying all persons who believe that they have been subject to discrimination because of "race, color, religion, or national origin," with final decision to be made by the commanding general. Because of these provisions—and the fact that they are enforced—the people concerned know that the Army means what it says about integration and equal opportunity. The 4,000 Italian employees at SETAF seem to be about the best good will ambassadors for America that I have ever met.

Integration and prejudice: To what extent does integration do away with prejudice, not just during military service, but after it? The answer, I found, depends upon the breadth and type of individual experience. In the end, it is personal knowledge of the acts and characters of people, white or Negro, that lowers the barriers of prejudice.

Maj. John T. Martin, a Negro from New York, cites his experience with a white officer who served with him on court martial boards in Heidelberg. The officer was reared in Greenwood, Miss., attended the University of Mississippi and became a lawyer. After several years in the Army, the officer had a dilemma. The Army had given him new insights and attitudes. He did not know how he could ever again return to Greenwood—fountainhead of the White Citizens Council movement—"where 95 percent of my friends are council members." "As a matter of conscience, I can no longer tolerate and live with their prejudice," he said. His wife agreed and suggested that they don't go back to Greenwood. But a man's roots, spiritual and economic, are strong. The dilemma still faces the white couple.

Major Martin says that from this and many other experiences he has learned a basic lesson. Don't prejudge a white man by his accent or by the name of his hometown or State.

Other problems that result from integration are evident in some parent-child relationships. At Army schools abroad for dependent children, integration is complete. Outside of school, parents can use whatever standards they favor in helping their children select their friends. The result is often confusing for the child whose parents will not let him associate with Negroes after school. He may become baffled and resentful—of his parents, of his school, or perversely, of Negroes in general. The problem is a real one for some few parents and children, an unhappy concomitant of the process of integration.

Integration also engenders vital personal struggles, not only for the prejudiced but also for those who think they are unprejudiced but have heretofore been able to rationalize their own preference for segregation. These are the people who believe in equality of opportunity in the abstract—but who don't really care to live in an integrated society.

The Army experience shows some of the ways that integration will eventually affect the lives of those coming into contact with it for the first time. At present, the armed services are more advanced in their race relations than the rest of the United States. Perhaps it is uniquely fitting that this should be so, that in one of the greatest peacetime battles of our history, the Armed Forces should be leading the way to victory.

Trinity Project: Representative Utt Spells Out Taxpayer's Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on July 7 the Chico, Calif., Enterprise-Record carried an editorial comment based on views of our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT], regarding the Trinity project which is pertinent to consideration of this vital issue and particularly relevant to U.S. taxpayers' pocketbooks.

The editorial follows:

WORTHWHILE READING ON TRINITY PROJECT

A week or so ago, Gov. Edmund G. Brown sent a statement to Washington urging the Senate Appropriations Committee to approve funds to get the Government started on Federal construction of the power facilities on the Trinity River project.

In his statement, Governor Brown assailed President Eisenhower's partnership plan, recommended by Secretary of Interior Fred Seaton, under which the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. would build the power facilities (at its own expense) and buy falling water from the Government to generate power. (Seaton's Department of Interior figures say partnership would save the Government more than $300 million.)

In his statement against partnership, Governor Brown stressed that California is now underway on its vast water resources development program. But he reminded that the State can't do the job by itself.

"This State must continue to seek assistance from the Federal Government such as it has appreciatively received in the past," Brown said. He went on to voice his opinion that, "The State will not receive this assistance to the maximum extent required if the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. constructs the power elements of Trinity."

Along with his statement to the Senate committee, Governor Brown also sent telegrams to Members of Congress urging them to work against the partnership plan.

Representative JAMES B. UTT, Republican, of Santa Ana, was one of the Congressmen receiving telegrams. As coauthor of a measure currently before Congress to approve the partnership plan, Representative UTT is in possession of volumes of testimony which in past sessions have established the partnership idea as proper.

A man who keeps the interest of the taxpayer always foremost in his mind, Representative UTT sent a return telegram to Governor Brown explaining some of the financial angles—and possible consequences—of the Trinity power controversy. UTT's telegram to Governor Brown is worthwhile reading for all citizen-taxpayers:

"DEAR GOVERNOR: Regarding your telegram, I am glad the legislature has approved the California water resources development program. You say California must rely upon and hope for continued and increased Federal participation. That the problem is rapidly becoming critical. This I realize.

"The San Luis project is important to the development of the State program and you are asking the Federal Government for millions of dollars. To implement this overall program will cost near $2 billion and requires not only cooperation of the Federal and State governments but also financial assistance from private enterprise when it is ready, willing, and able to assist.

"Private development of the power facilities at Trinity (partnership) would save the Federal Government $300 million over the life of the contract—and yet you insist that the taxpayers install this facility and give the power away at one-half the cost of production to a few preferred customers.

"The effect of this would be to completely deplete the surplus in the Central Valley project. This surplus was supposed to be used for additional water conservation and to divert it is a violation of the public trust.

"The partnership development of the Trinity power resources would be a cash register which would pay the entire cost of the San Luis Reservoir, which is part of the overall Central Valley project.

"Unless the Trinity power facility is taken off the backs of the taxpayers and made to work in behalf of the taxpayers (through partnership) I intend to oppose the San Luis Reservoir project before the Rules Committee and on the floor of the House as being an unnecessary expense to the American taxpayers when the cost could well be paid from revenues and savings generated from private development of the power facilities of Trinity.

"JAMES B. UTT,
"Member of Congress."

In our mind, Representative UTT's telegram tersely sums up the issue. Federal construction (public power) at Trinity would be a money-losing venture for the taxpayer because the power would be sold to a few preference customers for less than the cost of production. This would frustrate existing Federal law which says that power from projects should help pay the costs of the projects—it is clear that selling power for less than it costs would produce no revenue.

Partnership, on the other hand, would save the Government the cost of constructing the power facilities—and then would provide a steady income over the years through the purchase of falling water. This income would, of course, help pay the costs of the Trinity project and others, such as the San Luis Reservoir.

Governor Brown and others who are pleading the cause of public power at Trinity should examine the issues more closely. Representative UTT's telegram should be must reading for all of them.

Business Week Editors Evaluate Ways and Means Committee Interest Ceiling Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve's predictions of disaster in the wake of the adoption of the Metcalf amendment to the Ways and Means Committee bill to raise the present 4¼-percent interest ceiling on long-term bonds have been quietly and firmly contradicted by a responsible spokesman for the business community. Business Week, in its July 18, 1959, issue, states that the administration's and the Federal Reserve's stand on the amendment is puzzling in view of the constructive

nature of the amendment's instruction to the Federal Reserve.

The editorial follows:

MORE FLEXIBILITY IN DEBT MANAGEMENT

More heat than light has been apparent since the House Ways and Means Committee approved a bill that would lift the present arbitrary 4¼-percent ceiling on the interest rate the Government can pay on new issues of its bonds. Although the committee bill would give the Treasury substantially what it asked, there is now grave doubt that it will be passed, because the administration and the Federal Reserve are taking strong objection to it.

The administration's attitude is somewhat puzzling. For the committee gave the administration what it most wanted—namely, greater freedom to conduct its debt management operations.

To be sure, the victory was limited, but many experts had been sure that the administration was headed for total defeat. The Democratic majority in Congress is not in sympathy with any more toward higher interest rates; yet it acceded to the administration's request for a lifting of the ceiling, adding the proviso that the President take responsibility for doing so and limiting this freedom to a period of 2 years.

These limitations do not seem too big a price to pay. Under present conditions, the Treasury has been severely handicapped. With the Federal Reserve pursuing an increasingly restrictive monetary policy, and with private borrowers stepping up their demands for credit, the Treasury has been completely frustrated, forced to confine itself to selling short-term obligations. This has not only proved costly but is also potentially inflationary.

The committee, headed by Representative WILBUR MILLS, recognized that failure to act would place the onus for the Treasury's plight on Congress. It decided to give the Treasury greater freedom but placed the responsibility squarely on the White House. Given the political realities, this is an understandable compromise.

But the President has objected both to the 2-year limitation and to an additional amendment which suggests that the Federal Reserve should seek to assist the Treasury by more flexible open market operations when consistent with administering a sound monetary policy.

This amendment has alarmed many faithful supporters of the Fed, who have interpreted it as an allout attack on the independence of the central bank.

There is nothing in the amendment itself to support such an extreme view. It is, in fact, a very moderate statement. It does not seek the restoration of the pegged market that made the Fed an engine of inflation. It does not lessen the Fed's authority, nor does it strip it of the weapons it possesses. It merely points out that it is the sense of Congress that the Fed's open-market operations should show greater flexibility.

The implication is plain that the committee feels the money managers have been unduly rigid in their insistence that in carrying out open-market operations the Fed should deal only in bills and should never buy or sell the longer-term securities. Many observers who can be counted as good friends of the Fed share this opinion of the "bills only" doctrine. Allan Sproul, former president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, for example, recently criticized the money managers for their unswerving allegiance to orthodox high church policies. Sproul thinks that the Fed should assist the Treasury's debt operations whenever it appears necessary.

This is the practice followed by every other central bank in the Western World. Only the Fed has followed a hands-off policy.

There is some hope that this attitude may be changing. The Fed is now at pains to point out that it really follows a bills usually policy rather than bills only. If this is the case, it can certainly live with the committee's amendment as easily as the Treasury can.

HEART OF THE PROBLEM

But some Fed supporters insist that Congress wants to curb the Fed's hard-won independence. It cannot be denied that congressional critics have frequently accused the Fed of acting as a fourth branch of government, responsible and responsive to no one. For its part, the Fed has taken the position it must remain free of administration pressure; otherwise, it will revert to its position as a handmaiden of the Treasury. It draws support for its position by arguing that its authority derives from Congress, not from the executive.

Now the committee is seeking to make the Fed responsive to Congress. It is not seeking to put the Fed in a subordinate position but is indicating that the Treasury's subordinate position should be replaced by something approaching equality.

We think there is merit in this position. The committee's solution is far from ideal, but even under the best of circumstances, it is doubtful that a perfect solution could be achieved. In recognizing that the U.S. Treasury deserves special treatment, the committee has hit at the heart of the matter.

The fact is that the national debt, which is close to $290 billion, can have an enormous influence on our economic position. To handcuff the debt managers, to treat their problem as if it were the same as that of any private borrower, is to accept a doctrinaire and unrealistic approach. The Treasury must have freedom, and the Fed should provide as much support and cooperation as possible—consistent with carrying out its own policy. The committee's bill seeks to encourage it to do just that.

Puerto Rican Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, July 25 is a date of deep significance both for us here in the United States and for our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico.

Just 64 years ago the landing of American forces on that island brought the Spanish control of Puerto Rico to an end. Exactly 54 years later, on July 25, 1952, Puerto Rico adopted the constitution by which it entered into the unique and happy status of a commonwealth in union with the United States of America. On this, the seventh anniversary of the founding of the Puerto Rican Commonwealth, it is indeed fitting that we should pause for a moment to pay tribute to our remarkable neighbors to the south with whom we have experienced such a harmonious and fruitful association.

Few people with so little prior experience at self-rule have managed to rise to the challenge of democracy as quickly. Enjoying the external protection and support of the United States and unhampered by internal interference, Puerto Rico has achieved a record of political, social, and economic progress for which all Americans can be quite justly proud.

In the area of political institutions, Puerto Rico has discovered, under the imaginative leadership of Gov. Luis Muños-Marín, the rich implications of democracy when it is applied to new and unusual situations. Puerto Rico's demonstrated ability at self-government is a striking proof that there is no problem too great for a government dedicated to democratic ideals backed by the enthusiastic support of its people.

Many examples may be cited of Puerto Rico's progress. One important indication of achievement is the 50-percent reduction in illiteracy resulting from a school enrollment comparable to that of the United States. Another example is the fight against poverty which has produced an amazing fourfold increase in per capita income since 1940. Due to improvements in health conditions, medical facilities, and a general rise in the standard of living, the life expectancy of the peoples of Puerto Rico has risen sharply. Operation Bootstrap has taken Puerto Rico a long way along the road of self-improvement. New industries are booming, and advances are being made in employment, housing, and agricultural production.

The key to this success can only be found in the Puerto Ricans themselves. Proud of their freedom, imbued with a deep sense of the dignity of the individual, full of the joy of life which finds expression in music and dancing, our Puerto Rican neighbors have made for themselves a way of life which charms and fascinates the visitor from the mainland. Travelers invariably return home full of enthusiasm for the hard-working, energetic, irrepressible people of that beautiful island.

Therefore, on this, the seventh anniversary of the founding of the Commonwealth, we send our greetings and our good wishes to our compatriots in the Caribbean. May the recent successes of Puerto Rico be merely the prelude to a greater, more prosperous future.

Red U.N. Doubleheader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article entitled "Red U.N. Doubleheader," written by Alice Widener, which appeared in the July 17, 1959, issue of U.S.A. In my opinion, this article deserves the study of every Member of the Congress:

RED U.N. DOUBLEHEADER

(By Alice Widener)

What seemed to be on first reading an innocuous press release issued by United Nations Secretary General Hammarskjold,

June 19, turns out to be, on close scrutiny, a highly important document proving conclusively:

1. The U.N. Secretary General exercises dangerous dictatorial power in the selection of U.N. personnel;

2. The Secretary General feels entirely free to appoint a Red to key posts in the administration of U.N. worldwide welfare, despite the fact that we put up more than a third of the money for it.

The seemingly innocuous press release of June 19, 1959, began: "The Secretary General has accepted with regret the resignation of Mehdi Vakil [of Iran] from the post of Secretary of the Economic and Social Council * * * effective * * * August 20, 1959."

Then, after a few sirupy phrases, came the announcement—bitter as gall to all friends of free enterprise—"Wladyslaw R. Malinowski will succeed Mr. Vakil as Secretary of the Economic and Social Council. Mr. Malinowski is of Polish nationality. * * * He has served with the United Nations since April 1946, and has been occupying the post of Head of the Regional Commissions Section in the Department of Economic and Social Affairs since July 1952. He will continue to exercise his present function together with his new responsibilities."

As anyone familiar with U.N. Secretariat affairs can see, Secretary General Hammarskjold has appointed a Communist Pole to an enormously important new position, which he will hold in addition to the key post he has held for so long as chief of the U.N. Regional Economic Commissions for Latin America, for Asia and the Far East, for Europe, and for Africa.

This takes in a rather large area of the world. But now, in his new post, Mr. Malinowski will exercise his sway as an economic overlord of the globe, having a major voice in policies affecting the use of U.N. aid funds and all kinds of social welfare activities mainly financed by U.S. taxpayers.

This appalling situation highlights once again the fact that though American national well-being depends on the triumph of capitalism over socialism, our country is committed to economic U.N. partnership with Socialists bent on smashing capitalism. Under U.N. rules, we must accept the Secretary General's executive decisions regarding who's who among U.N. personnel.

Mr. Hammarskjold's attitude in personnel matters is nothing if not imperious. Reliable sources say that when U.S. Government authorities bring facts about the extracurricular activities of Red U.N. personnel to his attention, the Secretary General turns a deaf ear to the facts and castigates the U.S. authorities for their interference.

In this bad situation, our Government appears to be helpless. Time and time again, Members of Congress, responsible members of the press, and patriotic businessmen inform the State Department (and its agent, the U.S. mission to the U.N.) of their deep concern over the activities of Socialist personnel within the U.N. Secretariat.

All the protests are wholly unavailing. Mr. Hammarskjold does exactly as he pleases, knowing that his right to hire and fire U.N. personnel is inviolate.

The executive position of the U.N. Secretary General (regardless of the holder's identity) is more and more becoming that of a dictator.

Secretary General Hammarskjold's appointment of Malinowski as Secretary of ECOSOC is a slap in the face of the United States. Mr. Hammarskjold is well aware of American public opinion concerning Mr. Malinowski. For example, the Saturday Evening Post (a magazine well described as an American habit) carried a lead editorial by the Honorable Spruille Braden, August 11, 1956, which was captioned "Why Let United Nations Bureaucrats Dole Out American Foreign Aid?" and which stated:

"The Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) sets basic policy for economic aid and technical assistance to underdeveloped nations. The heads of the various U.N. Secretariat departments and committees * * * all have a say in distributing the funds. * * * Chief of the regional commissions section is Wladyslaw R. Malinowski, a Polish Communist. * * *

"American taxpayers must decide whether they wish to promote legitimate American interests in foreign lands through private capital investment and loans, or to promote global socialism by permitting the vast sums contributed by American taxpayers to be administered by United Nations bureaucrats. It is difficult to believe that our people have so far forgotten the maxims of prudence as to favor handing over billions of their money to an international organization whose ideas on how to use it are unlikely to resemble ours."

In the face of the news about the appointment of a new Red Secretary of ECOSOC, there are two major developments:

1. Many members of the House and Senate Foreign Affairs Committees and Appropriations Committees are fed up. They vow that the United States will soon take the only reprisal it can—that of cutting down on and eventually cutting out U.S. funds for the U.N.'s economic activities.

2. The Soviet Union, emboldened by its success in the Malinowski affair, is demanding more and more U.N. posts for its minions and its own nationals.

Only 5 days after the public announcement of Malinowski's appointment, Georgi P. Arkadyev, acting head of the Soviet delegation to the U.N., presented a complaint to Secretary-General Hammarskjold charging that Moscow is being slighted in the appointment of high officials to the U.N. Secretariat.

Next day, June 25, Arkadyev issued a 5-page press release at the U.N. charging discrimination against Soviet citizens in the Secretariat.

"Despite the somewhat aggressive tone of the Soviet announcement," reported New York Times' U.N. correspondent Lindsay Parrott, June 26, "official sources said that the conversation between Mr. Hammarskjold and Mr. Arkadyev had been quite friendly. The Russian message to the Secretary-General is not considered as an attack on him."

Mr. Parrott commented, "Current figures show that the Soviet Union has one under secretary, one director of a department, four assistant directors, and various lesser positions. The United States has several hundred nationals employed at the Secretariat, although many are in lesser positions. The same is true of Britain and France."

For obviously practical reasons, most of the lesser positions at U.N. headquarters are indeed occupied by U.S. nationals. For example, most of the maintenance personnel—engineers, elevator operators, guards, etc.—live in Greater New York City, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

Obviously, too, the Soviet Union controls many of the non-Russian top echelon U.N. personnel. It is a fact that many positions in the U.N. and its specialized agencies are held by persons of Canadian, French, British, Indian, Latin American, Asian, and African nationality who are politically subservient to Moscow because of their pro-Communist sympathies or actual affiliation with the Communist Party.

The entire U.N. personnel situation arises out of the fact that the United Nations is an alleged united front organization in which Communists and free peoples are supposed to be working together for peace and progress.

It is an historic fact that no united front with Communists has ever advanced the cause of freedom or achieved even a small measure of human betterment.

Advocates of our partnership with Communists at the United Nations invariably plead: "It is better to be talking and working together than to be shooting one another."

These idealists are wholly unwilling to admit that there is more than one way to skin a cat.

While we talk and work with Red personnel at the U.N., they are undermining us. Unless we prevent it, they will go on undermining us until our capitalist system is destroyed and the United States falls down deep enough into the pit of socialism to be buried alive.

Statement by AFL–CIO President George Meany on the Labor Bill Reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in order that the record be correct in regard to the question asked by many on where labor stands on the so-called reform bill squeezed out of the Labor Committee today, I want to present the official statement of President George Meany, of the AFL–CIO:

The bill which the House Labor Committee has just reported is unacceptable to the AFL–CIO.

Despite the valiant efforts of some members of the committee to prevent the reporting of a punitive bill, this bill, under the guise of labor reform, does grievous harm to legitimate unions.

The bill does not meet the test which the AFL–CIO believes must be applied to this legislation.

We have repeatedly made clear our determination to seek legislation which will get at the crooks and to oppose legislation which will do harm to the legitimate trade-union movement. We have repeatedly pointed out that there are forces seeking to capitalize upon the corruption issue and determined to use it as a vehicle for the passage of punitive legislation disguised as a labor reform measure.

The AFL–CIO wants honest, effective labor-management reform legislation. We believe it can be achieved in this session of the Congress. It is a matter of record that we have been seeking this kind of legislation in vain for many years.

The AFL–CIO will not, however, silently acquiesce in injury to the legitimate trade union movement under the guise of dealing with corruption.

We have been urged, advised, and counseled to accept this measure even though we know its specific and inherent dangers. As a matter of practical expediency, we have been told that if we don't accept this package, worse damage will be done to the labor movement. We cannot agree to the doctrine that principle should be sacrificed for expediency.

We have been advised and counseled that the "people demand legislation this year, no matter what kind of legislation it be." This we have been told is a political reality and that politicians must heed the voice of the people.

We do not for a moment consider the public a moronic body demanding a measure which will hamstring free democratic trade

unionism under the guise of getting at the crooks.

We must recall to both parties the fact that the AFL–CIO, in testimony before both platform committees in the summer of 1956, urged the adoption of public disclosure statutes to cope with the possibility of corruption in the handling of welfare funds. This was some time before the McClellan committee came into existenec. In March 1957 we urged the extension of this principle to union funds generally.

Nor have we been content with just urging platform language. We have appeared before the committees of both Houses in support of legislation which was strong, meaningful and enforcible. It was that kind of bill, with some few exceptions, which was reported to the Senate floor after long and careful study.

It is tragic that on the floor of the Senate this measure was transformed into a weapon for the harassment of the union movement—a weapon which the House committee has only slightly blunted.

We share with the distinguished columnist Mr. Walter Lippmann the feeling that "the Senate, which was set to enact a very useful bill, was stampeded by political demagogs who want an issue and not a bill. The result is that unless the mischief can be undone in the House, a brilliant opportunity will have been lost. * * *

"It is still conceivable that the labor reforms can be saved if the leadership in Congress and if the President in the White House want to save them. But they must reckon with the demagogs who do not want a bill because it would deprive them of an issue to beat their breasts about."

To date, the very forces to which Mr. Lippmann alluded have been victorious.

We do not believe the fight is lost. We are convinced that those, who truly believe with us that Federal legislation can meet the problem of corruption and yet not destroy legitimate union activities, will amend this bill on the floor of the House of Representatives so as to achieve a measure that could legitimately bear the title "Reform Legislation."

In principle, we are opposed to writing legislation on the floor. It was exactly this tactic which changed the Senate bill into punitive legislation. But the majority of the House committee failed in its task. In response to pressure, the majority conceived a bill only slightly better than the Senate version and have reported one which could only be classed as antilabor.

Therefore, we believe that it is essential for Members of the House to support amendments designed to improve this measure by restoring it to its proper concept.

So that there will be no misunderstanding of our position, the following is a summary of the AFL–CIO's bill of objections to the measure, reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor.

THE AFL–CIO BILL OF OBJECTIONS

Title I—Rights of union members

The committee has retained, although in a somewhat less objectional form, the so-called bill of rights inserted on the Senate floor in haste, confusion, and ignorance.

While the committee omitted much of the loose and demagogic language as well as the broad, drastic criminal penalties of the Senate bill, it failed to come to grips with the fact that such a title is unnecessary and unworkable.

The rights purported to be protected by this section are already protected either by other titles of the bill or by the courts under doctrines worked out over the years in accordance with the traditional evolution of common law. On the other hand, the committee's proposal injects confusion and uncertainty into the conduct by unions of their own internal affairs which can only be resolved after years of litigation. Every local union official and business agent in the country will be acting at his peril in performing the most routine task in administering the affairs of his union. Every chairman of a local union meeting will be acting under shadow of a court suit each time he makes a ruling on the conduct of the meeting. We, of course, do not object to the principles involved. Most, if not all, union constitutions fully recognize and implement them. But it is one thing for a voluntary association to voluntarily do this and quite another to compel it by law to do so.

Some of these provisions are so general as to be susceptible of almost any interpretation. Others are so detailed as to inhibit obviously reasonable and proper union practices. The most objectionable, of course, is the determination here and elsewhere to make unions responsive to both State and Federal laws even where they conflict and thus create new areas of confusion and potential litigation.

Title II—Reporting and disclosure

The AFL–CIO has repeatedly urged reporting and disclosure—the goldfish bowl concept—as the realistic vehicle for deterring corruption.

For this method to be effective, however, it must be applied with equal justice to all the parties to labor-management relations—union officials and their agents, management officials and their agents, and so-called labor consultants and their agent.

The deterrent would be, of course, the fact that disclosure of all activities would act to prevent corruption. This deterrent power evaporates with each exception to the rule and the House committee has exempted employers and labor relations consultants from reporting everything except that already illegal. In fact, the House committee has made reporting by employers and labor relations consultants the merest sham. The House committee has negated the usefulness of reporting as a deterrent to crime, obviously responding to the will of employers who want to carry on antiunion activities and which have sometimes encouraged, if not inspired, corruption in the ranks of the trade-union movement.

Title III—Trusteeships

While for the most part the changes made here by the House committee are an improvement over the Senate bill's title dealing with trusteeships, a major and unacceptable defect remains. Despite the whole new body of Federal substantive and procedural law established by this title, unions would continue to be subject to the diverse and frequently conflicting body of State rules. Unions should be able to measure their conduct in establishing and maintaining trusteeships according to a single standard, and not be subjected to the sometimes impossible task of conforming to the differing requirements of Federal and State regulation. If Federal rights and remedies apply, they should be exclusive.

Title IV—Elections

In the provisions dealing with elections, which we have long supported, the committee has included a dangerous and self-defeating provision.

By including "the right to inspect and copy" the unions' membership rolls, the committee provides protection for the pro forma candidate for office who is in reality a company spy or a Communist agent, pretending to union candidacy for the sole purpose of obtaining membership lists for nefarious purposes. Less damaging, but nonetheless a problem to legitimate unions, would be the lack of protection for its membership rolls from the pro forma candidate whose only purpose was to sell the list to commercial agents who now regularly and unsuccessfully seek such lists for sales purposes.

The provisions of the Senate bill provide a preferable vehicle.

Title V—Safeguards for labor organizations

The committee has approved provisions to which we take vigorous exception.

Operating from a premise with which we certainly agree and which we have consistently supported, that union office is a sacred trust, the committee has proceeded to establish standards of fiduciary responsibility which could only lead to widespread confusion and the multiplicity of litigation.

There are certain obvious similarities between the obligation for safe, honest administration of funds and property entrusted to the care of a union officer or employee to those obligations which bank or corporate officers owe their stockholders. The dissimilarities, however, are far more important, and it is these which the committee has ignored.

The prime responsibility of the union officer is to advance the interest and welfare of the members. The prime concern of the banking official is to enhance the value of the property he holds in trust.

A union does not exist for the purpose of making money. It exists as a mechanism through which its members can combine to promote their mutual improvement, both as employees and as members of society generally, and both materially and in other ways.

One of our main objections is that the reach of this fiduciary concept as expressed in the bill is not determinable and the property of many union activities now considered as normal union functions is shrouded with the blanket of uncertainty and confusion.

Under this provision, union officers may be hailed into court for making legitimate expenditures, such as charitable contributions, which have been approved by a majority of members. Unions ought not to be thus restricted in using their resources for the betterment of the whole community.

The specifications under which union members are barred from holding union office are not equated by the provisions disqualifying individuals from holding labor relations positions in corporations. Labor history is replete with instances in which employers, especially in heavy industry, have used ex-convicts as goons in labor disputes. The disqualification should apply to all officers, directors, and employees engaged in labor relations activities for an employer.

Adding to the list of specified instances which bar a union member from union office is "assault which inflicts grievous bodily injury." What this means, is subject to variable interpretations for the statutory language of the several States differs markedly. More importantly, injustice would invariably follow if, for example it should be interpreted that a black eye suffered in a picket line scuffle involving excitable individuals could bar a man from union office or from a labor relations position with an employer.

Title VI—Miscellaneous

This title retains a States rights proviso which is, at best, a vague statement of antiunion prejudice and, at worst, a device for compounding the confusion already engendered elsewhere in the measure.

Title VII—Taft-Hartley amendments

The committee's wise choice of a simple, sound solution to the no man's land problem and its wise provision giving voting rights to economic strikers does not mean that the committee's judgment in this title has been uniformly sensible.

It eliminated a desirable provision in the Senate bill designed to make it clear that service assistants in the communications industry are not supervisors excluded from the protections of the National Labor Relations Act.

It made the prehearing election provision illusory by raising an extraneous issue—the

appropriate bargaining unit—and it failed to correct the serious defect in S. 1555 which repeals present consent election authorization.

We have serious reservations about delegating to the general counsel of the NLRB the function of appointing the entire field staff.

Although the so-called "hot cargo" provision has been somewhat improved by making clear that it does not force union members to cross lawful picket lines against their will, the provision still remains objectionable in principle. In the crucial area of transportation by common carrier, it strikes a mortal blow at the long-recognized right of unions to appeal directly to employers to assist the union in removing sweatshop conditions in an industry by refusing to deal with unfair, antiunion employers.

The "hot cargo" provision is simply intended to keep union people from using one of their most traditional methods of improving the lot of the workers. It is another prime example of an attempt to eliminate one of labor's effective economic weapons under the guise of fighting racketeers. The "hot cargo" provision has very little to do with labor reform.

The committee has unintentionally, we are sure, provided an incentive for corrupt and unscrupulous elements on both the union and employer sides to engage in collusive deals and "sweetheart" contracts.

This is done by providing that an employer could prevent picketing by one union simply by recognizing and contracting with another union.

A principal purpose of organizational picketing is to persuade workers to join unions. Such activity is clearly legitimate, since organized workers cannot maintain their hard-won wages and working conditions if nonunion employers are free to depress those standards and labor is prevented by law from advertising that fact.

The picketing provision in the committee bill would prevent such picketing if, within the preceding 9 months, a representation election has taken place. This is unjust. Workers should be permitted to picket if their union did not participate in the election or if their union was forced to an early election without adequate opportunity to organize.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly upheld organizational picketing as a valid exercise of the fundamental right of free speech. The Hobbs Act, a Federal statute, already imposes severe criminal penalties for abuse of the right to picket. The committee bill imposes an additional criminal penalty for extortion picketing. The additional restriction on picketing contained in this bill can only further burden honest trade unions performing legitimate and reasonable functions. It can be of comfort only to those who seek to cripple the labor movement.

CODES OF ETHICAL PRACTICES

The committee chose to kill title V of S. 1555, designed to encourage unions and employer associations to subscribe to codes of ethical practices. It thus discourages the voluntary self-policing efforts of the labor movement to rid its ranks of crooks and gangsters.

Virtually alone, without support from Congress, and often in the face of scorn from other quarters, the labor movement has endeavored to develop its own principles and procedures for dealing with corruption and unethical practices within its own ranks. Certainly such efforts deserve support. Certainly it would serve the public interest to encourage employer associations to take similar action, for unethical conduct, to say the very least, has pervaded the ranks of employers to an unsavory degree.

Such voluntary efforts cannot entirely eliminate the need for Federal legislation, as the AFL–CIO has repeatedly stated. But they can, if successful, considerably reduce the need for such legislation. Certainly recognition of the merit of voluntary efforts is in the national interest. The only purpose served by the committee's destruction of this concept is to conceal the fact that employer associations have refused or failed or been unable to engage in any similar self-policing activities; or, in fact, in any method for putting their own house in order.

The elimination of the tri-partite advisory committee to the Secretary of Labor charged with administering the act is certainly ill-advised. Since this bill represents an excursion by Congress into new and uncharted fields, such an advisory committee, representing employers, workers, and the public, could contribute substantially to constructive administration of the act.

CONCLUSION

During the debate on the floor of the House of Representatives, it is possible that this measure can be restored to its original concept—a bill which would get the crooks and not damage legitimate unions.

We urge every Member of the House to adopt that as his goal. Anything less would be unworthy of the House of Representatives; anything else would be destructive of democratic organizations and voluntary associations which are the very lifeblood of a democratic nation.

We look with confidence to the House of Representatives for the achievement of justice and the adoption of legislation which can honestly be called reform legislation.

South Vietnam a Nation of Outstanding Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, at a time when some sensation-seeking publications are distorting the picture on foreign aid in Vietnam, I think it is worth while to call to your attention the studied, on-the-spot opinions of an impartial and veteran newsman, Ernest K. Lindley. Mr. Lindley's byline appears on his weekly column "Washington Tides" in Newsweek magazine. In the June 29 issue, Mr. Lindley, writing from Saigon, South Vietnam, termed that country "an ally worth having."

His comments support the observations I made while in Vietnam last November, and which I discussed here on the floor yesterday when the Mutual Security Act conference committee report was considered. I commend it to the consideration of my colleagues. The article follows:

AN ALLY WORTH HAVING

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

SAIGON.—South Vietnam has made more striking progress in more ways than any other Asian nation I have so far revisited. For this, credit must go to: (1) A dedicated, canny, indefatigable, invincible man, President Ngo Dinh Diem; (2) an industrious people; (3) effective American aid.

Four years ago when I was here, this southern half of the country divided at the 17th parallel by the Geneva agreement of 1954 was in chaos, a nation in name only. Bridges and rail lines had been wrecked. Much of the countryside was controlled either by armed Communist cells or the independent armies of the quasi-religious sects. The last of nearly 1 million refugees flooding in from the north were huddled in public buildings and doorways.

Diem was then a dim little figure, with only the barest nucleus of a government, hardly known in most of South Vietnam. He was hated, or at best distrusted, by the French, who still had troops here. Other observers, Asian and Western alike—including some important U.S. officials—said he lacked both organizing ability and the flair ever to compete with the Communist Ho Chi Minh as a symbol of Vietnamese nationalism. This despairing view had been widely reflected in the Western press. I accepted the judgment of others—resolute Americans, such as Leland Barrows, head of our ICA mission, Edward Stansbury, local USIA Chief, and Col. Edward Lansdale. On this return visit, high Vietnamese officials told me my report (Newsweek, June 6, 1955) was the first to say that Diem could succeed.

LAND REFORM

In 5 years, these are some of the achievements: The armed sects have been destroyed or disbanded. Most of the Communist nests have been wiped out. The nearly 1 million refugees have been resettled and are earning their living.

More than 52,000 people have been moved into the previously almost empty plateau area where they make Viet Minh infiltration more difficult and produce new fiber crops. The second largest land reform of free Asia, involving the conversion of 300,000 former tenants into small landowners, is two-thirds completed. A nationwide agricultural credit system is operating. Rail lines and bridges have been repaired, and new highways are being built. Rice exports have been resumed. Rubber exports have risen, and new higher-yielding trees are being planted. Schools and other social services have been expanded. A start has been made on assimilating 700,000 Chinese.

The Vietnamese armed forces, 150,000 in all, are American-equipped and American-trained. Diem thinks they should be enlarged since north Vietnam has upwards of 300,000 troops. But the official U.S. view is that Diem has enough to hold a Viet Minh attack until SEATO forces could arrive. (Although not a member, Vietnam is SEATO-protected.) However, we have just agreed, after 3 years of objection, to supply light arms for 32,500 members of the civil guard. This purely internal security force is needed because Viet Minh infiltrators have launched a new campaign of terrorism and sabotage—probably because, economically, south Vietnam has outstripped the Communist "paradises" to the north.

ABLE LEADERSHIP

Diem, well-known and respected through his land, has long since become the authentic symbol of nationalism, although some Vietnamese fret about his semiauthoritarian methods and heavy reliance on his relatives. His biggest problem is how to make south Vietnam self-supporting—our aid is now about $180 million annually. American officials—and Diem's own American adviser, Wolf Ladejinsky—think the gap can be greatly narrowed, if not closed in 5 years, by increasing agricultural exports, and starting new light industries.

In two off-the-record talks, totaling 5¼ hours, Diem impressed me deeply by his grasp of the problems, not only of his own country but of Asia as a whole. He remains, of course, an unflinching foe of communism. On his record, he must be rated as one of the ablest free Asian leaders. We can take pride in our support.

Hospital Insurance and Related Benefits for OASDI Beneficiaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a statement which was presented by Prof. Wilbur J. Cohen, representing the American Public Welfare Association, before the Committee on Ways and Means in the course of hearings on legislation proposing to provide hospital insurance and related benefits under the social security law.

Professor Cohen is a fellow Milwaukeean, and has been associated for many years with the administration of our social security law. I am pleased to commend his statement to the attention of the membership of this body.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF WILBER J. COHEN, REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, ON SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1959, HOSPITAL INSURANCE AND RELATED BENEFITS FOR OASDI BENEFICIARIES, JULY 15, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Wilbur J. Cohen. I am a member of the welfare policy committee of the American Public Welfare Association and am representing that organization here today. I am professor of public welfare administration at the University of Michigan where I am engaged in teaching and research on social security.

THE AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION: EXPERIENCE AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE IN MEDICAL CARE ADMINISTRATION

The American Public Welfare Association is the national organization of local and State public welfare departments and of individuals engaged in public welfare at all levels of government. Its membership includes Federal, State and local welfare administrators, board members, and welfare workers from every jurisdiction. As a result of the discussions in our councils, committees, and conferences our board of directors of 27 persons, representing all parts of the country, adopts official policy positions on issues of current significance.

The agencies and individuals making up the membership of the association are charged with administering the various assistance, medical care, and social service programs in public welfare under the Social Security Act. The public welfare departments of the country, under authority given to the States by the Congress, have major responsibility for meeting the medical requirements of needy people assisted under these titles and in the general assistance programs which are financed by State and local funds. They have broad experience with the health needs of these persons and also are faced daily with the problems of the thousands upon thousands of individuals and families with borderline income who today, in this great Nation of ours, are unable to meet the costs of medical care and who, far too often, have no place to turn for help with these costs other than the welfare department.

Over the years the association has supported strongly all sound recommendations which have advocated broadening and strengthening the social insurance programs of our country. In fact, we have been in the forefront of the groups which have advocated such legislative steps since, as is indicated in the following exeerpt of the association's Federal legislative objectives for 1959, we believe this is a preferable means of meeting income maintenance needs and will keep public assistance expenditures to a minimum:

"The contributory old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, as a preferable means of meeting the income maintenance needs of people and as a means of keeping the need for public assistance to a minimum, should be strengthened by making benefit payments more adequate; by increasing the amount of earnings creditable for contribution and benefit purposes in line with current conditions; by providing benefits for disabled insured persons of any age and for their dependents; by extending coverage to earners still excluded."

For more than 20 years the association's medical care committee, made up of persons knowledgeable in health and welfare programs throughout the country, has studied the medical care problems of needy and low-income individuals and families, and methods of administering and financing medical services required by them. In recent years the committee has given special attention to the health needs of the aged and disabled. On this committee at the present time are physicians, hospital administrators, State and local public welfare administrators and staff members, and other persons highly qualified in the field of medical care administration. This committee is fully familiar with the present extent of medical care programs in public welfare and with the gaps which still remain, despite recent Federal legislation providing for improvements in the matching formula with respect to medical care in public assistance. Last year, as a result of its studies, the medical care committee reviewed the earlier verrsions of the pending bill and made recommendations to the welfare policy committee which resulted in the following statement adopted by the association's board of directors and embodied in the association's 1959 Federal legislative objectives:

"Health costs of old age, survivors, and disability insurance beneficiaries should be financed through the OASDI program. Arrangements for achieving this objective should take into account the priority needs of the groups to be served; availability of facilities, personnel, and services; and protection and encouragement of high quality of care, including the organization of health and related services to effect appropriate utilization of services and facilities."

MEDICAL CARE IN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

One of the major services which the association has provided to the field of public welfare, since its inception almost 30 years ago, has been to stimulate and promote the development of programs of medical care of adequate quality and quantity in the public assistance programs. We supported the medical assistance amendments to the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act which were adopted by the Congress in 1950, 1956, and 1958, and which now provide a sound fiscal base on which the country can build more adequate financing of this service so essential in restoring public assistance recipients to the highest possible level of independent living, self-care, and self-support.

Despite the very large expenditures for medical care in these programs, however, and although there has been substantial progress, we find that there are gaps and deficiencies still existing in some States with respect to the provision of medical care for the needy aged and other needy persons. These gaps are often due to a deficient legislative base in the State, to insufficient appropriations, and to administrative complexities. As a result we do not believe there are more than 15 to 20 States in which needy persons, including the aged and disabled, can receive all the medical care they require with the assistance of public funds. There are major variations in the other States, with a number of States providing little or no medical care to public assistance recipients and others financing one or more services but not providing the entire scope of care which is needed by sick people.

On the other hand more and more the new applications for old-age assistance, for example, come from persons who, although they are receiving OASDI, are unable to meet their medical requirements with this limited income. Unless some program—public or private—is inaugurated to assure adequate health insurance coverage to all aged persons, public assistance expenditures will continue to increase.

Medical care payments in public assistance in 1958 are estimated at $400 million of which $300 million is for direct payments to suppliers of medical services. About one-half of this latter total—$150 million—is for medical services to aged assistance recipients. According to the best estimates I have been able to make, if all States were participating fully and providing reasonably adequate medical services at the present time, about $300 million more would be expended just for OAA.

Assuming that hospital costs will continue to rise about 5 percent a year, that OASDI benefits remain at their present level relative to wages and prices, I would estimate that within 10 years medical expenditures in public assistance might reach, or exceed, $1 billion annually.

These totals do not include some $500 million spent for hospital care by Federal, State, or local governments. Nor does it include about $100 million in income tax savings based on medical care deductions for aged persons or $20 million in corporate income tax savings based on employer contributions to health plans.

All of these expenditures will continue to increase as our aged population increases and the need for medical care increases. Voluntary health insurance does not adequately cover the medical needs of aged persons; fails to cover many low-income aged persons; and is not likely to cover all or most low-income aged persons in the foreseeable future. Hence, some new arrangements must be developed to meet the health needs of aged persons.

HOSPITAL COSTS ARE RISING

The number of aged persons is increasing over a thousand each and every day. Both the number and proportion of the aged in the population is increasing.

Since 1947–49, the overall Consumer Price Index has increased about 24 percent. Medical care costs have risen over twice as fast—49 percent. But hospital room charges have risen 105 percent, and are continuing to increase.

Private expenditures for hospital services have increased from 1 percent of per capita disposable income in 1948 to 1.16 percent in 1952, 1.33 percent in 1954, and 1.43 percent in 1956—a 43 percent increase from 1948.

In 1955, public and private expenditures for hospital care in all general and special, short- and long-term hospitals was $4.3 billion, of which 26.6 percent came from general tax sources. If mental and tuberculosis hospitals are included, the total expenditures reached $6 billion, and the portion coming from tax sources was 43.8 percent. From these figures, it can be seen that the issue is not whether public funds shall be used to finance hospital care but in what manner and to what extent.

VOLUNTARY HEALTH INSURANCE IS INADEQUATE

This Committee on Ways and Means already has before it a most comprehensive

and excellent report prepared at your request by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Hospitalization Insurance for OASDI Beneficiaries." We concur in the validity of the five reasons summarized in the report as to why the Federal Government should act in this field. In a review of the characteristics of the present aged population, particularly with respect to sources and amount of income and assets, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare report substantiates the following conclusions which we believe demonstrate why congressional action is warranted in financing health benefits for social security beneficiaries through the exitsing OASDI mechanism:

1. The income of older persons is markedly less than that of the general population, both with respect to average income and distribution of income.

2. The medical needs of older persons are greater than younger persons. They have prolonged health problems and, as the age distribution of persons on the OASDI beneficiary rolls shows, more and more this is a progressively older group so that these prolonged health problems become greater in complexity and quantity.

3. Because medical need is greater, expenditures for personal health services are greater. Many aged persons have little or no assets to meet this need.

4. The voluntary health insurance movement in this country has shown great vigor and imagination but despite this it is quite evident that we cannot expect, at any time, in the foreseeable future, development of voluntary health insurance coverage which will meet the major portion of the health needs of the aged, either with respect to services or dollars expended. The type, scope, and period of present voluntary insurance benefits are seriously inadequate and, it appears, will continue so for meeting the health needs of the aged.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATION

As the association's policy statement quoted above indicates, we are in full accord with the principle of amending the OASDI program to include the financing of certain health benefits for social security beneficiaries. We believe that it is not the wish of the American people that substantial numbers of our aged citizens be required to turn to public welfare for help with their medical needs. Whereas cash benefits under the OASDI program in many instances may be sufficient for the individual's average maintenance requirements, it is rare that medical costs of an unpredictable or large character can be met unless the aged or disabled person has considerable other income and resources. It has been established that only a small proportion of aged and disabled people fall into this fortunate group.

We have pointed out, too, that although there has been considerable improvement in the provision of medical care in the public assistance programs, this is still far from adequate and in many States medically needy persons may be unable to receive help to meet their medical bills. Furthermore, to qualify for public assistance, individuals often must first exhaust insurance and other assets because of the strict eligibility requirements most of the States have established for public assistance. People who do not qualify for public aid or who cannot bring themselves to apply for it must go without medical care since private charity is not generally available for this purpose. All of these alternatives are uncertain and unpalatable to the American people. They want neither assistance nor charity but insurance protection as a matter of right.

We strongly urge, therefore, the establishment of a program of health benefits for social security beneficiaries as part of OASDI.

ADVANTAGES OF THE OASDI APPROACH AS COMPARED WITH THE VOLUNTARY APPROACH

The OASDI approach in the bill has a number of very important advantages over the voluntary approach. These advantages are as follows:

1. Contributions are collected from nearly all persons who work for a living under the bill. This results in a large number of persons contributing, without the adverse selection that tends to accompany voluntary community plans. This reduces the cost per person and assures a strong financial base to the whole program.

2. Contributions are payable under the bill only while the individual is employed. Since contributions are payable in relation to earnings, an individual does not pay for any period in which he has no earnings or is not working. In voluntary plans, contributions must be paid for individuals whether they are earning or not.

3. Contributions under the bill are levied in some measure with ability to pay. In voluntary plans, contributions customarily are on a flat basis in relation to number of dependents. Thus, in a voluntary plan, an individual earning $2,000 a year and an individual earning $6,000 a year both pay the same premium. Unequals are treated equally. In the bill, since contributions are a uniform percentage of earnings up to a limit of $6,000 a year, the $2,000 individual would pay only one-third the amount the $6,000 individual would pay.

4. Contributions in the bill are levied over the individual's working lifetime and are not paid during the period when he is not earning and is retired. Under most voluntary plans, the individuals must continue to pay their premiums after they retire and until they die. Where employers contribute toward the cost of voluntary protection prior to retirement, such contributions usually cease on termination of employment. This is burdensome to many older people whose incomes are sharply reduced when they retire. The result is that as people grow older, they may drop their voluntary insurance in order to conserve their limited funds. If they retain their voluntary insurance, the flat rate premium takes a very high proportion of a small income. The bill aims to solve these difficulties by requiring individuals and their employers to pay small amounts, in relation to their earnings, over an entire working lifetime and then to forego any contributions when the individual has no earnings and is retired. The result is a financing arrangement better adapted to the lifetime earning pattern.

5. Contributions in the bill are not related to the number of dependents. In voluntary plans, the contributions usually increase with the number of dependents. Thus, in a typical plan, there is one uniform rate for an individual, a higher rate for an individual and spouse, and a still higher rate for a family. The result is that the individual with the family has to pay a higher proportion of income for his protection than the individual without a family. From a social point of view, this is not only undesirable, but unnecessary. The individual with the family has the cost of maintaining and educating his family and, since his health costs rise in relation to the size of his family but not in relation to his earnings, he is doubly penalized. In the bill, since contributions are a uniform percentage of earnings, there is no such double penalty on the family earner.

6. The employer is required by the bill to pay one-half of the cost. Under many voluntary plans, the employer pays part of the cost, and in some voluntary plans the employer pays all of the cost. However, this trend is spotty. In many plans, the employer makes no contribution. Under the bill, the employer would be required to pay one-half of the cost. The existing law permits employers to pay a larger proportion—or all of the cost—if the employer wishes, or if this is agreed to by the employer and employee by contract or collective bargaining. Thus, where the employer now pays all the cost, this would not be disturbed by the bill.

7. Benefits are not cancelable under the bill. In many private plans benefits are cancelable at the option of the insurance carrier or the employer. They can be terminated by action of the insured when sufficient income is not available to pay the premiums. Whatever may be the reasons for these actions, they inevitably result in public agencies having to bear the cost of the care of those persons who cannot finance their medical care. This is undesirable. The bill provides for a paidup policy with the backing of the Federal Government. It gives patients and hospitals assurance of payment and protection superior to that of most private plans.

8. Benefits under the bill are not limited during a person's lifetime. Under many private plans benefits are limited not only in terms of days of hospitalization per year but also in terms of total dollars over a person's lifetime. This completely undermines the security provided in the plan. Under the bill, no such lifetime limit is provided nor is it necessary. Thus, the OASDI approach is much superior to the private plan.

9. Benefits under the bill in many cases are more adequate than under many private plans. In many voluntary plans, hospital insurance benefits are limited to 30 to 50 days or have a fixed dollar limit on payments per day of hospital care.

10. The cost of administering the plan in the bill would be less than the administrative costs under existing private insurance plans. Since contributions would be collected as a part of the regular social security contributions, it would not require any new machinery. There would be no salesmen or acquisition costs as in private insurance. The savings in administrative costs would make it possible to pay the same benefits as private insurance at less cost, or more adequate benefits at the same cost.

SUGGESTED PROVISIONS OF A DESIRABLE PROGRAM

Individuals to be covered: The association recommends that OASDI beneficiaries should have health costs financed through the OASDI program. This would not limit the program to aged persons but would include disabled persons, widows, and their dependents, when eligible for monthly benefits.

Scope and quality of service: Medical care of good quality cannot be attained if the range of services is not complete and actually available. It is generally accepted that a satisfactory treatment result cannot be achieved if it is not possible to provide all the services which are needed by an individual.

The association recognizes that there are some problems in developing comprehensive medical services. We should like to place before you, therefore, our suggestions as to a reasonable minimum range of services which might be considered as a starting point in any program relating to OASDI beneficiaries.

It has been established that the need for hospital care for the aged and disabled beneficiaries is greater than that of the general population, whereas their financial ability to meet this increased need is less. Many more aged persons enter hospitals because of need for medical treatment than for surgical treatment. It would be desirable, therefore, if provision were made for meeting the inpatient hospital care costs of beneficiaries, including the cost of medical and surgical services required by them. It

can be maintained that it is more urgent to meet the cost of medical treatment in the hospital by physicians than the cost of surgical services.

In order that there should not be unnecessary utilization of hospital care a number of alternatives to hospital care should be made available in the proposed program. In listing these we have taken into consideration the kinds of services for which physicians might find it necessary to hospitalize patients if the services are not otherwise available:

1. Diagnostic services which can be provided on an outpatient basis;

2. Skilled nursing service in the home, including visiting nurse service, under medical supervision;

3. Surgical services on an outpatient basis in the emergency room of the hospital, in a clinic, or in the physician's own office.

The next priority should be the provision of physicians' services in the home and office, and limited amounts of expensive drugs when prescribed by a physician and required by persons receiving care outside of hospitals.

Duration of hospital care is limited in the bill you are considering. If appropriate alternatives to hospital care are included, we believe this limitation will save relatively little money, but may work a hardship on a number of individuals. If the services we have indicated are included we believe the duration of hospital benefits could be increased.

The proposed amendment provides for payment for skilled nursing home services for persons who have been hospitalized and who require this service for the same condition which required hospitalization. In our opinion there are very few nursing homes that would presently meet the requirement of providing truly skilled nursing home service. But there is a great need for skilled nursing home service and the legislation should encourage the establishment and expansion of adequate skilled services in this area. We urge that the legislation specifically enumerate the basic standards for such homes to qualify for payments and that such homes be connected with or under the supervision of hospitals, or other appropriate medical direction.

Improvement in quality of service and reduction in financial costs: Consideration also should be given to including two other provisions in the bill:

1. Payment of the cost of rehabilitation to be financed from the insurance program by arrangements made with State vocational rehabilitation, health and welfare departments. This would serve to reduce the recurrent need for medical care and disability benefits.

2. Payment of the cost of research and demonstration programs designed to improve the quality of service provided under the legislation and to minimize the costs for health services. Extension of organized home care programs, preventive geriatric care, and similar projects would be encouraged under this authorization.

Administration and quality of service: We believe that, as proposed in the legislation you are considering, any extension of the OASDI program to provide health benefits should be on a service benefit basis rather than a cash indemnity basis. It has been demonstrated in the commercial cash indemnity programs now in operation that this is, in general, a most unsatisfactory means of meeting health costs and places a large share of the expense burden on the patient and his family. The service benefit, on the other hand, would guarantee full payment without regard to the differences in charges and costs which exist throughout the country.

If a broad scope of health benefits is included in the program, consideration might be given to adding to the bill a provision which would permit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into contracts with appropriate State agencies such as State health or wefare departments which would serve as the State administrative agency for the Department. If there is a broad scope of services in the program this would involve negotiating contracts with a sizable number of purveyors of service. On the other hand, if the program is limited at the outset, with no provision for paying physicians or other practitioners, this would involve contracts only with the hospitals of the country and this could be handled directly with hospitals or their representatives by the Federal agency.

Role of Advisory Council: We endorse the general provisions in the bill for an Advisory Health Council with which the Secretary shall consult in administering the bill. We urge, however, that the Council should have more specific advisory functions including giving advice to the Secretary on methods of assuring and improving the quality of care, assuring full and reasonable payment for services rendered, effective access to the services provided, efficient and economical administration, and any other matters it deems essential to the operation of an effective program. It should also have the duty of making recommendations to the Secretary and the Congress for legislative changes it deems appropriate with respect to benefits, financing and administration.

Financing: We subscribe to the principle of financing the costs of any health insurance benefits to OASDI beneficiaries through the contributory social insurance program so widely accepted by the American people. We believe it is both proper and desirable for all employers, employees, and the self-employed to finance the costs. Moreover, adequate health benefits to aged persons can only be effectively and widely provided if the costs are distributed over a person's lifetime. It appears that voluntary insurance cannot accomplish this for any large number of persons within the reasonably near future.

One of the arguments made by those who oppose Federal action in this field is that it is difficult to estimate future costs of the health benefits with any accuracy. This type of argument has been repeatedly used against old-age and disability insurance amendments but has not prevented this committee from taking action. Nor should it now. To the extent that cost estimates are subject to error, the same problem is faced by voluntary insurance as by social insurance. And social insurance can deal with the problem more effectively since it readily can adjust contributions and benefits on a statutory basis to meet changing experience.

In order to assure the financial integrity of the contributions and benefits for health benefits, a separate account or trust fund could be established for this purpose. Contributions could be collected for 6 or 12 months before benefits were payable. The contribution rates in the early years could be set somewhat higher than current expenditures to reflect longer-run experience. In this way a small reserve would be built up which would assure that the benefits could be soundly financed on a self-supporting basis.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, we reiterate our support of the principle of meeting the health care costs of the aged, the disabled, widows and their dependents through an amendment of the social insurance program which will finance health service benefits to those eligible for cash benefits. We hope that this committee, which drafted the original contributory old-age insurance program in 1935, added survivors insurance benefits in 1939, and disability insurance benefits in 1955–56, will add further to the demonstrated vision and statesmanship shown on these three occasions by taking action which so logically builds upon the sound principles incorporated in the three earlier actions.

Paul Butler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Communist mouthpiece, the Worker, has projected itself into the Paul Butler versus Lyndon Johnson-Sam Rayburn controversy. As to be expected it is vigorously defending Mr. Butler and viciously attacking Speaker Rayburn and Senator Johnson.

The Worker in its last issue bitterly attacked committee chairmen and accused Senator JOHNSON and Speaker RAYBURN of a "plot against popular elections." This organ of the Communist Party was also critical of Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, and Senator YOUNG of Ohio.

Mr. Butler claims favorable mail at the rate of 6½ to 1, lately revising this estimate upward to 10 to 1. My mail from out of my State has been critical of me and favorable to Butler. In fact I am surprised that Mr. Butler's mail is not 100 to 1 favorable because a few telephone calls and orders from the bosses can in a moment prompt a flood of favorable mail to Butler and likewise vicious, profane letters of abuse to me. The housewife, busy with children and daily chores, is not likely to write Mr. Butler. The farmer, in the midst of a busy season, is not prone to letter-writing.

The industrial worker is looking to Congress, not to Mr. Butler, for legislation. Mr. Butler can only offer flimsy promises in 1960, while Congress is now acting to solve the evils of the day. It is Congress, not Mr. Butler, that is working long and hard to curb inflation. The workingman is not writing favorable letters to Mr. Butler. He is writing his Congressman.

Mr. Butler could have postponed his attack on the congressional leadership until after the conference on Berlin. He could have waited for the return of our Governors from Russia and for the result of the Vice President's visit to Moscow. If he is sincere about legislation, he could have waited until this international crisis passed and then launch a drive this fall with prospects of congressional consideration next January. Or he could have started sooner in this session. He is well aware that nothing can now be accomplished by his blast except confusion, discord, and strife. My principal quarrel with Mr. Butler is his untimely and unjustified attack on a leadership whose responsibility is more than a party obligation. The Democratic leadership of this Congress shares with the President a grave concern for national and international problems.

The $64 question most Americans are asking is what is Mr. Butler's motive? Does he really plan to leave the Democratic Party and form a third party—a National Socialist Party? Or does he plan to split the Democratic Party and elect a Republican? Or does he plan to seize control of our party and throw out our great leaders who have served the United States with honor and distinction.

The worker has accused me of disloyalty to my party. This is an old story. I have been attacked by the Communists and their fellow travelers many times, including the label of America's No. 1 Warmonger by Russia's late Andrei Vishinsky on September 18, 1947, at the United Nations, Lake Success, N. Y.

I will put my loyalty to the party alongside of Mr. Butler. I have traveled thousands of miles and made countless speeches for the Democratic Party. I will continue to labor for unity and harmony in our party. I will do all in my power to reject agitation, disunity, strife, and discord.

This attack upon me and other congressional Democrats bears a striking similarity to the letters I have received attacking me. The same labels, innuendoes, and attack by slogans is obvious. Our leadership, in the letters I have received, is likewise abused but in no way is an intelligent argument advanced. They abuse and attack, but offer no program.

I believe Mr. Butler is a loyal American and is not connected with un-American organizations. However, I do believe that he is falling for the old, old game of divide and conquer.

Arnold Johnson, author of the following article which appeared in the Worker on July 19, 1959, is reported to be the Arnold Johnson who was the Communist Party nominee for Governor of Ohio in 1940.

DIXIECRATS, NORTH ALLIES GANG UP ON DEM CHAIRMAN

(By Arnold Johnson)

When Paul Butler, Democratic national chairman, hit at the LYNDON JOHNSON-SAM RAYBURN leadership of Congress as jeopardizing the 1960 chances of the Democrats, he drew the fire of the Dixiecrats and the criticism from northern Democrats which proved his point.

Butler charged that "the congressional seniority system lends itself to the buildup of power and influence, control of committees by southern Democrats, when the Democrats are in control of Congress." He also called for Congress to pass progressive legislation, and made an appeal to the country "to influence the Democratic leadership of the Congress to come along with the national program, rather than the conservative and moderate program which they are trying to follow."

The first reaction came from Dixiecrat Representative WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, South Carolina, who demanded Butler's resignation. DORN exposed the fears of the Dixiecrats when he charged that Butler was "masterminding a plan to oust RAYBURN as permanent chairman of the 1960 convention; to unseat Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK as chairman of the convention platform committee and to appoint a convention credentials committee which would deny seats to several delegates from Southern States." He also questioned Butler's Democratic loyalty. Senate Leader LYNDON JOHNSON did the same by linking Butler with Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Dixiecrat leader of Virginia's interposition against the Supreme Court desegregation decision, called for Butler's ouster "at the earliest possible time." Other Dixiecrats from Virginia, including Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON and State Democratic Committeeman Fred Switzer, joined the attack.

JOHNSON's power in the Senate was revealed by the way in which Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, the Democratic whip, and Senator R. VANCE HARTKE, of an opposing faction in Butler's home State of Indiana, came to JOHNSON's defense with speeches that virtually nominated JOHNSON for the presidency.

This much was expected but the surprise to many observers was the support from Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio, and from the 91-year-old Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island. YOUNG put himself in support of views expressed by Dixiecrat Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND, of Florida, who in turn was acting as a spokesman for John C. Davis, Democratic chairman of Dade County, Fla. Obviously, JOHNSON was using all the trickery to force Senators into line that he developed in the opening days of Congress to save his version of filibuster rule 22.

Butler hit back and continued the fight in a reply letter to Senator GREEN proving his charges by reference to housing legislation, civil rights, and other issues.

Much more is involved than an inner party struggle of personalities.

The Dixiecrats realize there has been a growing movement to free the Democratic Party of their arrogant racist domination exercised in Congress through the seniority system and their coalition with the McCarthyite Republicans. Butler's statement is also apparently directed to break up that coalition.

It likewise has major importance in preparation for the 1960 convention and elections as to issues and candidates. It makes clear that the record of Congress is decisive in the 1960 elections. Butler and others held that only a progressive legislative record can help the Democrats win and that the bipartisan conservative and moderation program of JOHNSON-RAYBURN and company plays into the hands of the Republicans and gives the present leadership to Eisenhower.

The danger signal in the present internal struggle is the silence of labor and the liberals. At other stages also, when Senators JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania; WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin; and PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan, spoke up against JOHNSON's one-man autocratic rule, too many liberals and labor forces remained too much on the sidelines.

Labor and the liberals could well have taken the Butler statement and the earlier declarations of CLARK and PROXMIRE as occasions to make demands on Congress and the Democrats and win victories on specific issues. But they allowed the Dixiecrats with JOHNSON and RAYBURN to hold the initiative.

The Dixiecrats take full advantage of the division in labor's ranks and push their own program. The Byrds and the Eastlands seek to impose their program on the entire Democratic Party.

While doing this job inside of Congress with their Republican coalition and their position of power on committees, they have also had laws passed in Southern States which seek to make a shambles of popular elections by maneuvering the electoral college into an instrument for their own ends. Six States have passed laws which give their delegates to the electoral college the right to vote as they please regardless of popular vote or party candidates.

That Senators THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN or STEPHEN YOUNG did not rise to denounce this Dixiecrat trickery to rob the 1960 election instead of slapping at Butler is shameful.

The Dixiecrats intend to use the threat of a vote as they please in the electoral college to dictate candidate choice and platform at the 1960 convention. With this device, they intend to keep the nominal status as Democrats to hold their position of power in congressional committees.

That is the plot against popular elections which is one of the underlying factors in the present fight of Butler versus the JOHNSON-RAYBURN Dixiecrats. Labor, the Negro people, and the liberals have big stakes in that struggle. This Butler fight is part of the debate on candidates and platform developing in every State. It is part of the internal struggle raging inside the Democratic Party in every city and election district. The issues and stakes involved as well as the laws of the Southern States and the role of the Dixiecrats in the Congress and in their States makes this fight a major public issue. It is no longer a private affair of the Democrats.

Home Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include extraneous matter, I am submitting the text of a resolution passed by the Connecticut General Assembly endorsing home rule for the District of Columbia. This memorial is an indication of the sentiment of the people of Connecticut.

The Senate has already passed a home rule bill in this session. I am in hopes that we of the House will be given the opportunity to consider this question.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 201

Resolution memorializing Congress concerning home rule for the District of Columbia

(Adopted by the Connecticut General Assembly May 28, 1959)

Resolved by this Assembly:

Whereas there are 826,000 Federal taxpaying residents in the District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital, who have long lacked any voice in the government of the District of Columbia in which they live; and

Whereas the taxpaying residents of the District of Columbia are without even a voteless delegate to represent them in the halls of Congress; and

Whereas the United States Senate has, during the last decade, four times passed legislation granting home rule to the residents of the District of Columbia; and

Whereas such legislation has four times been killed in the District of Columbia Committee and the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas it is a matter of grave injustice to deny American citizens the right even to govern themselves as to matters of local interest, and particularly so when they are obliged to bear the costs of such government: Be it

Resolved, That this assembly favors legislation to grant home rule to the District of Columbia; and be it further

Resolved, That this body urges the members of the Connecticut delegation in the House of Representatives of the United States to sign a discharge petition to bring a bill granting home rule to the District of Columbia onto the floor of the House of Representatives in the event that such a bill is again approved by the Senate and bottled up in either the District of Columbia Committee or the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerks of the house and senate are directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from Connecticut in the Congress of the United States.

ELLA GRASSO,
Secretary of State.
FRANK J. MONCHUN,
Senate Clerk.
ROBERT J. SULLIVAN,
House Clerk.

Save the Mustangs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, I submit an editorial appearing in the Bristol Press of Bristol, Conn., entitled "Save the Mustangs."

The editorial follows:

[From the Bristol (Conn.) Press, July 16, 1959]

SAVE THE MUSTANGS

Congressman WALTER S. BARING, Nevada, Democrat, has introduced a bill into Congress which would halt the mechanized wild horse roundups which threaten some 20,000 remaining mustangs with extinction. But if passage is too long delayed, it may be too late. The speed with which the mechanized gangs are rounding up the mustangs indicates that they will capture all that they can before any law prohibiting this type of cruelty can become effective.

Under the Baring measure, hunters could not use trucks or planes to catch burros on public lands and take them to slaughter without using even the smallest humane tactics.

Baring, who gave the description of the mechanized roundup in a recent interview, said that once in his State there were 70,000 wild mustangs but the number has now been reduced to 5,000. He said that his bill is aimed at saving the mustangs from extinction and at the same time securing humane treatment for those who are captured for sale as horsemeat.

The Society for Animal Protective Legislation has taken up the cudgels for the Baring bill and is circulating Members of the Congress as well as newspaper editors and others to familiarize them with the practice of mechanized roundups. Their circular contains vivid pictures of the actual procedures to which the beasts are subjected. Planes sweeping overhead scare the mustangs out of their mountain hideouts onto the plains where they are roped by experts riding in speeding trucks whose lassos are tied to heavy tires which eventually anchor the burros until they are picked up and loaded to the slaughter houses.

It is a cold-hearted business proposition for these ropers who are simply interested in making all they can with no thought of the animal's condition. No care is taken of the beasts who are being taken to slaughter.

We believe that the situation is serious enough to warrant the passage of this humane measure and that our representatives in Congress should be urged to support the Baring measure. It might also be noted that time is of the essence in this matter.

Cuba and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Thursday, July 23, 1959:

CUBA AND COMMUNISM

(By Walter Lippmann)

Shortly after Dr. Castro brought his revolution to power in Cuba, the Governor of Puerto Rico, Mr. Muñoz-Marin, came up to Washington. He came to give us advice which he was preeminently qualified to do. For he had been carrying through successfully a peaceful revolution in his own country, he had the personal confidence of the Cuban revolutionists, and he was and is our very great friend.

Even then, at the beginning, he foresaw the troubles in Cuba, the stubborn difficulties against which the revolution was waged and which it then inherited, the inexperience and the emotional instability of its fighting leaders.

Whatever you do, he said in effect, do not let yourselves become enemies of this revolution. For this revolution is the real thing. It is not a mere change of the guard at the top as is so common in Latin America. This is a popular revolution of the sort which, more than 30 years ago, Mexico went through, and after years of blood and tears brought to a happy ending.

It requires great skill to manage our relations with a revolution of this character in a country which is such a very near neighbor. We have to find ways of reconciling our political and economic interests with a revolution which cannot be stabilized until the chief grievances which produced the revolution has been redressed. This can be managed only if the American Ambassador in Havana can work out a relationship with the revolutionary leaders in which they will listen to him, and even seek his advice and his help.

There is a good reason to say that we have such an Ambassador in Havana, one who is capable of carrying out such a delicate mission, who has, one might say, "good hands" when he rides. But of course he has no chance whatever of succeeding if Congress is going to roughhouse our relations with Cuba, as did the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate just the other day. This was when it provided a platform and loudspeakers for a disaffected Cuban adventurer to denounce the Cuban revolutionists as Communists. This country, as the President was quick to point out, "has made no such charges." But the damage done by the subcommittee's irresponsible meddling may not be repaired easily or quickly.

The policy which we are following in Cuba is to avoid a break with Dr. Castro and to seek more contact with him. This policy is the product of years of experience in our relations with the other American states. There is no alternative to it, given the fact that we have most solemnly renounced the right of intervention to suppress a revolution. In this century, we have committed ourselves repeatedly and wholly to the principle that each country in this hemisphere has the right of self-determination. This carries with it inseparably the right of revolution, and imposes upon us the obligation to live with the revolutions, when they occur, as best we can.

Beneath these large generalizations and abstractions, there is the substantial fact that in this century, which is seeing the awakening of the submerged masses of mankind, the old style of imperialism and overlordship is not only morally unacceptable but is practically impossible. To put it specifically and bluntly, the United States could not install a puppet to govern Cuba in place of Dr. Castro and his revolutionists. The United States must, therefore, do what it can to keep on good terms with Dr. Castro and his successors.

There are those who think differently. They see Dr. Castro going far to the left in the company of a number of fellow travelers of the Communists. They think the way to deal with what they see is to denounce Dr. Castro who tolerates and associates with fellow travelers as himself a fellow traveler and virtually a Communist. What good will it do, I would like to know. The result of such tactics will not be to cause Dr. Castro and the fellow travelers to abandon their revolutionary program. It will be to cause them to regard us as their enemy, and to become as thoroughly anti-American as they dare to be.

The wiser course and the more practical one is to be patient and relaxed—to remember that Cuba is our nearest neighbor and is far beyond the reach of the Soviet Union. Remembering this, we can rely ultimately on the high improbability that Cuba will drift or be pushed and pulled into the Soviet orbit.

Just as it was a great mistake to treat Egypt under Colonel Nasser as a Soviet satellite, so it would be an even greater mistake even to intimate that Castro's Cuba has any real prospect of becoming a Soviet satellite.

For the thing we should never do in dealing with the revolutionary countries in which the world abounds is to push them behind an iron curtain raised by ourselves. On the contrary, even when they have been seduced and subverted and are drawn across the line, the right thing to do is to keep the way open for their return.

Cross Country With the On-to-Oregon Cavalcade—X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following story from the July 9, 1959, issue of the Drain (Oreg.) Enterprise which contains the 10th chapter of a series by Robert

(Rudy) Roudebaugh, concerning the cross-country trek. The wagon train was in Idaho while this was written:

RUDY LOCKED IN JAIL WHEN WAGONS STOP IN IDAHO TOWN

(By Rudy Roudebaugh, driver of Drain Covered Wagon now traveling in Idaho)

Sunday, June 28: Mr. and Mrs. Andy Curtright and sons Frank and Ronnie of Yoncalla were here to visit the wagon train. Also Billy Alsup and family of Yoncalla. A few people from Utah, but more from Washington and Oregon than Montana are visiting the wagon train. Janell went to Vicki Jensen's ranch and stayed all day. Ki and I stayed with wagons and passed out the letters from the Drain mayor. We had church sunrise services at 5.

June 29, 5:55: All hooked up and ready to roll, but waiting on Roy Brabham again. The weather is cloudy and cold. Ki and Janell are in bed. They didn't feel too sharp this morning. Must have been something they ate. 6:22: Going west on big, wide oil highway.

I notice after Mr. Blair left the wagon cavalcade for his home at Sheridan, Oreg., they are leading the team he was driving. Dic and Jim are walking right out this morning. 6:55: The valley here is getting narrow. 7:17: Entering Bennington; just a small town. The road is narrowing. 8:12: In rolling country. 8:49: Entering Georgetown, population 404. There wasn't many people out to see us—mostly children. 9:13: Going up a canyon. 9:38: It's starting to rain. 9:57: Stopped to rest. Been pulling a steep hill. 10:10: The elevation now 6,283. 11:13: Stopping for camp.

We were invited out to dinner by the chamber of commerce, and the Daughters of the Utah Pioneers of Camp Meade arranged the whole thing. They also took us to see Soda Springs and Hooper Park and famous captive geyser. We are 9 miles out of Soda Springs, but they came out and picked us up in cars and even hauled us firewood.

June 30, 6:01: We are heading west on Highway 30. 6:29: Leaving Bear Lake County and entering Caribou County. There is snow on the high peaks and it froze last night. Chilly in the morning. This is wheat country. Mrs. Walker (first ranch on our left) served us two plates of hot biscuits for breakfast. 8:27: Soda Springs, population 2,600. Ben and I went to the bathroom in the jail and were locked in. Have been in town 20 minutes and gave out about 250 letters from the mayor. 12:03: Leaving Soda Springs, which is a pretty place. Reminded me of Oregon with all the green grass and trees. 10:25: We're back in the sagebrush on a lava road. Arrived at camp at 10:27. We are parked right under the Great Divide where the water runs southeast into the Great Salt Lake and northwest into the Columbia Basin. We are 5 miles from Grace, Idaho. Sandals were brought to us by the Lowe Drug Store in Grace.

July 1, 5:45: All hooked up and ready to go. The sun is out bright, but the temperature is cool. 5:59: Heading up Fish Creek Road. 6:59: Passing by Central Market way out here in the sticks. Jean Marshal slept in our wagon with Janell last night. We are going through a valley that grows a lot of wheat. 8:24: Passing Lund's Post Office—that's all that is here. 8:40: Stopped to rest on a hill, the steepest we've seen since we been on the trip. 9:44: On top of Fish Divide. 9:48: Just got off the hill and we had to block our wheels to get down: 10:31: Going up a canyon. 10:51: Crossed the Partneuf River and pulling onto Highway 30. 11:16: Arrived in camp at Lava Hot Springs rodeo grounds. I greased my wagons this evening. We had free baths at the spa pool. The chamber brought dinner out to us. Ki is on cook shift again."

July 2, 6 a.m.: Waiting on Roy again this morning. There are a few clouds in the sky. 6:05: Going west on gravel road. They have begun to hay in this narrow valley. The hills are rocky with few small trees growing in the canyons. 6:43: We are pulling on highway 30.

We passed a grandma walking and she stopped to watch us go by. I asked her to ride with us, but she declined. 7:26: Crossed over Porteuf River. 7:32: Going down a canyon. Ki is on cook shift again today. 8:29: Turned off highway to gravel road. 8:46: Going through McCannon. 9:08: We are in sagebrush country again with cactus all in red blossoms. 9:20: Crossed Marsh Creek. 9:45: Going along foothills above Marsh Creek. 11:23: Camped on the Jack Stanley ranch along Marsh Creek.

July 3, 5:50: All hooked up and ready to go. The weather is cloudy and warm. We had a little thunderstorm last night with a shower. 5:58: Here we go. Doc and Jan are doing better each day. 6:45: We are going through Portneuf. Their main industry is cement. They have a large plant. 7:30: Going up a valley about a mile wide along the foothills. Sagebrush on the hillside and hay fields on the other side. It is lightning and thundering like h—. Boy. The rain is here. Doc and Jan are acting up. I guess they don't care for this sort of thing. Ki doesn't either. Janell is asleep so nothing is bothering her. 8:10: We are parked on Highway 30 a quarter of a mile away is the Portneuf River. The sun is coming out. 9:25: The first escort has come out to meet us. The president and some of the officers of the chamber of commerce are out here to come in with us. They are wearing beautiful Indian chief feathers and carrying a peacepipe. They came to our camp last night and gave us gifts from all the business places in Pocatello. Everything you can think of was in the gifts. Also eight watermelons.

We will be here over the 4th and have every minute planned to entertain us. Free laundry, meals, sewing machines, irons, ironing boards, baths, etc. 9:55: Entering Pocatello. 10:58: Went by a home and they came out with ice cold lemonade and cookies. 11:20: Arrived at camp at the fairgrounds. It is pretty here. Lots of trees and shade.

We just got here when Ed Duncan, son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard Duncan of Drain, came up to the wagons. It was sure nice to see someone that at least used to be from Drain. They furnished us with cars here to use until we left. Ed Duncan and family seen to it we didn't need one. They put off crowning the rodeo queen until the wagon train pioneers got there. This evening they put on a small rodeo for us. Mr. and Mrs. Wayne Hutchinson and family of Drain were here today. Also Heb Cogner from Cottage Grove.

July 4, 10: We went over to Ed's for lunch. They have a beautiful new home. They moved in 2 months ago. He picked onions and radishes out of his garden for lunch. The corn isn't quite ready yet. They put in their lawn 3 weeks ago and it is up and looks good. Ed said he had to water often as the sun drys the ground out fast. We had a ham dinner. It seemed good to relax in a home again.

This evening we went to a banquet at the Green Triangle, and then back to the fairgrounds for fireworks. We ended our evening going out to Ed's and visiting and drinking coffee. He has a wonderful family, three children and a lovely wife. He wants us to tell everyone in Drain "Hello" especially his parents and brothers and sisters.

Emma Lazarus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the East Side News of July 17, 1959, commemorating the birthday of Emma Lazarus, authoress of the sonnet inscribed on the base of the Statue of Liberty:

EMMA LAZARUS: 1849–87

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Wednesday, July 22, we commemorate the 110th anniversary of the birth of Emma Lazarus, the beloved American poetess. Children of liberty will clasp her hand in loving memory.

Emma Lazarus is the author of the inspiring sonnet, "The New Colossus." Her message to the world, all the world may read. It is engraved on the Statue of Liberty. It is standing in the gateway of democracy.

The noble soul and human heart of Emma Lazarus are symbolized in the Goddess of Liberty. It was given to a child of oppressed generations to understand the true meaning of this liberty-loving nation; to pen the immortal lines with such prophetic pathos; to express the spirit of democracy with such eloquence; to welcome the persecuted of the Old World, to the glorious promise of the New World.

And through the years we can hear the echo of Miss Liberty's voice speaking to these pilgrims to our blessed land: As you breathe the free air of our shore homeless wanderer, reaching home, become one with us in freedom's cause, take the riches of our liberties and repay the gift of becoming one with us—an American.

The Goddess of Liberty and Emma Lazarus have become synonymous. No poet of any nation has ever received such worldwide distinction. The "Lady With the Torch" was presented by the people of France to the American people to commemorate the first centennial of American independence.

Emma Lazarus was born on July 22, 1849, in New York City. She was the daughter of an old Jewish family. The story of her literary evolution is the story of the fulfillment of the evolution of a soul. Many women of every race, many men of every race, have evinced literary ability.

But it is rarely given to man or woman to so combine the powerful poetic expression with the clear insight and courage, with the conviction and devotion, as it was in Emma Lazarus. Her poems had power. Her poems had fire.

Since Miriam sang of deliverance and the triumph of the Red Sea, the Jewish race has had no braver singer. Her songs of divine unity repeated on the lips of her own people, in all zones and continents, have been heard round the civilized world.

Her poem, "The Crowing of the Red Cock," written when the Russian sky was red with blazing hatred, is a powerful lyric worthy of the Maccabean age. Her poem, "Banner of the Jew," has the ring of Israel's war trumpet. It sounded the clarion call to all Jews to unite for human rights, for new achievements and for new glories as in the days of the Maccabees.

She was one of the pioneers of Zionism. She was one of the outstanding advocates of a Jewish homeland. It was in that cause

that her character had its fullest flowering.

It is heartening to see that the same poetess who was the first to give expression for the national renaissance of her people has become the symbol of humanity and democracy. She died on November 19, 1887. She was in her 38th year.

On that tragic day no better appreciation of Emma Lazarus was expressed than that of the famous American poet John Greenleaf Whittier who wrote: "Her people will mourn the death of this woman. But they will not be alone. At her grave the tears of the daughters of Jerusalem will mingle with those of the Christians."

As long as liberty shall live in the human heart, as long as the Statue of Liberty shall remain our symbol of freedom, the name of Emma Lazarus will forever be a part of the fame of that symbol as the champion of liberty.

THE NEW COLOSSUS

Not like the brazen giant of Greek fame,
With conquering limbs astride from land to land;
Here at our sea-washed, sunset gates shall stand
A mighty woman with a torch whose flame
Is imprisoned lightning, and her name
Mother of Exiles. From her beacon hand
Glows worldwide welcome; her mild eyes command
The air-bridged harbor that twin cities frame.
"Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp," cries she
With silent lips. "Give me your tired, your poor
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Health and Hospitalization Program for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the important subject of a health and hospitalization program for Federal employees is now under consideration by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, my statement to the committee on July 21, 1959.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Post Office an Civil Service, your committee is considering legislation relating to a health and hospitalization program for Federal employees. Among the bills before you is my H.R. 2326, to provide for Government contribution toward personal health service benefits for civilian officers and employees in the U.S. service and their dependents, to authorize payroll deductions for participants, and for other purposes.

I am pleased that your committee has scheduled action on this long-overdue program for assistance to our Federal employees. We know that employees in the Federal service have always been underpaid; their salaries have never equalled salaries paid by private employers for comparable work; the small pay raises granted Federal workers have never been commensurate with ever-rising living costs, and at this point, living expenses have reached a new high.

Our Federal workers, with families to support or other dependents for whom they must provide, find it barely possible to meet their financial obligations; high living costs plus high taxes prevent saving for the proverbial rainy day or the day when a Federal employee or his dependents suffer a serious illness. A critical illness requiring protracted hospitalization, surgery, costly hospital facilities and medicines, nursing care, doctors' fees, not only wipes out any little savings a low- or middle-income employee may have accumulated through great personal sacrifices over a period of years but also throws him into debt for years to come. Such a burden becomes intolerable, such worry must lower the morale and efficiency of any human being. The cost of personal health service insurance is prohibitive to the millions of Federal employees in the low or middle salary brackets, when procured on an individual basis.

The well-being and efficiency of our Federal employees must be considered and preserved if we wish to keep our Government offices and other installations operating at the peak of accomplishment and effectuality. Large private employers have for many years helped their employees to obtain benefits which this legislation would now provide for Federal employees. To refuse to give this assistance to our Federal employees is to withhold reasonable and sound protection against the high costs of illness. Surely the Federal Government owes to its employees the same consideration which private industry, on the whole, has found it possible to extend to its workers. The legislation before you provides the needed and necessary protection at a cost which employees and the Government can afford.

I urge your committee to take favorable action so that our Federal employees may be accorded this sorely needed assistance.

Nixon's Trip to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion on the trip of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON to Russia.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent editorial which appeared in the New York Daily News on the subject. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

NIXON'S TRIP TO RUSSIA

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's trip to Soviet Russia (he's due in Moscow this morning) can have almost any number of important effects and repercussions.

For one thing, the trip can profoundly affect Mr. NIXON's own political future—his chance of landing the 1960 Republican Presidential nomination and, if he gets that, of winning the Presidency.

The trip, too, may swell the already sizable stream of U.S. socialites visiting Russia—through passeth our understanding that any American should want to inhabit Russia's dowdy hotels and consume stodgy Russian food after fuming and hour or two before the waiter brings it.

Most importantly, the Nixon trip can affect the Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers, which shows signs of collapse.

The Big Four powers (United States, Britain, France, Russia) have wrangled for weeks over N. S. Khrushchev's demand that the Western Allies pull out of West Berlin, which is 110 miles deep in East Germany.

TWO PROPOSALS ABOUT GERMANY

The dispute has boiled down to two proposals.

Our side wants a Big Four Commission set up, with West and East German advisers, to study reunification of Germany. The Kremlin proposes an all-German committee to work on German reunification, with Western allied rights in West Berlin undisturbed for 18 months.

The Russian scheme is one to bulldoze all Germany into the Red slave empire. Consent to it, and we'll lose probably the decisive battle of the entire cold war.

Fortunately, as we see it, President Eisenhower goes on voicing determination never to let the Western allies be pushed out of West Berlin without a fight—a first-class nuclear fight, we gather, if it comes to that. Standing firmly with the President are France and West Germany, and, at least outwardly in the last few days, Britain.

Vice President NIXON's scheduled talks with Khrushchev may conceivably help to ease the West Berlin situation.

NIXON is not authorized to make any deals with Khrushchev. But should the latter come up with concrete suggestions regarding the cold war, NIXON is to report them at once to the President, who will mastermind the next moves.

IF KHRUSHCHEV SEES THE LIGHT

Our sub-Chief Executive is a man of proved courage and political "savvy." It may be that he can convince the Red czar that the United States will not be pushed around, and is no more afraid of Soviet Russia and Red China than it was of Hitler Germany and Tojo Japan.

Should those facts penetrate Khrushchev's brain, he may well "crawfish" as most gangsters do when called.

For our part, we hope Mr. NIXON will go even further in his talks with Khrushchev. We hope he will grab the offensive for the West in the cold war.

At a Warsaw news conference Tuesday evening, Khrushchev screeched and screamed about the current Captive Nations Week in the United States, as proclaimed by the President with congressional approval, to remind Americans that nine nations plus East Germany are still slaves of Soviet Russia.

ASK "KHRUSHY" ABOUT THE SLAVE NATIONS

Khrushchev's bellow was enlarged upon in a three-column article yesterday in Pravda, most important of the Russian-kept newspapers. Pravda claimed to be outraged that anybody should think people living under communism are slaves—which is exactly what all such people except the Communist bosses are.

This incident, it seems to us, points up again what many observers say: that what worries the Kremlin most in this group of restless and resentful slave nations.

The West's best single cold-war bet, say these same observers, is to agitate and propagandize in every feasible way for the liberation of the slave nations, thereby keeping the Kremlin worried and off balance.

If Mr. NIXON will hammer on this point as he talks with Khrushchev, we believe his doing so can be utilized as the opening barrage in a Western cold-war offensive which can get real results if pressed without letup.

A Sorry Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from todays New York Times.

EISENHOWER GIVES WHEAT VOTE VIEW—SAYS FARMERS HAVE "SORRY CHOICE" IN REFERENDUM ON CONTROLS TODAY

WASHINGTON, July 22.—President Eisenhower said today "it's a sorry choice" wheat growers have to make tomorrow in voting on continuance of Federal production controls for the 1960 crop.

The President made the comment when asked at his news conference if he had any advice for the growers on the eve of their annual referendum.

The President replied that the wheat farmers had faced a hard choice because Congress had failed to pass what he regarded as satisfactory farm legislation.

"So," he said, "they have now the choice between taking the program as it is now, which last year piled up again these tremendous surpluses. The other alternative they have is no program at all.

"'SORRY CHOICE' IS SEEN

"So I think, because of the failure to have something they could vote on that was a little bit more meaningful, it's a sorry choice they have to make."

Earlier, the President listed "a recent farm bill" as one of the major things he hoped Congress would vote for before it adjourned.

The Democratic-controlled Congress passed a bill—which was vetoed—that would have reduced wheat planting allotments and raised price supports. The administration wants instead to move in the direction of lower supports and fewer controls.

Agriculture Department officials predicted a light vote in its referendum in 39 producing States tomorrow.

More than 900,000 growers are eligiole to vote. But seldom in past referendums on the same question have more than a fourth of those eligible cast ballots.

NEVER HAVE BEEN REJECTED

Never have controls on wheat been rejected.

The specific question to which growers must mark "Yes" or "No" on secret ballots is: Do you favor Federal marketing quotas on the 1960 wheat crop?

At least two-thirds of those voting must approve for them to be in effect.

Last year the vote was 84 percent for quotas on this year's crop.

Generally speaking, quotas limit penalty-free sales to the quantity of wheat grown on each farm's share of a 55-million-acre national planting allotment. If quotas are approved, the crop will be supported at $1.77 a bushel, compared with $1.81 this year.

Rejection of quotas would drop supports to $1.18. Supports would be limited, however, to growers who stayed within their planting allotments.

The present program has been criticized by farm leaders in and out of Congress because it has not prevented the accumulation of a record large surplus. Under the law, the national allotment cannot be cut below 55 million acres.

Seaway Progress and Prospects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway—already fulfilling its promises of increasing traffic into the Great Lakes region—holds even brighter prospects for the future.

Once dubbed an "impossible task," the seaway has become a reality, through the combined efforts of men and machine to transform the "big ditch" into a modern waterway, utilizable by 90 percent of the deep-sea shipping of the world.

Once-rampant, untamed waters of the mighty St. Lawrence River are now effectively controlled and harnessed to carry—and lift and lower, through a tremendously complex lock system—millions of tons of shipping annually. The gigantic hydroelectric powerplants of the waterway, too, will turn out millions of kilowatts of electricity to provide power and light for homes and farms, and job-creating businesses and industries.

Overall, the great waterway will provide new economic opportunity, not only for the resourcefully rich, highly populated Great Lakes region, but also for the whole Nation and our good neighbor, Canada.

Recently the Trade Union Courier published a special seaway supplement edition. Among the fine articles in this publication was a particular one entitled "Seaway Progress and Prospects," by Lewis G. Castle, administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Trade Union Courier, July 17, 1959]

SEAWAY PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS

(By Lewis G. Castle)

The basic purpose of the seaway is that of providing a waterway of 27-foot depth between the Great Lakes and Montreal which can be navigated by vessels having up to 9 or 10 times the capacity of ships that are now accommodated in the existing 14-foot canal system along the upper St. Lawrence River. By the time the project is completed, there will have been excavated a total of about 112 million cubic yards in the construction of new channels and deepening or improvement of existing channels. Approximately 3 million cubic yards of concrete will have been placed, chiefly in the construction of seven new locks which will raise or lower large vessels by a total of 226 feet between Lake Ontario and Montreal. Each of these locks will have a usable length of about 768 feet and a width of 80 feet.

Extensive dikes have been erected in various areas and numerous aids to navigation are being installed. Substantial bridge construction has been required to provide crossings which will have a clearance of 120 feet above the seaway. Included in this construction is a new high-level suspension bridge having a length of almost a mile between Rooseveltown, N.Y., and Cornwall Island on the Canadian side of the boundary.

Two tunnels for highway traffic have also been incorporated in the project. One of these tunnels is contained in the Eisenhower lock; the other passes under the seaway channel near the Beauharnois locks in the Canadian portion of the project. There are other interesting items of construction too numerous to mention on this occasion. All in all, the project as a whole will be an outstanding example not only of technical skill and ingenuity in overcoming great natural barriers, but also of the ability of two nations to work together in carrying out a monumental undertaking for the benefit of their own countries and world trade.

Fundamentally, the seaway will permit the shipping of a far greater volume of freight more expeditiously and more cheaply between the Great Lakes and ports on the lower St. Lawrence River and overseas, than is now possible within the limitations of the shallow St. Lawrence canal system which is being superseded by the new modernized seaway facilities. That canal system was developed to its present form and dimensions about a half-century ago. Its freight traffic recently reached an annual volume of approximately 13 million tons, which represents a marked growth in the course of a decade, and there is no doubt that this volume would have been much greater if there had been sufficient capacity to accommodate somewhat larger ships.

The old canal system has a controlling depth of 14 feet and contains 21 locks which can accommodate vessels having a length of not more than 253 feet or beam not exceeding 44 feet. These limitations have resulted in the development of the so-called canaller type of vessel having a deadweight capacity of something less than 3,000 tons. Seagoing vessels of the general cargo type can transit with about 1,500 tons.

In contrast, the seaway locks will accommodate ships having lengths up to 730 feet and beams up to 74 feet. As a result, large lakers having a deadweight of over 25,000 tons will be able to navigate between the Great Lakes and the lower St. Lawrence River all the way down to Seven Islands in Labrador. Ocean vessels carrying general cargo will be accommodated in sizes ranging up to about 9,000 tons deadweight, in services between the Great Lakes and overseas destinations.

As is well known, the larger the cargo capacity of vessel, the smaller the operating cost per ton of capacity. The much larger vessels which can be accommodated in seaway facilities will not only have lower ship operating costs per ton of capacity, but will permit savings in transportation costs through the elimination of the expense incurred in the transshipment of cargo to small canallers that is now involved in the movement of a considerable tonnage of freight to and from the Great Lakes.

As a bonus, further savings will accrue to shippers through the elimination of the risks of damages to merchandise or weight losses or deterioration which are inherent to varying degrees in the transshipment of many kinds of cargo. Additional economies in transportation costs will be possible as a result of the faster transiting of ships through the seaway facilities. As compared with 21 locks in the present St. Lawrence canal system, the seaway will have only 7 locks between Montreal and Lake Ontario.

The old maxim that "time is money" is very applicable in the operation of ships, and the reduction in lockages on the St. Lawrence River as well as other improvements will by themselves result in savings ranging to more than $1,000 per vessel per trip in terms of ships' time, depending upon the size of a vessel.

Altogether, the seaway will have possibilities for substantial dollar savings in annual transportation costs. In fact, the economies in transportation costs made possible through the use of the seaway will be even more impressive in view of the increase in general price levels and transportation costs that have taken place since 1953.

We are aware, of course, that an initial period of traffic development will be required to build up cargo volume, but we shall not be starting from scratch. During the development period, amortization of indebtedness can be deferred with a consequent book deficit, that will be made up as traffic develops. There will be no out-of-pocket deficit unless some entirely unforeseeable contingency should intervene.

With regard to construction costs, there has, of course, been a considerable increase in price levels in the several years which elapsed between the preparation of original cost estimates and the different times at which contracts were actually placed for various stages of work and equipment. Another factor to be considered with respect to costs is that the seaway project is intended to be a modern waterway which will permit the expeditious handling of ships, rather than merely providing minimum facilities to meet the bare requirements of navigation. In this conection we have coordinated our plans with those of our Canadian counterpart.

For example, our two locks, and the five locks of our Canadian counterpart, have guide walls at lock entrances which are 1,650 feet in length in order to permit the tieup of several vessels while awaiting their turn to pass through a lock. If we had reduced the length of the guide walls of our locks to save costs, our portion of the seaway would at times be a source of inconvenience to waiting vessels and would slow up seaway traffic. We also found it advisable to add a training dike to our project for the elimination of currents which are not desirable from the standpoint of navigation. Likewise, no provision had been made for navigation aids in the original cost estimates.

Our dredging costs have been increased in consequence of channel improvements and excavations made in excess of minimum requirements, in order to provide a waterway having better characteristics for navigation purposes than was originally contemplated. Also, we have had to keep in mind the development of increased lengths and beams of vessels built in recent years, particularly on the Great Lakes.

Other additional cost factors might be mentioned, including the obvious necessity of replacing the existing narrow roads with modern highways, to carry a large volume of traffic on approaches to bridges and other facilities included in the seaway project.

In any project having the magnitude and complexities of the seaway, there would inevitably be problems that arise as the work progresses and I am glad to pay tribute to the splendid job which has been performed by the Corps of Engineers as our construction agent.

In the long run, the improved features of the project will pay off in terms of increased traffic capacity and reduced ship operating expenses. Our latest estimate of the cost of constructing United States and Canadian portions of the seaway is on the order of $450 million and we estimate that the average of annual expenses, amortization of debt and interest for both countries will be less than $26 million. Keep in mind that this investment is not a taxpayer's burden. Toll revenues will retire the total cost advanced by both the Canadian and United States Governments.

Engineeringwise the construction of the seaway and power projects has been coordinated, but they are separate undertakings in all respects. The power project is a joint undertaking of the Power Authority of the State of New York and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario. The seaway is, of course, a project of the Federal Governments of the United States and Canada, which was authorized by legislation of each country charging their respective entities, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation and the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada, with responsibility for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the seaway works in their respective territories.

It appears that some people are under the impression that the seaway project also embraces the deepening of the connecting channels between the Great Lakes above Lake Erie to a depth of 27 feet. Such is not the case. The deepening of the connecting channels above Lake Erie is a separate program which is being carried out by the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army with public funds appropriated by Congress.

In the course of the next 6 weeks a major portion of the U.S. section of the seaway and a part of the Canadian facilities will be opened to 14-foot shipping through the area known as the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. This will be necessary because the raising of the water pool of the St. Lawrence power project will flood out the present St. Lawrence Canal system west of Cornwall, Ontario.

The opening of the seaway for deep draft navigation at a controlling depth of 27 feet throughout its entire length will take place next April. That event will inevitably contribute to the changing of transportation patterns and the stimulation of the economy of large areas in the United States and Canada. The forerunners of these developments are already becoming evident in current programs for the construction of port facilities, industrial plants and ships involving an aggregate expenditure of well over $100 million as a direct or partial result of the prospective availability of the seaway.

This is a good beginning but it is still only an entering wedge in opening the door to the opportunities which can be developed from the use of the seaway if proper initiative is exerted.

In the extensive discussions of the seaway project over many years, there have been differences of opinion regarding the various possibilities of the project, but in general those differences have not been due to doubts that the seaway would have a stimulating effect upon the economy of the Great Lakes Basin and adjacent areas. What has been questioned has been the extent to which the potentialities of the seaway route could be, and would be developed in the light of facilities and conditions on the Great Lakes, especially with respect to oversea trade.

Let us examine factors which should be considered in this connection:

The stimulating effect of low-cost water transportation on commerce has been vividly demonstrated in recent years by the growth of traffic on our inland waterways. That traffic increased from 9 billion ton-miles in 1931 to 109 billion ton-miles in 1956, exclusive of traffic on the Great Lakes.

This represents a 12-fold increase in a period of 25 years. Major waterways in other parts of the world have also had a large increase in cargo movements. Freight traffic on the Manchester Canal in England tripled between 1946 and 1956. Cargo shipped through the Panama Canal increased from 5 million tons in 1915 to 50 million tons in 1957.

In the case of the Suez Canal, the registered tonnage of ships transiting the canal is the only comprehensive index of traffic that is available. Between the first year of Suez operations in 1870 and 1955, the last year of full operations before the Egyptian takeover, the net registered tonnage of shipping through the canal rose from a half-million tons to almost 116 million tons.

Certainly the seaway will provide improved water transport facilities for the Great Lakes Basin, which has economic potentialities as great and as diversified as those served by any major waterway elsewhere. Almost half of the total of U.S. exports of nonagricultural products to oversea destinations originate in that area. And that area is also productive of much of the agricultural exports from this country. On the Canadian side of the border the potentialities are probably even greater in relation to that country's economy.

The State of Michigan is a major part of this highly important region of domestic and foreign commerce. Not only does this State have a broad base of economic capacity for further expansion, but it is in an unusually favorable geographical position to benefit from water transportation.

With the exception of the southern boundaries of the State, Michigan has a Great Lakes water frontage on all its sides. It has the further advantage of having a shoreline on the channels which connect four of the Great Lakes. In these respects Michigan holds a unique position among the States on the Great Lakes. Detroit itself is in the strategic position of having a waterfront on the connecting channel through which an enormous volume of shipping passes between Lake Erie and the upper lakes.

The benefits which can be derived from these natural advantages will be enhanced by the opening of the seaway. In fact, foresighted enterprises are already developing their business in preparation of further expansion when the seaway facilities are in operation. Among the interesting examples is the direct exportation of agricultural products by the St. Lawrence route, which is being developed through the Port of Muskegon, Mich. Savings are also being achieved by the increasing shipment of industrial products over this route.

In the field of shipbuilding, a yard at Bay City has obtained Navy contracts of over $60 million for the construction of four warships which are to be delivered through the seaway. Another Michigan shipyard now has under construction a large cargo vessel of seaway dimensions. At this time we might also refer to the Dow Chemical Co., who will establish its own marine terminal on the Saginaw River.

I do not wish to convey the impression that the mere availability of the seaway will automatically result in a deluge of new business to this State and elsewhere on the Great Lakes. The extent to which the potentialities of the seaway are converted into realities will also depend to a large degree upon the facilities available at ports on the Great Lakes and other factors which affect traffic patterns. There are handicaps to be met in this connection but those conditions are not insurmountable.

For example, it has been said that the closing of navigation on the Great Lakes and upper St. Lawrence River during the winter would necessitate dual traffic arrangements for the off season with resultant inconvenience and expense if importers and exporters were to use the seaway route during the open navigation season.

In this connection I would invite your attention to the fact that the 8-month navigation season on the Great Lakes has not prevented a marked growth in imports and export shipments through the St. Lawrence gateway during recent years. For comparative purposes, it might be well on this occasion to note the development of oversea cargo traffic at the port of Toronto since we find many similarities between the economies of southern Ontario and Michigan.

As you know, Toronto is the center of a highly industrialized region having a widely diversified output of manufactured products, including automobiles, machinery, electrical merchandise, et cetera. It is of particular interest to note, therefore, that the volume of direct waterborne overseas cargo loaded and discharged at the port of Toronto rose to over 200,000 tons during 1957; a substantial increase over the quantity recorded in the preceding year.

Obivously, the exporters and importers of diversified products to and from Toronto have found it economical and efficient to use the St. Lawrence route regardless of the necessity of diverting some of their shipments to other routes during the season of closed navigation.

Of course, some firms on the Great Lakes which have in the past developed traffic patterns and arrangements for the distribution of their exports and imports at or through the seaboard may find it necessary to make some appreciable changes in order to route shipments via the seaway. We believe, however, that with relatively few exceptions there will be compensatory savings in the long run through the use of the seaway route.

It has also been argued that the ports on the Great Lakes will not have the shipping services and facilities or the labor and know-how required to handle a large volume of export and import shipments in an economical and expeditious manner.

Such an argument does not give adequate consideration to the fact that in 1957 there were already 373 regular line sailings on routes between the Great Lakes and Europe, Africa and the Caribbean. In addition, there were 40 sailings of so-called tramp ships. The opening of the seaway will stimulate the expansion and frequency of Great Lakes services to any parts of the world having an appreciable volume of trade with the Great Lakes region and its hinterland. Let me remind you in this connection that the Federal Maritime Board has already demonstrated that it is alert in the establishment of essential routes for the operation of American-flag shipping services between the Great Lakes and overseas ports through the seaway. Two such routes have already been designated.

As to the availability of waterfront services and the experience required for the handling of ocean ships and cargo, it has been alleged that the 8-month navigation season on the Great Lakes will adversely affect the retention of a sufficient supply of trained labor for the loading and discharging of seagoing vessels at ports on the lakes. It has also been asserted that the lack of year-round traffic will render it uneconomical to make the investment needed to provide the up-to-date equipment required for the expeditious handling of ocean ships and cargo at lake ports. These are generalities which convey a distorted impression of the Great Lakes situation as a whole.

Of course, there are some ports on the Great Lakes which are not yet equipped to handle all types of cargo, but there are also ports which have developed the facilities, equipment, labor and experience required to deal with the general run of cargo. They are expanding their facilities and equipment to meet foreseeable additional requirements on seaway traffic. No one has questioned the ability of the Great Lakes marine industry to handle bulk cargoes, nor has anyone questioned the ability of the Great Lakes ports to deal with the requirements of the increased shipments of general cargo. Enterprising communities have shown that they recognize the need of making reasonable preparations to enable their ports to obtain an equitable share of seaway traffic.

At this time may I make mention of a few names out of many who have contributed constructively and actively in port planning as well as stimulation and promotion of shipping trade in the port of Detroit: Carlis J. Stein, port director, and the members of the port commission, Tom Reed, Foster Winter, Mayor Miriani. They are entitled to high praise for their performance.

Navigation authorities are aware that shipping and traffic are attracted to ports which can handle vessels and cargo in the most expeditious and economical manner. They are also aware that the handling of ships and cargoes benefit not only waterfront interests, but also increase the business of the community as a whole. This is so well known by major ports on the seacoast that they devote considerable effort to the encouragement and retention of shipping traffic through their facilities.

There is still quite a bit to be done in order to be prepared for seaway traffic. But I have no doubt that the imagination, ingenuity and initiative which have brought Great Lakes shipping and the handling of bulk cargo to their present high level of efficiency will be capable of dealing with the problems of accommodating increased ocean traffic with equal efficiency. This is already being done at several ports on the Great Lakes.

The seaway is about to become an accomplished fact after a long struggle and the time has now come for positive and objective action by all, to reap the benefits of this new artery of water transportation. This will involve constructive consideration of the possibilities offered by the seaway route. Unless this is done, the inhibitions created by the habit of thinking in old established traffic patterns and arrahgements may well create blind spots that will result in "missing the boat" so far as seaway opportunities are concerned.

The challenge to all interests on the Great Lakes has been well expressed by a prominent shipbuilder who recently stated: "The expansion of marine interests in all phases that will undoubtedly take place is almost inconceivable to the imagination. How much expansion in additional business will be generated by Great Lakes shipyards will depend entirely on the initiative and imagination exerted by the personnel involved."

That statement is applicable to all forms of economic activity in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin and adjacent areas of the United States and Canada. In conclusion let me say, anyone who endeavors to predict the developments which will take place in the economy of this heartland of both countries runs the risk of underestimating rather than overestimating the possibilities. Let us not forget that the development of industry and commerce which has occurred in this region during recent years has gone far beyond the prognostications made only 10 years ago. The seaway will be an additional element in the bringing about of further economic expansion in the years to come.

Wheat Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, today an editorial entitled "Wheat Inflation" appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald. This editorial deserves the attention of every person in this great body. The editorial follows:

The country witnesses today another wheat referendum in which farmers will choose between disaster by route No. 1 and disaster by route No. 2. If they choose to continue the present program, which they are expected to do, the result is likely to be further excess production. The country already has nearly a 2-year supply of wheat on hand, and taxpayers have nearly $3.5 billion tied up in stored wheat.

If farmers should vote against continuation of the existing program, the national average support price would drop from $1.77 to $1.18 a bushel—a very drastic reduction. They would be relieved of penalties for planting in excess of their quotas but would still have to keep within quota limits to obtain the lowered price-support loans. The choice is thus a dismal one.

Three factors in the present law have contributed to its unfortunate consequences: It forbids the Secretary of Agriculture to cut the total acreage allotments below 55 million acres; it allows every farmer to grow up to 15 acres of wheat without penalty; and it will not let price supports be fixed at less than 75 percent of parity. The result has been to put a premium on overproduction at heavy cost to the taxpayers.

President Eisenhower again voiced hope at his news conference yesterday that Congress will pass legislation to relieve this most critical of the numerous farm problems. This hope must be shared by a vast majority of the wheat farmers and by an even larger percentage of the taxpayers who must pay the bill for the current folly.

Today is decision day for farmers growing wheat. Today there is being held the marketing quota referendum for the 1960 crop of wheat.

Many Members of this body probably are unaware that today is voting day for the wheat program. Probably few here realize that most wheat farmers are prohibited by existing law from expressing their opinions at the polls on what kind of a program they want.

Today 40 percent of the wheat farmers—the bigger ones—can vote in a referendum to decide whether there shall be wheat marketing quotas for the 1960 crop. But 60 percent of the farmers growing wheat—those who do not have allotments of more than 15 acres—are ineligible under existing law to vote. This is the only agricultural crop that discriminates against the small producer. This is made mandatory by the law. It discriminates against the small family farm. This is regrettable.

Under present legislation wheat farmers really do ont have a very realistic

choice to make in the referendum. They have only two alternatives: (a) The present program, which has proven so disastrous insofar as piling up surpluses and excessively high costs are concerned and the likelihood of a continued piling up of even greater surpluses, or (b) they can vote for no program since the law requires price supports at 50 percent of parity if there are no marketing quotas. Farmers still would have to comply with allotments. This, of course, is not a fair or realistic choice to place before the wheat farmers. Charles Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation calls it "an absurd farce that denies producers any realistic choice."

The wheat farmers should not be blamed for the situation they now find themselves in. They are not responsible for the outmoded and unrealistic laws that are on the books and which have to be administered. Their response to legislation is only what should be expected.

The farmer is not responsible for the inaction of the Congress to provide a workable wheat program. A better program should have been adopted before this—before the wheat referendum was held. We should give attention to obtaining a workable and acceptable program. There has been ample opportunity before this. The President months ago recommended alternative approaches to the wheat problem. Other approaches have been submitted this session, which, if adopted, would have given the wheat producer a sound, workable program to replace the very unsatisfactory one now operating. The Congress should not turn away from trying to get constructive legislation of wheat this session. The wheat farmer should not be let down by no remedial legislation. It is not too late for action.

Harnessing the Yukon River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it has long been the hope of many Alaskans that the mighty Yukon River and its gigantic hydroelectric power potential could be harnessed for the benefit of a vast area of Alaska. This hope has found articulate expression in an article written for Rural Electrification by George Sundborg, administrative assistant to Senator GRUENING. Mr. Sundborg is not only a student of the subject of public power, but in this field is considered an expert, by reason of his widely acclaimed book "Hail Columbia," which detailed the history of the struggle for the Grand Coulee Dam and the Columbia Basin project. Mr. Sundborg was formerly a newspaperman and editor in Alaska and Washington State, and for a number of years was general manager of the Alaska Development Board. I ask unanimous consent that the article, appearing in the July 1959 issue of the magazine, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIGGEST DAM ON THE MIGHTY YUKON

(By George Sundborg, administrative assistant to Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska)

Alaska, supplanting Texas as the biggest State, has a lot of other "biggests" and "mosts" to call to the attention of the Nation.

The 49th State has a coastline several times longer than that of all the other maritime States combined. It has at least 15 mountains, all of which are higher than any in the "lower 48." It has the biggest moose, biggest salmon, longest days, coldest winters. It is the home of the largest carnivorous animal on earth—the Alaska brown bear.

Now Alaska comes to the fore with a proposal for construction of the biggest hydroelectric power project in the world—nearly three times as big as Grand Coulee, producing more energy than all of the dams of TVA combined.

Recently the Senate Public Works Committee adopted a resolution calling on the Corps of Engineers to determine the advisability of improvments in the interest of hydroelectric power and other water uses in the Yukon Basin, Alaska, with particular reference to the Rampart Canyon site.

Rampart Dam, if built—and Alaska's congressional delegation would quickly correct that to "when built"—will dwarf any powerplant now in production anywhere in the world. Its installed capacity of million kilowatts would compare with a total of 1.9 million at Grand Coulee, the biggest dam under the American flag. Even the Russians, making rapid strides in the development of hydroelectric energy, do not yet have anything as big as Rampart, though dams as big are said to be on Soviet drawing boards.

The Yukon River is the third largest on the North American Continent, after the Missouri-Mississippi and the Mackenzie. Along its 2,000-mile course within Alaska, not a single dam bars or slows its flow.

Rampart Dam would be 400 feet high and a little more than half a mile long at the crest. It would impound 1.5 billion acre-feet of water covering 10,000 square miles, creating a lake as big as one of the Great Lakes. Meteorologists say the existence of such a lake would substantially modify the climate of interior Alaska.

Harnessing of the Yukon River at the site provided by the rock walls of Rampart Canyon would produce electric power which would cost about 2 mills per kilowatt-hour at the bus bar, preliminary studies indicate. The site is 90 miles northwest of Fairbanks and 300 miles due north of Anchorage, the two largest cities in Alaska, to which needed power could be transmitted from the huge dam.

"There is no question," Senator ERNEST GRUENING (Alaska) stated in a letter to Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ (New Mexico), chairman of the Public Works Committee, requesting the resolution, "that, with the availability of the tremendous amounts of low-cost electric power which could be produced at Rampart, further industrial development of the entire region would be rapid indeed."

The Senator emphasized that it is of greatest importance that studies preliminary to construction be undertaken as soon as possible. He noted that at best many years will elapse before power from the dam will be available, even with the early start envisioned by the Public Works Committee resolution.

The Corps of Engineers, which has had a preliminary look at Rampart Canyon in connection with its interim report on the Yukon and Kushokwim River Basins, estimate the cost of a dam and power facility there at between $900 million and $1.5 billion, depending on the size of the power installation.

Whether the dam would be built of concrete or would be of rock-fill construction with a concrete spillway is a matter to be determined in the course of the investigation which the Corps of Engineers has been directed to make. Some who have looked at the site estimate that a dam could be built there which would produce energy for as little as 1 mill per kilowatt-hour.

Rampart is the largest and key structure in what Alaskans envision as a future power empire, surpassing even the Columbia River in capacity and cheapness of energy. The new State has a total hydroelectric power capacity at known sites of more than 50 billion kilowatt hours annually. Less than one-fourth of 1 percent of this potential has been harnessed.

Noting that the Russians have embarked on a 7-year program of Siberian development which will include building dams twice as big as Grand Coulee, Senator GRUENING remarked recently on the Senate floor that, "What Russia is doing in Siberia represents a specific challenge to the United States to do no less in the area which was once Russian America—for 92 years the district, and then the Territory of Alaska, and now the 49th State.

"In physical terms, Alaska is America's equivalent of Asia's Siberia. It lies in the same latitude. It has corresponding climates. It has vast undeveloped natural resources. It has the greatest undeveloped power potential on the North American continent.

"The construction of a mighty dam and hydroelectric facility at Rampart Canyon on the Yukon, will provide the United States with the largest source of hydroelectric power yet developed."

Rampart is the most promising of the Alaska sites studied so far. But three others also offer prime power of more than 1 million kilowatts each. Two of them, Kaltag and Woodchopper, lie in the same basin as Rampart. This trio of sites offers a prime potential of more than 6 million kilowatts. The fourth site of 1-million-kilowatts-plus is Wood Canyon on the Copper River, near the gulf coast of Alaska.

In addition the Army Engineers list nine more sites with prime potentials of more than 100,000 kilowatts, and seven other sites of between 50,000 and 100,000 kilowatts of prime power.

Just one Federal project exists in Alaska today. That is Eklutna Dam, with an installed capacity of 30,000 kilowatts. This Bureau of Reclamation operation serves Anchorage and its environs through the Chugach Rural Electric Cooperative and the city system. The REA has done a fine job in moving along some of our smaller projects. As of last March 31, REA had loaned a grand total of $43,845,000 for Alaska generation and distribution facilities. An example is Cooper Lake, where a 15,000 kilowatt project is now under construction, financed by a $13 million REA loan. REA financing has accounted for 33,100 kilowatts of installed capacity in our State.

Rampart is obviously of a different magnitude. It is for the future. Under optimum conditions, the Corps of Engineers estimates it can begin to produce energy in 1972. This timetable contemplates 3 years for the studies now authorized, 2 more years to design the dam and then 8 years to build it.

Just to fill the huge reservoir behind Rampart would take nearly 20 years, under a regimen of one-fourth use and three-fourths storage. Some power production would be

possible from the first year, at the end of which the head would be 173 feet. When in full operation, the annual drawdown would be only 2 feet. Because of the vast storage and great depth of the lake, the operation would not be affected even by the 70-below-zero winter cold of the area.

What we know today about Rampart is not much. It is based on reconnaissance-type surveys conducted by the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation. But available information is enough to prove that here can rise the biggest dam in the free world. The Alaska delegation in Congress has devoted its energies to bringing that about.

The Economic Development of the Canadian North

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST GRUENING
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on various occasions during this session of Congress, I have brought to the attention of the Senate the importance to the entire United States of continued development of the unexcelled and relatively untapped resources of the State of Alaska. The importance to our Defense Establishment and to our peacetime economic progress of the invaluable treasures which are available in the 49th State cannot be easily overstated. For example, the construction of a hydroelectric project at Rampart Canyon on the Yukon River could produce a larger amount of electric energy than is available anywhere else in the United States. The potentialities of such power, produced at low cost, are stirring to contemplate.

I have, in the past, pointed out the rapid development of Siberia which has been undertaken by the Soviet Union. It is not only our potential enemy which has made energetic efforts toward the development of arctic areas and the resources therein. Our friends in Canada have also been looking northward and are undertaking an exciting program, having as its purpose the opening up of the tremendous resources of the Canadian North.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the principal parts of a paper given at the annual meeting of the Ontario Geography Teachers Association at Toronto on March 31, 1959, by Mr. John L. Jenness, chief of the economic division, Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources. The paper is of special interest not only to Alaska, but to our entire Nation, in view of many of the problems which Alaska has in common with Canada in the development of low temperature areas and the importance of Alaskan development to our national economy and to our national security. Of particular import is the discussion by Mr. Jenness of the problem of transportation in Canada.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE CANADIAN NORTH

(Parts of a paper given at the annual meeting of the Ontario Geography Teachers Association, Toronto, on March 31, 1959, by Mr. John L. Jenness, Chief of the Economic Division, Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources)

I have been asked to discuss presnt trends and future possibilities in the economic development of the Canadian North.

Until quite lately, indeed, the North was remote and isolated. Today, however, we see it in a new perspective. We have learned that the shortest intercontinental air routes follow great circles, that from San Francisco and Vancouver to London or Paris, and from New York to Tokyo or Moscow, the shortest and fastest routes traverse the polar region. In this air-minded age the Arctic has moved from the periphery of things to the center; it is becoming in fact one of the great aviation crossroads of the modern world.

In recent months, too, certain events have focused still more attention upon the most northerly reaches of Canada. Headlines in your newspapers have described the stampede of applicants requesting permits to explore for oil and gas in Canada's Arctic Islands, islands that as we now know, actually lie closer to the hungry markets of industrial Europe than do the oilfields of our western provinces or those of the Middle East and Venezuela. This dramatic oil rush has opened before us a new horizon, one which offers vistas of Arctic ports and submarine tankers, and raises the prospect of a day when the frozen polar ocean will become a mediterranean sea for international commerce. Equally suddenly, our Arctic islands have lost their remoteness; the land as well as the latitude has moved from the periphery of our map to its center.

The point I am making here, of course, is this: our conventional maps may be quite adequate for courses in civics, or for delineating the centers of manufacturing; but they fail us for transpolar travel, and they are rapidly becoming outdated for northern development. What we need is a polar projection map to emphasize our northernmost territories.

In point of fact, geographers or economists should consider our national territory as consisting of two dissimilar entities. Here in the south, along a narrow band stretching from coast to coast, lies the urbanized, industrial Canada, the part of the country which furnishes the economic backbone of our entire national structure. All the rest of Canada—almost nine-tenths of it—is "the North," a vast underdeveloped frontier land that includes the northern half or more of every province outside the Maritimes, and in addition the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. This enormous area is little known, poorly explored, and accessible only with difficulty. It contains, it is true, a few small mining communities, some defense and government establishments, and numerous trading and missionary outposts; but these are mere pinpricks on an otherwise empty map. Taken as a whole, the area remains today what it has always been in the past—the habitat of nature rather than of human progress.

Yet this vast area is our second Canada, "the North" we are really talking about when we refer to northern development. That parts of it are federal territory, and parts come under provincial jurisdiction, should make no material difference.

PROBLEM OF TRANSPORTATION

The vastness of Canada and her limited financial resources have created one fundamental problem: the provision of adequate transportation facilities. Wherever, in the past, no form of transport has been available, economic development, too, has lagged. It is in this field of transportation that the Federal Government is making its most imaginative contribution toward the development of the Canadian north. It has undertaken to spend upward of $100 million of Federal funds over the next 5 to 10 years on a national roads program to stimulate the development of the national resources of Canada. In the Provinces, where Federal and Provincial Governments are working cooperatively and sharing costs on a 50–50 basis, the program has been named "Roads to Resources." If these governments built all the roads it allows for, the total expenditure would run as high as $135 million. In the northern territories the Federal Government alone holds jurisdiction, and must bear the entire cost burden. The program for that area therefore is known as territorial roads and is expected to produce $70 million worth of roads in the next 7 years.

In both the Provinces and the territories the objectives of this vast scheme are identical: to give access to known and potential resources in promising underdeveloped areas, in the hope and expectation that the development and production of those resources will speedily follow. Thus the horizons of settlement and industry will be extended, and all of us, wherever we may live, will benefit through fuller employment, and through the variety of other economic and social gains which accompany an expansion of the gross national product.

Our program, therefore, will produce new roads in both of the northern territories and in 9 of 10 Provinces. Under "Roads to Resources", agreement in principle has already been reached with all Provinces except Quebec, and negotiations between the Federal and Provincial Governments leading to the signing of formal agreements are well in hand. To date, one agreement has been executed between Canada and British Columbia; it covers the construction of a road between Stewart and Cassiar at an estimated cost of something over $15 million. Work actually started on this road during the 1957 season. In the other eight Provinces with which negotiations are nearing conclusion, the Provincial governments have received authorization to commence work on roads already agreed to.

Ladies and gentlemen, our kind of civilization is moving rapidly northward and it is moving into the Canadian north to stay. The Government is alert to the need for positive action. It is doing everything in its power to ease the plight of those natives who are suffering. It is striving, with equal determination, to educate them as rapidly as possible, to absorb them into a viable wage economy. It has accepted the challenge of raising their standard of health; of creating opportunities for honorable and steady employment; of providing them with an opportunity to become an integrated, fully adapted and prosperous part of the Canadian family, able to employ their special talents in the development of our north.

The Government is aware that the economic growth of the north will vitally affect their lives, and with great initiative it is preparing them for the change. But it is private enterprise that must follow up this Government lead as it moves in to develop the physical resources of the area. Private enterprise must assume part of the task of promoting the prosperity, and well-being of our native peoples.

ROLE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

You may ask what part private enterprise has played hitherto in the development of the Canadian North. For many years now private industry has been operating in the underdeveloped parts of the Provinces and in the territories. It was under private initiative, for example, that gold mining sprang up in the Yukon in the late 1890's, and oil commenced to flow at Norman Wells, in the Mackenzie Valley, in 1920. Yellowknife, Flin Flon, and Timmins are

old-established mining centers, all lying outside the perimeter of urbanized Canada. These are but a few instances, selected at random, of the attraction our northern resources have held for industry, and of the communities these industries have sponsored. One could cite many more.

In this context, it is fair to point out that a substantial proportion of the development now taking place in the North is directly attributable to private enterprise. While governments of the past have been deeply preoccupied in consolidating and developing the more settled parts of our country, private enterprise has kept one eye fixed on our northlands. Individual prospectors and numerous companies have probed the wilderness, gradually extending our knowledge of its remoter areas and pushing back the frontiers of settlement. They have staked out and examined many attractive properties, and have brought some of their wealth into production. Thus, past development of our northern resources has made a significant and growing contribution to our national wealth. Nevertheless, that development remains still small, and our vast northern area contains an infinitely greater potential than current production figures would indicate.

Fortunately, during the last few years private capital has shown increased interest in our northern resources, and some of the world's largest companies have actively participated in their development. Alcan accomplished one of the outstanding engineering feats of our time, for example, when it brought its Kitimat plant into production; it withdrew headwater lakes from the upper Fraser Basin and diverted them through lofty coastal mountains to enable aluminum to be manufactured on the Pacific coast, at tidewater. Already it is generating a million horsepower of energy, and possesses the potential for a million more. In British Columbia's interior trench, a Swedish multimillionaire and corporate interests have evolved a grandiose plan for a huge industrial empire. Their project is still at an exploratory stage; but if it materializes it will create the largest man-made lake in the world, will generate twice as much power as Niagara, and will establish a number of industries utilizing timber and mineral resources. In Manitoba, late in 1956, International Nickel began a $175 million operation for mining and refining the nickel of the Mystery-Moak Lake area, 400 miles north of Winnipeg. And on the shores of Ungava Bay in northernmost Quebec, two separate companies—one representing Krupp-Cyrus Eaton interests, the other a Rio Tinto subsidiary—have reached an advanced planning stage that may lead to the mining, the beneficiation and the marketing of immense quantities of iron ore at an early date.

These and other activities of private enterprise in the northern parts of the provinces augur well for further expansion and development in those areas. Yet more spectacular than any of them is the exploratory activity just now materializing far to the north, in territories which come under Federal authority. There, in the Yukon, in the District of Mackenzie and in the Arctic Islands, we are witnessing a land play of almost unbelievable proportions, an exploration surge that directly involves upward of 100 separate companies and individual concerns. By the end of December 1958 the Federal Government had issued exploration permits covering no less than 76 million acres (roughly 120,000 square miles) on the territorial mainland; and more recent applications for permits embrace an almost equivalent area in the Arctic Archipelago.

The magnets exciting this amazing stampede are oil and gas. Geological structures over a major portion of the territories favor the occurrence of these two fuels: we have found there sedimentary formations similar to those that have yielded oil farther south. The Norman Wells Reservoir, for example, occurs in a limestone reef of Devonian age, similar to many oil-producing reefs in the Edmonton area; and in the Arctic Islands. Ellef Ringnes possesses salt domes comparable reportedly to those of the Texas gulf coast where oil is so abundant.

These and other indications incline such companies as Shell, Texaco, and California Standard to believe that north of latitude 60° Canada may conceal tremendously large accumulations of the energy fuels, and that this area may become in the future one of the world's major producers. According to one estimate (admittedly speculative) it could hold in reserve more than 30 billion barrels of oil and 200 trillion cubic feet of gas.

I think these several examples will show that we are on the threshold of exciting and challenging changes in our North. For one thing, it is now the definite policy of the Federal Government to stimulate the development of the region's resources, by itself creating the conditions that will render such development possible. For another, the role of our provincial governments has become more dynamic; on their own initiative they are extending their horizons to the remoter parts of their territories. And finally, private industry has become alerted to the possibilities of the region and seems ready to participate far more actively in the development of its available resources.

Under these circumstances, it is surely not unrealistic to look forward to an increasingly vigorous growth in our north, and to anticipate more change there in the next decade or two than has taken place in the entire 3 centuries of its history. As in the past, we shall witness the unrolling of the frontier northward from southern Canada, but on a larger scale and at a somewhat faster pace. New transportation roads will be carved through the wilderness and will fan out throughout much of the continental interior. New mining and marketing communities will spring up and prosper, stimulating a demand for secondary industries, and public services. Employment opportunities will multiply and become more varied, necessitating more schools and more hospitals. Altogether, the land and the people just beyond the already developed areas of Canada can look confidently forward to an expanding share of our national prosperity.

Mr. GRUENING. I am particularly impressed with the statement of Mr. Janness that "wherever, in the past, no form of transport has been available, economic development, too, has lagged. It is in this field of transportation that the Federal Government is making its most imaginative contribution toward the development of the Canadian north. It has undertaken to spend upward of $100 million of Federal funds over the next 5 to 10 years on a national roads program to stimulate the development of the national resources of Canada." This great program of our Canadian neighbors has been descriptively entitled "Roads to Resources." I commend our Canadian friends on their imagination and vigor in pursuing the development of Canada. I hope it may serve as an example of action which can be taken by government agencies in Alaska which is lacking a highway system to insure the fullest development of all the resources of our great Nation.

Power Facilities on the Trinity River in Northern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, with increasing frequency I find myself actually questioning whether we have reached a point, in the electric power field, where any offer, suggestion, proposal or request for consideration proffered by an investor-owned utility is ipso facto prejudged to be against the interests of the general public, and automatically to be treated with skepticism and suspicion.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, if a feeling exists among any of us that even though we are able to acknowledge an overall benefit to the country through a proposal which also benefits a utility, and that therefore we must oppose it, we are indeed in a tragic rut. If we were to oppose a project which we know is for the betterment of the Nation, simply because it also is helpful to a company, I feel that our action could not be dismissed lightly as being merely politically expedient to do so. The issue rather is one of political morality and conscience.

Probably a number of us have some knowledge of past conduct on the part of a utility which would be subject to serious question regarding its propriety. I believe that many utilities are aware of instances in their histories which they regret had ever taken place. But I also believe that, even granting such instances, it would be manifestly unfair and unjust to condemn every suggested agreement involving a utility, or anyone else, without considering such a proposal on its merits.

Bearing the above in mind, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the joint development proposal of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to construct and operate the power facilities on the Trinity River in northern California. After much study of this offer, both as a member of the House Interior Subcommittee, which heard 8 days of testimony last year, and as a present sponsor of the proposed legislation, I am convinced beyond a doubt of its worth and of the benefits to the Nation's taxpayers which it would provide. My unqualified conviction is backed up by that of every segment of our economy—water users, farmers, labor, business and the ordinary taxpayer who is sick of needless Government spending.

The Humboldt Beacon of Fortuna, in northern California, states:

In fact, with all of the bellowing by politicians, no one has ever contradicted the figures that Pacific Gas & Electric will pay $62 million in local and State taxes, $33 million in Federal taxes, and $165 million for the use of the people's Trinity water to produce power, water that will again be sold by the Government to the valley irrigation districts for reuse by agriculture.

Mr. J. D. O'Dell, president and editor of the Beacon, continues—

We have lived in northern California and Oregon now for nearly 32 years and no one will ever convince us that Pacific Gas & Electric Co. hasn't been a good operation for the advancement of this section of the State, nor that it will ever cease to be. We like that kind of partner in any business.

Can Mr. O'Dell be speaking of the "big bad private utility, up to its elbows in the public trough"?

From San Juan Bautista, in central California, speaks the Mission News regarding the chances of cutting the Federal budget:

Here's a suggestion on how to save $310 million as a starter: Go ahead with the Trinity River project which has already been approved by Secretary of the Interior Seaton. This plan advocates a partnership between the Pacific Gas & Electric and the Government. The company would build the power facilities at no expense to the Government, and would pay for the use of the falling water. Over a 50-year repayment period, the Government would gain $310 million.

Concerning the proposal for Trinity joint development, the Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press Democrat states:

Pacific Gas & Electric has to pay Uncle Sam 52 cents out of every $1 it nets, in corporate income taxes. Your electric rates would be much lower if a big piece of them didn't have to be passed on to Uncle Sam in paying this heavy tax. Socialized power, which pays no income taxes, frequently sells for lower rates than does private power. The higher the taxes, the greater the spread between rates—and the greater the urge to socialize more power development.

The Press Democrat continues:

It's a con game, of course, as long as Uncle Sam spends so many billions, somebody has to pay the taxes and the portion not paid by socialized power systems is simply paid by you in your own high individual rates. Regardless of whether you pay it hidden in your electric bill from Pacific Gas & Electric Co., or whether you pay it in withholding from your paycheck, you pay the cost of running the Federal Government.

Comments the Santa Cruz (Calif.) Sentinel:

It's time that approval be given to the Trinity partnership program proposed by Secretary of the Interior Seaton. Despite loud outcries from the advocates of public power, the Trinity "partnership" program between the Federal Government and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is the far superior plan for the development of additional power in northern California. Power, the surplus or the lack thereof, has become a political football parlayed into some of the greatest outlays of cash ever kicked off by the Federal Government.

The editorial continues:

In California, we have experienced no shortage of power and the privately owned utility companies have been able to meet the demands of a growing State without delay. We have yet to discover the Government operating a powerplant or any type of business with the same flow of efficiency required by taxpaying private business operations.

The Sentinel concludes:

As long as the utility companies are able to provide adequate power at reasonable prices, the Government should refrain from the favored political pastime of public power.

Mr. Speaker, if the customers of a company feel as these statements indicate, should we not, in good conscience and with open minds, consider the Trinity joint developmnet power proposal with an eye turned toward saving $60 million in construction costs and gaining $175 million from payments for the use of the falling water, as well as picking up $83 million from the company's Federal tax payments?

The Hutton Lottery Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert in this RECORD the remarks of Mr. E. F. Hutton, a New York banker and respected American citizen, which appeared in the Voice of the People section of the New York Daily News on Tuesday, July 21. Also, an editorial in the same issue in support of a Government lottery plan. In view of the $12½ billion Federal Treasury deficit for fiscal year 1959, just announced, I thought these articles would make interesting reading:

MR. HUTTON FAVORS LOTTERY

MANHATTAN.—The time has come to find out if the general public would favor a National Government lottery. If inflation is to be stopped, it is necessary to balance the Federal budget and reduce the national debt, now approaching $290 billion.

I believe a nationwide lottery, authorized by Congress, and conducted through the banks, would yield $5 billion, or more, to the Treasury each year it was in operation. Nothing would do more to restore confidence in the dollar than to reduce the debt.

No one would be obliged to participate, but everyone would benefit, as the debt is reduced, through tax savings on their own earnings.

The prizes should be tax-free. With this added incentive, the lottery would divert huge sums of money now being lost in all kinds of shady rackets.

The Treasury, the Congress, and the bankers would have to work out the details. It is certain, however, that neither the Treasury nor Congress will make a start on this until it has strong public support.

Objections will be made. But there is no comparison between a Government lottery, run with complete honesty, and private lotteries and gambling generally.

A Government lottery helped build the first Capitol in Washington, with the blessing of President George Washington. The News would do a great public service by presenting this proposal to the people.

E. F. HUTTON.

THE HUTTON LOTTERY PLAN

Your attention is asked to the letter from E. F. Hutton which leads today's Voice of the People.

The News is glad to print this communication from a respected and outstandingly successful citizen who has thought long and deeply about our colossal national debt and the continuing threat of inflation.

PAINLESS REVENUES

This newspaper has long favored some form of national lottery.

Without going overboard for the Hutton or any other specific plan, we'll observe that this one merits wide public discussion—and if you feel like sending the Hutton letter and this editorial to your Senators and Representative, we're sure neither Mr. Hutton nor the News will object.

Pilot Training Pays Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the tremendous excitement which prevailed over Idlewild International Airport 2 weeks ago when a Pan American World Airways jet Clipper lost 2 of its 10 rubber wheels. Since there was no absolute certainty that the plane could land normally with only 8 wheels, emergency conditions existed as the plane, bound for London, returned to Idlewild.

What happened thereafter all of us must view with mixed emotions. Fortunately, an experienced pilot in the person of Capt. Edward Sommers was at the controls, aided by a superbly trained and well disciplined crew. Unfortunately, on the ground, there existed uncontrollable mob psychology, with tens of thousands of persons streaming toward Idlewild, attracted by television and radio accounts of the plane's difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, all is well that ends well. There is little likelihood that police and airport authorities will again be taken by surprise in the event of any similar air emergency. Certainly Pan American and its crew benefited greatly from this experience, if only to make certain that it will not be repeated. And for the public, there must be renewed confidence in the flying ability of our scheduled airlines and the soundness of their equipment.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD three editorials concerned with this memorable flight experience, taken from the New York Journal-American, the New York Herald Tribune, and the New York Daily News:

[From the New York Journal American, July 16, 1959]

JET AGE TRIUMPH

The appeal of jet air travel has been heightened, not dampened, by the safe emergency landing of 113 persons at Idlewild in the Pan American Boeing 707 last Sunday.

We don't think you have to go far for the reason. Reliability of man and machine always has attracted customers and always will.

It was A–1 airmanship of the highest order that the crew, under the steady skipper, Capt. Edward Sommers, demonstrated for 4 fateful hours.

It was durability of a desirable degree that the airplane exhibited, bringing passengers and crew safely back on the ground though part of its disabled landing gear was gouging a spark-strewn path down the runway.

This performance proves the 707 is an amazingly sturdy jet.

People like to fly with the best that's flying. This latest incident of the jet age gave us all a glimpse of some real class in action.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 13, 1959]

NIGHT DRAMA OVER IDLEWILD

Most New Yorkers went through Saturday night unaware of the agonizing drama that was being enacted in the skies above them. Many others heard about it, through broadcast bulletins, and followed its suspenseful progress as best they could. Yet to none could it have held more tenseness or immediacy than to the 113 persons who, flying a crippled Pan American jet through the night skies, knew that their lives would be literally at stake when the plane attempted an emergency landing at Idlewild within a few hours. It was a remarkable tribute to the efficiency of the crew and the coolness of the passengers that the emergency was met with calm, confidence and courage. Hysteria and panic were completely absent; no one even sang songs, that traditional refuge in time of danger. Although fear and doubt must have gnawed at them, although they could have guessed that ambulances and emergency trucks were standing by, the passengers kept their heads and acted outwardly much as they would have on a normal flight to London. Although they knew the consequences of even a minor slip-up, the crewmen, headed by Capt. Edward Sommers, sat tight and did their jobs.

Thus the great plane finally roared in for a landing at Idlewild with two of its eight wing-wheels missing, upon a strip that had been coated with foam to choke off any fires. The principal danger, the pilot said afterward, came from sightseers who inexplicably had been able to crowd upon the field and line the edges of the runway. How this breach of airport safety practices managed to occur must surely be a subject for investigators to study, no less than how the giant aircraft lost its two wheels in the first place.

But the overall reaction to this remarkable incident in the skies must be gratitude and pride—gratitude for the enormous skill and resourcefulness which mastered the danger; pride in the serenity of spirit with which it was met. It was an occurrence which may seem almost trifling in an epoch beset by perils and pitfalls, yet it will be enormously heartening to all who face an uncertain future by quietly carrying on their everyday lives.

[From the New York Daily News, July 14, 1959]

HEROISM ALOFT, SNAFU BELOW

Capt. Edward Sommers, his crew and his passengers looked by far the best of all those involved in Saturday night's and early Sunday's melodrama of the jet liner that dropped two port wheels on takeoff from Idlewild for London.

Sommers showed superb skill. His and his crew's heroic calm communicated itself to the passengers.

On the ground, meanwhile, the Port of New York Authority and the fire department were in a jurisdictional dispute which slowed the lining up of rescue equipment for a possible crash.

Neither agency thought to ask TV and radio stations to add to their newscasts some urgent and preferably threat-loaded advice to thrill seekers to stay away from Idlewild. Some 4,000 of these persons, risking their lives, were allowed to spill over onto the runway, so that rescue apparatus could not have been rushed to the plane. Working newsmen were unnecessarily sprayed with foamite.

We realize we're talking like Monday morning quarterbacks. But we do want to suggest, urgently, that the port authority and fire department work out all possible precautions for similar situations in future—and that next time, if there is a next time, the two agencies at least cooperate rather than fall to fighting over which is boss where.

Hon. Neal Smith, of Iowa, Proposes New Farm Stabilization Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful statement by Hon. NEAL SMITH, of Iowa, embracing a proposal for a farm program intended to prevent bankruptcy prices in agriculture and to open to the farm families of America an opportunity to share equitably in the rewards of this Nation's free enterprise system.

Our colleague from Iowa is serving his first term in the House, but he already has firmly identified himself to this body by his devotion to the well-being of the farm families across this broad land who produce our food and fiber. He has introduced specific bills on agriculture and he has testified before the House Committee on Agriculture, which it is my honor and privilege to serve as chairman.

Although it has been impossible in this Congress thus far to develop sorely needed farm legislation which would meet with the President's approval, our colleague has been hard at work; and I am certain that his studies and activities will be of value to this House as we continue our efforts to deal effectively with the pressing problems now confronting our farmers.

The statement I am submitting for the RECORD was presented by Mr. SMITH to our Committee on Agriculture. I think it is of such a character as to provoke discussion, looking toward constructive action, on one of the most important problems of our times:

STATEMENT OF NEAL SMITH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FIFTH DISTRICT OF IOWA, TO HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE

BASIC FACTS

Seventy percent of our new wealth comes from farm-produced crops and 30 percent is derived from mining, fishing, and other sources. All of our wealth results from the conversion or reconversion of this new wealth. Unless the standard of living in the United States is raised drastically, or until the population increases by about 35 percent, the new wealth we have the capacity to produce at the present time will furnish more raw products than would be converted at a reasonable profit for our use. Except in time of war, the American people have never been willing to use the Goverment to the extent necessary to assure distribution of all the products that could be converted from the new wealth we are capable of producing.

Through supercorporate combinations, industry has the power to limit the production of their goods to the amount that can be converted and sold at a profit. Through the 40-hour week, overtime pay provisions, and the minimum wage, the work in these industries has been divided to a great extent. Factories where employees worked 60 hours per week during the war now are on a 40-hour week. In spite of the fact that industry is receiving a huge subsidy from the $40 billion per year defense spending, the steel industry, which converts a large portion of the new wealth derived from mining, is now operating at less than three-fourths of capacity. Many years ago, Andrew Carnegie and his associates pyramided the corporate steel structure and so organized the steel industry so that both prices and supplies can be administered, and again following World War II, the reduction in supply to balance the demand available at the administered price was promptly put into effect.

The farmers have no such structure to cut back production. They were asked to and did, during the emergency period, expand their production by using technology that had been known for 50 years but not used and by replacing horses and mules and small machinery with larger machinery. Since there are millions of farmers without any supercorporate structure, they have no way to reduce their production to the amount that can be sold in our economy at a reasonable profit. Farm operators have had no way to divide the production so that they can reduce their average 65-hour week back to a 40-hour or even a 50-hour week. If the farmer's workweek had been so reduced, millions of efficient farmers would not have been driven from the farm to replace city workers or join the ranks of the unemployed. Since unemployment in May of 1959 was 159 percent of the number unemployed 6 years earlier, it is obvious that jobs are not waiting for replaced farmers who average more than 50 years of age. Farmers will not be able to reduce their workweek unless (1) they can make enough profit per unit so an efficient farmer can make a living by working a normal workweek, and (2) there is a way to equitably divide the production so that a farmer working a normal workweek will have such a market for the units he produces.

THE OPEN MARKET

Expecting an open market alone to do this for agriculture is penalizing farmers drastically for increased efficiency by making them give away the abundance they produced and would be expecting too much of an open market. The principal purpose of an open market in the present agricultural situation is to efficiently distribute our abundance. When there is no big shortage or excess of supply of any commodity, the open market can establish a fair price and feed the supply efficiently to the consumers; but to expect the open market to gage supply and establish a fair price for basic agricultural commodities under present circumstances is expecting too much of the open market and giving it a bad reputation in this field that it does not deserve.

OUR ALTERNATIVES

In other words, we have a choice of either finding a way through government for farmers to divide their production and gauge it to the Nation's needs or the alternative will certainly be that a supercorporate structure will emerge wherein a relatively few non-

Government nonelected officials determine the supply and price of our food. We are heading toward the latter alternative very fast. There are now 4 million less farmers than 6 years ago working approximately the same 60-to 65-hour week and for less money. Farm assets are now only 83 cents of each $1 compared to $1.87 for each $1 owed 15 years ago. Thus the farm financial situation has become ripe for an integration drive, and it is well under way.

If we conclude this trend with fewer farmers each working a 65-hour week instead of a full compliment of farm producers each working a normal work week, we will have failed to preserve the capacity to expand farm production with the flexibility needed for national security and to assure a sustained supply of food and fibre at a reasonable price. This is true because farmers working a 60-hour week cannot increase their work week very much, and skilled farmers who have moved to the city will not lose their seniority in a plant to return to farm work.

HUMANS WILL REPLACE THE HORSES AND MULES

In the past 20 years, there has been one principal increase and one principal decrease in the demand for feed grains. The decrease has occurred from the fact that millions of horses and mules have been fed to the dogs and replaced with tractors. The feed they ate must now find a new market that will pay for the gasoline for the tractors.

The increase in consumption has occurred as a result of an increase in population. This increase has been so great that it has absorbed the increased production. The total of food grains and feed now stored is approximately equal to the amount of the same that the horses and mules would have eaten if we had used them for draft purposes instead of feeding them to our dogs.

This would indicate that if population and productivity increases continue at a similar rate, the additional productivity will be absorbed by the increased population. However, almost all agricultural economists agree that the population will increase faster than productivity. The increase in population should be enough to absorb both increased productivity and the food that can be converted from the feed that horses and mules ate when they were used for draft purposes. After that time has arrived, we will have to find new land and farmers or face a food shortage. While we stand amid abundance, we can predict that during this century and during the lives of many of us, American citizens will either be rationed on meats and protein products or they will be so high in price that consumption per person will be reduced. In other words, the cereal diet of many countries will begin to replace our protein diet.

Under all these circumstances, it seems to me that our goal should be to preserve our extra productive capacity and the family farm structure and release it as it is needed to assure an abundance of food. This is especially in the interest of consumers.

The alternative is to have surplus and scarcity alternating just as high profits and bankruptcy would alternate. After each period of bankrupt prices, less farmers would survive until eventually the factory-type, collective farm would emerge as the average farm unit. This would destroy the middle income farm structure and substitute for it a structure such as exists in agriculture in so many other countries; namely, a few high-income persons and a lot of low-income workers. This also would leave agriculture in a position where administered prices could replace competitive prices, and for this the consumer would pay dearly. Violent fluctuations are also hard on consumers who are largely on fixed incomes. An example of this is potatoes which are now just twice as high as they were a year ago. The same thing will happen to protein products unless some program is devised to help give us the reasonably stable prices the President says are in the national interest.

HOW CAN WE ADJUST?

If we are to divide production equitably and provide stable prices, we must withdraw and increase either labor, capital, or land as needed or some combination of the three for those are the three ingredients that produce our food. If we were to withdraw capital, we would not preserve our extra capacity to produce and to expand production when needed. In order to withdraw labor, we must withdraw land.

It seems to me there are two basic ways to accomplish the withdrawal of land and be within the long-term goals for consumers and farmers. One is for the Government to set the production goals and lease the productive land not needed to met those goals. This is the soil bank method. The other way is to set production goals and offer some insurance that if he withdraws some land, the productive land remaining will give an efficient family farmer a reasonable income if he works a reasonable work week.

The soil bank method would mean a continuing large appropriation of Federal money. The latter method would mean a small total cost to the taxpayer if set up properly. The latter method is embodied in H.R. 7710 and in some other bills before your committee.

STABLE SUPPLIES OF FEED GRAINS HELP PERISHABLES

It seems to me that proper division of the production of basic commodities can go a long way toward stabilizing the price of basic perishable items such as meats, poultry, and dairy products—we are now again seeing feed grain prices at only 65 percent of parity wreck the poultry and pork markets. Live hogs are already down to $15 per hundred which is a drop of 25 percent in 1 year and a bigger crop and lower prices are on the way. The consumer is not getting the benefit from the farmers' loss either. Loins are $56 per hundred wholesale while the live animal brings $15 per hundred.

FEED GRAINS

Lowering the support prices as the method of balancing production with consumption has again failed miserably, and the farmer is again paying the bill for the costly retrial of this method. It is also ridiculous to pretend we can advertize our way out of this predicament. On the other hand, the basic laws of supply and demand, when properly applied as in the case of tobacco, have worked. Experience has shown us that some improvements can be made, and so far as feed grains are concerned, I have attempted to insert the needed improvements into H.R. 7710. H.R. 7710 would briefly operate as follows:

1. Corn, oats, rye, grain sorghum, and barley would be tied together as feed grains instead of being under separate programs, and each grain would be given a comparative value according to nutrient value.

2. Production would be equitably divided among farm units and each farmer would be free to raise whichever feed grain or feed grains he pleases so long as the total feed grains raised does not exceed his total nutrient allotment as measured by comparative units.

3. Wheat raised without an allotment would be counted against the feed grain allotment for the farm. This would help avoid hurting the wheat program. Wheat farmers and others should also comply with a similar provision and quit hurting feed grain farmers.

4. Support nonrecourse loans would be limited to the normal production on the acreage allotment for the farm. Bushels raised in excess of normal yields would not be supported. This discourages heavy use of artificial productive formulae but permits some reward for high efficiency.

5. Since it is a voluntary program, an equalization payment is provided for feed grains fed by a producer so that livestock and poultry producers will not have to turn their grain over to the government and buy replacement grain in order to receive some security of price for grain raised within an allotment. This would also encourage farmers who feed their grain to stay within the allotment.

6. Support loans and equalization payments on feed grains fed would be limited to those who stay within their allotment and observe cross-compliance.

7. Feed grains in Government ownership in excess of a 1½ billion bushel reserve would only be sold at the rate of 1 bushel for each $2 spent for meat, dairy, and poultry products purchased by the Government and distributed to the needy, institutions, and the school lunch program. Thus, grain held would pay for more than one-half of the protein foods cost. We wouldn't think of raising pigs without a good protein supplement, but hundreds of thousands of our children are being raised without adequate proteins. The provision would assure the distribution of some of our feed grains that have been converted into proteins to the people who need more proteins.

8. It provides a referendum to let farmers decide whether they prefer this program. Feed grain farmers have never had an opportunity, like many other farmers, to vote for this type of a program.

I believe the application of H.R. 7710 would: (1) Assure an abundant supply of food for a longer time for more stable prices. It would avoid the low productivity and scarcity that follows periods of bankrupt prices for meat, poultry, and dairy products. If stable prices are a national goal as President Eisenhower has said, then this feed grains program is certainly in the public interest. (2) It would permit farmers to divide production so they can make a living on the farm instead of moving to town to replace city workers. (3) It would certainly cost the Government a lot less than the present program; and (4) it would provide for the conversion of feed grains now held in excess of needs into meat, dairy, and poultry products for people who need them. This program applies the law of supply and demand, and while it is set up for a 4-year period, it should need little changing when reviewed and extended.

WHEAT

In looking to a long-term program for agriculture, I believe we should recognize the shift in the importance of support prices under certain conditions. So long as production exceeds consumption, the support price is very important; but when a program is adopted to bring production below consumption, then the market price will be guided by the price at which the commodity in the Government warehouse goes onto the market.

To use an example we have currently considered, I would like to review the wheat situation. The compromise bill turned down by the House provided basically as follows:

1. A 20 percent reduction in acreage resulting in a 16 percent reduction in bushels down to a total production of one million bushels.

2. A payment in kind taking 125 million bushels from the Government bins and making a total market supply of 1,125 million bushels which is in excess of estimated consumption by 75 million bushels.

3. An increase in the support price from 75 percent to 80 percent. The provision in that bill for payment in kind would have resulted in an estimated unbalanced market, and, therefore, much grain would have gone

through non-recourse loans to the Government. Under the circumstances, the support rate would have been the guide for the market price and would have been at about 80 percent of parity.

Let us suppose that the provisions of the bill were the same execpt (1) there was no payment in kind, and thus the market supply outside of Government stocks would be 50 million bushels less than consumption; and (2) nonrecourse loans were left at 75 percent of parity, but section 407 were amended to provide that no wheat can be sold from Government storage at less than 90 percent of parity instead of at support price plus 5 percent (or 79 percent).

Under those circumstances, the price in the marketplace would actually be guided by the price at which Government stocks were available, and therefore, the market price under the latter would be approximately 11 percent of parity more although the support price would be 15 percent of parity less. In the latter example, no new wheat would be going into Government bins, and the CCC would have a market for 50 million bushels of wheat it now has in storage and at a profit. In the latter case, wheat sold directly through regular channels would bring a great deal more than under the compromise bill. Thus the payment-in-kind feature in the bill actually took out of one pocket what it would have put into the other pocket for farmers who do not have storage for all their wheat and who sell to the market, and this is most farmers; and the cost to the Government through unbalancing the market would be far in excess of the value of the wheat it would distribute as payment in kind.

I believe a long-term program should (1) never let a payment-in-kind gimmick unbalance the market; and (2) amend section 407 so the prices received by the CCC for Government-held stocks are set according to a desired market price rather than the percentage of parity at which nonrecourse loans are made.

CONCLUSION

I would urge the committee to adopt long-term programs for basic commodities which would—

(1) Assure an abundant supply of food and fiber at reasonably stable prices by dividing the production of basics needed among farmers so that an efficient farmer can make a living on a 50-hour or less working week instead of moving to the city to replace a city worker;

(2) Depend less upon Government appropriations and more upon the market paying value for goods produced; and

(3) Provide a formula for converting stocks in Government storage into food and fiber for persons in need and for institutions.

I believe the basic provisions of the tobacco program as amended and improved in H.R. 7710 would provide the general formula for all of the basic commodities. At least there should be a referendum to vote on having that kind of a program as an alternative to unstable consumer prices and ragged individualism.

Trinity River Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, a bill providing that the Federal Government could take over all private electric utilities upon payment of the net investment therein would get nowhere at this time. Such legislation would not be advocated openly by even the most rabid proponents of Government ownership. To do so would be obviously to tip their hand as to the desired objective.

The alternate method of accomplishing this result is by the much more disarming approach of piecemeal acquisition; biting off a city or small area now and, after a while, another, and so forth, until the remaining fragment is forced to sell out "voluntarily," is undoubtedly a more cunning policy. And the Government power advocates, aware that too many bites or too large bites too fast would give away their goal of total takeover, prefer to prevent companies from developing further.

An apt illustration of this technique is before us now in the pending legislation proposing joint development of the northern California Trinity River powerplants. As the Galt (Calif.) Herald has put it:

A byproduct of almost any water development, of course, is the production of power, and this is a healthy thing. Inevitably, however, there are those—dedicated to the extension of governmental power over our lives—who will seize upon such power production as a means to an ideological end. This is evidenced—

The Herald points out—

in the opposition to the administration's proposal to take advantage of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. "partnership" offer for development of power in the Trinity River project—a partnership that would benefit the taxpayers by some $365 million.

This editorial concludes with the statement:

There is no power shortage, no need for Government intervention in industry. Today, as in the early thirties when the Central Valley project was approved by the people, water is the want.

Galt lies midway between Sacramento and Stockton, in the heart of the great valley to be benefited by the Trinity project, and is truly representative of the many agricultural areas espousing joint development of Trinity power.

In pointing out that the Bureau of Reclamation Commissioner concurs in the opinion that this proposal conforms to the basic purpose of the reclamation program of developing irrigation water supply and land reclamation, the Grass Valley (Calif.) Union continues—

Electric power is generated as an incident to the basic purposes of the program. Development of the power resources of the Trinity River division under a joint proposal such as that offered here would mean that power would become a better partner of irrigation development in the Central Valley project area than under all-Federal construction.

The Half Moon Bay (Calif.) Review, commenting on a statement that the Trinity partnership proposal would set a precedent to stop the expansion of Federal power in California and end its competition with private utilities, declares:

Indeed it would. That is exactly the purpose of the Eisenhower partnership policy—to take Government out of competition with private industry wherever possible, and to strengthen the sinews of private enterprise for its gigantic task of keeping our economy strong, flexible, and adequate to the challenge of the Nation's growth and the world's demands.

As the Sacramento Union commented recently, the tragedy of those who want big government to do nearly everything is that they lull themselves into a mesmeric state which convinces them these things are free.

They are—

The Review concludes—

of course free neither in the financial sense nor in the even more vital coin of individual liberty and national strength.

The House conferees on the public works appropriations bill, and the members of the House Interior Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation now have the opportunity to cut expenditures by $60 million while increasing Government revenues and benefiting all taxpayers by $320 million—simply refuse to permit needless Federal construction of the Trinity River power facilities and take advantage of the Pacific Gas & Electric offer to build and operate them at its own expense.

Rutgers New University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, since the founding of Rutgers University as Queen's College in 1766, its selection as a land-grant college in 1862 and its adoption as a State university, this institution has been indeed synonymous with the development and growth of New Jersey itself from its earliest colonial days. So today, I think it is fitting that in a State largely concerned with new urban type problems, that the State university has been selected to undertake an experimental program in urban extension.

The Ford Foundation has announced that it will grant to Rutgers a sum of three-quarters of a million dollars to establish such a program. What it hopes to achieve is to apply the university's vast resources to the complex problems facing the State's urban communities. Only one other such grant has been awarded by the Ford Foundation for this purpose and that is in far-off India.

We are honored that such an unique opportunity has been offered our State university. Its unfolding will hold much interest to those of us involved with the complexities of urban living.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Daily Home News of New Brunswick of Tuesday, July 21, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Daily Home News, July 21, 1959]

RUTGERS' NEW OPPORTUNITY

We heard a prominent retired local resident say the other day that "you have to go 30 miles from New Brunswick to realize the greatness of Rutgers University as an American educational institution." We do not entirely agree with this statement, but on the other hand, probably many of us do take this venerable local landmark for granted.

Sometimes it takes the kind of an announcement on our front page today to realize this greatness. This states that Rutgers will receive three-quarters of a million dollars from the Ford Foundation to establish an experimental urban extension program in New Jersey. This is one of two such pilot projects in urban extension. The other is in far-off India where the foundation is aiding the Delhi Municipal Corp., by a $155,539 grant.

Goal of the 5-year program is to apply the university's vast resources to the complex problems facing this State's urban communities. In trying to achieve this goal the project will be a continuing two-pronged process servicing both the university and the communities of New Jersey.

In speaking of this two-way process, Dyke Brown, Ford Foundation vice president, said: "On one hand, the communities will benefit from fundamental and applied research otherwise not available. On the other hand, the university will make its research meaningful through listening posts and outlets in the communities."

When Rutgers became a land-grant college after Abraham Lincoln signed this far-reaching bill in 1864, no one at this small New Jersey institution ever dreamed that a program for urban problems analogous to the agricultural research and extension programs of the Nation's land-grant universities for rural problems would be established almost a century later.

We concur with Dr. Mason W. Gross, president of the State university, who is "both pleased and proud" that Rutgers was chosen for this work. He said he "looks forward to this new opportunity to serve the people of the State."

Living in the center of New Jersey's complex urban area, we will also watch, with intense interest, the unfolding of this unique and untried program.

Current Farm Programs and Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the recent hearings, before the Committee on Foreign Relations, on the Food for Peace Act of 1959, the committee received some very favorable testimony relating to the use of our surplus foods, and also some important testimony on the so-called farm surplus crisis.

I hold in my hand an editorial entitled "Farm Surplus Crisis," which was published in the July 14 edition of the Des Moines Register. The editorial states very cogently and concisely what has been happening in our farm programs, and at the same time it criticizes very justly the attitude of the administration in attempting to weaken current farm programs and policies.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Register]

FARM SURPLUS CRISIS

Though it had been anticipated well in advance, the first official estimate of the corn harvest for 1959 comes as a shocker. Assuming average growing conditions from now on, the Federal Department of Agriculture expects farmers to turn out 4.2 billion bushels of the yellow grain next fall. This would be 400 million bushels more than the record of last year.

The reserve stock of corn on hand also is a record. The Department of Agriculture has predicted a carryover of 1.6 billion bushels just prior to harvest. This would mean a total supply of corn next November of nearly 6 billion bushels—about double what was considered an average supply just a few years ago.

That's only part of the story. With the harvest of another billion-plus bushel wheat crop, the Nation has on hand more than a 2-year supply of wheat. World wheat production is at a record level, too, and stocks are large in all major wheat-exporting countries.

A major farm surplus crisis is in the making. And Iowa will bear the brunt of it.

Grain surpluses are moving into livestock at a rapid rate. Hog production is expanding and prices are falling.

In a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture last week, the Iowa Farm Bureau board of directors expressed concern about the imbalance between supply of and demand for farm products and about the future prospects for farm income. The board said the outlook was for "catastrophic" prices for livestock within the next few months.

The Iowa Farm Bureau indirectly criticized Agriculture Secretary Benson for creating public misunderstanding of the agricultural situation, which it said was "grave." It said it believed the Department of Agriculture has "rightly called attention to the economic inadequacies * * * of existing farm legislation." But it said this effort toward "self-analysis" on the part of agriculture "has produced serious public misunderstanding."

The farm bureau said the chief benefactors of past and present farm programs have not been farmers but the consumers. It said it resented that agriculture was made the subject of public denunciation. This might be taken as a barb at Secretary Benson who has orated incessantly about the evils of farm programs, price supports, and subsidies.

The leaders of the Iowa farm organization said agriculture's bargaining position must be strengthened, and called for an immediate and intensive study into ways and means of helping agriculture develop the countervailing position necessary for successful competition. It suggested study of land retirement sufficient to balance supply and demand, accompanied by an end to price-fixing attempts. It also suggested use of surpluses in a program to benefit U.S. allies and improve foreign relations.

The tone of this letter is quite different from some of the pronouncements by the American Farm Bureau.

The Iowa group did not point out, though it might have, that Secretary Benson's policies were responsible for the expansion of both wheat and corn acreage this year. The acreage reserve phase of the soil bank was abandoned. And the corn allotments were done away with, as a result of a farmer referendum.

Secretary Benson offered a higher corn loan this year if farmers voted to abandon the acreage controls. The farm bureau supported this policy. The result has been a sharp increase in corn acreage—nearly one-fifth more in the Corn Belt. Wheat acreage is up 2 million acres (about 5 percent) as a result of ending the acreage reserve.

There have been inadequacies in the farm programs, to be sure. Acreage limitations have been far from a satisfactory device for controlling farm output. Price supports have often provided the wrong kind of incentives.

But to abandon these programs without substituting anything else—which is the direction of Secretary Benson's statements and policies—could be much worse. The Iowa Farm Bureau evidently is beginning to recognize this.

Address by Juozas Kajeckas at Opening of Lithuanian Pavilion, Chicago International Trade Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by Mr. Juozas Kajeckas, Lithuanian Chargé d'Affaires, at the opening of the Lithuanian Pavilion at the Chicago International Trade Fair on July 3, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY JUOZAS KAJECKAS, LITHUANIAN CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES AT THE OPENING OF THE LITHUANIAN PAVILION AT THE CHICAGO INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR, JULY 3, 1959

As Lithuanian Minister B. K. Balutis spoke at a similar occasion in Chicago exactly 26 years ago, all of those who attended were shocked at the news of the tragic fate of Darius and Girenas. On that day two of our esteemed flyers died, but Lithuania on that day was enriched with the addition of two new heroes. I am happy that I was able to attend the impressive ceremony honoring their memory last year in Chicago. I am glad that this occasion takes place in the month of Darius' and Girenas' great triumph.

At this international fair we do not mourn two Lithuanian heroes. Today we mourn a legion of heroes. We sorrow that a long night has again darkened Lithuania.

Such is our unfortunate destiny. In the words of poet Maironis:

> "In the fate of Lithuania's sons
> Let us no longer seek bright days.
> Misery and tears—their fare."

I consider it a great honor to participate this year in the opening of the Lithuanian pavilion at the Chicago International Fair. During Lithuania's independence this would not have made big news, because free Lithuania participated in many international events. However, a Lithuanian Pavilion at the Chicago International Fair in the present circumstances is a significant event.

We have had a similar case once before. At the turn of the 20th century (in 1900), when

the two-headed eagle was on guard so there would be "neither word nor writing" in Lithuania, to keep it forever dark and blacked out, the idea of having a Lithuanian pavilion at the international fair in Paris was carried out. The Lithuanian pavilion at that time was a matter of Lithuania's honor. Lithuanian determination and donations turned this dream into reality. American Lithuanians supported the idea. The nation has not forgotten and points with pride to this important upholding of Lithuania's honor.

Today, as in that yesteryear, Lithuania is again enslaved. The present occupant is incomparably more cruel. The number of Lithuanian "martyr flowers" on the altar of freedom is incomparably greater. Today, the free and the enslaved Lithuanian are both happy that the honor and the suffering of the Lithuanian nation are so importantly emphasized by the presence of this Lithuanian pavilion at the Chicago International Trade Fair.

The pavilion is a consequence of the diligent and devoted efforts of a group of determined and patriotic Lithuanians. They were determined to restore Lithuania to its rightful place in this fair. I deem it an honor to express a public and sincere thank you in the name of the Lithuanian Legation to the Lithuanian Chamber of Commerce of Illinois, and particularly to its officers, with Dr. Jerome in the forefront, for carrying out such a noble idea. I am especially grateful to the secretary of the chamber and the chairman of the Lithuanian pavilion committee, Mr. Adolfas Baliunas, the untiring motivator of the pavilion idea. The free Lithuanians are of the same bone and blood as their enslaved brothers. They are in general, therefore, one-minded. The feelings of the enslaved Lithuanians are no riddle to us. The sons and daughters of suffering Lithuania are also cheering today because of this pavilion. Their cheering, alas, can be done only in their hearts and minds. Let us not expect a direct and open greeting from the occupied nation. I thus consider it my duty to express thanks to the Lithuanian Chamber of Commerce of Illinois in behalf of the gagged portion of the Lithuanian nation, for this great opportunity to explain to the world its suffering and its aspirations. The nation will forever remember with due respect the initiators and supporters of this grand idea.

Writer Vaizgantas once said that it is possible to torture Lithuania, it is possible to behead Lithuanians, but if even one Lithuanian remains alive he will, at the proper moment, having breathed the air of his native land, shout in the name of the nation, "I am still alive." With the Lithuanian pavilion at the Chicago Fair the nation is saying to the world, "I am still alive."

The general purpose of an international fair pavilion is to portray the achievement of the Lithuanian nation, to demonstrate its products, find a market for them, and to encourage tourism. That is how it used to be in the days of independence. At the present time the Land of Roadside Shrines can portray only its losses, the torture, the backward turn of the wheel of progress.

Let us glance in passing at the record of harm done to Lithuania by the occupant—a record he will most certainly conceal at the New York Soviet Fair. The occupant declares that 2,713,000 people live within today's Lithuanian borders. According to their own figures; before the seizure there were 2,880,000 people living in Lithuanian territory excluding Klaipeda territory, or 3,030,000 with that territory. Thus, their own statistics show a decrease of 317,000 in the population of Lithuania. If the imported Russians are excluded, then the Lithuanian population has become smaller by some half a million people. Adding the natural population growth in approximately 20 years, the total loss in population numbers at least 800,000 people. Deducting the loss of some 200,000 persons during the Nazi occupation, there is a balance of 600,000 Lithuanians lost as a result of Bolshevik acts in Lithuania. This number is made up of those who were annihilated and deported by the Bolsheviks, the youth sent as so-called volunteer workers to develop the Siberian wastes, and those forced to flee to the free countries of the world as refugees. This is the greatest single Bolshevik-inflicted loss to Lithuania. It is comparable only to a loss such as could be caused by a plague. What a plague could not do in the 20th century, the Bolsheviks have done. While the population in Lithuania decreased, the population kept increasing beyond the Urals, partly with Lithuanians. This is a Bolshevik "victory" which the Lithuanians countenance with loathing.

We cannot trust the victories in agriculture proclaimed by the Soviets. The present ruler of the Kremlin at one time belittled the honesty of the statistics on livestock specified by Stalin. We have no confidence in the probity of the present statistics either. The Soviets are known to us not as spreaders of the truth, but as disseminators of the big lie.

The Bolsheviks themselves do not deny the shortages of everyday needs. The Lithuanian actually cannot afford to buy even those scarce goods which do appear on the market. Thus arose the need to help the pauperized Lithuanian with parcels from America. This in turn brought about Soviet efforts to severely restrict aid to the enslaved Lithuanian.

If the production of some consumer goods has been greater than it was before the war, it has not been for the Lithuanian market, but, in Bolshevik jargon, for the "wide homeland." That is where Lithuanian textiles, shoes, and other commodities flow. The Lithuanian worker is merely a serf of Moscow.

The average pay of the urban worker is 400 to 500 rubles per month. The kolchoz farmers, who comprise approximately half of the country's inhabitants, on the average last year earned only 2½ rubles and 2 to 3 kilograms of grain per day. The purchasing power of the ruble is about the equal of 10 prewar Lithuanian cents or 1 American cent. Meanwhile a kilogram of bacon costs 30 rubles; herring, 10 to 13 rubles; sugar, 10 rubles, etc.

In the matter of living quarters it is the same backward Bolshevik progress. According to one Soviet source, each Lithuanian had 6.4 square meters of space for living quarters last year.

The occupant-published data for schools and students speaks about increases. Yet they would have normally increased in independent Lithuania, the more so because Lithuania would not have lost some 600,000 people. Independent Lithuania knew well how to travel the road of progress, and at an even speedier pace than the Soviets. That is one side of the education picture. The other side shows a decided fall in the study of humanities in Lithuania, in comparison with her days of independence. Only a couple of months ago the so-called Minister of Justice, more aptly called the minister of injustice of occupied Lithuania, Litas, complained about the lack of jurists. During the entire period of occupation not one person has received a doctorate. The reason is Moscow considers jurists unnecessary for the Lithuanians, since that profession is reserved exclusively for Russians, as loyal supporters of the regime. This is evident in the recently published regulations setting forth the conditions for entrance to professional schools. In competitive examinations in history, philosophy, law, and cultural-education specialties, the deciding factor is Russian language and literature (oral and written). How can a Lithuanian graduate who majored in Lithuanian win out over a Russian applicant in these specialized fields? So first place invariably goes to graduates of Russian, not Lithuanian schools.

Most of the Lithuanian professional school graduates receive no work in Lithuania. Employment is offered to them only in the depths of Russia. There is no benefit whatsoever to Lithuania from such graduates, and their inclusion in the general statistics is fraudulent. In addition, it is another means to Russianize and Bolshevikize the schools.

Having sifted the Bolshevik claims of progress and welfare through the prism of facts, it is plain that they are in the main a myth and a lie. We had decidedly better conditions in Lithuania on the eve of the last war. One of the reasons why foreigners are not permitted to enter Lithuania is that they would expose the Soviet myths.

The presence of Lithuania's Pavilion at this Fair coincides with two other major events. This is the eve of America's Independence Day. The Lithuanian nation is impressed by this act not only because it brought freedom and prosperity to this Nation and to our emigrees living here, but we are also impressed because the Declaration of Independence solemnly declares:

"* * * the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them * * *" and that "* * * all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

The "all men" emphasized in this act includes the Lithuanians. They too are people. They too are a nation. Lithuania also has a right to the blessings of freedom and independence. That is why this act is so precious to us, and the anniversary of this act so near and dear to our heat. We are happy that our Lithuanian Pavilion saw the light of day on the even of such an important anniversary.

This Pavilion came into being under the sign of another great anniversary. This is Lincoln's year, 150 years from the birth of the great emancipator. Lincoln is a son of Illinois, but he belongs to the entire world, for all time. He particularly belongs to the enslaved part of the world. He belongs to Lithuania as much as does John Foster Dulles, since both of these men were devoted to the cause of the enslaved man. We gratefully remember Dulles on the eve of America's Independence Day particularly, because even in illness he remembered Lithuania on her February 16 Independence Day. He remembered the Baltic States with a splendid statement which was, it seems, his last official act. But let us return to Lincoln.

Speaking about the U.S. Declaration of Independence he said: "* * * [it] grants freedom not only to the people of this country, but gives hope to the whole world, for all time." It was his aim "that all people be free," because, according to him, "freedom is the inheritance of all the people, in all the lands, everywhere [in the world]." On still another occasion he stated what is appropriate for the present-day occupant of Lithuania "Those who deny freedom to others are not worthy of it themselves."

Just 100 years ago Lincoln termed the acts of the czars in the matter of the Hungarian freedom fighters "an illegal and unjustifiable intervention in the affairs of another nation." Were Lincoln alive today he would certainly condemn the seizure of the Baltic States by the Red czars.

The American Lithuanian, in this year of Lincoln and on the eve of America's Independence Day, can say: "Thank you, Lincoln,

for reminding the Lithuanian through your actions of his duties towards Lithuania." The Lithuanian Pavilion is one expression of that pleasant duty.

Darius and Girenas offered the heroic deed of their Lituanica to reborn Lithuania. I believe I will surmise the wish of all of you in stating that the pavilion opened here today is also offered in honor of Lithuania, its suffering nation and her certain restoration to the family of free nations.

I just had the honor and the great pleasure of accepting, from the hands of Mr. Anthony Rudis, the esteemed former president of the Lithuanian American Chamber of Commerce of Illinois, two most beautiful flags which will grace the Lithuanian Pavilion—the Lithuanian tri-colored banner and the American Stars and Stripes. This presentation was made at a symbolic moment, on the eve of the anniversary of America's Declaration of Independence. Both these flags are close and dear to Lithuanian hearts, and it is impossible for a greater gift to have been made.

The enslaved Lithuanian is today forbidden to publicly stretch out his hand to his beloved Tricolor. In his circumstances, he would be deprived, by the occupant of his country, not only of his hand but of his head as well. The Lithuanian nation knows that, in the glorious undulating of the unfurled American flag, independent Lithuania still lives, and that here, the flag of the Lithuanian state still waves. The enslaved Lithuanian knows that the American Lithuanian believes in, and unrestrictedly makes sacrifices for, the resurrection of Lithuania.

May the Stars and Stripes wave gloriously at our pavilion in the company of the Lithuanian Tricolor. May this red, white, and blue banner sustain and fortify the hope of enslaved and free Lithuanians alike.

Oh beloved Lithuania's Tricolor, wave freely and gloriously in this capital of Lithuania's immigrants and refugees, in this friendly country, in the august company of the American banner.

When the Chicago Fair comes to an end, I would appreciate it very much if the leadership of the Lithuanian pavilion would be so kind as to let these flags pass into the custody of the Lithuanian Legation in Washington for safekeeping. When the dawn of freedom will again come for the land of our fathers, may these two flags be duly honored by the grateful Lithuanian nation on the Hill of Gediminas in the capital city of Vilnius.

Once more I proffer sincere thanks for creating this historic pavilion, and express my deep gratitude to Mr. Anthony Rudis for these historic and precious relics, to the leadership and members of the Lithuanian American Chamber of Commerce for their warm hospitality in honoring me, and to all of you for hearing me out so patiently.

The Non-Communist Oath Requirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Offensive Oath," published in the Washington Post of July 23, 1959, relating to the offensive non-Communist oath requirement.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFENSIVE OATH

The Senate today is to consider Senator KENNEDY's proposal to rid the Defense Education Act of its futile and offensive non-Communist oath requirement. Senators GOLDWATER, DIRKSEN, and PROUTY, while agreeing with the majority of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee that the oath ought to be eliminated, propose to put in its place a provision making it a felony for anyone accepting benefits under the act to advocate or belong to an organization advocating overthrow of the Government by illegal means. We hope the Senate will accept the Kennedy amendment and reject the Goldwater amendment.

Education affords the strongest possible bulwark against subversion. Those who would make orthodoxy a condition of education have lost faith in the utility of freedom, in the appeal of free institutions, and in the loyalty and good sense of American youth. They do a grave injustice to their country and their countrymen.

United States-Soviet Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the week of July 19–25 has been proclaimed Captive Nations Week. It is not a week that we can celebrate with much pride. We have done nothing to relieve these captive nations as they languish in chains.

As these people see us fraternizing with their oppressors they must sometimes wonder if this Captive Nations Week is not a rather poor joke, by which we may fool ourselves, but certainly fool no one else.

Mr. Speaker, I belong to the American Friends of the Captive Nations and I am placing the following article by our chairman, Mr. Christopher Emmet, in the RECORD. This article appeared, with others on the same subject, in a special section of the New Leader of July 20–27, 1959.

Mr. Emmet has put many problems before us, but he has answered them in a lucid and forthright manner, which may well clear our thinking on what is at stake at Geneva.

UNITED STATES-SOVIET RELATIONS

(By Christopher Emmet)

A curious paradox characterizes the world situation as we await the next Soviet moves in the Berlin crisis. On the one hand, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev has been waging the cold war with intensified brutability. He has given the Western Big Three an ultimatum to get out of Berlin and has repeated it on at least a dozen occasions. At every available opportunity, he has brandished his hydrogen missiles; in particular, he has tried to dislodge the British and Germans from their solidarity with the United States by warning them that it would take only a handful of hydrogen bombs to destroy their countries completely. He has warned Italy, Greece, Turkey, West Germany, and other North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries that they will permit the installation of NATO rocket bases at their own peril.

While all this has been going on, cultural exchange between the Soviet Union and the Western countries has achieved an unprecedented volume. In recent months, there have been the Bolshoi Ballet, the Moiseyev Dancers, the Soviet Exhibition in New York, the Soviet folk singers and dancers, and scores of delegations of various kinds. The entertainment section of the New York Times for Sunday, June 28, devoted three full pages to reviews of Soviet companies of performing artists who were in this country, had just visited, or were about to visit it. In Moscow, huge crowds have turned out to hear the New York Philharmonic Orchestra, to see the Ice Capades and the performances of Porgy and Bess. This increasing exchange is taking place—as is inevitable—to the disarming accompaniment of talk about improved understanding and relaxation of tensions. And there has also been a seemingly miraculous improvement in the parlor manners of Soviet diplomacy.

These two phenomena might appear to run counter to each other, but in reality they complement each other. Nothing the Soviet Union does is accidental—and it is certainly no accident that the vast increase in the cultural exchange program and the improvement in the Kremlin's diplomatic manners coincide with Khrushchev's ultimatums and the critical negotiations on Berlin. The cultural exchange program and the Berlin ultimatum are both part of the same offensive pattern. The purpose of the former is to serve as a smokescreen for the Soviet political offensive.

Ever since Stalin's death, the Soviets have been making a tremendous effort to promote cultural and technological exchange. They attached so much importance to this that it was made one of the four main points on the agenda of the 1955 summit conference, under the heading "Increased East-West Contacts." Clearly they expected an important net gain from such contacts—and their hopes have already been justified in Europe and in the Far East.

The uncritical enthusiasm with which we have responded to the Soviet cultural exchange program, which has now become the chief instrument of the Soviet campaign for "peaceful coexistence" and "relaxing tensions," has been one of our greatest mistakes. These slogans are incompatible with a Western political offensive or the encouragement of resistance in the captive nations, for Khrushchev has made it abundantly clear that he would consider any Western initiative relating to eastern Europe as a hostile act. Thus, any Western diplomatic offensive directed toward a Soviet withdrawal from eastern Europe and the holding of free elections directly conflicts with the relaxation of tensions. Because of this, we have failed to use our greatest political asset.

The only real breaks in the adverse trend for the West since Stalin's death have been provided by the Polish, Hungarian, and Tibetan revolts, which, temporarily at least, shook the Soviet and Peking empires to their foundations. Here is proof that the single greatest hope for peace and freedom lies in the active or passive opposition of the Soviet and satellite peoples toward the governments which oppress them.

The relaxation of tension rules out any effort to take the offensive by increasing or even maintaining the will of the captive peoples to resist. It is equally incompatible with maintaining the political structure of

NATO and an adequate NATO defense. Tension is a healthy reaction to the presence of danger. The only safe way to relieve the tension is to remove the danger. If we relax our sense of urgency, how can we maintain the intensity of effort and sacrifice needed to defend ourselves, or carry out the hard bargaining and maximum pressure necessary to win concessions from the Soviets on such key matters as German unification? Why should the Soviets yield anything if we relax our pressure whether they yield or not?

Democracies are at their best either in time of real peace, when they can afford disunity and glory in it, or in the time of war, when a voluntary unity is forged by danger. Democracy is at its worst in a state of half-war, half-peace. By a great effort, the West forged the necessary unity to fight the Communists to a standstill in the early phase of the cold war. The high point in this effort was Korea, where, despite the over-cautious Western strategy, our successful defense against Communist aggression climaxed the long series of similar Western successes from Iran to Greece and Berlin.

Our decline began with the inauguration of the more subtle Communist tactics, which began after Stalin's death with the signing of the Korean armistice. Under the influence of the new Soviet blandishments, the West, with each passing year, increased the scope of the cultural exchange program with the Soviet Union, stepped up the exchange of trade and scientific delegations and, in the case of most of our allies, sought for ways of enlarging trade with the Communist sphere. In our desire to be friendly and in our naive belief that the Communists will be influenced once they discover what friendly people we really are, we have ignored the consequences of this fraternization on our own foreign policy, on the captive peoples, and on the men in the Kremlin. It tends to obscure the truth that our real friends are the peoples of these countries who hate their Communist rulers, and it tends to strengthen the holds of these rulers over the peoples they enslave. It also increases the danger of war by creating an atmophere conducive to concessions, by further emboldening the Soviets, by making Khrushchev believe the West is soft and effete.

Despite Khrushchev's immediate repudiation of his 1955 Geneva agreement to the principle of unifying Germany by free elections, Western trade restrictions were relaxed, NATO defenses were reduced, and NATO disputes, such as the dangerous quarrels over Cyprus and Suez were permitted to increase. This increase in disputes between the allies was as much a reaction to the new Soviet tactics of "relaxing tensions" as were the reductions in the term of military service in many NATO countries. The prolonged disarmament negotiations directed by Harold Stassen, which continued with frequent spurts of optimistic reports for nearly 2 years, further served to relax the Western defense effort by making sacrifices appear unnecessary. Under cover of these negotiations, the Soviets achieved their missile headstart, dramatized effectively by the launching of the sputniks in the autumn of 1957.

After 4 years of success with their coexistence propaganda, interrupted only by the Hungarian and Polish setbacks, the Soviets began their present policy, which can be described as "working both sides of the street." On the one hand, they continued and expanded their peaceful protestations and their pressure for negotiations at the summit, for increased trade and cultural exchanges, etc. On the other hand, they exploited their missile headstart to intimidate the weaker nations of the West by a series of threats. With their Berlin ultimatum, they are now attempting to intimidate the Western Big Three.

The launching of these threats may have been premature from the Soviet point of view, since it partially counteracted the success of their "relaxing tension" policy. Intellectually, the threats provide a constant proof that the "friendly coexistence" propaganda is insincere. Khrushchev might have accomplished more if he had waited a little longer, but once again the overconfidence of a dictator has given the free world another chance to meet dictatorship head on.

Yet so far the Western response has been ambivalent. While in general we have stood firm in the Berlin crisis, we have made significant concessions on other matters, such as the negotiations on ending atomic tests, the easing of trade restrictions and even the granting of some credits in connection with East-West trade.

Thus the NATO countries have made every effort to maintain their old policies on the defense of Europe in Berlin, while at the same time they fraternize with the Communist leaders. This ambivalent strategy has not worked well in practice because the democratic countries are neither psychologically nor organizationally prepared to understand and implement such a dual policy.

The most typical and highly publicized aspect of East-West fraternization is the cultural exchange program. The idea conforms to the basic Western faith that, in any fair and open exchange, truth will triumph over falsehood, and freedom over slavery. But the program as organized at present is not a fair, open and equal exchange.

Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Frol Kozlov stated Moscow's position in his July 3 speech before the National Press Club:

"Let us take a very simple example: The conclusion of the Soviet-American agreement on cultural and scientific exchange—though it certainly does not settle outstanding international issues—does, in fact to some extent, promote this goal. American theatergoers applaud the Bolshoi Ballet, the Beryozka and Moiseyev dancers. Soviet audiences in their country warmly acclaim the envoys of American art. Thus, the irritation of mutual incriminations gives way to the mutual pleasure of contacts with the domain of beauty. And this is only to be welcomed.

"There might possibly be some jokers who would call visits of Soviet people to the United States Communist infiltration. These visits, however, help us to know each other better. Let someone call the visits of your Senators to the Soviet Union capitalist infiltration into our country. All right, we agree to put up with such infiltration. For visits such as these serve the cause of mutual understanding."

All this is very persuasive, but we must remember that the same man who uttered those words is pressing relentlessly for a Western retreat from Berlin. To get the United States to agree to that retreat is at present the supreme target in Soviet-American relations. Therefore, what Kozlov says about cultural exchanges should be divorced from what he says about Berlin. The two must be considered together as part of the same political operation. It should be quite obvious that the Soviets hope, by all the favorable publicity connected with cultural exchanges and the Kozlov visit, to obscure the fundamental fact of their threats to Berlin and thus reduce Western indignation and psychological ability to react to those threats.

On the record, it would be suicide for the American people to trust the Soviet Government. But the effect of the exchange program is to promote such trust indirectly. Since the Soviet visitors here and the Soviet citizens who officially receive American visitors in Russia are all either members of the Soviet Government or chosen by it, how can the increasing cordiality which the exchanges are supposed to foster fail to increase American trust in the good intentions and trustworthiness of the Kremlin? Does it make sense for our Government to encourage that trust at the very time when it is prepared to ask its citizens to face the supreme danger of nuclear war in order to check Soviet aggression in Berlin?

Many people hope, of course, that the main effect of increased exchanges will be to overcome the Soviet people's mistrust and misunderstanding of the American Government. But the impact of America on Soviet visitors, or of American visitors to the Soviet Union, cannot lead to any action by Soviet citizens to change Soviet foreign policy except possibly in the long-term future. On the other hand, in America every citizen who is converted to a friendlier and more trusting attitude toward the Soviet Government and its policies can make his voice heard in his community and in Washington itself. Therefore, what the United States is inadvertently doing by the exchange program as now organized is to encourage the formation of an American pressure group against U.S. foreign policy. If this does not happen, it will be due to the good sense of the American people and not to the effect of the present exchange program.

No mass exchange of free tourists or students is possible as long as there are no free private citizens in Russia, where everyone works for the Government. They cannot even work where they please, let alone travel where they please. When they are permitted to travel, they are watched by secret police, who are ostensibly members of these various delegations; their families are kept at home as hostages to prevent their defection in the countries they are visiting. Moreover, in contrast to the Westerners who visit Russia, Soviet citizens given permission to travel abroad belong to the privileged Communist elite in the arts, sciences, professions, and Government positions. Of all Soviet subjects, they have the least reason to criticize or defect. Most Soviet visitors are also trained as propagandists, and most of them are trained to speak the languages of the countries they are allowed to visit. There is serious reason, therefore, to question the effect on Soviet visitors of seeing "the truth about America for themselves"—a thing on which the U.S. Government seems to place much hope for improved American-Soviet relations.

But what of the effect of these visits in the United States? Unless these facts are thoroughly explained to the American communities receiving Soviet delegations—and there is no adequate machinery for doing so—it is almost impossible for the average American to imagine how these things are managed in a totalitarian country. When Soviet delegations arrive in a local American community, all our customs of friendliness and hospitality are brought into play. When any important foreign visitor comes to an American town, it is considered a compliment to the town because it puts it in the news. The local civic leaders, chambers of commerce, fraternal organizations, press and radio, do their utmost to publicize such visits favorably. Picketing of Soviet delegations may help to remind the people of forgotten facts, but it may also provoke sympathy for the visitors, unless it is done with dignity, skill, and timing. Moreover, the technical excellence of performances by Communist artists or technicians is bound to give the impression abroad that the Communist regimes which all the visitors represent cannot be so bad if they produce such able and apparently happy leaders in many fields.

A main argument advanced by Americans in favor of the cultural exchange program is

that the Russian people hate the West because they believe Communist anti-Western propaganda, and that exchange visits are a way of refuting that propaganda by showing the Russians what America is really like. But this theory simply does not jibe with such facts as these:

1. The British fleet visited Leningrad in 1955 while the germ warfare charge, which had been featured on every Soviet radio program and movie screen, must still have been fresh in the minds of the Russian people. An estimated crowd of nearly a million gave the British sailors a tremendous ovation and in some cases broke through police lines—an unprecedented event in Soviet Russia.

2. All the earliest American and other Western visitors to the Soviet Union after the "thaw" began, following Stalin's death, were met with similar friendliness. Even Adenauer, portrayed by the Kremlin as the symbol of the German invaders in World War II, was warmly received.

3. Khrushchev first appeared in the streets, daring to mingle with Soviet crowds, in company with visiting French statesmen.

4. There were great cheers for the American Olympic team at a Soviet sports stadium on the very day when the American Embassy in Moscow was being stoned on Kremlin orders.

5. When the crew of an American plane, which went astray and crashed over Soviet Armenia, found itself menaced by angry peasants who seemed prepared for a lynching, the crew saved itself by identifying itself as American—which would have increased its danger had the Soviet anti-American propaganda meant anything to the Armenian people.

Since the reception the Soviet people have accorded Americans and other Western visitors has been amazingly friendly from the beginning, this friendliness cannot be attributed to the effect of cultural exchanges. Cultural exchange merely made it possible to register friendliness which already existed. The extent of the cordiality suggests not only that Soviet propaganda had been ineffective, but that the friendly demonstrations toward Western visitors may have been used as a safe and indirect way of demonstrating hostility to the Kremlin. Since the Western visits were officially encouraged by the Soviet Government, it could not punish the people for cheering them. These facts reveal that the Soviet people were wholly uninfluenced by the anti-Western propaganda of their Government, and registered total disbelief in what their Government told them.

Under these circumstances, the spectacle of American visitors fraternizing with Soviet officials who receive and guide these tours, at all levels, could only have one of two effects on the people. (1) If they are hostile to their Government, it would discourage them to see that the American visitors are being fooled by the Soviet officials into thinking that they really represent and are popular with the Soviet people. Thus the visits would tend to discourage hopes and pressure for a change in the regime. (2) If most of the Russians are not really hostile to their Government, but merely friendly to the West and wholly indifferent to the Government's anti-Western propaganda, then the effect would be to have the popularity of the Western visitors rub off on the Soviet officials. The visits stimulate hope that the Soviet Government's policy is being liberalized. They will, therefore, reduce popular opposition or at least resentment toward the Government—all of which would simply make it that much easier and safer for the Kremlin to pursue its present aggressive and totalitarian policies.

Since only a tiny minority of Western visitors speak Russian and the great majority are dependent on official interpreters; since an equally small minority are experts on communism; and since, moreover, Soviet citizens would never dare express criticism of their government to the official interpreters (and would be unlikely to trust even a Western visitor who spoke Russian because he came there as a guest of the Soviet Government)—the Western visitor is prevented from hearing any political protest, even if it exists. He is received cordially by the Soviet officials as well as by the people, so naturally the cordiality of the two groups seems to merge and suggest to the visitor an identity between the people and the Communist officials. Also, since the officials at different levels are his real hosts and guides, his pleasure and gratitude for the cordial reception will naturally be directed first toward those officials.

Nature—and the human mind—abhors a vacuum. Since the visitor is not permitted to see the bad things in Russia and is guided toward whatever is best, his mind is filled with good impressions as well as pleasant memories. Therefore, unless he is steeped in the study of the Soviet Union and a knowledge of Communist tactics, it will be difficult if not impossible for him to remain completely objective, and to remember that he is getting a one-sided picture. This is all the more true because there is now no special political preparation or briefing for visitors to the Soviet Union to recall some of the terrible facts in the Soviet record, or to warn against its "Potemkin Village" techniques.

Moreover, the time and money which the visitor invests in the trip gives him a vested interest in thinking that he is getting something valuable from it and is really learning something. Of course, he is learning, but what he learns is so one-sided that his view will almost automatically be more unbalanced than it was before he entered Russia. He will think he knows the good because he has seen it, while the bad is remote hearsay. It was the same with the prewar visitors to Nazi Germany. There is also the fact that the visitor has a vested interest in proclaiming the value of the trip and the importance of what he was able to see on his return home, and in making his experiences appear as significant as possible in his conversations with friends and in his reports to his fraternal organizations.

In the case of visiting American artists, to whom applause is food and drink, the gratitude is proportionately greater. Soviet audiences, indeed, generally give them a far more enthusiastic and tumultuous reception than they have experienced in their own country. The cast of Ice Capades, which they have experienced in their own country. The cast of Ice Capades, which was enthusiastically applauded by scores of thousands of Soviet citizens, returned to the United States literally bursting with appreciation and with nice things to say about the Soviet people. The psychological impact is all the greater because before the visitor goes to Russia, he has an imaginative and exaggerated picture of Soviet economic and technical backwardness. His knowledge and understanding of the totalitarian police state is generally so crude that, if he looks over his shoulder and determines that he is not being followed, or if he sees people smiling in the streets, he is apt to conclude that the charges against the Soviet regime are surely exaggerated.

The American visitor may not be crudely propagandized, in a political sense, by the Soviet officials he meets—but the more subtle and restrained the propaganda, the more effective it would be. The reasons for the bad political relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States must inevitably come up often in conversations in the Soviet Union. Many Russian officials are trained in skillful political propaganda. They are instructed to explain Soviet policies to Americans, with which the average visitor does not have the historic knowledge to cope. This is all the more true when, say, a French visitor is told about Soviet complaints against America in connection with the cold war.

A PLAN FOR CULTURAL EXCHANGE

Because of the fundamental appeal of the cultural exchange program to the best traditions of our free society, it would be unwise to try to abolish it. In any case, it would not be practical politics to do so. What we must do is to see that it is organized on a more truly reciprocal basis. The following safeguards would eliminate all or most of the dangers discussed above.

1. The U.S. Government should set up, in cooperation with the various Russian institutes and foreign policy institutes attached to universities, a briefing service for all American visitors and tourists who go behind the Iron Curtain. Congress would be asked to provide funds for that purpose. Prospective tourists would be given a kit of documents as well as oral briefings and lectures outlining and analyzing the chief features of Soviet communism. The briefing would not, of course, be mandatory, but, if it were publicized, many would avail themselves of it. This briefing should consist of three parts:

Information about the particular Russian field in which the delegation or tourist is interested, and any special pitfalls and Communist tricks which might mislead them in that field; a general outline of Communist history and techniques, especially those of the "Potemkin Village" category; and outline of the facts about American foreign policy on subjects in dispute with Soviet Russia which are liable to be raised in conversation, so that the American visitor can give an adequate answer.

2. The same machinery should be used to brief local officials and leaders of American communities and organizations which plan to receive distinguished Soviet visitors and delegations. Such briefings about visiting Soviet delegations should include an analysis of the personnel and their positions and records in Russia, showing that they are not private citizens, as their American hosts imagine.

3. All oral briefings would be private, but some of the printed material used in the briefings could be distributed to local newspapers and responsible local organizations for their own use. The State Department itself would not, of course, publicly attack or comment upon the visiting delegations unless it should be necessary to refute some false statement. Since the State Department and the institutes with which it would cooperate in the briefing would not and should not engage in propaganda beyond the private briefings suggested above, volunteer anti-Communist organizations could play a constructive role.

4. Every effort should be made to reduce the factor of intimidation and censorship of Soviet visitors to this country by secret members of the MVD attached to the delegation, and to reduce the suspicion of spying in connection with such visits. The State Department should, for example, insist on incorporating a solemn undertaking by both governments in the projected new cultural exchange agreement, to the effect that all members of each delegation must be bona fide members, performing the functions in Russia or the United States as described in their passports, and none other. Such a solemn word of honor from the Soviet Government would mean nothing in itself, but violation of such an agreement would involve a real risk if any member of a visiting Soviet delegation should defect and denounce another member as an MVD agent. This would act as a partial deterrent

against threats and bullying of the members of the visiting delegation. Aside from this, U.S. visas should be refused for known or suspect members of the MVD who accompany Soviet delegations.

5. American interpreters who speak Russian should be provided for each visiting American delegation to Russia, as a check on the Soviet interpreter and to serve as a guide and counselor to expose Soviet propaganda to members of the American delegations.

6. The budget and personnel of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, and in the satellite countries other than Poland, should be increased to provide such interpreters and to offer other services, such as on-the-spot briefing when the American visitor or delegation first arrives and before it leaves the country.

7. The period of student exchanges should be at least 1 year, for the longer the Soviet student stays, the greater the chance of his coming to appreciate American freedom. Also, it would give Western students in Russia a chance to form real friendships and penetrate, at least to some extent, the Iron Curtain which exists within all totalitarian countries.

The Soviet Government would, of course, resent any and all of the above precautions because they would reduce the advantage it derives from the exchange program. It might carry its resentment to the point of bluffing a refusal to renew the agreement if these safeguards are adopted by the United States. However, Moscow would have no choice but to accept them or to abandon a propaganda maneuver on which it has invested an enormous amount of money and personnel training.

Presidential Veto of Housing Bill—Letter and Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the mayor of the city of Fargo, N. Dak., transmitting a resolution adopted by the Board of City Commissioners of Fargo, relating to the Presidential veto of the housing bill.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF FARGO, N. DAK.,
July 16, 1959.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
U.S. Senator from North Dakota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: You will please find enclosed herein a resolution adopted by the Board of City Commissioners of the city of Fargo, N. Dak., at its regular meeting Tuesday, July 14, 1959.

We respectfully request that you give this matter your serious consideration and that you lend your support and assistance in overriding the President's veto of the housing bill of 1959.

We further request that arrangements be made by the North Dakota congressional delegation to have the enclosed certified extract of the minutes of the Fargo City Commission, together with covering letter, introduced and read on the floor of both Houses of Congress.

Sincerely yours,
HERSCHEL LASHKOWITZ,
Mayor.

RESOLUTION

Commissioner Hagen moved the adoption of the following resolution:

"*Be it resolved by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo,* That—

"Whereas Mayor Lashkowitz having presented to the Fargo Urban Renewal Agency the matter of President Eisenhower's veto of the housing bill of 1959 and the serious consequences stemming from such unfortunate veto; and

"Whereas pursuant to the request of Mayor Lashkowitz, the following resolution was presented and adopted by the city of Fargo Urban Renewal Agency;

" 'RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OVERRIDE THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE HOUSING BILL

" '*Be it resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Fargo Urban Renewal Agency,* That—

" 'Whereas it has been called to our attention that the President of the United States recently vetoed the 1959 Housing Bill passed by the Congress of the United States, and

" 'Whereas it is our understanding that the bill vetoed by the President was a compromise bill, and

" 'Whereas this commission is of the opinion that the federally aided urban renewal program is of vital importance to the cities throughout the United States, and

" 'Whereas at the present time hundreds of applications are being held by the Federal Government pending favorable action towards the adoption of a new housing bill that will provide funds for urban renewals; and

" 'Whereas municipalities in the State of North Dakota together with the city of Fargo are interested in participating in the federally aided urban renewal program, and

" 'Whereas this Commission is unanimously of the opinion that the citizens of the city of Fargo are benefiting from the carrying out of the North Dakota R-1 urban renewal project: Now, therefore, be it

" '*Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Fargo Urban Renewal Agency,* That we do hereby recommend to the Senators and Congressmen from the State of North Dakota and to the entire Congress of the United States that they override the President's veto of he 1959 housing bill; be it further

" '*Resolved,* That this Board of Commissioners does hereby recommend to the Board of Commissioners of the city of Fargo, that they adopt a similar resolution; be it further

" '*Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the city of Fargo Urban Renewal Agency,* That we do hereby direct the executive director to forward copies of this resolution to the North Dakota congressional Representatives and to the Board of Commissioners of the City of Fargo': Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the board of city commissioners of the city of Fargo, N. Dak., does hereby concur in the above resolution, recommending that the Congress of the United States override the President's veto of the 1959 Housing bill as contained herein; be it further

"*Resolved,* That Mayor Lashkowitz be entrusted to write each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation, apprising them of the wishes of the board of city commissioners, and requesting that they take action to override the President's veto of the 1959 housing bill; be it further

"*Resolved,* That this resolution be spread upon the permanent minutes of the board of city commissioners of the city of Fargo, N. Dak."

Second by Markey. On the vote being taken on the question of the adoption of the resolution, Commissioners Hagen, Lewis, Markey and Lashkowitz all voted aye.

Absent and not voting: Commissioner McCannel.

The President declared the resolution to have been duly passed and adopted.

HERSCHEL LASHKOWITZ,
Mayor, President of the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo, N. Dak.

How To Plan Oversea Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on "How To Plan Operations if the Boggs Bill Is Enacted."

HOW TO PLAN OVERSEAS OPERATIONS IF THE BOGGS BILL IS ENACTED

(By Paul D. Seghers)

(This article discusses the Boggs bill, which is the first comprehensive attempt to make many needed reforms in the jumble of provisions in the Internal Revenue Code for the taxation of foreign-source income. The author is a member of the law firm of Seghers, Reinhart & McCall, New York City.)

If all who would benefit from the Boggs bill (H.R. 5) knew how much it means to the free world, as well as to American business, the tide of support would run so high, that its early passage would be assured. (It is now in the hands of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and early hearings on it are hoped for.)

Closer ties of friendship and understanding between our country and the other countries of the free world are vitally necessary, not only for our own national security, but for the survival of our way of life itself.

The closest ties between nations are those arising out of intelligent self-interest, and today these are best created and strengthened through mutually profitable international commerce. The American businessman is the best ambassador of good will we could have, creating bonds of friendship with the people of every land. He must be, because the American businessman abroad, and the business organization through which he operates, must understand, must be sympathetic to, and win the good will of, the people where they do business, or the business venture in that country will fail and pass from the scene.

Such strengthening of the ties of mutual self-interest and friendly commercial understanding is doubly important for our side today, in view of the increased tempo of the Communist cold war on the economic front.

These are the strongest reasons why our Government should encourage and assist U.S. business abroad. Just how business will be helped by the provisions of the Boggs bill, if enacted, is explained below.

Briefly, H.R. 5 would make possible the use of a domestic (United States) corporation to accumulate income from sales of goods and other business operations abroad, thereby making additional funds available for the expansion of such business, free of U.S.

tax until distributed to its stockholders. Furthermore, when distributed, the maximum U.S. tax rate would be 38 percent instead of 52 percent, and the foreign tax credit will be allowable.

These provisions, and other tax benefits available under H.R. 5, are described in some detail below, with especial emphasis upon the manner in which U.S. corporations may avail themselves of these advantages.

TAX DEFERRAL

The feature of H.R. 5 which has attracted the most attention is the deferral of U.S. tax on business income earned abroad by a domestic (U.S.) corporation until withdrawn from its operations abroad.[1] In order to defer payment of its U.S. taxes, the corporation must qualify (under the provisions of the bill) as a foreign business corporation. For this purpose, the corporation must derive 90 percent or more of its gross income from sources without the United States and "from the active conduct of a trade or business."[2] The latter phrase is defined to include dividends and other income from a corporation in which the recipient owns 10 percent or more of the voting stock, subject to the requirement that the paying corporation would meet (or has met) tests for qualification corresponding to those of an FBC (foreign business corporation).[3]

Having qualified as an FBC, it is subject to U.S. tax on its foreign-source business income only when, and to the extent that, it pays it out as dividends or otherwise withdraws its property from employment abroad.[4] (An FBC is taxable currently on its income from sources within the United States in the same manner as any other U.S. corporation.[5])

In the taxable year in which an FBC pays a dividend and becomes subject to U.S. tax on the portion of its profits (before U.S. tax) represented by the amount distributed,[6] it is allowed credit against such U.S. tax for foreign income taxes paid and deemed to have been paid by it with respect to such profits.[7] (Such credit is subject to the usual percentage limitations.[8])

Finally, when dividends are paid by the FBC to a U.S. corporation owning its stock, a 100 percent dividends-received deduction is allowed,[9] resulting in no U.S. tax on the receipt of such dividends.

SIGNIFICANCE OF TAX DEFERRAL

Now, what does this provision for deferral of the U.S. tax mean to the U.S. businessman? He can (after enactment of H.R. 5) organize a corporation under the laws of one of the States (or use an existing domestic corporation, such as a Western Hemisphere Trade Corporation, which qualifies as an FBC) to conduct business abroad without any U.S. tax being payable on income from such operations until the income is brought home and distributed. Thus, he can use the funds resulting from such profits, undiminished by U.S. taxes, to expand the business of the FBC in the country in which earned, or in any other country outside the United States.

Many U.S. businessmen who have hesitated to make use of a foreign corporation, are now ready to organize a foreign business corporation if the Boggs bill is enacted in its present form. In this way they will be enabled to expand their oversea operations, using the additional capital made available by the deferral of U.S. tax on the foreign-source income of such an FBC.

BENEFITS TO FOREIGN SUBSIDIARY OPERATIONS

Even in the case of a U.S. corporation already obtaining, through the use of one or more foreign subsidiaries, all the benefits of deferral of U.S. taxes on income from sources outside the United States until received as dividends, and the benefit of the averaging of foreign income taxes so as to minimize the loss of foreign tax credits, some benefits can, in certain circumstances, be derived from the use of FBC.

One advantage of FBC in such circumstances is that, being a domestic (U.S.) corporation, it is eligible for International Cooperation Administration guarantees, while a foreign corporation is ineligible for this protection.

Another feature of FBC is that it is subject, as a domestic corporation, to all tax conventions (treaties) between the United States and other nations, and entitled to the benefits thereof.

STOCK TRANSFER BENEFITS

An interesting example of a tax-free transfer to an FBC is a transfer, by a U.S. parent corporation to an FBC, in exchange for stock of the latter, of stock of a foreign subsidiary now owned by the parent.

Such a transaction (between a parent and a wholly owned subsidiary) would not be subject to the provisions of 1954 code section 367, both transferor and transferee being domestic corporations and it being immaterial whether or not the foreign corporation be considered a corporation for the purpose of determining, under code section 351, the tax-free effect of such an exchange. Hence, it would not be subject, under section 367, to the exceptions to the general rules in subchapter C regarding tax-free exchanges.

One of the advantages of transferring stock of a foreign subsidiary to a subsidiary FBC is that such foreign subsidiaries could pay dividends to the FBC (thus removing assets from the country in which said subsidiary was incorporated and/or operating) without resulting in any immediate U.S. tax. The advantages of such flexibility are obvious, and it will be found in many instances, that such a method of operation (with both a foreign subsidiary and an FBC) has other tangible advantages.

Benefit evaluation

In order to ascertain the possible value of using an FBC in a specific case where a domestic corporation already has one or more foreign subsidiaries, all feasible transactions involving the three types of corporations should be imagined. Then compute the resulting deferral of payment of U.S. taxes and the ultimate income tax consequences (United States and foreign) of such transactions. Only in this way is it possible to reach an informed decision as to which transactions and methods of operating would produce the most advantageous overall result. It is probable that some surprising results will become apparent from such tax computations. It will, of course, be essential also to take into consideration local taxes other than income taxes, and all nontax factors which would have a bearing upon the desirability of such transactions.

TAX REDUCTION

Despite the advantages which some see in the deferral provisions of H.R. 5, discussed under that heading, if the stated objectives of the Boggs bill to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance are to be attained, much more than tax deferral is necessary.

To encourage American businesses to expand their activities in (or into) other countries, the mere postponement of the time for paying U.S. taxes on income (if any) thus earned outside the United States is not a very strong incentive.

Income earned outside the United States, beyond its jurisdiction and protection, should be taxed by the United States only once—when such profits are received by U.S. citizens or residents. That is enough, rather than taxing such foreign profits when received by a U.S. corporation, and again when distributed to its stockholders. It should not be necessary to advance arguments in support of this view—on the contrary, it is Congress that should have to justify its imposition of two successive taxes, one on top of the other, on income earned outside the United States.

EXTENSION OF WESTERN HEMISPHERE TRADE CORPORATION TAX REDUCTION

A step in the right direction is taken in the Boggs bill—the extension to worldwide business operations of the 14-percentage-points tax reduction presently allowed to U.S. corporations qualifying as Western Hemisphere Trade Corporations.

The Boggs bill would allow this reduction with respect to business income from abroad, including dividends and other income, of a domestic corporation which qualifies as an "International Trade Corporation."[10] To qualify as such, the income of such a corporation must meet the above-described tests applicable to the income of an FBC "for the 3-year period immediately preceding the close of the taxable year (or for such part of such 3-year period during which the corporation was in existence, or for such part of such 3-year period as follows December 31, 1958, whichever is the shorter * * *."[11]

It usually will be found desirable even where not essential, to organize a new corporation (under the laws of one of the States) to qualify as both an FBC and an international trade corporation. No U.S. tax problem under 1954 code section 367 would result from any transfers of properties to such a corporation from one or more individuals or from another existing domestic corporation, inasmuch as no foreign corporation would be a party to the transfer.

An illustration of the potential advantage of the provision for the 14-point reduction may be found in the case of a U.S. corporation now making sales in the Western Hemisphere through a WHTC subsidiary, but selling directly to customers in Europe. Under the Boggs bill, the benefit of the 38-percent maximum U.S. tax rate on income realized by such a corporation from sales in Europe would be available to an international trade corporation to the same extent as is presently the case with the sales being made in the Western Hemisphere but outside the United States. Such operations in both hemispheres would no longer present the same problems as to loss of tax credits where the tax rates in some countries are higher than 52 percent. This would result from another provision of the Boggs bill (mentioned further below) permitting the use of either the overall or per-country method of computing the limitation on the allowable amount of such credit.

It is clear that a domestic corporation which qualifies as an international trade corporation may also qualify as an FBC, thereby obtaining the benefit of both the 14-percentage-point reduction in the tax on its foreign business income and the deferral of U.S. tax on such income until distributed. These two provisions, taken together, afford

[1] Sec. 951. Unless otherwise stated, all citations of code sections in footnotes refer to sections of the 1954 code as proposed to be amended by H.R. 5, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959).
[2] Sec. 951(a).
[3] Sec. 951(a)(2).
[4] Sec. 951(b)(2) and sec. 78.
[5] Sec. 951(b)(1).
[6] Sec. 951(b)(4).
[7] Sec. 951(b)(2)(C).
[8] 1954 code, sec. 904.
[9] Sec. 243(c).
[10] Sec. 921.
[11] Sec. 921(1).

sufficient benefit to constitute a strong incentive to American business to expand its activities abroad, thereby accomplishing the announced objectives of the Boggs bill, as well as the broader objectives of strengthening the ties of commercial and friendly relations with other nations of the free world.

The Treasury, apparently without adequate statistics on how much tax (net after deduction of foreign tax credits) it has been collecting with respect to business income from abroad in recent years, "guesstimates" that it runs from $200 million to $500 million, and objects to the effect of these provisions upon its revenue. Even if one of these estimates happened to be approximately correct, the cost would be small, compared to (1) the billions of dollars being poured out in government-to-government aid (the need for which would be lessened by the effects of enactment of H.R. 5), and (2) the increased income tax revenue that would flow to the Treasury as a result of the stimulation of U.S. business as a consequence of acceleration of our international trade if H.R. 5 is made a part of our system of taxing income earned outside the United States.

It is far easier to prove that this would be the effect of enactment of the Boggs bill, than for the Treasury to prove how much revenue loss it would sustain (temporarily) as a result of H.R. 5's provisions for tax deferral and the 14-point tax reduction.

One thing is certain: Business will not be encouraged to any great extent to embark upon and expand operations abroad if the only incentives offered are tax reductions which will not even temporarily reduce the Treasury's tax revenues from such activities.

If business appreciates what it can do for our country through increased business with other countries, and what the Boggs bill can, in turn, do for such business, very desirable results would quickly ensue in both directions.

TAX-FREE PROPERTY TRANSFERS

The Boggs bill will greatly facilitate tax planning because of its provision [12] permitting "tax-free" transfers of "foreign business property" to foreign corporations, in certain circumstances. Such transfers are distinctly different from (1) transfers of property of any kind from an ordinary domestic (U.S.) corporation to a "foreign business corporation"—which may be made completely "tax-free" [13]—and (2) transfers from a foreign corporation to an FBC, which may be made in such a manner as not to give rise to U.S. tax at the time transfer is made [14] but will enter into the computation of the FBC's "reinvested foreign business income" [15] and hence be taxable to the FBC at the time it makes a distribution out of such "income." [16]

Benefits in computing tax credit

Another provision of H.R. 5 which will greatly facilitate tax planning is that which allows, in the determination of the amount of the foreign tax credit, the use of either the existing "per country" limitation or the "overall" limitation, whichever will produce the larger credit.[17]

This would eliminate the present necessity of planning steps to avoid loss of tax credits in situations where, due to operating in countries where the income tax rates are higher than 52 percent, it is desirable (if possible) to effect an "averaging" of such taxes with taxes levied at lower rates in other countries.

INVOLUNTARY CONVERSIONS

Another type of situation, in which the resulting tax burden could be very heavy and inequitable, has likewise been corrected by the Boggs bill. This has to do with situations where, due to local conditions, the U.S. parent company wishes to be the payee of insurance policies covering property owned by a subsidiary.

Those operating in such countries are familiar with the reasons why this is highly desirable, if not practically essential. Under existing law, proceeds received by the parent company in such a situation, even though reinvested in similar property thereafter owned by the subsidiary, are taxable to the parent company in their entirety as ordinary income. This is so because the parent company has no cost to apply against the receipt of such proceeds and, hence, cannot claim that such proceeds are from the sale or disposition of any asset owned by it. Under the proposed provision in H.R. 5,[18] the receipt of such proceeds by the U.S. parent would not be taxable to it provided that the money was reinvested in similar property thereafter owned by the subsidiary. This will protect the U.S. corporation in the event of the receipt of proceeds of casualty losses of property in such circumstances and relieve the existing burden of the tax counsel, although there is believed to be, under existing law, at least one means of achieving approximately the same result.

TAX CREDIT FOR "FORGIVEN" FOREIGN TAX

Finally, one of the great planning opportunities for obtaining both business and tax benefits is offered by the provision in the Boggs bill which would allow U.S. taxpayers—during a maximum period of 10 years—credit for foreign income taxes forgiven by the government of a foreign country as an inducement to render technical, engineering, or like services, or to actively conduct a trade or business in such country, provided the facts as to such forgiveness are certified by our Secretary of State (or his delegate).

This so-called tax-sparing provision is essential to remove the obstacle which presently deters foreign governments from giving U.S. business adequate and effective tax incentives sufficient to justify the risk in investing money, time and know-how in new enterprises in less-developed countries. Under existing law, taxes so forgiven by the foreign government are sooner or later collected from the U.S. taxpayer by the U.S. Treasury, thus depriving the taxpayer of any net tax benefit as a result of the incentive sought to be extended by the foreign government.

This provision would benefit taxpayers without any actual loss of revenue to the Treasury, inasmuch as it would collect as much tax from the taxpayer as if the foreign tax had not been forgiven by the foreign government.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it might be mentioned that there is nothing in H.R. 5 which would result in any different method of determining the source of income or place of sale of goods, whether produced in the United States by the parent company or by an affiliate of the taxable entity making the sale, or otherwise acquired.

It is not believed that there is anything in the Boggs bill or its legislative history to date which would indicate that any different rules would be applicable with respect to the necessity of substance in the case of a foreign business corporation or an international trade corporation than are applicable to domestic and foreign corporations under existing law. Hence, the problems of source of income (that is, place of sale) and of substance will still confront the tax counsel.

One last word—it will still be worthwhile to plan entirely to avoid the U.S. corporation tax on income from abroad, whenever possible.

[12] Sec. 367(b) and (c) and sec. 1492(2).

[13] Under 1954 code, secs. 351, 354 and similar provisions of subch. C, ch. 1 of the 1954 code.

[14] Sec. 921(b)(2).

[15] Sec. 921(b)(2)(B).

[16] Sec. 921(b)(2)(A).

[17] Sec. 904(d).

[18] Sec. 1033(g).

Mallory Rule No Longer Panics the Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD a recent article appearing in the Washington Post which clearly refutes the contention that police are and will be hampered in their law enforcement duties by the Supreme Court decision of 1957 in the Mallory case barring confessions obtained between arrest and arraignment, if there had been delay in arraignment. Despite all the predictions of dire consequences which last session and this year in the House passage of bills to nullify this decision have been contended would result from this ruling, actual experience of the Police Department in 2 years has served to show the soundness of the Supreme Court's McNabb-Mallory decisions protecting the rights of individuals. Even, as the article points out, U.S. Attorney Oliver Gasch has frankly admitted that the experience has undermined his position that legislation is needed that in fact would sanction the breaking of the rule against lengthy questioning of suspects in order that the police might solve crimes and win cases. In 2 years, virtually no effect has been had upon the solution of crimes. The practical effect of the Mallory rule has been to eliminate many inequities in the handling of suspects, particularly as they relate to Negroes who in many instances, because of racial prejudice, are brought in disproportionate numbers into contact with the police under suspicion and arrest.

I commend the reading of this article to Members of this body as one example of the baselessness of "blood will run in the streets" arguments against court decisions which seek to protect the rights and privileges of the people and constitutional guarantees to them:

[From the Washington Post, June 14, 1959]

THE MALLORY RULE NO LONGER PANICS THE POLICE

(By James Clayton)

On June 23, 1957, the Supreme Court reversed the conviction of Andrew Roosevelt Mallory for rape because a confession used at his trial had been obtained during an illegal delay between his arrest and his appearance before a judge.

The decision catapulted Mallory into fame of a sort, staggered local police and prosecutors and brought anguished cries that effective law enforcement was no longer possible in the District of Columbia.

"In a relatively short time, thousands of guilty persons will go free," a ranking police official told Congress. Unless police can question suspects and get confessions from them, he implied, the law cannot be enforced.

JAILS STILL BUSY

In the 2 years since, it has become obvious that the decision did not end effective law enforcement here. Perhaps a dozen other persons have gone free because the only evidence against them was contained in statements they gave to police while they were being held illegally. But the decision has given only unrealized dreams of freedom to the 2,000 others charged with serious crimes since that June day. The percentage of serious crimes solved has not changed appreciably.

There are two obvious reasons why the dismal predictions failed to come true:

One is that the Metropolitan Police Department and the U.S. attorney's office discovered that they can solve most crimes and win most cases without breaking the rule against lengthy questioning of suspects. This was a discovery clearly forced by the Mallory decision and a discovery which has reduced cases in which the Mallory decision is a serious issue to a minimum.

The other reason is that the U.S. Court of Appeals here has decided that the sharpest critics of the Mallory decision had not understood what the Supreme Court meant. The critics broad interpretation—which would have invalidated any statements made after an arrest and before a preliminary hearing—has been replaced by an interpretation which is about as narrow as it can be.

Paradoxically, a minority of the judges, composed of the court of appeals' strongest liberals, interpret the decision just as did the strongest critics, who are mostly stanch conservatives. The difference is that the liberals praise this view while the conservatives damn it.

THE DECISION

The Mallory opinion was written by Justice Felix Frankfurter for a unanimous Court. It said that a confession obtained from Mallory 7½ hours after his arrest was obtained during an "unnecessary delay" between his arrest and his hearing before a judge, which came 12 hours after the confession.

At that hearing, Mallory was told of his right to refuse to talk to police. He might not have confessed after that.

To force the police to obey the law requiring these hearings "without unnecessary delay," the Supreme Court excluded the confession from evidence at Mallory's trial. Mallory subsequently went free. Without his confession, there was insufficient evidence to convict him, U.S. Attorney Oliver Gasch said, especially with the rape victim most reluctant to undergo a second trial.

This rule is not new—there are similar rules for evidence seized through illegal wiretaps and unreasonable searches—although law enforcement officials jumped up and down as if it were new. It is merely a reiteration of a rule the Supreme Court laid down in 1943 in the McNabb case. In Mallory, the Court classified 7½ hours as an "unnecessary delay" and announced that it had meant what it had said in McNabb.

DIFFERENT TACTICS

After the initial shock wore off, U.S. Attorney Gasch told the police that they had better learn to live with the decision. He and his staff then worked hard to give the police a series of lectures on how procedures should be changed.

Gasch is convinced that the police have worked just as hard to put these changes into effect. There has been more diligence in complying with the law requiring immediate hearings, and less reliance on confessions in solving cases. This, of course, was precisely what the Supreme Court wanted.

The result, Gasch frankly admits, has undermined his own position that legislation is needed to clarify Mallory-type situations. He knows that the good police record, which he and Chief Robert V. Murray have fostered, makes the need for that legislation harder to prove.

NARROWING THE RULE

At the same time, the court of appeals has been stripping the decision of the broad interpretation. The result is that some critics now frankly admit that the decision, as applied here, is no longer objectionable. They still want Congress to revise it through legislation but only to write into law the present interpretation in case someone decides someday to adopt a different interpretation.

At first, it had looked as if the court of appeals was not going to take so narrow a view. The court banned a confession made at 3:15 a.m. when the defendant was arrested at 6:40 p.m. Then it banned others made at 8 a.m. after an arrest at 1 a.m. and at 3 a.m. after an 8 p.m. arrest.

The best explanation of these was given by Judge John A. Danaher, who said that the suspects had been subjected to inquiry or to a course of conduct which lends itself to eliciting inculpatory statements.

That seemed to mean that any delay between arrest and hearing or any questioning at all by police would invalidate any confession. This triggered a series of midnight court hearings so that confessions would be usable at trials.

Then came a case in which Judge Warren E. Burger wrote that "unnecessary delay" does not mean mere passage of time. It means, he said, "passage of time during which that which should and could be done is not done." The appellate court upheld a confession obtained while police were acting as quickly as they could to get a preliminary hearing.

This indicated that police could ask questions of suspects if, at the same time police were trying to take a man before a judge. That is, questions could be asked during booking procedures, during transportation in police cars and so on, if the police goal was an immediate court appearance.

Last June, the Court went further. It said that "reasonable questioning" is all right until police have had an opportunity to reach "any reasonably accessible magistrate."

This apparently meant that if an arrest was made at night and no magistrate was reasonably accessible, confessions would not be affected by a delay until he became accessible.

Three months later, Burger spelled out what questions the police can ask. He said that they can ask a suspect what he knows about a crime. If the suspect says he doesn't know anything, they can tell him what they know and ask him about that. If he still denies knowing anything, they can ask if he wants to say something or just let the case stand the way it is.

"It is only when the questioning crosses into what can be termed 'grilling' or is continued beyond the brief period allowed, that the resulting confession may be inadmissible," he said.

This is a long way from the view, vigorously presented to Congress last year, that every statement made between a man's arrest and his preliminary hearing is inadmissible under the Mallory decision. This interpretation sanctions the use of statements made during any reasonable delay.

Thus, the court of appeals has approved delays to allow time for booking and for investigation other than questioning. It has approved delays when no magistrate was immediately available and when a suspect was drunk.

All this indicates that its position is much like the position of those who supported a bill in Congress last year to approve reasonable delays after arrest. This passed the Senate but failed during an attempted compromise with a House bill which approved all delays after arrest.

The compromise had to fail because the House bill directly reversed the McNabb-Mallory rule while the Senate bill adopted that rule as interpreted in the court of appeals here.

The House has before it now the same bill it approved last year but there have been no stirrings in the Senate this session.

Throughout this narrowing of the decision's effect, Judges Henry W. Edgerton and David L. Bazelon, of the court of appeals have consistently objected. They argue that the Supreme Court meant to eliminate all confessions obtained during any delay between arrest and preliminary hearing. They also argue that a confession coming after any illegal arrest is inadmissible.

This last point, once a widely accepted reading of Mallory, was disposed of by the court of appeals last year. Judge Walter M. Bastian wrote that the illegality of an arrest does not affect a confession as long as there is a prompt hearing.

One point remains to bother the Mallory decision's critics. In 1948, George Morris Fay, then U.S. Attorney, admitted error before the court of appeals and asked it to upset the conviction of Andrew Upshaw because Upshaw's confession was obtained during an unnecessary delay before a preliminary hearing in violation of the McNabb rule.

The court of appeals said, two to one, that Fay was wrong; that the McNabb rule did not mean a delay invalidated a confession unless the delay was a part of coercion to get a confession. Judge Edgerton dissented. He said his brothers misunderstood the rule.

The Supreme Court promptly said that Edgerton was right and his brothers were wrong. Edgerton thinks now that his brothers are wrong again.

Resolution by Pennsylvania House of Representatives on the Immigration and Naturalization Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I include in the RECORD, for the consideration of Members of Congress, house resolution No. 45, which was unanimously adopted by the house of representatives of the Pennsylvania General Assembly on June 30, 1959. This resolution relates to the fourth preference quota of the Immigration and Naturalization Act and reads as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 45

There are many Americans who have filed petitions with the immigration authorities of the United States for the entry of their sons, daughters, brothers, and sisters which petitions are classified in the fourth preference quota of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

Of the four preference quotas established by the Federal Immigration and Nationality Act the first, second, and third quotas are

allotted 100 per centum of the total annual entry quota;

As a result those persons who fall within the fourth preference section must depend for entry into this country upon deficiencies in the first three quotas;

There is frustration and despair resulting from the law that gives hope to Americans by permitting them to file petitions, getting them approved, and then compelling them to wait for their kin who may never come;

Thousands of discontented people abroad whose hopes are first raised and then dashed certainly cannot believe in the good will we try to engender through our foreign policy and thus become easy prey to the propaganda of unfriendly Nations;

Congress has recognized and alleviated a similar problem through Public Law 85-316 which includes a provision for reuniting spouses and minor children of aliens legally residing in this country whose petitions were approved prior to July 1, 1957: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the provisions of Public Law 85-316 to include cases which fall within the fourth preference quota in order to provide for entry of the many thousands, petitions for whom have piled up in a backlog in prior years, that in order not to create another problem of separated families those applicants who are married and have families be permitted to bring them, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to each Congressman and U.S. Senator from the State of Pennsylvania.

Paul D. Abramson, Jr., Awarded CAP Scholarship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce to the House of Representatives that one of my constituents, Paul D. Abramson, Jr., has won, in the face of heavy competition, a 4-year aeronautical engineering scholarship given by the Civil Air Patrol. Forty thousand young men of the CAP competed in the contest which resulted in this award. The funds to pay the $4,000 scholarship, which will be used to attend the Massachusetts Institute of Technology at Cambridge, Mass., this fall, comes entirely from private non-Government sources.

The scholarship is named the Gen. Lucas V. Beau Scholarship, he having been a former national commander of the CAP.

I am particularly pleased to inform the House of this award as I know this young man and his family well. His father, Dr. Paul D. Abramson, was a personal friend of mine and a very prominent surgeon in Shreveport, La., until his unexpected death this past week.

Young Abramson has been an outstanding honor student at Byrd High School in Shreveport where he ranked 12th in his graduating class of 575. This, in itself, speaks very well of the ability and capabilities of this young man.

I have repeatedly recognized the urgent need for more and better scientific training of the young people of the Nation. I am happy to know that the top scientific award of the CAP this year has gone to one of my constituents.

I would like to point out that listed among young Abramson's hobbies are operating radio controlled airplanes and the study of electronics, photography and astronomy. You must admit these are not the usual hobbies of a young 17-year-old. He has also served as president of his high school science club.

While young Abramson was building his outstanding record in high school, he took time to participate in the CAP program. During his cadet career, this honor student won his certificate of proficiency with the CAP and was named a member of the National Honor Society. He is rated as excellent in every phase of cadet life by the commander of the Shreveport squadron of the Louisiana CAP wing to which he belongs.

He has in the past 2 years amassed such a splendid record that he ultimately was awarded this coveted CAP scientific scholarship which can only be used to further his training in aeronautical engineering.

In the space age into which we are now entering such scientific education will be in great demand and I strongly urge our young men to enter the various scientific fields.

The CAP is doing a grand job in encouraging such study by its cadets and the CAP offers a well-rounded basic program for its cadets. I urge all our young men to take part in the CAP program. I commend the CAP in its selection of young Abramson for the award of this scientific scholarship.

I congratulate Paul Abramson, Jr., on being awarded this scholarship and express my best wishes for his continued success at MIT during his studies there.

The Barter Program Under Public Law 480

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the text of a statement I delivered this morning before the House Committee on Agriculture in connection with the barter program under Public Law 480. My statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE VICTOR L. ANFUSO, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, THURSDAY, JULY 23, 1959, ON PUBLIC LAW 480

Mr. Chairman and my former colleagues on this committee, while my anatomy may not be on one of those chairs you occupy, my heart is still in this room. It was not my idea to be taken off this committee, and I sincerely feel that we were making wonderful progress in bringing about better understanding between the producers of agricultural commodities and those who consume them. May I say also this morning that the farmer also needs the businessmen from the cities to help him dispose of his agricultural products by barter, as well as cash sales.

The President of the United States has often expressed himself in favor of barter and so has the Secretary of Agriculture and many in the department who administer the program. Congressional leaders of both parties have told the President and the Secretary of Agriculture that we should do more bartering.

Where then is the opposition which has been so effective as to make those rugged American pioneers, who braved all sorts of dangers to bring strategic materials to this country in furtherance of our national security and defense, look almost like criminals engaged in a nefarious occupation? It comes from those men in very high places in government who sincerely but nevertheless misguidedly, believe that it is wrong for this country to engage in honest-to-goodness competition with our allies; that whenever our competition interferes with the foreign trade of any of our allies, we alone should back down and let their products through even though what they are doing always hurts our taxpayers and many times helps our enemies.

When those who are opposed to barter say that barter transactions interfere with normal trade, what they really mean is that through barter we are disposing of more agricultural surpluses than our friendly competitors.

Foreign competitors naturally want us to relax our barter transactions so that they can do more business through direct sales or barter.

The question then should be asked these well-intentioned men: Is it right for our competitors to undersell us and make use of barter and wrong for us to do the very same thing?

Mr. Chairman, this barter program is a good one. If properly administered, not only will it dispose of surpluses equaling the value of the needed materials which we acquire, but we have had ample testimony before this committee from competent exporters of agricultural commodities to the effect that disposals through barter materially assist in their disposals for cash. And as you, yourself have very eloquently demonstrated, time and time again there has never been one single instance where a barter transaction prevented a cash sale for dollars. In other words, our total disposals have been increased by the barter program operating before the Department of Agriculture decided to curtail it.

The misguided apostles who oppose barter constantly give the argument that barter disturbs normal marketing. I have already told you what they really mean, but let me go further. In title I, which is a program of great magnitude, we carefully wrote restrictions about the disturbance of normal marketings. Title III, even at the level desired by the Congress, is only a fraction of our governmental disposal program. The Congress has felt that in this instance, the danger to normal marketings would never be as great as in the title I program. This stems from its small volume and the fact that at every step of the way, a barter transaction is precisely the same as a transaction for cash. Every step of the transaction is handled exactly the same way as a cash sale. The only difference, Mr. Chairman, is that in barter the sale of the commodity is tied into a sale of a material which has made it possible for our businessmen to sell agricultural commodities abroad on a more competitive basis than if they were merely selling for dollars.

Mr. Chairman, it has already been pointed out by you and others why the nations of

the world with whom the United States competes in the export of cotton and wheat have been vociferous in their opposition to the barter program. It has also been made clear in these hearings and in those we had last year that certain American firms who have large holdings in Mexican cotton have been active in building up support within Government against the barter program. At least one of the large grain companies which, according to the public press, has rental contracts for the storage of our surplus grains totaling $13 million annually, has recently become very active in opposition to the barter program.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I knew, but I don't, why both the Departments of State and Agriculture should be listening to those few who are advancing their own selfish interest to the detriment of our national program.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot honestly find any logic or justification in the arguments advanced against barter. I know that the record shows that as the sales through barter increased, our total exports incresaed and so did our cash sales. I know that as the barter program decreased, so did our total exports and our cash sales until they have sunk to their present low levels. I know that the storage costs for our surplus agricultural commodities now cost approximately $2 million per day, and the Department estimates a considerable increase in the next few years. I know that the materials that we have been receiving in exchange for our surpluses are not only a valuable insurance against a national emergency, but more importantly, they are materials which we will urgently need in our future economy, and are, therefore, valuable national assets. I know that the value of the materials that we have taken in exchange for the deteriorating and expensive-to-store surplus commodities have increased significantly since their acquisition. I know that barter, and barter alone, has permitted us to acquire materials from many of the underprivileged nations of the world which they could not privately sell for dollars to the United States. And, Mr. Chairman, I know, as you so ably pointed out on the floor of the Congress, that since we have curtailed our barter sales the Soviet bloc has moved into the vacuum and increased their exports to the very nations to which the Department of Agriculture and our State Department will not permit us to export through the barter program.

Knowing these things as I do, and recognizing that this committee also knows them and has always, on a nonpartisan basis, supported the type of barter program which all of us advocate, the question is what can we do about it?

There are pending before this committee many bills designed either to set the level of the barter sufficiently high as to force the removal of the restrictions presently on the movement of commodities or through other means to make it mandatory that the Secretary carry out the type of barter program which the Congress intends. Any of these bills, with a little rewriting, would serve the purpose.

I have read carefully the bill, H.R. 7983, recently introduced by the chairman of this committee and believe that the language in section 4 is perhaps the most competent language which has been prepared to require the Secretary to carry out the type of barter program that the Congress wants. It may be argued by some that the Congress should not mandate the Secretary to carry on such a program. However, experience shows that no other alternative is effective, and I sincerely believe it would remove criticism of both the Secretary and those who administer the program if the mandate were clear and unambiguous. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, we might as well abandon the program.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the history of this program is still relatively new. In 1954, as farm surpluses began to pile up in our warehouses, Congress enacted Public Law 480 providing various methods for disposing of these surpluses abroad. One of these methods was barter for strategic and other materials, and services of value to the United States.

Such authority was not new. It had existed for many years in the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (sec. 4(h)) and had been implemented in various other statutes. Relatively little use had been made of this authority, however, because there was no clear congressional policy for such a program.

Section 303 of Public Law 480 established such a policy by directing the Secretary of Agriculture "to use every practicable means" to arrange and make such barters or exchanges whenever he "has reason to believe" that "there may be opportunity to protect the funds and assets" of the CCC by barter or exchange of agricultural surpluses for "strategic materials entailing less risk of loss through deterioration or substantially less storage charges."

The clear intent of this legislation was to establish the congressional policy that barter did protect the funds and assets of the CCC and to establish barter as a priority method of disposing of agricultural surpluses, second only to cash sales for dollars.

For about 2½ years, until May 1957, the Department of Agriculture carried out a barter program as intended by Congress. During this period it exchanged more than $900 million of surplus agricultural commodities for an equivalent amount of foreign minerals and other materials of permanent value. These materials went into the strategic or supplemental stockpile, from which they can be released only by Presidential proclamation or joint resolution of Congress. Therefore, contrary to the fears expressed by the witnesses from the State Department, these materials cannot be a threat to the market, nor do they affect adversely any domestic minerals market or production and in fact support domestic prices by drawing surplus materials from world markets.

This is the best business we have ever done in disposing of surpluses. As shown in the extremely well-prepared staff study of your committee, during the years 1954–58 we exchanged $979.6 million in essentially worthless farm surpluses for barter materials. On March 27, 1959, these materials were worth $1,035.2 million or $55.6 million more than we paid for them. At the same time, we have been saving more than $100 million a year in storage costs. The Department of Agriculture estimates the annual cost of storing the farm surpluses we have exchanged by barter would be $109.1 million, while the annual storage cost of the materials we have received in exchange is only $4.4 million.

Why in May 1957, the Department of Agriculture suddenly brought this highly successful program to a halt is still a mystery. The announced reason was that it was interfering with cash sales. More recently it has become clear that this means the cash sales of other nations, not ours. In numerous appearances before the House Agriculture Committee, Department witnesses have never been able to submit any proof of significant interference with cash sales. On the contrary, the Department's records as shown in your committee staff study show that our total exports of agricultural commodities have been highest in the years when barter exports were the highest.

As I have previously stated, the real reason for the action was that small groups of employees in the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State who had always been opposed to the barter program had succeeded over the years in impressing their views on those at the policy level.

Committees of both the House and Senate have tried repeatedly to get the Department of Agriculture to reinstate the barter program but without success. From May 1957 until November 1958, after Congress had enacted a new and stronger barter policy provision, there was virtually no barter business done.

The device used by the Department of Agriculture to prevent barter transactions was to require a showing by the proposed contractor that the exports of surplus commodities involved in the transaction would be over and above all possible cash sales of these commodities. Obviously, it was impossible for private contractors to submit any satisfactory proof of such additionality. It is unfair to place the burden of proof upon them.

The insincerity and inconsistency of the Department's position on this matter was demonstrated by the fact that during the fiscal year 1958 the Secretary made agreements to sell surpluses for foreign currencies (under title I of Public Law 480) to at least 12 countries into which he refused to let surplus commodities move under barter transactions without proof of additionality, although he had the burden of proof under section 101(a) of the act to determine that sales under title I will be additional to usual marketings of the United States before approving any such sales.

Over the objections of the Department of Agriculture, the act extending Public Law 480 in 1958 (Public Law 85–931) embodied a revised barter policy section intended to reestablish the barter program at the level at which it was operating prior to May 1957 and undertaking to prohibit the Secretary from requiring a showing of additionality on the part of the proposed contractor before approving a barter transaction.

The policy of Congress that the Department of Agriculture should carry on an aggressive and substantial barter program is clearly set out in the 1958 amendment and is summarized by the House conferees, of which I had the honor to be a member, in the last paragraph of our report on the bill:

"As we have stated above, the substantive changes in the law, while significant, are not nearly as significant as the fundamental fact that the Congress has felt it necessary to enact legislation to require performance of a program which it has previously established by law. This bill is designed to reinstate a barter program of at least the magnitude followed prior to the restrictive regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture."

In spite of this clear intention of Congress, this program has continued to be hedged about by restrictions and obstacles which will prevent it from attaining more than one-third of the volume Congress had in mind.

The restrictions are in two general areas:

(1) Designation of most of the major trading areas of the world as markets into which surplus commodities may be exported by barter only with a showing of additionality, and

(2) Arbitrary and unnecessary limitation on the list of foreign materials which may be imported as part of a barter transaction. The Department of Agriculture itself admits that it is more difficult to make a barter transaction under the reinstated program than it was under the regulations in effect prior to the 1958 amendment of the law.

Since the announcement of the reinstated program in November 1958, the Department has received, as of June 30, 1959, some 559 formal written offers to enter into barter contracts for a total value of $854 million. However, it has rejected offers amounting to $493 million and has accepted only offers with a value of some $156 million.

Significantly, the volume of new offers has been drastically reduced so that new contracts will be in a greatly reduced volume.

For instance, while during November through February the new offers averaged over 115 per month, since then they have averaged only 38 per month. This is basically because the materials offered were no longer eligible for barter because quotas established by the materials committee had been reached.

For 3 months the Department refused to accept any offers to barter cotton, although U.S. cotton exports are running 51 percent below last year and American cotton has virtually ceased to move on the world market because of our export pricing policies. Listen to this: It refused to approve the barter of soybeans into West Germany although that country is increasing its purchase of soybeans from Communist China. It refused to approve barter of feed grains into the Benelux countries although their purchases of feed grains from the Soviet bloc are increasing. It refused to approve a barter of cotton and tobacco to France, entering instead into a sale of these commodities for French currency, although the French were willing to pay for the commodities by valuable materials instead of with soft currency, which as times goes on will be reduced in value. It refused to approve a multilateral transaction involving movement of American cotton to Japan, although Japan was negotiating and has since entered into, its first barter deal with Russia for Soviet-controlled cotton.

While our Department of Agriculture is preventing surplus agricultural commodities from moving into European markets under the barter program, while our agricultural exports are at the lowest point since 1955, agricultural commodities from the Soviet bloc are moving into the West European market in steadily increasing quantities. Numerous new trade agreements with the Soviet bloc involving agricultural commodities have been signed by West European countries within the past year.

Under these trade agreements alone, more than an estimated 1.5 million metric tons of wheat, feed grains, tobacco, cotton, and rice will move during the calendar year 1959 from the Soviet bloc into countries where the Department of Agriculture will not permit our surpluses to move under barter without a special and virtually impossible proof of additionality, and I might add that these are the so-called hard-currency countries.

The second major impediment to the barter program is the small list of materials which have been designated for importation under the program. The 1958 amendment broadened the base from which the President may designate materials to be received in barter so that it could include materials others than the approximately 70 on the official stockpiling list. The President assigned the responsibility for recommending such materials to an interdepartmental committee and this committee has done the exact opposite of what the Congress recommended. It has designated only a relatively few materials which can be received in barter, about 25, and, without specific authority from the President, has placed quantitative limits on even these few materials. The effect is that there are at present only a relative handful of materials—at best estimates about 12 in number—which are actually eligible for importation under the barter program.

It is reported that representatives of the Department of Agriculture on the Inter-Agency Materials Committee have tried strenuously to get additional materials on the barter list and to have quantitative limits removed from those now on the list but that their efforts have been thwarted consistently by representatives on the Committee from the Department of State and the Bureau of the Budget. In addition, it is reported that the Bureau of the Budget representatives have put pressure on the General Services Administration, which established the price paid for barter materials, to reduce the price levels they will approve, so as to further handicap the program.

I repeat that the President has expressed himself as favoring a substantial barter program—probably close to that carried on prior to May 1957—that the Secretary of Agriculture is not opposed to a substantial program and that the main impediments to this program are being erected by those below the policy level in the Departments involved. In most instances, those making policy can only accept the reports and recommendations of those working under them and if these reports indicate that a program is being carried out in accordance with the intent of Congress, although this is not the fact, this position will ordinarily be accepted by policymaking officials.

To me, Mr. Chairman, the collateral benefits arising from a barter program such as that carried on by the Department before May 1957 are even more important to the United States than is the primary benefit of disposal of essentially worthless surpluses for valuable minerals. Among these collateral benefits are the following:

Resistence to Soviet trade expansion: Many of the materials acquired under the barter program come from economically underdeveloped countries of Africa, Asia, the Near East, and South America. In many instances, these materials are the major export commodites of those countries. Under the barter program we were providing these countries with a profitable outlet for what they have to sell. We were establishing and cementing their trade relations with the United States. We were making it difficult for Russia to move into this same trade area. With the curtailment of the barter program, we have cut off this trade relationship with many of these countries and in so doing are aiding and abetting the efforts of the Soviet bloc to extend their sphere of economic influence. Don't take my word for this, look at your own committee staff study which shows the countries from which we were acquiring materials under the barter program.

Barter is an effective form of foreign aid: In the case of many of the countries listed in the staff study, the commodities obtained by the United States under the barter program are substantially the only products those countries have to sell to this country and in many instances they are extremely important to the economy of the country involved. Under the barter program we were not only obtaining full value for our agricultural surpluses but we were providing the most effective type of aid to the economies of the countries from which we were acquiring materials. Without $1 of cost to the taxpayers of the United States we were providing these countries with millions of dollars worth of purchasing power and providing it in the place where it does their economic development the most good, in the direct channels of trade and commerce.

Barter stabilized our own minerals industry: Under the barter program, the world price of lead and zinc was stabilized at a level satisfactory to virtually all concerned. Only after the Department of Agriculture discontinued the barter program and acquisitions of these metals under that program ceased, did the world price of lead and zinc drop to the point where assistance had to be provided for the domestic mining industry. The steps which have had to be taken to subsidize the domestic lead and zinc industry would probably not have been necessary had the barter program been continued. It is worth noting that now that there is again a barter program—even on a limited scale—the world price of these two minerals is improving.

Barter is good foreign relations: A large part of the unpleasantness which Vice President NIXON encountered in South America was the outgrowth of the curtailment of the barter program. Although the quantity of materials which had been obtained from South American countries was not large, it had been sufficient to provide an important prop to their economy, not only through direct sales but through stabilization of world minerals prices. In the opinion of competent observers, unrest and hardship related directly to termination of the barter program provided the environment which made possible organization of the demonstrations against the Vice President. It is probable that this situation is being repeated in other countries and other parts of the world.

Barter is good business: No other form of surplus disposal gives the United States as much in return for its surplus commodities as barter. Under barter, surpluses are exchanged at their full export value for strategic and other materials which (considering the effects of inflation) are actually worth more than dollars, and the exporter pays the ocean freight. Under title I sales, the selling price is frequently discounted by a favorable exchange rate, part of the CCC dollars go to pay the ocean freight, and the United States receives in return foreign currencies subject to serious depreciation. Even cash sales take dollars out of the importing countries, while barter transactions put dollars or their equivalent into the countries from which the materials are acquired, and the record is convincing that these dollars are immediately spent in the United States—thus giving us two full-rate commercial transactions for our surplus commodities.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I hope that this committee and the Congress and, for that matter, the executive branch, will not judge the many values of this total program solely in the light of unproven and now shopworn statements that barter sales displace cash sales, or in the light of the objections from friendly foreign countries, who, while doing extremely well in exporting their own agricultural commodities, are most jealous of any exports from the United States. These are relatively minor considerations raised against a proven method of increasing our agricultural exports, reducing our surpluses, assisting friendly nations, and building our economic resources—a method which has strengthened the United States to wage economic war against the Soviet, and enabled us to better protect the very allies who are complaining.

Farben Does Not Renounce Claim to General Aniline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced H.R. 1345 to amend section 9(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

Enactment of this bill would permit the Attorney General of the United States to dispose of this Government's majority stock-control interest in General Aniline & Film Corp., which was vested in 1942 at the outbreak of World War II, as enemy owned.

Following the end of hostilities, a Swiss holding corporation then known as I. G. Chemie and now as Interhandel, brought suit in our Federal court against the Attorney General of the United States, claiming ownership of this majority stock of General Aniline & Film Corp., which has its principal manufacturing operations and over half of its approximately 8,000 employees in my congressional district in the State of New York.

During 10 long years of litigation through the Federal courts, our Government has maintained that I. G. Chemie, or Interhandel, was a cloak for the huge Nazi industrial cartel—I. G. Farben, the major builder of Hitler's war machine.

I. G. Chemie, or Interhandel, for its part has contended in the U.S. courts and through 7 years of congressional hearings in both the Senate and House committees that it had no connection with I. G. Farben in regard to General Aniline & Film Corp. at the time of vesting.

Throughout, since the end of hostilities, I. G. Farben, now in the process of liquidation, remained quiet until late last year when reports were published and statements made here and abroad that discussions were taking place between American representatives of I. G. Chemie, or Interhandel, and our Government to reach an out-of-court settlement. One such published report said that the two parties were on the eve of settlement.

Immediately (on November 5, 1958), this flushed out of the closet the skeleton of I. G. Farben, and its trustees in West Germany filed a motion in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to intervene in the case of I. G. Chemie, or Interhandel against the Attorney General of the United States. The motion asked our Federal court to determine the rightful owner of General Aniline & Film Corp., before any disposition is made of the proceeds from any sale of the vested stock.

On December 19, 1958, Judge David A. Pine, of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia denied the motion by I. G. Farben to intervene on the basis of this Government's assertion that since I. G. Farben was a German national it was ineligible to intervene in the suit by I. G. Chemie, or Interhandel against the Attorney General of the United States. The court did not rule on the merits of I. G. Farben's claim to ownership.

Both here and abroad representatives of I. G. Chemie (Interhandel) vigorously opposed the action by the trustees of I. G. Farben in liquidation.

The American legal representatives of I. G. Farben in liquidation, however, stated in the press that they would appeal this decision. They had 60 days, or until February 17, 1959, to do so. As the deadline was reached, they had not done so.

However, regardless of their failure to appeal, the liquidators of I. G. Farben continue to maintain that I. G. Farben has a rightful claim to the proceeds from the sale in the United States of the vested shares of General Aniline & Film Corp. This is evident in the following translation, an excerpt from the report for 1958 of the liquidators of I. G. Farbenindustrie A. G., in liquidation, to the annual stockholders' meeting, scheduled for July 10, 1959:

The intervention in the litigation of *Internationale Industrie-und Handelsbeteiligungen A. G. (Interhandel)* v. *Alien Property Custodian.*

As reported in the daily newspapers on November 5, 1958, the liquidators petitioned the district court in Washington, D.C., for permission to let the I.G.I.L. intervene in the pending litigation between Interhandel and the American Government about the stock of General Aniline & Film Corp.

In view of the importance of this matter and the often confusing and inaccurate publications about the proceedings, a detailed report on the action of the liquidators seems to be appropriate.

As mentioned in the annual report for 1957, the liquidators sometime ago started to undertake an examination of the relationship between I.G., Interhandel and GAF. This examination was difficult because the files of I. G. had been decimated and neither Interhandel nor the Sturzenegger bank were willing to give the necessary information and to permit an examination of their relevant books and papers. In spite of this, the laborious work done succeeded in obtaining information on the relations and transactions between I. G., Greutert & Cie. (later Sturzenegger & Cie.) and Interhandel and in developing a picture which may be summarized here already as follows:

The liquidators gained the conviction that the I. G. was entitled to certain rights concerning the GAF stock at the time of vesting, or its proceeds in the event of a sale.

In 1942, the American Government issued a series of so-called vesting orders by which 93 percent of the GAF stock was transferred to the United States. Most of the vested stock was held by Interhandel, originally called I. G. Chemie A. G.

The vesting orders were based on findings that the GAF shares "were owned by or held for the benefit of I. G. Farbenindustrie A. G., or held on behalf of or on account of I. G. Farbenindustrie A. G."

In 1948, Interhandel brought a suit against the United States in the district court in Washington for the return of the vested GAF shares. This is "the Interhandel suit" which is still pending today. First the district court dismissed the complaint because the complaint had not complied with the order of the court imposing on it a duty under American procedure for the production of all the documents available. The appeal filed by Interhandel from this decision was dismissed by the court of appeals in 1956. Upon Interhandel's petition for certiorari, the decision of the court of appeals was reversed by the Supreme Court of the United States in July of 1957 [sic] and the matter was remanded to the district court.

Soon thereafter there were reports from Washington about the start of negotiations between the American Government and Interhandel about a settlement of the Interhandel suit.

In view of this report, the following considerations had to be made:

The value of the vested GAF shares is extraordinarily high. Their book value as of June 30, 1958, was $109,858,012 according to a report of the U.S. Office of Alien Property. The present stock quotation shows a considerably higher value. How much can be obtained by a public auction cannot be predicted.

"If the I. G. had certain rights at the time of vesting with regard to the GAF shares, or their proceeds in the event of a sale (and the liquidators are convinced of these rights on the basis of their examination, in conformity with the position of the American Government in the Interhandel suit), then the I.G.I.L. has a contingent claim for a corresponding return of such proceeds or a claim for compensation in the event of return legislation in the United States or under a German indemnification law.

According to information obtained by the I.G., the danger existed that a settlement attempted by Interhandel would have thwarted the subsequent realization of the claim of I.G. or would have made it at least much more difficult. Such a settlement, which could have been concluded at any moment, would have led to a serious injury to the interests of the owners of liquidation certificates. By the petition to be permitted to intervene in the Interhandel suit, the I.G. hoped to prevent the threatening damage which a settlement might do to its claim. The liquidators had the choice between such a petition and just marking time without doing anything. After weighing all the circumstances and after consulting with their American counsel, the liquidators in agreement with the chairman of the board took the position that the petition for intervention had to be filed in order to protect the interests of the I.G. stockholders, after all the efforts to come to an understanding with Interhandel had failed.

Without going into the merit of the claims of I.G., the district court refused for purely formal reasons to permit the intervention of I.G. in the Interhandel suit. However, in the course of the proceedings the attorneys of the American Government made some important statements. They declared implicitly that the existence of rights of the I.G. concerning the GAF shares had to be acknowledged and that a settlement with Interhandel would be concluded only on the basis of the rights determined for the benefit of Interhandel regarding the GAF shares. Furthermore, they declared in their reply to the petition of the liquidators for the perpetuation of all documents the production of which the American Government had obtained in the Interhandel suit, that all papers relevant to the case would remain in their custody. Therefore, I.G. did not have to be afraid that later a resort to these papers would be impossible.

In view of these statements, the liquidators after consulting with the board decided not to file an appeal from the decision of the district court and not to pursue any further, for the time being, the petition for perpetuation of documents.

It is understood that the fact that no appeal has been filed does not mean a waiver of I.G.I.L. of its claim based on former rights of I.G.

Occasionally it has been maintained in the press that the court by denying the petition for intervention has made a determination that the I.G. had no rights regarding the GAF shares at the time of vesting. Such statements are wrong. In denying the petition for intervention, the court did not have to and did not make any decision about the rights of I.G.

On the basis of information collected in their work for many years on the relations and transactions between I.G., Greutert & Cie and Interhandel, and the contents of the record in the Interhandel suit, the liquidators are convinced, as mentioned above, that I.G. had rights at the time of vesting regarding the GAF shares or their proceeds in the event of a sale. This result is not in contradiction of the cancellation of the dividend-guarantee-agreement in 1940 because it is based on facts existing independently of the dividend-guarantee-agreement.

The liquidators follow closely the present negotiations between Interhandel and the American Government. In addition, the liquidators continue to examine all possibilities available to them for the protection of the interests of I.G.I.L.

Poison in Your Water—No. 144

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Milwaukee, Wis., Journal of May 17, 1959, entitled "Whitnall Park Stench Bothers Nature Lovers":

WHITNALL PARK STENCH BOTHERS NATURE LOVERS—POLLUTED WATER ODORS CHASE VISITORS AND AFFECT THE AREA AS WILDLIFE RETREAT

(By Loren H. Osman of Staff)

The stench of polluted water is mingling with the perfume of flowering crabapples at Whitnall park.

Beauty still abounds in this Milwaukee county showplace. But the defiled creek areas are in sharp contrast to the spring flower attractions.

Green scum has collected in the lagoons along the North Creek, which meanders through the park to the Root River. From these ponds, odors are so overpowering on a hot day that visitors hurry through the area.

John Voight, the park's superintendent, reported "quite a few complaints" from the public, especially groups on nature hikes. Picnickers are subjected to the smells, as they spread out their food under the trees.

DANGER TO WILDLIFE

Park officials are becoming increasingly concerned about the problem. It has worsened rapidly in the last few years. They are seeking out the sources of the pollution, which is not only offending the park's visitors but endangering its position as a wildlife retreat.

Allied problems also have cropped up. Wash water detergents in the stream have reached a level where they foam up at the dams and falls. Sometimes the foam reaches several feet in depth. It is whipped off by the wind and almost becomes a traffic hazard on park drives.

Sediment slowly is clogging the ponds. The silt has build up from runoff of other areas. Meanwhile, water tables have dropped, as hundreds of wells have been punched in the adjoining sections.

But pollution is the big headache. Its effects were examined the other day by Voight; Howard Gregg, general manager of county parks; Edward Mallonen, county landscape architect; and Leonard Pampel, county acquarist.

POLLUTION TESTS NEEDED

The green in the water, explained Pampel, indicated that the stream was "trying to bounce back." Pollution occurs when deposits of organic matter in the water decay. The process requires more oxygen for the photosynthetic activity. Robbed of its oxygen, the water no longer supports the same level of plant and animal life.

Extensive tests would have to be made to determine just what the polluted water contains, Pampel explained.

Ducks have disappeared from the creek, Mallonan pointed out, as duckweed has vanished. The waterfowl used to nest along the banks. Blue heron also have declined. Even dragonflies are less numerous. Minnows and even bass once were in the waters. Only the foraging carp remain.

"Everything used to be jumping along here," Mallonen said. "Now a good percentage of the nature trail is shot, as activity declined."

WATERCRESS HAS RECEDED

The bloom of algae extends across broad expanses of water. In the backwaters the scum is blackish and hangs over submerged twigs like thin mud. Here and there, bubbles have boiled to the surface. Oil slicks can be detected in some spots.

A spring which feeds into the stream still is operating, despite the decline in water levels. But watercress, which formerly grew around it but which will not stand pollution, has receded.

Much of the work on Whitnall park's waterways was done in the 1930's by work progress administration labor. Extensive planting and landscaping also was done in the early years. Now the entire plan has reached its climax—only to have pollution invade the scene.

"It is hard to put one's finger on what has happened," Gregg remarked. "However, we do know that the woods and fields which once surround the park had a natural filtration action for the streams. The buildup of an area brings more runoff."

CREEK GETS RAW SEWAGE

Rising several miles to the west, the stream enters the park at the intersection of Highway 100 and North Cape Road, Hales Corners. Another tributary of the Root passes through the park farther south. It is less polluted, so far.

Park officials found, on their walk upstream, that raw sewage was being fed into the creek. It came out of an overflow pipe at a sewage pumping station on North Cape Rode, near the park's west entrance.

This was only a temporary situation, according to Elmer Faehrmann, superintendent of Hales Corners public works. He said the pipe had been opened briefly so a valve in the system could be repacked. But it was still open Saturday night, 2½ days later, spewing out garbage, feces, and other matter carried in grayish water.

Faehrmann then explained that the bypassing continued after the repairs had been made, because "someone is giving us an awful lot of water." He said he suspected it was coming from a newly built-up area, or that a new sewer had been opened. A check was being made, he said.

PUMPS CAN'T HANDLE LOAD

The station's two pumps, pumping some 450 gallons a minute, couldn't handle the load, Faehrmann said. The village is planning to add a 600-gallon-per-minute pump, he said. There also is an emergency gasoline pump at the station.

The chlorine content in the effluent also will be doubled, to see if residual chlorine can be built up in the stream to clean it out, Faehrmann added.

Officials mention a combination of possible causes of the park pollution—inefficient septic tanks, sewer overflow, surface contamination such as filling station oils, even runoff of farm fertilizers, notably nitrogen. Faehrmann claimed the stream actually had been a problem as long ago as 1941.

"I don't see why the park should be having so much trouble now," said Faehrmann. "Houses here and there do have problems with septic tanks. That's why we are putting in sewers."

SEWER SYSTEM HELPS

Faehrmann said he believed that as other areas were "sewered in," park pollution would clear up. But he added that "it can't be blamed strictly on our development." Neighboring communities, also rapidly being subdivided, could be offenders, he said.

Faehrmann led a tour through the village's half-million-dollar treatment plant. He pointed to the end product, clear, clean water which is put into the stream. The plant, of the trickling filter type, is designed to handle an ultimate population of 10,000. Present population is 5,400.

Hales Corners officials note that their treatment plant has been rated one of the best by the State board of health, taking out 95 percent of the oxygen removing particles. It is running at less than half of its 1 million gallon a day capacity now.

However, the plant serves only about half of the village. Some 200 homes in 2 sections and 2 schools are to be included in a $400,000 expansion of the sewer lines, to be done within 4 years.

DETERGENTS NOT REMOVED

About 100 of the unsewered homes are in the Hale Park subdivision, west of the park. The others are north of the park, between highway 100, North 92d Street, West Edgerton Avenue and West Ridge Road. The schools to be connected, Valley View and St. Mary's, also are in this section.

The treatment plant does not take out detergents, used in dish and wash waters. No plant has been able to do this successfully, Faehrmann claimed, but they are harmless except for the appearance of foaming, he maintained. A chemical could be added at the plant but would dissipate before it reached the park, he said.

The park commission will work on the pollution problem, Gregg said. But the maintaining of pure, sparkling waters in a metropolitan area appeared to have no easy solution.

Whitnall Park was named for Charles B. Whitnall, who envisioned a system of natural beauty for Milwaukee County. The park recently issued a guidebook to its natural trails. Gregg wryly agreed that a hike through the fumes and past polluted waters offered a lesson not in the book.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Commencement Address by Carl Sandburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. CANNON
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 24, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, recently graduates of the University of Nevada were honored by having as their commencement speaker one of America's truly great poets and philosophers, Carl Sandburg.

The remarks made by Mr. Sandburg cut deeply into the consciousness of America and, in my opinion, bring a fresh light to the ills of our present society. Yet his address is so valuable because, like a physician, Mr. Sandburg was able not only to diagnose our malady but also to suggest a ray of hope for mankind's salvation.

He has taken the best of the American philosophy from its inception and traced it through to our time.

In his message to the 1959 graduating class of the University of Neveda, Mr. Sandburg states the problem of the jet age, or the space age, clearly. I believe he goes beyond mere criticism. He clearly states the problems, and Mr. Sandburg gives his answers to the deep and challenging questions: Where did we come from? Where are we now? Where are we going?

I believe Mr. Sandburg's wisdom will be of great benefit to everyone who reads his address, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is good to be here. If I can't give the members of the graduating class any advice worthwhile, we can at least have fellowship here today. This morning, for the first time in many years I thought of a little anecdote which a young minister gave one morning at chapel exercises at the prairie college in Illinois, about the boy who came to the minister of his church and said he had been having dreams, this country boy who helped his father work his farm. He said the dream had come over and over again, letters of fire against the sky. There would be the two letters, the capital letter P and the capital letter C. What could they possibly mean? He meditated about it. He told the minister, "Could it mean that I should go forth and preach Christ?" And the minister was very thoughtful, a thoughtful face for a minute or two, and then he said, "It might mean what you think, and then again it might mean that you should stay home and plant corn."

Some of you have chosen your careers, some of you who have chosen your careers and professions may make changes, and that little anecdote may help.

You will hear, across the years, those little questions: Where did we come from? Where are we now? Where are we going? The first two you can do fairly well getting the answers. As for the third, there was never a generation on earth that had a more mysterious and complex future before it. Some of the ancient philosophers may be good for you, some of the moderns may be good, but the new media in education that you will be in contact with, these three new media that have come across the last 30, 40 years, you'll be in contact with them more or less. At times you will have to exercise your willpower to keep away from them and what they might do to you.

Referring to the cinema, the silver screen, the movies, for one. And then, referring to radio, and I'm referring to television. You face any of them and take what they want to hand you, and you are getting education always, either good or bad. They may claim that it's entertainment, but all the time they conceived it they had the subconscious of you in mind. They give you impressions that go deep into the blood and the brain; they do things to you that you have to think about afterward in order to get at really what they did do to you. That book that in its year was a best seller, the Hidden Persuaders, had portentous doctrines, portentous facts and theories about that street in New York. When you address a letter there, you address it Madison Avenue, and some of the inmates of it call it "Ulcer Gulch." They are among the educators in this country. Sometimes you can see something very much worth your time on television, for instance; I could name a dozen plays, I could name panels. The best things on TV are priceless, but even among the best things they have to intersperse. You can't look at the world series in baseball without hearing incessant advice that gives you the impression that there are millions of men running around in this country wondering how they can get a shave.

I wonder at these voices that bawl at you, "Buy this soap today. Get it. It's the best." "All cigarettes are milder than all other cigarettes."

I wonder what's happening to the minds of the young. Incessantly, day in and day out, these lies are told you, these extravagant statements about what a product will do for you, how to help you live your life. The best, the greatest—lies on lies into the ears of the young. I wonder what it does to them? I will point to, say, Socrates or Aristotle, Leonardo da Vinci, William Shakespeare, John Milton, good old Ben Franklin with that fine mind of his, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln. Not one of them ever knew anything in their lives about these three media. None of them ever saw a movie or heard a radio cast, or saw a TV screen, but they had books—they had books. I've been told about the large sum, the large, generous sum that's been given the University of Nevada for a new, large library. The book; you can go to a shelf—you can go to a shelf and pick out what is for our mood today. If you want entertainment, it's there, assured and guaranteed. If what you want is for the tough mind and you feel like tackling it, it is there, and you can turn the pages and if you come to passages that seem to you a little stupid you can skip them, and if there are favorite passages that have a thought that you find attractive or even fascinating, given in a somewhat musical style, you can go back to it and read it over and over again.

But before the TV screen you sit there and you take it. You have no choice, you get yourself soaked with it and you're helpless.

I will mention the phrase. I will mention the phrase that goes for all of these great minds and hearts of the past that never had anything to do with these modern media. They had books, and besides that they had conversations with people of their choice who were fruitional and productive and incitatory, but most of all they had solitude and they knew how to make solitude creative. They were not afraid of loneliness. It was in loneliness, it was in solitude, in silent rooms that their minds operated toward the great works that today we revere them for. Creative solitude.

I rode across the State of Michigan one time on the Michigan Central train, the Wolverine. In front of me was a woman who had a 6- or 7-year-old boy who stood at the window and looked out, and he would clap his hands, and he would howl with delight, and he would turn to his mother and tell her to see, too. The man who was seated in front of them, he was bothered; he would turn and give the two of them a dirty look every once in awhile. And finally the woman saw what was the matter, and she had to say to the man, "You must excuse him; he thinks everything is wonderful." I hope that the most of you have learned in your courses, and now that you start out with life, that there's not much that your eyes will meet but which is wonderful.

I asked J. Robert Oppenheimer a few weeks ago a question, a point that had bothered me.

"After years of trying it with your cyclotrons, finally you did divide the up to then indivisible smallest particle of matter, known as the atom. You shattered it, and when it came apart, what were the pieces?

And this learned man, this physicist before whom I am very humble, said, "When it came apart, it didn't come apart in pieces, it came apart in things that never existed before."

It's quite a generation we're living in, the very young having access to these media of information—the newspapers, movies, radio, and TV, and the elders discussing what a time it is we're living in. The atom bomb, the bombers flying in the air at all times, day or night, ready—ready with their atom bombs in case war should be begun against us. So I hear from a friend of mine about an 8-year-old son of his who was asked the question, "What do you hope to do, and be, when you grow up?" And he had a short answer, "Stay alive."

I could offer a short poem perhaps that might serve, an actual incident, but it could serve as a parable to the next war that all of us pray so earnestly will not come:

"In a Colorado graveyard two men lie in one grave.
They shot it out in a jam over who owned one corner lot.
For a piece of real estate they shot it out.
And it was a perfect duel; each cleansed the world of the other.
Each, horizontal in an identical grave, had his bones cleaned by the same maggots.
They sleep now as two accommodating neighbors."

And perhaps I could read lines from Lincoln that some of us regard as truly as important, truly as portentous, and fully as marked by a rhythm and concentrated wisdom as the Gettysburg speech. In the first week in December, December 1 in 1862, he sent a message to Congress. In those days the message wasn't read by the President. He sent a message about the need for funds, the need for a fund by which the slaves in the border States that had not seceded from the Union, the slaves could be bought and freed, and the decisions of the courts and the Constitution as to the slaves being property, the property rights would be respected, and the action would have an effect on the States of the Deep South toward ending the war. He was pleading with them at the end of that message, saying:

"We can succeed only by concert. The darkness of the quiet past is inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. If our case is new, so must we think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves.

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance nor insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will let us down in honor or dishonor with the next generation. We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

Man wants to know. Man has been called improbable animal; you never know what he's going to do next. He has performed so many wonders of valor, discovery, invention, that he has forgotton such things as who made the first wheel or who first dared dream that man could fly. You can repeat, man wants to know, not sure why he wants to know; his hunger and thirst are irrepressible. Will man get to the moon? Of course he will get to the moon, and he will circumnavigate it and he will report what he may see and touch and taste. One daring visionary sees man at a time when, a million years from now, the planet Earth will no longer support the human race. That time is seen, but having found by trips to Venus that he can live there, man moves there, and after another million years or so and when the time comes that he must move again he breeds a special stock of human beings, short, massive, strong, hairy, and able to subsist nicely on another planet, to which man will migrate. And you can take that or leave it, but none of us know what we'll be doing a million years from now.

In his "House Divided" speech in 1858, Lincoln said—the opening sentence—"If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it."

In the past 60 years we have seen large-scale slaughters of human beings. Diabolical shames and outrages. Dehumanizations of men and women and children by the millions, almost inconceivable violations of human dignity, of a kind and on a scale never before known in the family of man over the earth. And yet, so strangely it seems, in this same 60 years runs the chronicle of the historians, in transport and communications, in mass production.

An old Chinese proverb: "Everything in the past died yesterday; everything in the future was born today."

There are things being born today that only our children and grandchildren will know. The future, so terribly real, waits where it cannot be seen, and sometimes comes rushing at us like the wind. I wouldn't be surprised at all if a reckoning could be taken 50 years from now of the members of this graduating class more than half of you will have circumnavigated the globe in a swift-moving, high-powered plane of later years to come. And I like it. The Phi Beta Kappa Fraternity has a toast—it goes back many years—"Here's to pure mathematics, may it never be of use to anybody." Don't ever feel sorry for the thinking in abstractions that you have had to do; it makes you more preeminently practical.

Curiously enough now, we can ask: Who is the man of war today? Who is Mars? He ain't in the Pentagon there in Washington; he don't wear a uniform, fruit salad over his bosom. He goes around very plain, dark blue, usually, briefcase, plenty of paper and pencils, and he likes a laboratory or an experiment.

The professor! The professor. I remember the time in the New Deal when the fellow with the briefcase was ridiculed—another one of those professors. But he stands high today. Nuclear weapons. And don't believe that some of them were not sad when they saw the results of their creation. There were those who had moist eyes about Hiroshima and about heroes of the war, and where everything on earth goes up for all time.

And then we've got a production apparatus; we've got a production apparatus. When I'm asked what is the worst thing to look at in this country now, I quote the eminent physicist, Albert Einstein, the man who changed the shape of the universe in our times. We used to say on the earth, up and down; it's no longer up and down. Everywhere there is movement and direction change; no longer up and down. Professor Einstein said that to think of happiness and material comfort is not a desirable goal.

You think too much about happiness or comfort, you're on the wrong track; and we have a widespread, fat-dripping prosperity in this country now. These new media, radio, movies, the TV—they kind of make you feel you're a pauper; there's so many things that you ought to have that you ain't got if you're going to really belong.

There's something a little silly about it. It's healthy to read that foremost apostle of simple living, Henry Thoreau, and his friend, Ralph Waldo Emerson, who said that plain living goes with high thinking. Now, even a book has come out on status; millions of people are seeking status; they want class. They can hardly conceive Diogenes in his tub, having himself a nice sunbath, and Alexander the Great, who had conquered half the world, comes along and asks Diogenes, "What do you want more than anything else?" And Diogenes said, "Will you please stand out of the sun?"

I should mention in connection with this matter of going without that it is no longer a matter of prime virtue. The virtue of thrift—oh, it runs all through McGuffey's readers. Preceding generations, they were taught, as one department store has it in New York, "It's smart to be thrifty." But you get into that store and you don't feel like being thrifty; that's the catch. When Ed Murrow asked Rocky Marciano, "How much weight have you taken on since you retired from the heavyweight championship of the world?" Rocky said he had gained 20 pounds in the 4 months since he had quit the championship, after a career where he was credited with 40 knockouts and never a failure to deliver the knockout. He said to Murrow, "In those days I was hungry, always hungry. To be in good form, it's nice to be hungry."

In connection with these times that we live in, there's a novel remembrance where there's a physicist, a Danish physicist, an affirming character, who says, "Man is a changer; God made him a changer." You young people may become the witnesses of the finest, brightest era known to man. The nations over the globe, it may be that they shall have music, music instead of murder. It is possible. That is my hope and prayer for you, for the nations, and I say it here this morning.

I have somewhere a Lincoln passage perhaps worth our time. This is a paragraph out of a speech of his that you might say was the most majestic interpretation ever given, that old document known as the Declaration of Independence. He quoted the Declaration as having the statement, "All men are created equal." One time, he was asked whether that wasn't a little absurd, that we're born with such diverse gifts, attainments, and possibilities. And he said the framers of that Declaration, that all men are created equal, had the same intention of the Saviour in the New Testament, telling people, "Be ye perfect," knowing very well that they couldn't become perfect, but in trying to become perfect, they would find more peculiar treasures than if they didn't care.

Lincoln said, one August afternoon in Lewiston, Ill., when he was campaigning for the senatorship against Senator Douglas, "This was their lofty, and wise, and noble understanding of the justice of the Creator to His creatures." Yes, gentlemen, to all His creatures, to the whole great family of man. They grasped not only the whole race of men then living, but they reached forward and seized upon the farthest posterity. Wise statesmen as they were, they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants, and so they established these great, self-evident truths that, when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest, should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, or none but white men, were entitled to the pursuit of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence, to take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began. I charge you to drop every paltry and insignificant thought for any man's success. It is nothing; I am nothing; my opponent, Judge Douglas, is nothing. But, do not destroy that immortal emblem of humanity, the Declaration of Independence."

In that same year he wrote the meditation that he didn't use in any of the debates with Douglas. It was a private affair between him and his conscience. He spoke of the emancipation of the slaves in this particular memorandum, not knowing that 5 years later he would sign a paper declaring all men, all men and women under pains of involuntary servitude be forever free, forever free. He said, "I have never failed; I do not now fail, to remember that in the Republican cause there is a higher aim than that of mere office. I have not allowed myself to forget that the abolition of the slave trade by Great Britain was agitated a hundred years before it was a final success, that the measure had its open fire eating opponents, its stealthy don't-care opponents, its inferior-race opponents, its Negro-equality opponents, and its religion-in-good-order opponents. But all these opponents got offices, and their adversaries got none. But I have also remembered that, though they blased like tallow candles for a century, at last they flickered in the socket, died out, stank in the dark for a brief season, and were remembered no more, even by the smell."

I am proud that, in my passing speck of time, to contribute an humble mite to the glorious consummation which my own poor eyes may not last to see. So I could say, don't be afraid of lost causes if they go deep in your heart. Deep in your heart if you feel that what looks lost is worth your time, throw yourself into it. There'll be health for your heart, mind, and spirit.

I don't hesitate to call Harry Golden, an apostle of freedom in his book, "Only in America." It embodies the American dream and it pleases me. For more than a year now it's been at the top of the best-seller list. (I wrote a foreword to the book in which I said, "It's the most interesting pro-

Semitic book that I have ever read except possibly the Old Testament."). Mr. Golden told me that he once wrote a letter to Albert Einstein, and had a reply to this effect, "I cannot give you an adequate answer to your question, but I can play it for you on the violin."

And it's a good sign that Edward Steichen's photographic exhibition, "The Family of Man," has been seen by more than 5 million people of the earth. It affirms the unity of mankind more simply and eloquently than any other pictorial or literary production of the past or present. The language of the Family of Man is older than any alphabet; it is in the modern, perfected image-writing of photography. Weddings, births and babies, crops, fish, food, quarrels, fighting, dancing, war, play and fun, death and music, they're all there. In all the countries over the world mankind has likeness, basic likenesses, and that's part of the American dream. It's not important that the Department of State is sending Steichen and myself to Russia this summer to open the Family of Man in Moscow, but it's interesting, and possibly important that millions of Russians are to see this exhibition having as its theme the universality of mankind, how there are kinships that bind all the peoples of the earth.

For the first time in my life, and possibly for the first time at any commencement exercise in North America, I'm going to read from a paperback. This is one of the four novels that constitutes the long novel, "Remembrance Rock." I was thinking as I riffled through the book yesterday, these things are very important. You've probably had them in classes, but they are worth not forgetting. The ancient proverbs: "Woe unto him who believes nothing," "Always the impossible happens," "God works in moments," "For a web begun, God sends a thread," "Nothing happens for nothing," "Everything belongs to others and in time returns to others" (it sounds like the New Deal), "The glutton understands little of the hungry," "Many a famous prince has at last been put to bed with a dusty shawl," "We're born crying, live complaining, and die disappointed," "The praise of self gives forth a stench," "Wait long enough and the most evil gossip dies," "The moon waxes, the moon wanes; the world goes by and life goes by."

And there are here the four stumbling blocks to truth. These were written by Robert Bacon, one of the forerunners of modern science.

The four stumbling blocks to truth: First of all, the influence of fragile or unworthy authority. You are told something and wonder whether you should believe it or not. Much depends on whether it's a fragile authority. Second stumbling block—custom. Status, class, keep up with the Joneses. Look out, people will point you out and say, "There goes a nobody; he looks like he doesn't care to belong." Whereas all progress, all advances of the human mind, they are wrought by men who did not think in grooves of the past, they are not afraid of any kind of ridicule. Third of the four stumbling blocks, and this is very important: the imperfection of undisciplined senses—the imperfection of undisciplined senses. You see something and look at it from another angle; sometimes you're sure you've seen it, and then again it might be the atom. Any time you could take it apart it would consist of parts that never existed before. Last of all, concealment of ignorance by ostentation of seeming wisdom. What do you know?

I want to close off with an old Irish toast, old and Irish: "The best o' luck before ye, bad luck behind ye, an' the grace o' God to guard and claim ye."

Oregon Joins Brucellosis Honor Roll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 24, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the State of Oregon pioneered in the testing of cattle for brucellosis in 1928, and it has continued, with Federal cooperation, a long campaign for eradication of this costly livestock disease. I was highly pleased to learn today that, as a result of the success of this long battle, Oregon has been named a Modified Certified Brucellosis State by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Oregon now joins 19 other States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands on the certification honor roll. To be eligible, a State must have no county with more than 1 percent reactor cattle and 5 percent of its herds infected.

I am proud to have supported the $2.5 million increase in Federal funds for the brucellosis eradication program when it passed the Senate last year particularly because of the outstanding example of my own State in this program.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the telegram to Oregon's Governor Hatfield from Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson on Oregon's certification be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with an article from the Salem Capital Press for July 10, 1959, entitled, "Brucellosis Freedom Battle Accomplished."

There being no objection, the telegram and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 23, 1959.

HON. MARK O. HATFIELD,
Governor of Oregon,
Salem, Oreg.:

Our sincere congratulations to you and all those responsible for Oregon becoming a Modified Certified Brucellosis State. Oregon joins 19 other States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands that have previously attained this important step toward bovine brucellosis eradication. This is further evidence of the values derived from State-Federal cooperation, demonstrating again the accomplishments possible by State and Federal Governments working together with farmers, dairymen, and livestock producers. We are pleased that through such cooperative effort this significant accomplishment has been made. We look forward to the continuation of Federal-State cooperation for the furtherance of this important program in Oregon.

E. T. BENSON.

BRUCELLOSIS FREEDOM BATTLE ACCOMPLISHED

Oregon's accelerated brucellosis testing program, aimed at statewide certification for the first time in history, ended late July 2, Frank McKennon, State director of agriculture, announced.

Certification for a State means no county with more than 1 percent reactor cattle and 5 percent of the herds infected.

Last reports on the Oregon program will be submitted immediately to the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Washington, D.C., for review.

"We will not know the final outcome of the work here until Washington studies the records," McKennon said.

"If the Federal decision is as we hope, this will mark the end of a battle begun more than 30 years ago," he added.

STATE PIONEERS

McKennon recalled that Oregon pioneered in brucellosis (then termed Bang's disease by which many still know it) testing back in 1928. Varying degrees of testing, first on a voluntary basis and finally on a statewide compulsory basis since 1957, have been in effect since then. Original work was in dairy herds and dairy counties were the first to go after the disease in earnest.

The work was wrapped up in Harney County last week with percentage testing of a 600-cow herd. No reactors were found, the field laboratory reported. (Percentage testing requires the entire herd to be tested if any reactors show on the first 20 percent from which the blood sample is drawn.)

With exception of the one herd in Harney County, testing was completed by the June 30 deadline set more than 2 years ago.

MOP UP RAPIDLY

Twenty-eight of the thirty-six Oregon counties and the Warm Springs Indian Reservation were certified by April 1. In the last 2 months, State and Federal veterinarians, assisted by private veterinarians deputized by the State, have conducted a heavy mopping-up operation in Jackson, Crook, Jefferson, Klamath, Lake, Harney, Gilliam, and Wallowa Counties.

Dr. A. G. Beagle, in charge of Federal veterinarians in Oregon, says "there is no apparent question about any of the county records with exception of Lake County." He anticipates Washington will give this county careful study before making a decision.

"I believe Washington will consider the Oregon work a remarkable record in view of the obstacles placed in the path of the program," Dr. Beagle prophesied. He cited the suit filed by a group of cattlemen, who attacked constitutionality of the 1957 compulsory test act, as a major slowdown to the program. The court decision earlier this year upheld the law.

The contesting cattlemen insisted that calf vaccination alone was sufficient for control in beef operations. Calf vaccination has been in use here since the early forties.

Dr. L. E. Bodenweiser, State veterinarian, and Fred Pope, animal division chief, both with the State department of agriculture, expressed satisfaction and relief at completion of the testing. They said the situation had been "nip and tuck" the last few weeks. They said they would have additional comments when Washington renders its decision. They do not know how soon this will be.

In the meantime, McKennon pointed out that the Bang's program, although long and costly, has reduced Oregon cases of undulant fever—the human aspect of brucellosis—from 183 and 2 deaths as recently as 1945 to virtually no cases today. Nationally, 802 undulant fever cases were reported in 1958.

And Dr. Beagle said, "In my opinion, control of brucellosis through testing and vaccination has raised the average of our range country calf crop from about 50 percent to the present level of between 95 and 100 percent. This has undoubtedly added millions of dollars worth of cattle to the Oregon economy and untold tax dollars to the State."

Between $6 and $7 million have been spent on brucellosis control in Oregon by county, State and Federal governments since 1934, the year the Federal Government started paying indemnities. It was the all-out Federal drive commenced in 1954 which sparked

the cleanup program in Oregon and other States.

The 1957 Oregon legislature gave the final push here in authorizing the compulsory, State-financed program.

The Nuclear Ship "Savannah"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the launching of the first steamship *Savannah* in 1819 was an occasion of great significance as all of us know from our history books. And Tuesday, July 21, 1959, represented an occasion of equal historic significance. I make reference to the launching of the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, the NS—nuclear ship—*Savannah* from Camden, N.J.'s New York shipyard.

This atomic cargo-passenger ship was built at a cost of about $40 million after years of planning and debate. Sleek and modern in design, the *Savannah* will have a maximum power capacity of 74 million watts and will be able to sail 300,000 nautical miles without refueling—that is, for about 3 full years.

No one expects that she will ever pay her way as a commercial vessel. But as an example to be sent the world over to demonstrate American skill and to provide operating experience for ships of her type, no more effective instrument of foreign policy could be found.

Camden, N.J., is proud to have had a part in the construction and launching of this pioneering vessel which President Eisenhower said "will be the forerunner of atomic merchant and passenger fleets which will one day unite the nations of the world in peaceful trade."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorials from the Camden Courier Post, the New Brunswick Home News, and the Woodbury Daily Times, of July 21, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier Post, July 21, 1959]

A PIONEER VESSEL IS LAUNCHED HERE

America's gracious First Lady, Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, christens the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship this afternoon at Camden's New York shipyard.

This is therefore a great day in Camden's history, and an occasion of historic significance to the world.

The United States has pioneered in the field of nuclear-powered shipping and the famous submarine *Nautilus* was commissioned many months ago as the first nuclear-powered Navy vessel. Its voyage under the North Pole and many other achievements have made its name imperishable.

Only a week ago the Navy launched its first nuclear-powered surface ship, the cruiser U.S.S. *Long Beach*, built at the Quincy, Mass., yard of Bethlehem Steel Co.

The Navy also has in operation or being constructed other atomic submarines, an aircraft carrier and a destroyer.

The Soviet Union has built the only other nuclear surface ship thus far, an icebreaker recently launched and outfitted.

The ship being launched in South Camden today will be known as the NS (nuclear ship) *Savannah*. She is being built at a cost of about $40 million. Although years of planning, debate, and negotiation preceded her construction, her keel was not laid until May 22, 1958, and she has thus been constructed in the remarkably short time of 14 months. Up to 24 more months, however, may pass before she is commissioned and puts to sea with her first regular cargo.

There is no expectation that as a commercial vessel the *Savannah* will pay her way. But Clarence G. Morse, head of the Maritime Administration and one of her chief backers, is confident she will perform the function for which she is intended.

That is to provide operating experience for ships of her type, so that nuclear merchant ships of what he calls the second and third generations will prove economically feasible.

Morse says that the atomic ship now is at just about the stage John Watt had reached in development of the steam engine when he was fooling around with a tea kettle. He things that the atomic ships to come will make the NS *Savannah* seem as quaint as the old steamship *Savannah*—one of the first ocean steamers—seems to us now. He points out that while atomic ships may seem economically impractical now, back in 1819 people thought oceangoing steamships would be impractical, too, because salt water would rust their boilers.

Harborough I. Lill, project engineer on the *Savannah*, says that even now, just as the *Savannah* is being launched, ways have been found to make the next ship of its class more nearly competitive with conventional steamships.

Credit for the *Savannah's* construction must be shared by many, many persons, not the least of them being President Eisenhower, who first proposed her being built 4 years ago. Many Government officials and scientists have done their part to bring her into being. New York Shipbuilding Corp., management and men, have magnificently done their part.

Camden is immensely proud that the *Savannah* has been built here by our friends and neighbors.

We join with President Eisenhower in the hope and confidence he expressed in 1956 on authorization of the *Savannah's* construction that this pioneering vessel "will be the forerunner of atomic merchant and passenger fleets which will one day unite the nations of the world in peaceful trade."

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Home News, July 21, 1959]

"SAVANNAH" IS EXPECTED TO BE SHOWOFF BOAT

As Mamie Eisenhower wielded the traditional bottle of champagne against the hull of the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, the NS *Savannah*, in Camden today, all eyes turn to the future of this boat.

President Eisenhower on October 15, 1956, called this ship "a floating laboratory * * * a forerunner of atomic merchant and passenger fleets which one day will unite the nations of the world in peaceful trade."

The rosy future, however, is a long way off. Viewed in purely economic terms, the *Savannah* will be a seagoing white elephant. The required investment, about $42.5 million, and the poor cargo-to-size ratio, badly overbalance the advantage of relatively low operating costs. Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, asked to evaluate the commercial prospects of atom-powered cargo vessels, answered with one syllable: "Dim."

The *Savannah* should be viewed as a demonstration project, not one to bring a 6 percent return, either in dollars or scientific data. It is something that can be sent the world over to show off American skill and, more important, to prove our sincerity about beating swords into plowshares.

And an impressive exhibit it will be Sleek and modern in design, the *Savannah* will have a maximum power capacity of 74 million watts and will be able to sail 300,000 nautical miles without refueling. That is for about 3 full years. These whopping statistics are likely to make the *Savannah* as effective an instrument of U.S. foreign policy as we've sent abroad since the days of gunboat diplomacy.

[From the Woodbury (N.J.) Daily Times, July 21, 1959]

ANOTHER FIRST

Some 15,000 persons saw the Nation's First Lady launch the world's first atomic-powered cargo-passenger ship. With a broad smile on her face and her hands gripping a bottle of domestic champagne like a baseball bat, Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower sent the nuclear ship *Savannah* down the ways at the New York Shipbuilding Corp. yards in Camden, and another first was born in this land of ours.

We wonder what Robert Fulton would have thought of this 595-foot-long craft. What a difference between this and his little *Clermont* which made the trip successfully from New York to Albany in 1807. And what a difference between the original *Savannah*, which was the first steamship to sail across the Atlantic 140 years ago.

The first *Savannah* sailed from Savannah, Ga., to Liverpool, England, and carried a 30-day fuel supply. The *Savannah* launched yesterday will carry enough fuel for 3½ years which is enough to take the big ship 300,000 nautical miles.

Fulton's *Clermont* used wood for fuel and since then coal and oil have been used to create steam to drive ships on the high seas. However, the new *Savannah* will generate steam by nuclear energy and will be far safer than either the *Clermont* or the first *Savannah*.

When Robert Fulton made his first steamboat it was mighty difficult for him to make people believe in his invention. When the first *Savannah* left the city of Savannah 140 years ago there was little faith shown that she would reach Liverpool under her own power. In contrast, the new *Savannah* was launched with the greatest optimism. If there were any doubters as to her ability to achieve what was planned for her they did not make themselves known.

From this it would seem that the thinking of our people has changed a lot during the 140 years of progress. We seem less doubtful as to the outcome of new adventures in the fields of science and invention. Somehow our eyes seem to have opened to vast new conceptions and we do not scoff at those who come forth with new ideas of making and doing things.

There will be other firsts coming our way and from the looks of things the generations that follow us will witness things we never dreamed possible. This generation has seen many firsts but what new things have come to them will seem as nothing compared with those that should be coming our way within the next generation or two. Let us hope that we will continue to strive for more firsts that will do much to lift more burdens from the backs of humanity and give them more joy in their day-by-day living.

American Aid in Free Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 24, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Our Hidden Scandal—the Magnificent Goof of Radio Vietnam," which was published in the Washington Daily News of July 22; together with an article entitled "The Price of Stupidity and Arrogance—It Is Not a Compliment To Call a Vietnamese 'Pro-American'," published in the same newspaper on July 23, 1959.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, July 22, 1959]

OUR HIDDEN SCANDAL—THE MAGNIFICENT GOOF OF RADIO VIETNAM

(By Albert M. Colegrove)

SAIGON, VIETNAM, July 22.—Today let us take up the magnificent goof known as "Radio Vietnam." It will give you, in one electronic nutshell, the whole fantastic story of what's happening to your tax millions out here.

It includes just about everything that is wrong with our American aid setup in Free Vietnam.

I have pieced this story together from many reliable sources. You will not find it in public records. On phony grounds of "security," much of it has been tucked away in the secret files of the U.S. Operations Mission (USOM), which is what they call the economic aid agency here.

The friendly Americans swarmed into South Vietnam in 1955, intent on conquering poverty, uplifting the masses and keeping communism at bay.

THREE-STATION NETWORK

Naturally, their attention soon turned to Radio Vietnam.

This was the small (three-station) radio chain which he newborn nation inherited from its former French rulers.

In 80 years as masters here, the French had avoided training Vietnamese for anything better than semiskilled jobs. Thus, the director of Radio Vietnam was one Maj. Doan Van Cuu, a veterinarian whose speciality was the intestinal disorders of elephants.

The three chief technicians were non-engineers whose qualifications were that they had friends or relatives at the Presidential Palace.

Then there were the girls—dozens of small-boned, soft-lipped, gently-curved, laughing, trilling beauties with which Vietnam is so happily endowed—and all of them hired and thrust behind microphone or control panel after a couple of hours' training by the admiring Cuu.

The 7 a.m. news often came on at 1 p.m. Saturday night's serial frequently was postponed to Tuesday morning because the leading lady (one of Cuu's little birds) was busy Saturday night.

A MAZE OF IDEAS

Then came the American experts.

Unhappily, each brought to this bedlam his own theories on the salvation of Radio Vietnam. Each had his pet idea on how to revamp the station's news broadcast operation. Each at various times put his plan in action. As a result, Radio Vietnam today has, not one, but three costly teletype reperforating devices it never has used.

Still, some projects were agreed on among the Americans. One was a proposal for a series of low-powered local radio stations around the country, which would take the government's messages to the grassroots level.

A meeting was scheduled with one Tran Chanh Thanh, a convert from the Communist Vietnam Minh who had become (and still is) the high Pooh-Bah of all communications—press, radio, and printed propaganda—in South Vietnam.

Information Minister Thanh opened the meeting by flatly rejecting the American proposal. What his Government desired, Thanh said, was a giant 100,000-watt shortwave transmitter which not only would reach the Communist north; it also would go all the way to America where millions of families, huddled around their shortwave receivers, would be swayed to send more aid to Vietnam.

The Americans coughed nervously and suggested this might be a trifle ambitious for now. The Minister walked out.

Thus, both American and Vietnamese hopes were stymied temporarily, but there were other projects.

STYMIED BY LAW

Under U.S. guidance, it was decided to move the Saigon transmitting station. An American supervised construction of a $25,000 building and drew plans for a lofty antenna tower. Then it was discovered a law prohibited any tower over 90 feet tall so close to the Saigon airport. This eliminated use of the best broadcasting frequency.

Radio Vietnam Director Cuu, the specialist in elephant bellyaches, finally overreached his privileges. A horde of police, acting on information received about Cuu's unique bookkeeping (which never had been open to American inspection) swooped down one day—a trifle late. Major Cuu had just burned his books in the alley. Some $446,000 of the money entrusted to him remains to be accounted for today.

Major Cuu's successor was (and is) Buo Tho. He's former private secretary to President Diem, and former Vietnam fisheries chief.

Tho brought to his job a built-in obsession. He wanted equipment that would jam the Red radio at Hanoi—and not merely make it unintelligible in free Vietnam but all over Asia. This is impossible. (However, in recent months, Tho has been partially appeased. Some U.S. jamming equipment is on the way.)

Tho also ramrodded through a U.S.-financed project to air condition Radio Vietnam's Saigon studios. Seven machines, costing $27,000, were installed. A local contractor, paid in advance, was hired to install the necessary ducts throughout the building. He skipped the country. The air-conditioning machines are still there, idle; and Radio Vietnam's Saigon studios remain uncooled.

However, morale got a great boost soon after Tho took over. The Vietnamese were still unhappy about not getting that powerful transmitter to sway North Vietnan and Americans.

WASHINGTON FOUL-UP

Then came Abbott Washburn of Washington, deputy director of the entire Voice of America program, swinging through Saigon to see how things were getting along.

The problem of the transmitter impasse reached his ears. "Why," said Mr. Washburn, "what a lucky thing I passed by. The Voice of America happens to have a 50,000-watt transmitter it's not doing anything with just now. That may not reach to America, but it will get the message to North Vietnam. We'll give it to free Vietnam, how's that?"

The Vietnamese were delighted.

Later, after Mr. Washburn had zoomed back to Washington, it was discovered that American law positively prohibits even him from giving away Voice of America equipment to foreign nations.

This threw foreign aid officials into a tizzy. What to do? American "face" was at stake. Above all, the boat must not be rocked. So—the 50,000-watt, $100,000 transmitter was quietly sandwiched into the USOM budget for Vietnam.

There was at least one American "expert" in the Radio Vietnam program who seems to have been really qualified for the title.

He is Frank McIntosh, who has supervised the building of more than 400 radio stations in America and abroad. He headed all U.S. electronic development for our War Production Board during World War II and has been a Bell System scientist since. He came here in 1957 and again in 1958 as a temporary consultant on the American plan for putting low-powered stations throughout South Vietnam.

After much travel and study, Mr. McIntosh recommended 11 sites. He drew up detailed designs for equipment at each site. He then returned to America. The Vietnamese rejected most of his designs and all but two of his sites as unsuitable.

As of today, we are going ahead with a program, American-financed, that is partly ours but mostly theirs.

[From the Washington Daily News, July 23, 1959]

THE PRICE OF STUPIDITY AND ARROGANCE—IT IS NOT A COMPLIMENT TO CALL A VIETNAMESE "PRO-AMERICAN"

(By Albert M. Colegrove)

SAIGON, VIETNAM, July 23.—Stupidity and arrogance of the people who represent our Government in Vietnam may be losing friends for America faster than aid dollars can gain them.

Showing rare talent in this department, American bureaucrats and their families have managed to get themselves disliked, not merely by the Vietnamese but also by other Asians, Europeans and even their fellow countrymen here.

There are exceptions, of course—people who individually have gained respect and fondness.

But—

Speaking with typical Oriental restraint a prominent Vietnamese editor unhappily told me: "It is not considered a compliment to call a Vietnamese pro-American, these days."

Added a successful Vietnamese publisher: "Americans in your Embassy and in your foreign aid and propaganda branches do not get out and around. They tend to stick together or, at best, to associate only with the people who they think comprise the upper crust of our society."

But that is only part of the story.

There is, for example, the American movie house.

NO FOREIGNERS ALLOWED

This Government-operated, air-conditioned theater is one of only two places in Saigon where current, popular English-language films are shown. (The other is in the British Information Service building.)

Many intelligent Vietnamese love to sharpen up their knowledge of English by seeing our movies. But they are barred from the American theater, even as guests. So, also, are all other foreigners—in fact, everybody except American Government civilian and military employees and their families.

British employees in Saigon may bring guests—of all races—to their movies on Friday nights.

ISOLATION OF THE COMMISSARY

Then there is that fantastic horn of plenty, the American commissary.

"The commissary has done more to isolate us here than any other one thing," said a perceptive U.S. employee who's been in Saigon since 1955.

"When the Americans first arrived in numbers, 4 years ago, there was no commissary. American wives had to patronize the Vietnamese groceries and drug stores. Then the commissary was built. Now, the wives and husbands go there and let their servants do any other necessary shopping.

"I've actually heard women brag that they haven't been in downtown Saigon for 6 months. Not only has the blending process stopped, but also the local merchants are plenty unhappy, to say the least."

But perhaps the greatest American bid for the ill will of all nationalities and classes in Saigon has been our house and apartment rental policy.

GENEROUS RENT POLICY

All U.S. employees here are provided quarters rent free. Uncle Sam picks up the tab, leasing apartments and villas for his wards at a sucker price.

Here is a typical sample:

Mr. G is an American Government employee. He and his wife have no children. Our Government leases for them a four-room apartment for $300 a month.

By contrast, an American businessman and his wife, paying their own rent, have a slightly nicer apartment in a more convenient neighborhood for which they pay $180 a month—or $1,440 a year less.

Actually, that $300-a-month figure is quite modest. Many American Government families here enjoy homes and villas that cost U.S. taxpayers upward of $600 a month. These rents are not paid with so-called counterpart funds, either, but with piasters purchased by U.S. dollars from the U.S. Treasury.

What rankles the people of Saigon, though—from top-salaried private business leaders to lower middle-income Vietnamese wage earners—is that Uncle Sam's free-spending rental policy has caused a chain reaction that has skyrocketed virtually all rents.

For instance, the couple with the $180-a-month apartment paid less than $100 before the Americans came. A Vietnamese interpreter who used to pay $28 a month for his home now pays a staggering $62 and is in the clutches of the loan sharks as a result.

Unlike the United States, Vietnam has had little inflation in the past 5 years, except for that of rentals. That, however, is a key item in the budget of the average Vietnamese city dweller.

And on the subject of "hardship pay":

A LIFE FRAUGHT WITH PERIL?

Our State Department tells the folks back home that life in Vietnam is so fraught with peril, discomfort, and expense that our brave bureaucrats must have handsome bonuses to compensate for their sacrifices.

The fact is from the moment he boards a U.S. plane, bound for 2 years in Saigon, the average Government worker enjoys more luxurious living and fewer tensions than 90 percent of his taxpaying fellow citizens will ever achieve.

There is, indeed, tension and hardship—among the Vietnamese and espeically outside of Saigon. But at least 90 percent of the Americans never leave Saigon overnight.

For withstanding these "hardships," all our Government civilians in Vietnam receive bonuses amounting to 20 percent of their base pay.

In addition to this, to compensate for a nonexistent "high cost of living," an unmarried civilian receives $400 extra a year, while the family man draws $800 extra.

WHAT "HIGH COST"?

In Saigon a mile's taxicab ride costs about 10 cents, including tip. Or you can travel the same distance in a human-powered pedicab for less than a dime.

Scotch whisky is available at the Navy-operated commissary (for Government employees only) at $2 a quart. Even in civilian stores, it's under $5. Cigarettes at the commissary are 10 cents a pack.

An excellent steak dinner at the city's best restaurant is $4. Two can dine in a better than average cafe for that price.

As for staples: Two bachelors I know each has a Vietnamese cook-housekeeper do all their grocery shopping. Each of them gives his cook the equivalent of $30 a month to buy the grub; each enjoys three delicious meals a day. In other words, food costs them $1 a day apiece—and the cook manages to feed herself out of this, too.

Besides all this, every U.S. employee gets an apartment or home rent free, including utilities.

Here, then, is how the typical civilian employe is doing, financially:

He receives $9,500 a year in base pay.

To that is added $1,900 annually for hardships.

Throw in another $800 for his cost-of-living adjustment.

Thus, his total comes to $12,200 a year—or $1,016 a month plus free rent and utilities.

No wonder many workers remarked to me that, for once, they've been able to put away substantial savings while on duty in Vietnam.

Working conditions are pleasant and often leisurely. There is a 2-hour lunchtime siesta daily. Employees work Saturday mornings, but take Wednesday afternoons off.

And in addition to all the standard Government benefits, there are 20 official no-work holidays annually—including a 3-day layoff for the Vietnamese New Year and a day's rest on the anniversary of Confucius.

Grant by Office of Naval Research to Oregon State College for Oceanography Research Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 24, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the past year there has come about an increasing public recognition of the vast importance of a field about which little is understood outside the realms of its scientific practitioners—that of oceanography. As a result of a comprehensive and fascinating report, "Oceanography 1960 to 1970," put out last February by the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Science, further attention has been focused on the subject, in this body and elsewhere. It was this week, however, that this field suddenly took on a real, personal importance to me, when it was announced that the Oregon State College Department of Oceanography had received from the Office of Naval Research a $319,555 grant for purchase of a special oceanographic research vessel and expansion of its research and student-training programs. The grant comes to Oregon State College as a part of a national research project, under which funds are divided between 10 schools, located along the Nation's coastlines.

It is therefore surprising that, in this age of reaching outward into space, we should know so little about the fascinating, still faintly awesome depths of salt water which cover two-thirds of the surface of the earth, and the virtually unfathomed landscapes at their bottom. While we spend vast sums of money and energy to keep up with or surpass our rivals in space technology, we often virtually ignore the wealth of information and possibilities for a better, safer life which lie in the seas around us. Valuable knowledge about the forces acting on the earth, shaping its surface; new ways to feed a fast-growing world population; a degree of control by man over his old and oftentimes malicious enemy, the weather; new uses of the ocean and oceangoing vessels in the Nation's enormous network of defense: all these possibilities lie just out of reach, to be grasped and changed into realities by research such as that to be done at Oregon State College and in nine other institutions under the Navy grant.

Commendations are due to the Office of Naval Research for its work in formulating such a program and in securing the funds to put it into practice. They are due, in addition, to Oregon State College, and to Dr. Wayne V. Burt, head of the oceanography department there for their interest in this vital subject as well as for having built the kind of educational institution and department which merit such a grant from our Naval Department.

The information released by Oregon State College following its receipts of this grant follows. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON STATE COLLEGE GETS $319,555 TO STUDY OCEAN, BUY RESEARCH BOAT

OREGON STATE COLLEGE.—A $319,555 grant has been received by Oregon State College from the Office of Naval Research to triple basic oceanography research on Oregon's coastal waters and to purchase a special $250,000 ocean research vessel.

The boat will be a specially designed and equipped floating laboratory that will permit Oregon State College oceanographers to probe the depths of the ocean and explore the ocean floor off Oregon.

It will be approximately 75 feet long with quarters for 12 to 15 scientists and crewmembers. It will be built to order with the construction contract to be awarded on bids and with completion expected within a year. Newport will be the home port.

Part of the special equipment will include powerful winches that will permit the scientists to take ocean floor samples of sediment and marine life and to take water samples at depths down to 2 miles.

Dr. Wayne V. Burt, head of the oceanography department, said the boat will be the key to unlocking the unknown of Oregon's ocean area.

Up until now, Oregons' offshore region has been left blank on many detailed oceanography maps of the Pacific coast waters because so little research has been done, he pointed out.

Burt himself started the first extensive studies of Oregon's 350 miles of coastal

water—fourth longest coastline of any State—when he joined the Oregon State College staff in 1954. Since then, he has worked on studies of tides, inlets, water temperature, salinity, and oxygen content. In the 6 years, he has received research grants totaling more than $75,000 including $25,000 during the past year.

Next year under the new grant, $69,555 will be used to expand and intensify the research program.

The grant is part of a vast new 10-year national program of research in waters surrounding the United States. Oregon State College is one of the 10 institutions proposed by Office of Naval Research to conduct the studies and to assist in training vitally needed oceanographers. The 10 schools are strategically located along the east and west coasts and the Gulf of Mexico.

The 10-year program is aimed at providing basic information about deep ocean areas, and waters, the coastal shelf, and the ocean floor around the United States.

Observance of Pioneer Day in State of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 24, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in connection with the annual observance in a great part of Idaho of Pioneer Day—the anniversary of the arrival of Brigham Young and his Mormon pioneers at Salt Lake.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHURCH

It is 112 years ago this afternoon that Brigham Young, leading a train of wagons, looked out upon the valley of the great Salt Lake and told his Latter-Day Saints, "This is the place."

These simple words marked the end of a thousand-mile trek across the Great Plains and the Rocky Mountains, as the Mormons moved away from the persecution they had met in the East, and set out to establish their religious community free from bigotry and hate.

Today, in Utah and many parts of Idaho, communities join in the annual observance of Pioneer Day, commemorating the arrival of the Brigham Young party. Major celebrations are being held, including parades, pageants, dramas, special addresses, and even rodeos. These are proper accolades, for the Mormons did more than found a colony in which they could enjoy their religious freedom.

Brigham Young has been called the greatest colonizer in our country's history, because he sent Mormons into all the areas surrounding the Great Salt Lake, pioneering the agricultural empire that now flourishes where once there was only a vast expanse of sagebrush. Indeed, it was Mormon pioneers who founded the first settlement in my own State of Idaho at Fort Lemhi in 1855—and although it was later abandoned, in 1860, they founded the first permanent settlement in Idaho at Franklin. This frontier village was named for Franklin D. Richards, a distinguished Mormon pioneer. During their first year at Franklin, the settlers built a 3½-mile canal, admitting the waters of Maple Creek to their 10-acre farm tracts, and thus also launched the first major irrigation effort in the State.

Not only, of course, had the Mormons moved in and begun the early development of southeastern Idaho, but they also turned the barren area near the Great Salt Lake into a green and prosperous countryside; here, too, they built one of the most beautiful cities in America. The State of Utah was thus being born.

Today, we in Idaho pay our respects to Brigham Young and his valiant western pioneers, conscious that their decision to attain religious freedom in the untamed wilderness brought civilization and progress to much of our State. The words which Brigham Young spoke as he crossed a mountain range and looked down upon an uninhabited and desolately beautiful land, have rung down through the corridors of time as the epitome of discovery and journey's end. Truly, this was the place.

Proposed Exemption of Small Coal Mines From Mandatory Compliance With Federal Coal Mine Safety Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 24, 1959

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held hearings this week on three bills, S. 743, S. 1562, and S. 2403, proposing to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act with respect to the present exemption granted small coal mines from mandatory compliance with certain provisions of the law.

The Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal on Thursday, July 23, published an excellent editorial treating an important facet of the proposal to completely repeal the exemption. I commend it to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial, entitled "What John L. Really Wants Is the Death of Small Mines."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT JOHN L. REALLY WANTS IS THE DEATH OF SMALL MINES

John L. Lewis and JOHN SHERMAN COOPER matched wits and lung power in a Senate hearing Tuesday, debating the merits of the Federal mine-safety bill. It was not an especially enlightening discussion. John L., as usual, was louder. Senator COOPER made more sense.

The bill which they discussed is, as legislators love to say, "just a simple little bill" that would do nothing but drive the small mine operator out of business. It would do this by requiring little mines, even those employing 15 or fewer men, to meet the same safety standards as the huge, mechanized mines, including the installation and operation of equipment that large mines need and can afford but which little mines neither need nor can pay for.

A mine extending a few hundred yards into a hillside does not always need the extensive ventilation and electrical equipment of a mine whose openings run for miles underground. And a small family mine that produces a few hundred tons of coal a day cannot support the cost of safety equipment that is easily supported by a large mine.

John L., eyebrows flashing, voice thundering and heart bleeding for the imperiled coal miner, waved statistics before the senators to prove that the small mines are death traps, operated by profit-greedy monsters eager to fatten on the blood of helpless miners. The facts, however, are not so simple, and the statistics of mine safety can be used to show that there are more injuries and fatalities per ton of coal produced in the small mines. But statistics also show that there are fewer fatalities in the small mines per man-hour worked.

But these figures, like the whole argument over mine safety and mine inspection standards, are pretty much a smokescreen. No one wants to permit unsafe mine operation. Certainly John Cooper does not, and when John L. Lewis accuses him of the "crucifixion" of miners' hopes, the mine boss is being ridiculous as well as unfair. And though some Kentucky mine operators do their industry a disservice by their short-sighted attempts to get legislative permission to use black powder in the mines, most of them have long since learned the economic value of modern safety methods, and few of them object to safety procedures that make sense for their operations.

But despite Mr. Lewis's breast-beating, safety for miners is a minor issue in this argument. The object of this bill—and the object of Mr. Lewis, the United Mine Workers of America, and the loose organization of railroads and large coal producers that have joined in the attempt to pass such legislation—is the eradication of the small mines of America. This is what the fighting is really about. It may be that Senator CLARK, who introduced the bill, does not know this. But that is the actual purpose of the bill, and John L. would do himself and his cause credit by admitting it.

John L. has been trying for the past 15 years to get rid of the small mines. He tried it with the wartime measures that required union wage scales of all companies selling coal to the Government. He tried it with the Walsh-Healy Act which restricted governmental coal purchases to companies paying the going wage, which happened to be the union scale. He tried it last year with his new contract that forbids companies holding UMW contracts to handle coal produced in nonunion mines. And he is trying it now with this mine-safety bill that will drive 80 percent of the small mines out of business.

There can be good arguments made for putting the small mines out of operation. Most of them are uneconomic. Few can pay union wages. Few of them can afford all the modern, efficient safety equipment that mines should have. The fact that they hire a lot of men at low wages has an adverse effect on area economy. Few of them can afford mechanization that makes work lighter and safer for the miners.

The big, efficient mines can pay better, operate more safely and still make more profit. It might well be better for the national economy if only the big mines survived. Certainly it would be better for John L. Lewis. Big mines produce a lot of coal using few miners, and that is just what John L. wants. It means that his union gets a 40-cent per ton royalty on the coal produced, and has fewer miners to provide with hospitalization, strike benefits, and pensions from the treasury that the royalty builds.

But this is reckoning without two factors—the miners who work in the small mines and the communities that depend on

them. Today half of all American miners are employed in small operations. Eastern Kentucky, eastern Tennessee, southwestern Virginia, and western West Virginia would be crushed economically if the small mines were abolished. Mechanization and the drop in the coal market have already put thousands of miners in each of these areas out of work, and have produced in all four sections a state of serious and chronic depression. If Mr. Lewis has his way, this safety bill will close more mines, put more miners out of work and deepen the depression of the coalfields.

That is what the shouting is all about, John L.'s oratory to the contrary. And for that reason, it is good to see Senator COOPER fighting for a milder bill that will put the small mine in a separate category when it comes to safety inspections, and grant the small miner at least a temporary lease on life.

Our Commonwealth of Puerto Rico—Seventh Anniversary—Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, we congratulate Mr. Fernós-Isern, colleague and Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico upon the great progress effected by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in establishing its governmental functions in accordance with public law passed in 1950 by the 81st Congress. Saturday, July 25, is the seventh anniversary of this given right to enter that compact with the United States—an enjoyment of certain self-governing authority with those limits necessary for the functioning of a continuing resposibility of our Government.

The Puerto Ricans were overjoyed to be counted as Americans and have reflected their satisfaction by assuming every responsibility of citizenship.

Her economy has prospered and her people have raised their living standards in conformity with American tradition.

The people have entered occupational pursuits through the expansion of manufacturing and mercantile interests—so that agriculture is no longer the sole activity for employment.

The Puerto Rican Legislative Assembly functions similarly to those of our States operating in the same jurisdictional areas.

We may predict that the next State to be admitted might well be the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

I am proud to number among my close friends in Chicago a great number of our citizens of Puerto Rican ancestry. They are outstanding in their activity in all community matters. Their contribution to the economy through industry and other pursuits are stimulating to the common effort of every American to better his or her station in life.

Puerto Ricans would have had to make many more difficult sacrifices to realize their present status if it were not for the zealous activity and persistent efforts of our own Commissioner, Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. He fought so valiantly for the passage of the public act establishing the Commonwealth.

We are happy to celebrate with our loyal fellow citizens of Puerto Rico this their seventh anniversary of their embracement as a Commonwealth and her acceptance as a governmental unit in the circle of the United States of America. May God preserve us to protect and guard over our cradle of American freedom—Puerto Rico.

Grandeur of the State of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 24, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, few States have a more colorful and vivid landscape than my native State of Oregon, which this year commemorates 100 years of membership in the Union. The July 12 issue of the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard has published a vivid and expressive editorial entitled, "Seeing the 'Out-Backs' in Oregon." I rarely have read anything which so synthesizes the appeal of the Oregon outdoors and of the Oregon people. I ask unanimous consent to have this colorful editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEEING THE "OUT-BACKS" IN OREGON

Oregon, even in the centennial year is more than a big exposition in Portland, more than miles of freeway ribbon and more than the mountains, beaches, and resorts that attract the tourists. Oregon is also miles and miles of land, often inhospitable land, and scores of little towns, struggling streams and reminders of the farm, forest, and mine from when commeth our strength.

To see this the tourist, especially in the centennial year, would be well advised to avoid the highways and to take to the back roads. That way he'll see another Oregon, but a very real one. Such was our opportunity a few days ago, driving from the northeast corner to Eugene on roads that are bypassed by those in a hurry. We found the other Oregon.

Oregon is a ghost town, a town that once had a bright future—before the gold ran out and before the big fire of 1917. Now it's a few houses, a country store, acres of vacant lots and a rusting iron safe, its door agape and its interior empty of the treasure that once poured into the building that burned.

Oregon is a ditch, 100 miles long, built by Chinese hired to grub out gold. Oregon is piles of tailings, rock mounds which will puzzle archaeologists thousands of years hence.

Oregon is scenery right out of a western movie. Oregon is Zane Grey country.

Oregon is a combination restaurant, bar, and card parlor. "What kind of soup is it?" The wife of the proprietor looks carefully into the pot and replies, "Chicken noodle—now." Men in big hats fondle stacks of silver as cards appear and reappear on the green covered table. The dealer wears an eyeshade. The question: "Isn't gambling illegal over here?" and the answer: "Sure, but who's going to make a pinch?"

Oregon is bad road, road with rocks in the middle and road almost barricaded by fallen logs. Oregon is low gear stuff, washboardy, dusty. Beside the road is sagebrush, snakey looking stuff that prompts the traveler to look before he steps.

Oregon is a motel with a missing proprietor. Where is the motel man? "He's out on the firetruck. Barn afire. Green hay. He'll be back after a bit." An hour and a half later he returns, dirty, hot, and mad. "Missed my TV program," he explains.

Oregon is multicolored rimrock rising above brown hills. The hills shade to brown from the rich green that means either a stream or irrigation. And on the green mat are black cattle, healthy looking beasts.

Oregon is two girls at a restaurant in Fossil. "My motto used to be 'See the world,'" says one, "but no more. It's too wild up there, way too wild. Now my motto is 'No place like home.' They can keep Condon." Condon is 21 miles from Fossil.

Oregon is old John Silvertooth at his combination store-saloon-barbership-museum at Antelope. "Centennial? We celebrate the centennial here every day. Have for years."

Oregon is a Cadillac in the driveway of a lonely ranchhouse, a house that must have cost many thousand dollars and that is miles from its nearest neighbor. And Oregon is a deserted hut, long abandoned by a family which was displaced by industrial agriculture.

Oregon is car bodies beside the road, so far from a town that the metal is not worth hauling back for junk. And Oregon is "Jesus Saves" signs.

Oregon is a service station proprietor who notices the rock hammers in the car and who invites the tourists into the backroom to see the pretty rocks he found—an agate as big as a ham and a beautiful limb cast. It's not polite to ask where he found them. But the tourists are welcome to look.

Oregon is TV aerials in the middle of nowhere, schoolhouses in remote valleys, and gas pumps in the most unlikely places. A tourist could lack a bed, lack a meal, but even in the back country he is never more than 20 or 30 miles from a gas pump.

Is there a place without a rodeo? Is there one where they don't elect a queen? Keep looking. Try what the Australians call the "out back." It's a refreshing view of a State too few of us have ever really examined.

Will the United States Have To Shoot Down Zeros?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of Sunday, July 12, 1959, carried an article concerning the efforts of the present French Government to restore the franc to respectability by the process of dropping two zeros from all old denominations.

This would be almost humorous if the reasons which brought about the action were not so tragic. For those of us who are inclined to smile smugly with regard to this problem, may I say that it is not inconceivable that the American dollar

might one day become so inflated that a similar solution would have to be sought. To those who wish to keep spending, spending, spending, I commend the reading of this article and I ask them: "Will you be the one to trim the zeros when the need arises?"

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that this article was brought to my attention by Mr. Martin T. Purtell, of Elmira, N.Y., who is "Mr. Democrat" in Chemung County, New York, but who is apparently appalled at the wild spending habits which many Members of his party have developed in recent years.

The article follows:

TRIMMED FRANCS—FRANCE TO START ITS CURRENCY REFORM BY DELETING TWO ZEROS FROM NOTES

(By Robert Doty)

PARIS.—The first stage of an operation to slim down the French franc to an elegant, svelte silhoutte one-hundrdeth of its former bloated inflated self will get underway on Wednesday.

At that time the Bank of France will start issuing the first currency overprinted with new denominations with two zeros stricken from the unit value. Thus, the old 500-franc note, for example, will be overprinted and thereby become a new 5-franc note.

The operation is going to demand a good deal of financial flexibility on the part of everyone dealing in French money, and particularly the American tourist in France this summer.

The purpose of the operation is both practical and psychological, with the emphasis on the latter. The principal practical reason for the change is to aline French currency more closely with those of this Nation's most prosperous continental associates and competitors, West Germany, Switzerland, and Belgium.

When the new franc is finally enthroned it will be within hailing distance of parity with the German deutsche mark, and Swiss and Belgian francs.

In nontechnical terms, the operation consists of wringing the water out of French money. The simplest way to picture it is as the division of currency denominations, wages and prices by 100. This means that a worker will earn one new franc for each 100 old francs he now receives, without any change in his total purchasing power.

NEW ISSUES

Thus, present banknotes of 500, 1,000, 5,000 and 10,000 franc denominations, this month will begin to make their appearance—the operation will be spread over several months—bearing a red ink overprint stating that they are now, respectively, worth 5, 10, 50, and 100 new francs.

The U.S. dollar which now buys 485 old francs (the official rate of 493.7 minus bank charges and commissions) will purchase 4 francs, 85 centimes in the new currency. This will put the franc back just about where it was at the turn of the century, worth a little more than 20 cents United States. Successive devaluations over half a century had abased its value to a dismal decimal—.00202 of a dollar at the present time.

Here the psychological factors come in. The older funny money was incompatible with the dignity of the New France that President Charles de Gaulle is trying to lift by its bootstraps. It also was inconvenient in foreign exchange. It smacked of extravagance, both personal and governmental. State budgets were expressed in trillions and bureaucrats would acknowledge nothing smaller than the "milliard," a billion in U.S. terms.

Anyone in France who earned the equivalent of about $2,000 a year—that is, virtually everyone—was a millionaire but nobody had any respect for the unit of currency except in units of thousands.

When the public has become accustomed to the overprinted bills, either at the end of 1959 or early in 1960, the second and third steps of the changeover will take place. The overprinted bill will give way to new ones having only the new franc value. The handsome engraving of Cardinal Richelieu, the present 1,000 franc ($2.05) note, will apear as the 10-franc note. The present 500-franc note, with Victor Hugo depicted, will become 5 francs.

Bearded King Henry IV will look out from a 50-franc instead of a 5,000-franc note and the young Napoleon will preside on the 100-franc (ex-10,000 franc) note. A new piece of currency, engraved originally as a 50,000-franc denomination but never circulated may make its appearance as 500 new francs, with Molière, the great 17th century dramatist, on it.

At about the same time, the new coinage will flow out of the mint. Heading the procession will be a handsome, heavy silver 5-franc piece, 29 millimeters (slightly more than 1 inch) in diameter and weighing 12 grams, that has the feel of real money and the approximate value of a dollar. In descending order will come a silver 2-franc piece, a nickel 1-franc piece and pieces of 50 and 25 centimes (one new centime equals one old franc), in copper and nickel, and 10, 5, 2, and 1 centimes, probably in aluminum.

The implications of all this for French industry and trade are enormous. Every calculating machine and cash register in the country will have to be altered to install a decimal point. Slots and release mechanisms on coin-vending machines will have to be altered to the size and weight of the new coinage. Price tags, theater tickets, stock and bond certificates all must be reprinted.

TOURIST VIEWPOINT

And, as important as anything, tourists must be reeducated.

French authorities see two difficulties and and have taken steps to bypass both. The first is that some of the unscrupulous in French retail trade will try to parlay the overprint on the bills, tourist innocence and lack of French language ability into a profitable con game.

To ward off such incidents, the Finance Ministry will see that visitors, upon entering France, receive a brochure with pictures of ordinary money and the overprinted bills, with text in half a dozen languages explaining that both are of equal purchasing power and validity during the transitional period.

A peril is that a tourist may encounter frustration in trying to pay in "old francs" for merchandise priced in "new francs". He may offer a shoe merchant, for example, a coin worth 100 old francs for a pair of shoes marked "100 new francs." Feeling badly used when the merchant refuses this "bargain" transaction the tourist is likely to return to his hotel to write a letter instructing his congressman to vote against all future foreign aid bills and advocate withdrawal from the United Nations.

To avoid such misunderstandings, the Government has decreed that, during the transitional period, merchants who choose to advertise prices in "new francs" must have, on the same sign or ticket, the price in "old francs" as well.

DIFFICULT PERIOD

In the short but inevitable period at the end of the year when old franc bills, overprinted bills and new denominattion bills, and both sets of coinage are all circulating together, everyone, tourist and native alike, will have to exercise constant vigilance to make sure that they do not pay in new francs, and get their change in old francs.

Finally, one bright young Ministry official foresaw, and foreclosed, a great opportunity for swindlers in the changeover. In many cases, adjectives follow the nouns they modify in French. This meant that, on a check, a paper would normally have written, for example, "Dix Mille Francs Nouveaux" (Ten thousand francs new).

But, the official anticipated, if this were the accepted form, it would be a permanent invitation to crooks to get hold of old checks written in old francs and simply forge the word "Nouveaux" after the word "Francs," thereby increasing the face value of the check 100 times.

The Ministry and the banks slammed the door on this potential racket by decreeing that the legal formula on checks should be "Nouveaux Francs." This will make it impossible to insert the forget word "Nouveaux" between the numerals and the words "Francs" on an old check.

Shortage of Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have receiver a letter from my good friend Dr. Dominick F. Maurillo, of Brooklyn, which I believe all of my colleagues should read and consider carefully. Dr. Maurillo is a regent of the State of New York and chairman of the committee on licenses, and as such no one can question his authority to speak with knowledge and understanding. He has written as follows:

DEAR FRANK: I read in the New York Times that hearings are being held in reference to create a $50 million Institute of International Research within the National Institute of Health. May I make the following comment.

Today we have millions of dollars (either privately or publicly donated) earmarked for research work in medicine which cannot be used because good, capable research men are not available. Many medical centers especially those in very large cities, are making attractive offers to obtain doctors who can do good research work but so far they have had little success. This dedicated individual is very scarce.

If this $50 million is to be used for the purpose of hiring foreign trained research doctors, that I am in favor of the bill. But I am sure the intent of the bill is to include our own American research men which we do not have.

The people of the United States want a congressional committee to invcstigate. Why?

A. There is a shortage of 25,000 to 40,000 general practitioners.

B. There is a shortage of 10,000 to 15,000 specialists.

C. There is a shortage of 2,500 to 5,000 dedicated research doctors and teachers.

D. More than 8,000 top grade students (in upper third of their class) are refused admission to medical colleges each year.

E. Why 85 medical colleges in the United States limit the number of admissions to less than 8,000 a year.

Therefore why not use $49 million for this International Research Institute and use $1

million for a thorough investigation for our own medical needs.

Sincerely,

DON.

I might add that on April 15, 1959, I reintroduced H.R. 6417, which would provide for the establishment of a commission to study the shortage of doctors of medicine in the United States. In view of Mr. Maurillo's statements, I believe it warrants favorable consideration.

The Congressional Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 24, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial about the RECORD itself, which was published in the Oregon Journal of Portland on July 15, 1959. The title of the editorial is "Let It Really Be a RECORD." I heartily indorse and subscribe to the theme of the editorial which emphasizes that drastic changes and amendments should not be permitted in the record of Senate debate after that debate has occurred on the floor of the Senate.

This editorial supports, by inference, a resolution to forbid substantive changes in the record of Senate debate, which the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and I sponsored during the 85th Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET IT REALLY BE A RECORD

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been the subject of considerable discussion by Oregon's editors in recent weeks and much of the comment has dealt with the Appendix.

According to the UPI's Frank Eleazer, some 17,000 pages have been printed so far in 1959 and of these 6,000 are Appendix. At the present printing cost rate of 5¼ cents per word, this makes a costly Appendix, particularly when the Appendix contains items that are rarely if ever presented on the floor of the House or Senate, and frequently have no bearing on legislation under consideration.

The Appendix, despite the nature of its contents, comes under the heading of "Extension of Remarks" and these remarks may be anything from a farm constituent's favorite cure for nervousness in hogs to a speech made at the opening of the Podunk County courthouse.

The Eugene Register-Guard's remarks that much of this material is "guff" brought a reply from CHARLES O. PORTER, Representative from Oregon's Fourth Congressional District.

He says, in effect, that many of the insertions, while they may be self-serving in some cases, frequently are valuable. PORTER then adds, "If the words make good sense to me by pointing up a new approach or backing me up in an opinion or heralding a beauty of Oregon or the district, I believe it is good Appendix material. * * * Much of what I read I find interesting, helpful, often important. Not 'guff' at all, but the fabric of our legislative process, reflecting both strengths and weaknesses but always demonstrative of the unmatched worth of our democratic processes."

Comment on this statement, the Medford Mail Tribune grants that much of the RECORD may be waste but says, "If the RECORD—unwieldly, verbose, and overweight, as it is, can in some measure assist in the legislating process, and in keeping open the lines of communication between Representatives and constituents, then it is worth its cost, which is, after all, only a tiny fraction of the other costs of Government."

In the main, we go along with the Mail Tribune, and would oppose any drastic cutting. But we do have our own pet gripe. This applies not to the Appendix so much as it does to the RECORD itself.

At best it is tough reading, but there would be consolation if there were assurance that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was in fact a record. Too often Capital news reporters' versions of what goes on on the floors of Congress and what the RECORD says have little similarity.

This occurs because Congressmen have the privilege of editing their remarks before they appear in the RECORD. This editing sometimes results in an almost complete change in meaning.

If there is to be a record of congressional doings, then let it be a record in fact as well as in name. Then there would be real justification for the RECORD, despite its high cost.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

Successful Firing of the Corvus Missile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Navy recently announced the successful firing—on its very first test—of its new Corvus missile.

This report was particularly gratifying to me for two reasons:

As a Texan, I am able to point out that this new missile was developed in the Lone Star State; and successful completion of the test marks another advance in the defense technology of our Nation.

This new supersonic missile was successfully flown at the Pacific Range Test Center, at Point Mugu, Calif.

The Navy describes the Corvus as an "air-to-surface missile to be used by carrier-based aircraft and is designed to attack heavily defended areas, including surface ships."

The Dallas Morning News of July 19, 1959, carried a story, by Clardy McCullar, detailing further information on the Corvus. Because of the Corvus' potential importance to the defense of our Nation, I ask unanimous consent that this dispatch be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW TEMCO MISSILE IS UNVEILED BY NAVY

(By Clardy McCullar)

Temco's Corvus soared to success on its very first test firing Saturday and shot away some of the secrecy shrouding it.

The Navy made public the first picture of Corvus, and following today's rule of thumb that the handsomer a missile the more deadly it is, Corvus is at least as lethal as Ingemar Johansson's right hand.

Also revealed in the picture are little stub wings which show that Corvus is no ballistic (flies like a cannon shell) bird. And the wings are highly swept, showing that Corvus flies at a very high rate of speed indeed. (The Navy-approved news release said Corvus is supersonic, faster than sound.)

Corvus was described in the news release as:

"A liquid propellant rocket powered, air-to-surface missile of a size to be used by carrier-base aircraft. It is designed to attack heavily-defended areas, including surface ships."

Corvus flew its first test from the Navy's A4D Skyhawk, Douglas' speedy, long-range, carrier-based attack bomber, off Point Mugu, Calif., over the Pacific Missile Range Test Center.

I. Nevin Palley, senior vice president of Temco Aircraft Corp. of Dallas, told the News that Corvus' creators decided 2 years ago that the missile's first test would go without a hitch—just as if it were a new airplane.

Although no size figures were given, Corvus is thought to be about as big a load as the Skylark can lift. It is thought to be about 15 feet long.

Its description as an attack missile for heavily defended areas, including surface ships means that Corvus is a long-range missile which can be fired hundreds of miles from the target. Its wings and tail fins, operated by some sort of guidance system, would steer it right to the target.

This would put it in the class with the Bold Orion, which some Air Force strategists say will replace the ICBM (intercontinental ballistics missile.)

Address of Hon. Gale W. McGee, of Wyoming, Before the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Properties Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a speech given by my colleague, the Honorable GALE W. MCGEE, junior Senator from Wyoming, on June 24, before the National Association of State Agencies, meeting in Grand Teton National Park, Wyo.

Senator MCGEE has shown, in his short time as a Member of this body, intelligence, foresight, and the ability to cut to the heart of a problem. Perhaps the beauty of the Tetons has inspired him further—for this speech on the vital need for truth and new ideas shows breadth of vision. He brings into perspective the image America must present to the underdeveloped countries of the world.

I hope my colleagues will all find time to read his remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE GALE W. MCGEE, SENATOR FROM WYOMING, BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE AGENCIES FOR SURPLUS PROPERTIES CONVENTION, JACKSON LAKE LODGE, GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK, WYO., JUNE 24, 1959

I didn't realize that you had been in session so long this afternoon that you had to stand for relief. Believe me, I appreciate that. You know that does a freshman's heart a world of good because a freshman doesn't receive great respect back there in this new game in which I am now a participant; and so when I can come out here and live it up and then be accorded a standing ovation, it's great for one's morale.

Indeed I am proud of all the States that you have associated me with, although I began to suspect that you were talking about a sort of interstate bum who was just one step ahead of a dissatisfied employer from time to time. Anybody who is entitled to claim so many States for residence is automatically suspect. We had to leave Nebraska because we couldn't find a climate of opinion there that was receptive to mine. They still don't receive some of my ideas well, although my mother maintains a beachhead there in the interest of the family. But she has to be a Republican Committeewoman in order to do that.

Colorado—Loraine and I did spend our honeymoon in Colorado. It's a very wonderful place. They have beauty but it's commercialized beauty. They don't have the naked, raw, rugged beauty such as you look out upon from the window of this hotel and enjoy.

Unfortunately, the commercialists have invaded our lands in Wyoming, too, and we who truly love the West and love it for its native beauty secretly resent this intrusion of civilization which is changing the face of our country. As a public official, of course, I have a moral obligation to becken to all to come on because the more tourists we can attract in the summertime, the more prosperity we can enjoy. But the hard truth of the matter is that really down inside, where it counts, we wish you'd all stay home and leave our fishing alone.

We have long since, now these last few weeks, discovered the real definition of capital punishment. Capital punishment can be defined as that necessity which calls for some of us to have to live in Washington in the summertime—and it is real capital punishment. You don't know what the contrast is until you make that overnight jump from the hot, steamy streets of Washington, where the humidity is always high, where the thermometer is in the nineties, out here to God's open spaces where the sky is blue and the space is unlimited and the air is fresh. We never come home to this without wondering why in the world we should go back. Yet there is something that draws us back, that electric something which I guess, infects many of us. It has nothing to do with the time spent; it has to do with the commitment to participate in decision making. That, whatever else you may say about it, does make a difference, and I think it is that which buoys you up and keeps you going in the U.S. Senate.

When I was in the teaching business, as I was for 22 years until a year ago just about now, there existed in that profession a sense of rank and seniority. I remember when I was in the graduate school in Colorado and then at the University of Chicago really resenting a little bit the instructors on the staff because I thought they were snobs and looked down their noses at us poor graduate students trying to struggle along. I was determined then and there to get into the professoring business and see what it was like to look down upon the unfortunates below me. I got to be an instructor at Nebraska Wesleyan University and then discovered, only too late, that instructors didn't amount to anything because there were assistant professors, associate professors, and, finally, full professors who towered over them. After a dedicated career of suffering and sacrifice and by outliving

some others, I rose through the ranks and got clear to the top as a full professor. I thought that we had it made then, only to discover that in the educational profession, in which many of us here are interested, there has not emerged a hierarchy over all that we call administration and administrators. That seemed so hopelessly frustrating to me that I thought it was time to get out of the business. I wanted some simple employment that would be a little easier going in which rank played a lesser part, and I applied for a job with the Senate of the United States. For reasons beyond my control and due to the rationale of the citizens of Wyoming, I got the job. Now, as a result, I have gotten into the worst kind of rank situation. I don't suppose there's any institution in the world which is so rank conscious or where seniority plays such a tremendous part in the thinking of the participants.

In the group of us who did descend on Washington last November, there were 18 new Senators, all of them with my political faith. We thought we were so numerous that we'd take the place by storm and that all these fetishes about seniority—who was the oldest and who represented what in what order down the line—would be destroyed by numbers, by mass impact. But we didn't reckon with the Senate of the United States and its traditions, and, upon arrival there, we discovered our best intentions were stymied by the depth of the tradition and the inveterate dedication to seniority. The result was that they had a rule for every one of us. The Senate is sacred in its belief that no two Senators—I don't care which two Senators they are—can ever be absolute equals. There is a niche for each, 98 of them, and each takes his place beneath those who outrank him.

Well, it was then I learned the hard way that in order to break up this gang of 18 new freshmen, they were going to allot us our places, and they had a special place—a special precedence—for all former members of the House of Representatives. That involved 9 or 10 of our gang—quite a portion. And then they had a second order of precedence for anybody who had been a former Governor of his State. That took three or four more, but it still left four of us who stood shoulder to shoulder, exactly the same height, and that's when the resourcefulness of the Senate, naturally, came into play. They resurrected a couple of old precedents which had not been used since before the Civil War which dictated the separation of the remaining four who thought they were equal. They decided they could separate us according to the year in which our State had been admitted to the Union. Well, the passengers aboard the *Mayflower* didn't quite make it to Wyoming. Very little of the sea washed the shores of this wonderful State. In fact, we didn't come into the Union until 1890, and so we were way, way down that list. Even with this ruling, however, the final status of two of us was not resolved. Two States came into the Union in 1890 and that created a tie they couldn't break until they found another old beat-up rule which said that in such a case seniority would be determined by alphabetical order of States. Well, consult the list of States and you'll see that Wyoming is quite a ways down. In fact, there is no whicher than Wyoming in the alphabet. So, ladies and gentlemen, today you are looking at No. 98. One consolation about it is that it leaves us no direction to go but up and that's hopeful. And they assure me back there that the longer I'm around, the better I will think of seniority and that I will temper my views as the years pass.

It is genuinely refreshing to me, under all of these circumstances, to come here and talk to you. You have been having your seminars; you have had your old pros batting away at each other; you are going to have them some more. I don't know anything about surplus property problems except I am for you. I was told to say that so that you'd know I was dedicating my efforts in your behalf and, rest assured, if you tell me what those efforts are, I will. I happen to believe in the people who brought me out here. That's the only reason I'm here. And I firmly believe in the line that you're trying to hold—making available some of the surplus materials for schools and in the educational field. It would be dishonest for me not to say that very bluntly and forthrightly.

I want to talk to you today about an area quite far removed in one way from the professional concern which has collected you here this week and particularly this afternoon—a topic that's quite far removed from the minds of all too many Americans today. It is the parts of the world which we have for generations taken for granted and continually ignore. I am speaking of the so-called underdeveloped regions of the globe. They are not totally unrelated with the problem that you are, on the domestic front, concerned with here—surplus properties. If I were to say to you that tomorrow, not the day after tomorrow, not the 21st century, but tomorrow, the whole vibrance of the world will be coming from the heartbeat of Asia and Africa; not from Washington; not from London; not from Paris or Rome, but from Asia and Africa, it would be sufficient to suggest the new focus which we are very slow to make a part of American thinking.

Take a cross section of the people of tomorrow, the people now that are between adolescence and middle age—that is 10 years older than I am, I always say—take a cross section of all the people of the world who lie between the ages of 12 or 13 and 50 and who make up tomorrow's world. They will be determining our future policies. Take such a cross section and it's made up something like this. On the basis of a sampling of 100 to reflect that cross section, 6 of them would be from the United States and Canada; another 5 or 6 of them would be from Latin America—our neighbors to the south; 7 or 8 of them would come from the Soviet Union—Russia; perhaps 9 from Africa; 15 or 16 of them would come from Western Europe and non-Russian Europe; and 56 of them—56, I repeat—would come from Asia. There is your world of tomorrow. Yet, in our own concept, we don't go much beyond the shores of the Atlantic, and might I say to you very frankly, as a former student of history, that the Atlantic age of history is already on the downgrade. And we pretend to be the leaders of the world. We are talking about a world that we are still fighting over—the world of World War II. That's what got us down in the 1930's when we were still trying to stay out of World War I, wasn't it? Now we are trying to correct some of the mistakes of World War II. All too few of us are asking about tomorrow and worrying about where we are going.

Now, I want to talk to you for the next few minutes about some aspects of the American concept toward the rest of the world which I think are fundamental if we are to create a sound American policy position that will lead not only to our survival but to our survival under circumstances that are amenable to the kind of life which we associate with a free society.

I will say to you then, first of all, that above all the other concepts Americans must learn to believe in and to understand is the fact that people are different. We have undergone a number of exercises in which it has been our apparent intention to make little Americans out of everybody around the world. As President Eisenhower once reminded us, we not only can't make little Americans out of the world, but it would be a bad idea even if we could. Because of the impact of World War II and, more important, because of some of the problems—if I may drag it in by the heels—caused by surplus property left over in some strange corners of the world after that conflict, we began to try to make little Americans out of everyone.

In reality, however, I am talking about people's thinking, about their cultural habits, about their standards of value, about the things they believe are important, the things which make a difference. Not everybody believes in skyscrapers, in jets, or in a bank account. People have different standards.

I always remember the story that James Michener of South Pacific fame still tells. It happened when he was in Seoul during the Korean war, at the time of the second siege of the city of Seoul when the Communists had moved down from the north very rapidly and threatened to trap not only the garrisons but the people of the city. In that emergency, the American commander called in the city officials and said: "We have very little evacuating material or means of evacuation available. We are caught unready. There is only one barge and it will accommodate about 100 people. Pick the 100 most important people of the city of Seoul, get them on the barge, and we will get them out so that they can save the city when it comes time to rebuild. But pick your key people." The city government, the city officials of Seoul, quickly convened and made their decision, and they put on that barge for the evacuation the 100 members of the Seoul Symphony Orchestra. The American commander cussed a blue streak and called them "blankety-blank so and so illiterates."

But people are different. People have contrasting sets of values and we must understand that.

I once heard the then General Eisenhower describe a similar experience in Africa during the north African campaign. When it was about finished, and there was a light weekend ahead, General Eisenhower was flown into the interior of Africa to view a special housing project that one American group had promoted. It was in a tribal area where the tribes had formerly been living in grass huts. General Eisenhower found there in a beautiful clearing in a corner of the Belgian Congo, neat rows of little white Cape Cod cottages that the American benefactors had set up for them, and which had all of the plumbing conveniences that you could desire.

There was only one thing missing—people. The houses were all empty. The general asked the chief escorting him around, "Where are the people?" The chief, a little bit embarrassed said, "Well, General, I think I can show them to you." He then escorted him some distance down to the bank of the nearby river, and there were the people. They were building grass huts and the babble of their talk made quite a din. The chief said, "You know, General, they very much appreciated those wonderful, wonderful houses, but they just didn't think they could live in them, because with all of the conveniences—running water and the like—my people felt that it would deprive them of their one reason for living, the one joy they had every day, and that is the daily trip down to the bank of the river to get water to wash their clothes and to commune with their neighbors."

Well, people are different: They are different in as many ways as there are people. That's why we have sometimes gotten into trouble in America. We haven't been willing to allow for those differences.

At the University of Wyoming, while I was teaching there, we had a great many stu-

dents from Afghanistan. We had these students from Afghanistan because we had opened a sort of branch of the University of Wyoming over in Afghanistan. We had an exchange program. We kept this program very much alive because Afghanistan was a high-altitude country with agricultural and soil problems similar to our own. I had many of these Afghan boys in class and would talk to them at every opportunity about their experiences here. They had a wonderful time in Wyoming.

One of them told me he spent a weekend over near Torrington—which is as far as you can go from here and still be in Wyoming. He had been riding a cornpicker all afternoon. He said it was an exciting thing and he would like to have one to play with. But he said, "You know, Professor, it is no good to me back in Afghanistan. I have wasted my time. In many parts of my country, people are still planting seeds with pointed sticks."

We fail to allow for the fact that some of the world's peoples don't care to use anything else but a pointed stick.

When Loraine and I were in Moscow—and it's nearly 3 years ago now—we got trapped one afternoon in a rainstorm. I should say I got trapped. The women didn't. They were out looking for bargains which they never found. But I stayed in the hotel. I sat in the lobby of the Leningradskoya Hotel until the rain stopped. In that 3 hours, I witnessed the arrival in Moscow of whole delegations from a dozen Asian countries which had been flown there at the expense of the Russians. One of the delegations was from Communist China, and I struck up a conversation with them. I did so because the Chinese speak English very fluently although they can't understand Chinese. This is literally true because there are over a thousand dialects. They speak the English language better than I do. We got along very well in understanding what we were saying to each other. I said to the Chinese, "I suppose you are excited about Moscow." They said, "Very much excited. It's an exciting city." I tried to imagine, in my own mind, why Moscow was exciting to the Chinese because by our standards it is a dreary city, a sort of sprawling slum with the exception of a few showplaces which they display to tourists and the party faithful from Siberia. With those exceptions, Moscow is a very, very dull city. But these Chinese were excited. Then I thought I could understand why they were because, compared to some of the hills of China, this would indeed be a refreshing and new place to them, and I made allowance for that.

So I said to the Chinese, "Gentlemen, you know, I think I can understand why you find Moscow as exciting as you do, but I wish you'd visit my country some day. We have some exciting things, too, which might open your eyes." He said, "I have been to your country. I have visited it four times. I have been in New York, Washington, Chicago, Detroit, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Seattle." Then I did scratch my head. I said, "You have been to all those places and you tell me you find Moscow exciting. Why?" He said, "You know, we in China think you have gone so far and reached so high, and achieved such marvels that we don't even dare dream about them, we are so far behind you. It has no meaning for our people; they couldn't understand it. But here in Moscow we know where these people were 40 years ago. They were just like us and we can see with our own eyes where they have come in less than a generation. And if the Russians can do it," he said, "China can do it. That's why we admire Moscow."

That's something for every American to ponder. There are different ways of reaching people and you can overshoot your target; you can aim too high by trying to make little Americans out of everybody. That's the basic, fundamental concept that all of us have to acquire, have to understand, have to believe. We have to make allowance for the differences of people and do it in ways that they can understand through their insight instead of ours.

The second thing that I would leave with you is the suggestion that we have some surplus property, so to speak, that's surplus property only because we are not using it, surplus property that is begging to be used in meeting this precise problem which I have posed for you here today. That surplus property is of two forms: It is a surplus of ideas and a surplus of truth—ideas and truth. It is strange that we could speak of having a surplus of either one. We happen to have a surplus only because nobody's interested in either one. The people are not demanding either ideas or truth. They don't care. Thus, these commodities exist in bountiful quantities at the present time.

Some few years ago, I was with a private group in New York directing a little study on Soviet intentions. In the course of those long deliberations, we were entertaining, for the purpose of picking her brains, a lady from Asia. I will never forget the very plush banquet which was thrown in her honor. We invited her to the banquet along with 50 very affluent, industrial, and banking leaders of America. They were grouped around the lone lady, and I was included in the group only because I was directing the study.

The chairman for that meeting said: "Madam, before we get underway, I thought you might be interested in knowing something about the men who are here doing you honor tonight." He said, "These 50 men, I suspect, between them and among them, in their own personal wealth, have something in excess of $10 billion." Well I remember the warm glow coming over my face. Fifty divided into $10 billion meant that we were worth $250 million apiece. I never had it so good.

I will never forget her reply. She said, "Mr. Chairman, you know I do appreciate these very, very wealthy men taking time out from their accumulation of great wealth to dine with me tonight. But I hope you won't be offended if I suggest to you that this isn't a new experience for me, that this isn't the first time I have dined with men of great wealth. Just before I left my country on this trip, I had breakfast with eight maharajas whose total wealth was probably that of these men. But you know in India," she said, "we don't brag about that." (Leave it to a woman to put a man in his place.) She went on in a very, very rich way and she said, "May I say to you very fine Americans something that's very blunt but which I hope you will appreciate?" She said, "Let me tell you why the people of the world respect you, why they look to you for leadership, why they revere your history." She said, "It is not because of your skyscrapers; it is not because of your bank accounts; it is not because of your automobiles." She said, "We admire America because of your ideas. We admire America because you stand for truth wherever it may lead. And, gentlemen," she said, "why don't you put your great strength to work as you seek to lead the world?"

Ideas and truth—and I have never forgotten that memorable little occasion. The history of our own time bears out the validity of her observation. Look at our ideas. We have forgotten them long since. The ideas of free government, of the dignity of the individual, of the respectability of ordinary society, of the equality of all peoples, these are the magical, electric ideas that fire men even in this nuclear age.

When the troops moved into what is now Jakarta, Indonesia, but which was called the Dutch East Indies at the time, at the end of the war the Japanese had seized the area and they put up a very fanatical resistance. They destroyed most of the material assets of the region. But the troops which had entered Jakarta reported finding on the bombed-out walls of that ruined city inscriptions scrawled there by these resisting natives who were driving the Japs back out—inscriptions of little quotations from Ben Franklin, from Thomas Payne's "Common Sense," from Abraham Lincoln's second inaugural address, and from Thomas Jefferson's first. Most Americans don't remember these inspiring words.

These are the ideas of America and they have been carried into even the most backward areas. These areas are backward, my friends, only in the American materialistic sense, and that's the basis upon which we have been judging them.

I talked to a diplomat from Ceylon once. He said, "You know the thing that put my country so strongly on the path toward freedom was that we copied your Constitution. It was our inspiration." I heard Nehru say that what kept India from going to pieces, what prevented her from passing through the radicalism that sweeps through any new area during periods of political experimentation was the examples afforded by the American and British systems. Ideas. The Indian Constitution begins how? "We, the people of the United India, in order to form a more perfect union * * *." Word for word. There's the American inspiration; the American idea.

My friends, 1778 is the most electrically inspiring date in human history and everyone knows it except Americans. We have forgotten its significance. The rest of the world knows about it, but we are failing to use the dynamic influence it still exerts. It is one of our surplus commodities. It is stored in the attic collecting cobwebs with the other relics of our Nation's history.

Ideas, and ideas that we invented, not Karl Marx—that we invented, not Mr. Lenin or Mr. Stalin or Mr. Khrushchev. This is what is inspiring the people of Latin America and Africa and Asia. We did it. Yet, with the rest of the world trying to follow us, what do we do? We look down our noses as if there were some foul smell at the other end that offended us. We want nothing to do with it because it might be radical. These people, my friends, would be on the paths of change, they would be in the throes of revolution, if there had never been a Communist on God's earth because all they are craving is human dignity; the integrity of the individual; national independence and national pride. And what else is there in the Declaration of Independence? We don't have to go out and plant revolutionary fires, but we can certainly recognize them for what they are and understand them instead of trying to hold up our hands as though we could stop this floodtide that's sweeping the world. If it be our decision to stop it, to dam it up, to hold it back, what happened to us in China is going to happen to us all around the globe. It will simply pour over us. We will be inundated and we will literally drown in our own ideas because we were too stupid to use them.

But with that surplus of ideas, we have also a surplus of truth. What I am trying to say to you is this, that the search for truth must be eternal. It is the guidelight of any historian and it must be the constant goal of every citizen. It sometimes will lead you into unpleasant paths; it sometimes requires unpopular conclusions. But, ladies and gentlemen, our Republic has been founded on the willingness to risk the truth. It is the Communist who doesn't dare to face the truth. That's why they have censorship; that's why they have the Iron Curtain; that's why they use brutality to impose falsehood. But we are afraid of truth. Oh? We are afraid of it. Go to the Rotary Club some

noon, or to the Lions Club, the chamber of commerce, the women's club—you pick it—and you will discover that they go along talking to each other week after week, saying the things that they like to hear from each other because if they say something different it rocks the boat. It is easier to conform and we are demanding conformity because it is easier to control. I don't mind saying that, as a Senator, I wish all the constituents of Wyoming would conform to one man's ideas—McGee's. It would be a lot easier. There isn't an administrator here or one who was ever an administrator who would not encourage conformity among those beneath him because it would mean an end to his problems. We are afraid of truth.

The truth is unpleasant and uncomfortable and inconvenient. And we have reached the point in this country where we are encouraging half-truth or untruth in government in order to be comfortable, to have time to play golf, or better still, to fish. We have so surrendered our eternal quest for truth that those who merely raise the ugly questions in pursuit of truths are belabored and smeared and twisted and tortured by the public mind and by public pressure because they aren't willing to say what people like to hear or they aren't willing to surrender by leaving well enough alone.

Now this is not what made Americans strong in the past and yet it is this pressure to which we are forfeiting our heritage now.

We have just passed through an extremely painful ordeal in the Senate involving one of the strangest and most difficult personalities, I suppose, in this century—Mr. Strauss—a difficult and strange personality because when he was good there was never a man in all history who was so good. But when he was bad there were some extremely serious complications. He is a man who has perfected a technique that he didn't invent. Democrats and Republicans, long before him, hammered out the perfections of the gobbledygook of words, words without meaning, words of evasion, honeyed words, big words, little three-letter words. These words were aimed at covering up, at hiding, at concealing unpleasantries or mistakes in human judgment; and the mushrooming of the bureaucracy in Washington has aided and abetted this whole practice. Mr. Strauss was not the inventor of this at all. He may have been its victim. Some of us felt very deeply that in the search for truths the time for a reckoning had long since passed. When this man, in a very tortuous process, was stripped of almost a million words; when he stood naked before his committee, he was revealed as a liar.

My friends, these are people living in fear. You live in fear of dictatorship. That's what was wrong with Hitler and Naziism; that's what's wrong with the Communists in Moscow. Yet, under the guise of leaving well enough alone and not disturbing placid waters, we were surrendering to the very dictatorship we feared.

I was personally tortured that my President was very much embittered about the ugliness of this decision because the President's wishes rank very high in my scale of values. But there's one thing that ranks higher than his wishes in my book, and that one thing is the right of the people in a democracy to know, the right to go behind the veil of the so-called executive privilege and secrecy, to strip away from the mistakes that humans are entitled to always make in a democracy the veil of nondisclosure or the camouflage of words. And I say this in the context of my opening remarks for this reason. The one appeal that we have to the rest of the world lies in our willingness to pursue truth, wherever it might lead; and in a record which has stood the test of truth and which can in the future stand repeated reexamination in the light of truth.

I don't know whether or not you have read the little volume "The Ugly American"; but if you do, you will find we are in trouble because people, for whatever reasons, chose to distort the truth, to perpetuate a false front, to assume a mistaken level of power and prestige.

We are all right if we'll trust in the truth, if we will abide by its revelations, if we will conduct ourselves within the limits of its disclosures. This is not alone a problem for Americans overseas or a problem of trying to get foreigners to understand us. It comes right down to the hearts of our understanding of ourselves; what we believe and why we believe it.

If we would only utilize these two surpluses, we would readily discover that they are not surpluses at all, but that they are in short supply. We would discover we haven't enough of either. But if we use what we have, we can hold out to the rest of the world the kind of appeal, the kind of human inspiration that alone should guide the history of man. It is our strength, more so than our scientists, our military might, or our satellites in outer space.

Asia and Africa and other areas are on the move, and they are in the throes of deep change. Let's face it. Let's not only learn to live with it; let's seek to guide it constructively.

I have often thought in this context of the old legend of Rip Van Winkle. You know old Rip got a bit in his cups and fell asleep in 1769; he slept for 20 years. What happened in that 20 years? When old Rip fell asleep, George III was his King. When he wakened 20 years later, George Washington was his President. Old Rip Van Winkle had slept through a revolution. God help us, my friends, if we sleep through this one.

Dedication of the National FFA Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last Friday a very impressive ceremony was held near Mount Vernon on a tract of land that was formerly owned by George Washington, at which time the National Future Farmers of America Building was dedicated.

The Future Farmers of America is an organization composed of 381,621 members in every State in the Union, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico and is a part of the vocational education program under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The national officers of this organization are Adin Hester, Oregon, president; Bryan Hafen, Nevada; Thomas E. Stine, Missouri, Lee Todd, Tennessee, Richard Van Auken, New Jersey, vice presidents; and Norman A. Brown, Michigan, student secretary.

The chairman of the board is Dr. W. T. Spanton, Director of the Agricultural Education Branch of the Office of Education. Dr. Spanton's many years of dedicated service to this organization has built it to one of the leading youth organizations of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the program and the dedicatory speech I delivered be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the program and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM AT DEDICATION OF THE FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA BUILDING

Music: U.S. Air Force Headquarters Band, Harold Hoyt, captain, USAF, Director.

Flag-raising ceremony: Norman Brown, national student secretary.

National anthem: U.S. Air Force Headquarters Band.

Invocation: Richard Van Auken, national vice president.

Opening remarks: Adin Hester, national president.

Introduction of guests.

Greetings from new farmers of America: Martin Luther Goodson, national president.

Historical background: W. T. Spanton, Director, Agricultural Education Branch, Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

Greetings: Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Gathering and spreading of State soil: Tom Stine, national FFA vice president.

Acceptance of State stones: Bryan Hafen, national FFA vice president.

Dedication address: The Honorable FRANK CARLSON, U.S. Senator from Kansas.

Acceptance of FFA Building: Lee Todd, national FFA vice president.

FFA march: U.S. Air Force Headquarters Band.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR FRANK CARLSON AT DEDICATION OF FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA HEADQUARTERS, WASHINGTON, D.C., FRIDAY, JULY 24, 1959.

I regard it a distinct honor to be invited to participate in a program dedicating—or setting apart for service—this new headquarters building for the Future Farmers of America supply service and national magazine.

This building will stand as a serviceable monument to the Future Farmers of today who will be the successful farmers of tomorrow.

It is most fitting that this modern structure be located near Mount Vernon, the home of George Washington, and on land formerly owned by him. He was considered first as a great general—our first President—an engineer—but George Washington's first love was the farm he called Mount Vernon. He was one of the first in the Nation to practice contour planting, crop rotation, and other soil conservation methods. It has been stated he might be truly considered as America's first "scientific farmer."

It is also my understanding that he is one of the patron saints of the Future Farmers of America and that his name has a prominent place in the opening ceremonies of the FFA.

Vocational agriculture and the Future Farmers of America constitute a most successful program for training boys to be good farmers and helping them become established in the farming occupation of their choice.

In view of the Nation's need for new farmers it is most fitting that we set apart a new modern building for their headquarters.

It was our third President, Thomas Jefferson, who said, "Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God."

It was Gifford Pinchot, the great conservationist, who said, "As the farmer prospers, so prospers the Nation."

Leaders in the field of agriculture, both men and women, are receiving further well-deserved recognition in the establishment of the Agricultural Hall of Fame.

I am delighted that this agricultural shrine is to be located in my home State

of Kansas—just a few miles from Kansas City where thousands of FFA members will have the opportunity to see it each year at the time of their national convention.

Agriculture today is undergoing a drastic change. Capital investment on farms and the cost of production items are at record levels.

Agriculture as a whole is confronted with some very different problems that must be resolved and I know of no one better qualified to tackle these problems than our young farmers who will soon be dominant in agriculture. Your background, your training, give you the qualifications that are going to be needed as we go through this difficult period.

I am not here to paint a dark picture of our situation. As a matter of fact, I am an optimist and I have great faith in the future. I have great hopes for the members of your organization.

I am here to talk about opportunity—about change—about ideals and about making peace in a world that sorely needs it. I want to say to you that I cannot think of a more exciting time to be alive.

Certainly the challenge is more difficult today than it has ever been before in history. But never before in history do we stand to win so much, and when I use the word "we," I am not thinking of Americans alone—I am thinking of the human race.

No previous generation in human history has had finer or more abundant means at its disposal for making this planet serve the ends of man.

For the first time in human history, we have as much potential power as we need to irrigate dry lands—operate the machines that man needs to carry on his work and give man shelter. There seems to be no limit to the new and fascinating discoveries being made in the field of agriculture.

For the first time in human history, we can tap the basic energy of the sun. We can derive new minerals from the oceans. Nuclear energy, properly used, can even help to control weather.

We are on the verge of discovering the answers to the incurable diseases that have blighted the life of man on earth.

I believe we have it within our means to extend the average life of a human being to more than a century—not in some distant age, but within your lifetime.

But one thing is clear, we are not going to get this better world by just wishing it into being. We are going to have to work for it the hard way.

Now, I don't have to be reminded of all the obstacles. I don't have to be reminded that we have to make this planet a lot safer for human life than it is now before we can talk about making it more attractive.

Indeed, it is precisely becuse I am aware of the problems that I say to you that the only thing that is greater than the difficulty is the opportunity.

It is true that the human race has been able to invent war, but has yet to invent peace. This has been true in the past, but it need not be true today or tomorrow. It is within the means and the power of our own generation—and I am thinking mainly of the young people of this country—to do what has never been done before—to find a way to outlaw war and establish peace on the basis of justice in the world.

Is this impossible? The fact that it has not been done before doesn't mean that it is beyond our reach.

They have said for centuries that man is a warring animal and that he will keep at it until he devises the means to exterminate himself.

But I believe in our time we will succeed in doing the seemingly impossible. I believe it is within our power to make the greatest contribution to human progress and safety in history by creating the design of a workable world peace.

This, I believe, is the big opportunity for youth in an atomic age to help create such a design and to put an end to the era of human slaughter on earth.

We want a peace that guarantees the independence and integrity of all nations large and small, a peace in which progress and freedom are possible, a peace which doesn't mean human decay or dry rot, but the growth and betterment of individual human beings throughout the world.

This is the kind of peace we want. This is the kind of peace, God willing, we are going to get.

This kind of peace is not going to be handed on a silver platter to the American people, or to anyone else.

You and I, particularly the young people of this Nation, must dedicate ourselves to working and praying for a program of peace. No greater challenge—no greater opportunity—was ever presented to our youth.

As we build a better world, a better Nation, we must also build a better man, based on the lines of the great poet, Edwin Markham, who wrote:

"We are all blind, until we see
That in the human plan
Nothing is worth the making if
It does not make the man.
Why build the cities glorious
If man unbuilded goes?
In vain we build the work, unless
The builder also grows."

I dedicate this building in behalf of the Future Farmers of America and their successors, and pray that they, too, will grow and build a better farm economy, which is so important to the future of our Nation.

Club Cleanup Idea Catches On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, more and more people in this country are availing themselves of their increasing leisure time to go out into the forests and onto the lakes and streams of this conntry. I am sure all over America people are being confronted with what we are encountering in Arizona—the litter bug—the person who does not care where he throws his beer cans or how he leaves the campsite.

In Arizona recently the Phoenix Sportsmen's Association put into effect a very novel idea which is described in two publications, Outdoor Boating and Wildlife News of the Arizona Game and Fish Department.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLUB CLEANUP IDEA CATCHES ON

(By Charley Niehuis and Hal Moore)

As more and more people are going to outdoor living, especially boating, for their recreation, a major problem has arisen—what to do about the litterbug.

Recently an organization of hunters and fishermen, the Phoenix Sportsman's Association of Phoenix, Ariz., decided to do something about it. A group of these outdoor-loving people conceived the idea of having a cleanup day on a certain area. They made their attack on Tonto Creek, one of the most beautiful and uniquely placed trout streams in the Southwest. Tonto Creek had been a wonderful trout stream, but in more recent years it has become a sewage ditch.

The project was so successful and received so much acclaim the club looked around for another place to clean up.

They selected Canyon Lake, one of the more picturesque bodies of water in the State.

Since their first cleanup had attracted so much attention they had offers from several clubs to assist. The idea has snowballed. The cleanup campaign has now been adopted as a statewide project by the Arizona Game Protective Association. Local boating and outdoorsman's clubs affiliated with the statewide organization have selected areas of their own to clean up. The idea—since the Canyon Lake cleanup project was completed—has caught on to such an extent that a skiing club (the snow kind) recently announced they were tackling the San Francisco Peaks in Arizona where a snow bowl is available during winter months and which has been cluttered with debris left by skiers.

Here's how the Phoenix Sportsman's Association does it:

1. Appoint a committee.
2. Select a project—an area that needs cleaning up.
3. Survey the project—to determine what is needed in the way of materials.
4. Organize a campaign and set a date.
5. Do the job.

It's a very worthwhile and rewarding project for any club.

AGPA PAGE

(By Tom Calhoun)

The man with the shovel in his hand stopped and mopped the sweat off his brow. His feet were planted wide apart in the tumbling stream water, little whitecaps trailing away where his blue denim pants legs disappeared in Christoper Creek.

In the bank, where the man has been digging, a big alder log was now being lowered. The notch in the bank was opposite another one in the other bank, so the log was anchored at both ends when it was dropped in place, churning up the clear creek water and a chocolate spray rose like dark lace and spattered coldly on the face of the man with the shovel. He scooped up a palmful of sparkling, liquid diamonds and dashed it on his face and laughed while the chill ran down inside his shirt. The palms of his hands were red as though unaccustomed to a shovel, and he looked at them and laughed again.

The water gurgled under the great log where stubborn boulders held it up from the streambed, and along its dark length other men wrestled with the boulders, the mad race of the stream lifting its cold surface higher and higher around their legs, and men gasping from exertion and from the sharp bite of the cold water.

A man fell, and rose while the others laughed, and then the great log was seated firmly across the stream, and without a word they turned to wrestle huge rocks against the log while the man with the shovel heaved shovel after shovel of mud and gravel between the new placed granite.

Up the slope a man spoke to another observer of the swarming activity in Christopher Creek, "Chain gang?"

"Naw. GPA."

"Gee, Pee Aye?"

"Uh-huh—sportsmen's club."

The curious man snorted. "Gee Pee Aye—you mean they're doin' that for nothin'?"

"Not exactly."

"No man with brains would work like that." The curious man had turned positive.

The observer looked at the men laboring in the cold stream and his voice was gentle. "See that man with the shovel? He's got a law office down in Phoenix where some important people come to talk with him. They think he's got quite a lot of brains, and that fellow out there with the yellow shirt, he's a building contractor. I heard he handled bids on a couple of million dollars worth of construction last year. Now, that fellow that fell down a minute ago—he's in the electrical contracting business." The observer laughed quietly. "Why, my friend—" and his tone was very gentle "at least half of those men are professional men, men with college degrees, in that stream down there. They are capable of pretty sound thinking."

The curious man said, "Then why—?"

The observer interrupted. "They're building trout pools, backing up the water, increasing the habitat capacity which increases the total possible limit catches; they're increasing the recreational potential of every mile of stream and forest in the State of Arizona; they're amplifying the challenge of hook and line to compete with the lure of bars and parked cars. Some folks say they've got AGP'itis, but whatever it is—it's not being done for nothing. It's being done because it's their way of helping to build a great State and a great Nation. It's being done for a purpose—about the best purpose there is, I believe."

The curious man moved down the slope and entered the stream and his eyes brightened a little as the cold water flooded his two-tone shoes. The water surged around his white cuffs as he manhandled a big boulder into position against the log dam. For a minister not accustomed to labor he managed very well. The lawyer with the shovel smiled between shovelfuls of earth. Another fellow with AGP'itis.

Our Bank Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Congressman HENRY REUSS, of Milwaukee, to the Sunday New York Times of yesterday be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, Congressman HENRY REUSS is a brilliant Congressman with a particular competence in monetary policy. He is generally reputed to be the author of the current sense of Congress proposal before the House Ways and Means Committee that would tie a directive on Federal Reserve policy into any change in the 4¼ percent interest ceiling on Government bonds.

The general charge against the Reuss proposal is that it is inflationary. As Congressman REUSS drives home convincingly in his letter, the "sense" amendment is not inflationary because it would not require or direct or even suggest that the Federal Reserve create one nickle of additional reserves or money supply.

It simply provides that should the Federal Reserve in its good judgment decide to expand the supply of money—as it has said it intends to do at a rate of about 3 percent a year, it should do so—when feasible—by buying Government obligations—and thus supporting the Government bond market instead of increasing reserves.

This letter of yesterday, incidentally, constitutes an excellent answer to the attacks on the Reuss resolution by the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board and the Secretary of the Treasury—reported in this morning's papers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR BANK RESERVES—AMENDMENT DEFENDED AS ATTEMPT TO GUIDE FEDERAL RESERVE

(The writer of the following letter is a Representative to Congress from Wisconsin.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In your editorial of July 15, "The Treasury's Problem," you ask the question: "Are there devices by which the Federal Reserve System, without pumping up the Nation's bank reserves and money supply to inflationary proportions, could help solve the Treasury's problem?"

You then look at the "sense of Congress" amendment to the interest-ceiling bill approved by the House Ways and Means Committee and conclude that it will not help solve the Treasury's problem without being inflationary.

The "sense of Congress" amendment which I proposed to the Ways and Means Committee, and which was adopted, states:

"It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Reserve System, while pursuing its primary mission of administering a sound monetary policy, should to the maximum extent consistent therewith utilize such means as will assist in the economical and efficient management of the public debt; and that the system, where practicable, should bring about future needed monetary expansion by purchasing U.S. securities of varying maturities."

MONEY SUPPLY

This amendment, it will be noted, does not require the Federal Reserve to create one nickel's worth more of banking reserves—and thus the money supply—than the Federal Reserve thinks wise. Reasonable men may differ on what the supply of money ought to be, but the amendment does not attempt to sway the Federal Reserve in any way on this. The Federal Reserve has recently testified that it envisages an average annual increase of 3 percent in the money supply. For the 2-year duration of the Ways and Means Committee bill, therefore, the amount of new reserves to be created would be on the order of $2 billion.

The question is: Should the Federal Reserve create these reserves by further lowering bank-reserve requirements, as it has been doing during the last 6 years and as it threatens to continue to do, rather than by purchasing U.S. securities, as the sense amendment envisages.

Using the securities-purchasing method rather than the reserve requirements-lowering method would assist in the economical and efficient management of the public debt in these three ways:

Assuming purchase by the Federal Reserve of $2 billion of U.S. securities in the next 2 years, it would result in a saving to the taxpayers of the interest charge on that amount, since the Federal Reserve earnings substantially revert to the Treasury.

PRICE FLUCTUATIONS

The purchase by the Federal Reserve of these securities would at least moderate somewhat downward fluctuations in the prices of U.S. securities, and thus make them more attractive to investors.

The lodging in the Federal Reserve of a higher proportion of the debt would make Treasury financing more orderly by reducing the amount of attrition—where securityholders refuse to accept exchanges and demand cash repayment.

The sense amendment does not purport to be a universal panacea. But I believe it to be a sincere attempt by the Congress to give some needed guidance to the Federal Reserve, the agency to which the Congress has delegated some of its monetary powers.

It is not inflationary, and it does help solve the Treasury's problem.

HENRY S. REUSS.

WASHINGTON, *July 23, 1959.*

Using Farm Products in International Farm Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on June 30, our distinguished colleague and agricultural specialist, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], delivered before the International Economic Policy Association, at the Mayflower Hotel, an address entitled "Using Farm Products in International Farm Programs." I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USING FARM PRODUCTS IN INTERNATIONAL FARM PROGRAMS

(Speech by Senator FRANK CARLSON,[1] before the International Economic Policy Association, Mayflower Hotel, June 30, 1959)

The American farmer is the world's largest exporter of food and fiber and for this reason plays an important part in our international economic programs.

The export of these farm commodities means only dollars for farmers, but it has been—and will continue to be—an important part of a program of bringing closer relationships with countries that do not have an abundant food supply. Food for Peace

[1] Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and has a distinguished record of public service, including six terms in the House of Representatives, two terms as Governor of Kansas, and three sessions of the Kansas State Legislature. Noted as an expert in the fields of farm and tax legislation, Senator CARLSON also serves on the Senate Finance Committee and the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Outside the Senate, he also acts as international president of the International Council for Christian Leadership. First elected to the Senate in 1950, he was reelected in 1956.

must be more than just a slogan—it can and must be a reality.

Our Nation must continue to expand its export market of farm products. We exported the crops from 50 million acres of cropland last year.

I do not like to delve into statistics, but it is interesting to note that slightly less than 20 percent of the total volume of all farm products similar to those produced in the United States entered into world trade.

We exported about one-half of our cotton produced—two-fifths of our wheat and rice—one-third of our soybeans and tobacco—one-third of the tallow produced in this country and one-sixth of our lard output.

At the present time we have a number of surplus disposal programs. Under Public Law 480, the Agriculture Trade Development Act, we have had programs under which we could sell our surpluses for foreign currency—donate them to foreign countries for emergency relief—distribute them to private agencies—to hungry people at home and abroad and barter them for strategic materials.

Thirty-eight countries have participated in the Public Law 480 programs. Under title I, which allows surplus sales for local currencies, India has received $544 million, Yugoslavia $341 million, Spain $276 million, Pakistan $240 million, and Brazil $155 million from U.S. surplus stocks.

Through our mutual security program we are distributing our agricultural commodities at the rate of $175 million per year. This $175 million was continued for another year in the authorization bill which is before Congress.

Many are asking why it has not been possible to make greater use of the ever-increasing surpluses, particularly wheat. I think it should be mentioned that there are three principal reasons:

1. The most important is the problem of competition. This makes a real problem in dealing, particularly, with our Canadian neighbors to the north who also have great surpluses of wheat.

Only last month the Canadian Chamber of Commerce complained that the United States was using subsidized flour as an economic weapon to displace Canada from second place as a supplier to the new West Indies Federation.

2. Another problem we have in moving this food to foreign countries is the inability of many of the underdeveloped countries to handle incoming shipments.

For instance, we send a shipload of American wheat to India every day, but India's ports are so congested that it is impossible to secure immediate handling of our shipments.

Many suggestions have been made that improved unloading and handling facilities at the docks be arranged, but these suggestions have met opposition from the Indian Government because of the great surplus of labor, and therefore, the unloading is done mostly by hand.

In addition to this problem, we have the problem of inadequate storage and distribution facilities in most of the underdeveloped countries.

3. Congress must appropriate money to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for stocks that are removed and distributed for food in needy countries.

Many of us on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had hoped that we might increase substantially the amount of money available for food through the mutual aid program, but evidence was presented to our committee which indicated that the present authorization of $175 million was about all that could be used, based on the facilities that the underdeveloped countries had for receiving and distributing this food.

From a humanitarian standpoint, I know of nothing we can do as as a nation that will win friends faster and more permanently than getting food and fiber into the hands of the needy.

We had evidence and testimony showing that these gifts through our mutual aid program prevented millions of people from starving to death.

The distribution of this food to underdeveloped countries where there are millions of needy and undernourished people is more than a commodity disposal operation—it has important psychological value. In my opinion, it is one of the most effective forms of foreign aid.

The possibilities of this program have been amply demonstrated in India. Since 1956 the United States has shipped the following farm products to India out of our surplus production: 230 million bushels of wheat, 8 million bushels of corn and sorghum, 4.3 million bags of rice, 235,000 bales of cotton, 5 million pounds of tobacco, and 25 million pounds of dried milk.

These millions of tons of American agricultural products are vital to India for more than purely humanitarian reasons.

This successful experience in India with the constructive uses to which our farm surplus has been put illustrated why the Congress must reenact legislation dealing with this problem. It is a program that we can use to great advantage in other underdeveloped countries.

I, personally, had an opportunity to see the result of these programs in Pakistan, India, Thailand, and Formosa.

While it is essential that we maintain programs of military assistance, defense support, and economic aid, it is, in my opinion, equally important that we continue to build good will and friendship, based on our Nation's Christian teachings and background that we are "our brother's keeper."

Our military strength—our great national production through the private enterprise system—and the humanitarian aspects of our people, by giving aid to those who are less fortunate, have placed us in an enviable position among the nations.

U.S. Economy in Serious Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unimous consent that a very timely column written by David Lawrence entitled "U.S. Economy in Serious Crisis," which was published in the Arizona Republic of July 22, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ECONOMY IN SERIOUS CRISIS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The Nation is in the midst of a serious crisis in the financial and economic sense. Here are some significant facts:

1. Five years ago, the Government could borrow money for 1-year notes at an interest rate of 1⅛ percent. Last week it cost the Government 4¾ percent to borrow 1-year money—the highest rate in 30 years for short-term money. Predictions among bankers are that it will go to an unprecedented 5 percent rate before the end of the year.

2. Interest rates for commercial borrowing are rising. Also tax-exempt bonds of States and cities that just a few years ago used to bear interest at 1¾ percent now pay more than twice as much to attract investors. The State of California borrowed 4 years ago at 2 percent, and last month had to pay 3.94 percent.

3. Because U.S. savings bonds pay too low a rate of interest, many people are cashing them in and investing in something else. In June alone, the public cashed in $470 million and bought only $323 million of the E and H bonds.

4. President Eisenhower is pleading with Congress to raise the ceiling established by law so that Government bonds can compete with other interest rates, but the Democratic Party politicians are blocking action. They are urging the Federal Reserve banks to buy into the market and keep the price up artificially. This is called printing-press money by the Federal Reserve Board Chairman. One wonders whether a catastrophe in the financing of Government securities has to happen before the inflationists will be convinced of the wisdom of the President's request.

5. Mortgage money for house building now requires a high interest rate, and the end isn't in sight. This can squelch the building boom and result in unemployment. Interest rates for mortgages now are above 6 percent in many parts of the country.

What's it all about? The truth is that inflation is in full swing. The Government has been spending more than it has been taking in. The spenders are still fighting against the savers in Washington. Confidence is lacking. The public is being repeatedly told, however, that the Democratic Party is going to win in 1960 presidential and congressional elections, and that's less than 18 months away. So if there's going to be more and more spending and more and more inflation in the next few years, the investor feels he must turn now to the places where he can get a higher return on his money. Also the Government later would have to pay higher prices for the same quantity of things it bought this year. This means more deficits and a further weakening of confidence in the dollar.

As for the economic situation generally, while there has been a business boom for the last few months, now the steel strike has produced a new climax. It could mean a turning point for the Nation in both wages and prices. If the steel unions win, inflation will be encouraged because steel prices will rise. If the steel companies, however, can effect a stabilized settlement that saves money on "working rules," then prices can be held down despice a slight increase in wages next year. Every business and every union in America is watching steel for a clue to the future of the economy. It will do the worker little good to get a wage increase now and pay out more later for living costs. This really reduces his pay.

To illustrate the meaning of inflation, it is necessary to look back only a few years. Thus, in 1946 a new house prices at $10,000 required about $4,000 down and a 20-year mortgage at 4.6 percent. The total cost amounted to $13,202. But today a similar house costs $17,600, and the usual down payment is $3,250 and the interest rate is 6 percent, so the total cost is $27,748.

Until the Nation as a whole becomes aware of the unsound doctrines of the inflationists who steer the Democratic advisory committees and influence a substantial number of Democrats in Congress, there will be little accomplished toward developing a

sound economy. Likewise, the union leaders keep pointing to the profits of corporations, forgetting that surpluses have to be accumulated to buy new plant and equipment at higher and higher prices each year. Profits went down during recession. This deficiency now has to be made up in succeeding years.

The steel strike will itself cost the Nation billions of dollars. One wonders why the leaders of organized labor do not see that this is one time when a wage-and-price freeze would rescue the economy and start a real wave of prosperity.

The facts are just as clear today as they will be after a lengthy strike. The answer is simple: A pledge by the companies that they will not increase prices, and an acceptance by the labor unions of a revised set of working rules that will help the employers to improve efficiency, and increase productivity so that the next wage increase can be absorbed by the companies without a price increase. It would be a salutary lesson to the whole business and financial world and gain a big victory for the champions of stabilization as against the destructive forces of inflation.

Good Union Leader Serves Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Dallas, Tex., AFL–CIO Council made a wise selection when Allan Maley, Jr., was named its secretary-treasurer.

He works hard at his post and also is active in many other fields of citizenship.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article telling of Mr. Maley's good work. It was written by Don Freeman and published in the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News for June 14, 1959, under the heading: "Good Union Leader Serves Community."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, June 14, 1959]

GOOD UNION LEADER SERVES COMMUNITY

(By Don Freeman)

What goes into the making of a union leader?

The circumstances vary as much for that calling as for others.

Allan L. Maley, Jr., started life as a farmboy, a football player good enough to be nominated for All South Texas Schoolboy, salutatorian of his high school graduating class, a paratrooper.

Before he was 20, he knew nothing about unions. But he more than made up for lost time.

By the age of 24, he was secretary of a big oilworkers' local in Corpus Christi.

And now, at 31, he is the secretary-treasurer of the Dallas AFL–CIO Council—a key position in the labor movement here.

Despite the change that the years have brought to his station in life, Maley still is chubby-cheeked, regular-featured and athletic looking enough to suggest an All South Texas boy.

In short, Maley is not the stereotype picture—or cartoon caricature—of a union official.

But, he avers, "There is no stereotype. That's an image built up in the minds of people. It's like the image of a fat politician with a big, bulging cigar in a back room."

COUNCIL A FACE CARD

The AFL–CIO Council—of which Maley is the only full-time elected official—is a central body for some 90 local unions and 30,000 union members, in much the way the chamber or commerce is a central body for businesses.

As such, the council is the chief face of the labor movement here in public and civic affairs.

During Maley's administration—he first was elected secretary-treasurer last June—the council has gained face, partly through increased unity.

The organization is taking a deeper interest in public relations, community activities, politics and helping affiliated unions on organizational drives.

"It's tragic, the lack of participation our working people have in politics," says Maley.

Barely an adult when he was a precinct chairman in Corpus Christi, he adds:

"I don't think there's anything livelier than attending a precinct convention. It may not always be pleasing, but it's always interesting."

SHORT FOOTBALL CAREER

Maley was born at Ingleside, near Corpus Christi. There he worked on his dad's small truck farm and for other farmers.

His athletic and scholastic prowess at Ingleside High School landed him a football scholarship at Rice Institute in Houston.

Though his 5-foot-10 frame packed only 150 pounds, he was the starting left end on the team in his freshman year at Rice. But early in the season his collarbone—and his gridiron hopes—were broken in practice.

Maley soon got healthy enough, though, to become a paratrooper in the 11th Airborne Division at the tail end of World War II. He served with the army of occupation in Japan, made 10 noncombat jumps and was discharged with the rank of corporal in 1948.

After bumming around a few months in Corpus Christi, he got a job as a pipefitter's helper there with the Sinclair Refining Co.

RISES FAST IN UNION

Two things soon changed his ignorance of unions into keen interest. First, the union now known as the Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers got the Sinclair men a 30-cent-an-hour package increase. Second, the union straightened out a grievance for him, even though he was not a member.

So Maley joined and became the kind of member who attends meetings. He served in a procession of posts before being elected the local's secretary-treasurer.

His years as an oil worker remind him of one of the many stereotypes he likes to shatter.

"Everyone talks of unions in terms of strikes, strikes, strikes. I've been out on strike only once in my life—in 1952, when we were out 12 working days in a national oil dispute."

In 1954, Maley got a full-time job as a labor representative with the Texas Employment Commission, through the recommendation of a top officer of the old State CIO Council.

BACK TO UNIONS

The job generally meant being a "troubleshooter" for the TEC on specific cases involving unemployment benefits and other concerns of the workingman.

Convinced that top echelon changes in TEC were making it partial to employers, Maley was glad after 4 years to get the AFL–CIO Council post. Last Februrary he was reelected without opposition.

His office in the Labor Temple at Young near St. Paul is simple, neat, and airconditioned. Its walls are hung with symbols of various causes—pin-stuck precinct maps, for instance, and a picture of the council's big check presentation for the Gonzales Warm Springs Foundation.

On Maley's desk are photos of his three smiling youngsters, who pretty well take up the time of his wife, the former Mary DiStefano, of Lufkin. The family lives at 6737 Patrick Drive in the Hillside area.

And work—late into starlight—takes up husband Maley's time. After a full day's activity, he's more than likely to have a council committee meeting on his hands, or a talk to make to some union.

Also, he serves as a director of the Community Chest and is a charter member of the Texas Society on Aging, which is devoted to geriatrics.

Though work has preempted active participation in fishing and other sports, he occasionally watches a football game or a boxing match.

Political Melting Pots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in recent weeks we have witnessed a serious and important debate concerning the appropriate roles which various officials in our Nation's political parties should fulfill in formulating policies for which these parties are to stand. On July 12 the Detroit News printed a thoughtful and interesting editorial entitled "Political Melting Pots" which placed a fresh and useful view on this debate. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit News, July 12, 1959]

POLITICAL MELTING POTS

Democratic liberals and moderates knocking ac othr over the head in a preelection warmup are playing an old political game—as old as the two-party system and necessary to it. Essentially it is the process by which an opposition, always divided, patches up a temporary harmony for the November event on which the party's bread and butter rides.

Much the same thing is now going on among the Social Democrats of West Germany. The surface issue there is not government spending but government policy toward the Soviet Union. But what really worries the Social Democrats, the main opposition German party, is that they are losing ground in the popularity polls.

This fact—this threat to the party members' political livelihood—has set loose the always-present differences of opinion and clash of personalities to be found in any such large grouping. The resulting interparty fight seems to be a struggle of ideas.

In part it is. There are real differences of opinion between left and right, as there are in this country between Northern and Southern Democrats or between "modern" and old-guard Republicans. But the objective of the opponents everywhere is not essentially to make a certain point of view prevail but to find a common and promising ground on which to fight the next election.

Right-thinking people (particularly those belonging to opposing parties) regularly deplore these family squabbles. Yet on them probably depend our liberties. For, contrary to appearances, parties exist to organize agreement, not disagreement.

Our major political battles are waged within, not between parties. Once the Democrats have worked out a formula capable of enclosing Senator BYRD of Virginia, and Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, in the same fold they have of necessity a formula capable of enclosing everybody. And that's the point—the ultimate aim of practical politics.

It is equally apparent that this all-embracing Democratic formula cannot be very different from the one that includes Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and Senator JAVITS, of New York, in the Republican camp. Both parties by stretching to include almost the whole range of American political opinion obviously must come to occupy pretty much the same ground.

This is a good thing, and would be even better if the parties faced frankly the implications. Parties are not the crusaders for ideas; they are the organized support of their candidates. Their attractiveness is in the people they put forward. And that, too, is their usefulness.

Don Antonio and His Friends: New Strength for a Middle Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Don Antonio and His Friends: New Strength for a Middle Class," which appeared in Middle America, a quarterly publiaction of the United Fruit Co.:

DON ANTONIO AND HIS FRIENDS: NEW STRENGTH FOR A MIDDLE CLASS

In May of 1958 four Hondurans, longtime employees of the United Fruit Co., met in La Lima to draw lots for a new future. At stake was the division of some 1,200 acres in the Santiago area along the Ulúa River, which flows into that elbow of the Caribbean that seperates Honduras and Guatemala.

Since the floods of 1935 the land had been out of production, accumulating the rich silt deposited by the Ulúa at intervals since then. Now the land was being used to help set up independent farms for four men with 14 to 33 years of experience with the company.

A few things were already certain, no matter how the drawing came out. All four were banana men and would grow bananas on the acreage that chance would allot to them. Each of the four would have a perpetual lease to his land and access to all the technical facilities required by modern banana agriculture: irrigation, electricity and roads, disease control. He would have two tractors and six wagons, a modern home for his family and another for his foreman. Each man would have a guaranteed market for the fruit he raised. He would be his own boss.

But there were questions, too, in each man's mind as Arthur C. Hamilton, UF's assistant manager in the area, passed the hat with the little white slips of paper. From which hill will I look out on the Ulúa? Who will be my next-door neighbor?

Gradually more objective questions came to mind, appropriate to a man of new responsibilities: Will the foreman I want come to work for me? Can we get seeding started by June so as to get a crop before next year's winds?

There were a lot of questions in Hamilton's mind too. Most of them could be boiled down to one question: Will the experiment work?

When the slips of paper were drawn, Antonio Caranza found himself with a farm slightly smaller than the others—just under 300 acres. For him and his wife and two younger children self-employment came like a long-awaited rain: they wanted it, and they knew how to use it.

Born in San Luis, in the Province of Comayagua, young Antonio had managed to finish the first year of commercial high school before going to work in the sugar cane fields that surrounded La Lima in those days. Native ability and a willingness to use it brought him positions of growing responsibility in the company's banana operations.

Today Don Antonio employs an average of 35 men from the nearby villages of San Manuel and Santiago. Although his workers get none of the benefits available to employees of United Fruit, some who had worked with him when he was an overseer for the company have come with him to his new farm. His wife has help in running their airy two-story house and as soon as there is time she will start a kitchen garden in the space available for it. Guy Cantrell, United Fruit's agricultural superintendent in nearly Progreso, stops by at least twice a week to see how things are going and to offer advice.

In seven average years—5 years with luck—they will be free of all the debts incurred in starting their new life. Thereafter a set fraction of the price paid to them by the company for their bananas will be deducted for maintenance of irrigation and disease control services—operations too big for any independent farmer to handle alone.

Fruit harvesting operations began last April. Guy Cantrell now is able to ask, "How many stems can you cut for Thursday? The *Tivives* is loading for New York." Don Antonio cocks his head thoughtfully, gazing into the lush greenery of his bananas as though counting the full stems from memory. He says, perhaps, "Three hundred." Cantrell makes a mental note and those bananas are sold.

They are good bananas and Don Antonio takes pride in them. He hopes that his 16-year-old son, now in school, will decide on an agricultural career and take over some day. (An older son, with the advantages of company schooling, has a job with the National Development Bank.)

Today United Fruit Co. gets approximately 32 percent of its entire banana output from associate growers with whom it is freely contracted, from Guatemala to Ecuador. According to the recent report of the National Planning Association, the average return to the farmer is as much as 50 percent higher than on other croplands where he bears all the costs.

The suspense of that day when the lots were drawn has been replaced by excitement of a different kind. Antonio Caranza and his neighbors at Santiago know that what they are doing is important for Honduras and for all of the Middle America, as well as for themselves. They have recently heard that six more similar farms will be set up on virgin land near the port of Cortés during the coming year.

These independents are proving that Middle America's new middle class can work in a new kind of partnership with foreign enterprise, to the increased benefit of all.

Why the Importance of Water Conservation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems confronting the great Southwest is the conservation of underground water. Proper and sound water conservation practices will benefit not only those in areas where they are practiced, but also those far away, whose water table might be adversely affected.

Recognizing the need for informed minds and opinions on this important subject, the Panhandle Underground Water Conservation District No. 3, with headquarters at White Deer, Tex., has again conducted an essay contest, and three high school seniors have been declared the winner, writing on the subject "Why the Importance of Water Conservation?" The first prize was won by Clifford Belcher of Panhandle, Tex. His prize is a $150 scholarship. Under unanimous consent, I include his essay in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHY THE IMPORTANCE OF WATER CONSERVATION?

(By Clifford Belcher, Jr., first place winner)

Water has been termed the key natural resource. It sustains life, makes possible agricultural, commercial, and industrial activity, is a source of energy, serves as a medium of transportation and provides opportunities for recreation. On the other hand, water has detrimental attributes: it erodes soil, destroys life and property through floods, impairs the utility of land when drainage is inadequate, and menaces health when it is polluted or when it serves as a breeding place for disease-carrying insects. The overall water problem is that of obtaining the desired benefits from water resources and of minimizing the hazards associated with water. This problem confronts individuals and groups; it is a matter of concern to many levels of government.

There are indications that water problems will demand increasingly greater attention of the Texas Legislature. Important factors are the mounting pressures upon available water supplies by increasing population and growing commercial, industrial, and agricultural activity. It has been estimated recently that water use in the United States will show the following increases by 1975: Municipal and rural use, 50 percent; irrigation, 25 percent; direct industrial use, 170 percent. Comparable figures are not available for Texas, but in view of the relatively greater rate of growth of population and economic activity in Texas than in many other sections of the Nation, it would be reasonable to expect that estimates of the percentage increase of water use in Texas would be still higher.

The growing demands that water problems of the State be solved will not be easily satisfied. A major difficulty inheres in the complexity and range of such problems. Water resources give rise, not to a single problem, but to numerous problems which are different and yet interrelated. Hardly any aspect of human welfare and activity is unaffected by water resources.

Water is like a living thing. Essentially all of it that is usable is in motion. This

vast circulatory system is known as the hydrologic cycle. In this cycle water evaporates, rises into the atmosphere, is condensed when an air mass rises to pass over another or over a mountain range, and falls as rain or snow.

The hydrologic cycle offers a multitude of approaches toward utilization of water resources. Successive stages of the cycle offer unique opportunities for obtaining benefits. Effective control of water while it is in the clouds may soon be achieved. It may be possible to reduce evaporation losses by impounding water in deep reservoirs with minimum surface exposure. In regions where the rate of evaporation is especially high, it may be advisable to seek underground storage reservoirs. Losses due to transpiration can be reduced by destroying useless vegetation consuming huge amounts of water. By means of land use practices designed to retard runoff of water into rivers, the usefulness of water on the land where it falls as precipitation can be prolonged, the harmful effects of erosion can be reduced, and the threat of floods can be minimized.

While methods of controlling water after it has reached rivers are well known, there are also less fully appreciated opportunities for extracting benefits from water underground. Water which has been diverted for use in irrigation and industrial processes can be utilized more efficiently. Even after water has returned to oceans, it may someday serve man's needs for fresh water when economical methods of converting salt water to fresh water are devised.

It is physically possible to increase substantially the capacity of Texas water resources to furnish desired benefits. The only physical limitation is the quantity of usable water in Texas. According to one estimate, not more than one-tenth of the water which could be made available in Texas is being used. With present knowledge about the water resources of Texas and with available professional skills, much more development could be accomplished. It is also reasonable to expect further events of advances along those lines. In particular, the discovery of additional ground water reservoirs and the perfection of techniques for obtaining greater benefits from such reservoirs may be achieved in the future.

Nearly all water now being used in the Texas high plains is pumped from the ground. Most of it comes from the sands and gravels of the Ogallala formation, which contains a vast supply of water except in places where the formation is thin. Perhaps the most significant characteristic of the Ogallala formation is its isolation from other waterbearing formations, which is due to its location in the upper part on the plateau, above the surface of the surrounding land. Consequently, the recharge of this formation is dependent upon rain which falls upon the plateaus. Due largely to evaporation and transpiration, hardly any of the annual rainfall of 20 inches reaches the formation. In the absence of pumping, the natural discharge at the edges of the plateau is about equal to the natural recharge. In view of these hydrologic conditions, pumping withdraws water which is not being replaced by nature. Hence the pumping of ground water in this area is said to amount to mining a nonrenewable resource. It appears inevitable that the recoverable water stored in the Ogallala formation will be exhaused or that water levels will decline to the point where it will no longer be economical to pump. That time may not be many years away.

Various estimates have been made of the amount of fresh underground water in storage in Texas, but all such estimates are likely to be incorrect because of lack of basic data. The major underground water formations have not been studied sufficiently, and most of the minor formations have had no quantitative study.

Except for the depletion of storage accumulated over the centuries, the rate at which underground water can be withdrawn perennially through wells is limited to the amount of natural discharge that can be intercepted—the natural discharge being that water now feeding the base, or low, flows of the streams and being lost from the water table by evaporation and transpiration. Probably a large part of the underground water feeding low flows to the streams can be intercepted, but this of course will deplete the streamflow. It may be justified as a man's means of diverting the water at more convenient places, but does not represent a supply of water in addition to that measured in streams.

It is well known that water resources in their present state of development are failing to satisfy the desires of people in many parts of Texas. Greatest concern is being manifested about the inadequacy of water supplies for municipal, irrigation, and industrial uses. The rapid expansion of the population and economy of Texas in recent years has been accompanied by one of the most severe droughts in history. Many cities have been forced to ration water and to consider methods for obtaining additional supplies. Water has not been readily available to irrigate many acres of land which were irrigated in the past, and much other land could be made productive if irrigation water were furnished. It is reported that water scarcity has kept several industrial concerns from establishing plants in Texas.

Population growth alone, though great, causes only a very small portion of the increased demands. It is not the amount of water the individual uses for himself but the amount he uses in providing goods and services for others that causes the greatest demands. Agriculture and industry use large amounts of water.

Some of the most troublesome Texas problems occur in connection with the production of oil and gas. Salt water extracted with oil is commonly stored in large earthen tanks from which seepage and overflows pollute streams. The physical solution appears to be the return of salt water by injection wells to the underground formations from which it was pumped, but this method of handling the problem is expensive. When both fresh and salt water strata are pierced by oil and gas wells, there is danger of polluting the fresh water. This threat is minimized by proper casing of oil and gas wells and plugging abandoned wells.

The failure of many Texas cities to treat sewage adequately before discharging it into streams is another major source of pollution. While most cities in Texas have facilities for sewage treatment, many of these works have become overburdened as cities have grown. The cost of constructing adequate facilities appears to be the principal obstacle.

Many land and water problems of grave importance confront irrigation agriculture today. In many areas there is more land suitable for irrigation than can be irrigated with the amount of water available. Yet over spread sections less than half of the water applied to the land actually benefits growing crops. Delivery of irrigation water in open ditches contributes heavily to water loss which may be as much as 70 percent. Most of it is due to seepage. On many farms a different method of irrigating is needed. Irrigation systems need to be studied in an effort to improve water delivery and cutting down seepage losses can be reduced by lining canals, using closed conduits, and controlling weeds in the canals and ditches.

Large quantities of water are also used for hydroelectric power, but this water is neither consumed nor polluted, and it use for power generation usually is supplemental to other uses. Industry's use of water is illustrated by the fact that it takes 70,000 gallons to make 1 ton of high-grade paper, 65,000 gallons to process a ton of highly finished steel, and more than 1,000 gallons to slaughter and process a hog. Air conditioning is another new use which makes heavy demands, and in the future these demands will probably increase. Increasing use is not the only difficulty. Hot weather and dry weather usually come together so that irrigation, heavy municipal and industrial use, and air conditioning all occur simultaneously with the critical period for supply. This is also the time of year when streamflow and watershed runoff are usually at their lowest and evaporation is at its highest.

Increased consideration is being given by engineers and geologists to the possible storage of surface water in natural underground reservoirs and especially in areas where heavy pumping is taking place. Two general methods are used, water spreading and the use of recharge wells. Artificial recharge through wells seems to be successful only in direct proportion to the conditioning of the water that is to be put into these underground formations.

Engineers have developed water treatment practices to the point where almost any kind of water, through one or more processes, can be reclaimed for certain uses. Treatment for reuse of water should be the goal. Engineers have developed water treatment practices, but the economics involved may make it impractical for grossly polluted water. Keeping municipal and industrial waste out of streams and absorbing them on land, or evaporating them, may not be the most desirable answer to water-short areas. Land absorption and evaporation of sewage as a means of disposal usually dissipate water as a resource. In order to maintain water supplies, this should not be promoted in water-short areas, even though it is more expedient to evaporate the sewage than it is to build a treatment plant and release the water for downstream users. In Germany the waters of the Rhine River are used and reused many times, the only limit being an ultimate salt concentration that renders the water finally unusable. This practice will come to be used more as demands for water exceed the amount that nature provides.

We shall have to learn to use water more efficiently and economically than we have in the past. We must stop the waste of water in homes, agriculture, cities, industry, and at the points where waste can be prevented. We must bring about reuse whenever possible. An expanded system of storage and flood control reservoirs must be employed. Water can be trapped in times of and used to carry us through periods of low supply. The amount of water actually needed to do a job efficiently may be considerably less than the amount we have been using. Efficiency and economy in use of water will determine Texans' success in water conservation.

Sugar Beets in the Red River Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, because of the great volume of mail that has

come to my office expressing concern for the development and progress of the production of beets and the sugar beet industry throughout the Red River Valley, I take this means of conveying to Congress the significant part that the production of sugar beets plays in the economic stability and opportunity for the Red River Valley.

All of us, of course, are greatly concerned with the agricultural problem that confronts this Nation. In my humble opinion, there is not any crop which has as great a future potential for an improved agricultural economy as that of the production of sugar beets to the Red River Valley. The very fertile soil, climatic conditions and available labor necessary in the production of beets, are all available in abundant quantities. Possibly just as important is the fact that sugar beets is a crop that is raised as a row crop and for this reason, has a real importance to this area in the control of weeds and adds a great deal to the diversity of farming throughout the valley. These are facts that have certainly been well established during the last decade as the sugar beet industry and production have grown and prospered.

The valley now has three processing plants located at East Grand Forks, Moorhead, and Crookston, that accommodate the production of over 90,000 acres. These 90,000 acres, located in northwestern Minnesota and northeastern North Dakota, mean a gross average annual income of well over $13 million. However, this is only a small part of the potential for expanded production of sugar beets, as is so clearly indicated by the continuous desire on the part of farm people in the area to raise additional beets. During the last year there were 3,517 actual signed applications requesting beet acreages totaling 44,916 acres. Of these requests, under present limitations, it was only possible to grant an acerage of 460 acres to 18 new growers. This means that 99 out of every 100 applications had to be turned down. There might well have been requests for an additional 30,000 acres but for the fact that so many of the farmers felt that it would be only a futile effort to complete the applications. There is, as well, a great desire on the part of farmers now producing beets that they might be permitted to expand their acres. For, during the past years they have experienced reductions in their sugar beet acreage allotments. It is somewhat difficult for the farmers to understand this curtailment in the production of a crop in which we, as a Nation, produce only 30 percent of our needs.

May I take just a moment to further point to the significance that this implies to the agricultural and economic future of the Red River Valley. The production, or the growing of an additional 70,000 acres of beets would mean an additional gross income to that area of over $10 million annually. Just as significant is the fact that the production of sugar beets, which has grown to be highly mechanized in the past years, requires a great deal of machinery. The sale of these necessary implements and equipment would be of substantial benefit to the welfare of implement dealers and business enterprises throughout the many small towns. These small towns are presently having a difficult time surviving with the reduced farm income. The job opportunities that would be provided would, of course, add to the strengthening of the entire economy. Surely these are points to which we would want to give our most sincere consideration as we ponder the possible solution to the agricultural problem and the economic future of our States and Nation.

It is my hope that Congress, in its wisdom, may give adequate consideration to the potential of production of sugar beets in the Red River Valley as we direct our attention to the controversy that presently exists regarding the renewal of the Sugar Act. Not only will expanded production of sugar beets improve the gross income of farms in the Red River Valley, but it has the further potential of reducing the production of other crops which presently are in surplus and are depressing the markets.

The Department of Agriculture has just announced an 8 percent reduction in farm income for the first 6 months of 1959. This is a further indication of the need for Congress to consider every possible avenue of approach to deal in a realistic manner with the agricultural problem.

Each of these points have been substantially emphasized by the mail that I have received from so many farm people throughout the Red River Valley.

Navy Correspondence Course Center in Scotia, N.Y., Provides Education for Hundreds of Thousands of Naval Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important agencies of the U.S. Navy is the U.S. Naval Correspondence Course Center which is located at the Navy Supply Depot in Scotia, N.Y., within my district. This highly efficient organization at the present time is conducting one of the most effective and far-reaching educational programs ever to be carried on. As a result of its activities more than 181,000 students throughout the Navy and the Naval Reserve are improving their education. Only 2 short years ago this correspondence course center moved into my district from an area closer to metropolitan New York City. Since coming here, I am informed its efficiency has increased and its effectiveness has been enhanced, a fact which is certainly a tribute to the splendid atmosphere in which naval activities are carried on in the 32d Congressional District of New York.

The announcement last fall that the Navy was planning to close down the naval supply depot at Scotia, with an attendant loss of some 675 jobs, came as a heavy blow to the community of Schenectady, already hard hit by unemployment. Nevertheless, we were gratified to learn that at least this action did not involve any transfer or disestablishment of the naval correspondence course center, which will continue to be located in Scotia even after the formal disestablishment of the depot itself.

Mr. Speaker, I was greatly impressed recently with a summary of the job which the correspondence course center is doing which appeared in the Navy Times for July 18, 1959. I believe that this summary will be of interest to every Member of Congress, as well as to people throughout the Nation. In fact, when they have had a chance to read how efficiently this job is performed in Scotia, I also hope that the leaders of our Defense Establishment will recognize the folly of their decision in closing down an equally efficient operation at the Scotia Navy Supply Depot.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article, prepared by Lt. (jg.) George S. Durland, USNR, of Scotia, N.Y.:

[From the Navy Times, July 18, 1959]

NAVY EDUCATION FOR A STAMP

(By Lt. (jg.) George S. Durland, USNR)

SCOTIA, N.Y.—The new Naval Correspondence Course Center can be found in this small village, just outside the city of Schenectady. From offices in the administration building at the supply depot here, the hardworking staff of 17 officers, 87 enlisted men, and 127 civilians administers courses for more than 181,000 students now enrolled at the center.

The center's learn-by-mail students are varied and scattered around the world. You'll find admirals, seaman apprentices, Army personnel, Air Force personnel, foreign naval officers, reservists, and civilians employed by the Department of Defense, all enrolled in at least one of the many courses offered.

Officer in charge is Comdr. Fred P. McDaniel, USN, and assistant officer in charge is Lt. Comdr. William R. Wright, USN. The center is under the management control of the Bureau of Naval Personnel. However, these officers and their staff are directly responsible for administering the 340 courses offered by the center.

The Navy's correspondence course program deals with professional subjects which are for the most part only of interest to Navy and Coast Guard personnel who also participate in the naval correspondence course program. This is in contrast to USAFI courses, such as history or languages, which are of interest to anyone.

Another contrast is that an entrance fee of $5 is charged for the first course by USAFI, while the center's courses are free.

Because of their specialized nature, naval correspondence courses aren't taken by many personnel of the other services. But despite this, and despite the fact that the Army, Air Force, and the Marines have their own correspondence course programs, 1,397 personnel from these services are enrolled in Navy courses. Most are enrolled in basic courses such as mathematics or electricity, or possibly personnel administration or leadership.

An Army or Air Force man can take any Navy course, such as quartermaster third

class or Navy public information, if he has some special reason for wanting it.

How does one enroll in a correspondence course?

If you are an enlisted man on active duty, see your information and education officer and he will give you an application form (NavPers 231) which is to be forwarded via your commanding officer. When the center receives your application, it will forward the course and all necessary materials, including an answer sheet, to your commanding officer. He will designate an officer to grade your assignments and generally help you with the course.

When the course is satisfactorily completed, your commanding officer will make a notation in your service record. This is what is known as local administration of correspondence courses. Any enlisted man can meet his qualification requirements this way or by taking a naval training course administered by his I and E officer, his training officer or his division officer.

The procedure of mailing assignments back to the center for correction is only allowed for inactive duty personnel men assigned to commands with fewer than three officers or for enlisted men and officers taking officer courses. Enlisted personnel requesting center-administered courses should use NavPers Form 580.

If you are a reservist, you can get applications from your unit commander or district comandant. Upon receipt of a properly endorsed application, the center will forward the course to you and establish an enrollment record. You then forward at least one assignment a month to the center in the envelopes provided.

Officers and enlisted men can enroll in an officer course by forwarding an application form (NavPers 992) to the center whereupon the center will establish an enrollment record and forward all materials necessary for completing the course. Enlisted men must have their commanding officer's permission to take an officer course.

All enrollment applications should be made out carefully and completely, typewritten if possible. Many applications have to be returned for lack of information and on others the name of the student or the address can't be read which means the application can't even be returned for clarification. Remember the center handles hundreds of thousands of courses.

As a matter of fact, during the year from May 1, 1958, through April 30, 1959, over 800,000 courses were mailed out to students.

Let's follow enrollment application and see what happens to it at the center.

The mail room receives about 10,000 pieces of mail daily, not counting book returns. Much of this mail consists of enrollment applications—about 3,000 each day. All applications are routed from the mail room to the enrollments branch. Here they are checked for accuracy and completeness of information.

If an application is for a locally administered course, the 231 form, the course and answer sheet are forwarded immediately and no record is kept by the Center.

If the application is for an officer course or for an enlisted course to be administered by the center the application is stamped with the date that materials are mailed and then routed to the posting branch.

In the posting branch, the application, which is also a student's course status record, is filed on a Simpla-wheel. A Simplawheel is a special type of rotating file made especially for holding large numbers of record cards. Each wheel can hold approximately 10,000 to 12,000 enrollment cards. Each card is filed alphabetically according to course title. Each wheel holds from 3 to 14 courses, depending on the number enrolled in each course.

For example, submarine periscopes has only two enrollees while military justice in the Navy has 12,492 enrollees. This is why it is so important for anyone writing to the center asking about some aspect of a course to give the title of the course so that the center can find the writer's enrollment record. The center receives many letters inquiring about the status of a course with the writer neglecting to mention the course title or number.

After you have submitted your application and it has been processed by the center, the course you have requested will be sent to you complete and free of charge. There are, however, temporary shortages of course materials now and then, so officers are requested to list second choices. When a course is temporarily out of stock, applications are held on file and the courses forwarded as soon as they become available. Cards are sent to all applicants stating that the courses will be sent as soon as they are available.

When you receive your course, you will find a text or texts, an assignment booklet with instructions, and all necessary material for completing the course.

In most courses, the book return receipt (NCCC 86 Form which is returned to the center when books are returned) and all assignment sheets are an integral part of the assignment booklet.

A number of assignments in Navy correspondence course varies from one to 17. Each assignment contains a varying number of objective questions such as multiple choice, true-false and matching. Answers are marked on the separate answer sheets and each marked sheet is returned to either the appropriate training officer or to the center in one of the pre-addressed envelopes provided.

Since correspondence courses are not tests, they can be worked with open texts. Don't let this throw you. Many questions are still answered incorrectly.

Now that we know what happens to an enrollment application and you have received your course, let's find out what happens to an assignment sheet when it is submitted to the center for correction.

The center grades about 1½ million assignments yearly and between 5,500 to 6,000 assignments are received daily in the center's mailroom. Here they are opened and sorted according to course numbers. From the mailroom the assignments are forwarded to the grading branch where they are placed in a rack containing a shelf for each course. An assignment may remain in the rack a few days, depending on the workload at the time. The assignments are removed from the rack chronologically and each assignment sheet is graded by hand, using a template.

There has been a template constructed for each assignment of every course the center administers with the exception of some of the law courses which are essay types. The templates fit directly over the assignment sheets and enable the graders to determine at a glance the questions which have been answered incorrectly and also enable them to write in references next to the incorrect answers and to assign a grade to each assignment. The passing grade is 3.4 for officer courses and 3.2 for enlisted courses.

After an assignment has been graded, it is alphabetized according to course number and forwarded to the posting branch. In the posting branch, assignments are posted to the students' enrollment records and returned.

When a course has been completed (all assignments posted to the enrollment record), the record is removed from the Simpla-wheel and forwarded to the statistics branch which assigns a grade for the course, stamps and returns the last assignment, and counts each card so that an up-to-date record of the number of students enrolled in each course is readily available.

From the statistics branch, the enrollment card goes to the files branch where it awaits a book return (86 form). Upon the return of the course material, the enrollment card goes to the terminations branch where a completion letter is typed and sent to the student.

Completion letters are sent directly to enlisted personnel and USN officers. For Reserve officers, completion letters are sent via the Reserve Officer Recording Activity in Omaha, Nebr.

RORA keeps all Reserve officer training records and is responsible for recording promotion and/or retirement points. For Reserve officers, the assignment of a course which comprises a 12-point unit is forwarded to RORA and points assigned as of the date the assignment was mailed. Officers should allow 4 to 6 weeks for completion letters and assignments which are forwarded to RORA.

Five of the officer courses are classified and a Reserve officer on inactive duty has a special procedure to take one. To enroll he must submit an application via the command holding his service jacket. The center will issue a classified course to this command which can, at its discretion, forward the course to the command nearest the enrollee.

Enrollees should keep in mind that it takes longer for the center to process courses for completion around promotion time and at the end of the fiscal year because of the greatly increased workload at these times.

What happens if you fail a course the first time through? All students are informed of failing assignments and these assignments are retained by the center until the course is completed. If the final course average turns out to be satisfactory, all failed assignments are returned.

If the final course average is unsatisfactory, the center will forward blank answer sheets and the failed assignments can be reworked. Grades assigned reworked assignments are the minimum passing grades (3.2 for enlisted courses, 3.4 for officers), regardless of the actual passing grade which may have been attained.

If upon resubmission, the course is satisfactorily passed, a completion letter is issued. If a course is failed upon resubmission, a letter of participation is issued.

Why are so many students enrolled in correspondence courses? The Navy's correspondence course program was started in 1932 and has been enlarging ever since.

In 1954, the Navy started a promotion plan for officers which greatly increased the program. This plan required Regular and Reserve officers to pass professional examinations in order to be eligible for promotion. They could, however, bypass the exams by taking resident courses at Navy schools or by completing a required number of correspondence courses. This resulted in many officers enrolling in correspondence courses. Enlisted men must take certain training courses to be eligible for advancement in rate. In many cases this training is received in the form of Navy training courses given by I and E officers and division officers. However, the majority of enlisted men receive their training through correspondence courses.

Reservists earning promotion and retirement points also account for many enrollments.

Since July 1, no professional examinations are given for the promotion of officers. Resident courses at a Navy school or correspondence courses will still be required and most correspondence courses will contain an end-of-course examination. BuPers Instruction 1416-1E of March 9, 1959, states:

"(a) End-of-course examinations will be prepared as an integral part of most correspondence courses listed in enclosure (4).

"(b) These examinations will be developed from the correspondence course text material and will be given under closed-book, monitored conditions.

"(c) Officers on active duty who complete a correspondence course subsequent to June 30, 1959, will be required to pass the examination, if available, before the course will be creditable for promotion credit under this instruction.

"(d) Officers who complete a correspondence course prior to July 1, 1959, will be granted promotion credit for that course without completing the examination.

"(e) Instructions for ordering and administering end-of-course examinations will be promulgated with the correspondence courses. Instructions for safeguarding examination material are promulgated in reference (c) or the "Security Manual for Classified Information," as applicable.

"(f) Correspondence courses satisfactorily completed by officers not on active duty satisfy professional requirements as stated herein, and end-of-course examinations will not be required for such courses. Upon reporting for active duty, these officers will continue their professional study in accordance with the requirements outlined herein for their grade and designator.

"(g) Officers receiving an unsatisfactory mark for an end-of-course examination will be reexamined. If an unsatisfactory mark is again received, action will be taken in accordance with the provisions of reference (a).

"(h) Where an end-of-course examination is not offered as an integral part of a correspondence course, course completion without examination will be accepted as meeting promotion requirements. Possession of a certificate of satisfactory completion will indicate that the course was satisfactorily completed."

All of the activities and personnel at the center are organized into four departments—Administration, Student Services, Extension, and Fiscal.

Of the 87 enlisted men in these departments, storekeepers and yeoman rates are the most common, with 16 and 14 men, respectively. About half of the personnel are in pay grades E–5 and E–6.

There are no messing facilities available and housing facilities on the station are limited to a small trailer park and a few quarters. Therefore, most of the men and officers find living quarters in the surrounding community.

The Administration Department performs the services common to all naval units, such as central filing, personnel management, and the control and routing of all correspondence. The Administration Department also has charge of records disposal and forms control. This Department is headed by Lt. Matthew L. Mayer, USNR.

Student Services Department, under Lt. Comdr. Florence L. Erickson, USN, performs the real function of administering courses to the students. This Department enrolls students, makes up the courses, controls the stock of courses, grades assignments, posts assignments, files, enrollment records, and answers all correspondence pertaining to the status of correspondence courses.

The Fiscal Department under Lt. Robert W. O'Conner (SC), USN, prepares the center's annual budget, controls center funds, provides logistic support to the center, and is also in charge of household goods and disbursing.

The Extension Department is headed by Lt. William W. Patterson, USN. Its job is to review new courses, recommend revisions to courses, prepare error analyses of courses, and answer all technical questions written by students.

In an error frequency analysis, for example, if a high percentage of students seem to be missing the same question on an assignment, the Extension Department will analyze the question and the text. Many times this will show that the text was not very clear or that the question was ambiguous. The Extension Department will then recommend a revision to the Bureau of Naval Personnel.

Many students write in disagreeing with answers. Most disputes are caused by a misinterpretation of the text or the misunderstanding of a definition. Also, many disputes are caused by purely mechanical errors in solving problems or the misreading of the text or question.

Most technical queries can be answered simply by citing more references in the text or by working out the solution of a problem; however, some questions become quite involved and the "instructor" and student sometimes get into a very lengthy "discussion by mail."

The center's fan mail from students comes in all shapes, forms, sizes, and languages. Many students just grab the piece of paper nearest at hand and scribble a note. Recently the center received correspondence in Spanish and Portuguese.

Some of the correspondence received reads like this letter from a disgruntled officer: "This is the worst course I have attempted to date. The answers are so intricately involved in the phraseology of a difficult text that it is almost imposisble to keep your mind on the course."

For every one of those, there are dozens that read like this one: "I want to take this opportunity to thank you for the fine job you did in getting my final assignments to me. I was very much surprised to receive them in this afternoon's mail. I never thought the Navy or the postal service moved quite so rapidly. It certainly is gratifying to know that the Correspondence Course Center will help out a person in a tight spot."

Then there was this letter from a chief who was writing about the naval leadership course: "I really enjoyed the course. It will be a great help to me in understanding myself and the men in my crew. I only wish I had known of its existence earlier.

"In my opinion, the Navy would benefit if more enlisted personnel were made aware of this course's availability and content."

This one is from another chief writing about enlisted correspondence course military requirements for petty officer first class and chief: "I wish to congratulate the Correspondence Course Center for the clear and concise manner in which this course has been prepared. In my own experience with this course I found that I was continually engrossed in the subject matter to such an extent that I could not lay the book down for very long at one time. It actually had an appeal to me quite similar to 'Anatomy of a Murder' although of course the subject content is entirely different.

"For this reason I felt compelled to complete this course during this past weekend."

Vice President Nixon's Speech at Opening of American Exhibition in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech given by Vice President NIXON at the opening of the American national exhibition in Moscow July 24, 1959. Surely this is one of the finest expositions anyone has ever given anywhere of the true heart and soul and mind of our beloved America. What a pity that the Soviet rulers refused to let it be broadcast in Russian to their people. Our gratitude and commendation go to the Vice President for a splendid job will done.

REMARKS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, RICHARD NIXON, ON THE OCCASION OF THE OPENING OF THE AMERICAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION IN MOSCOW, SOKOLNIKI PARK, JULY 24, 1959

I am honored on behalf of President Eisenhower to open this American exhibition in Moscow.

Mrs. Nixon and I were among the many thousands of Americans who were privileged to visit the splendid Soviet exhibition in New York, and we want to take this opportunity to congratulate the people of the U.S.S.R. for the great achievements and progress so magnificently portrayed by your exhibition.

We, in turn, hope that many thousands of soviet citizens will take advantage of this opportunity to learn about life in the United States by visiting our exhibition.

Of course, we both realize that no exhibition can portray a complete picture of all aspects of life in great nations like the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

Among the questions which some might raise with regard to our exhibition are these: To what extent does this exhibition accurately present life in the United States as it really is? Can only the wealthy people afford the things exhibited here? What about the inequality, the injustice, the other weaknesses which are supposed to be inevitable in a capitalist society?

As Mr. Khrushchev often says: "You can't leave a word out of a song." Consequently, in the limited time I have, I would like to try to answer some of these questions so that you may get an accurate picture of what America is really like.

Let us start with some of the things in this exhibit. You will see a house, a car, a television set—each the newest and most modern of its type we can produce. But can only the rich in the United States afford such things? If this were the case we would have to include in our definition of rich the millions of America's wage earners.

Let us take, for example, our 16 million factory workers. The average weekly wage of a factory worker in America is $90.54. With this income he can buy and afford to own a house, a television set, and a car in the price range of those you will see in this exhibit. What is more, the great majority of American wage earners have done exactly that.

Putting it another way, there are 44 million families in the United States. Twenty-five million of these families live in houses or apartments that have as much or more floor space than the one you see in this exhibit. Thirty-one million families own their own homes and the land on which they are built. America's 44 million families own a total of 56 million cars, 50 million television sets and 143 million radio sets. And they buy an average of 9 dresses and suits and 14 pairs of shoes per family per year.

Why do I cite these figures? Not because they indicate that the American people have more automobiles, TV sets, or houses than the people of the U.S.S.R.

In fairness we must recognize that our country industrialized sooner than the Soviet Union. And Americans are happy to note that Mr. Khrushchev has set a goal for the Soviet economy of catching up in the production of consumer goods.

We welcome this kind of competition because when we engage in it, no one loses—everyone wins as the living standards of people throughout the world are raised to

higher levels. It also should be pointed out that while we may be ahead of you as far as these items are concerned, you are ahead of use in other fields—for example, in the size of the rockets you have developed for the exploration of outer space.

But what these statistics do dramatically demonstrate is this: That the United States, the world's largest capitalist country, has from the standpoint of distribution of wealth come closest to the ideal of prosperity for all in a classless society.

As our revered Abraham Lincoln said "We do not propose any war upon capital; we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else."

The 67 million American wage earners are not the downtrodden masses depicted by the critics of capitalism in the latter part of the 19th and early part of the 20th centuries. They hold their heads high as they proudly enjoy the highest standard of living of any people in the world's history.

The caricature of capitalism as a predatory, monopolist dominated society, is as hopelessly out of date, as far as the United States is concerned, as a wooden plow.

This does not mean that we have solved all of our problems. Many of you have heard about the problem of unemployment in the United States. What is not so well known is that the average period that these unemployed were out of work even during our recent recession was less than three months. And during that period the unemployed had an average income from unemployment insurance funds of $131.49 per month. The day has passed in the United States when the unemployed weree left to shift for themselves.

The same can be said for the aged, the sick, and others who are unable to earn enough to provide an adequate standard of living. An expanded program of Social Security combined with other government and private programs provides aid and assistance for those who are unable to care for themselves. For example, the average retired couple on social security in the United States receives an income of $116 per month apart from the additional amounts they receive from private pensions and savings accounts.

What about the strikes which take place in our economy, the latest example of which is the steel strike which is going on? The answer is that here we have a firsthand example of how a free economy works. The workers right to join with other workers in a union and to bargain collectively with management is recognized and protected by law. No man or woman in the United States can be forced to work for wages he considers to be inadequate or under conditions he believes are unsatisfactory.

Another problem which causes us concern is that of racial discrimination in our country. We are making great progress in solving this problem but we shall never be satisfied until we make the American ideal of equality of opportunity a reality for every citizen regardless of his race, creed, or color.

We have other problems in our society but we are confident that for us our system of government provides the best means for solving them. But the primary reason we believe this is not because we have an economy which builds more than 1 million houses, produces 6 million cars and 6 million television sets per year.

Material progress is important but the very heart of the American ideal is that "man does not live by bread alone." To us, progress without freedom to use a common expression is like "potatoes without fat."

Let me give you some examples of what freedom means to us.

President Eisenhower is one of the most popular men ever to hold that high office in our country. Yet never an hour or a day goes by in which critcism of him and his policies cannot be read in our newspapers, heard on our radio and television, or in the Halls of Congress.

And he would not have it any other way. The fact that our people can and do say anything they want about a Government official, the fact that in our elections, as this voting machine in our exhibit illustrates, every voter has a free choice between those who hold public office and those who oppose them makes ours a true people's Government.

We trust the people. We constantly submit big decisions to the people. Our history convinces us that over the years the people have been right much more often than they have been wrong.

As an indication of the extent of this freedom and of our faith in our own system, 40 hours of radio broadcasts from the Soviet Union can be heard without jamming in the United States each day, and over a million and a half copies of Soviet publications are purchased in our country each year.

Let us turn now to freedom of religion. Under our Constitution no church or religion can be supported by the state. An American can either worship in the church of his choice or choose to go to no church at all if he wishes. Acting with this complete freedom of choice, 103 million of our citizens are members of 308,000 American churches.

We also cherish the freedom to travel, both within our country and outside the United States. Within our country we live and travel where we please without travel permits, internal passports, or police registration. We also travel freely abroad. For example, 11 million Americans will travel to other countries during this year, including 10,000 to the Soviet Union. We look forward to the day when millions of Soviet citizens will travel to ours and other countures in this way.

Time will not permit me to tell you of all the features of American life, but in summary I think these conclusions can objectively be stated.

The great majority of Americans like our system of government. Much as we like it, however, we would not impose it on anyone else. We believe that people everywhere should have a right to choose the form of government they want.

There is another characteristic of the American people which I know impresses itself on any visitor to our country. As Mr. Mikoyan and Mr. Kozlov both pointed out after their visits to the United States, the American people are a peace-loving people. There are a number of reasons for this attitude: As this exhibition so eloquently demonstrates, we Americans enjoy an extraordinarily high standard of living.

There is nothing we want from any other people except the right to live in peace and friendship with them.

After fighting two world wars we did not ask for or receive an acre of land from any other people. We have no desire to impose our rule on other lands today.

Our hearts go out to Mr. Khrushchev who lost a son, to Mr. Kozlov who lost two brothers, and to the millions of other Soviet mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, sons and daughters who mourn for their loved ones lost in defending their homeland.

But while it is generally recognized that the American people want peace, I realize that it has sometimes been charged that our Government does not share the attitude of our people. Nothing could be further from the truth.

For 7 years I have sat in the high councils of our Government and I can tell you that the primary aim of our discussions has been to find ways that we could use our strength in behalf of peace throughout the world.

Let me tell you of the background of some of those who participate in our policy discussions. The Secretary of State lost his brother in World War I. I saw boys as close to me as brothers die on barren islands 4,000 miles from home in World War II. No man in the world today has more knowledge of war and is more dedicated to peace than President Eisenhower.

Those who claim that the policies of the American Government do not represent and are not supported by the American people are engaging in a completely inaccurate and dangerous from of selfdeception. Any administration which follows policies which do not reflect the views of our people on major issues runs the risk of defeat at the next election. When our elected officials cease to represent the people, the people have the power to replace them with others who do. The reason the leaders of both our major political parties are united in supporting President Eisenhower's foreign policy is that they are reflecting the views of a people who are united behind these policies.

The Government and people of the United States are as one in their devotion to the cause of peace.

But dedication to peace, good will, and human brotherhood should never be mistaken for weakness, softness, and fear.

Much as we want peace we will fight to defend our country and our way of life just as you have fought so courageously to defend your homeland throughout your history.

The peace we want and the peace the world needs is not the peace of surrender but the peace of justice, not peace by ultimatum but peace by negotiation.

The leaders of our two great nations have such tremendous responsibilities if peace is to be maintained in our time.

We cannot and should not gloss over the fact that we have some great and basic differences between us. What we must constantly strive to do is to see that those differences are discussed and settled at the conference table and not on the battlefield.

And until such settlements are agreed to, our leaders must exercise the greatest restraint, patience, and understanding in their actions and their statements. They must do nothing which might provoke a war no one wants.

The fact that one of us may have a bigger bomb, a faster plane, or a more powerful rocket than the other at any particular time no longer adds up to an advantage. Because we have reached the point in world history where the Bibical injunction "they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" is literally true today.

The nation which starts a war today will destroy itself. Completely apart from any retailiatory action which might be taken by a nation which is attacked, the deadly dust from radioactive bombs used in an attack will be carried by the winds back to the homeland of the aggressor.

With both of our great nations holding this terrible power in our hands neither must ever put the other in a position where he has no choice but to fight or surrender. No nation in the world today is strong enough to issue an ultimatum to another without running the risk of self-destruction.

The Soviet exhibition in New York and the American exhibition which we open tonight are dramatic examples of what a great future lies in store for all of us if we can devote the tremendous energies of our peoples and the resources of our countries to the ways of peace rather than the ways of war.

The last half of the 20th century can be the darkest or the brightest page in the history of civilization. The decision is in our hands to make. The genius of the men who produced the magnificent achievements

represented by these two exhibitions can be directed either to the destruction of civilization or to the creation of the best life that men have ever enjoyed on this earth.

As I have said on previous occasions, let us expand the idea of peaceful competition which Mr. Khrushchev has often enunciated. Let us extend this competition to include the spiritual as well as the material aspects of our civilization. Let us compete not in how to take lives but in how to save them. Let us work for victory not in war but for the victory of plenty over poverty, of health over disease, of understanding over ignorance wherever they exist in the world.

Above all, let us find more and more areas where we can substitute cooperation for competition in achieving our goal of a fuller, freer, richer life for every man, woman, and child on this earth.

The Wheat Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, as I have so often pointed out, the basic problem confronting the wheat farmers of the great winter wheat-producing area comprised of the States of Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Colorado, and Texas, is that of surpluses.

These States are historically, commercial wheat-producing States. Wheat has been their lifeblood since the time they were first settled.

The present farm program has encouraged States east of the Mississippi River to engage in the production of winter wheat, a crop that was never general grown in that section of the United States. This production has in large measure been responsible for the present critical surplus situation.

The present program for wheat will continue to complicate the problems of the High Plains wheat farmers simply because it provides no way of relieving the accumulating surpluses.

The comercial wheat-producing area has been extended to cover most of the United States, thus limiting the acreage that rightfully belongs to the historical wheat-producing areas of Kansas and its neighboring States.

Congress has for many years been trying desperately to find a solution, one that would provide the protection to wheat farmers they justly deserve—especially those in the summer-fallow region where income from wheat is the principal factor in the economy.

I hope all my colleagues, especially those from the States mentioned above, will take a few minutes of their time to read and carefully weigh in their minds some comments made by Mr. Lud Strnad of Brewster, Kans., in an article appearing in the Sherman County Herald of Goodland, Kans., no July 16, 1959, on the wheat problem.

Mr. Strnad is a real wheat farmer who is thoroughly familiar with and highly qualified to comment on the serious situation confronting our agricultural economy. He has, in my opinion, stated accurately the reasons for the failure of Congress to pass satisfactory legislation for wheat.

Mr. Strnad's comments follow:

Lud Strnad of Brewster, Kans., a commercial wheat grower, states:

"I'm going to vote 'No' on July 23 in the wheat referendum. In the past I always voted 'Yes.' This 'No' vote on my part comes about after considerable thought.

"Wheat farmers need some kind of a program, and in the not too distant future, one will be evolved. But before a successful program is worked out, several things must happen. The things that must happen will not be enacted by Congress. Farmers will do this on their own.

"First, before a wheat program can work the now established commercial wheat area must be redefined. The only way to find out what area of the United States really raises wheat and should be called commercial wheat area is to find out what areas can sell wheat cheap. And/or what areas will continue to raise wheat even though the price is 50 cents per bushel.

"My reason for saying this is simple. In 1938, when the farm program was first enacted about three-fourths of the United States was not considered wheat area. Now only nine States are not in this commercial area. Naturally, the Ohio Congressmen, and there are 24 of them, will not vote to take wheat allotments from Ohio farmers. Nor will the 36 New York Congressmen do that. Yet, these States were not considered wheat States in the early farm program days.

"Ohio has more Congressmen than Kansas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Wyoming, Nebraska, etc. combined. What then will keep the eastern farmers from producing wheat. The answer is price.

"Let me explain. Even as close as Topeka, wheat was $1.65 on Saturday, July 13. Brewster price was $1.74. Actually, adding freight, there is a difference of almost 30 cents. The Topeka wheat is not going on the market because the loan there is close to $1.80. The same is true in Indiana or New New York. Some wheat was always produced in the eastern areas, but the price controlled the acres. It was more profitable to sell corn than wheat. Now, the wheat in these areas goes into loans, and the power of Congressmen in those areas keep taking our acres from us. After all, Congressmen from those States are politicians.

"I've talked to hundreds of farmers from all sections of the country. My wife and I travel quite a bit. In Springfield, Ill., last spring, I talked to several farmers. Corn averages 100 bushels per acre. At $1.06, this equals $106 per acre; 30 bushels of wheat at $1.80 is $54.00.

"'Well, why do you plant wheat?' I asked. The answer was, 'I know I make more money on corn, but with wheat loans at $1.80, I get part of my income in July and the rest in November.'

"'Suppose wheat went down to a dollar, would you still raise wheat?'

"The answer was, 'Hell, no. Not with corn at $1.06.' 'If wheat goes down, won't corn do the same?' The answer was, 'Oh no. We voted to peg corn at a good price. We'll keep our corn program.'

"Wheat is a commercial crop only in the High Plains area. Regardless of low price, it would still be raised there. We can't produce anything else. Congress would have no problem with allotment demands from Ohio, or elsewhere, outside of the High Plains, at lower wheat prices.

"We'd have to forget black hull wheat. Only good wheats could be seeded, only those the market demands.

"Sure, a lot of us would get hurt. Yet, we're being cut to pieces anyway, a little at a time. Ohio would get tired of low priced wheat (which would take only 1 year), we could then go to Congress and ask for and get a wheat program for wheat farmers of the High Plains.

"On their own, the eastern farmers must stop producing wheat. Congress will never pass laws to compell them to do so. Price will do the job.

"My remarks are brief, because of newspaper space. I'll answer any and all questions on the above.

"When you vote on July 23, vote any way you please. I'm only telling you why I'm voting 'No.'—LUD STRNAD."

Inflation's Cost to Washingtonians Reported in Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I feel that if the public is to fully appreciate the danger of inflation, this danger must be spelled out in terms of what it means to each individual pocketbook. Very recently an excellent study of what inflation costs residents of the State of Washington was made by the National Association of Manufacturers, and was carried in the Yakima Daily Republic and other newspapers in the State.

I believe the NAM study has gone a long way toward making the public aware that here is a real threat to our security, a threat that is one we must face now, for later will most certainly be too late. The following is the story:

[From the Yakima (Wash.) Daily Republic, July 10, 1959]

STATE'S INFLATION COSTS SET AT $3½ BILLION IN 8 YEARS

PORTLAND.—Inflation filched $3,602,400,000 in spendable income from pockets of Washingtonians between 1947 and 1955, according to National Association of Manufacturers' researchers.

The multi-billion-dollar after taxes loss to Washington residents in 8 years is reported in NAM's latest study, "The High Cost of Inflation in the 11 Western States."

Washingtonians can view the loss on a very personal basis, as the sum referred to is lost individual income. It does not include sums lost to Government and industrial budgets through inflation.

Difficult to grasp the size of $3½ billion dollars?

The sum, at current construction costs, would build a total of nearly 4,450 new, 30-room elementary schools in Washington, or a total of 1,045 new, 75-room high schools. That would provide 17 new elementary schools or 4 new high schools for each of Washington's 259 incorporated towns and cities.

Such a school construction program exceeds the most grandiose building plans, of course, as only 39 of Washington's 259 incorporated communities have populations exceeding 5,000 and Tenino—population 1,030—is considered median-sized for the State.

The same $3½ billion would build one 600-bed hospital in each of Washington's

incorporated communities, including Hatton—population: 58.

The loss to Washingtonians through inflation is measurable in still another monumental way:

Visualize a first-class highway entirely around Washington's 1,460-mile border. Then, double the highway's width. And finally, add a third parallel highway along the State's southern and eastern borders.

That amount of highway could have been built, at the going rate of $1,098,585 per mile, with the money that Washingtonians lost to inflation between 1947 and 1955.

The schools, the hospitals and the highway projects are strictly imaginary, but inflation's cost to Washingtonians is very real.

In fact, Western Highway Institute says that Washingtonians' spendable income loss to inflation during 1947–55 is 5⅓ times the estimated cost allotted for the State's share of the huge Interstate and Defense Highway System.

The same inflationary theft was 7⅓ times what Washington spent for schools, in capital outlay, from 1947 to the present.

And, it was 23 times the total assets of Washington's non-Federal hospitals in 1957.

So, who's to blame?

Among the environmental factors the NAM study blames for inflation are government and private debt, continuing wage increases surpassing productivity increase and farm support and national defense costs.

Big Federal Government contributes to inflation through deficit spending and taxation excesses. By competing in the marketplace with borrowed money, Government bids up prices of raw materials, equipment, and labor.

Early this year, the NAM study notes, Uncle Sam accounted for 11½ percent of the Nation's goods and services purchased, and had 1 of every 20 employed persons on his payroll.

Private indebtedness is another inflationary pressure due, in some measure, to public debt. Industry must borrow to expand because taxes, which took only one-eighth of corporate profits in 1929, rose to more than one-half of 1958's corporate profits.

Inflationary effects of wage boosts outrunning productivity have been increasingly evident since 1956, the study notes.

As an example, nonfarm workers' pay rose 61 percent between 1947 and 1956. Reducing those payments to real compensation, by adjusting for price increases, the wage boosts amounted to 33 percent. Yet productivity gained by only 26 percent in the same period.

Labor unions, operating as monopolies, force increases in major industries, the study says, even though productivity in those industries (if measurable) might justify them. These basic industry increases tend to spread to other industry groups where productivity might be set at different levels.

Inflation's impact has been felt most acutely by those with fixed incomes. Doubling of consumer prices since 1941 has pauperized millions and created more human suffering than unemployment.

Today's $127 social security check is just about equal in buying power to the $60 check a retired person may have received in 1940, according to a National City Bank letter cited in the study.

Inflation creates the need or desire to supplement family income. As a result, it is a factor in such current labor market conditions as "moonlighting"—multiple jobholding—and the increase in working women.

Plight of pensioners under today's inflationary squeeze in the light of predicted population growth and shifts serves to dramatize what may lie ahead if inflation is not curbed now.

Census Bureau projections indicate that the age 65-and-older group is growing three times faster than the total population increase.

Public insistence on sensible Government spending and for tax rate and labor law reform will, the study concludes, help stop inflation and its total effect of turning a nation of savers into a nation of spenders.

Foreign Service Short of Trained Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the U.S. Foreign Service is the window through which our friends abroad see our Nation.

In order to provide more personnel trained in the fine and careful art of diplomacy and to better equip our representatives abroad to interpret America to people overseas, I join in sponsoring a bill to provide a Foreign Service Academy. The State Department opposed the idea. I do not believe their position was a wise or sound one.

Mr. President, to illustrate my point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Austin (Tex.) American for Friday, July 17, 1959, entitled "Foreign Service Short of Trained Careerists."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Austin (Tex.) American, July 17, 1959]

FOREIGN SERVICE SHORT OF TRAINED CAREERISTS

The question is how to develop a U.S. Foreign Service competent to do its job in an increasingly complex world? It must be truly representative of the best in America without being considered an Ivy League clique or caste.

The State Department has again turned thumbs down on the idea of creating a National Foreign Service Academy—a kind of West Point to train diplomats.

Senators STUART W. SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, and several Congressmen are this year's authors of bills to set up such a finishing school.

But Loy W. Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration and a career Foreign Service officer himself say, "No." Department of State still prefers to take college graduates just as they come and teach them diplomacy in the school of experience.

A recent check of 670 young people recruited into the Foreign Service in 6½ years showed them to be graduates of 145 U.S. colleges and universities.

Harvard led the parade with 68, Yale was second with 56, Princeton third with 46. Then came the University of California, 32; Chicago, 26; Georgetown, 23; George Washington, 21; Columbia, 17; Stanford and Wisconsin, 14.

This "Big 10" accounted for 47 percent of the personnel in training. The other 135 schools had 1 to 10 graduates apiece in service, from 44 States in the Union.

Well intentioned as this broad base of selection may be, the system still is not producing enough high caliber Foreign Service officers to meet the demand.

As one distinguished FSO remarked recently, "There are only about 25 career people in the State Department to shove around in the top jobs." It was a startling confession. Quantity is short as well as quality.

The U.S. Foreign Service now has only two active, $20,000-a-year career ambassadors. They are Deputy Undersecretary of State Robert Murphy and Ambassador to Austria H. Freeman Matthews. They rank, protocolwise, just above the 27 four-star admirals and generals.

Right through the services, the country is seen to be better equipped—personnelwise—for war than peace.

In the rank below the career ambassadors, the Foreign Service has 71 career ministers at $19,200 apiece. They rank just above the 86 three-star generals and admirals.

Forty-five of these career ministers are serving in foreign countries as ambassadors. The other 26 are shoved around in top State Department jobs.

Ambassador George V. Allen is running the U.S. Information Agency. James W. Riddleberger is running the foreign aid program. Livingston T. Merchant is Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs. And so on.

In addition to the fact that these career ministers aren't paid enough so they can afford to be sent to the top diplomatic posts, there aren't enough of them.

So, of the 82 U.S. embassies abroad, 26 have political appointees as ambassadors. With the exception of men like David K. E. Bruce in Germany, and Ellsworth Bunker in India, few of these political ambassadors have had diplomatic training or experience.

This is another factor leading to the demand for better Foreign Service training system. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been really rough on political appointees this year.

For their diplomatic experience they have to depend on the 195 class one FSO's and the 398 class two's. They rank with the 629 two-star admirals and generals and the 457 one-star brigadiers.

Nearly all of the flag and general officers are educated in the service academies at Government expense. The State Department's 4,333 FSO's, including 815 reserves, must provide their own education before they join the Government.

What Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, long ago it was wisely said: "The price of freedom is eternal vigilance." This vigilance is essential to protect our Nation from outside enemies. Too, it is necessary to assure protection of rights, beliefs, and privileges of our people—within the framework of our laws and the boundaries of our land.

Since the early days, people have come to the shores of America seeking liberty and the pursuit of happiness—according to self-determined goals as God gave them the light and the understanding to see them.

Those people came from all walks of life, with a wide variety of religious beliefs, creeds, and philosophies.

To the best of its ability, our Nation has attempted to write its laws to accommodate these different people, ideas, and ideals—while preserving the basic

freedom foreseen as essential by our forefathers.

Unfortunately, there have been difficulties in making adequate adjustments in all our laws.

At times, we have been unsuccessful, for example, in accommodating new statutes and programs to minor—though nevertheless significant—groups.

Recently, I received a letter from Mrs. Ernest H. Berger, enclosing a copy of "The Employment Counselor," containing an article entitled "What Freedom?"

Specifically, the article reviewed an instance in which, because of religious beliefs, a group of Amish farmers did not pay social security taxes. In accordance with the law, the Government seized and sold some of their property.

Regretfully, such actions by a Federal agency sometimes appear to be harsh, and in discord with our traditional principles—even though they may be carrying out the "letter of the law."

Recognizing the fact that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance—that laws should, insofar as possible, accommodate the conscience of all our people, I believe the article merits our attention of Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have Mrs. Berger's letter, and the article, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THURSDAY, *July 23, 1959.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: What is happening to our beautiful America that things like "What Freedom" (an article in the Employment Counselor enclosed) can happen.

We are staunch Republicans and were so happy when President Eisenhower was elected, a man we could again respect. I thought that after the Republicans came in again things would be different.

I know law is law but when such things can happen law should be changed. It is an awful blot on our honor and integrity, please do your best to bring it to the attention of everyone possible in Washington. We must give these horses back to them or remunerate them to be able to buy others. I am sure you will agree with us.

I do hope you will be able to do something constructive in this respect.

I am very respectfully yours,

ESTHER H. BERGER.
(Mrs. E. H.)

WHAT FREEDOM?

Having religious scruples against it, the Amish farmers of Wayne County, Ohio, refused to pay their social security taxes. Accordingly, the Government seized and sold their farm horses. These industrious, self-reliant men of high character and integrity watched the sale of their horses in silence. We are pleased to quote the following significant comment in this event, which appeared in an editorial in the Indianapolis Times.

"As the sale began, a young Oberlin College student turned up wearing on his back a crudely lettered sign that read, 'If the Government can take these horses today it could take yours tomorrow—Don't bid.'

"He had hardly walked a dozen steps before two burly sheriff's deputies grabbed him and hauled him off to their car. The Gestapo couldn't have done it more efficiently. The sale went on.

"The Amish farmers cling to a simple and somewhat primitive faith that forbids them to accept anything they have not honestly earned. That includes the so-called insurance or old-age assistance or retirement benefits or social security along with any other kind of charity, gift, subsidy, or welfare handout of any kind whatever from Government. They provide for their own old age by lifetimes of hard work and thrift. They help one another when misfortune strikes as a normal act of brotherly obligation. They consider it, indeed, deeply immoral to get something for nothing.

"There was a time, and not so long ago, when nearly all Americans felt the same way about such things.

"What the Federal agents were doing was in strict compliance with the letter of the law. By its terms, any property of anyone who doesn't make his social security payments as ordered can be similarly seized and sold. There is no choice about it, and no consideration given to anyone who for whatever reason may not want this security.

"Here in Indiana, we have lately watched the unrelenting attempts of Federal agents to confiscate the tractors of an Indiana farmer to punish him for growing—on his land, by his own labor and for his own use—somewhat more grain than a Federal bureau had decided he should grow. Nor is this an unusual case. All over this country fines have been levied, and in general, meekly paid without battle or even the formality of a trial for this offense against the Nation."

The Mallory Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on July 11 there appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune an editorial entitled "The Mallory Bill," which made such good sense to me when I read it at breakfast in that pleasant city of Rochester, Minn., I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that others may have the benefit of this sound reasoning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, July 11, 1959]

THE MALLORY BILL

Last February, when Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, lectured at the University of Minnesota law school, he made the point that "the difference between detention at the pleasure of the police department while it seeks evidence and a detention with only the necessary elapse of time before formal charges are filed is the difference between a police state and a free country."

We have disagreed with the Oregon Senator on many different issues in the past, but we couldn't agree more wholeheartedly on this point and we said so at the time. The point of bringing it up again is that Senator MORSE's lucid observation is the very core of the objection to the so-called Mallory bill which has just passed the House and is now headed for the Senate.

Andrew Mallory, a Negro sentenced to death on a rape charge in Washington, was freed when the Supreme Court, June 24, 1957, threw out his conviction on the grounds police had held him too long before arraignment and before advising him of his constitutional rights. While Mallory was being held incommunicado and being threatened with a lie-detector test, a U.S. commissioner, before whom police could have arraigned him, sat in the same building. The Supreme Court ruled that Mallory had been deprived of his constitutional rights.

It is important to understand the point that Senator MORSE makes about the Mallory case. It is just this: In a free society men cannot be held as long as the police please but only as long as it takes, reasonably, for the machinery of formal arraignment to function. When this breaks down you have a police state.

The Mallory bill would override the decision of the Supreme Court and would permit police much wider latitude in detaining and questioning prisoners. Although passed 262 to 138, the bill had vigorous opposition on the House floor. Eleven members of the 23-man judiciary committee, including Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, New York, fought it bitterly. It is to be hoped that the Senate will defeat the measure.

Jim Hogg of Texas: Man and Legend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the late James Stephen Hogg, first native-born Governor of Texas, is known and loved for his outsanding career as an honest, progressivel, liberal, and straightforward public servant. Jim Hogg fought for the people; he fought trusts and monopolies. When they had grown more powerful that the Government. He is regarded as one of the four greatest statesmen of Texas, along with Stephen F. Austin, Sam Houston, and John H. Reagan.

Jim Hogg was a leader in the agrarian reform movement of the 1880's and 1890's in Texas. He championed William Jennings Bryan, sat on the front row during the famous cross-of-gold speech, and nodded encouragement to Bryan during its course.

The University of Texas Press has just published a biography of Gov. Jim Hogg, by Robert Crawford Cotner, a history professor at the University of Texas, being the first full book length biography of Hogg yet published.

Years of painstaking research went into the volume; it is likely to remain the definitive life of Hogg for years to come.

The book was reviewed for the Austin (Tex.) American-Statesman by another well-known Texan, Harry Benge Crozier, a longtime political writer for the San Antonio Express and the Dallas News, later a public officer in Texas. Mr. Crozier's review of Mr. Cotner's book is excellently done and gives a great deal of Crozier's own insight into the character and personality of the beloved Jim Hogg.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by Harry Benge Crozier which was published in the Austin-

Statesman for Sunday, June 7, 1959, entitled "Jim Hogg, man and legend—best remembered of Texas Governors through anecdote and oratory, Hogg now comes into new focus through the University of Texas historian's definitive biography of him."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Austin (Tex.) American-Statesman, June 7, 1959]

JIM HOGG, MAN AND LEGEND. BEST REMEMBERED OF TEXAS GOVERNORS THROUGH ANECDOTE AND ORATORY, HOGG NOW COMES INTO NEW FOCUS THROUGH A UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS HISTORIAN'S DEFINITIVE BIOGRAPHY OF HIM

(By Harry Benge Crozier)

About midnight on March 2, 1906, James Stephen Hogg went to bed and to sleep in the Houston home of Frank Jones, his partner in the practice of law. That evening there most assuredly had been talk of Texas, for it was the 70th anniversary of Texas' declaration of independence from Mexico. Just a little more than a decade before, Hogg had closed out the most exciting and tempestuous 4 years Texas had known from a governor since Sam Houston walked out of the office rather than go along with secession from the Union. Hogg had been the first native-born Texan and the youngest among the 20 who had held the office. Too, there must have been bold, brave talk of many things, for the titanic Texan who had suffered injury in a railroad accident a few months before was feeling better that night and they did not retire until midnight.

In the long conversation Hogg had said to Frank Jones and to Ima Hogg, his daughter:

"Let my children plant at the head of my grave a pecan tree and at my feet an old-fashioned walnut tree."

It was not in prophecy of impending death. When his daughter remonstrated he assured her that he intended to recover his health and remain alive for years.

MAN OF TOUGHNESS

And well he should, for his was a body of uncommon toughness of fiber. As a young man he had survived a rifle bullet fired into his back near the spine by a country east Texas gunman, and the rigors of farflung political campaigns had never fazed him. Too, he was not old; he lacked just 3 weeks of reaching his 55th birthday. Not many years before a hostile Texas newspaper had referred to him as:

"Finished, well-rounded, and symmetrical formed James Stephen Hogg." (Has some cigarette ad writer been peeking into old files?)

In a preceding sentence he had been called: "The completest and most perfect specimen of the demagogue ever produced."

On the morning of March 3 at 8:30 o'clock Frank Jones heard the breathing of a man in peaceful slumber in Hogg's bedroom. At 11 o'clock Miss Hogg went to wake her father. James Stephen Hogg was dead.

That was 53 years ago—almost as long as his life's span, and yet there is about his memory an odd sort of freshness not quite explicated—a sort of redolence reserved for men who charge a people with fervor that carries over to succeeding generations.

Better remembered than other Governors before and since, until now memory of Jim Hogg has not been sustained by recorded history of his life and works but by word of mouth acclaim. Before solemn conclaves and boisterous brawls dedicated men and poltroons alike have invoked the name of Jim Hogg for half a century to stir political fervor. For decades committees of the Texas House of Representatives have caucused for instant decisions at the great picture of Jim Hogg behind the Speaker's dais.

Some of the Hogg saga has been kept alive by anecdote and by quotation of explosive imagery from Hogg speeches. While Teddy Roosevelt was an unheard-of Civil Service Commissioner during Grover Cleveland's administration, Jim Hogg was effecting reforms in Texas government and thundering "By Gatlins" denunciations at the lobby.

And while Teddy was grinningly exclaiming "bully," lashing out at malefactors and putting reforms into effect nationally, Hogg in private life was declining further political preference such as a place in the U.S. Senate, but still inveighing against the corporate lobby and punctuating picturesque speech with his "By Gatlins." These two men had their likenesses and there are those who find good reason to believe that the Texan was the larger, inside and out, his greatness squeezed by the corset of limited geography.

The great drought of written word on the life and works of Hogg is over. Even now the presses are running off the pages of a definitive "Biography of James Stephen Hogg" (publication date Monday) by Robert Crawford Cotner of the history teaching staff of the University of Texas. It is a book that has been in the making 30 years or more ever since Cotner was a boy in Reagan School in Oak Cliff (Dallas) and the principal of the school was Peyton Irving, Jr., a sometime writer for the Dallas Morning News. Father of Cotner's school principal was Peyton Irving, Sr., who had been Jim Hogg's teacher in Rusk.

Schoolboy interest in Hogg mounted with the continued educational schedule of Robert Cotner at Southern Methodist, Baylor, the University of Texas, Harvard and Brown University where in 1929 he acquired an master of arts degree to go with his Baylor bachelor of arts degree. Later there were teaching stints at Henderson College in Arkansas and Stetson University in Florida.

Cotner joined the teaching force at the University of Texas in 1940. There followed a 4-year tour of wartime duty in the U.S. Navy and Cotner returned to the University of Texas in 1946—and to more dedicated research on Hogg.

FACT AND PROBABILITY

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., author of the recently published "The Coming of the New Deal" said recently that in character delineation the dramatist may introduce the element of probability but the historian (and authentic biography is history) must hold fast to fact. There is every evidence that Cotner has painstakingly stuck to the facts and as painstakingly cited authority in all material instances.

Although Hogg had never been the subject of full length treatment and only a few papers and unpublished these had been written about him. Cotner could find more than 50,000 items in the Hogg collection at the Univeresity of Texas along with sundry theses and an unpublished manuscript by the word gifted George Bailey of the Houston Post. Perhaps his greatest lift in the prodigious labors that were to follow came from the gracious and all out cooperation from Miss Ima Hogg. She not only gave assent and cooperation to the use of files but accompanied him on visits to the East Texas haunts of Hoggs' youth and among persons who had known him as a young newspaper editor, lawyer, justice of the peace and prosecuting attorney.

And there were dramatic facts to be discovered among folks who had observed a young man subjecting himself to character forming activities, maturing a code for himself while he was molding public opinion through the printed word with newspapers at Longview and Quitman before he took up the gauntlet of law enforcement. Cotner, scrounging hungrily for facts was able to nail down probabilities with spikes of truth.

Many men have wondered how it was that a young man who had served a brief but most effective tenure as district attorney became attorney general of Texas in 1887 at the age of 36. Cotner's study is revealing of that phase of Hogg's life as it is of many other little known aspects of the man. There were lawbreakers in East Texas in those turbulent after-the-war days and Jim Hogg was bad medicine for law violators. He prosecuted with zeal and relentlessness because he believed in the law as the only way to preserve a government that stood in dire need of preservation.

In those days there were political king makers in east Texas and seat of their council, where they counseled to choose favorites, was Tyler. By force of character and a certain quality of vitality and vim that charmed people Hogg won the favor of the Tyler group. It was the quality of person that was to impel his arch opponent in later years, Judge George Clark of Waco, to say:

"He had a power of dominating his followers that I have never seen excelled in any man."

LEGEND PRESERVED

Hogg came into the office of attorney general somewhat in the same fashion as another district attorney was to make the same transition and go on into the Governor's office under his own power some 35 years later. Dan Moody recalls now that his first urgings to become a candidate for attorney general in 1924 came from a meeting of farmers in Dallas after his prosecution of Ku Klux Klan terrorists had challenged statewide attention. Hogg had had the same kind of support from farmers and rural folk.

For the next rung in the ladder, however, there was a difference. For his first term Hogg had had the support of the retiring Governor Sul Ross. In the celebrated Hogg-Clark campaign, when Hogg won a second term, Ross gave support to his fellow townsman George Clark of Waco whose ingrained conservative views were more in line with those of Ross. Issues that developed during their first 2 years in office made Attorney General Dan Moody an opponent of Governor Miriam A. Ferguson for a second term and Moody won. Moody had taken over Hogg's title as the State's youngest attorney general and his victory over Mrs. Ferguson made him the youngest Governor.

The legend of Jim Hogg has been valiantly preserved in anecdotes of Paul Bunyan tenor. It is only typical that in these very weeks newspaper columnists and letters to the editors are putting ink on paper out of concern about a legendary heroic Jim Hogg (or was it a Sam Houston) bathtub that once had place in the Governor's mansion. It hasn't been long since this reviewer sat in a huge oak chair on a lakeside veranda and listened to its owner proudly describe the chair as once the prized possession of Jim Hogg. There are probably such chairs all over Texas and all pointed out in the same prideful fashion.

Ever since he returned from war service in 1946 Robert Cotner has worked hard in the search for and the compiling of the hard core facts about James Stephen Hogg. The completed work fills more than 600 printed pages and there is little that is dross within the book's covers. It is rich, red meat for reading and the Cotner history does no violence to the folk legend; nor does the legend do violence to the compilation of fact.

Not only does the book run more than 600 pages but Cotner confesses that perhaps more painful than the torture of writing was the editing process that resulted in excision of words and detail without end.

If Cotner seems at times to be needlessly in rejoinder against the charge that Hogg was a demagog, there may be good reason. Politics is a breeder of anomaly. Pol-

iticians and press alike distort, deviate, and indulge in hyperbolics. Hogg, himself was a master hyperbolist. Where could you find finer tongue-in-cheek Texanic hyperbole than this from a Hogg speech at Houston in 1898 after the Spanish-American War:

"Cuba is an island at the mouth of the Gulf of Mexico, formed by the washings of the Mississippi River. By Gatlins, it's ours anyhow."

(The quotation is from a report of William Green Sterett in the Dallas News, later recorded in Sam Acheson's illuminating biography of Joseph Weldon Bailey).

LIVER AND LIGHTS

There are many other instances of this extraordinary exercise of hyperbole as a rapier of speech and usually they were delivered ex tempore. It was employed in perhaps the most famous of all; the "liver and lights speech" delivered before national guardsmen in 1894 encampment in which Hogg was quoted:

"* * * those 14-story buildings in Chicago will be bespattered with blood, brains, hair, hides, liver, and lights, and the horrors of the French revolution will be repeated twofold."

Even then there was fear of Federal usurpation of State's right and Hogg was speaking in denunciation of President Cleveland's dispatch of Federal troops to quell the rioting incident to a railroad strike in Illinois. There were questions about the correctness of the offhand reporting of a newspaperman of an offhand speech by Governor Hogg but Hogg-hating newspapers (and that included nearly all of them) made much of what they called "boorishness" and "truculence." Newspaper derision of the Governor continued day after day. Finally Hogg arranged a public meeting in San Antonio and made answer in a carefully prepared speech, and again Hogg came out victor over a hostile press.

It may be said in review of the brief but action packed career of James S. Hogg that the newspapers in their intemperate opposition provided meat that might have prospered a Caesar. Farmers and merchants restive and feeling oppressed by excessive railroad rates could scarcely be wooed and won when the Dallas Morning News proclaimed:

"Every such measure (to create a railroad commission) points to the final conversion of government into an engine of communism."

It should be noted, perhaps, that the word "communism" did not then carry the connotation of the present Red or Russian variety of that governmental philosophy.

A person who would comment on Cotner's splendid marshalling of Hogg material is under constant inner pressure of temptation to reflect on many or all of the dramatic sequences that called for and got action from Hogg. Cotner develops them well and with commendable restraint. These things are exciting and excitingly revealed:

Hogg's perception of a coming land famine and his battle for land recoveries from the railroads;

Hogg's spurring of an $80,000 Federal sugar bounty for the State's prison farmlands;

Hogg's handling of the delicate situation brought about when the Pacific Railroad sought to leave a remnant of Coxey's army stranded in the desert near Sierra Blanca;

Hogg's crusade against and ouster of fraudulent insurance companies;

The carbarn convention and his greatest battle and greatest victory, the Hogg-Clark campaign of 1892;

Hogg's forthright denunciation of the then Governor of Arkansas, Jeff Davis, for rabble-rousing slander of Negroes before an audience at the State fair in Dallas in 1904. In the course of his answer to Davis, Hogg said:

"* * * I don't want to build up the prejudice of my children against them and let them be murderers of the black race. I don't want the young men of this country to understand that they are to make any attack upon any human being unless it is by due process of law."

Hogg's persuasion of the Reverend John H. Reagan to resign from the U.S. Senate to be chairman of the new railroad commission was high drama.

Of keen interest along with his administration of high office are the accounts of his later days in private life that was distinctly of his own choosing.

LEFT OFFICE POOR

He could have been U.S. Senator for the asking. He left the office of Governor with a bank account of $135. He made money in the private practice of law in Houston and later made a moderate fortune from land acquired at Spindletop and from other lands. That fortune was to be increased after his death from oil-rich lands he had purchased.

Newspapers and political opponents incessantly pounded Hogg with the charge of "demagog" and "radical." He was one of a company of high-minded men, Altgeld in Illinois, La Follette in Wisconsin, Theodore Roosevelt in New York, who became Governors of their States in an era when reform was due—and they by dominance of will effected reforms.

Hogg was in New York and other eastern cities negotiating with capitalists for railroad and other industrial investments in Texas when his successor, Gov. Charles Culberson, vetoed a bill authorizing a Southern Pacific Railroad consolidation on the ground that it was adverse to public interest. Hogg, with a "By Gatlins" exclamation, wrote out a telegram to Culberson:

"I would approve [the veto] if all my financial arrangements got smashed by it."

That would appear in some measure to refute the charge that after Hogg left office he ceased to care for the people's interests, but editorial flogging of Hogg had become an occupational more. The San Antonio Express commended Governor Culberson for the veto and added a gratuitous slur at Hogg calling him "a bond broker and promoter of railroad schemes."

The perennial "demagog" label and libel hurled at Hogg by his political enemies as long as he lived intrigued a young Southern Methodist University professor of history some 30 years ago. Herbert Gambrell, who later was to write an award-winning biography of "Anson Jones, Last President of Texas," did some delving in the records and came up with a lively and diverting essay: "James Stephen Hogg: Demagog or Statesman?" In the essay, published in the 1928 spring issue of the Southwest Review, Gambrell concluded that Hogg was in no degree a demagog, but a sincere and dedicated man who was never suspected of any form of bad faith or malfeasance in office.

WHAT IS EDUCATION?

In appraisal of Hogg Gambrell casts doubt on the quality of his educational and legal attainments. It is true Jim Hogg's schoolroom education was brief and he learned his law as he practiced in the courthouses and at brief writing in his office except for the short while he spent in preparation for admission to the bar. But just what comprises an education? Who has brought forward a definition that is sufficient? After calling education "training of youth" and in another paragraph "animals" Webster's New International Dictionary offers this elaboration:

"The totality of the information and qualities acquired through instruction and training which further the development of an individual physically, mentally, and morally."

Hogg won more than a fair share of his lawsuits and nearly all of the large and important ones. As a printer, country editor, prosecuting attorney, State's attorney, Governor, and businessman he displayed a tremendous thirst for knowledge and information. His pursuit of knowledge ranged far and wide in books and in travel.

In a Labor Day speech at La Porte in 1904 Jim Hogg gave expression to a thought about the mental processes of man:

"Intellect's calcium light turned onto the rugged brain walls of an unlettered man often exposes crude inscriptions of the profoundest philosophy there."

He must have thought well of his words for in one of his intimate, chatty letters to his daughter and sons who were on a visit to Massachusetts he used the identical language.

Hogg's intimate friendly relations with his own children and with other children was a marked characteristic of the man. He loved all kinds of domestic animals and was a dedicated gardener and horticulturist in his yard in Austin and on broader scale at the Varner Plantation where he closed out the latter days of his life.

WAS HOGG FAIR?

One other question demands answer. Was Hogg a fair and reasonable man?

He was rough, volcanic, and ever so ready in conflict, in the courthouse or political arena, but with the legislature as with defendants in law suits, he could reconcile differences and come to reasonable agreement.

One instance offers persuasive evidence of his reasonableness and sense of fairness. One of his first battles as attorney general was against the Southern Pacific Railroad as it was then constituted. Col. E. P. Hill was vice president and general counsel of the railroad and as such was chief negotiator with Hogg outside the courthouse and chief adversary inside the courtroom. Hogg won his battles with the Southern Pacific and won the respect and confidence of Colonel Hill; a victory that had political consequence because the Houston Post, alone among major Texas newspapers, supported Hogg for his second term against George Clark, the champion and attorney of the railroads of Texas. And that somewhat surprising support came about because the Vice President Hill of the Southern Pacific was also Vice President Hill of the Houston Post.

In preface to his work Cotner hails Hogg as a middle-of-the-roader and a leader of the vital center. There are those, both from the right and the left, who will be quick to challenge that conclusion and back up their contention with facts from Cotner's own splendid arraying of them. There is sterility in the center of things political and a vital center quickly becomes stagnant. There was nothing sterile about Jim Hogg and stagnant waters cleared instead of clabbered when he thundered.

LEADER OF PEOPLE

Thought that Hogg was a demagog won credence from some credible historians from afar such as Van Woodward of North Carolina. In the absence of handy records they depended on fragments and perhaps associated him with others of his day for there were abroad in the land then the Sockless Jerry Simpsons of Kansas, the Jeff Davises of Arkansas, and Pitchfork Ben Tillmans of South Carolina along with others of their temper.

Jim Hogg was no demagog except in the original and historical sense. The word derives from two Greek words meaning "people" and "leader" and Hogg fitted that definition. He was a leader of the people as was attested by his greatest rival, George Clark. Along with his sensing of the needs of the mo-

ment, Hogg had rare prescience about things that should be. He opposed prohibition and long, long years before even the medical profession suggested such a course, he advocated hospitalization and treatment of drunkenness. The word "alcoholism" hadn't yet found its place. Hogg was opposed to the poll tax. He persuaded the legislature to provide him a two-member board of pardon advisers and then was enabled to grant freedom to a greater number of prisoners.

Students of Texas history, yea, all people of inquiring mind wishing knowledge of this country's growth, may well be thankful to Robert C. Cotner.

All is serenity out in Austin's Oakwood Cemetery where within a neat privet bound plot are the carefully tended graves of James and Sarah Ann Hogg and their three sons William C., Mike, and Tom Hogg. The pecan trees that Jim Hogg wanted are there at the head of his grave but in that upland soil they lack the robustness of body and limb that was his. There is no walnut tree there. The only hyperbole there issues from the throats of singing birds and from the eye catching vividness of verbena, phlox, and bluebonnet, glorious in spring parade.

Federal Income Tax Yields From 1914 to 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Paul O. Peters, the foremost and highly respected statistician circulating on Capitol Hill, has recently compiled these figures with the following statement. The statement and figures tell the story of how American taxpayers have been hit. The proponents of the Federal income tax simply said, at best, this tax will only collect several million dollars. These proponents simply started the approach of little items that grow into mountains.

Here follows Paul Peters' account:

FEDERAL INCOME TAX YIELDS: SELECTED YEARS, 1914–59

With the formal adoption of the 16th amendment to the Constitution on February 25, 1913, the Government of the United States became a partner in the earnings of every individual and corporation in the United States. For the first time in our history the Congress was given the unusual "power to lay and collect taxes on incomes from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

At first the rate of the levy was very small and even as late as 1934 the top rate was 4 percent with exemptions of $2,500 for the head of a family and a credit of $400 for each dependent.

Under the strain and stresses of war and the socialistic philosophies which were induced into the American political system, the income taxes grew at an almost confiscatory rate, until in fiscal 1959 the collections amounted to nearly $59 billion.

The table following shows the yields from corporate and personal income taxes for selected years from 1914 through 1959:

Fiscal year:	*Tax yield*
1914	$71,381,275
1915	80,201,759
1916	124,937,253
1917	359,681,228
1918	2,314,006,292
1919	3,018,783,687
1920	3,944,949,288
1921	3,206,046,158
1922	2,068,128,193
1923	1,678,607,428
1924	1,842,144,418
1925	1,760,537,824
1926	1,982,040,088
1927	2,224,992,800
1928	2,173,952,557
1929	2,330,711,823
1930	2,410,986,978
1931	1,860,394,295
1932	1,057,335,853
1933	746,206,445
1934	817,961,481
1935	1,099,118,638
1936	1,426,575,434
1937	2,163,413,817
1938	2,640,284,711
1939	2,188,757,289
1940	2,125,324,635
1941	3,469,637,849
1942	7,960,464,973
1943	16,093,668,781
1944	34,654,851,852
1945	35,173,051,373
1946	30,884,796,016
1947	29,305,568,454
1948	31,170,968,403
1949	29,482,283,759
1950	28,262,671,097
1951	37,752,553,688
1952	51,346,525,736
1953	54,362,967,793
1954	53,905,570,964
1955	49,914,825,888
1956	56,632,508,140
1957	60,560,424,638
1958	59,101,874,000
1959	58,816,444,450

Sources: Annual reports, Secretary of the Treasury.

Equal Time Amendment to Federal Communications Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recall that on July 22 the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported a bill, S. 2424, to the Senate.

In essence, the measure would provide exemption of certain newscasts, including interviews, documentaries, on-the-spot coverage, and panel discussions, from the equal-time provisions of the Federal Communications Act.

As we know, this provision requires that, if a radio or TV station permits a legally qualified candidate for public office to use its broadcasting facilities, it should afford equal opportunity for all such candidates for that office.

We recall that an earlier ruling by the Federal Communications Commission raised some serious questions as to whether or not radio-TV broadcasting facilities could cover what they considered news events, without being subject to providing equal time for any and all other candidates—if a candidate for public office were covered in such newscasts.

The general objective of amending the law to clarify this situation with respect to newscasts, I believe, has merit.

Since the FCC ruling, I have received communications from a great number of persons in the broadcasting and telecasting industry, stressing that, unless legislation were enacted to modify the FCC ruling, they would face serious difficulties in attempting to provide the public with adequate reporting of significant events.

I ask unanimous consent to have a number of these communications printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL STATIONS,
Milwaukee, Wis.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We are certain you are aware of the recent fiasco in regard to section 315 of the Communications Act as it pertained to a ruling given on behalf of a Chicago mayoralty candidate.

The inadequacy of the act in regard to section 315 has long been apparent to us as broadcasters. The Chicago incident has more than brought that inadequacy to light. We know that a number of bills are being presented in Congress now to correct the situation. We petition you, on behalf of ourselves and other interested broadcasters, to do whatever you can to correct this situation.

Yours very truly,
THE JOURNAL CO.,
GEORGE COMTE,
Vice President and General Manager of Radio and Television.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: You are undoubtedly aware of the recent publicity concerning section 315 of the Communications Act, especially the provision concerning "equal opportunity" as applied to news programs. This matter was brought to the attention of the public by the FCC's decision in the Lar Daly case in Chicago. The FCC decided in this case that if a radio or television station covered a news event involving a candidate for public office, that equal time would have to be given to all of the candidate's opponents. I believe you can easily understand that this would make it practically impossible for radio or television stations in the future to report any news information or pictures of candidates for public office.

The results of this case actually regulate every news program handling a political campaign and tells broadcasters the conditions under which they can report campaign information and also the conditions under which they can report activities of candidates during political campaigns even though in some instances these activities

by the candidates might not necessarily have any connection with their running for office.

I would like to urge that you support and vote for this bill or any bill that will correct this very bad situation for the American people and for your people who may be candidates for public office in the future.

Kindest personal regards.

WKBH-WKBT,
HOWARD DAHL, *Manager.*

THE ONEIDA BROADCASTING CO.
Rhinelander, Wis.

U.S. Senator WILEY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: May I add my voice to those in the Broadcasting Television industry currently seeking relief from Section 315 of the Communications Act. It is a political broadcasting law that should have been repealed a long time ago because it is absolutely unworkable and discriminatory against our industry. It denies us equal status with the press.

Thank you for any help you can honestly give our industry in this matter. Being well acquainted with Section 315 and the Hartke Bill, I believe you can, in good conscience, support the modifications contained in said Bill.

Respectfully yours,
LEE W. ALLERTON,
General Manager.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am taking this opportunity to write you concerning the future of section 315 of the Federal Communications Act.

I strongly feel that you and we have a rather considerable stake in this matter.

In the absence of a direct repeal of the act of the law as it now reads, we will feel compelled to eliminate all political mentions from our programing. This affects a broad area of public and community service which we certainly wish to perform.

I hope you will give the repeal of section 315 your immediate personal attention in the interest of enlightened public service.

Thank you and best personal regards.

Sincerely,
Bill
WILLIAM C. GOODNOW.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Building, Washington, D.C.:

As a Wisconsin broadcaster I urgently ask that you do all in your power to repeal section 315 of the Communications Act. All radio needs relief from the impossible features of this law.

JAMES T. BUTLER,
Station Manager, WISN Radio, Milwaukee, Wis.

Chief Issue—Sound Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we get a breath of fresh air from out in the hinterland—or from faraway places such as the High Plains region.

Here is an editorial that points out some basic facts: There can be no security in a bankrupt nation.

Certainly, a 42-cent dollar points the direction we have been traveling.

In the United States—political parties are the sounding boards and listening posts—for the direction of travel. It is to be hoped the Republican Party is listening to the necessity of sound money doctrines.

[From the El Dorado (Kans.) Times]

CHIEF ISSUE—SOUND MONEY

What's the chief issue in the presidential campaign coming up next year?

Among the numerous answers, some say, "sound money."

This phrase has an old-fashioned sound in the midst of the hand springs of the brave New World, but its meaning grows more important and significant every day.

Richard W. Robbins, of Pratt, long an important business and political leader in Kansas, is one who insists that the question of sound money is now paramount for the welfare of the Nation.

Mr. Robbins, in his thinking, goes back over 50 years to the campaign of 1896 for historical precedent.

In a letter to THRUSTON B. MORTON, chairman of the Republican National Committee, he wrote: "In 1896 we elected a Republican President and a Republican Congress on one issue, namely, sound money."

This was the famous contest between William McKinley and William Jennings Bryan concerning the gold standard, with 16 to 1 silver dollar overtones.

"We have the same opportunity in 1960," Robbins told MORTON. Then he continued his argument—which, in this corner, seems an impelling one.

"Obviously inflation affects every man, woman, and child in the United States and their children and grandchildren." Robbins declared that the Democrats, now in congressional power, are reckless spenders who don't seem to care what happens to the purchasing power of the dollar. "They would lead us down the road to destruction as Germany and China were led in the 1920's," he asserted.

Robbins also told MORTON he feels Republicans are not going to get anywhere unless more is done to arouse and unite the people against the reckless spending programs by Congress, and more and more inflation.

"The problem is in your lap as Republican national chairman," Mr. Robbins said.

It's in Mr. MORTON'S lap, of course, but it lies also in the lap of every citizen who cares for orderly, sensible, and economical courses of government. The United States—richest country in the world—is allowing itself to be overcome by the present trend of overspending, of rub on the salve remedies for all economic ills, and of unwise and imprudent fiscal policies in general.

The dollar has now dropped to a value of 48 cents—which can be viewed as little less than a crime on the part of America's statesmen. It is bound to drop further if the present pace of disregard for all sensible business rules continues. Eventually the brutal payoff must come—as inevitably follows all giddy sprees.

No one issue before the public today is so vital and demanding as the one of sound money. Why politicians can't, or won't, perceive it, is an astonishing mystery.

William S. White Heralds House Members Who Fight for Labor Reform Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a thoughtful and significant column by the distinguished syndicated columnist, William S. White, was published in the Washington Evening Star and other papers for July 27, 1959.

Mr. White has paid tribute to five Members of the House of Representatives, all Democrats, who have insisted uopn passage of labor-reform legislation at this session of Congress.

These five are STEWART L. UDALL, of Arizona; CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama; EDITH GREEN, of Oregon; JAMES G. O'HARA of Michigan; and FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey.

I join William S. White in heralding their vision and steadfast position. I am particularly pleased that Mrs. EDITH S. GREEN is included in Mr. White's roster, because she is the Member of Congress from the Third Oregon District, where Mrs. Neuberger and I make our home and permanent residence. We are pleased with her attitude on this vital question, for labor reform is a must before the present session of Congress adjourns.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 27, 1959]

FIVE WHO SHUNNED PARTISANSHIP—RELATIVE UNKNOWNS ON HOUSE LABOR UNIT RESIST PRESSURE IN BACKING REFORM BILL

(By William S. White)

Five comparatively young and comparatively unknown Members of the House of Representatives, four men and a woman, have deliberately leaped from safe cabin berths to a chancy raft that bobs now in a wide and dangerous political sea.

Whether they will come to safe harbor in the next election or whether they will sink will not be the least important of all the tests provided at the polls in 1960. For what they have done is to take a great risk in defense of a principle bigger than all of them or any party. Theirs happens to be the Democratic Party. But the question they embody is not partisan, or even ideological.

They have assumed, these five people on a raft, that at the end the voters will permit politicians to act on tough national issues in the public interest, rather than only in some group interest. They have assumed that in the end Congress has an inescapable duty to perform on such issues, come what may.

These five are Representatives STEWART UDALL, of Arizona, CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama, EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, JAMES G. O'HARA of Michigan, and FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey. It was they who

through 5 weeks of bitter, cursing wrangling, of harsh competing labor union and promanagement pressures within the House Labor Committee, stood steadfast upon an unalterable position:

That the committee must bring out a labor reform bill. That it must be a bill actually doing something to curb labor abuses. That it also must be a bill that would not destroy labor. That, above all, it must be a bill—simply a bill—to prove that Congress was strong enough to legislate, not merely to talk, in an area of extreme prepresidential campaign sensitivity. It is due most of all to these five that the committee has now come through with a measure on which the House itself can act in due time. It was long touch and go as to whether the extremes within the committee would not simply paralyze it beyond any action at all.

The Labor Committee has 30 members altogether. All have in one degree or another their problems of political survival, their convictions, and their prejudices. But it was upon this small band of five that there beat the fiercest and most pitiless of all the pressures of these five weeks. And it was at their heads that the bitterest cries of "betrayer" were flung by labor spokesmen.

For these five are all liberals. Most—if not all—never would have been in Congress without labor support. In the ordinary definition, they were prolabor.

Thus against the violent oversimplification which politics produces on issues of pay and pocketbook, they had to run perils of special poignancy. They knew that the national good, the good of their own party, and the good of Congress itself as an institution of representative government required something more than the simple either-or attitudes of other partisans.

It is easy, as a labor Congressman, simply to say no, no, to each and every proposed restriction upon labor. It is easy, as a "business" Congressman to cry yes, yes, to every one. But it is not easy to draw a middle line which, in a matter such as this, pleases no pressure group on either side.

This, all the same, is where the five took their stand. They said to labor about this: We are still basically for you and not "against" you. We have no intention to destroy you. But you will not even listen to any real change of any kind, even though we know—and you really know, too—that some changes must be made. You will denounce us? Very well, if you must. But we are the people's elected representatives—including yours. We asked for the responsibility to make the laws. We are going to discharge the responsibility we asked for. We are going to do it in everybody's interest—not least, your own interest. And we are going to make the parliamentary process work.

It will be interesting to see, now, what labor does next year to this raft of the five that bobs upon so wide, so dangerous—and so lonely—a sea.

Why the Importance of Water Conservation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Miss Vaneece Osborne, of Panhandle, Tex., has been selected by the Panhandle Underground Water Conservation District No. 3 as the third-place winner for her essay on the importance of water conservation. Because of her fine performance, and that of the other two winners, other organizations and citizens will surely be encouraged to face up to this problem, and make it possible to bring, for the benefit of all mankind, the talent and intellect of these leaders of tomorrow in the solution of the water conservation problem. Under unanimous consent I insert Miss Osborne's essay in the RECORD:

WHY THE IMPORTANCE OF WATER CONSERVATION?

(By Vaneece Osborne)

The task of finding, developing, and maintaining suitable water supplies has not been limited to modern times. It has had to be faced by men everywhere and especially in semiarid and arid places all down through the centuries. In fact, the story of man's growth could be written in terms of his epic concerns with water. Even where there is an abundant supply of water in an area it must still be conserved if the inhabitants of that land are foresighted and are thoughtful of the generations to come. Even more in an area such as the high plains of west Texas there is needed much thought and careful planning to conserve the water which is stored underground to sustain life for many years.

Modern civilization imposes heavy demands on water. Merely to sustain life takes relatively little water. But even in pastoral or other simple societies, additional amounts are needed in preparing food and washing our bodies and clothes. The total daily requirement for all purposes, including drinking, in ancient villages may have averaged 3 to 5 gallons a person. Now a person uses 60 gallons or more each day for household and lawn-watering purposes in the average electrified farm or urban home in the United States.

But our technological civilization could not have been attained at a level of water consumption geared to requirements of primitive societies, even in our humid sections, where the need for irrigation crops is relatively slight. The steady rise in the consumption of water in industrially advanced countries explains why we now regard our water supplies with great concern.

The impact of new inventions and new developments and growth in population and industry has not commonly been given attention it has merited.

Many critical local water shortages, therefore, have occurred that could have been forstalled. For example, rural electrification has brought about such heavy increases in the use of water for household and production purposes that the limited well water supplies of many farms have been severely strained.

Similarly, factories have been built without prior studies to determine whether water would be available to operate the factories and to provide for the communities around them.

Towns, cities, industries, and farms have kept expanding beyond the safe limits of available water. Often makeshift efforts have been necessary to meet emergencies, especially in years of low rainfall.

Such efforts have often hastened the depletion of the limited reserves in underground reservoirs, generated disputes with other cities or industries drawing on the same sources of water, introduced conflicts with the use of water for recreation, and threatened the permanant flooding of lands valuable for farming, forestry, wilderness, or wildlife.

Still the search for more and better water goes on. Use continues to rise; advancing standards of health and comfort, the application of more intensive farming practices, and the development of new products all impose additional demands. In fact, the proportion of our total economic and recreational activity—both in rural and urban areas—that depends on handy and abundant supplies of clean, safe water is greater than ever before in history.

"Water is this semiarid region's blood of life. Without irrigation crop yields would be cut drastically and the health of the Plains' economy would be seriously impaired," says Jack Porter, reporter of the Amarillo Globe News.

Falling water tables have already increased pumping costs, and some Government water surveyors believe that by 1975 irrigation operations will reach a point of diminishing returns.

Water usage is increasing each year and and there is no appreciable amount of recharge. It has been said that water is the most vital single issue facing the plains people today. There is hardly any recharge from underground streams and little or none from natural rainfall. So every effort must be made to conserve what underground resources there are.

Whatever methods of conservation are used, there must be something done. This problem concerns each and everyone of us. It is not limited to farmers, ranchers, and industries.

We have a duty to pool our efforts if we expect to apply appropriate and durable prescriptions for our water ills. Few activities have so clearly brought out the interdependence of all individuals, communities, and regions, as have our harried concerns with this product of the heavens. How it moves over the land and whether it aids or harms us depend on its behavior during its return to sea and atmosphere.

Planning for the maximum development of our water resources for the longtime developed benefits of all our people, when properly conceived, can bind together individual and the community, farmer and urbanite, as few other conservation activities can do. Conservation has received perhaps its greatest impetus since our dealings with soil, forests, wildlife, recreation, community betterment, and industrial development have come to be viewed in terms of their interrelationships with water. More and more people have become informed and interested in all these fields because our water troubles and our attempts to resolve them on the watershed lands and in the river channels have had a direct impact upon our personal, economic, social, or recreational affairs.

Men have for ages had to settle where the water is deficient, inferior, or eratic and the fact should be established that often the causes lay in the acts or failures of men themselves. Being dependent on water for life itself, men must not underestimate its great value and not only not underestimate it but also spur themselves to action to control, conserve, and use it in the best way possible. We must remember that our actual health, vigor, and social stability depend on water.

Men, women, boys, and girls, in the communities of the plains should study, think, plan, and carry out programs to restore the attractiveness and utility of our local water courses. Water can be considered commonplace, but commonplace things are often the least appreciated and the hardest to understand. However, man can understand the simple statement, "Water is needed for life." Maybe this true statement will prod us all to action and the question, "Why the importance of water conservation?" will never need to be asked again.

The Wheat Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Grain Terminal Association Daily Radio Roundup for July 23, 1959.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP

President Eisenhower, in his press conference, says that the wheat referendum is a "sorry choice." And in that he is correct. We think wheat farmers deserve more than 75 percent of parity for wheat grown on 30 percent less than normal acreage. But that's not what the President meant when he told newsmen that the Nation needs a "decent farm bill." He declined to explain just what would be in this mythical bill. The President just hints that it is up to Congress to write a farm bill—but it has done that several times and every time it has been vetoed.

But this is really not such a big mystery, after all, when you examine the situation. If you want to know what the administration wants for farmers ask Secretary of Agriculture Benson. He makes administration farm policy. It's really Benson that we hear from the White House.

What does Benson, and consequently the administration and those who back it, want for farmers? That's no mystery, either. It's been said and resaid in the farm Secretary's speeches. It's been printed and reprinted in magazines and newspapers all over the Nation. It is this: Do away with price supports and do away with farm regulations. That's what would be in the "decent farm bill" that the President speaks about. Simple, direct, but deadly as a rifle bullet.

But is that what farmers want? They've got their own ideas about staying in business. They've held the fort year after year with wheat and cotton and rice and peanut referendums, voting to stick with marketing quotas and price supports. Congress won't buy Benson's ideas, either. It passed a wheat bill that died under the President's pen even though it would have trimmed the surplus, saved money for taxpayers, and held the income of wheat farmers steady.

So it's a deadlock, with farmers and Congress on one side and Benson and the administration on the other. As it was summed up by Senate leader LYNDON JOHNSON: "It looks like we won't be able to pass a farm bill that pleases the administration as long as Ezra Taft Benson is Secretary of Agriculture."

Well, that's a very pessimistic view because we think that soon the farm facts will have to be recognized by the administration. If Benson's huge no-control corn crop comes through this fall at 4 billion bushels plus, it's liable to open a lot of eyes to the fact that intelligent regulation and decent prices make better sense than a knock-down drag-'em-out price and production brawl that nobody wins.

And that's what the wheat referendum is all about.

We note in the newspapers that the cost of living has gone up again despite the multi-billion dollar contribution farmers have made toward controlling inflation. The Government's figures, not often repeated by the Department of Agriculture, shows that farm products at wholesale dropped almost 2 percent in the last month and they are now more than 7 percent below what they were a year ago. The prices of industrial commodities, however, rose 2 percent—so the cost of living is up.

This program is sponsored by the farm families that market their grain and buy their livestock feed—GTA, the co-op way.

The Loss of Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion of the withdrawal of gold from our reserves by foreign countries. I wish to include in my remarks an article by George E. Sokolsky on this subject, which I am sure will be of interest to the Members of the House. This article calls attention to the dangers we face if this depletion of our gold reserves is allowed to continue. The article follows:

THE LOSS OF GOLD
(By George E. Sokolsky)

The New Deal economists did not believe in a gold base for money. They fussed over the question and in a large measure had their way. President Roosevelt had the gold hoard of the country buried at Fort Knox; citizens were not permitted to have gold coins; gold certificates were removed from currency.

For a long time, however, the American dollar was the only stable currency in the world and the American dollar stood firm. Nevertheless, our gold hoard has been reduced by two processes—by export and by earmarking. We prefer to regard earmarked gold as still ours, although our relationship to it is only that of a caretaker who should relinquish it immediately when called upon. Prof. Walter E. Spahr, one of America's greatest authorities on money, gives these startling figures:

"Foreign withdrawals of Treasury gold • • • began during the week following February 19, 1958. On that date Treasury gold stood as $22,785,000,000. For the week ending December 31, 1958, the Treasury's gold was down to $20,526,000,000, a decline of $2,259,000,000 in 45 weeks. For the week ending May 13, 1959, the Treasury's stock was $20,251,000,000, down $2,534,000,000 during he 64 weeks since February 19, 1958."

Actually, earmarking his increased. According to Spahr, earmarked gold stood at $8,664,300,000 on March 31, 1959—an all-time high. One can go into considerable statistical material to indicate what has been happening to our gold. Suffice it to say along with Professor Spahr that the situation is serious. He bases such a statement on the following data:

"• • • The withdrawal of gold in 1958 amounted to 12.3 percent of total foreign short-term dollar claims at the end of that year plus gold withdrawals for the year and involved 9.9 percent of our Treasury gold stock at the end of the year plus gold withdrawals for the year.

"Thus we have 12.3 percent of claims exercised and 9.9 percent of gold stock withdrawn in 1958 as compared with an average of 3.5 percent of claims exercised and 1.3 percent of gold withdrawn during the period 1922–57."

Whereas, in this country we continue to ignore the importance of the gold standard, European countries are clearly preparing for such a restoration. They are strengthening their gold reserves and are seeking to build their own economic facilities by reinforcing the value of their currency.

The question that needs to be answered is how much gold can we afford to lose without the psychological effects setting in which could destroy the value of our currency. The value of the American dollar, as of any currency, must be premised on confidence and confidence is based on a complex of facts and assumptions, upon statistics but also upon rumors.

It is not sound statesmanship or competent banking to wait until it is imprudent to permit further export or ear-marking of gold. Obviously it is too late to wait until an embargo must be placed on gold, as that would destroy confidence in the dollar altogether.

It does not make sense to continue to permit the piling up of foreign claims against our gold, particularly as Americans in the United States are not permitted to have any. But an American in Europe or in Asia can purchase gold certificates and keep them in foreign banks.

It is significant that most earmarked gold remains in the United States which displays confidence in our stability and in our future. There has been no flight of capital in this sense. There has, however, been a steady export of American capital abroad to evade high taxes, high American labor costs and the exclusion of American goods in the areas where preference is shown to products of area manufacture, as in the Common Market, for instance.

When the United States subscribes to the International Monetary Fund or to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development or to foreign aid, it usually pays in whole or in part in gold. If goods manufactured in the United States are supplied, the payment is made in dollars.

It would not seem provident to permit claims against our gold hoard to pile up at a time when the hoard itself is being reduced. This is a case in which one agency of government is permitting itself the luxury of improvidence while another agency has to count its pennies.

Why the Importance of Water Conservation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the second annual Panhandle Underground Water Conservation District No. 3 essay contest, Miss J'Non Urbanczyk of White Deer, Tex., has been awarded the second prize of $100 for her essay on the subject of water conservation. It is most encouraging that this young lady has such a firm and intelligent appreciation of this subject and under unanimous consent I insert Miss Urbanczyk's essay in the RECORD:

WHY THE IMPORTANCE OF WATER CONSERVATION?
(By J'Non Urbanczyk)

Conservation is not only for the farmers and ranchers but for all true Americans who are interested in the welfare of their country.

Conservation should awaken our Nation to the appreciation of a God given resource, without which, life itself could not exist. With continued abuse, eventually, all living things could be reduced.

Here in our blessed land, where water is cheap and plentiful, our people have never learned to appreciate it. To learn to appreciate it would mean to want to conserve, to preserve, to guard, and to protect it.

Early history records 350 major famines, but this record was incomplete because starvation and famine was considered a common thing.

For one who lives in the United States, it is difficult to imagine that hunger and want still prevails over large areas of the world.

Soil and water are recognized as our two basic resources. Conservation of the water and wise use of the soil is the key to keeping our land productive, our people healthy, and our Nation strong.

Modern life requires more water than was ever used before in the history of mankind. Not only because of increase in production but because of our high standard of living, uses of water have been greatly multiplied. Water for homes, farms, factories, transportation, recreation, and generation of electric power are but a few of the uses. It is a known fact, from recent scientific experiments, that plants can be grown without soil but not without water.

It is the responsibility of every human to protect and guard the waters of the Nation, not just to treat it with chemicals in order to purify it, but to avoid waste and contamination of his resource. Little needs to be said for the domestic needs of water, as we are all made aware of these, but much is to be said about water pollution and waste. Water pollution is a problem of modern life. In early days, streams and lakes were sparkling clean, but today with the growth of cities and development of agriculture and industry, bodies of water have become dumps for dirt, filth, and the by-products of labor. Water pollution means adding to water, substances that cannot be eliminated through the processes of nature. There are three types of water pollution: domestic, agricultural, and industrial. Domestic pollution comes from dumping garbage and sewage into bodies of water. Since man canont live by bread alone, it is essential to have a pure supply of water for drinking, cooking, bathing, washing, and recreation. Cities and towns, located along water routes must seek ways to control their people from making dumps and sewers out of rivers and streams.

Agriculture pollution is caused by soil erosion. Irrigation has brought millions of acres of land into agricultural use where rainfall is light. Our natural resources have ben moving toward depletion at varying rates of speed. The depth and fertility of our topsoil is rapidly being reduced. In areas where water supply is normally low, overuse of water has resulted in lowering the water tables. Water conservation and soil conservation go hand in hand. Every step toward the control of water is a step toward conserving of the soil. Conservation of water plus soil is the answer to the eternal struggle for daily bread. Researchers must continue to find the causes of water and soil losses and to teach wise farming practices. Conservation of water and laud is the most imoprtant problem facing American agriculture today.

Industrial pollution, which is the most difficult to control, means the pouring into streams, waste from manufacturing and processing. Factory wastes contain salt of metals. These destroy plant life on which fish are dependent. It, therefore, destroys fish, is not good for human consumption, and is unfit for recreation. Man cannot make over nature but can try to correct his misuse of nature.

Pollution is one type of waste and loss of water another. Control of rainfall is beyond man's power, but there are ways to capture it and thereby reduce floods and runoff waste.

Floods can be brought under control to a large extent, but it takes huge sums of money and much time. Flood waters pour through valleys, cities, and towns, and destroy lives and property. The place to control it is where the raindrop falls. To halt it there, means great value to the land and a stop to water destruction.

It is written that 1,500 cubic miles of water falls on our country every year, an amount that would cover the entire country 2½ feet deep. This falls over a period of 12 months and is not evenly distributed. Since no water is ever lost or destroyed, it is imperative, that we all study this problem, to learn what happens to this water, and to learn to conserve this essential commodity. What is not absorbed by the soil, or evaporated back into the sky, moves downward to streams and rivers and back into the ocean. Many things, such as grass, leaves, roots, terraces, plowed fields, ponds, dams, lakes, and swamps help to capture or hold the water for growing plants and animals. They also help reduce soil erosion, floods, and drought. All this calls for study, research, official care, and supervision.

We must educate the people of the importance in the wise use of this precious resource. Since we are here today and gone tomorrow, why bother? Man's desire to solve the unknown and to guard our resources for unborn generations provide us with a reason. In those of us who are aware of this, and to the youth who inherit this problem of preserving and conserving the water, lies the future of water conservation.

Remarks to the National Strategy Seminar, the National War College, by Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, July 24, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered to the National Strategy Seminar for Reserve Officers at the National War College on July 24, 1959, by Mr. Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence Agency. I believe this address deserves the attention of the membership and I commend it to them:

REMARKS TO THE NATIONAL STRATEGY SEMINAR, THE NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE, BY ALLEN W. DULLES, DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE, JULY 24, 1959

I appreciate the opportunity to make the concluding remarks to the National Strategy Seminar for Reserve Officers. From the reports I have had of your meetings, and my intelligence on this is good, I realize that you have broadly covered the various elements of Soviet strategy and tactics, the nature of the Communist threat, the relative military strength of East and West, and the face of war in the nuclear age.

In dealing with analyses of the Soviet threat I find that there is often a tendency to go to extremes. There are experts in this field who tend to magnify all aspects of Soviet power and become prophets of gloom. Others tend to discount Soviet accomplishments and unduly magnify their internal difficulties. This could add up to an unhealthy complacency.

The first class of experts is the larger, though recently we have seen the other extreme in some magazine articles which have attempted to discredit, on what appears to me to be the flimsiest evidence, recognized Soviet accomplishments, particularly in the field of outer space.

Certainly it is more dangerous to underrate than to overrate, though the latter can well be expensive in terms of our budget.

In these estimates of where we stand in relation to the Soviet, one of the crucial areas where some tend to underrate the Soviets is in the assessments of the relative economic output of the two great power blocs.

True, the gross national product of the United States alone is over twice that of the U.S.S.R. If we add to U.S. production that of other countries of the free world, while adding to Soviet production that of Communist China and the Soviet satellites, the ratio is still more favorable to us.

But as against this we must recognize that the rate of growth of the Communist bloc is substantially greater than that of the free world, and will probably remain so for some time.

Even more important is the extent to which Soviet present production and investment are keyed directly and indirectly to their military power. In fact, Soviet military outlays are now about equal to ours in terms of what they would cost us. Similarly, their annual investment in industry—vital to military power as well as economic growth—is now equal to that of the United States. To achieve all this from their lower economic base, they have to devote about twice the proportion of their gross national product to military purposes as we do.

Of course, to achieve such goals within their much smaller economy, they are forced to curtail consumers' goods. But by emphasizing guns instead of butter, they have greatly reduced the significance, in the terms of the power struggle of the still great gap between their overall economic strength and ours.

Naturally, Khrushchev would like to have his people believe that the U.S.S.R. has already achieved a state of military parity, if not superiority. While it is not the role of intelligence to attempt detailed net estimates of our relative military position vis-a-vis the bloc, we have good evidence on which to reject any such conclusion.

Furthermore, the theory that either of the great nuclear powers could destroy the other, without the attacker himself being devastated, is not, I believe, subscribed to on either side of the Iron Curtain. The threat of mutual nuclear destruction is a nightmare that cannot be dismissed, but even though international communism expects to gain the world, it does not wish to acquire a world in ashes.

From Soviet statements as well as from other evidence available to us, it seems clear that the U.S.S.R. is placing more and more reliance on the development of ballistic missiles as its chief instrument of strategic nuclear attack. But the Soviets are not immune to the many difficulties inherent in developing new and untried hardware into reliable weapons systems.

Meanwhile Khrushchev and his military aides have done their best to deprecate the manned bomber, both to their own people and abroad. In fact he has called them museum pieces. This may be, in part, to quiet the fears of their people and to bolster their assertions of superiority in one key military field.

Last May, Khrushchev told a delegation of West German Social Democratic editors that, though the NATO countries really possessed a large air force, it was, he said, techni-

cally outdated and it could be shot down by ordinary antiaircraft artillery, and even by ordinary fighters.

"Why, then," said Khrushchev, "do the Western military leaders base themselves on bomber aviation and talk a lot about it? Because their rocket technology is still weak. * * * Therefore it appears that talk about a large number of bombers is being indulged in for purposes of deceit."

From Khrushchev's viewpoint this is undoubtedly good propaganda if he can make it stick, since the U.S.S.R. today is in a position of inferiority vis-a-vis the United States with regard to manned bombers. The tremendous effort which we see the Soviets putting into advanced radar, ground-to-air missiles, and other defenses against aircraft would seem to belie the deprecatory statements of Khrushchev about them.

Obviously both our military defenses and our ability to retaliate by missile and aircraft should together be kept adequate to meet the threat. Here is where the superior industrial capacity of the free world and of the United States in particular can and must play its role.

In the past when a technical, scientific, or industrial problem, such as that we face today in the missile field, has been put up to the ingenuity of our scientists and production experts, we have not long remained in second place. It is certainly incumbent upon us to see to it that we do not fail in this instance.

If we do keep up our military defenses, the most immediate threat to us for the years immediately ahead is not likely to be physical destruction by all-out nuclear war. The danger is rather the slow attrition of the power position of the free world by a combination of political warfare, and economic penetration and subversion.

Despite occasional missile rattling, as at the time of Suez, during the Middle Eastern crisis last year, and more recently in talks with Mr. Harriman and others, we do not estimate that it is the Kremlin's present intention to advance communism by deliberately provoking war.

We cannot entirely discount the risk, however, that the Soviets might miscalculate Western strength or the firmness of our intentions, and adopt positions from which it would be hard for them to find an acceptable line of retreat. The Soviets have miscalculated before, as in the 1948 Berlin blockade and in Korea. We can hope that Khrushchev, after having castigated Stalin for adventurism in the famous speech of February 1956, will not fall prey to the same temptation at Berlin or elsewhere. Aggression by proxy against the newly emerging and less developed countries may be a tempting but it obviously is a dangerous course.

The basic strategy of international communism, with its primary emphasis on measures short of war, has remained remarkably unchanged over the years. So, too, have its objectives.

These were never more bluntly stated than in Khrushchev's ebullient speeches in Poland these last days.

Obviously referring to the phrase attributed to him, "We will bury you," he explained that when he said that communism would be the graveyard of capitalism, he did not mean that Communists would take shovels and start digging: "history," he said, "would take care of capitalists." They, too, he suggested, would become museum pieces, and added that "if there were a God and he could act, he would take a good broom and sweep you out."

Certainly Khrushchev pictures himself as devoted to the task of helping in this burying and sweeping.

The "we will bury you" theme has been the fanatical tenet and credo of communism, sophisticatedly preached by Lenin, brazenly carried out by Stalin, and more subtly practiced by Khrushchev.

If Soviet policy were restricted to building a better Russia for the Russians, we could not object. To the Kremlin leaders, however, the U.S.S.R. is merely the base from which communism is to be expanded to cover the world.

As we are entering a period of greatly increased personal intercourse between the two power blocs, with exhibitions, tourism, cultural exchanges, and the like, it is important not to lose sight of the fundamental nature of this conflict.

This is too often overlooked by the casual visitor to the Soviet Union. To a considerable degree the Kremlin's international objectives are not well understood or necessarily shared even by the Soviet people themselves with whom our tourists and exchange missions come in contact, and with whom as individuals the American people have so much in common.

We should remember that the Soviet Union is a dictatorship, run by the high command of the Communist Party, that the party itself numbers only about 8 million—about 5 percent of the adult population of the Soviet Union and only about 13 percent of the number of actual voters in our own last presidential election.

Furthermore, these 8 million party members have no real freedom even in choosing their local party leaders much less the leaders in the presidium. It is these latter who determine the policies on which the fate of the Soviet people depend, including the policy of the secretly subsidized export of communism on a worldwide basis.

This policy is an insidious interference in the internal affairs of free countries. If the Communist program were advanced in the international field by open and peaceful means as a form of competition between two great conflicting views of how society and the lives of people should be organized, we could well accept this challenge. Let us compete, let the peoples choose and decide which system is the better. Khrushchev claims he is inviting us to such a competition.

But this is a mirage.

Where behind the Iron Curtain have the peoples themselves had a free opportunity to choose? Certainly not in Czechoslovakia in 1948, or in Hungary in 1956, or in East Germany today. And where in the free world would Khrushchev give this choice, if our liberties had once been taken away? And if Khrushchev wants an open competition why does he shield the Soviet people from a full exchange of ideas, of information, and of persons? Why the almost pathological concern to hide things from us and from his own people also?

The answer is that communism, despite its brazen ideological pronouncements, cannot tolerate free competition. Nowhere has a nation fallen under Communist domination and then been allowed to test its choice by resort to free elections.

Instead, peoples are faced with the fait accompli of being taken over before they realize what has happened. In Hungary this was helped on in the immediate postwar days by what I understand has been vividly described to you as the Rakosi "salami" technique—biting off, bit by bit, elements of freedom until the whole structure was eroded.

In Czechoslovakia the popular front technique succeeded in putting a minority party into power. This illustrates the grave danger of a situation in any state where the Communist Party and its allies succeed in gaining even a substantial minority position. Once in power, the voting ends and popular say has no peaceful way of recovering control. In the case of Czechoslovakia the danger point was reached when the Communists gained less than 40 percent of the electorate, with the non-Communist parties, as is so often the case, hopelessly divided.

Today the Communists, with their progress blocked in Western Europe and to a great extent in the Far East, are concentrating a major effort in the newly emergent states of Asia and of Africa. Here they exploit political weaknesses as well as dynamic nationalism and the surge of rising expectations which are not easy to satisfy.

Their weapons include economic penetration, the development of hard-core Communist Parties—underground or above ground—propaganda both open and black, and in the areas around the periphery of the Communist bloc itself, they maintain the overhanging threat of their military power.

Yet there is no reason to adopt an attitude of pessimism as we face this particular challenge of international communism.

We are far better prepared than is generally believed, to deal with the Communist political and subversive threat.

In the last 10 years, after going through far too long a period of naive complacency, this country has been awakened to the danger. We have also learned to understand Communist operating techniques. We know about the orders given in Moscow to leaders of other Communist Parties. This is not too difficult. The security of these parties as they operate in the free world varies from medium to poor. We have ways of covering their activities and we get the basic information we need to gage their strength and tactics. Like too many of the rest of us, they talk too freely for their own good.

Furthermore, the efficiency of the Communist organization in the less developed areas of the world is itself not well developed. In the post-war days they had in many European countries, as in France and Italy, for example, sophisticated old-line Communists of the Thorez-Togliatti school. Throuh death and old age this type of leadership is wearing out in Europe, and it will be a long while, if ever, before such leadership could be developed for Asia, Africa, or Latin America.

In area after area Moscow and Peiping, and their covert spokesmen in their far-flung apparatus, have overreached themselves. Their true hand has been shown in Hungary, Tibet, Egypt, and in many other countries that could be mentioned. It may be that in their overeagerness to promote a Communist-dominated Iraq the Communists have overplayed their hand with the new Iraqui leaders and damaged their position in the Arab world.

Here is an interesting sidelight on Tibet: The agreement of May 23, 1951, between the Peiping government and the local government of Tibet provided that the Chinese Communist army units entering Tibet should not "arbitrarily take a single needle or thread from the people." Eight years later they took the lives of many Tibetans, the liberty of all.

The Communists are fond of saying that the forces of history are on their side. One of the great forces at work today is that of nationalism, particularly in the newly emerging countries of the world. However, not the Communists, with their goal of domination, but the West, with its ingrained respect for self-determination, is coming more and more to be recognized as the ally of the new Afro-Asian nationalism. As anticolonial feeling subsides in the new states, it is being replaced by growing realization that Sino-Soviet expanionism is a far greater threat to their cherished independence.

Soviet economic aid is beginning to run into the same type of problems we face in our own aid programs, including too many Soviet experts and technicians and here and there shoddy goods. Also, the political petticoats of the programs have shown up badly in several instances, notably in Yugoslavia,

where aid was promptly terminated and half-built projects left to the weather, when Yugoslav policy no longer pleased the Soviet.

Here, as in certain other instances, the so-called "aid without strings" has been shown up as "strings without aid."

It is significant that little or no publicity is allowed to reach the Russian people themselves about the Kremlin's loans and aid to foreign countries. This leads one to believe that this use of their assets would not go down well with people who are themselves denied so many of the good things of life.

When things don't go as the Soviets want, they tend to lose their temper in public, as most recently in the cancellation of Khrushchev's Scandinavian trip and in the Chinese Communists' retort to India over Tibet.

Many of the states in Europe, Asia, Africa, and even in parts of this hemisphere, which have tended toward neutralism have markedly changed in their attitude about communism over the last few years. Their former complacent approach to the danger is being replaced by a far greater degree of sophistication. Here some of the initial appeal of communism is wearing off. The uninitiated are becoming initiated.

Finally, there are signs of change within the Soviet Union itself which over the years might bring about some relaxation of the aggressive expansionist policy of the international Communist movement.

The rigid police state of the days of Stalin has been relaxed. Education is being pressed and while special emphasis is being placed on education in scientific, technical, and engineering fields, which would add to their industrial and military strength, there is nevertheless, a general broadening of the educational base in the Soviet Union.

While the Soviet Government is still a closely regulated autocracy, it is not today quite as free as under Stalin to disregard wholly the desire of the people among which the yearning for peace is foremost. As long as the Soviet people are only permitted to hear, to read and to learn what the Soviet Government dictates, progress will be slow. But as long as there is some progress there is hope of gradual evolution. Increasing contact between the American and Russian peoples should contribute to this end.

I would not leave the impression, in concluding, that this listing of favorable trends should in any sense cause us to relax our sense of urgency in taking measures to counter Soviet political, economic and subversive penetration in the free world.

Quite the contrary, the moment a tide shows signs of slacking, then is the opportunity to drop holding operations and press the advantage. Since I appreciate there are many "doubting Thomases" on this score, I can assure you that we are better prepared and better coordinated to deal with this challenge, and are dealing with it more effectively, than many of you realize.

But too much talking about plans and practices would only alert the challenger to our counter measures. Hence silence in face of criticism is better than any bragging about past accomplishment, or programs for the future.

One of the key purposes of this Reserve officer seminar has been to alert a highly selected group to the nature and implications of the challenge which we face from international communism. I would like to give my fullest endorsement both to the objective of the seminar and to the manner in which it has been carried out. But the job does not end here tonight. Each of you in turn can help to give the thinking citizens of your communities the benefit of your own impressions. In a free society like ours an informed public opinion is indispensable to give the backing to those men and to those measures that are needed to meet Khrushchev's challenge to us.

Tribute to Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Leibowitz Blasts Prisons in United States, Sails Soon To Visit South America," written by Alfred C. Roller, and printed in the New York World Telegram and Sun of July 3, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, July 3, 1959]

LEIBOWITZ BLASTS PRISONS IN UNITED STATES, SAILS SOON TO VISIT SOUTH AMERICA'S—JUDGE, WIFE LEAVE FRIDAY FOR 6 WEEKS

(By Alfred C. Roller)

The United States must overhaul its antiquated penal system or give up the war against crime, an outspoken jurist charged today.

This criticism of the prison system came from Kings County Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz. He said that 6 out of every 10 discharged convicts commit new crimes—many more vicious than their earlier offenses.

"We can anticipate," the judge explained, "that of the 175,000 prisoners in our prisons today, 115,000 will return."

The 65-year-old jurist, who has sentenced some 10,000 felons during his 19 years on the bench, lashed out at the prisons.

SYSTEM A FAILURE

"In our country we keep a prisoner caged like a wild animal. When we think he's served his time we give him a $10 bill, some prison-made clothes, and tell him not to get into trouble. But prisons do nothing to help the convict. Our rehabilitation system has been an abject failure. Our prisons are stewpots where the good is destroyed and the bad nurtured and developed."

The judge added, "We must change our prison system or abdicate to the unrelenting war we are waging against crime."

He said one of the biggest frustrations of a judge is that he must sentence at least 500 criminals every year and yet know in his heart that there is very little that he can do for the pitiful creatures.

"They are twisted and need rehabilitation, but I know they won't get it in prison. It is just a waste of time, of effort, and of money."

TO LEAVE ON TOUR

The judge said the United States could take a lesson from some of the "backward" countries of Europe and South America who treat their convicts in an enlightened manner.

To gather further information on penal system in other countries, Judge Leibowitz is taking a busman's holiday in South America. He and his wife, Belle, are leaving Friday, July 10, for a 6-week tour of Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Paraguay, among other countries.

"Isn't is a strange story that an American from the Empire State should have to go to these countries to learn modern penology," he asked. "It's as if General Motors or Ford sent technicians to darkest Africa to learn the latest ideas of automotive engineering."

"NOT CAGED RATS"

As an example of enlightened penology, Judge Leibowitz mentioned the Penitenciaria Nacional in Buenos Aires which he visited several years ago.

"Outside it looks like a bastille," the judge stated, "but inside it is comfortable, efficiently managed and makes the prisoners feel like they are living people, not caged rats. Why, the prison even has a swimming pool."

Judge Leibowitz said that probably the most important step taken by the Argentine prisons is to teach the criminal a useful trade. He said that he visted modern shops in which the prisoners were learning up to 40 trades.

Another practice followed by both the Argentine prisons and many in Europe is to allow the prisoners a private visit from their wives, the judge said. This helps to boost a prisoner's morale and breaks the prison tensions, he added.

The judge said that the main curse of our penal system is idleness. "Most prisoners loaf away their time," he continued, "because no real work is there to be done or useful skills to be taught. Better than half of the inmates are either idle or engaged in slowmotion boondoggling. In time, metal processes deteriorate and soon the dry rot of prison routine takes its toll."

The antiquated machinery and poorly maintained shops found in prison also came under the judge's attack.

Big Steel Hypocrisy a National Scandal: Controls Prices, Soars Profits, but Would Suppress Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the August 3 U.S. News & World Report has a special report titled "A Boom on in Profits." The subtitle says:

Profits now are surging upward for U.S. corporations in practically every line of business.

For many companies, second-quarter earnings are setting new highs. Among the leaders: steel, autos, chemicals, building materials. Railroads, too, are gaining.

All signs point to the best profits year in history.

The article shows that second-quarter earnings, after taxes, of 395 large corporations have gone up in 1959 by 74.9 percent over 1958 earnings.

It is interesting to see what is happening to the profits of the big steel corporations who have forced unions to strike in order that workers may enjoy even a small share of the prosperity the steel industry enjoys. The second quarterly report shows Jones and Laughlin steel profits up 556.1 percent, Inland steel 100.6 percent, Colorado Fuel & Iron 651.1 percent, and Allegheny Ludlum up 1,110.4 percent.

In another report the U.S. News headlines "Living Cost Up Again, to an All-Time Peak."

Is it not strange that the steel companies should be striving, in the current negotiations with the steel unions, to eliminate the cost-of-living escalator clause in their contract in an attempt to prevent the workers from even maintain-

ing their standard of living while the corporations' profits soar?

In still another article, and despite the soaring profits of Big Steel, the U.S. News predicts another $2 increase in the price of steel when the strike is over.

Let us have done with any pretense that this is a free and competitive economy when it is evident that the major segments of our economy are, like steel, governed by administered prices where price levels are set by a few big corporations at whatever price will yield the greatest profits. In view of the sky-high profits the steel companies have been rolling in, it is evident that the only reason they are considering another raise in the price of steel is so that they can increase their take again while they holler about the inflationary effect of any labor settlement.

The complete table follows:

As corporate earnings move higher

[From U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 3, 1959]

Earnings after taxes	Latest quarterly reports		Change	
	2d quarter, 1958	2d quarter, 1959		
				Percent
Ford Motor Co	[1] −$13,700,000	$151,100,000		
Chrysler	[1] −10,100,000	42,800,000		
American Motors	7,284,000	16,084,000	Up	121.7
Studebaker-Packard	[1] −7,020,000	4,318,000		
General Tire & Rubber	1,357,000	7,895,000	Up	481.8
B. F. Goodrich	8,017,000	9,288,000	Up	15.9
Union Carbide	27,069,000	48,861,000	Up	80.5
Monsanto Chemical	9,134,000	17,991,000	Up	97.0
Jones & Laughlin Steel	4,034,000	26,468,000	Up	556.1
Inland Steel	12,119,000	24,313,000	Up	100.6
Colorado Fuel & Iron	1,063,000	7,984,000	Up	651.1
Allegheny Ludlum	646,000	7,819,000	Up	1,110.4
Johns-Manville	6,509,000	10,274,000	Up	57.8
National Gypsum	3,700,000	7,870,000	Up	112.7
Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing	6,304,000	8,938,000	Up	41.8
Clark Equipment	1,651,000	4,319,000	Up	161.6
Worthington Corp	2,054,000	1,906,000	Down	7.2
General Foods	12,754,000	14,722,000	Up	15.4
United Fruit	10,074,000	5,983,000	Down	40.6
Wrigley	2,065,000	2,583,000	Down	3.1
R. J. Reynolds Tobacco	19,349,000	22,786,000	Up	17.8
Liggett & Myers Tobacco	7,825,000	8,018,000	Up	2.5
Continental Can	9,896,000	13,221,000	Up	34.0
American Radiator & Standard Sanitary	2,294,000	3,870,000	Up	68.7
Gillette	6,537,000	7,279,000	Up	11.4
General Electric Co	54,197,000	64,461,000	Up	18.9
Radio Corp. of America	4,540,000	6,500,000	Up	43.2
Avco Corp	3,413,000	2,853,000	Down	16.4
Great Atlantic & Pacific	13,274,000	14,638,000	Up	10.3
Kroger	5,281,000	6,075,000	Up	15.0
Safeway	7,738,000	8,269,000	Up	6.9
Corning Glass	3,444,000	6,009,000	Up	74.5
Kennecott Copper	11,307,000	25,364,000	Up	124.3
Ideal Cement	4,796,000	5,787,000	Up	20.7
Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass	2,157,000	15,942,000	Up	639.1
St. Regis Paper	4,406,000	7,904,000	Up	79.4
Consolidated Paper	3,783,000	3,606,000	Down	4.7
Scott Paper	5,513,000	6,027,000	Up	8.7
American Airlines	4,541,000	5,268,000	Up	16.0
North American Aviation	5,342,000	8,701,000	Up	62.9
Douglas Aircraft	4,049,000	[1] −10,802,000		
Carter Products	1,644,000	2,645,000	Up	60.9
Parke, Davis	6,265,000	6,835,000	Up	9.1
Norwich Pharmacal	905,000	997,000	Up	10.2
Smith, Kline & French	5,128,000	6,796,000	Up	32.5
International Business Machines	27,202,000	35,066,000	Up	28.9
Colgate-Palmolive	3,935,000	6,079,000	Up	54.5
Shell Oil	23,372,000	34,720,000	Up	48.6
American Viscose	[1] 284,000	4,140,000		
American Telephone & Telegraph	226,822,000	281,252,000	Up	24.0
Great Northern RR	4,394,000	7,084,000	Up	61.2
Chicago & North Western Ry	[1] 72,000	2,331,000	Up	3,137.5
Pennsylvania RR	[1] 10,453,000	12,613,000		
New York Central RR	7,984,000	9,955,000		

[1] Loss.
Basic data: Standard & Poor's Corp.

An Invisible Line That Protects America: The Atlantic Barrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House one of the lesser known, but vitally important defensive roles undertaken by the U.S. Navy. The Atlantic barrier is one of the more expensive current operations undertaken by the Defense Establishment, but, after witnessing the work of the dedicated young men who make the barrier a reality rather than an invisible line across the Atlantic and Pacific, I feel that the expense to date has been worthwhile. Both the Atlantic and Pacific barrier operations are an extension of the defense early warning — DEW line — system across northern Canada. They were inaugurated to prevent an end run by enemy bombers wishing to penetrate to our shores. In a real sense of the word, they were inaugurated to prevent a repeat of the tragedy of Pearl Harbor.

By invitation of the Navy I was recently able to witness a part of this operation, based at the Argentia Naval Station, Newfoundland. I came away impressed by several very important things I saw. The men who are stationed at Argentia regularly or who fly from there on a periodic basis, are dedicated to the protection of the United States. They are operating consistently and effectively under conditions which are hard for those of us in this country to imagine and which can be best described as comparable to the rigors of actual combat. The morale of these men, despite the tedious nature of their work, the isolation of their base and the dangers of their occupation, is extremely high. Most important, they have provided an effective barrier across which no enemy bomber fleet could penetrate without being observed and their course and number tabulated.

Here is how the system operates:

From the tip of Newfoundland to the Azores, and from the Aleutians to Midway and Hawaii, the navy has stationed at intervals radar picket ships to detect the approach of all aircraft to our shores. But due to the nature of radar waves, these ships cannot keep a complete radar watch and their efforts must be supplemented by those of aircraft flying from our bases on a constant, 24-hour air watch. It is the duty of these planes to maintain a vigilant lookout for low-flying aircraft.

From Argentia Naval Station a plane carrying highly effective radar gear is launched once every 3 hours. These planes make a 2,297-mile round trip to the Azores, each in the air from 12 to 13 hours. In good weather this would not be much of a chore; but there is no good weather at Argentia. In fact, there is probably no place on the globe where we have men stationed that the weather is so consistently bad.

Pilot after pilot, crewmember after crewmember, calmly told me of take-offs in weather which not only would find commercial aircraft grounded, but would find very few souls hardy enough to brace the elements. It was not uncommon last winter for planes to take off in winds ranging up to 80 knots—90 miles per hour—or higher with snow so thick the plane's wingtip tanks could not be seen, and with ice on the runways.

Fog is normal. Almost all of the flights that took off while I was at Argentia did so in thick fog or rain. The winds are constant and extremely variable.

Conditions on the Picket ships are not much better. These small destroyer escort craft toss and pitch in some of the most rugged weather to be found in the Northern Hemisphere. They are at sea for 25 days at a time and the crews get a really rough workout during that time.

However, Mr. Speaker, I found the men from Adm. W. I. Martin down to be skilled, effective, and efficient, and dedicated to their work.

Admiral Martin, in the briefing, made one point very clear: There is a real need at Argentia for more adequate housing and recreational facilities for the officers and men. Housing condi-

tions off the base are primitive and extremely costly. Because of the bad weather conditions during much of the year outside recreation is impossible.

It is my feeling that as long as the United States expects young men to live in the kind of isolation and under the conditions that prevail at Argentia, we as a Congress must accept responsibility to provide adequately for their basic needs.

As long as the threat of manned enemy bombers, which up to now has been the major threat to the United States exists, we must maintain the barriers across the Atlantic and Pacific. When that threat is replaced by a greater emphasis on missiles, whether land-based or submarine-launched, the need for this particular operation will decline. However, the threat of submarine warfare is so great, I have the impression that an operation similar to this one must be continued to detect the presence and course of enemy submarines which might be approaching our shores.

Argentia is a permanent base; it should be treated as one. There are also special problems of isolation and weather at Argentia which should be taken into consideration by the Congress in developing future plans for this area.

More Military Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, public reaction to waste in our Military Establishments is well reflected in this editorial from the Milwaukee Journal:

MORE MILITARY WASTE

The high-priority, 300-bed hospital that the Air Force finished and fully equipped last year near Evreux, France, at a cost of $5,708,500 stands empty and unneeded. And an Air Force spokesman admits that there are no firm plans for the military to make use of it, ever.

Of course, the Air Force planners and budget makers never revealed their blunder. When probabilities that the hospital would be needed at Evreux began to fade, nobody said, "Let's stop this thing quick, right here, so no more money will be wasted."

That's not the usual military way. Once a multi-million-dollar military project gets congressional approval and a little money to make a start, there seems to be no way to apply the brakes. The military can always conjure up some excuse to push the job to completion. How well we in Wisconsin, who have watched the Bong Air Base project, in Kenosha and Racine Counties, from the beginning know that.

Representative LAIRD, Republican, of Wisconsin, stumbled onto the ghost hospital of Evreux, in France. Otherwise the American public might never have known about it. Representative LAIRD and some other members of the House Appropriations Committee have been doing what they could to curb military waste and extravagance (sometimes in apparent deliberate violation of congressional intent) wherever it can be detected. Revelations of the way tax money has been wasted and overspent on the new Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs are enough to raise any taxpayer's temper to the boiling point.

Punctilious as the military is supposed to be, an Air Force Undersecretary couldn't explain to the Appropriations Committee a mixup about double expenditures for drapes at the Academy. This was a minor item—$4,500—but all he could say was that "strange things happen which are disconcerting."

They certainly are. And the attitude that so often permits these things to happen is most disconcerting. For top men in the Pentagon, so prepossessed with keeping the Nation militarily strong in the cold war, appear almost blind to the necessity for keeping the Nation economically strong, too. They do not seem to understand the danger of wrecking the country financially by extravagance and sheer waste.

Proper Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Sam H. Jones, former Governor of Louisiana, on July 6, 1959, presented before the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations what I feel is an unusually fine statement in support of a Proper Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations. Since the former Governor has been working on this matter as a member of the Federal Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and has served as chairman of various local government committees, I believe his views are entitled to great consideration. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his statement, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SAM H. JONES, FORMER GOVERNOR OF LOUISIANA, TO INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

My name is Sam H. Jones. I am a practicing attorney of Lake Charles, La., and, by way of identification and qualification, I submit the following:

I served as Governor of Louisiana from 1940 to 1944. Prior to my tenure as Governor I served 14 years in various capacities in municipal, parish (county) and district governments. I was a member of the Federal Commission on Intergovernmental Relations from 1953 to 1955 and served as chairman of the Local Governments Committee.

I favor the legislation embraced in H.R. 6904 by Mr. FOUNTAIN, H.R. 6905 by Mrs. DWYER, and S. 2026 by Mr. MUSKIE, et al, with one modification.

The basic and fundamental reason why I favor this legislation is the language of the last sentence in the letter of transmittal by Chairman Meyer Kestnbaum of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to the President on June 20, 1955, wherein he said:

"We are hopeful that this report will be regarded as the beginning rather than the end of a contemporary study of the subject of intergovernmental relations, and that it will stimulate all the levels of government to examine their respective responsibilities in a properly balanced federal system."

Then, too, I agree with Chairman FOUNTAIN when, speaking before the House of Representatives on May 6 on the subject of the "Proposed Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations" he said:

"Building on the foundation laid by the Kestnbaum Commission studies and the work of our subcommittee, I believe it is desirable that we now concentrate on the practical and continuing problem of seeking to improve the operation of our Federal system."

And with his observation that "the most important function of the Commission * * * would be that of bringing together Federal, State, and local officials on a continuing basis for discussion of the problems which concern and affect all levels of government," and that "the Commission would provide a favorable atmosphere for promoting mutual understanding and would help to produce a smoother functioning of our Federal system."

These statements are in agreement with the recommendation of the Kestnbaum Commission that "an Advisory Board on Intergovernmental Relations" should be appointed by the President, and that "provision should be made for a permanent center for overall attention to the problem of interlevel relationships."

Very few people, outside the small circle of professional political scientists, realize how grossly Americans have neglected the study of the functioning of their Federal governmental system. It is well to remember that the 1953–55 study by the Kestnbaum Commission constituted the first official study in 164 years—or from 1789 to 1953. In the light of this fact it is no wonder that we have accumulated a complicated labyrinth of tangled problems that will take years for the best brains of America to set right and place in order.

The strength of the proposed Commission, it seems to me, is that it will result in bringing together representatives of the three levels of government for voluntary discussion of common problems. As Senator MUSKIE so well observed, in his remarks to the Senate on May 21:

"It would serve as a central clearinghouse for information on all aspects of intergovernmental relations; it would serve as a forum for discussion of specific problems and particular programs; it would give specialized attention, on a continuing basis, to particular intergovernmental problems with a view to promoting greater cooperation among the various levels of government and providing a systematic means of encouraging better relations among them."

And, I think, as Mrs. DWYER said in her remarks to the House on May 6, that "the creation of a permanent Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations would help bring order, understanding, careful planning, and more effective control into the complex world of Federal-State-local relations," observing quite correctly that, at the present time, "there is no existing machinery whereby improved relations between the several levels of government can be fostered and encouraged."

To these observations permit me to add, with justifiable pride, that on September 25, 1954, the Committee on Local Governments, of which I had the honor to be chairman, became the first to advocate a permanent, or continuing, Commission such as is now sought to be established by the pending legislation. In our report to the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, we said:

"Since no final solution, good for all times, can be found to all the issues involved in

the relations between governments, this Committee favors the establishment of a continuing Commission on Intergovernmental Relations with duties generally comparable to those set forth in Public Law 109. Periodic or continuous studies are needed to search out and compromise the points of conflict between the National Government on the one hand, the State and their local governments on the other."

Thus we find that, after exhaustive study and mature deliberation, the following official groups have come to the same conclusion in favor of a continuing Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: First, the Advisory Committee on Local Governments in 1954; second, the Commission on International Relations in 1955; and, third, your Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee in 1958.

Then, it is proper to observe that there has been wide public acceptance of these views. Chairman FOUNTAIN has observed that "the philosophy and principles of federalism reported by the Kestenbaum Commission were found by our subcommittee to be generally valid and widely accepted.

Mrs. DWYER went further to say that "I should add that the subcommittee found wide support for some such form of continuing examination of the Federal system."

In my opinion there is no validity to the arguments that "this is just another commission" and "it has no power and can do nothing." The wisest thing about our Federal system is that each level of government, is within limitations, autonomous within its own sphere. It is, therefore, within the nature of our system that no one level can completely dominate the other two levels. This legal situation makes an advisory commission the only method by which we can tackle and ultimately solve the accumulated and constantly increasing problems of our three-level system.

And I might add here that, whilst the controversy between the advocates of States rights and those who lean toward national control is very real and highly publicized, there is another controversy that is just as determined. I refer to the battle that is now raging between the advocates of State control and those who sponsor wider latitude for municipal and county governments. This latter controversy is, in many respects, more difficult than the former because local governments are creatures of the State, while the States are not the creatures of the National Government. It is much more important, therefore, that there should be brought about some forum for the discussion of State-local problems than for the discussion of National-State problems.

The proposed Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations would do both.

That there is a trend toward big government and away from the independence and autonomy of State and local governments is illustrated by the growth of Federal grants in aid. From 1900 to 1950 the increase was from $3 million to $3 billion. Even more significant is the fact that Federal grants have increased, since the report of the Kestnbaum Commission, to a total of approximately $7 billion annually.

Then when we realize, while local taxes amounted to 53 percent of the total of all taxes in 1932—and that local taxes, at the present time, amount to somewhere between 10 percent and 12 percent of the total of all taxes—it is not difficult to see the trend away from the grassroots and toward the State and National capitols.

It is probably true that there is some justification for increased reliance upon the superior tax abilities of the State and National Governments, and the subsequent distribution to the lower units in the form of grants. But the movement is proceeding at such a rapid and precipitate speed as to be alarming. The United Kingdom has recently recognized that this probably means the destruction of the strength and influence of the local level of government, if continued. As a consequence the present British Government has gone far, in recent legislation, toward combining all assistance to local governments in one grant.

The least we here in this country can do, in my humble opinion, is to stop and take stock. And that, precisely, is what the proposed legislation would do. As Chairman FOUNTAIN so aptly puts it, the Advisory Commission provided by the proposed legislation "would not * * * be a panacea for eliminating all of the sore spots that arise out of the division of powers in our Federal system. It would, however, be a modest but constructive step in the right direction."

For these reasons and many others which a statement of this kind could not possibly embrace, I wholeheartedly endorse the legislation now pending before the Congress.

I do this with one reservation. I hope that greater weight can be give the county governments on the proposed Commission. County governments in America are, in the main, archaic. They still operate with a system that was born of the horse and buggy days. Only a very small percentage of our counties have an executive officer. Government, on all levels, needs overhauling in this country, but the crying need is on the county level.

Yet the proposals give the counties only 1 representative out of 24 on the Advisory Commission. Four are given to the municipalities. Four are given to the States. On this basis I would say that four should be allotted to the counties, and that, under no theory should less than two members be allotted to county governments. I hope this change will be made.

I thank the committee for this opportunity to make known my view of this important subject.

Cultural Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. and Soviet academies of science have announced agreement on an extensive exchange of scientists between the two Nations.

This is the latest development in the cultural exchange program between the world's two mightiest nations. Personally, I hope that this approach will do much to lead to a better understanding with the Russians.

The Russians are extremely difficult people to negotiate with. Certainly the developments at Geneva bring this point home. And it points up once more just how little the Russians really understand the people in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, all of us know that one of the great dangers facing the world today is that the Russians, because of this ignorance, will seriously miscalculate and touch off another war. Anything that will lead to a better understanding is certainly a step in the right direction.

Under this new agreement, Mr. Speaker, scientists of the two countries will deliver lectures, carry out research and observe scientific progress. The leading scentists of the two nations will learn to know each other and understand each other better. I am sure that the Russians will be impressed by the peaceful intent of the U.S. scientists.

It is appalling to think that very few of the Russian leaders have ever been outside the Iron Curtain. How can we expect them to understand the West as long as they live in such complete isolation?

Under the cultural exchange program, it is hoped to bring citizens of the two nations together. Last weekend, for example, United States and Russian track teams engaged in a dual meet in Philadelphia. These Russian athletes are bound to have a better appreciation and understanding of this country after they return home. We have sent artists of all kinds to Russia. We plan to send businessmen and representatives of other groups to tour Russia. In return, people from that country will visit the United States.

Vice President NIXON is now in Russia. He will have an opportunity to visit many parts of the country and talk with top officials.

The Russians are a suspicious people, particularly on an official level. But surely the Russian people, just like people everywhere, detest war. I am sure they want to live in peace just as we do.

Because of tight censorship and government control of the daily lives of the people of Russia, it is difficult to reach the people. But every contact we can make will be helpful. For example, the Harlem Globetrotters, a very fine basketball team, recently visited Russia for a series of exhibits with Russian teams. About 350,000 Russians saw three games in Leningrad.

Exchanges on these unofficial levels are good things. People with common interests can help bridge the vast gulf separating the two nations much easier than can diplomats.

We have no aggressive intentions in the world. If the Russians could be made to understand this, perhaps much of the tension between the two countries could be wiped out. It is certainly worth the effort to bring this home to Russians on every level whenever we have the chance.

Americans Should Decide Kind of Money They Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of Members of the House to a timely, well-advised editorial on unwarranted, excessive spending by our Federal Government which appeared last Tuesday in my hometown daily newspaper, the Jackson Sun. It is a warning to our people against the dan-

gers of inflationary spending and excessive, unwarranted appropriations authorized by Congress. We must keep our economy sound, and if we do not, inflation can destroy its foundation.

Naturally our people are greatly worried and deeply concerned over our tremendous Federal debt, our failure to keep the Federal budget balanced each fiscal year and the excessive appropriations and spending measures approved by Congress. Why should not the general public be aroused over our financial situation when the Federal Government has just ended its fiscal year on last June 30 with a deficit of over $12½ billion for the year. With the tremendous Federal debt of nearly $290 billion indebtedness and with interest payments each year costing the Federal Government over $8 billion annually, why should not the general public be disturbed and alarmed?

It is high time that we drastically reduce Federal expenditures, balance the annual budget, and begin reducing our enormous Federal debt or else ruinous inflation can destroy our economy and the sound value of the dollar.

The editorial in the Jackson Sun of Jackson, Tenn., is as follows:

AMERICANS SHOULD DECIDE KIND OF MONEY THEY WANT

Americans now, perhaps as never before, need to decide what kind of money they want.

That decision can govern what the Congress does in the remaining portion of this session.

The amount of money the Congress votes to spend will help get this Nation back on a sound dollar basis—or it will stoke the furnaces of inflation.

Sound dollar economy can give a sound foundation to the greatest era of prosperity this country has even seen.

Unsound Government spending can help cut the value of the American dollar until it will be no longer buy the necessities.

There are certain essential Government spending programs. For example, the appropriations for national defense require some $40 billion. But what would our lives be worth as slaves of a foreign power?

We have embarked on a social security program which provides retirement and dependents benefits for which covered workers and their employers help pay.

A massive building program is designed to provide this Nation with a network of superhighways capable of meeting the requirements of peace and war.

But there is a numberless array of proposals which might benefit some segment of our population but which, desirable as they may be, cannot qualify as essential to our national safety and prosperity.

There is but one source of money with which to pay for Government's spending, good, bad, or indifferent; the taxes collected from American citizens.

A major source of these taxes is from the income of those who work or have investments.

So many Americans have been doped on the collection of taxes that they fail to realize what a large part of their income goes to Government.

What we mean is that the withholding method of collecting taxes is like an anesthetic—it deadens the pain without saving the patient from the operation.

The point has arrived, however, when huge Government borrowings are draining off available lending money—and driving the interest rates up to where the individuals and private businesses cannot borrow, or must pay large amounts for the privilege.

The vast majority of Americans are affected by this situation. Either they own (through stock, insurance, etc.) a part of one or more businesses or they depend for their living on the work for which they are paid or they have as their sole income the retirement provisions already made.

Some of the reasons for demanding that our Government cut down on its spending where possible are set out eloquently in a series of advertisements carried by the Sun, advertisements which are paid for by local business and professional men for the good of all.

The Sun, in conjunction with other free American newspapers, is trying to show the effect of huge Government spending programs, the dangers of continued appropriations above what the Nation can pay without borrowing.

This situation is not one to affect any one segment of our Nation exclusively. The day laborer is as much involved as the banker, the farmer as much as the dry goods store operator, the railroad section hand as much as the rail president.

All of us depend upon money to buy our needs. The soundness of our dollars controls how much we can buy with what is left us by Government.

We can do much toward obtaining a sound dollar by letting our Senators and Congressmen know we want it.

Communist Youth Festival Illumines West's Gamble in Cultural Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, many naively assume that in contacts between us and the Communists, we will, of course, always come out on top. Our system of freedom is better, our living standards are better, and therefore the better will automatically rub off on the less good. This is an unjustified assumption. Many a student from Asian and Middle East countries, who was pro-Western when he came to the United States, has gone home pro-Communist. I am completely certain that we can win, but only if we work harder than the Communists in understanding both systems and learn how to explain and to sell our views and values more convincingly than they sell theirs. That requires deep knowledge, dedication, and persuasiveness, not just curiosity, on the part of those Americans who go abroad in our so-called cultural exchanges. Casual Americans—whether students or professors or businessmen—will be no match for trained Communist agents. Amateurs seldom win over professionals in any contest. We must become professionals in this most important contest of our lives.

Mr. Speaker, the contest is highlighted just now by the so-called World Youth Festival convening in Vienna. The use by them of such a grand name for what is merely a Communist rally is itself a sample of smart professionalism. The pros and cons of cultural exchange are discussed in the following column by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

YOUTH FESTIVAL ILLUMINES WEST'S CULTURAL GAMBLE

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

By the time these lines are published, some 17,000 young people from a variety of countries will be gathered in Vienna, Austria, attending the Seventh (Communist inspired) World Youth Festival. Some 400 will be Americans, of whom about 300 are to be official delegates, the others spectators and tourists. It is therefore legitimate to ask what can come out of such a Red-dominated propaganda meeting and if Americans do well to attend.

There a difficulty arises. Among the Americans, as well as the young people from other countries, there are bound to be several sorts. A few will almost surely be fellow travelers eager to show their solidarity with the organizers. They will seek to give a dangerously misleading picture of America to the world. But one group of enthusiasts, the American Youth Festival Organization with headquarters in Chicago, has recruited dedicated anti-Communists, eager to carry the word of freedom and democracy to the heathen Communists at Vienna. And most of the American spectators will probably be animated chiefly by curiosity and the desire to meet and swap impressions with people of similar age from so many other countries.

MOSTLY HELPFUL

Most U.S. officials believe that presence of young Americans at a similar youth festival in Moscow 2 years ago, on the whole, was beneficial, even though a few disgraced themselves by their fervid support of openly Communist ideas and causes. Others, however, amply made up for them by eloquently and stubbornly standing up for freedom and decency.

Yet this year, young people from a number of places have refused to attend and lend themselves to a major Soviet propaganda drive.

The Government of India officially disapproved the festival and the Indian Youth Congress voted against participation. The Islamic students of Indonesia urged Indonesian youth to have nothing to do with this Communist enterprise. Nasser's United Arab Republic showed its (at least temporary) opposition to Moscow by declining to send a delegation. The neighboring Sudan simply banned attendance by its citizens.

Pakistan, South Africa, and the Philippines decided to boycott the festival. Ghana expressed disapproval of the Vienna meeting.

In the Western Hemisphere, Peru and Chile refused to attend while Venezuela, Argentina, Cuba, and Mexico showed enthusiasm—as current political developments in those countries might have led one to expect.

Against such a controversial background, it is obvious that those young Americans, delegates or not, who have elected to attend, have assumed a real responsibility. They have overridden a State Department warning, which is their legal right. But one may hope that they will heed the Department's further advice: (1) it warned that the festival is Communist-inspired; (2) it explained that communism would attempt to use their presence to help the U.S.S.R. and harm the United States of America; (3) it suggested that before going, they should acquire full information about what communism is and what its leaders plan to do to the free world.

ALL IT COULD DO

The Department could do no more; contact between American and Communist young people at Vienna is just one facet of the policy of favoring cultural contacts with communism which the U.S. administration, after long hesitancy, somewhat reluctantly adopted a few years ago. That is now a gamble with an outcome nobody can foresee. What can be assumed is that the net result will depend not only upon the superiority of free society over slave society but upon the courage, wisdom, and conviction of those Americans who make the contacts, no matter in what field. This responsibility is heavy.

The young Americans who attend the festival in Vienna all share it.

North Dakota Is Quite a Place

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John F. McLeod, appearing in the Washington Daily News, July 20, 1959, entitled "The News Discovers North Dakota." Had Prospector McLeod completed "digging" he would also have found the oilfields and the friendly western atmosphere of Williston, the busy and progressive Gate City which lies in the center of the fertile Red River Valley, Fargo, and many more hospitable towns and cities lying in between.

The article follows:

THE NEWS DISCOVERS NORTH DAKOTA
(By John F. McLeod)

Ask almost any well-traveled American which of the 48 (pardon, 49) States he's missed, and he's likely to answer:

"Well, let's see, I think I've visited all except Wyoming and North Dakota" or "Rhode Island and North Dakota" or—

Invariably, North Dakota is the least known of all the States to most U.S. tourists.

This fact has become increasingly a cause of State concern, though there is no shortage of tourists—mostly Canadians, who come down for the cheap dollar and to whoop it up in North Dakota's lively small cities.

We took a 10-day tour of North Dakota and we especially recommend:

Jamestown: This area is especially popular for pheasant and duck hunters in the fall, but a nearby reclamation lake also provides good summer boating and fishing and excellent campsites.

Bismarck: Don't miss the beautiful, modern skyscraper capitol and the State museum's collections of Indian relics and guns.

Mandan: From nearby Fort Abraham Lincoln, General Custer sallied against the Indians. An outdoor summer horse opera enacted by college students tells the story of his 7th Cavalry.

Dickinson-Medora: Here's where the real West begins. Plan to stay several days, either at Dickinson's excellent and inexpensive Ray Hotel, managed by Joe Regan, a former Washingtonian, or at one of the campgrounds along the Little Missouri River in Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park. See a cattle auction in Dickinson and one of the many rodeos thereabout.

In the park, see the prairie dog town and "ever-burning" veins of lignite coal which actually are forming new Badlands before your eyes. Just outside, visit the Chateau de Mores mansion of French nobleman who tried to set up as a cattle tycoon in the 1880's when Theodore Roosevelt also lived thereabout. "Old Four Eyes," horse opera about those days is set in the Burning Hills Amphitheater.

Minot: With a brandnew, big SAC air base, it boasts the State's liveliest nightlife, and possibly its best hotel, the Clarence Parker. Enroute, see Garrison Dam, which has backed up a 200-mile-long lake.

Lake Metigoshe: This is rolling hill and birch country and is listed in "Bargain Paradises of the World." You can rent a lake cottage for $30 a week. Nearby is the International Peace Garden maintained by Canada and the United States.

Devils Lake: Besides the lake (saltish) and usual resort facilities, visit the nearby Fort Totten Sioux Indian Reservation.

Grand Forks: Don't miss a really wonderful motel, the Westward Ho. It has a heated, glass-walled swimming pool, shaped like a cowboy boot.

A thing we particularly liked about North Dakota: Stopping at a roadside rest area, we noticed a State employe actually scrubbing down the picnic tables. He said there's never much trash to pick up: "North Dakotans aren't litterbugs," he said.

The Next Political Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, for those people who are concerned about our national problems, present and future, and who are wondering about the vehicle through which the American people will choose to deal with these problems, I commend an article by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the Washington Post today, entitled "The Next Political Era":

THE NEXT POLITICAL ERA—NEW PROGRESSIVISM FORECAST BY SCHLESINGER
(By Roscoe Drummond)

How would you like a political forecast for the next 8 or 10 years? Not a prediction of who will be President or which party will control Congress, but a preview of a political climate, the political problems, and the trend of the political answers?

This is what Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. has recently submitted, in the form of a most stimulating memorandum, to the New York committee for the Democratic Advisory Council.

Although Mr. Schlesinger has often been identified as a spechwriter for Adlai Stvenson in two presidential campaigns, he is no ordinary "ghost." He is a voice in his own right, a highly respected and intelligent voice, a Harvard professor, a Pulitzer-prize biographer, and author of the scholarly study of the Presidency of Franklin Roosevelt.

It would be idle to dismiss lightly Mr. Schlesinger's forecast of the shape of things soon to come. His views will strike a responsive chord with many people and they need to be looked at understandingly. The principal proposition in his memorandum are these:

That the Eisenhower epoch—the swing to conservatism—is drawing to its "natural end" in light of the rhythm of political change in the United States.

That the new political epoch to be ushered in by the 1960 election will not resemble the New Deal, which took its special character from the depression, so much as it will the progressive period of the turn of the century.

That it is uncertain which party will be the instrument of the new progressivism; that it might well be the Republican Party under Nelson Rockefeller and that it won't be the Democratic Party "if the Democrats are foolish enough to expect to inherit by default."

Mr. Schlesinger argues that the great difference between the politics of the sixties and the politics of the thirties will be that, while the New Deal dealt with the problems of subsistence and survival, the new progressivism will deal with how to improve the quality of life of the American people.

He sees such concrete issues as these most likely to preoccupy us during the next decade:

Improvement of community facilities—cities, suburbs, slum clearance, better housing, urban renewal, etc.; revitalizing our educational system; improving medical care and care for aged; equal rights for minorities; development of natural resources; control of inflation; improvement of social security; elevation of popular culture; adequate foreign aid; prosecution of our weapons effort.

Mr. Schlesinger's prediction that the Eisenhower swing to conservatism is drawing to a close is not just wishful thinking. The 1958 election added to the liberal strength of the Democratic Party both in Congress and in the governorships; it weakened the conservative ranks of the Republican Party. The most decisive Republican victory was Governor Rockefeller's in New York. My own guess is that any change in the political consensus next year will be leftward, particularly since, as I see it, either Mr. Nixon or Mr. Rockefeller would be less "conservative" than Mr. Eisenhower.

The reason I put quotes around conservative is that it is a loose and subjective word. It needs to be understood, I think that progressive and conservative ideas do not necessarily conflict, that a progressive era of political action need not necessarily violate conservative principles. The best example is Theodore Roosevelt, whom Mr. Schlesinger cites as the first great figure of the old progressive movement.

A conservatism which uses conservative principles to deal with the Nation's problems rather than to neglect them would be a haven for a progressive. And I am convinced that if the post-Eisenhower leadership of the Republican Party does not show that it is intent upon dealing with the problems Mr. Schlesinger has cited, the voters will choose the Democratic Party to do so.

The Farm Mess: Stop Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in order to emphasize the fact that the people are sick and tired of farm subsidies, I

have on several previous occasions placed extracts in the RECORD of letters approving my four-point program to end farm subsidies. Here are more such extracts:

I have read with much interest your program "to end the farm mess." The plan you suggest should merit the support and endorsement of a majority of thinking citizens.

I congratulate you on your sound and forthright position, and trust you will find strong and growing support for it.

My father did not expect the Government to give him money for not raising crops. Many farmers buy poor land where they couldn't raise crops if they tried and the Government pays them for not raising crops and they are getting rich on it.

Your recent attacks on the farm mess are in accord with my thinking for over 5 years. Let's hope your outspoken views will be gratefully supported by a huge number of people from all areas.

Farm mess, I agree; no business should be subsidized; give the money back to the taxpayers, who have paid for the $9 billion in surpluses and have paid and are paying the $1 billion a year for storage.

I think your ideas about the farm mess are excellent.

Your idea on a fire sale to get rid of our farm surpluses sounds great. However, what are the possibilities of it coming to pass within the foreseeable future? What can I do as a citizen to help further this wonderful idea? Please let me know.

I agree with you 100 percent regarding the farm subsidies.

I was about to write you about the farm mess which indicates what happens when Federal Government makes funds available for subsidies without controls and pray your efforts will be successful and that all our Representatives will go along with you 100 percent.

Regards this price support have read where the farmers themselves wish it would be removed and allow them to dispose of their products in open market. If ever there was a problem that should be disposed of, once and for all, is this soil bank before it ruins us financially.

I am certainly most pleased with your comment on the farm situation, it is sensible and constructive.

We hope that you are successful in cleaning up the farm mess. All farm subsidies should be eliminated as quickly as possible. Keep hard at it.

I am for it 100 percent and wish you would tell me how we can assist you in getting some action. Will letter writing to Congressmen and Senators help?

We are all sick of the farm mess. Why are the farmers entitled to so much of the tax dollar of other working people in this great country of ours.

The farm mess, is right down our alley. This problem is already preposterous and something drastic is necessary now, not next year or later.

Also, I would commend to reading the following editorial which recently appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner:

HOGS, HAM, AND BACON

When hogs are scarce, the price of ham, bacon, and pork chops runs high in the markets of the big cities.

When prices are very high, speculators get into the agricultural business. They grow corn; they grow wheat; they raise hogs. They overdo the job and produce so much that prices begin to go down.

At that moment the speculators and the honest farmers join forces and begin to bring pressure on Congress to provide subsidies out of taxes.

That means we city folks pay twice for what we get. We pay the high price charged in the meat market and then we pay taxes to subsidize the farmer and the speculator.

The politician, particularly the Members of Congress, know that this is all wrong. They know that, at the present time, if prices found their level in the market, the entire country would be better off.

They know that the greatest menace to the United States is inflation and that every subsidy is a stimulus to further inflation.

Special Pay for Extra Skill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 1, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide additional compensation for employees in the postal field service who are required to qualify on scheme examinations.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide remuneration to those loyal and dedicated postal employees who have for years been required to spend their own time learning complex schemes or systems for the distribution of mail.

These schemes change frequently, and postal clerical employees, members of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, for example, are forced to engage in a constant effort to keep current with changes necessitated by a growing city and consequent expanded delivery service or by changing train or plane schedules.

Every time there is a change in an arrival or departure time for a train or plane, post office schemes are changed to reflect the new schedules. To give some idea of just how difficult it is to learn a post office scheme, I suggest anyone try to memorize any 10 pages of the Washington, D.C. telephone directory. That will embrace some 4,000 items, an approximation of an average postal scheme. Add to this the daily and weekly changes that occur then you have a vague idea of what a post office clerk has to remember for a single scheme period. Many clerks have to know two, three, and even four such schemes.

I believe these schemes are necessary to the prompt and efficient dispatch of mail, but I do not believe we have any right or justification to demand these loyal employees devote their own time to learning such schemes without compensation.

For that reason, I am introducing legislation which I feel will at least provide a token recognition on the problem and furnish a small recompense for the effort and time necessarily devoted by these loyal and faithful employees.

I hope the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will move promptly to the consideration of this very important legislation.

Labor Reform Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, it was a rather serious disappointment and in many respects a distinct shock to see the result of the considerations by the House Committee on Education and Labor of labor reform legislation. I am convinced that this proposed bill makes a mockery of the extensive hearings had by the McClellan committee in the other body.

This is very definitely not antiracketeering legislation and is a complete farce as an attempt to meet the outrageous disclosures thus far elicited. The American people should not be deluded into believing that this is legislation which will stop the abuses so forcibly and vividly portrayed for the record.

If we are to meet this problem head on, we must have the courage to stand up and be counted as the responsible representatives of the people of the country.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, will not bend to the whim and wish of certain labor leaders, particularly when they throw their weight around by threatening to call a national strike creating a national emergency or by threatening to raise $1½ million to use in a campaign to defeat Members of Congress who will not do their bidding, as against what I deem to be the best interests of the American people.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter received from Mr. D. J. Hardenbrook, chairman of the board, American Creosoting Corp., in which he very effectively points out the shortcomings of the bill reported by the House committee and outlines what the average American citizen expects of us in this field.

AMERICAN CREOSOTING CORP.,
Louisville, Ky., July 24, 1959.

The Honorable ALBERT BOSCH,
House Office Building Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is my understanding that the House of Representatives will shortly take action on a labor bill and because I feel so strongly that this is one of the most challenging and important issues to come before Congress, I would like to take the opportunity to express my views.

All responsible citizens, including most of those who make up the labor movement, have been sickened by the grim revelations of the McClellan committee. The lawlessness, gangsterism and utter disregard for the public welfare that characterizes some unions is repugnant to the average American's concept of fairness and decency .

It is my fear that neither the labor bill which passed the Senate, S. 1555, nor the bill approved by the House Committee (and particularly the latter) is adequate to deal with the forces in the labor union movement which have been responsible for the extortion, the embezzlement, the arson, the general gangsterism that has been detailed by the McClellan committee.

It seems to me that if Congress is going to come to grips realistically with this problem, a few minimum provisions should be added to the labor bill now before you. These will include a firm and effective ban on secondary boycotts, solid restrictions on organizational picketing, some control over union political activity, restoration of State authority to act in labor matters and provisions for the rank and file union member which will make labor union leaders responsive to the wishes of a majority of their members. It seems incredible to me that Congress will permit a few union leaders to continue to flout the public interest as well as the interests of their members. Yet, it is my firm conviction that that will occur unless the pending bill is vastly strengthened.

It is my opinion that strengthening this legislation would be fully in accord with the wishes of a majority of American citizens who feel that Congress must do something very fundamental in order to curb the wild excesses of certain union leaders, some of whose actions border on anarchy.

Thank you very much for your consideration of my views.

Sincerely yours,

D. J. HARDENBROOK.

The Cure for Mistakes in the Mutual Security Program Is To Correct Them, Not To Wreck the Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of July 25, 1959:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 25, 1959]

THE ISSUE OF WASTE IN FOREIGN AID

The waste in the foreign aid program as revealed by a House Appropriations Subcommittee is indeed deplorable. It arises from a number of causes, not the least of which is the multiplicity of government bureaus and departments which administer it. Another is the inability of the planners, who must do their work a year ahead, to foresee changes in conditions which occur in various countries—a difficult problem in the best of times. A third is surely the size of the program itself which employs thousands of personnel and distributes billions of dollars annually. Obviously, better discipline and more imaginative supervision are in order immediately.

This said, the worst thing that could happen would be for Congress to use evidence of waste as a pretext for cutting still further into foreign aid funds. And the timing of the subcommittee's release, on the eve of debate on mutual security appropriations, suggests all too strongly that it aims at doing just that.

In a government enterprise on this scale some degree of waste can always be found, and criticism if justified. But, as the Draper committee's latest report on the subject emphasizes, the answer is not to emasculate the program but to continue it and to administer it satisfactorily. Just how this could be done is something the report goes into at length, and its recommendations deserve the careful attention of both the executive and legislative branches. We should remember, however, what we are really after. Reduce the number of iceboxes in use among American personnel in Pakistan, by all means, if there are too many. But do not reduce Pakistan's ability to protect its freedom.

High Time for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of this body, an editorial entitled "High Time for Action," reprinted from the Il Progresso, which appeared on page A6239 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 20, 1959. Its thesis is that it is time to take notice of the increasing tendency on the part of some magazines and newspaper chains to link up a handful of irresponsible Americans, who happen to be of Italian descent and who have had bad criminal records, with all Americans of Italian lineage. Referring to the well-known Apalachin meeting, the editorial states that if the members of this group were meeting for some nefarious undertaking, "we not only do not condone them, but we denounce them and their ilk, for this tiny group of 60 furnished the pretext for bringing discredit and contempt on more than 12 million loyal, law-abiding, decent Americans of Italian origin who daily make their valuable contribution to the enrichment of our country in every field of human endeavor."

The editorial commends Senator KENNETH B. KEATING and Senator HUGH SCOTT, for directing letters to the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury asking for a statement of policy designed to protect the civil rights of people mistakenly identified with criminal acts and for an instruction to Federal agents to beware of defamatory public statements about any group.

I was pleased to note the immediate response of the Attorney General to the effect that "to my knowledge there is no nationwide ring consisting of criminals of any particular national origin." The Attorney General stated also "Naturally it is the desire and the duty of the Department to protect the civil rights of any person mistakenly identified with any criminal acts."

He Helped Phoenix Grow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to insert in the RECORD the editorial of July 21, 1959, in the Arizona Republic, Phoenix, Ariz., entitled "He Helped Phoenix Grow." Mr. Oliver King, business manager of the Arizona Republic and Phoenix Gazette, started his business career with the old Arizona Republic in 1908. His contributions to the newspapers, and the affairs of the city, county, and State have been immumerable and invaluable. His friends are legion, and the respect and admiration which is felt for him is universal. I am sure the people of Arizona join with me in wishing Mr. King the very happiest years of retirement and in thanking him and congratulating him for a job well done.

HE HELPED PHOENIX GROW

Oliver King, who started as newsboy and ended up as general manager, will leave the Arizona Republic and the Phoenix Gazette next month. At a spry 65 years of age, he has decided to take his first real vacation by traveling with his wife and daughter in Europe. There are a lot of other things he intends to do, including seeing more baseball games, visiting historic and scenic places in the United States, and taking a more active part in politics.

Mr. King's long association with the Republic can best be summed up by two figures. The circulation was about 4,000 when he started carrying papers, back in 1908. It now exceeds 120,000 daily, and 180,000 Sunday. No one has been more intimately connected with that growth than Oliver King.

A lot of other things have changed since the young Ohio boy came to Phoenix with his parents. A mighty metropolis has risen from the dusty little desert village. The old flat bed press of his early years has been replaced by huge rotary presses, capable of printing in full colors. Nearly 1,000 employes now work for the organization that could have gathered its entire work force in a small room back in 1908.

Mr. King always worked on the editorial and business side of the paper, but he never lost touch with the news departments. He helped set up the efficient election bureau that has given Arizona readers the election results hours before they would otherwise have been available. He helped direct the publication of extras on such great news stories as the sinking of the *Titanic*, and the bombing of Pearl Harbor.

Mr. King's participation in civic affairs has been extensive. He has been a long-time member of the Phoenix Lions Club, and helped start the club's excellent program of aid for the blind. He is the immediate past president of the Arizona Newspapers Association, and frequently attended West Coast and national publishers' conventions. He helped the Maricopa County Campfire Girls in its early years and for many years was treasurer of the Phoenix Community Chest. He has worked for the Republican Party in various capacities, and has helped the Party recoup from the days when a State convention could almost literally have been held in a telephone booth.

Oliver King's coworkers will be sorry to see him walk out of his office for the last

time, but they know—as publisher Eugene C. Pulliam put it—that "we will still be seeing a lot of Oliver King around the Republic and Gazette plant, because this is where his heart is." Phoenix also will be seeing a lot more of him in the years ahead, for 50 years of active newspaper work have only broadened the outlook and tempered the judgment of the man who remembers when the town ditch ran right through the lot on which the Republic and Gazette building now stands.

Coal-Tar Colors for Butter, Cheese, and Oleo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the proposal in the Congress to reinstate coal-tar colors F.D. & C. yellow Nos. 3 and 4, as coloring agents for butter, cheese and oleo, I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress a letter which I have received from the Chr. Hansen's Laboratory, Inc., Milwaukee, Wis., pointing out some very poignant reasons why this bill should not be enacted into law. I think these arguments deserve the thoughtful consideration of the Members of this body:

CHR. HANSEN'S LABORATORY, INC.,
Milwaukee, Wis., July 22, 1959.

Re bill H.R. 6852.

Representative LEONARD G. WOLF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WOLF: This bill introduced May 4 by Congressman CURTIS of Missouri would reinstate coal-tar colors F.D. & C. yellow Nos. 3 and 4 as a coloring agent for butter, cheese, and oleo. We hereby voice our opposition to this bill and ask you, in the best interest of the dairy industry, to oppose same.

We wish to point out that our company used to sell more certified butter color (yellow Nos. 3 and 4) than any other company in this country, but we did not voice any protest when yellow Nos. 3 and 4 were delisted by the Food and Drug Administration, because we felt that this step was in the best interest of public health and the dairy industry in general.

Some high-pressure advertising is taking place in order to get H.R. 6852 adopted so we feel you should be acquainted with the following facts, being our reasons for asking you to oppose this bill.

1. There are plenty of oil-soluble pure vegetable colors available to the industry and these colors have already been in use for years—not only in this country, but also in other countries which have long ago banned the use of yellow Nos. 3 and 4 in food, therefore, no hardship was imposed on the industry when Food and Drug delisted yellow Nos. 3 and 4.

2. There are plenty of responsible medical and toxicological reasons why yellow Nos. 3 and 4 should not be permitted in food. Without going into lengthy details, we limit ourselves to quote that at a symposium under the International Union Against Cancer, yellow Nos. 3 and 4 were placed in the category "Colors considered undesirable or potentially dangerous for use in foods" (Acta de L'Unio International contra cancerum 1957 XII N. 2, p. 198):

This designation was the result of a large amount of experimentation which showed that these colors are definitely toxic at a level of 1,000 parts per million for rats as well as dogs. The lowest level fed with no demonstrable effect has been 300 parts per million. Applying the recognized safety factor of 100 to 1 (Federal Register, March 28, 1959, p. 2435), this would be a tolerance level for yellow Nos. 3 and 4 combined of 5 parts per million or far less than the amount regularly used for butter.

Continued use of yellow Nos. 3 and 4 in the oleo and dairy industries would invite much adverse publicity and would leave the United States the only civilized country in the world using these colors in butter, cheese, and oleo.

4. As an example: The Canadian Government just announced that from now on they are not buying any butter which has been colored with yellow Nos. 3 and 4. This measure was undoubtedly dictated partly by health reasons, and partly because of the realization that butter colored with yellow Nos. 3 and 4 may not be salable in foreign markets.

We do not see how the U.S. Government (the Commodity Credit Corporation) could possibly afford to place itself in a position where the butter it buys may not be exportable because yellow Nos. 3 and 4 have been used for coloring.

We hope you share our viewpoint that reinstatement of yellow Nos. 3 and 4 would be dangerous and a step in the wrong direction and, therefore, will oppose this bill. If you require further information on this whole subject, we shall be glad to submit same.

Respectfully yours,

_____,
Vice President.

Poison in Your Water—No. 145

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Riverhead (N.Y.) News of June 4, 1959, entitled "Cites Danger of Pollution."

CITES DANGER OF POLLUTION

Two months ago Congressman STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, of Wainscott, issued a warning to the effect that water pollution had become a serious menace in certain areas of Long Island. The Federal Housing Administration has placed a ban on large development building where the builder plans to use shallow wells and individual cesspools. The use of household detergents is the cause of the contamination.

The first cases have now been received wherein a homeowner says that he is unable to sell his house due to the fact that mortgage insurance cannot be obtained because of his contamination. WAINWRIGHT pointed out that the criticisms leveled at the Federal Government were being misdirected. The problem is local in nature. The solution must also lie in county, town, and village decisions. WAINWRIGHT stated, "Unless some solution is reached—possibly in the form of sewerage and water districts—a serious depreciation of property as well as continued health dangers, will become more and more self-evident.

President Eisenhower to the People of the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the splendid message sent by President Eisenhower to the Russian people transmitted by Vice President NIXON.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, ON THE OCCASION OF THE OPENING OF THE AMERICAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION IN MOSCOW SOKOLNIKI PARK, JULY 24, 1959

Because of my inability to be present at the opening of the American Exhibition in the Soviet capital city, I have requested the Vice President of the United States to convey to you and to the Soviet people my personal greetings. I consider this exhibition at Sokolniki a symbol of the United States itself, and in this spirit, I wish to welcome you to visit it as guests of the people of the United States. In the same spirit, I also wish on all occasions to seek the friendship of the people of the Soviet Union. Indeed, I would be most happy if many of you could eventually come to our land and see the reality behind the pictures and displays of this exhibition.

I would like, moreover, to go beyond these words of official greeting and add some personal sentiments. The fact that the Soviet and American peoples were comrades in arms during the great war concluded 14 years ago remains fresh in my memory. At that time, as the Commander of the Western Allied Expeditionary Force, I was afforded the opportunity to meet with your valiant soldiers and to learn firsthand of their bravery. At the end of that war, in August of 1945, I had the privilege of visiting the Soviet Union itself. On that visit I was struck by the devotion and dedication of the people of the Soviet Union to the defense of Mother Russia. The exploits and courage of the Soviet people in that defense are matters of record for all to see.

Nothing that has happened during the interval has dimmed my admiration for the great people of the Soviet Union. Indeed, I have been further impressed by the strides taken by you in science and industry. Last month I greatly enjoyed my visit to the Soviet Exhibition in New York and was impressed by the vigor and the progress which was evidenced everywhere. I returned to Washington with a better understanding of the achievements of the Soviet people and the proud traditions of their land. Let me assure you that I speak for all Americans when I say that we desire nothing but friendship with this dynamic people.

But we must acknowledge that differences in governmental policies have created rifts in our wartime alliance. This fact has saddened me greatly, particularly because it is so unnecessary. Our nations have such a great common interest in world peace that every effort must be made to bring us closer together. I therefore hope that this exchange of exhibitions will be a first step toward a

restoration of the trust and unity that we felt during the recent World War.

I wish that I could have been here to open this exhibition in person. It has long been my hope to return to the Soviet Union to see, not only my wartime friends, but also the great progress you have made in rebuilding your ruined cities and factories. Perhaps the time may come when this desire will be realized.

Until that time, my concluding greeting is this: It is never too late to build a peace with honor and justice. May this exchange of greetings contribute to success in that effort.

Nomination of Frederick H. Mueller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the nomination of Frederick H. Mueller as Secretary of Commerce has been widely applauded. Contrary to the adage that a prophet is without honor in his own country, Mr. Mueller's home State of Michigan has long been appreciative of his capabilities and enthusiastically endorses his appointment to this high position in the Cabinet.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., commenting upon Mr. Mueller's nomination. The editorial follows:

[From the Lansing, (Mich.) State Journal, July 23, 1959]

NEW HONOR FOR STATE

President Eisenhower again has turned to Michigan for assistance at the Cabinet level.

The President has nominated for the post of Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller, Grand Rapids industrialist who was called to Washington in 1946 to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce in Charge of Domestic Affairs and who later was promoted to Under Secretary.

The choice of the Michigan man had been expected since the Senate rejected the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss, who had been serving under a recess appointment.

Initial congressional response to the nomination of the former Grand Rapids furniture manufacturer indicated he would have clear sailing when the nomination comes before the Senate for confirmation.

The widespread expectation that Mr. Mueller would receive the nomination was based on the logic of the choice from the standpoint of his experience as Under Secretary and his general qualifications for the highest post in the Commerce Department.

Mr. Mueller, who was graduated from Michigan State University in 1914, would be the third Michigan man to serve in the Eisenhower Cabinet. Arthur E. Summerfield of Flint, Mr. Eisenhower's original choice as Postmaster General, still is serving in that capacity and Charles E. Wilson, former president of General Motors, is now retired after having served as Secretary of Defense.

In addition to the Cabinet posts, several other key places on the Eisenhower team are held by Michigan men, including former Gov. Wilber M. Brucker who is serving as Secretary of the Army.

Michigan citizens can take deep satisfaction in the fact that President Eisenhower has found Michigan a rich source of material for his team and in this State's ability to contribute to the effective functioning of the Federal Government.

Puerto Rican Constitution Day—The Seventh Year

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, within a short 4 to 5 hours flying time from Miami, any one of us can be transplanted to one of the most beautiful islands of Antilles. The island I speak of is Puerto Rico.

Today I am happy to express the privilege I feel in commemorating Puerto Rican Constitution Day. On the third of July 1950, President Harry S. Truman signed into law a bill which authorized the people of Puerto Rico to draft their own constitution. A constitutional convention met during the following two years; a document was drafted that was met with enthusiasm from all quarters; and after minor changes, on July 25, 1952, the Governor of Puerto Rico proclaimed this constitution in force.

By this measure, Puerto Rico and the United States are bound together by a unique Commonwealth basis. Unique is a well-advised word. No two nations in the world have a relationship such as exists between our two governments. The Puerto Rican people—when speaking of themselves in correlation to the United States—refer to the island as an Associated Free State. This is a very apt description.

Under the present relationship, Puerto Rico has prospered, its industries have boomed, its standard of living has improved, and its vision has looked upward. In recent years I have had the privilege of visiting this beautiful island in traveling from San Juan into the mountains and around the shores to the southern part of this thriving community. The residents of the mountains and the countryside no longer live in isolation, but form an integral part of a community. A visual inspection of the children with their schoolbooks and the parents with their expectations of more prosperous days and a better standard of living reflects the achievements and accomplishments of a sturdy people under this unique form of government.

Puerto Rico is a showcase in which the relations of the United States and Puerto Rico are open to inspection for the world to see, especially in Latin America. This showcase reveals harmony, understanding, and cooperation. Puerto Ricans on the island feel a kinship to Puerto Ricans on the mainland, and together they take pride in being recognized as citizens of the United States and Americans all.

Within a very short period of time, Puerto Rico's growth and progress has been amazing. At a minimum, Puerto Rico has a per capita income of 353.6. This figure, next to Mexico, is the highest in all of Middle America. Moreover, the spirit of the Puerto Rican people, under the excellent and able leadership of Governor Muñoz-Marín, has produced new and vital art and literature, along with a net national income of well over a billion dollars.

Examples of all types of progress abound: Life expectancy has almost doubled since the thirties; illiteracy rates are half of what they were before World War II, well-planned housing projects are reducing slum areas by ever-increasing margins. "Operation Bootstrap," begun in 1948, has proved to be exactly that: a bootstrap of strength, durability and rising standards of living for all.

All this means that Puerto Rico is a living symbol of intelligent democracy at work. The people feel this in their hearts and see it in the tangible rewards of their island. It can be truly said that a rich port leads a visitor to a rich island.

In behalf of countless Americans of every race, creed and color, I wish to extend congratulations to the Government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and to our fellow citizens on that Caribbean isle. May your well-earned successes on all fronts long continue in the future.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Daily Press, St. Mary's, Pa.:

[From the St. Mary's (Pa.) Daily Press, July 20, 1959]

FOREIGN AID

The matter of foreign aid is much in the foreground of governmental affairs again at this time as the administration insists on spending more money for this venture into uncharted seas than Congress is willing to give him.

It has been estimated in the past few years since foreign aid has become a silent partner of the U.S. Government over $70 billion have been sent abroad, no small amount to Russia when that nation was considered a warm friend in World War II days.

The truth of the foreign-aid program, according to some of its opponents, is that it impedes the welfare of this country.

The Marshall plan, forerunner of these vast spending plans, proposed a maximum expenditure of $13.5 billion on foreign aid, launched in 1948, with the definite promise of the then President it would be wound

up in 4 years. That first year, it has been noted, some 450 persons were employed by the Government to administer and distribute foreign economic aid. Ten years and $41 billion later, the staff has grown to 12,000 employees directing 2,000 projects. In addition, some 9,000 persons are engaged in the military assistance program that already has totaled $23 billion.

It has grown, like a centipede develops new legs for the ones cut off, to the point where it has become a permanent tax burden on the shoulders of the American people who often wonder what value the program has developed.

Many Members of Congress, including the Representative from this district, feel this financial aid should be sharply reduced, as many beneficiaries of the program have reached such a high stage of economic recovery they are competing for world markets to the detriment of American manufacturers.

And those "Go Home, Yankee" signs seen here and there in the lands most helped by American money sour the taste and make one wonder what has been gained after all these years.

Gaps in Guarding Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, 30 million Americans are today without protection against disease by professionally staffed public health agencies. Elsewhere in our Nation, functioning agencies are understaffed. As our population grows, our ability nationally to train sufficient personnel to meet our public health needs has diminished. Still, this national problem does not seem to be widely recognized.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, in an article in the July 26 edition of the New York Times, again calls attention to these facts. He points out that legislation drafted by our distinguished colleague, Congressman GEORGE RHODES, of Pennsylvania, is a realistic measure which would set up a sustained Federal program of sufficient proportions to meet this need for trained public health workers. Under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to submit this article so that all Members of Congress may take note of the facts and direct their attention to the Rhodes bill, H.R. 6871, and to companion measures introduced by Congressmen WILLIAM MOORHEAD, KENNETH ROBERTS, ISIDORE DOLLINGER, TORBERT MACDONALD, ROBERT GIAIMO, and myself:

GAPS IN GUARDING HEALTH—TOO FEW WORKERS FOUND AVAILABLE TO STAFF PUBLIC AGENCIES IN UNITED STATES

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

In one of our largest Military Establishments in the South, a secret by very large number of highly skilled personnel are constantly on the alert as a part of the military mobilization essential to our national defense.

Almost weekly, new classes are started in the many highly specialized and technical aspects of modern defense, and graduates of these classes leave to take assignments throughout the free world.

These are the minutemen and vigilantes the 20th century. But in sharp contrast to their Revolutionary War and western frontier counterparts, they are not volunteers. They are highly trained and highly skilled professionals in every sense of the word.

We in the United States have recognized the importance of defense and the necessity for paying taxes to maintain our national defense. But today 30 million of our citizens are without protection against another enemy—disease.

HAVE NO PUBLIC HEALTH AID

These are the 30 million persons who live in areas of the Nation without organized public health services. They are reasonably sure that the water and milk they drink and the foods they eat are pure and that help will come to them if they are faced by an epidemic of communicable disease. Even this protection, however, comes largely from volunteers rather than from professionally trained public health workers.

The traditional responsibilities of controlling epidemic diseases and keeping food, milk, and water clean are the best known but by no means the only functions of public health. Public health workers also safeguard us against radiation hazards, promote healthful housing, conduct school health programs, protect the health of workers, and carry on many important functions.

In contrast to the work of the medical practitioner, the job of the doctor in public health is primarily preventing what are or might become hazards to health. To meet his responsibilities the public health doctor heads a team that includes a wide variety of coworkers: biochemists, nurses, bacteriologists, engineers, veterinarians, and other specialized, trained personnel.

ABILITY TO MEET THE NEEDS DROPS

Unfortunately, as the importance of public health services and the size of our population have grown, our ability nationally to train sufficient personnel to meet our needs has diminished.

Currently our 11 schools of public health graduate approximately 1,200 workers each year. This is an increase over the number of graduates of a few years ago, resulting from the initiation of a Federal program of traineeships that pay part of the expenses of the students.

This program was further strengthened by legislation in 1958 that provides grants for public health schools to extend and improve their training. Grants totaling $450,000 were made under this new legislation.

Helpful as this is, it is not enough.

There are now about 2,500 budgeted vacancies in our Federal, State, and local health agencies. Many public health jobs in voluntary agencies are unfilled. The number of jobs in both public and voluntary agencies would increase substantially if there were any prospects of such jobs being filled after they were created.

SOME NEED FURTHER TRAINING

In addition to the need for more trained personnel, more than half of the currently employed workers in Federal, State, and local health agencies need additional postgraduate training. Many have had no formal training in public health. Others had their training long before the development of the modern problems with which they must deal, such as air pollution, radiation, rehabilitation, and community mental health.

Our current professional training program in public health now provides us with but 6.4 percent of the trained personnel we need for public health agencies. Meeting our current and future needs for such personnel would require expanding our present program by five times. Even if we did this, it would take 10 years to meet current and future needs.

Last month, Representative GEORGE M. RHODES, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, introduced realistic legislation in the House of Representatives to meet these needs. His bill would provide $5 million a year for 5 years to public health schools to construct additional facilities; $1 million annually to train public health nurses; and $3 million each year to the States to train public health personnel.

By its very nature as reflected in its name, public health is primarily the job of government. Defense against disease is just as basic as defense against military attack. Modern technological and social development have increased the complexity and scope of this basic responsibility.

Today we do not have enough trained public health workers to meet this basic responsibility.

Added to these basic needs is the increased necessity for maintaining an adequate mobilization base in health as long as the cold war persists.

It is the responsibility of government to insure an adequate supply of public health workers as much as to insure that we have a sufficient number of highly skilled personnel to staff our military defense.

Hog Marketing Premium Payments Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL HOGAN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing for appropriate reference a bill to prevent any further drastic drop in the price of hogs. The average price received by farmers for hogs over the United States has dropped by over $6 during the past year. This is a drop of about one-third. In terms of parity, the price of hogs in June of this year had dropped below 70 percent.

Forecasts published in private trade journals as well as in U.S. Department of Agriculture bulletins indicate that unless something is done soon the prices received by farmers for hogs will continue to drop throughout the rest of this year and most of 1960.

The bill I am introducing today is an attempt to stop further decline in hog prices by working directly upon the cause for the weakness in the market, an oversupply of pork. The proposal provided in my bill is designed to slow the rapid buildup in hog numbers and bring about a quick adjustment in pork production before farmers' income from hogs becomes critically low. My bill seeks to reduce the total production of pork by making marketing premium incentive payments on lightweight hogs. The small payment involved would help directly, of course, to make up for some of the lowness in price. But the major effect of the payment on lightweight hogs is not the direct income effect but rather its supply-reducing effect which should help prevent the prices of hogs from dropping to an extremely low level

as they did at the bottom of the cycle in 1955 and 1956.

Various methods could be used to help bring about more orderly marketing and managed bargaining on the part of hog producers. But as a short-run program to stop the hog price decline that is already upon us, it is felt that direct payments to farmers would have more success in bringing about rapid adjustment than any other type of Government action.

Following is the program designed to deal with the short-run problem as provided in my bill:

First. The marketing premium payment would be applicable to all slaughter hogs marketed at live weights between 180 and 200 pounds.

Second. Producers presenting invoices of sales of lightweight butcher hogs could collect their marketing incentive payment at the county office.

Third. The payment would vary in accordance with how low the price of hogs should become. My object to make the incentive large enough so that the market supply of pork will be reduced.

The program proposed in my bill is not a longrun solution to the hog marketing problem. It is frankly a stopgap program to meet an emergency situation. It is aimed at encouraging a more orderly adjustment of volume of hogs slaughtered and to supplement hog farmers' income for a short period until the hog cycle can right itself. The program would remain in effect for a maximum of 1 year at a time. It should be extended for greater periods. Its purpose is to prevent the bottom or the hog price cycle from becoming so low.

The cost of the program can be estimated only approximately since no one knows for sure how low the price of hogs might go in the absence of the program. But in no event may the program provided in my bill require payments of more than $150 million in any one year. The program provided by my bill is self-limiting. If the price goes down owing to large marketings, the value of the premium payment on sale of lightweight hogs becomes more important relative to total return, this encourages larger numbers of farmers to sell at the lighter weights and qualify for the premium payment. This means that hogs would be marketed at 190 pounds, instead of at, say, 240 pounds per head. This would be a reduction per head of as much as 50 pounds less pork being placed on the market. This reduction in market supply would cause the market price to rise, thus reducing the volume of payments that would actually have to be made.

Mr. Speaker, it is an old saying that great minds often run in the same channels.

I have been working on this proposal for some time. I had been waiting to introduce it until it seemed like the proper time to catch hog prices before they drop too far.

I was surprised and gratified to note in the newspaper the other day that others had been working on a similar proposal. Among others who have been giving thought to this proposal has been the agriculture committee on the National Planning Association, which just recently put out a policy statement advocating premium payments on sale for slaughter of lightweight hogs.

I should like to read excerpts from the policy statement of the National Planning Association. While the specific mechanics of the proposal they have recommended is slightly different from that provided in my bill, the proposals are very similar:

TOO MANY HOGS

Heavy hog supplies in 1960, and resulting low prices, are likely to create a problem which will seem all the more acute because 1960 is a presidential year. Under these circumstances, there will be many pressures for Government intervention. There are likely to be proposals submitted which will not stem from a thorough analysis of conditions but from political expediency and which, if put into effect, might be detrimental to hog producers.

In this situation it is desirable that prompt attention be given to the problems before they become acute, in the hope that conditions can be carefully appraised and the best course of action determined. * * *

It should be emphasized that the type of Government action which we believe would be most appropriate and which is set forth below is designed to slow the rapid buildup in hog numbers and bring about a quick adjustment in production before farmers' income from hogs becomes critically low.

PRESENT FEED GRAIN SITUATION

For 7 consecutive years, the stocks of feed grain have increased and by October 1, 1959, will be nearly four times the level of 1952 which was considered to be about a normal carryover. This has occurred during a period when the number of grain consuming animal units was relatively large and the quantity of feed per animal unit was at an alltime high. It has occurred during a period when the population of the country was expanding at the rate of nearly 3 million persons per year, and the consumption of meat and poultry, per capita, averaged above any other 7-year period since the turn of the century. Yet, surplus stocks of feed grain have accumulated at a rate of about 8 million tons per year.

The present feed grain carryover will amount to about 75 million tons by October 1, 1959. Practically all of this carryover is owned or under loan by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The annual excess production of feed grains and the magnitude of present storage stocks have become major problems.

The production of feed grains for each year from 1955 through 1958 was higher than for any previous year except 1948 (and the last 2 years were alltime records). Despite the fact that the Government, through its price-support programs, has accumulated record surpluses, prices of grains have fallen rapidly. The price of corn fell from about $1.72 per bushel before the new crop was available in 1952 to about $1.16 during the same period of the year in 1958. The price of oats fell from about 80 cents per bushel in the summer of 1952 to 56 cents in 1958. The price of sorghum grain fell from $1.61 per bushel to 97 cents during the same time.

OUTLETS FOR FEED GRAIN

Over 80 percent of domestic feed grains are used for feeding livestock. The demands for feed grains for food, seed and industry normally account for about a tenth of total utilization. Exports which account for the remainder have varied from 0 to 7 percent. * * *

Cattle feeding is at an alltime high. However, the current buildup in cattle numbers will mean that there will soon be a greater supply of lower grade cattle on the market to compete with fed cattle. Under free market conditions, it is unlikely that cattle feeding will increase very fast in the face of rising pork output and later, rising total beef output. Cattle feeding remained practically constant from the end of 1952 (5,762,000 head), when large marketings of lower grade cattle began, until the end of 1957 (5,867,000 head), after the cattle and hog cycles had turned downward, despite the fact that the supply of feed grains was large and increasing during this period.

Poultry production is also at an alltime high after a rapid increase during the last 4 years. However, with increasing red meat production, it is unlikely that the rate of expansion in poultry will be maintained over the next few years. * * *

One of the most probable outlets for part of the present large feed grain supply is the hog industry. This industry is already a big user of feed grains. About 80 million hogs are produced for sale in this country each year. Usually about 450 pounds of feed concentrate are fed for each 100 pounds of live hogs, or about one-half ton per hog marketed. This amounts to about 40 million tons of feed grain per year.

During the past year, under conditions which favored an expansion in hog production, numbers have increased rapidly. It is almost inevitable that the increase in hog production will result in an even larger percentage decrease in hog prices.

Large price reductions at retail are necessary to stimulate consumers to purchase the increased production. These price reductions are so large that the farmers actually receive less total dollars from the marketing of a large crop of hogs than they do from a small one.

Recent estimates indicate that a 10-percent increase in hog production is associated with about a 25-percent decrease in hog prices. The likely income depression resulting from the current increase in production is one of the big problems currently facing the hog industry.

NO QUICK SOLUTION FOR GRAIN PROBLEM THROUGH HOG EXPANSION

However, any sharp buildup in hog numbers could give consolation in one respect: it would mean larger disappearance of feed grains. The thought might be entertained that at a reasonable cost, a hog program could be established with the object of using up the surplus feeds within a short period of time. But there is little hope of this, even if production of feed grains were held in close check.

The two problems, one of huge grain surpluses, the other of low and cyclical incomes to hog producers, are diametrically opposed. Any attempt to quickly feed a substantial amount of the grain surplus through hogs would severely depress the hog industry, disrupt resources in the industry, and would likely be very costly to the Government because of political pressures to assist the distressed producers. On the other hand, any attempt to reduce hog production to raise prices in the short run would add to the grain surplus.

The carryover on feed grains on October 1, 1959, will be about 75 million tons or 55 million tons more than a normal carryover. The approximately 80 million hogs which are now produced each year consume about 40 million tons of feed. This rate of production has grossed the farmer an average of about $17 per hundredweight during the last cycle.

If hog production were increased an average of 25 percent to about 100 million hogs per year, usage of feed would be increased about 10 million tons per year. But if the recent relationship between hog production and prices continued, prices of hogs on a free market basis would fall approximately 60 to

65 percent to average about $7 per hundredweight. This would reduce annual gross farm income from hog marketings on the free market from the $3.2 billion which it has averaged recently to about $1.6 billion, a reduction of about $1.6 billion per year. And even at this rate of hog production, it would take about 5½ years to reduce the present feed surplus to a level of 20 million tons, assuming that the production of feed grains, beginning with the 1959 crop, were successfully adjusted to other demands so that there were no new additions to surplus. During these 5½ years, gross income to hog farmers from the free market would be reduced about $9 billion relative to the average hog income over the past few years.

To look at the problem from another angle, suppose the current surplus grain stocks were insulated from the market, that is, frozen at their present size of 75 million tons. If this were done and if production continued to outrun utilization by about 8 million tons a year, what would be the effects if the excess output were fed through hogs? This excess production would feed about 16 million more hogs per year, increasing hog output 20 percent. Prices of hogs would probably drop about 50 percent, or from $17 to $8.50 per hundredweight, and cause gross farm receipts from hogs to decline from about $3.2 billion to about $1.9 billion per year.

THE HOG PROBLEM

From the year ending June 1954 to the year ending October 1956, federally inspected hog slaughter increased from 50.3 million to 67.6 million hogs. This was a 34-percent increase in 28 months and occurred under peacetime conditions. It occurred with a feed grain carryover less than half the present size, during years of average feed grain production with grain prices above present levels and during years of relatively high beef production which furnished strong competition against pork. Under present conditions of record large stocks of grains, record large current grain production, record hog-corn ratios in 1958 (average 18.6; previous record was 17 in 1926), and less competition from beef, the ingredients for a rapid buildup in numbers exist.

Production changes of the magnitude indicated above can bring violent changes in the free market prices for hogs. The annual average price received by farmers for hogs dropped from about $23 during the year ending May 1954 to about $13 during the year ending July 1956. Thus the price was nearly halved in 26 months. When the cyclical effects are compounded by the seasonality of production, even more fluctuation is observed. The farm price of hogs varied from a monthly average of $26.40 in April 1954 to only $10.60 20 months later. Cash receipts from sales of hogs fell from an annual level of $3,455 million in 1954 to $2,628 million in 1956.

LIKELY EVENTS WITH NO GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION

Under free market conditions, the present expansion in hog breeding which began about January 1958 will likely continue through at least part of 1960. Under conditions which did not appear to be any more favorable, if as favorable, to increasing hog numbers, the expansion in breeding during the last cycle continued for 26 months.

Marketings will likely peak during the winter and spring of 1960–61 and prices are likely to be near, and could slip below, prices of the 1955–56 winter low. A more level seasonal pattern of marketings may help keep prices from going extremely low during any particular month. But it is also possible that such a pattern could result in prolonged low prices for several successive months. At the bottom of the previous price cycle, the farm price of hogs was below $12 only in December 1955 and January 1956. It is possible that in the current cycle prices will be below $12 for several months. * * *

The instability of production which tends toward cyclicality not only has adverse effects on farm incomes, but it creates problems for market agencies, packers, and consumers. Fluctuations in hog production undoubtedly cause the establishment of excess marketing and processing facilities. It probably results in such facilities being operated at other than optimum levels of efficiency much, if not most, of the time. It tends to cause earnings of packers and marketing agencies to vary rather widely, as they are presented with problems in trying to merchandise a perishable product with resources which cannot be made as flexible as pork production. A highly variable supply for retail distribution is also undesirable because of the possible effects it has on the demand for pork. The high prices which tend to follow unduly low prices cause consumers to turn to alternative foods with the probable result that pork has to again fall to unduly low price levels to attract back some of its former consumers.

Even though the outlook for hogs during the next 18 months is not bright, there will be strong and well-reasoned arguments to let the situation run its course without Government interference: "The cure for 10-cent hogs is 10-cent hogs." Nevertheless, as numbers build up and prices decline, pressures for Government action will probably intensify. The peak of production is likely to come during the 1960 election campaign and it is only realistic to expect wide discussion of the problem. Careful thought needs to be given now to the question of what the objectives of Government action should be, and to the program which might best accomplish these objectives.

Governmental buying and surplus disposal programs are almost certain to be proposed as hog prices skid. These are essentially transfer payments from taxpayers and consumers to hog producers. However, it is difficult to find outlets for such purchases. Any large amount of disposal in the domestic market would probably have some adverse effect on the normal demand for pork. It is difficult to dispose of any large amounts in foreign markets without creating diplomatic problems. Such a program would not be effective in bringing about an adjustment in hog production; nor could it likely be of such magnitude as to have any material effect on producers' incomes. However, it should be used to the extent that it is feasible. * * *

DIRECT PAYMENTS

If governmental action is to be taken, it would appear that direct payments to farmers offer the best promise of dealing with the currently developing short-run hog problem. A direct payments program on lightweight hogs, properly conceived and administered, could accomplish the primary objectives. It would supplement producers' incomes; and by being applicable to only lightweight hogs, it would reduce the total potential pork which would normally be marketed from the available hogs, and thus of itself tend to raise prices and reduce the amount of subsidy. It would allow the free market forces of price differentials for quality, location and such factors to operate. It would reduce lard production, and provide leaner pork to consumers which could result in an increased demand for pork. It could be set up and be put into effect in a relatively short time, and would be readily understood by those involved. While it would lower the utilization of feeds in the short run, by tending to smooth the fluctuation in production, the amount of grains consumed over the entire cycle should be as high as if the free market were allowed to run its course. * * *

It is our thought, however, that this would be a stopgap program to meet an emergency situation. It is aimed at encouraging a more orderly adjustment in hog numbers and supplementing hog income over a short period. It would not appear that a seasonally adjusted base price or restriction of payments to meat-type hogs would aid in either of these objectives in the short run, but would only complicate the administration of the payments. It might be argued also that the payment should be triggered by the hog-corn ratio rather than by a fixed base price; or at least, that the hog-corn ratio should be used in conjunction with a base price in determining when payments should be made. However, most of the corn fed to hogs is fed on the farms where the corn is produced, and if the price of hogs goes to a low level, hog farmers would probably need assistance even if the hog-corn ratio were above a prescribed level. Also it appears that at the turning point of the last cycle, the adjustment in numbers was more closely tied to the prive level of hogs than to the level of the hog-corn ratio.

The cost of the direct subsidy program can only be roughly estimated. If 90 million hogs are marketed and this causes hog prices to decline to $11 per hundredweight, the total gross income to hog producers on a free market basis would be about $2.1 billion. Assuming that the cost of raising hogs, exclusive of the cost of labor and management, was $10 per hundredweight, the net return to farmers would then be $200 million. If hogs were supported at $12.50 and two-thirds of the hogs were marketed under 200 pounds so as to be eligible for the subsidy, nearly $200 million would be spent during the year in direct support of hog producers' incomes. This would about double the next return to producers.

Letter From Admiral Leahy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, there have been endless efforts to cover up or divert attention from the fateful decisions taken somewhere in the executive branch right after World War II, to make no real effort to give proper and effective aid to those resisting Communist expansion in China. Our people believed we were doing everything that could be done. Many knew that was not the case. One such was the late Adm. William D. Leahy who served so long and brilliantly under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman as their Chief of Staff.

The following letter, of which he sent me a photostatic copy, confirms that tragic fact. Unfortunately, the sympathetic change toward the Government of China which, at the time he wrote, just after Secretary of State Marshall had recommended "certain economic aid and assistance" to China, he felt might be developing, did not materialize. The forces in our Government who had decided to back the Chinese Communists won. The United States and the rest of the free world lost. We will be paying

dearly for many more years for the mistakes which Admiral Leahy, even though he was right on the inside himself, described as "completely beyond understanding."

The letter follows. Anyone who wishes to see it with his signature may do so.

DECEMBER 1, 1947.

CHIEF OF STAFF TO THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF, *The White House, Washington.*

DEAR COLONEL HOGAN: Thank you for your kind thought in sending me Freda Utley's "Last Chance in China," which I have read with much interest.

It is such a well-written story of China as to deserve a wide circulation in the reading public of America which I hope it will get.

It does not appear to contain much information that is not known to you and me and a limited number of others who have some understanding of the importance of a friendly China to the future welfare of our country, and one may hope that the book will stir up a sympathetic interest in our ally of the war years.

Our postwar attitude toward the Government of China is completely beyond understanding, but I am happy to have a feeling that the attitude is now undergoing a sympathetic change.

Anything that we may do now is late, but we may hope that it will neither be too late or too little.

With expressions of appreciation,

Most sincerely,

WILLIAM D. LEAHY.

You Can't Keep a Good Town Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 6, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, like many another American city, Flint, Mich., has had its ups and downs. Because of difficulties in the automobile industry—difficulties aided and abetted by the discriminatory excise tax on automobiles which I have repeatedly pointed out to this House—the past year or two has been one of Flint's rough periods.

There is still much unemployment, but no spirit of resignation. The citizens of Flint are confidently working and planning toward reaching the top again.

To show what they are up against, the New York Times of July 5, 1959, carried an article describing the efforts being made by business and union leaders to cushion the hardships of the unemployed. At the request of my labor friends, I am including herewith excerpts from the Times article.

As the article observes in its conclusion, Flint is not down and out. The encouraging figures cited in the article have since been updated through June, and show an even greater trend toward improvement. Unemployment edged down to 9.2 percent. New car sales, general retail sales, bank deposits and bank debits continued to climb. Building permits in June were 109.4 percent above June 1958, and for the 6-month period had increased by a third. Nonfarm employment went up to 121,500; families on welfare dropped to 1,738.

Other newspaper stories out of Flint underscore the city's optimism and determination. Edward D. Rollert, who became Buick's general manager on May 1, has outlined his company's plans to return laid-off workers to their jobs through finding uses for plant capacity not needed for current production and through a concerted effort to return Buick to its former share of the car market with emphasis on steady growth instead of sporadic gains and losses.

The Flint Chamber of Commerce announced appointment of G. Robert Nicholson as manager of its new Forward Flint Department, whose program will be to create a better business climate for existing industry and to attract smaller business firms in such lines as the service, wholesale, and retail trades.

Those are some of the ways in which Flint is fighting back. Meanwhile, the problems of the present are being faced up to as indicated in the following excerpt from the New York Times:

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1959]

BUSINESS AND UNION CHIEFS SEEK WAYS TO AID JOBLESS

(By Damon Stetson)

FLINT, MICH., July 4.—On a hot, humid afternoon recently a labor union leader, a credit union official, and several prominent Flint businessmen met in the directors' room of a credit union office on North Saginaw Street here.

They were solemn and serious as they discussed a plan to save the homes of unemployed Flint workers forced to default on their mortgage payments.

In the last 3 months alone, the labor leader reported, 160 homeowners had been faced with foreclosures proceedings and about 500 more might find themselves in the dire situation in the next few months.

In a small office about 2 miles away a retired businessman was going through a list of requests from some of the more prosperous Flint residents who were seeking workers to do handyman jobs.

WORKERS DISPATCHED

Meanwhile, at Local 599 of the United Automobile Workers on Leith Street, near the sprawling Buick plant, jobless members, who had exhausted their unemployment benefits, were dispatched to do the work as fast as the requests were relayed to the union offices.

At the headquarters of the Michigan Employment Security Commission at Payne and East Fourth Streets, a group of men in work clothes sat quietly on benches in a small room near the entrance. They were waiting for any odd job that might provide a few dollars.

In another office of the commission, an Illinois manufacturer was recruiting unemployed Flint workers for jobs on his assembly line in Illinois.

While such symptoms of Flint's economic unhappiness were evident behind the scenes, the sidewalks on Saginaw Street in the downtown section bustled with shoppers. Farther out, gaudy paint-splashed signs advertised special summer sales. Except for the UAW's thermometer of unemployment in front of City Hall, there were few outward indications that Flint was still one of the most critical cities in the Nation so far as unemployment was concerned.

Essentially, Flint is a dynamic, vigorous city—second in Michigan only to Detroit as a manufacturing center. It is the home of the General Motors Corp., which has Buick, Chevrolet, Ternstedt, AC Spark Plug, and Fisher Body plants here.

Some other factories are those of Standard Cotton Products; Anderson Tank & Manufacturing Co.; Michigan Central Airlines, Inc. (makers of Michigan Arrow trailers); Ottawa River Paper Co.; Pfeiffer Brewing Co.; E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., and Dinsmore Instrument Co.

Flint has a population of 198,000, many of whom came as transient workers and stayed because they liked the city and the rates of pay. Despite its industrial emphasis, the city has an unusual array of cultural activities, with greater adult participation than in most municipalities of its size.

Like Detroit, however, Flint's economy is extremely sensitive to fluctuations in the durable goods market and the ups and downs in auto sales, in particular. Last year was a bad year for autos and for Flint.

ELEVEN AND TWO-TENTHS PERCENT UNEMPLOYED

When Buick sales proved disappointing again this year, after last year's fall to 262,000, production was cut back and in March 4,500 Buick workers were laid off.

Last month Buick checked off the dues of only 8,426 production workers, compared with 15,000 last December, 22,000 in late 1957 and a peak of 27,772 in February 1956.

In many respects, these Buick employment figures are the measure of what has happened to Flint in the last year and a half. There used to be a saying to the effect that "as Buick goes, so goes Flint."

This is not as true as in the past, because Chevrolet and AC Spark Plug now employ more workers than Buick.

The United Auto Workers thermometer in front of city hall now shows 11.2 percent of Flint's labor force—15,500 persons—out of work. That is a dip from the 18,000 out of work a month ago. It is also a considerable improvement on the total of 25,500 jobless—17.7 percent of the labor force—a year ago.

For many months those out of work received State unemployment benefits and supplementary benefits from their companies. But more than 16,000 unemployed workers have exhausted their benefits in the last 18 months.

Although economic tragedy has unquestionably stalked many thousands in Flint in recent months, nevertheless, it would be unfair to portray the city as down and out. It is not.

Retail sales for the first 5 months of this year were 9.4 percent above the 1958 level; new-car registrations were up 51.2 percent for the 5 months; bank debits have increased 25.7 percent; bank deposits are up 14.4 percent, and nonfarm employment in the metropolitan area in May was 120,700, compared with 115,000 in May 1958. The number of families on relief in May was 1,822, a drop of 29 percent from the May 1958 total of 2,569.

Twenty-third Annual Conference of National Association of County Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from Detroit, Mich., where the National Association of County Officials is holding its annual convention. This association has as its officers and

directors: W. H. "Pat" Johnston, president, Georgia; William E. Dennison, first vice president, Michigan; Dan Gray, second vice president, Alabama; William O. Druffel, third vice president, Washington; Lawrence M. Lear, fourth vice president, New Jersey; G. A. Treakle, treasurer, Virginia; Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director, Maryland.

Board of directors: Norman A. Peil, chairman, Pennsylvania; Mark Johnson, Utah; Francis J. Pritchard, Connecticut; C. Arthur Elliott, Iowa; James H. Aldredge, Georgia; Marion Fogleman, Louisiana; Lester R. Gopp, Wyoming; Donald M. Neff, New York; Lloyd Rea, Oregon; Lemuel R. Johnson, North Carolina; Merle K. Anderson, Illinois; Herman C. Kersteen, Pennsylvania; C. L. Swenson, Idaho; David Bird, California; Keith McBurney, Colorado; Hurshel Jacobs, Indiana; Judge C. Beverly Briley, Tennessee; Earl W. Simmons, Florida.

Western regional district: Lester Gopp, president, Laramie County, Wyo.; M. James Gleason, vice president, Multnomah County, Oreg.; William R. MacDougall, secretary treasurer, Sacramento County, Calif.; Keith McBurney, national director, Colorado; Cleo Swenson, national director, Idaho.

National Association of County Recorders and Clerks: William P. Gable, Jr., Tulsa, Okla., president; Thomas P. Chapman, Jr., Fairfax, Va., first vice president; Hazel T. Chase, Salt Lake City, second vice president; D. H. Sloan, Jr., Bartow, Fla., third vice president; Mrs. Gertrude McCain, Celina, Ohio, secretary-treasurer; Mrs. Lucille Dunn, Hutchinson, Kans., historian.

National Association of County Engineers: Leighton O. Hester, Florida, president; Donald L. Smith, Alabama, regional vice president, southeast; Rufus Kirk, Kansas, regional vice president, south-central; C. Arthur Elliott, Iowa, regional vice president, north-central; Walter E. Rusk, Ohio, regional vice president, northeast; John A. Lambie, California, first vice president; L. T. DeBardeleben, Alabama, secretary-treasurer.

National Association of County Treasurers and Finance officers: Sharp M. Larsen, Salt Lake City, Utah, president; William A. Bell, Girard, Kans., first vice president; Howard L. Dietrick, Rock Island, Ill., second vice president; Lucille Woofendale, Indianapolis, Ind., third vice president; Robert Fitzsimmons, Minneapolis, Minn., secretary.

Conference of State Association Executives: C. L. Chamberlain, New York, chairman; William B. Speck, Virginia, immediate past chairman; Jack Lamping, New Jersey, secretary.

The staff of this association is composed of: Staff of National Association of County Officials: Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director; Alastair McArthur, assistant director for research and field operations; Jack Merelman, assistant director for Federal affairs; Philip B. Warren, Jr., assistant director for publications; Sally Ann Johnson, office manager; Elizabeth Loughlin, production manager; Sue Skillcorn; director of finances; Jacquelyn Pritner, administrative assistant.

More than 2,000 elective and appointed county officials are attending this 23d annual conference of the National Association of County Officials.

This meeting is one of the largest and most important national assemblies ever held on local government. The theme is "The Rebirth of the American County," and plays up the tremendous strides made by these local government units within the past few years. Counties are now assuming an everbroadening list of municipal-type services and are taking over many area-wide functions either alone or in conjunction with other agencies. Among these projects in key metropolitan areas are sewage, water, air pollution control, and airports.

Seven panel sessions are being presented during the conference, three are running simultaneously today and three more the following morning. These are: "How To Save Your County Money," "Improve County Administration," "A Successful Bond Sale," "Counties and the Press," "Massive Cooperation," and "How To Conduct Studies of Local Government." Each will feature a board of knowledgeable and nationally known experts in the fields under discussion.

The third general session, that same afternoon, will be devoted to adoption of resolutions, changes in the association's policy statement, the American county platform, and the election of officers and directors.

Following a custom started last year at the association's 22d annual conference in Portland, Oreg., Federal officials responsible for administering grants-in-aid and other U.S. programs of direct concern to localities are at the conference. They are answering questions concerning their programs and are giving personal advice and afford personal contact, for the county officials have from year to year to meet with the Federal officials responsible for many of these programs.

During the meeting the three affiliated functional groups, the National Association of County Recorders and Clerks, the National Association of Engineers, and the National Association of County Treasurers and Finance Officers, as well as the State Association Executives, are holding separate programs within the framework of the NACO meeting. Another fast-growing group within the national organization, the County Executives, will be informally organized during the conference. Some State associations are holding breakfasts and other functions on their own.

Each of NACO's nine standing committees are meeting during the conference. They are hearing leading Federal and other authorities within their areas of concern and are passing on policy statements for consideration by the membership.

I know that Members of the Congress will be pleased to know that these county officials, their constituents from over this great Nation of ours, are holding this meeting to help improve county government, exchange ideas, and to render a greater service to their people.

A Bill To Insure an Adequate Return on Social Security Trust Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 8407, a bill to remove the Secretary of the Treasury as managing trustee of the social security trust funds, and to substitute for him a person without conflicting interests; and to require a return on the social security trust funds as near as possible to the return being realized by regular investors in U.S. Government securities.

The old age and survivors insurance trust, and the Federal disability insurance trust, have been built up over the years since 1936 by the contributors of employees and their employers. As of May 31, 1959, the funds had assets of $20.4 billion, all of it invested, by law, in U.S. securities. Of this $20.4 billion, $3.2 billion are in assorted notes and bonds of public issues, whereas $17.2 billion are in so-called "special obligations."

The $17.2 billion of special obligations earned an average interest rate of only 2.556 percent as of May 1959. On the other hand, the average yield on marketable U.S. bonds for May 1959, was 4.08 percent. This means that the social security funds were and are being forced to accept a return of 1.53 percent less than they would have received if their investing trustees had been obtaining in the long-term U.S. securities market the going rate of return. At this rate, the participants in the social security funds will lose more than $260 million worth of interest in this year alone. In some degree this has been going on since 1953, when money first started to get tight, and the interest rate on U.S. securities began to climb. Unless checked by Congress, this shortchanging of the old folks will continue.

The interest yield is an important part of the total of the social security funds. The official publication, "Social Security Financing," by Ida C. Merriam, published by the Social Security Administration in 1952, assumed that "ultimately roughly one-third of benefit outlays will be met by interest earnings"—page 41.

This interest, compounded, is what keeps the fund actuarially sound. Together with current contributions, it is necessary to pay retirement benefits, aids to widows and dependents, and disability benefits. To the extent that the fund is depleted because its managers accept less than the going rate of interest for U.S. securities, extensions of benefits, both in amounts and in coverage, that would otherwise be possible consistent with actuarial soundness, are prevented.

The history of social security legislation reveals how this shortchanging of participants has come about. Under the original Social Security Act of 1935, the social security funds drew interest at the

rate of not less than 3 percent a year, which was perfectly fair to the participants, since 3 percent was above the going long-term rate of interest.

In 1939, the present trust fund management agreement was set up, consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury as managing trustee, together with the Secretary of the Labor and the Chairman of the Social Security Board—later the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The 1939 act also authorized the investment of the social security funds in any U.S. marketable securities, and also in special obligations, which were to bear interest at a rate equal to the average coupon rate of interest on the entire national debt. In 1956 came a slight amendment, changing the rate on special obligations to the average coupon rate on obligations of 5 years and over. This result in the inadequate 2.556-percent yield, now that yields of old outstanding U.S. bonds greatly exceed their coupon rate.

The present $17.2 billion holdings, of special obligations is almost three-fourths concentrated in certificates or notes callable in this year, 1959—a total of $12,374,300,000. $4,825 million are in bonds callable in 1963. The average return on the entire $17.2 billion, as I have indicated, is 2.556 percent.

To make the Secretary of the Treasury managing trustee of the social security funds as Congress has done, is to place him, as trustee, in an impossible conflict-of-interest situation. He is being made to serve two masters, which no man, particularly a trustee, can do.

As guardian of the social security trust funds, he and his cotrustee are duty bound to invest that money in U.S. securities so as to yield the highest possible return consistent with sensible administration. There is nothing in the law which requires the trustees to buy 2.556 percent special obligations, rather than outstanding U.S. securities yielding 4½ percent or more.

As Secretary of the Treasury, his duty is to administer the national debt at the least possible cost to the taxpayer. Here arises a square conflict—in this year a $260-million conflict.

Under the Treasury-Federal Reserve debt-management policies of the last few years, most holders of the national debt have never had it so good. Banks have made record-breaking profits out of their holdings of U.S. securities. Institutional and individual investors have likewise profited very substantially. For example, within the last few weeks the Treasury had to pay investors 4.728 percent for 1-year money.

But the joke—and it is a wry one—is on the old folks. While other money lenders were getting 4.728 percent for a 1-year loan to the Treasury, the social security funds were compelled to struggle along on 2.556 percent.

Last January the Treasury issued a 21-year 4-percent bond. If you or I, Mr. Speaker, had been trustees of the social security funds, surveying our portfolio yielding only 2.556 percent, we would have jumped to invest hundreds of millions in this 4-percent issue. Instead, the Treasury allowed the funds to purchase only $18 million.

The law of trusts is clear that a trustee must use the utmost care to invest trust property in the most productive manner possible without risking the loss of principal—Scott, "The Law of Trusts," 22d edition, volume III, section 277. Where trustees permitted money owing them by a corporation of which they were directors and officers to remain unpaid, they were held personally chargeable with the loss to the trust—*Matter of Keane* (95 Misc. 25, 160 N.Y. Supp. 200 (1916)).

Where the trustee lent trust funds to a corporation of which he was president, which later failed, he was held liable for the resulting loss. *Humpa* v. *Hedstrom* (345 Ill. App. 289, 102 N.E. 2d 686 (1951)). See also *In Sparks Estate* (328 Pa. 384, 196 Atl. 48); *In Matter of Whitmore* (172 Misc. 277, 15 N.Y.S. 2d (1930)); *Parsons* v. *Wysor* (180 Va. 84, 21 S.E. 2d 753 (1942)); *Carrier* v. *Carrier* (226 N.Y. 114, 712, 123 N.E. 135, 858 (1919)).

I am not suggesting that Secretary Anderson should have to restore to the social security funds the $260 million or so which will be lost this year to participants because of his failure to obtain for his beneficiaries the same yield on U.S. securities which other trustees are obtaining for their beneficiaries. I am suggesting that the Secretary of the Treasury should be removed from his conflict-of-interest situation. To this end, H.R. 8407 removes the Secretary of the Treasury as managing trustee of the fund, and instead provides for the selection of the managing trustee by the two other trustees, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The bill further provides that the reconstituted Board of Trustees shall within 4 months submit to Congress a comprehensive report, including recommendations for changes in the law, whereby the interest yield on social security funds "can be made most nearly equal to the yield earned by private investors of insurance funds from investments in securities of or guaranteed by the United States." Last January the Advisory Council on Social Security financing recommended that special obligations should have a yield equal to that of outstanding U.S. 5-year obligations—currently above 4 percent. This would be a vast improvement over the present yield on special obligations. Even this new rate, however, may be inadequate in view of the callable character of special obligations. And the Treasury, it should be noted, opposes the advisory council's recommendations.

To prevent Congress to act intelligently we need this advice of a managing trustee without a conflict of interest.

H.R. 8407 specifies that the managing trustee, in addition to not having any conflicting interests, shall be a person of recognized integrity, and shall have a thorough knowledge of the insurance program established by this title and its problems. Surely there are numerous able Americans who could act as managing trustee.

The text of HR. 8407 follows:

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to change the composition of the Board of Trustees of the Social Security Trust Funds, and to require a comprehensive report to the Congress with respect to the investment of such Funds

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America assembled, That (a) section 201(c) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the first two sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "With respect to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund (hereinafter in this title called the 'Trust Funds'), there is hereby created a body to be known as the Board of Trustees of the Trust Funds (hereinafter in this title called the 'Board of Trustees'), which Board of Trustees shall be composed of the Secretary of Labor, ex officio, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, ex officio, and a third member who shall be selected jointly by such two Secretaries in the manner provided in subsection (i) and shall be the Managing Trustee of the Board of Trustees (hereinafter in this title called the 'Managing Trustee')."

(b) Section 201 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i)(1) the Managing Trustee shall be selected from among individuals in private life who are persons of recognized integrity, and shall have a thorough knowledge of the insurance program established by this title and its problems, with no conflicting interests which would hinder the performance of disinterested public service either in the investment of the Trust Funds or in the other functions and duties vested in the Managing Trustee.

"(2) The term of office of the Managing Trustee shall be four years.

"(3) The Managing Trustee shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 a day for each day he is actually engaged in the performance of his functions under this Act, and shall in addition be reimbursed for the actual and necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of his duties.

"(4) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make available to the Managing Trustee, from the personnel, facilities, and services of his Department, such secretarial, clerical, technical, and other assistance, and such information and data, as may be necessary or appropriate to the performance of the duties of the Managing Trustee."

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "estimated by him and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare" and inserting in lieu thereof "estimated and certified to him by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of the Treasury".

(b) The first sentence of section 201(g)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "estimated by him" and inserting in lieu thereof "estimated and certified to him by the Secretary of the Treasury".

(c) Section 205(i) of such Act is amended by striking out "through the Fiscal Service of the Treasury Department," and inserting in lieu thereof "in such manner as may be appropriate".

(d) Section 218(h)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "through the Fiscal Service of the Treasury Department" and inserting in lieu thereof "in such manner as may be appropriate".

SEC. 3. Upon the selection of the Managing Trustee of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Trust Fund under section 201(c) of the Social Security Act as amended by the first section of this Act which shall be accomplished within thirty

days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board of Trustees as constituted under such section as so amended shall assume, continue, and carry out all of the functions and duties which were being performed by the Board of Trustees as constituted before such amendment, and the Managing Trustee so selected shall assume, continue, and carry out all of the functions and duties which were being performed by the Managing Trustee provided for by such section as in effect before such amendment.

SEC. 4. Within four months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board of Trustees provided for by section 201(c) of the Social Security Act as amended by the first section of this Act shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive report, including its recommendations for changes in the law, with respect to the investment of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, with particular reference to the ways in which the interest yield to such Funds can be made most nearly equal to the yield earned by private investors of insurance funds from investments in securities of or guaranteed by the United States. Such report shall include recommendations on the maturity of obligations subscribed by or issued to such Trust Funds; the proportion of such Funds which should be held in short-term obligations; the relative desirability of subscription to public issues of securities to the Trust Funds or to special issues of such securities; the desirability of establishing a statutory minimum interest rate on special issues of obligations to such Trust Funds; and any other matters deemed by the Board of Trustees to be appropriate or relevant.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Tribute to Weldon Tabor, of Quanah, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, aside from the standards of good-sense economics, the development of effective and realistic farm programs is important to us in one other way—the preservation of the family-size farm.

There is no better example of what life on a farm can mean for a young man than the case of Weldon Tabor, of Quanah, Tex. Weldon has been selected by the Texas Future Farmers Association as its outstanding Lone Star Farmer. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Dallas Morning News of July 18, outlining the extent of Weldon Tabor's achievements.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOP FUTURE FARMER

Those who lament that ambitious youths are fleeing from the farms and ranches to the cities haven't looked in on a convention of the Texas Future Farmers Association. There they could find several thousand trained youths whose ambition is to stay on the land and to increase its yield.

Typical is young Weldon Tabor, son of a Quanah ranch family. Still a student, he has raised Hampshire swine, range heifers and wheat on his own. He has leased 1,900 acres of rangeland, bought 12 registered Santa Gertrudis heifers and a bull and rented 170 acres for wheat. With holdings already valued at more than $11,000, he plans to return to ranching after he completes a college course.

The Future Farmers have named Weldon Tabor as their star Lone Star Farmer. Likely Texas will be hearing more about him in the years ahead.

Oregon Shakespearean Festival Opens Centennial Event on New Stage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there will be no cannon salutes or brass band fanfares, but tonight will mark the opening of one of the most important and popular features of Oregon's centennial year celebration. This is the Oregon Shakespearean Festival in Ashland, a small community near the California-Oregon border.

The Oregon Shakespearean Festival, which is one of the few such events in the world with a record of having produced all 37 Shakespearean plays, will celebrate Oregon's 100th birthday and its own 24th year by opening on a new stage, modeled after the Fortune Theater of 1599.

The dedicated people of Ashland and the Oregon Shakespearean Festival, led by Founder and Director Angus Bowmer, deserve much credit for this outstanding annual contribution to Elizabethan drama. I ask unanimous consent that an article by Dorothy Nichols from the Sunday New York Times of July 26, 1959, entitled "New Stage for Shakespeare in Oregon," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with an editorial from the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune of June 18, 1959, entitled "Will Would Like It."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 26, 1959]

NEW STAGE FOR SHAKESPEARE IN OREGON

(By Dorothy Nichols)

ASHLAND, OREG.—The Oregon Shakespearean Festival here, dedicated to the production of the playwright in the form for which he wrote—swift, continuous action—will have a new Elizabethan stage this summer. In its 19th season the festival successfully faced a $275,000 fund-raising campaign. A grant of $10,000 from the Ford Foundation to Angus Bowmer, founder and director, has made it possible to bring back many of the festival's finest actors.

The opening play, "Twelfth Night," on Tuesday, will be preceded by an Elizabethan-style masque in honor of Oregon's centennial. A visitor can stay 4 days and see four plays. With the other three, "King John," "Measure for Measure," and "Anthony and Cleopatra" in rotation, the plays will run through September 5.

GOOD AUDIENCES

Ashland is now one of the few places in the world where the complete Shakespeare canon of 37 plays has been produced. The festival has maintained itself without subsidy, on admissions and private gifts. Last summer it attracted close to 30,000 spectators, yet the setting is a small town just over the border from northern California, a long day's drive each way from centers of population, Portland and San Francisco.

The festival has resisted the temptation of big names; its actors are young, drawn largely from college faculties and graduate students; some go on to careers in the theater, or teach and direct, spreading the Ashland ideal.

The stage at Ashland, built to the specifications of the Fortune Theater of 1599, with its many playing areas, upper inner, inner below, balcony, and curtained center, permits the original rush of action when plot was the element that held the audience, and, what we now revere, poetry and character were extras. On this stage there are no breaks in action; one scene begins as another ends. Everything falls into place; the abrupt shifts of mood, comedy relief, soliloquies, processions, battles.

The histories, in heraldic costuming, have been Ashland's most consistent artistic achievement. In these authentic productions the evolution of Shakespeare's form comes clear: from the juxtaposition of violent comedy with violent tragedy in Falstaff and Hotspur, to the emerging theme drama of the second "Henry IV." "King John" this season is the first of the chronicle plays to be repeated.

Except for the chronicle plays, Ashland permits a latitude in costuming only from Tudor to James. The stage is bare; the costumes make the color. But even in "A Midsummer Night's Dream" this becomes an advantage, for the focus was on the poetry, the true scene painting in Shakespeare.

FESTIVAL FOUNDER

The festival was founded in 1935 by Angus Bowmer of Southern Oregon College. On a bluff overlooking a canyon park which opens out of the town plaza, there was a walled oval left from chautauqua days. Here the theater was built and audiences sit under the stars—even through occasional thunderstorms. By day Ashland is any small town, though in Lithia Park visitors will be reading the evening's play by the pond with the Avon swans, and madrigals may float down from rehearsals in the theater on the bluff above.

The actors, who have been unpaid except for 15 scholarships, come recommended from every part of the United States. Nearly 500 applications were received this year from all over the world. Scholarship is taught from a theater point of view in the affiliated Institute of Renaissance studies. Elizabethan dances and music are part of the spectacle and the dueling is expert.

With no tailoring to fit stars, without novelty angles of period or imposed interpretation, productions at Ashland, the less successful as well as the most impressive, have a way of lighting up some special value; each one illumines Shakespeare's form and intent.

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune, June 18, 1959]

WILL WOULD LIKE IT

If advance signs are any criteria, the 1959 season of the Oregon Shakesperean Festival is going to be the best one in its 24-year history.

The big new stage house is nearing completion, and is recognizable for what it will be opening night, July 28, despite the litter and debris of construction still surrounding it.

It is an impressive structure, and a credit to its designer, architect, and builders—to say nothing of the thousands of people who gave generously so that it might become a reality.

The grounds have been changed considerably, but with taste and good sense. For instance, the tiers of seats in the rear are on a much sharper rise than before, making them far better for viewing and acoustical purposes than the former somewhat flat seat bowl.

The greensward in the rear is slightly smaller in area than in past years, but still

will be ample for the preperformance entertainment. New, attractive booths, built in the Tudor manner, will add to the rear-area atmosphere.

The two big light poles, which in the past stood amidst the seats and blocked the view of many patrons, are being removed. They will be replaced by light towers off to the side. (It is hoped this will be a temporary expedient; it is planned, eventually, to have all the nonstage lighting come from the new control booth in the rear.)

The new stage itself towers higher than the old one. And (at least to the untutored eye) it appears to capture the spirit of the Elizabethan age better than did the former stage.

The technical crew members are certain that it will be far more flexible and usable and convenient, thus adding to the excellence of the plays, not only through its own presence, but by improved technical facilities.

By opening night, landscaping will be completed, lighting in place, and, barring a few last-minute bobbles (which insist on plaguing any theatrical opening, new stage or not), it will open impressively and on time.

(Parenthetically, and in a thoroughly practical vein, it should be mentioned that for the first time the theater will be equipped with toilet facilities. This has been a much-complained-about deficiency.)

Complementing the physical plant, the festival has assembled for this year what may well be—should be—the best acting company ever.

Special grants from the Ford Foundation and the Oregon Centennial Commission have made it possible to arrange for the return of a number of actors and actresses who have been favorites in past years—men and women who have accumulated experience not only in Ashland but in all parts of the United States and Europe.

These, together with the finest young talents of actors, new to the festival, and with the veteran direction of Angus Bowmer and James Sandoe, and the untested but promising directing of Richard Risso, promise good things.

The festival production is a tremendous undertaking—one which cannot be entirely grasped except by watching the behind-the-scenes work, and the organizational and planning work which goes on the year around, as well as the show itself.

It involves the trained skills of hundreds of people in dozens of different fields. Much of it is performed by volunteers, and more by people who do their jobs more for the love of it, and for the experience, than for the small financial returns they receive.

It was more than interesting, it was to a degree inspiring, the other night during the casting dinner, to watch the faces of the young company—most of them in their early twenties—as they renewed acquaintances, or made new ones, or animatedly discussed previous festivals, or the forthcoming one.

One could sense excitement, anticipation, veiled worries, and determination as they faced this new summer adventure.

How the directors can take their young casts and, in little more than a month, turn them from an assortment of individualists (many of them quite obviously nonconformists) into an integrated, trained, disciplined, and polished acting company, is beyond the comprehension of the mere bystander.

But do it they do.

Tensions and problems will mount between now and opening night; differences of opinion, arguments, disputes will arise and be settled. Lines will be memorized, actions drilled, technical problems solved.

And, on opening night, following the festive dinner in the park, the 19th session will begin with color, pageantry and excitement.

William Shakespeare should be around to see it. He'd approve.

Education: Instrument of National Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of an address by John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University, at the commencement of the National War College and Industrial College of the Armed Forces on June 9, 1959. In his remarks, President Hannah stresses the important need for an educational system adequate to serve as an effective instrument of national policy to meet the challenge of Soviet Russia.

The address follows:

EDUCATION: INSTRUMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY

(Address by John A. Hannah, president, Michigan State University, commencement of National War College and Industrial College of the Armed Forces, June 9, 1959)

General Harrold, General Mundy, graduates of the National War College, and of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, ladies, and gentlemen, let me begin by extending congratulations to the members of these graduating classes of the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, not so much upon completing the rigorous courses of study successfully as for being qualified to undergo this intensive training. You are men who give every promise of attaining important positions of leadership entailing heavy responsibility in the years ahead. You will have this Nation's security in your keeping, and you well deserve our confidence and our prayers.

This is an appropriate occasion to repeat what I have said many times: On the basis of by relatively brief experience in the Department of Defense and other agencies of Government, I believe that the American people are greatly fortunate in the integrity, intelligence, and devotion of those who serve them in positions of trust, in both the military and civilian professions. Most of these men could leave the service of their country tomorrow and find employment in business and industry, in colleges and universities, in the professions and vocations. They would receive far more by way of material rewards in their services than they now receive or can hope to receive in the future. That they remain in their country's service speaks more eloquently than can I of their sense of values and their dedication to the welfare of their fellow citizens. Gentlemen, I wish you well in all the years to come.

Since the purpose of these colleges is to enrich the educational background and experience of specialists in the military and civilian services, it seems appropriate on this occasion to discussion education as an instrument of national policy.

Not many of us consider education in this role. There is good reason for real concern because many of our political leaders and others in positions of great influence seemingly fail to recognize the fundamental importance of education to the preservation of our system of government. And because they fail, the general public fails to sense its importance. Lipservice is paid in plenty to education, but it is painfully clear that education does not receive, and that our educational institutions do not receive, the consideration and respect their importance to our national well-being deserves.

Thanks to Soviet Russia's recent alarming advances in scientific and technological fields, and its less startling but no less serious economic and political inroads, there has been a partial awakening to some basic truths which once were plain to us as a people, but that have been obscured in recent years by indifference and preoccupation with other matters.

One of these truths is that education is, and long has been, a primary instrument of national policy to atain our stated goals as a free people. We find this set forth in a hundred documents—the Ordinance of 1787 creating the Northwest Territory contains these words: "Religion, morality, and knoweldge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools, and the means of education shall forever be encouraged"; in the Morrill Act, creating the land-grant colleges and universities; in the constitutions of our States; and in the charters of scores of private colleges. We find it set forth in the writings of Jefferson and a long succession of national leaders.

In all of these source materials, we find plain evidence that schools, colleges, and the means of education were to be encouraged that the American people might work out their rightful destiny.

Education was to be used, first, to prepare for the wise and proper exercise of their roles as citizens in a democracy where the vote of the unlettered was to count for just as much as the vote of the doctor of philosophy. The founders of our country had confidence in the judgment of the common people, but they understood full well that such judgment would have to be an informal judgment, else the system of government they had laid down simply would not work. They understood that in preparing to give the vote to all they were taking a calculated risk, but they knew also that only by giving each man his say could they insure that political stability which has ben one of our great strengths as a nation.

Education was to be used, second, to insure that equality asserted in the Declaration of Independence, because political equality would be only a mockery unless there was equality of oportunity as well. They intended, through education, to give every man an equal chance to better his lot in life; they intended, through education, to remove the artificial barriers of birth, and wealth, and privilege which fenced in those of lower rank in the Old World they know so well. They intended, in short, to provide for social mobility—to make it possible for a man to rise or to fall acording to his own talents, and ambitions, and willingness to work.

That they planned wisely and well is attested by the position of eminence to which our country has risen among the nations of the world. Political stability and social mobility are the warp and woof of our national being, and education is the loom on which it is woven.

Another basic fact of which we are just becoming fully aware is that Soviet Russia

has deliberately set out to surpass us in education. Reading our history coldly and analytically, their leaders came to the conclusion years ago that they could not hope to challenge us successfully in any field unless they could first match and then excel us in education, both quantitatively and qualitatively. This they determined to do—and they were away to a flying start before we even realized that we were in a race.

A fact of which we have not yet become fully aware is that in our struggle with Soviet communism, the outcome will depend not as much upon weapons systems as upon educational systems.

In this new contest of strength and will, the short-sighted have urged that we adopt the salient features of the Russian system, particularly its heavy emphasis upon science and technology, its long school hours, its closely directed study. They would throw away the educational system that has served us so well and set up in its place an imitation of the Russian system.

There are some features of the Russian system which recommend themselves to educators: The salaries paid to college professors, the respect paid to them, the social position accorded to them, for example. But I know of no responsible qualified critic who advocates that a system intended to serve the needs of a monolithic political and economic dictatorship would serve the needs of a free people.

In this crisis, we must adapt our system to our needs of today and tomorrow, not turn to a hybrid imitation of the Soviets.

To my way of thinking, an educational system adequate to serve as an effective instrument of national policy would have these essential characteristics:

1. It would place increasing stress upon development of greater professional and vocational competency in all fields, not just science and technology alone;

2. It would encourage a far better understanding of the people of other lands, including knowledge of their languages and appreciation of their cultures;

3. It would stimulate greater pride in the United States and the principles for which it stands, and greater loyalty and devotion to the great Western traditions;

4. It would aim to toughen our young people physically, mentally, and morally, for the trials and perils through which they must pass in the years ahead.

5. And most importantly, it would be open equally to all who could benefit, at little or no cost to the individual.

Whether we will face up to the urgent necessity to develop such an educational system or one much like it, and pay the price it would cost, remains to be seen. But it is painfully clear that we cannot hope to meet the challenge of Soviet Russia with today's policies and facilities; they simply are not equal to the task.

There is ample evidence that we can afford what it would cost. Consider just this alone: In 1956, Government at all levels expended a little over $14 billion on education. That same year, the American people spent $13.8 billion on recreation, and another $5.3 billion at State and private liquor stores.

Now let us turn briefly to an examination of one concrete example of the use of education as an instrument of national policy in international affairs.

History is sure to single out as one of the most remarkable developments in the period following World War II the generous giving of American money, goods, and human resources to help struggling nations in all parts of the world. Discounting self-interest to the fullest, this outpouring of American wealth is certain to be counted as a gesture of human consideration for the needs of others beyond all comparison.

American universities are rightfully proud of the contributions they have made in the technical assistance phases of this vast program. The sums of money involved in their activities are small by comparison with the total investment, but the potential dividends are tremendous.

The secret of their success, it seems to me, lies in the fact that their efforts are directed at the heart of the problem, which is how to help other peoples in other lands achieve richer and fuller lives for themselves. The offensive of the universities has been aimed at the historic enemies of mankind: Hunger, disease, and ignorance. They have been welcomed in foreign lands because their motives have not been suspect, and therein lies their tremendous potential for good. It is difficult to suspect the motives of a man who comes to teach you how to grow more rice, how to eliminate malaria, how to read and write your native tongue. To the common man—and it is to millions of common men that we must direct our appeal—electric power, steel plows, and penicillin count for more than planes and tanks and artillery.

With no intention of being critical of military aid, it is interesting to speculate what the results would have been had we diverted some of the billions expended on military material and training to activities touching the lives of ordinary people more closely. I refer to such activities as industrial production, those stimulating the formation of capital, and above all, educational programs to utilize the knowledge and intelligence of native peoples in developing the agricultural and industrial potential of their own countries.

Many of you members of these graduating classes will at times in the future be stationed at posts in lands in which programs of technical assistance are being carried on along with programs of military aid and assistance. In my opinion, it is absolutely essential that you understand the relationships between them.

Gentlemen, military security is not and cannot be our final objective, at home or abroad. This is not the road to world peace. Military security is a first prerequisite to peace in a world such as that in which we live today, to be sure. But an invulnerable defense can never be more than the wall behind which we seek to bring about those conditions which are the ingredients of peace.

The role of the military in those foreign lands is to help the native governments and their peoples to build a military force with which they can defend themselves. The role of the technical assistance programs, in which education plays a leading part, is to help the native governments and their peoples rid themselves of the unfair handicaps under which they struggle in far too many instances. Intolerance, ignorance, disease, hunger, and rigid caste systems have for far too long weighed down upon the bodies, minds, and spirits of millions upon millions of our fellow men. To talk to them of democracy and freedom is to talk of things beyond their interest or comprehension. But offer to show them how they can stand upright like men, and look up toward the stars rather than down into the mud, and we will find ears eager to listen, minds eager to learn, spirits ready to meet in harmony with our own. These things education can do.

This is not to say that education—at least formal education—is the panacea for all social, economic, and political ills. It would be naive so to claim. It is a powerful force, but not all-powerful.

Despite all that education has done for the American people, we still have economic, social, and political inequality and injustice in the United States, and formal education alone cannot possibly effect their eradication. But education considered broadly as any change for the better in the mind and spirit of an individual is the key to the solution of these problems, and many social intrumentalities other than schools and colleges participate in education of this kind.

For example, in education in this broad sense lies our greatest hope for the elimination of those violations of fundamental civil rights based on race, creed, or national origin which handicap us so grievously in our relationships with the people of so many other countries.

This is a matter of the utmost seriousness in the development and implementation of national policy in international affairs. It must be remembered that roughly one-third of the peoples of the world are not now firmly allied with either the Communist bloc or with those nations who stand with us as examplars of freedom and democracy.

The struggle between these two opposing forces could be lost on the battlefield, but it will never be won there. It will be won in the hearts and minds of millions of men and women who are nonwhites, and for whom differences in skin color constitute the single greatest barrier to rapproachment with what we call the free world. They hold the balance of power, and they look with mingled emotion upon all efforts to win their adherence and loyalty. They listen to what we say about equality and justice and the dignity of the individual, they look at Little Rock and Poplarville and at the crowded slums of our great northern cities, and at many kinds of discrimination everywhere. They listen, they look, they ponder—and they wait to see whether we will practice what we preach.

The terrible necessity to effect what is a minor social revolution under the pressure of time and in the spotlight of world attention emphasizes more strongly than any words of mine that missiles, planes, atomic submarines, and moon satellites will not determine the ultimate destiny of mankind. In the end, all will be reduced to terms of human values, because human beings are all that really matter.

They crave, and we can help them attain, security in the military sense; but that will not be enough. We must give them hope for better lives and confidence in their own ability to attain their legitimate goals. We must persuade them that their chances for success will be greater under the banner of peace and freedom than under the red flag of communism.

A distinguished Filipino alumnus of Michigan State University wrote in a recent letter to me from Manila:

"The distinctive feature of great nations is not their ability to behave well or righteously at all times, but their capacity to produce greatness at a vital moment."

Many times in history, America has produced greatness at a vital moment. The ability to do so has been one of our strengths as a people.

This is such a moment in world history. Can we produce that evidence of greatness again? If we are to do so, then education must produce much of the leadership, much of the moral strength, most of the trained intelligence so necessary to the task.

I conclude with the assertion that education is, long has been, and must continue to be a primary instrument of national policy both at home and abroad if we are to attain our stated goals as a free people.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the paradoxical aspect of one of this country's most pressing domestic problems, the farm program, is that the situation is apparently going to get worse before it gets better.

While the Government continues to initiate new and expensive methods for reducing scandalous farm surpluses, technical aids, better fertilizers, and other advances in farming continue to produce greater and greater yields each year.

The extent of this serious problem is outlined in an editorial which appeared in the July 9 edition of the Nashua (N.H.) Telegraph, one of New Hampshire's leading daily newspapers. I ask unanimous consent that this commentary be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DILEMMA

Drive through many parts of the east, the Middle West and the plains States and you'll see golden wheat bending in the wind. It's a beautiful sight, captivating to the eye and suggestive of America's rich, natural bounty.

Yet there's a side that's not golden. This staple of our diet is grown today in such abundance that we cannot find outlet for it. Each passing year since World War II and its aftermath seems to heighten rather than ease the problem of surpluses.

Nearly everything has been tried: restrictive quotas, acreage limitations, special efforts to find foreign markets, rewards to farmers for putting land into a soil reserve.

All those together have done little to reduce the groaning, costly weight of excess output.

Today the U.S. Government has more than $3 billion invested in wheat for which there is no immediate market.

All assaults on the problem have been largely thwarted. To some extent the luck of the weather has been responsible. In 1958 the crop benefited heavily from good weather, to reach bumper proportions.

But a steadier factor is farmers' increasing use of fertilizer and many other technical aids to boost their yield per acre.

Acreage limits mean little in the end when farmers can apply a host of new techniques to get more wheat from a given patch of soil.

Being in the business of trying to get the most from what they have, they cannot be blamed for maximizing their chances to earn a decent return from their land. But acknowledging this doesn't get rid of the problem.

The blunt fact of the matter, plain to anyone who will read the long-range forecasts of the farm specialists, is that supply both in wheat and certain other major crops may continue to outrun demand for many years to come.

Countless farmers have barely tapped the available technical reserve which could help lift their yields. As they dip in, output will rise, and rise again.

On top of this prospect, science is sure to go on bringing still newer technical advances which may be translated into still larger production gains.

Everybody knows we have a dilemma. The problem is to learn how to live with it without producing for the storehouse, at immense charge to the taxpayer.

Answers are not even dimly seen.

Safety in Small Coal Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, last Friday I invited the attention of my colleagues to an editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal commenting on the economic motive underlying the efforts to completely repeal the provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act which exempt small coal mines from mandatory compliance with certain safety recommendations.

Subsequently, I read another editorial discussing the same subject in the Louisville (Ky.) Times, another leading Kentucky newspaper, which I commend to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, entitled "The Real Problem Behind Mr. Lewis' Rhetoric," published in the July 23, 1959, edition of the Louisville (Ky.) Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL PROBLEM BEHIND MR. LEWIS' RHETORIC

"Widows and orphans are being created; death is coming to strong men before their time."

The author of this cheerless observation was the venerable president of the United Mine Workers, John L. Lewis himself. If we are to believe him, the principal agent in creation of widows and orphans, and of cutting down strong men before their time, is Kentucky's gentle Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

This is such a preposterous suggestion that it deserves closer observation, and closer observation convinces us that Mr. Lewis, in fine form, was putting on a show.

The occasion was a hearing by a Senate Labor Subcommittee on the subject of mine safety bills. The bill which Mr. Lewis favors would require mines employing fewer than 15 miners underground to employ the same safety equipment that present law requires for mines employing more than 15 underground. Senator COOPER has introduced a bill that would allow Federal inspectors to shut down any mine where danger is imminent, but it would exempt the small mines from complying with certain safety provisions.

MORTON BACKS COOPER

Last week Senator COOPER introduced a second bill, proposing a study of safety problems in small coalfields. It was this on which Mr. Lewis turned his angriest glares. Obviously, he said it "is intended to delay longer any possible affirmative action by the Congress—obviously it is designed to prevent this from becoming a political issue until after the next election." Senator COOPER mildly retorted that he is interested in mine safety too, and that he introduced the safety study bill only after the subcommittee reported there was no authoritative information on the subject.

Yesterday Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON lined up with his Kentucky colleague, Senator COOPER. He declared the bill Mr. Lewis favors would "inflict grave consequences on the small mining industry."

Small mines resemble big ones only in that they both produce coal. The small ones work small seams with hand labor, often on a family basis. The big ones work deep seams with powerful mechanical equipment. The big ones are efficient. The small ones are inefficient; often they are marginal as to profit. The big ones produce far more tons of coal per man-hour than the small ones.

Because of these factors, the big mines can afford to pay higher wages—wages demanded by Mr. Lewis' UMW—than the little mines. At the same time the little mines provide jobs for men who would be jobless if the mines were closed. Kentucky has about one-third of all the Nation's coal mines employing less than 15 miners.

NEW JOBS: WHERE?

Mr. Lewis gets on very well with operators of the big mines, which are solidly unionized. It is the little mines, where men would rather work for less money than go jobless, that UMW runs into trouble. One may only guess that Mr. Lewis would be well pleased to see the marginal mines shut down permanently, and all the working miners safely inside UMW.

Indeed this would be fine except that it would take away the livelihood (admittedly not a very good livelihood) of hundreds of Kentucky miners. It might be argued that these men would find jobs elsewhere, but the miners themselves surely would want to know exactly where. The new jobs simply do not exist, certainly not in east Kentucky.

Considering all this we must conclude that Senators COOPER and MORTON are more interested in keeping men at work in Kentucky's small mines than they are in seeing these men cut down in their prime.

Ike and Johnson Make Divided Government Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in many respects we are living through a very unusual period in American history. One of the most unique of the factors involved is that we have had a period of divided Government—with the Executive under control of one political party and the Congress under control of another.

For many decades, historians have predicted that such a period would mean a real debacle for the American form of government. They havesaid that it would not work. They have said that government would be paralyzed.

But this Government has not been paralyzed under such circumstances.

This is largely due to the statesmanship and the determination of the Senate majority leader, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, that this Government shall work.

This situation was graphically illustrated by the distinguished and perceptive columnist, Roscoe Drummond. In a column on July 20, he said—and I quote—"But the historians will find, I am sure, that it is largely because of LYNDON JOHNSON'S special brand of leadership that divided government is producing good legislative fruit." Mr. Drummond went on to say that JOHNSON'S great contribution during this unprecedented period "is that he is choosing to transact the public business" instead of seeking to make issues.

I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, July 20, 1959]

IKE AND JOHNSON MAKE DIVIDED GOVERNMENT WORK

(By Roscoe Drummond)

We don't have to wait for the history books in order to render two important verdicts on an unprecedented period in our political history—the second term of the Eisenhower presidency and the second and third terms of the LYNDON JOHNSON Congress.

These 4 years, from 1957 to 1961, are an unprecedented period because we have been testing for the first time the effect of the anti-third-term amendment upon the functioning of the Presidency. Never before has a President been automatically on his way out of office the day he was elected to his second term.

This 4-year period is also unprecedented because for the first time a President has been confronted through the entirety of his second term with a Congress controlled by the opposition—a Democratic Congress thrice elected with increasing majorities during a Republican Presidency. It had never happened before.

The unusual character of this period is compounded by the fact that both unprecedented circumstances—the first impact of the 22d amendment and the continuous opposition-party control of Congress—occurred at the same time.

Most predictions were for a political cold war and a perilous legislative stalemate.

And what has actually been happening—and why? It seems to me already amply evident that when the historians come to write the history of 1957 to 1961 they will almost unanimously agree:

1. That Dwight D. Eisenhower has proved that a constitutionally lame duck President does not have to limp to the exist of his second term, that he can grow in power and political effectiveness, and that in so conducting himself Mr. Eisenhower has helped future Presidents faced with similar circumstances.

2. That, simultaneously, Democratic Senate Leader LYNDON JOHNSON—invaluably aided by Speaker SAM RAYBURN of the House—has himself made an original, courageous, and incalculable contribution to the functioning of divided government by insisting upon making divided government work and by setting the maximum area of compromise between a Democratic Legislature and an opposition party President. JOHNSON has had no precedent to work by; he has made his own precedents and I believe that history will call them good ones.

Mr. Eisenhower has said that it is "no bed of roses" dealing with an opposition party Congress. It is equally true that Senator JOHNSON finds it "no bed of roses" dealing with an opposition party President, particularly since some of the thorniest patches are being planted by some Democrats, particularly the Democratic national chairman, Paul Butler.

But the historians will find I'm sure, that it is largely because of LYNDON JOHNSON'S special brand of leadership that divided government is producing good legislative fruit. Senator JOHNSON has proved himself a constructive realist. He knows that Mr. Eisenhower won the Presidency, not Adlai Stevenson, and that Mr. Eisenhower's 9 million majority did not enthrone the Democratic platform.

It seems to me the difference between JOHNSON and Butler is that Butler wants to use divided government to make issues on which to try to win the White House next year and that JOHNSON wants to use divided government to get the best attainable legislation. The decision LYNDON JOHNSON faced was whether to paralyze the government or transact the public business.

JOHNSON'S great contribution during this unprecedented period is that he is choosing to transact the public business.

Fire Prevention Funds for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in 1957 over 5 million acres of forested public land in Alaska were destroyed by fire. This represented vast losses in natural resources, and in recognition of the need to do all possible to halt such a devastating force, the Congress appropriated for the 1959 fiscal year an additional $250,000 above the budget request of $387,900 to start a realistic and long-needed fire prevention program in Alaska. The fire loss last year was less than a million acres.

The President's budget this year went back to the wholly inadequate figure of $387,900. In the face of this inadequacy and because fires are again raging throughout many areas of Alaska, the Alaska delegation is seeking an additional $250,000 in the Supplemental Appropriations Act for the 1960 fiscal year. If this money is not made available, practically all the new program, inaugurated last year with the additional funds provided by the Congress, will cease.

This problem is a grave concern to Alaskans and to many others outside Alaska who are familiar with the situation. The gravity is related in an excellent editorial which appeared in the July 26 issue of the Milwaukee Journal. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, July 26, 1959]

EIGHTY PERCENT OF ALASKA'S FORESTS BURNED; LITTLE PROTECTION

Forest fire losses in Alaska are staggering.

The new State has some 125 million acres of forest land and nearly 80 percent of it has been burned over in the last 70 years, according to R. G. Lynch, of the Journal staff, who visited Alaska last year.

Most of the timber burned is on Federal lands, so the loss is borne by the American public generally. But it is distant and few people feel the impact directly, so there is little protest or pressure to reduce this waste.

Perhaps that is why Washington has been so niggardly in appropirations for suppression of forest fires in Alaska. In a dry season, when lightning may start scores of serious fires simultaneously in remote, roadless areas, the small corps of firefighters is overwhelmed. For only 2 years have they had planes and smoke jumpers for effective operation but they are hopelessly too few and now there is danger that there won't be money to carry on.

For next year the Budget Bureau recommended only $387,900 for forest fire control in interior Alaska, writes Senator BARTLETT, Democrat, of Alaska. That's to protect 125 million acres of forest and another 100 million acres of open ranges where the fire control is most difficult, while Wisconsin spends around $1.8 million a year to protect 16 million acres of quite accessible forest land.

Supplemental funds are made available to meet costs of fighting Alaska forest fires when emergencies actually arise. But lack of adequate specific appropriation prevents training the professional crews and acquiring suitable equipment in advance, to prevent emergencies or to cope with them efficiently if they cannot be prevented.

Here is an example apparently of very shortsighted efforts at economy in dealing with a situation that doesn't generate great political pressure. If the same situation prevailed in one of our populous States it wouldn't be tolerated, and should not be tolerated in our 49th and biggest State.

More Waste in Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine editorial published in the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, on Sunday, July 26, 1959, entitled "More Waste in Foreign Aid."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, July 26, 1959]

MORE WASTE IN FOREIGN AID

Here we go again. Another congressional subcommittee, this one headed by Representative PASSMAN, of Louisiana, points to the grossest waste and extravagance in the foreign aid program.

What are we to think when we are told by this House subcommittee that in Pakistan a staff of 271 Americans has been supplied by U.S. taxpayers with 229 passenger

automobiles, 529 refrigerators and 1,027 native helpers?

Much worse, however, is the situation in Korea, where the looting of military supplies for sale in stores seems to have been elevated into a gigantic racket.

The House subcommittee in question did not say in which country it learned of a 20-year supply of WAC clothing, along with a 45-year supply of .30 caliber carbine ammunition. The country turns out to be Korea. Also in Korea no fewer than 70,000 sets of new tire chains were left outdoors without storage, along with more than a million new carbine and submachinegun clips.

As for the diversion of military supplies furnished by us to civilian retail outlets, a Defense Department report, made last November, and now released to the public, says that in Korea there were "critical shortages of almost all items of supply" in forward areas, caused by these diversions. The shocking report goes on:

In the large centers of population, the quantity of military goods of all types that has entered the civilian economy is beyond belief. This activity is so extensive that an adequate description is impossible. Items such as tires, hand tools, clothing, flashlights, construction material, spare parts, food, wire, petroleum and oil and lubricants, and in fact virtually every commodity required to support a military machine, with the exception of equipment such as tanks and artillery pieces, is displayed openly for sale by private enterprise.

Incredible as this is, the report goes on to say that shortages affecting the Armed Forces had been rendered so acute by this thievery and pilferage that the military had to go into the civilian market and buy back the materiel stolen from it.

Witnesses for the Defense Department stated that a strenuous effort was being made by Korean officials to control this orgy of looting, and that high-ranking officers were being discharged and court-martialed.

How do such things happen U.S. Senator ERNEST GRUENING of Alaska has shed considerable light on the question in a letter to the New York Times. That newspaper had charged him with "irresponsibility" because he and 19 other Senators unsuccessfully sponsored an amendment designed to tighten up the Mutual Security Act, with a view to preventing gross waste.

Senator GRUENING stated that he had seen the vague and largely meaningless illustrative budgets submitted in support of this year's foreign aid program. He went on to say:

"These volumes contain no firm commitment that any of the funds requested will be spent for any of the projects listed in these wordy yet vague documents. * * * In effect, Congress is being asked to give a blank check made out to the executive branch to spend in any way it sees fit wherever it sees fit throughout the world for loosely defined purposes.

"Our amendment provided only that 90 days after the Congress appropriated the funds for these four foreign aid programs the Federal agencies involved would be required to submit budgets showing exactly on what they intend to spend the taxpayers' money. The amendment would require the agencies to spend the funds for the stated purposes only, or to permit the funds to go unspent."

Senator GRUENING added that in order to give the program flexibility the sum of half a billion dollars was exempted from the bill so that the Executive could spend that amount in unexpected or emergency situations. He said, with much justice, that he thinks half a billion dollars' worth of flexibility is enough.

The amendment he sponsored got only 38 votes in the Senate and, hence, was defeated. Its defeat was a tragedy. This becomes increasingly evident as official inquiries reveal scandalous waste and extravagance in the foreign aid program.

Some foreign aid is vital to the security of the United States, but unless the whole system is sharply tightened up there will be grave danger that in the future Congress and the people will insist on cutting out this needed aid, along with the rest.

How much longer are sloppy supervision, loose controls, and shocking inefficiency to be tolerated in the distribution of our foreign aid?

Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following comments I have received from a constituent of mine on the subject of labor unions. I believe the writer's reference to the application of the right-to-work law in Canada will be of special interest to Members of this body:

LABER UNIONS

I do not think that organized labor can become too powerful, at least until organized labor becomes the minority of the people of this country. If we are to have a democratic form of Government, the majority must rule, otherwise we have aristocracy, plutocracy, and many of the other forms of government which to me are anathema, but which can generally be collected under the name facism. It seems to me and has since the discussion became so bitter that the largest majority in this country is composed of working men, labor. Therefore I do not see how they can become too powerful. The American people have given lipservice to democracy during their entire history but have actually been under an aristocratic-plutocratic form of government until the past 20 years. The minority who have controlled this country throughout its early life are now the ones who are so vociferously demanding that the unions be stripped of power. The only legislation needed it seems to me is to compel the union itself to be democratic internally, such as compelling supervised elections so that each man shall have the right to a secret ballot and also that the funds members contribute to their union must be audited by independent auditors so that no funds can be misappropriated without sure penalty to the wrongdoer. In regard to so-called right-to-work laws, I am ashamed that my country is so dim-witted that it can't follow the example of Canada. As I understand it the Canadian Supreme Court has ruled that no man can be compelled to join a union. But if he works for an employer who has made concessions to an organized group of his employes and the individual has profited by the achievements of the union, he must pay dues the same as any union member. He doesn't have to belong to the union and be limited to union rules. But he cannot be a freeloader and profit without cost to himself from the efforts of the union. I have never belonged to a union and can't imagine myself ever a member. I could never accept anyone telling me I could do only so much work in a given period of time. But if an cessions such as higher pay, better working cession such as higher pay, better working conditions, etc., I should feel like a cheap skate if I didn't bear my share of the expense in gaining such concessions.

The Townsend Clubs and Dr. Francis E. Townsend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Those Townsend Clubs," from the Pendleton (Oreg.) East Oregonian, of July 21, 1959.

The editorial pays tribute to the pioneering vision of Dr. Francis E. Townsend, who set in motion the fundamental and basic idea that America had a duty to help care for its elderly citizens during their declining years.

The programs resulting from the Townsend plan and its impact upon public opinion have included such advances as social security, State and Federal programs of old-age assistance, improved retirement benefits for Federal employees, and many other gains.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Those Townsend Clubs," from the Pendleton (Oreg.) East Oregonian, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE TOWNSEND CLUBS

One of the hardest nostrums ever urged upon Congress is getting another round of publicity this week as the Townsend Clubs of America hold their annual convention at Portland. For a quarter of a century the Townsend movement has been selling one version or another of its familiar universal pension plan on Capitol Hill.

The scheme called originally for pensions of $200 a month for all citizens 60 years of age or over, the payments to be financed by a 2 percent transaction tax. The 1959 version is more modest, despite the inroads of inflation. One of its legislative sponsors, Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota, estimates that it would provide primary benefits of $130 to $150 a month.

This would be accomplished by repealing or suspending various provisions of the Social Security Act in regard to old-age and survivors and Federal disability insurance. In their place would be instituted uniform benefit payments to all U.S. citizens over 60 years of age, to all totally and permanently disabled persons between 18 and 60, and to female heads of families with dependent children under 18.

The program would be financed by a Federal gross income tax of 2 percent on all monthly personal incomes over $250 and on gross receipts of companies and corporations. The monthly tax collections would

go into a special Treasury account. After deduction of administrative expenses, the remainder would be divided equally among beneficiaries.

There are certain other refinements. For example, above the amount of $75 a month, adult beneficiaries would lose $1 for each $2 per month earned in excess of $50 in employment or self-employment.

The Townsend plan, depression-born, is advocated not only as an old-age security measure but also as a business stimulant and stabilizer. The idea is to increase the buying power of the aged and thus to encourage increased production. Opponents insist that the scheme would have no effect on buying power but would merely take a substantial part of the income earned by people under 60 and transfer it to people over 60.

In any event, the Townsend plan has proved to have heavy-duty, long-mileage political sex appeal. Twelve House Democrats and nine House Republicans are members of the Townsend plan executive committee. Dr. Francis E. Townsend, founder of the movement, claimed the 1958 congressional elections a tremendous Townsend victory with 82 percent of Townsendites—candidates recommended by Townsend State and congressional district councils—elected.

Dr. Townsend was, we think, unduly exuberant. Almost no candidates run any longer either for or against the Townsend plan. That the plan has managed to survive for so long is, however, quite a tribute to its author.

Results of University of Detroit Political Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following results of a political poll sponsored by the Young Republicans and Young Democrats of the University of Detroit Political Union. Returns were received from 435 students at the university.

UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT POLITICAL POLL SPONSORED BY UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT YOUNG REPUBLICANS AND UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT YOUNG DEMOCRATS UNDER THE UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT POLITICAL UNION

Please check answer which corresponds with your own thinking or opinion. Sign your own name, home address, age, and college at the bottom.

1. Do you believe that continued prosperity requires continued inflation? Yes 10 percent; no, 90 percent.

2. To combat inflation, would you favor price, wage, and rent controls? Yes, 40 percent; no, 53 percent; 7 percent no opinion.

3. Do you think the Federal Government should spend more for welfare pensions? 75 percent, yes; schools, 65 percent, yes; housing, 75 percent, no; hospitals, 60 percent, no; agriculture, 80 percent, no; vets, 95 percent, no.

4. If tax reduction becomes possible where should it come first? More liberal treatment for small business, 56 percent, yes; cut individual rates, 52 percent, yes; cut corporate rates, 80 percent, no; cut excises, 67 percent, no. Do you believe any present rates should be increased? 71 percent, no.

5. Would you favor a national sales tax collected at the manufacturer's level (except food, clothing, and medicine) if additional revenue is needed? Yes, 59 percent; no, 32 percent. 9 percent, no opinion.

6. Do you agree with those people who say taht organized labor is becoming too powerful? Yes, 78 percent; no, 22 percent.

7. Do you favor extension of coverage and increase in the minimum wage? Yes, 71 percent; no, 27 percent.

8. Do you favor hospital and surgical care for the social securities beneficiaries with an increase in the wage base for social security taxes to $6,000? Yes, 46 percent; no, 53 percent.

9. Do you favor Federal aid to education in school construction, grants, and teacher pay? Yes, 64 percent; no, 36 percent.

10. Instead of a Federal aid to education program, would you prefer permitting taxpayers to take a credit against their Federal income tax for new or additional school taxes paid? Yes, 56 percent; no, 31 percent; 13 percent, no opinion.

11. Do you feel that the small businessman needs more and bigger loan programs, protection and benefits to aid him to compete? Yes, 73 percent; no, 27 percent.

12. Do you feel that Federal action is needed in these fields? More guarantees of larger mortgages at lower interest rates? 59 percent, no; 30 percent, yes; 11 percent, no opinion. Public housing for middle as well as low income families? 91 percent, no; 8 percent, yes. Problems of social delinquents in slum areas, 61 percent, no; 37 percent, yes. Aid to the elderly, 56 percent, yes; 41 percent, no. Aid to the handicapped, 51 percent, no; 47 percent, yes.

13. Do you think that support prices on farm commodities should be tied more closely to market prices? Yes, 76 percent; no, 9 percent; 15 percent, no opinion.

14. In foreign aid, would you favor more emphasis on economic and less on military assistance? Yes, 82 percent; no, 16 percent. Do you favor gifts and sales of surplus farm commodities to underdeveloped countries? Yes, 73 percent; no, 24 percent.

15. In the field of public versus private power would you favor the expansion of TVA? 43 percent, no; 24 percent, yes; 33 percent, no opinion. Large scale Federal construction of power projects, 42 percent, no; 25 percent, yes; 33 percent, no opinion. More public projects in the development of atomic energy, 74 percent, yes; 26 percent, no. Would you favor legislation to relax Federal controls over independent natural gas producers? Yes, 20 percent; no, 78 percent.

16. Do you think that more federally administered programs should be turned back to State control? Yes, 42 percent; no, 46 percent; 12 percent, no opinion. Do you favor more Federal grants-in-aid? Yes, 54 percent; no, 39 percent; 7 percent, no opinion. Do you believe that the State and local governments should have more powers? Yes, 22 percent; no, 69 percent; 9 percen no percent; no, 61 percent.

17. Do you favor repeal of section 14–B of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits the States to enact right-to-work laws? Yes, 39 percent; no, 61 percent; 9 percent, no opinion

18. Do you favor Federal spending programs such as long-term, low-interest Federal loans for local public works or Federal aid to centers of chronic unemployment for plants and public works to attract new industry? Yes, 51 percent; no, 46 percent.

19. Did you vote at the time of the last election? (Only answer if you were 21 years of age at that time.) Yes, 61 percent no, 39 percent. (Of the 435 returns, 39 percent were over 21 years old.)

20. Would you vote for a Catholic presidential candidate primarily because of his religion? Yes, 3 percent; no, 97 percent.

Rear Adm. George J. Dufek, Navy's Top Polar Expert, To Retire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a pre-date special news feature of the United Press International of July 28, 1959, contains an informative biographical sketch of Rear Adm. George J. Dufek, written by Harry W. Frantz, a distinguished foreign correspondent of that news organization.

Under leave to extend, I quote the indicated story:

[UPI Newsfeatures, United Press International predate special, July 28, 1959]

NAVY'S TOP POLAR EXPERT TO RETIRE

(By Harry W. Frantz)

WASHINGTON.—Rear Adm. George J. Dufek will retire September 1 after a naval career distinguished by notable achievements in the polar regions.

Long a devoted associate of Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd, Admiral Dufek has worn the mantle of "Mr. Antarctica" since Byrd died in 1957. No other American officer has been identified more closely with the peaceful exploration and scientific conquest of the southernmost continent.

The present worldwide attention to Antarctica has resulted in a large degree from Dufek's application of modern technology to the problems of transport and human habitation in that continent.

A member of two U.S. expeditions in the Arctic and six in Antarctica during a 20-year period, Dufek is now unchallenged as the foremost American authority in the planning and command of maritime, air and land operation in the icebound polar regions.

On April 15 at New York Dufek turned over the command of the U.S. naval support forces, Antarctica, to Rear Adm. David M. Tyree. Tyree also has been appointed by President Eisenhower as U.S. Antarctic projects officer, succeeding Dufek as adviser on political, scientific and legislative activities affecting Antarctica.

Dufek was commander of Operations Deep Freeze I, II, III, and IV, which planned and conducted the logistical support for the U.S. Antarctic program during the International Geophysical Year. He sent more ships, men, and airplanes to the southern continent than had been there through all history.

Eleven other countries with Antarctic programs benefitted directly or indirectly from the Byrd-Dufek demonstration that the scientific conquest of Antarctica and permanent human habitation were practicable enterprises.

Apart from his physical tasks in Antarctica, Dufek is likely to be remembered as one of the great diplomats of the U.S. Navy.

Before the International Geophysical Year there was considerable uneasiness that the activities of expeditions from 12 nations in that region might lead to unforseen antagonisms and incidents. Actually, the international cooperation for advancement of science was accomplished without a single unpleasant episode. There were many instances of extraordinary assistance in emergencies, and a general atmosphere of international friendship was maintained.

Admiral Dufek's efforts thus contributed to the continuation of international scientific cooperation in Antarctica following the International Geophysical Year. In Octo-

ber, delegates from 12 nations will meet in Washington to negotiate a treaty which may establish Antarctica as a vast scientific laboratory for peaceful enterprises.

Although Presidents Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower all turned to Dufek as a master of ship and air operations in polar regions, it is a curious fact that he was not a member of a seafaring family and in his youth he thought of an army career.

The admiral's father, Frank, was born at Prague, and emigrated to the United States about 1885. The father was a cabinetmaker and founded a piano factory at Rockford, Ill. His mother, Mary Wachuta, was born in Prairie Du Chien, Wis., of Czech ancestry.

George Dufek, was born at Rockford, Ill., February 10, 1903, far from the United States seaboard.

In high school he was captain of cadets and he thought about entering West Point. Instead, he was given an appointment to the Naval Academy at Annapolis, where he was graduated in 1925.

His early interest in Antarctica was accidental. While he was serving as a lieutenant at San Diego in the spring of 1939, the Navy Department called for volunteers for Byrd's expedition to Antarctica, Dufek's application was accepted. In September 1939 he became navigator of the ship, Bear, which was flagship of a Navy Antarctic Development project ordered by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

During the 1939–40 season Dufek made exploratory flights over parts of Antarctica and was given a medal.

In World War II he served as U.S. Naval observer for aviation at London, as senior naval aviator at Oran and Mers El Kebir during the North African invasion, as staff officer in command groups which planned the invasions of Sicily, Italy, and Southern France. His numerous citations all remarked of his skill at planning and coordinating operations.

He was commander of the aircraft carrier Bogue which, with escorting vessels, sank the last German submarine sunk in World War II. After the war he was commanding officer of the former Japanese Naval Air Base at Ominato, Japan, and later commanded the Naval Air Transport Service Terminal near Tokyo.

In 1946 Dufek was sent to the Arctic as chief staff officer on a U.S. Navy-Coast Guard expedition to establish weather bases in the polar regions. He returned to Washington to help plan Operation High-Jump in Antarctica, and as a captain sailed with 13 ships of the task force under direction of Admiral Byrd.

Dufek's group of three ships in 1947 traced the coastline between Little America and the Palmer Peninsula. He made the first flight over the Thurston Peninsula. He also was acclaimed for rescue operations of a fallen airplane. Admiral Byrd said that his rescue of six survivors was in many ways unequalled in all the history of polar rescues.

In 1948, Dufek went back to the Arctic in command of a task force to establish new weather stations near the North Pole. His vessels went farther north under their own power than any other ship had.

In 1949–50 Dufek worked with the Logistic Planning Section of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In 1951–52 during the Korean conflict he was commander of the U.S.S. *Antietam* which set a new safety record for aircraft carrier operations under combat conditions.

In August 1954 he was designated as head of the Special Antarctic Planning Group in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.

In March 1955 he became commander of task force 43 for Operation Deep Freeze. In July 1957 President Eisenhower named him U.S. Antarctic project officer, in which post he succeedde Byrd as senior U.S. adviser on activities affecting the American Antarctic program.

Since then he has been the key figure in Antarctic plans and projects.

After retirement he will continue to write and lecture on polar topics, with special emphasis on their importance to the dawning space age.

What Is Wrong With the "Double Dip"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN V. CARTER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House a bill which proposes to repeal the present provisions in our laws which prohibit a retired military man from being employed by the Federal Government if he receives retired pay. This bill is prompted in large measure, of course, by the hearings presently being conducted before the Hébert subcommittee.

There will undoubtedly be extensive information and recommendations forthcoming as a result of the Hébert hearings bearing on this matter of civilian employment of retired military personnel by military contractors. I, of course, will reserve any opinions on the propriety of this matter until such time as the subcommittee makes its report. However, I would state at this time that it seems rather unfair to be critical of retired military personnel who enter civilian employment when the Government has laws in force which prevent them from making their services available to the Government. A number of these officers, some of them who retired with the rank of general, have stated that they would have preferred Federal employment to civilian employment, had a choice been available to them. Needless to say, their services would undoubtedly have been of great value to the Government due to their broad background of knowledge and experience in all phases of the military service and governmental activity.

During this time when our Government definitely needs the very best talent it can get, it seems rather shortsighted to prevent the full utilization of the capability of some of our most able professional, technical and managerial people after they leave the military service.

This, in brief, Mr. Speaker, is the theory that lies behind the introduction of this bill. I fully realize that amplifying legislation will probably be in order upon the conclusion of the Hébert subcommittee hearings, but I definitely feel that the repeal of present statutes prohibiting the so-called double dip will be a vital step in corrective legislation and will also make available to the Federal Government some very capable personnel whose services would be of tremendous value.

The text of the proposed bill is as follows:

A BILL TO REPEAL THE DUAL EMPLOYMENT LAWS INSOFAR AS THEY ARE APPLICABLE TO RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 406; 5 U.S.C. 59a), as amended, is repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205; 5 U.S.C. 62), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. No person who holds an office the salary or annual compensation attached to which amounts to the sum of $2,500 shall be appointed to or hold any other office to which compensation is attached unless specially authorized thereto by law. This section shall not apply to retired officers, warrant officers, or enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard."

SEC. 3. Section 7 of the Act of June 3, 1896 (29 Stat. 235; 5 U.S.C. 63) is repealed.

SEC. 4. The proviso in the paragraph under the center heading "Bureau of the Budget" in the Act of February 17, 1922 (42 U.S.C. 373), is repealed.

Erosion at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a very interesting editorial entitled "Erosion at Geneva" appearing in the Washington Post of July 22, 1959. I agree with the editorial that—

The danger now, however, is that in the search for some sort of face-saving agreement that would make possible a summit meeting, the western allies may be pressured into compromising their own basic interests to further an illusion of peace.

Unfortunately, as the editorial also well stated:

Democracies by nature are ill-prepared for prolonged negotiation with totalitarian regimes.

I am fearful that a summit meeting at any price would be most harmful to the free world, and that it might well be the starting point of the road of appeasement. The events before World War I, if we will only remember them, show that the road of appeasement is the road to war.

The editorial follows:

EROSION AT GENEVA

It is timely for the West to consider seriously whether an end to the Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers would be preferable to further attempts to negotiate with the Soivet stone wall. If a proposal to conclude the meeting will not induce any last-minute cooperation from the Soviet Union, then the conference can just as well disband before there is real erosion of Western unity or prestige.

So far there has been no major or damaging Western concession in fact, either on Berlin or on the larger German issue, although the West has offered many conciliatory proposals contingent upon Soviet reciprocity. The Soviet Union, however, has conceded not one single practical point beyond hazy postponement of an ultimatum

which it had no right to pose in the first place.

Mr. Khrushchev began the crisis last November with a demand which patently was aimed at the absorption of West Berlin and then at making permanent the division of Europe along present lines. Although the West has resisted any formal de facto recognition of East Germany, to all intents and purposes it has acknowledged that it cannot change the situation. But even this will not satisfy Mr. Khrushchev. Despite Western offers to modify the arrangements in West Berlin, he wants to dilute the Western position even further. He will not make any firm commitment to abandon his threat; he seemingly reserves the right to raise a new crisis 18 months hence. When this is coupled with understanding that to the Communists the status quo means merely an opportunity for continued subversion, the Soviet Union has yielded nothing.

To its great credit, the Eisenhower administration has been very clear on the essentials. Apart from his statement in March implying that there could not be a limited war over Berlin (which might be an invitation to Soviet nibbling in a gamble that the United States could not afford to engage in large nuclear war), the President has been a model of correctness and restraint. He has been firm on the principles, but conciliatory on method.

The danger now, however, is that in the search for some sort of face-saving agreement that would make possible a summit meeting, the Western Allies may be pressured into compromising their own basic interests to further an illusion of peace. Democracies by nature are ill-prepared for prolonged negotiation with totalitarian regimes. Time and patience are the most abundant Soviet commodities, and Mr. Khrushchev may well hope to win by erosion what he cannot get by an outright grab.

Well, a breakoff of the talks at this time would not be fatal; indeed, it probably would not make war any more likely than it now is. It would merely confirm what is becoming evident—that there is no reasonable hope of productive negotiations with Mr. Khrushchev so long as he is in a bullying and missile-happy mood.

But there will be a very important lesson for the West if a breakup becomes inevitable. That is that the only possible satisfactory basis for negotiations with the Soviet Union is one of equality; Mr. Khrushchev is unlikely to talk seriously so long as he thinks he is winning the competition through internal prowness and external harassment. The lesson is that the West needs not only greater unity than ever, with more military, economic, and scientific strength and the money to provide it, but also the spiritual and phychological effort to make its position meaningful to the Kremlin. There is lamentably little evidence that this lesson is yet fully understood.

Hoosier Watermelon To Be Brought to Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to announce to my colleagues a forthcoming treat. From the experience of the past 2 years, I know they will be glad to know that the day of the Indiana Watermelon Festival is approaching again. The best watermelon in the world is grown in southwestern Indiana. And, again, through the courtesy of the Southwestern Indiana Watermelon Growers Association, and the cooperation of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, we will serve Hoosier watermelon in the House dining room on August 6.

At that time I will be playing host to the Indiana Watermelon Festival Queen, who will come to Washington after her inaugural at Vincennes, Ind., on July 31. She will be my guest in the dining room that day, so we will offer you a treat for the eyes as well as the palate.

The watermelon was first grown commercially in Indiana about the turn of the century in Knox County. A typical summertime scene thereafter was wagons drawn by mule teams coming into Vincennes loaded with ripe melons to be sold house to house. In the early 1900's, one of the first melon growers began to broker the melons raised by his neighbors. The production soon outstripped local consumption and the melons were shipped by rail to Indianapolis and elsewhere.

The industry has grown in southern Indiana into a million-dollar business, encompassing 8,000 to 9,000 acres of watermelons and 3,000 to 4,000 acres of cantaloups. The production of seedless watermelons is also receiving increased attention in the State. In addition, millions and millions of melons headed for northern markets are brokered through the historic city of Vincennes.

With this special gustatory delight we will salute the third annual Indiana Watermelon Festival and the growers of this important Indiana product.

The Brusch Medical Center of Cambridge, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in reading recently the Tufts Medical Alumni Bulletin of June 1959, I read a most interesting and inspiring article about the Brusch Medical Center of Cambridge, Mass., and its founder, Dr. Charles A. Brusch, M.D., and of the fine cooperational work done by his brother, Dr. Joseph A. Brusch, M.D.

The article which I include in my remarks is a deserved tribute to Dr. Charles A. Brusch, in particular, and also to his brother, Dr. Joseph A. Brusch.

The medical profession is a great profession. Everywhere there are members of the medical profession dedicating and devoting, in many fields of medicine, their lives for the benefit and progress of mankind. When one such member of the medical profession is recognized and honored, they are all recognized and honored.

The dreams and hopes of Dr. Charles A. Brusch of many years ago—his brother cooperating—has come to fruition. I am proud to number them among my most valued friends.

The article appearing in Tufts Medical Alumni Bulletin of June of 1959, is further evidence of the efforts even against great odds, of members of the medical profession, in the dedication of their lives to mankind, to help suffering human beings:

BRUSCH MEDICAL CENTER

The medical class of 1934 celebrated its 25th reunion on April 6 to 8, 1959. The members, having come from scattered locations, were thrilled by the ceremonies. During a quarter of a century of devotion to medicine, the careers and accomplishments of the classmates have been quite varied. Illustrations of these have been noted. However, a somewhat different example is that of Charles A. Brusch, medical class of 1934, of Cambridge, Mass. His story is quite interesting.

When he started practice with his brother, Joseph A. Brusch, medical class of 1923, in Cambridge nearly 25 years ago, they had in mind starting a medical center and they gradually worked toward that goal. In 1950, they broke ground near their offices to erect a building, and in November 1951 they opened the Brusch Medical Center at 831 Massachusetts Avenue, within the shadow of Cambridge city hall.

This steel and castone building, the architecture of which is Grecian in style, is air-conditioned throughout, and has been so constructed that additional floors may be added as future needs indicate. There are approximately 7,000 square feet of space on each of its three floors. This was a private venture and the cost of the center was approximately a half million dollars. The existing facilities could not be duplicated today for less than a million dollars.

The purpose is to provide medical care of highest quality on an economical and efficient basis by specialists in the various branches of medicine, surgery, orthopedics, dentistry, radiology, physiotherapy, research, and laboratory work. Its staff membership numbers more than 60 of the area's leading professional men, each a specialist in his particular field.

The Brusch brothers worked out a plan of cooperative medicine. The center was set up as a diagnostic and treatment unit with the purpose of working along with the family physician. Patients are referred for diagnostic tests and the results are reported directly to the referring physician. In many cases this saves the patient the expense of hospitalization and a quicker diagnosis is obtained. The patient may have appointments at his convenience without loss of time from work. There are advantages to the physician of the staff since he can use the facilities, consult with others, and can have other men cover for him when necessary. Now, in their ninth year of operation, the record discloses that the yearly registration of new patients ranges between 2,000 to 2,200 and the annual number of visits is 26,000.

It is also of interest, too, that a separate nonprofit organization has been established for medical research, particularly in the field of instruments and new preparations. For example, this organization has produced the new camera-gastroscope which was sponsored by the Bristol-Meyers Co., research division.

Now the clinic has advanced to the stage where additional facilities are needed in the field of rehabilitation. Plans are in progress to add in the near future two more stories to the present building for a rehabilitation hospital at a cost of approximately one-half million dollars. Here a person will be able to be studied as an inpatient.

University of Oregon Team Establishes University as Part of ICA Project in Nepal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the setting for the book, "The Ugly American," which, unfortunately, has given the public a distorted picture of our foreign-aid program, is a small, mythical country in southeast Asia. It is a pleasure for me today to call attention to the outstanding success of an American foreign-aid project in a very real small country in southeast Asia.

I refer to the Kingdom of Nepal, a tiny nation squeezed onto the slopes and summits of the Himalayan Mountains, between India and Communist China. A special team from my alma mater, the University of Oregon, has worked for the past several years, under contracts negotiated through the International Cooperation Administration, to develop and improve the educational system of Nepal.

Representatives of the University of Oregon in Nepal have established an adult literacy program and have set up a teacher training institute. Each year, Nepalese students have come halfway around the world, to Eugene, Oreg., for graduate study at the University of Oregon.

The administrator of the project, Dean Paul B. Jacobson, of the University of Oregon School of Education, has just announced fulfillment of the most ambitious of the Oregon-Nepal goals: A national university has been established in Kathmandu, capital of the mountain kingdom of Nepal.

The new Tribhuvan University, named in memory of the late king who overthrew the tyrannical Rana family, now has colleges of liberal arts, science, commerce, education, law, and Sanscrit. Additional colleges are planned.

Mr. President, because it describes the successes of a foreign-aid project in one of the critical nations of southeast Asia, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "University Established With University of Oregon Help," from the Eugene Register-Guard for July 21, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY ESTABLISHED WITH UNIVERSITY OF OREGON HELP—DEAN ANNOUNCES NEPAL INSTITUTION

The establishment of a national university in the Kingdom of Nepal, the result of years of work, including aid from the University of Oregon, was announced this week.

Paul B. Jacobson, dean of the University of Oregon School of Education, said the new institution would be known as Tribhuvan University, in memory of the late king. This ruler led the revolution that overthrew the century-old tyrannical rule of the Rana family.

The university will be located on a new site in Kathmandu, and will administer all higher education in Nepal. As a first step, the existing colleges will be brought together under its single administration.

COLLEGE WILL MOVE

As soon as buildings can be constructed, Jacobson said, the college in the Kathmandu Valley will move to the university site. Colleges outside the valley will be affiliated with the university.

Jacobson noted that the system of branch colleges was similar to Oregon's State system of higher education, with several institutions under a common administrative body.

Several Oregon faculty members have, at various times, worked in Nepal to help establish the university, and have helped in other phases of the country's education. A three-way contract with the U.S. Government, the Kingdom of Nepal, and the university, provided funds and set out administrative procedure.

Dean Jacobson administered the details of the program. Charles D. Byrne, former chancellor of the Oregon State system of higher education, devoted 2 years to advising Nepalese educators. Hugh B. Wood, professor of education, was adviser to an earlier national commission that drafted the general framework and determined the need for the university.

OTHERS IN PROGRAM

Others who have worked in Nepal are Francis E. Dart, associate professor of physics, now en route home; James Tuley, a Washington, D.C., architect, placed temporarily on the Oregon staff to design a campus plan; Thomas O. Ballinger, assistant professor of art and education, and Clarence Hines, professor of education, and former superintendent of the Eugene public school system.

The new Tribhuvan University now has colleges of liberal arts, science, commerce, education, law, and Sanscrit. Planned are colleges of agriculture, home science, and engineering. Eventually, it will also include a college of medicine and a hospital.

Are Congressmen or Taxpayers Responsible for Spending Attitudes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was pleasantly surprised in reading an editorial of July 23 in the Palos Regional, a weekly newspaper in my district, to find that the editor had written an excellent editorial complimenting the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Hon. CHARLES E. BENNETT.

I believe the editorial which I am submitting for the RECORD contains not only a sound analysis of the budgetary problems of our Federal Government, but is also a deserving tribute to a sound, conservative, conscientious Member of Congress:

ARE CONGRESSMEN OR TAXPAYERS RESPONSIBLE FOR SPENDING ATTITUDES?

A great many people, in this era of super taxes and outer-space Government spending believe, understandably enough, that Congress is largely made up of spendthrifts—men and women with a compulsive urge to get rid of as much of the taxpayers' money as possible.

But an insider, writing in Nation's Business, presents a very different view. He is CHARLES E. BENNETT, an economy-minded Representative from Florida with 10 years of congressional service behind him. He sets the tone of his article with this incisive opening sentence: "Members of Congress are in a constant struggle to keep from becoming spendthrifts."

Two primary factors, Mr. BENNETT has found, frustrate the Congressman who seeks economy. One is loose fiscal practices within the Government itself. The other is the ironic prospending attitudes of much of the public. Both, he is convinced, can be corrected—and urgently need correcting if we are to avoid more inflationary deficits, and are to maintain both our economic and military strength.

It's true, of course, that the vast majority of people are in favor of economy—as a vague general principle. But when it comes down to specific matters in which they are interested a great change takes place. For instance, Mr. BENNETT tells of his experience some years ago, when the mail from his constituents expressed a fervent desire for economy. At that time a multimillion-dollar bill was before the House. It had popular appeal, but Mr. BENNETT felt that the appropriation wasn't necessary and he voted against it. Then came the deluge. In the following weeks "scores of letters criticized my vote and not a single one recognized my action as a vote for economy." And this is a common, not an unusual, situation.

A major trouble, Mr. BENNETT adds, is that "in the eyes of a large segment of the public, progress has become synonymous with more and larger Federal programs and benefits. Each new program is excitingly and attractively presented. In the dazzle, the ultimate cost to the people in taxes is obscured." The Federal Government is deep in personal and local matters coming under the categories of health, education, and welfare. Then, once a Federal program is started, it is virtually assured of immortality. Mr. BENNETT can recall only two programs that have been terminated during his long service. One had to do with the breeding of cavalry horses, and the other with rum-distilling in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. BENNETT deals with "a sort of budgetary sleight-of-hand which the Treasury practices and which, in many instances, is used to finance programs while dodging annual Appropriations Committee review. This happens with some of the most expensive programs—housng and farm price supports among them. He is convinced that steps must be taken to give Congress greater control over the handling of the purse strings.

He proposes a three-part program which would encourage and give aid and succor to the economy-minded people in Congress. First, economy efforts would be recognized

through a system of thrift-ratings and awards, to be handled by a private nonpartisan organization of a caliber that would engage national respect and attention. Second, there should be more emphasis on pay-as-you-go principles whenever possible. Third, procedures should be tightened to provide better control of Federal spending. For instance, the way money bills are now handled on a piecemeal basis, "we never know whether more has been appropriated than there are revenues to pay the cost until the last bills are voted on."

Finally, Mr. BENNETT is a firm supporter of the item veto, whereby the President could veto parts of appropriation bills without killing other parts. As matters stand now, it is whole hog or none—each bill must be signed or vetoed in its entirety. So the President must approve wasteful and undesirable legislation in order to save the essential.

Blaine's Diamond Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, among the communities in my district of Washington State that are celebrating key dates in their histories is Blaine, which is 75 years old. I want to take this opportunity to point out the importance of this celebration and the hard work that is being done to make it a success.

The city of Blaine is situated at the Canadian border where there is an arch bearing the words, "Children of a Common Mother." It is fitting, therefore, that Blaine is known as the Peace Arch City and that each year thousands of adults and schoolchildren from the United States and Canada meet on common ground at the arch to commemorate the 145 years this boundary has existed without border guards.

It is fitting, also, that Blaine's Diamond Jubilee will be celebrated in conjunction with the annual Peace Arch celebration. The Peace Arch parade on Sunday, August 2, will herald both the jubilee and celebration. The parade will end at the Peace Arch, where Miss Jeanne Sewell, 15, of Langley, British Columbia, and Merle Overland, who was graduated from Bellingham High School this year, will deliver the traditional student speeches.

President Eisenhower's personal representative to the Peace Arch celebration will be the Honorable Richard B. Wigglesworth, U.S. Ambassador to Canada. Following his address, the student speakers will receive Rotary Club plaques for their schools.

During the week of August 2–9, Blaine will have an historical pageant, daily program, street dancing and a spectacular fireworks display. On August 8, the diamond jubilee parade will pass through Blaine's streets. Our neighbors from British Columbia will contribute military marching units, floats and drill teams will join in the festivities.

Mr. Speaker, hundreds of Blaine residents have contributed many hours of hard work to make this week-long celebration one to remember. It would be impossible to name every person who has contributed so much, but I shall name those who have been entrusted with the leadership and administration of both the Diamond Jubilee and the Peace Arch celebration.

President of the International Peace Arch Association is Miss Nellie Browne Duff. Committee chairmen include Dr. Theodore J. Rasmussen, Clarence M. Beal, Joe Imhof, Mario Pagano, George Marus, Walter Grant, Ted Hovde, Herbert Viereck, Roy A. Howard, C. T. Gardner, Jerry Thorne, Mrs. Marvel Smith, Mrs. Harold King, Mrs. Walter Collins, Mrs. Leila Kagey, and Capt. Walter Hunter.

Members of the diamond jubilee are Mel Hollinger, general chairman; Fred Kerns, Mrs. Lance W. Dillworth, Robert Bainter, and Richard A. Nelle. Division chairmen include Al Dohner, Randy Ramstead, Wayne Parrish, Gertrude Goodman, Vernon McDonald, Wynn Haws, Harold Dodd, Bill Hay, and Traverse Skallman.

Mr. Speaker, the history of Blaine is filled with stories of industry and courage. The citizens of this border community can be proud they reside and work in such a beautiful, growing city, and I predict they will continue to bring prosperity throughout the years to come.

Our Nation's Natural Resources Have Helped Make Possible the Unparalleled Richness of Life of Our People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, it was almost 100 years ago that a former railroad conductor, Edwin L. Drake, completed drilling the first commercial oil well, and this year the centennial of the oil industry is being observed.

In 1854 the American whaling industry was on a decline. That year the 700 ships in our whaling fleet brought home more than 12 million barrels of oil. Such a catch would never be made again, for whales were becoming scarce in all the oceans of the world. But in a crisis the best often comes to the fore, and it was in 1859 that Edwin L. Drake drilled his well at a depth of 69½ feet. Little did our citizens realize the impact that this gentleman's feat would have upon their lives, and the lives of generations to follow. Indeed it was providential that an abundant supply of kerosine came along to replace the vanishing fuel from the sea. And certainly this is another proof that our Nation's natural resources have helped make possible the unparalleled richness of the life of our people. Mr. Edwin L. Drake carved a truly creative and enduring niche in American history.

The State of Kentucky has occupied an integral role in the oil industry's 100 years of development. The importance of this industry to Kentucky's economy is apparent by the fact that approximately 14,000 Kentuckians are employed in some phase of the petroleum industry, and in 1956 petroleum payrolls in Kentucky approximated $43 million. Motor fuel tax collections provide our State with almost 30 percent of its tax revenue. Also approximately 35 percent of all freight traffic on Kentucky rivers consist of petroleum and its products.

Mr. Speaker, on July 17, 1959, an editorial, in appreciation of the oil industry's contribution to the economic strength of our State and Nation, appeared in the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky. The editorial, entitled "Oil Celebrates First Hundred Years," is as follows:

OIL CELEBRATES FIRST HUNDRED YEARS

Oil is celebrating its first century as a servant of mankind—1859 to 1959—and among the celebrants is Kentucky Petroleum Council, which has its headquarters in Louisville.

On August 27, 1859, the council relates a former railroad conductor named Edwin L. Drake, who had been sent to Titusville, in western Pennsylvania, by a New England company founded for the purpose of producing petroleum, completed drilling the first commercial oil well in history.

Colonel Drake, as he was familiarly known, found oil at a depth of 69½ feet, thus becoming not only the first commercial oil producer but the first shallow well operator.

With oil all about us, and some in our own county, Hopkins Countians are in position to appreciate some of the progress which has been made in the industry in the last 100 years.

Kentucky has in fact played a large and important role in the oil industry's 100 years of progress. A lot of people may not be aware just how big the oil industry of Kentucky really is, and how far-reaching is its importance. What petroleum means to our commonwealth is highlighted by the following:

1. Approximately 14,000 Kentuckians are employed in some phase of the petroleum industry.

2. In 1956, petroleum payrolls in the State approximated $43 million.

3. About 35 percent of all freight traffic on Kentucky rivers consists of petroleum and its products.

4. Motor fuel tax collections provide Kentucky with almost 30 percent of its State tax revenue.

5. Sixty-seven of Kentucky's 120 counties have either oil or gas production.

The celebration of oil's centennial this year affords the industry the opportunity to show how it has served the people of State and Nation. And American Petroleum Institute, for its part, has prepared a handsome edition of its quarterly, a centennial issue devoted to the age of mobility.

As for the future of oil, we saw a statement the other day which said:

"The industry is not running out of oil, but instead has a good prospect for continuing to develop new supplies at the rate needed, provided no actions are taken to discourage exploration and development."

The oil industry is proud of its performance to date, and is taking occasion on its centennial to tell the public about it.

Zones of Black Darken the Map

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by the well-known columnist Marquis Childs appeared in today's Washington Post and Times Herald.

Mr. Childs brings out a most interesting point, which we are prone to forget, namely that in this age of advanced technology we know less and less about one-third of the earth's people who dwell behind curtains, iron, bamboo or silk, and are hidden from the outside world by the heavy hand of the censor and the muzzle worn by a controlled press.

While freedom of the press is always relative, it is a fact that even a so-called free press is controlled, at best, by the advertisers and, at worst, by editorial prejudices. Still it remains a fact that today the means of communication have deteriorated to the point where the "Black Zones" on the map, that Mr. Childs refers to, are becoming larger and more impenetrable each day.

ZONES OF BLACK DARKEN THE MAP
(By Marquis Childs)

It can scarcely have escaped the most casual newspaper readers that news of areas where day-to-day events may tip the balance between peace and war is coming at second or third hand. The map of the world is beginning to show as many black patches, marking territory unknown, as it did before the age of exploration and expansion.

This is pointed up by the struggle going on in Iraq between the forces of Gen. Abdul Kassem and the Communists. The news of that struggle, which can have decisive consequences in the Middle East, is being reported from Lebanon.

Just a year ago, with no warning whatsoever and apparently to the complete surprise of Western diplomats, a pro-Western regime in Baghdad was erased. First-hand reporting has since then been made difficult, if not impossible.

On the information map the blackness is almost total in the vast land mass of China, in Tibet, and in the Chinese dependencies of North Korea and North Vietnam. One or two British correspondents function under severe restraints in Peking, and occasionally Canadian, Indian, or other free-world journalists are allowed to make carefully guided tours. The press within China is a completely controlled propaganda press.

In Soviet Russia and the satellites, the last few years have seen some improvement insofar as travel and other facilities for Western journalists are concerned. But censorship of all outgoing dispatches—an exception is made for reporters accompanying Vice President RICHARD NIXON—is rigidly imposed. Access to news sources is difficult. The Soviet press is a disciplined arm of government.

The satellites, conspicuously Poland, have seen some relaxation. But the pattern is still that of tight Communist Party control.

The shading from dark gray to light gray takes in a lot of geography. Under Turkey's stern press law, editors have been given criminal sentences and criticism has been throttled. The press in Spain, Portugal, and most of the Middle East is completely controlled or "guided." Nearer home, in the Dominican Republic, the press is the sycophantic servant of the Trujillo dictatorship.

In Formosa, South Korea, and South Vietnam freedom of information is, to say the least, relative. Troubled and uncertain governments use persuasion or coercion to guide the press. And, as in other areas, if you want to survive, you accept the guidance.

Especially disturbing to those of us directly concerned with the free flow of information are the signs in the West of doubt and distrust. In France, the Assembly has had before it several bills to curb the press. Since the upheaval of May 1958 that brought Gen. Charles de Gaulle to power, the tone has been subdued, if not muted. Weeklies, such as L'Express and L'Observateur, that continue to be critical of aspects of the Algerian war are occasionally suppressed. A book, La Gangrene, purporting to give details of torture of Algerians imprisoned in France, was seized on orders of Premier Michel Debre.

The cold war has had a blighting effect. The tendency is to ask not what is news but what is good news for our side. America's allies are to be treated tenderly, and to expose their mistakes is less than good form.

Too often the West has shown itself ready to accept the barriers that have been put up. Far too little effort has been made to inform the public on what is going on inside China. Third-hand reports out of Tokyo are no substitute for what persistent analysis at second-hand might show. Reporting in many areas is inadequate.

Here at home critics have pointed to the way in which the news is increasingly molded by shrewd manipulators who consider it a commodity for political or financial advancement. With the techniques of Madison Avenue transposed to government, information becomes a matter for reward or punishment to those who are for you or against you.

It is only because there is still a vigorous free press—in Japan, India, the West—that this catalog of sins of omission and commission has significance. But no one aware of what freedom of information means to the survival of all the freedoms—perhaps to survival itself—can be in the least complacent after looking at today's somber information map.

Takeoff or Brushoff?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, when I heard Mr. John McClay's recent broadcast over WJZ–TV—channel 13 in Baltimore—I was very much impressed. Mr. McClay and WJZ–TV have been rendering an excellent public service in presenting to the people of Baltimore full information and constructive suggestions on issues of local and national importance.

Mr. McClay's most recent editorial entitled "Takeoff or Brushoff?" deals with a subject very close to my heart—Friendship International Airport. For the first time since the completion of its fine airport, Baltimore is now enjoying a few first-class flights because no other airport in the Baltimore-Washington area can accommodate jet aircraft.

"Takeoff or Brushoff?" candidly deals with Baltimore's airport problem and especially with the obligations of the Federal Government to Baltimore in the development of Friendship as a Baltimore-Washington terminal. One of the most pressing of these obligations is the need for a prompt decision by the Civil Aeronautics Board on the adequacy of service case which has been pending for 8 months.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including Mr. McClay's excellent editorial:

TAKEOFF OR BRUSHOFF?
(Aired by John L. McClay, general manager, WJZ–TV)

Hello, I'm John McClay, general manager of WJZ–TV. If you were running a grocery store and the Federal Government put up a much fancier store across the street, you would justifiably cry out that this was unfair competition. You would be especially irked if the Federal Government had used a lavish supply of the taxpayers' money—including yours—in its effort to compete with you. This is almost exactly what is happening to Baltimore in the competition to lure the commercial airline traffic of the Baltimore-Washington area.

In recent weeks we have all felt a surge of civic pride in the inauguration of daily jet airline service between Friendship International Airport and the west coast. After years of being a whistlestop on the airlines, Friendship is now the terminal for the best transcontinental flights to and from the Baltimore-Washington area.

Baltimore won this service because of the foresight of its airport board and the sacrifices of its taxpayers. Friendship was built to handle jet airliners. Washington National Airport was not. Hence all jet flights to the Washington area must use Baltimore's airport.

The lack of good service to Friendship has been a serious economic liability to Baltimore for many years. When the poor people of France begged for bread, Marie Antoinette said, "Let 'um eat cake." When the businessmen of Baltimore pleaded for better air service, the airline officials said "Let 'um go to Washington."

In terms of coldblooded business economics, the airline officials were right. Instead of serving Baltimore and Washington separately, it is far more efficient to persuade Baltimoreans to travel 44 miles to Washington National Airport to board a plane. Having no choice, this is what Baltimoreans have been doing, at the rate of nearly 1,000 a day. Nowhere else in the United States are the travelers of a large city asked to endure such an inconvenience.

But with the coming of the jets, a great opportunity is at hand, if Baltimore is ready to meet it. There are many problems to be solved as Baltimore attempts to establish Friendship as an important terminal. One of these problems is overwhelming; the Federal Government is, in effect, setting up business across the street.

In Chantilly, Va., 28 miles southwest of Washington, the Federal Aviation Agency is building one of the world's most lavish airports. The total cost of the project may run as much as $100 million including the highway from Washington. You don't have to guess who is supplying the money: The taxpayers of the United States, including you.

If Friendship could attract its own service, irrespective of what happens in Washington,

the building of Chantilly would pose no threat to Baltimore's economy. But the airlines, judging from their past performance, have no intention of voluntarily serving both cities separately. Therefore, a flight transferred from Friendship to Chantilly may well be a flight lost forever to Baltimore.

This brings us to the crux of the matter. Baltimoreans, as Federal taxpayers, are contributing their money to Chantilly Airport, even though that airport poses a threat to their own economy. To put it more bluntly, we are being forced to slit our own throats.

We at WJZ believe this situation is grossly unfair to Baltimore. However, there is a remedy, readily available.

Baltimore's immediate task is to prove to the airlines that Friendship is the best terminal for a majority of the flights in and out of the Baltimore-Washington area. As we pointed out in a WJZ editorial 7 months ago, a 30-mile circle around Chantilly embraces about 1,600,000 people. A 30-mile circle around Friendship embraces about twice that number. But this advantage will not be important unless Friendship can expand its facilities.

To keep up with the developments of the jet age there is an immediate need for specific improvements at Friendship. The terminal building must be enlarged. Taxiways must be widened. Most important, an existing runway must be lengthened to provide an additional jet runway. All of this will cost close to $10 million. Unlike the Federal Aviation Agency, Baltimore does not have that many millions to spare.

However, Congress has just passed a bill that, when signed by the President, will provide $126 million in Federal funds for airport construction. Some $30 million of this money can be allocated as the Federal Aviation Agency sees fit.

We at WJZ believe that Baltimore's unique position in relation to Washington justifies its receiving a large share of these funds. If nearly $100 million can be allocated for Chantilly, certainly a small fraction of this amount is justified for Friendship. No other city is in such a position that Federal competition can threaten its public convenience and its economy.

We are not opposed to the building of Washington's Chantilly Airport because in the distant future there will be a need for all three terminals—Friendship, National, and Chantilly. But, as Baltimoreans, we bristle at the thought that the completion of Chantilly at Federal expense will leave Baltimore as barren of air service as it has been in the past.

There are two other problems in connection with Friendship Airport that we want to touch upon briefly.

First is the question of airport promotion. In our editorial in December, we told you how Philadelphia's promotional efforts reaped rewards of better service. Philadelphia shares the costs of promotional advertisements with the airlines; the airport furnishes a continuous stream of news stories for television, radio, and newspapers; the city employs a consultant in Washington to represent its interests before the Federal Government. We strongly urge Mayor Grady to join forces with the Association of Commerce and the Greater Baltimore Committee in a real effort to promote Friendship's improved service. This promotion must be carried out in Washington as well as in Baltimore, especially in the Capital's northern suburbs close to Friendship Airport.

Second is the question of the airlines' legal obligation to provide better service to Baltimore. Last November, arguments were concluded in the Washington-Baltimore adequacy of service case before the Civil Aeronautics Board. This case was initiated by the Greater Baltimore Committee in an effort to force the airlines to offer better service on the grounds that they were illegally discriminating against Baltimore. The Civil Aeronautics Board has been 8 months deliberating and there has still been no decision. Since much of Baltimore's planning depends on this decision, there should be no further delay on the part of the CAB.

These three things: Promotion, a decision from the CAB, and, most important, special Federal funds, are the principal needs of Baltimore in the dawn of the jet age. The Federal funds are the foremost need because they offer Baltimore a chance at fair competition with the vast resources of the Federal Government. If we are to regain our rightful place on the airline map, every businessman, every traveler, must make his voice heard to city, State, and Federal officials.

Steel Strike and Economy of Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a letter dated July 16 I recently received from a resident of Michigan transmitting certain views and observations of a Chrysler employee and union member on the current steel strike:

JULY 16, 1959.

The Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENTLEY: A Chrysler employee and union member came into my office today to ask if I would write a letter for her to the Republican Members of Congress from Michigan. She is well read, and has studied the UAW–CIO economic warfare against the people of the United States thoroughly and over a long period of time. She has talked to us before and her reasoning and judgment on the activity of the Communist Party through the UAW–CIO is frighteningly logical.

From her observations and knowledge as a factory worker and union member, she believes the motive behind this present steel strike squeeze is to deliberately ruin the economy of this country, either for the union bosses' own ends or directly for the Communist Party, for two reasons: hoping to ruin the American economy to improve their foreign investments and/or to discredit the the Republican Party by using caused business recessions as a reflection on the job the Republicans can do. She knows the unions to have huge foreign investments in manufacturing, and the union bosses want Russia through Germany, to rule the economy of the world. She also feels they are succeeding.

After this steel strike starts "the first 2 weeks won't cost the unions any expense at all; it is the second 2 weeks that will use up the union's strike funds." She feels "it is imperative for the welfare of this country that the strike be allowed to continue the second 2 weeks in order to weaken the union's strike fund. But then, at the end of the fourth week, the President must commit himself and force the employees back to work, without a fund or wage increase, which would only increase prices and inflation. After the fourth week, if the strike is allowed to continue, foreign countries will get all the sales, and they will use it against the Republican Party when the buying power starts down."

This action—"using up the union's strike fund and saving the buying power"—are of paramount importance. She wants very much to get this word to the President. She feels "he was voted into office without the help of the average union member or union boss, and the same people who elected him will elect his Republican successor." She feels he owes it to the people who did elect him to save them from their own stupidity in not realizing the horrible threat this country faces.

Thanking you for your attention and cooperation, I am,

Very truly yours,

JANE H. STOCKING.

Education in Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] before the 14th Institute of Higher Education, Board of Education, the Methodist Church, Nashville, Tenn., on July 28, on the subject "Education in Foreign Service":

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION IN FOREIGN SERVICE

(Remarks of Senator ALBERT GORE before the 14th Institute of Higher Education, Board of Education, the Methodist Church, Nashville, Tenn., July 28, 1959)

It is a privilege and honor to participate in this significant conference on higher education.

In presenting to you some views on "Education for Foreign Service" I use the term "foreign service" in its generic rather than its political sense.

The field of foreign service is broad and is broadening by leaps and bounds. Moreover the challenge and the necessity of foreign service in the political, social, the religious, the economic, and other fields surges evermore appealingly and vitally.

We see that truth, a key to the Christian concept at home and abroad and the most effective weapon of freedom anywhere, is locked in a dramatic battle with propaganda, distortions and prevarication. We see that truth needs the service of more and better trained people and improved methods of communication.

We see that in the mortal cold war challenge to our way of life the ultimate target is the minds and the hearts of mankind. The most appealing and revolutionary political ideal that the world has known is democracy, described so eloquently by Lincoln as "of the people, by the people, and for the people." I hold that it is far more appealing, and perhaps in many parts of the world more revolutionary today, than even the theoretical concept of communism, let alone the vulgar, gangster distortion current in Russia.

Yet this idea and ideal, this system, however glorious and glittering it may be in the United States, eventually loses its appeal to

people who can find no reasonable basis for aspiration for attaining it or any share of its benefits and glories.

We see the Soviet efforts at economic penetration of underdeveloped areas and for political subversion, particularly among the politically unsophisticated peoples.

I say these things only by way of identifying both the scope and urgency of education for foreign service.

One of our national weaknesses is our deficiency in linguistic capabilities. This point has been made plain to me through somewhat excruciating experiences at international conferences. Within the last month, for instance, I was a member of the U.S. delegation to the conference on nuclear weapons tests suspension which invited the Russian and British delegates to dinner. Each of our Russian guests spoke English reasonably well, sufficiently to communicate intelligibly without aid of an interpreter. Not one of the American hosts could utter or understand one intelligible sentence in Russian.

American business representatives abroad are finding themselves handicapped because of the superior facility of communication by their competitors.

No longer, it seems to me, can we depend solely upon the isolated missionary to adequately an deffectively carry the message of Christian faith and ideals in competition with shrewd articulation of materialistic ideology.

In the past Americans have shown comparatively little interest in the study of foreign languages. Perhaps this was a natural consequence of our geographical position. It may be a consequence also of our complacency and self-satisfaction, which our position is world affairs will no longer permit.

This deficiency can be attached by institutions of higher education, but higher education alone cannot provide a satisfactory solution. The development of a national linguistic capability sufficient for the challenge of world leadership will require elementary language training in the primary grades and high school and supplementary study in higher education. In the field of higher education new methods of language teaching are evolving, influenced particularly by necessities for concentrated language studies by the Armed Forces during World War II and since.

Language, however, is not an end in itself. I shall never, never forget the withering experience I had when I undertook to matriculate for a public speaking course as a freshman at the University of Tennessee. The dean took one look at my matriculation card, quickly drew a line through the public speaking course, and looked at me as if to say, "You must first learn something to talk about." I am not sure that the dean was right. In fact, I was not sure then, and by some persistence persuaded him to let me take the course. Nevertheless, the facility to communicate is only a tool. Its effectiveness depends on how it is used, not merely on its possession. I would not, therefore, wish to overemphasize training in languages, necessary and important though it be.

One can be "fluently arrogant" in several languages and yet be a poor representative abroad of his country, of his business, of his mission, of his church.

Although this may be overlooked by some, it is most important that anyone going into foreign service in any field of endeavor be well informed about his own country.

Upon my daughter's return to Vanderbilt University as a student after working at the World's Fair at Brussels and completing a trip around the world, I heard someone ask her the following question: "What lesson did you learn in your travels around the world?" Nancy answered: "I have just registered for four history courses."

Not only is knowledge of the history of our country important in education for foreign service, but a knowledge of its people, of its geography, of its industry, of its business, of its social and political institutions, its religious life, its welfare programs, its labor organizations, its social customs, is strong points and also its weaknesses.

Moreover, a faith in our system and a dedication to its causes is essential to effective foreign service. I think it is reasonable to presume this faith and dedication. The more education, the more knowledge, the more understanding that our foreign service personnel possess, the more valid will be the assumption.

The need for qualified individuals educated for foreign service in various fields is acute. This problem concerns all. With the relatively new position of free world leadership which has come to us through the inexorable march of events and our own great good fortune has come the responsibility of dealing effectively and in all fields and at all levels with peoples all around the world. We are sending more people abroad than ever before and keeping them abroad for longer periods of time. This applies, I believe, to religious undertakings, as well as to economic, business, political, and military personnel.

I must not overlook, nor indeed must I minimize, the importance of American tourists abroad as representatives of our way of life. Here, too, we could stand a little more educational preparation for foreign service.

Through education, we can solve a great many of our difficulties. There must be preparation for any service, but unfortunately we do not have the facilities for proper foreign service training. Neither do we have, at the present time, a large pool of people with an interest in foreign service from which to select people for training. I would say, along with Alfred North Whitehead, however, that "the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed." The country which does not value trained intelligence and which does not take steps to select and train its intelligent people is doomed to failure. Perhaps this caveat is pertinent to the important field of foreign service.

Education for foreign service, as I have said, has many facets. Before such education can begin, there must be some process of selection of those to be educated. How are they to be selected? Who should select them? At what point in the educational process should specialized training for foreign service be undertaken?

When these questions can be satisfactorily answered, and it is determined that a qualified candidate for education for foreign service is in hand, one must then face the task of deciding how to educate him. What should be the specific objectives of his education, and how extensive, as a practical matter, should the curriculum be?

Finally, then, one is faced with the question of the best type of institutions for educating this candidate for Foreign Service. Should existing educational institutions be utilized, or should specialized institutions be established? In the Foreign Service of the Government, this is, and has been, a much discussed matter.

Now, I have raised a lot of questions. I don't propose to furnish easy answers. Essentially, I seek to identify the problem. Perhaps some of these questions can be resolved in the course of your further discussion and study.

It may be needless to point out that Americans abroad are subject to a great deal of criticism, much of it, I am afraid, justified. All things considered, however, the picture is probably not as bad as it has been painted. The recent bestseller, "The Ugly American," has popularized a type of American abroad who is not in my view typical of our State Department, Information Agency, or other related Government services. On the other hand, it certainly is true that our representation abroad, particularly in Government, is not what it should be.

There are three basic reasons for the criticism of Americans abroad. First is poor selection and training of personnel. This is what we are talking about now, and it is something we can correct. Second is the lack of a proper foreign policy. As educators, you cannot do too much about that right away. Third is the simple fact that unpopularity is the price of power. There is not much any of us can do about that.

Some experts in the field list another cause of friction, and that is the fact that there are just too many Americans abroad, and the mere fact of numbers will give rise to friction. This may be a factor. At the present time, almost 1 percent of our population is abroad, including members of the armed services and their dependents. But, before we draw any hasty conclusions about this, it should be mentioned that about one-fourth of all Americans abroad are living in Germany, and that country is probably the one place abroad where Americans are most appreciated and where there is a minimum of friction between our people and both government officials and private citizens.

Perhaps friction at any particular place revolves around what we are doing and how we are doing it, rather than the numbers of people involved. Certainly, whatever we have to do in various countries, and whatever numbers may be involved, the proper selection and training of our representatives will go a long way toward getting the job done in the best possible way.

In a democratic society, the selection of individuals for work, as well as the choice of avocation, is and must be on a voluntary basis. It is not possible for the Government, church, or company desiring representation abroad to designate individuals and earmark them for any particular task, except in the armed services. We must rely on incentives such as monetary income, improved status, interest, or the opportunity to be of service.

Our chief foreign competitor, Soviet Russia, has a big advantage in the matter of selection. The Soviets can and do select people at an early age and keep them in a specified program of training as long as the government feels such training is profitable. We do not desire such control. We abhor it. But we must recognize its challenge. It has been reported, for example, that the Soviets have, for several years, been training large numbers of selected individuals for service in Africa south of the Sahara and giving them intensive training in the languages and dialects of the area. We know as well as do the Russians that this is a critical area, but we are not able to mobilize our efforts so readily. I doubt that there are many people in this country who are undergoing training in Swahili or Ruanda, let alone the less well known languages and dialects of that section of the world.

As a practical matter, it appears to me that we will not be able to select young people for foreign service training at an early stage in their educational process. We will probably have to allow them to get through most of their college training before any real specialization can be undertaken. Even so, linguistic aptitudes can be discovered, encouraged, and developed at an early age.

It is often not decided by a college student that he wants to go into any given type of foreign work until he is in his junior or senior year. In such a case the bulk of the specialized training must be given at the graduate level. Our educational system, of course, does a great deal of selecting for us. A student often starts out in a liberal arts course, then shifts to prelaw or premedical studies. If he survives, he goes on into law school or medical school. What we do not

have now, and what we badly need, is a large pool of undergraduates who are foreign service prone. This would give us something to work with. We could then begin the weeding out and specialized training.

Regardless of the manner in which our candidates for service service training are selected, I think there are certain characteristics which these people should have, or which they should be capable of developing.

Dean Harlan Cleveland, of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of Syracuse University, recently discussed these characteristics with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The Maxwell Graduate School has done a good deal of work in this field, and Dean Cleveland has concluded that there are five major elements in effective overseas performance. These are technical skill, career dedication, a sense of politics, cultural empathy, and organization ability.

By technical skill is meant, simply, that a man must know his job. He must know it as if he were doing the same work at home. Career dedication will, of course, carry anyone over a great many obstacles. A sense of politics is vital when working among foreign nationals who may be more politically conscious than Americans. Cultural empathy is dicult to achieve, but likewise necessary. We must be able to put ourselves, when we are representing America abroad, into the other fellow's political, economic, and social shoes. Organization ability is necessary largely because of the fact that the American overseas has to work through an organization back home, and the long line of communications will invariably cause difficulties.

I am not sure that everyone would agree on these qualifications. Most of us would agree, however, that a person possessing, or capable of developing, all of these would certainly perform well in representing his country, his church, or his company in a foreign field.

It appears to me, however that it will be extremely difficult to test an individual for these qualifications prior to his having undergone a good part of his training. We must probably, then, merge selection and training to a great extent. We must begin to train a great many people. As I have said, one of our first tasks is to get a large number of students to become conscious of the need and the opoprtunities of foreign service.

Knoweldge of the area in which one is to serve, its language, its customs, history, geography, and its hopes for the future is a bedrock essential, second only to a knowledge of one's own country.

Since we live in an age of change, it is important to know the movements which are underway in a given country. One must know as much about the group or government which is on the way up as he does about the group or government currently in power. We must realize that the dynamics of political and social life in other countries may now be in the process of producing changes similar to those which our own country has undergone during the past 100 years.

Having covered in a very general way some of the areas in which a candidate for Foreign Service should receive special training, let us now consider the type of institution which can best give this training.

At this point, the question of some sort of national academy for Foreign Service training arises. Is there a need for such a specialized institution, operated by the Federal Government, especially for the training of a Government Foreign Service Corps?

All together, there are some 1,800 colleges and universities offering some sort of higher education. Many of these institutions, whether they be operated by church groups or other types of public spirited and civic minded boards or trustees on the one hand, or by States or other governmental agencies on the other, could do a much better job in Foreign Service training if they had some guidance and perhaps financial assistance from the Federal Government. I think it is upon these institutions that we should principally depend for higher education. Their structure and curriculum will require strengthening. So will our elementary and high school systems.

I feel that it would be in the national interest for the Federal Government to give financial assistance and encouragement to established colleges and universities in setting up programs for Foreign Service training, especially at the graduate level. A good program at the graduate level would have some effect on the undergraduate programs of these institutions. This would assist in making available to us a large body of Foreign Service minded students. Whether such individuals ever entered Government service or not, the Federal Government would profit. Our national welfare is involved in the competency of our Foreign Service, from the tourist to the trader, from the technician to the ambassador.

I would go further and say that I also think we need a national academy to specialize in this type of training. Here I would draw a parallel with our college military training programs. Perhaps some of the educational institutions represented here have ROTC programs. Those of you who are familiar with these programs know that a large proportion of the officers serving in the Army or Air Force, and to a lesser degree in the Navy, are ROTC graduates.

At the same time, I believe most of us would agree that, over the years, West Point and Annapolis have done a pretty good job of setting standards and providing a nucleus of trained personnel around which larger forces can be organized. I believe a National Foreign Service Academy would go a long way toward leavening the whole loaf of our Foreign Service personnel.

Last year, when it was obvious to me that our science education program needed strengthening, I introduced a bill to establish a National Science Academy and to set up a program of scholarships in existing institutions for the study of the natural sciences and mathematics. Congress passed the national defense education bill but it is too modest and restricted.

I am preparing a bill to establish a National Foreign Service Academy. The Federal Government can be, as it is in other fields, a pace setter. I find it disturbing, and I believe dangerous, that we spend only about seventh-tenths of 1 percent of our gross national product on higher education. We must place greater emphasis upon intellectual achievement.

In considering specialized educational institutions, we should not overlook the advantages to be gained from giving some of our people at least a part of their education abroad. We are accumulating large amounts of local currencies in many foreign countries which could well be used for educating our students in those countries. Furthermore, in the underdeveloped areas where higher education is not flourishing, we could use some of these funds to establish American-type universities. I have introduced a bill this year to do just this, and hope very much to secure its enactment early next year.

The United States has, willingly or not, entered upon a new era of international activity. No longer can we afford to live in semi-isolation. No longer can we afford to consider the rest of the world as something separate and apart from our own national life.

Our international relations are of such importance that we need an increasingly large number of trained people who know how to get along with other peoples of the world and who know how to represent our institutions abroad, whether they be political, religious or commercial.

Participation in U.S. Exhibition at Moscow by Oregon Manufacturing Firms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, at the U.S. exhibition in Moscow, recently visited by Vice President NIXON and Premier Khrushchev, two great Oregon manufacturing firms are represented. These are Jantzen Knitting Mills and the Pendleton Woolen Mills. Their products are outstanding in the Nation, and thus they have been chosen as among only eight major sponsors participating in the American Fashion Industries' presentation.

All of our State is proud of these two notable and successful firms, which manufacture products of outstanding quality. Jantzen is famous for female swimming garments of real originality. Pendleton Mills for fine blankets and other woolens. We rejoice that the people of Russia can see for themselves the excellence of these Oregon manufactured goods.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Oregonian of July 27, 1959, entitled "Oregon's Pitch in Moscow," which describes the participation of Jantzen Knitting Mills and Pendleton Woolen Mills in the U.S. exhibition at the capital of the Russian Government.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON'S PITCH IN MOSCOW

Portland's claim that it is now the sportswear manufacturing center of America is getting international attention.

At the U.S. exhibition in Moscow, with Vice President NIXON representing President Eisenhower, and Nikita Khrushchev representing himself, the products and personnel from two Portland firms have leading recognition.

The Portland firms are Jantzen, Inc., and Pendleton Woolen Mills. They were chosen among only eight major sponsors of the entire Nation for participation in the American Fashion Industries' presentation. Typical American girls will show the Russians what is being worn in sports this year under the Jantzen and Pendleton labels.

Also helping to carry the message to Moscow are Paul DeKoning, president of Jantzen, and C. M. Bishop, Jr., secretary of Pendleton, who were named to the executive advisory council of the fashion industries' presentation.

These home-State industries may be counted on to outshine the fashion display the Russians put on in the New York exhibition. Oregon's propaganda pitch: The Soviets may pack their missiles bigger and better, but let's see 'em compete with Oregon girls in swim suits.

Schools Are Not So Lousy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the name Adm. Hyman G. Rickover is synonymous with the development of the nuclear-powered submarine. Because of him, more than any other person, we have nuclear submarines as part of our defense system.

He is highly respected for his contribution to this technical and complicated field, but some people are beginning to question his excursions into areas where he is not an expert—particularly education. Recently the admiral visited Seattle, Wash., where he made some remarks about our system of education. Under leave to extend my remarks I want to include in the RECORD an answer to Admiral Rickover's statements.

This answer was written by Donald L. Kruzner, chief deputy superintendent of King County schools. It appeared in the July 7, 1959, issue of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

The letter follows:

NOT SO LOUSY

(By Donald L. Kruzner, chief deputy superintendent, King County Schools)

First, let me qualify myself for speaking on the topic Admiral Rickover refers to as our "lousy schools." I am a commander in the U.S. Naval Reserve. (I will probably be a retired commander when this is printed.) I have spent the past 21 years as a teacher and a school administrator. For the past 13 years I have worked at the improvement of education as the chief deputy superintendent of schools in King County. In preparing for this work I have spent approximately 9 years as a student in college. I have earned three degrees—a bachelor of arts, a master of education, and a doctor of education. Two of our five children have graduated from Roosevelt High School; the other three are in Nathan Eckstein Junior High School.

CHALLENGES

I have read Admiral Rickover's comments about the quality of education on the national scene and suffered in silence. But when he comes into my hometown and talks this way about schools he has never even visited, I have to challenge his unwarranted observation.

On the day the admiral spoke at our chamber of commerce, I was visiting three classrooms in one of our school districts in King County. I was observing first, second, and fifth grade classes learning mathematics. These classes were part of a pilot experiment to teach mathematics concepts instead of numbers to children in the lower elementary grades. I wish Rickover had been with me observing these children and their teachers at work in what he refers to as our "lousy" schools. I would have known if he was really sincere in his expressed efforts to improve the quality of education.

HONEST EFFORT

I wish the admiral had been with me during the past week when I visited accelerated classes for gifted children in many junior and senior high schools throughout Seattle and King County. At Mercer Island and Bothell High Schools, for example, the admiral would have seen gifted high school juniors and seniors in advanced college mathematics classes. At Asa Mercer and Nathan Eckstein Junior High Schools in Seattle he would also have seen gifted students doing advanced work in languages, mathematics, and history under special programs sponsored by Yale University and the University of Chicago. I also wish he had seen some of our honest efforts to help less gifted children find their places in school through special classes.

If Rickover is sincere in his efforts to improve education in America, I respectfully suggest that he get busy in a field where he has some competency, or that he utilize his great knowledge in scientific matters to provide specific, realistic, and constructive suggestions to help improve the quality of education. As a Navy commander, I could say considerable about the need for improvement of training in the Navy. But I am working at this too, you might say as a hobby, 1 night a week without pay because there is a job to be done. I am one of hundreds in the Naval Reserve trying to improve the training of our young men who may shortly be charged with the defense of our country.

So, Admiral, what I am trying to say is, let's be honest with ourselves and the American people, or at least with the people of Seattle and King County where I know we are really working constructively, even with the help of our destructive critics, at this business of improving education.

Representative Roosevelt Speaks on "The Key to Small Business Survival"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the chairmanship of Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Small Business Committee recently opened a series of hearings on the problems of small business in the food industry.

During the course of these hearings a great deal of valuable information was presented by small businessmen representing many different segments of the food industry. The nature and scope of problems that are causing serious, sometimes ruinous difficulties for small businessmen, were revealed to the members of the subcommittee by these witnesses.

In recognition of the interest shown over the problems of the independent operator in this vast industry by Representative ROOSEVELT during these hearings, the National Candy Wholesalers' Association invited him to address their convention in Chicago today on, "The Key to Small Business Survival." Representative ROOSEVELT has a record of giving constructive, positive assistance to small businessmen whenever possible, and the views and proposals presented in this speech will be noted with interest. Because of its broad implications, which go beyond the immediate problems of the day, I believe this speech will attract the attention of those concerned with the importance of protecting the small businessman in a free and competitive enterprise system.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KEY TO SMALL BUSINESS SURVIVAL

(Address by the Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, before the National Candy Wholesalers' Association, Chicago, Ill., July 27, 1959)

I am very happy to be with you today to discuss the "Key to Small Business Survival." As a group of small businessmen, you are well aware of the fact that a key must be found if small business is to survive.

Last month in Washington, the Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee, of which I am chairman, opened its investigation into the distribution problems of small business in the food industry. Your association, with many others, cooperated with the subcommittee in presenting the problems which you face.

This investigation has been hailed by some as one of the most important studies made of the food industry in a quarter of a century—and from the testimony we received, it is being made none too soon.

Much of the legislation which has been passed by Congress to aid and protect small businesses has had as its fundamental purpose the protection of the free and competitive enterprise system. It is the firm belief of those of us concerned with problems of small business that the continuance of the economic system we know in the United States is based on the existence of small business as well as large business.

The concentration of economic power in the hands of a few can lead to disaster, for the use of power often leads to its misuse. And in our country, when an economic situation is injurious to the public interest—Government steps in.

I believe strongly in the free and competitive enterprise system which has made our country great—and I want to keep it. I don't want to see State socialism. If the concentration of power in a single industry becomes an evil force, and contrary to the best interests of our people, in the end that industry will be nationalized. We must prevent this.

The facts given to the committee in Washington by many different groups of small businessmen indicated to us that there is a concentration of power developing in the hands of a few in the food industry. While there still remain many areas of competition, many have been eliminated. These are warning signs. Signs that we must heed, and we must act upon.

Today the food industry is the largest single industry in our economy. It is a $50 billion business. Many changes have taken place in the structure of this business in the last 20 years. Changes with which we are all familiar. The corner grocery store has all but disappeared from the neighborhoods and is being replaced by vast supermarkets. New products, frozen foods and different concepts of marketing have changed the food industry drastically.

In the period from 1948 through 1958, the total amount of annual sales through food stores rose from about $31 billion to more than $50 billion, but the number of merchants engaged in food retailing declined sharply. About 10 years ago more than 400,000 food stores were in business. The 1954 census showed that less than 350,000 stores were engaged primarily as food retailers.

The number of large retail food chains declined from 273 to 77 and less than 35

percent of these accounted for 77 percent of the total food chain sales.

We have seen the growth of the giants in the past 20 years. Fifteen of the largest chains accounted for 29.4 percent of total sales—and the big four (A. & P., Safeway, Kroger, and American Stores) accounted for 19.6 percent of total sales in 1957.

Since 1955, 2,657 locally owned food stores have been "acquired" by mergers. Their estimated total sales volume was almost $3 billion—equal to the current total sales of grocery stores in 14 States.

The largest chain—A. & P., has more than $4.7 billion in sales, over 4,000 stores, and is more than twice the size of its largest competitor. Sears, Roebuck had only $3.7 billion in sales in 1958.

If you accept the definition of a chain as four or more stores, they account for approximately 43 percent of the total retail food business in the country.

I believe that these facts indicate a high degree of concentration of power in the food industry. And I also believe that it is time we did something about it.

It is important that those of you in the wholesale candy business, and your colleagues who wholesale in other phases of the food industry, understand this situation and your responsibility in it.

Your executive secretary, Clarence McMillan, presented facts to the subcommittee last month which revealed that the candy wholesalers are faced with the same problems as the small meatpackers, the frozen food distributors, the preserve manufacturers, the small poultry and egg producer, the independent retail wholesale grocer and the farmers. The gigantic food chains are taking over the food industry from the crop to the shelf, and the small businessman is being squeezed out. "Grow big or die," former Gov. Ellis Arnall told the committee. "The small businessman is no longer able to compete in the marketplace."

The problems that you face as candy wholesalers are the same as those described by other small businessmen in the food industry.

Your secretary told the committee that candy is being used as a loss leader. The chains sell it at below cost prices to bring customers into the stores. The poultry industry has the same problem—and today thousands of them have gone into bankruptcy.

Chainstores, we were told, are receiving competitive buying advantages of one sort or another, which permit them to sell at very low prices—prices even lower than the wholesaler and retailer can get. A tobacco wholesaler from New Mexico testified that equal opportunity to purchase merchandise competitively is one of the most acute problems small business faces.

Mr. McMillan mentioned advertising allowances, promotional allowances, vertical integration, and mergers. Time and time again witnesses told the committee of the serious situation they are in because of the misuse of these practices in the food industry.

You as small businessmen in the wholesale candy field are feeling the results of revolutionary changes in production and distribution methods in the food industry.

You are an important part of the food picture. Thirty-five percent of the candy purchased is sold through food stores. But there are fewer food stores, for in ten years more than 50,000 stores have disappeared.

In 1950 there were 8,500 candy wholesalers supplying independent retailers. Today there are a little over 5,000 of you.

We are told that today a food chain is the largest candy manufacturer in the country, manufacturing candy to sell in its own stores. There is no place for the wholesale candy man in this picture.

Price wars are a common occurrence in the food industry. The housewife is delighted with the cut prices on dairy products, coffee, and fruit juice, and picks up these so-called week end bargains at the chain stores. And then what happens when the small grocer gives up and goes out of business, unable to compete in these price wars? The prices of these commodities go up and stay up.

Fewer and fewer firms are buying a larger and larger percentage of the total farm commodities. And the farm income which stood at $17 billion in 1948, slipped back to less than $11 billion in 1958. While the big chains are offering lower prices to the housewife, the small farmer is thinking—"Grow Big or Die".

Today 95 percent of all the broilers consumed by the American public are raised under some kind of a contract between the farmer and a company. The farmer has made very little profit and has lost control of his own operation. One small poultry owner called it a return to serfdom.

These tragedies result from monopolies. The evils of monopoly were well known to our forefathers. Thomas Jefferson, I am told, wrote a clause in a draft of the Constitution, which would restrict monopoly. Unfortunately, it was deleted. Many of our State constitutions prohibit monopoly.

The people of Italy and Germany learned that monopoly results in a loss of not only their economic freedom, but their social and political freedom as well. Democracy and our traditional free to compete-fairly economic system cannot live in the same climate with monopoly. One must die.

It is this threat of monopoly which has been presented to the subcommittee by small businessmen which deeply concerns me.

What can we do?

Businessmen in the industry should meet and advise on proper actions to protect the free enterprise system. The businessmen have a responsibility which they must meet.

This is one key to survival.

If the businessman does not present proposed solutions, others will come up with the best answers they can, but they would not be the best ones they could have reached had they had the help of the industry.

We have opened our study in Washington with a presentation to the subcommittee of the problems of small businessmen in the many different fields in the food industry. It is our intention to carry our hearings into major cities throughout the country to learn first hand what is happening to small business.

There are several aids which could be offered small business soon. Mr. McMillan proposed that the Federal Trade Commission be directed to earmark certain appropriations for the specific function of keeping an eye on the food industry. I believe there is a good deal of merit in that idea.

I am wondering of legislation paralleling the stockyard and packer's consent decree, which would prohibit a retail firm from going into the processing and producing end of the business, might not help solve some problems.

It has been suggested that the Federal Trade Commission should be given injunctive powers so that a small business would not go under while waiting for its case to come up in court.

Legislation is now pending in Congress to force a seller to make known his price, discount or other terms, to all buyers. This bill is sponsored by the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Small Business Committee.

The key to survival in any battle is to know your enemy. The enemy of the American free enterprise system is monopoly. Monopoly, which would mean the end of our American democracy, of the opportunity for a man to have his own small business, to choose independence, and the right to compete with his intelligence and energy.

This is the enemy we must fight and beat. This is the key to survival—yours and mine, and that of every American.

The Consultant: His Contribution to the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Dr. Joseph W. E. Harrisson, director, LeWall and Harrisson Research Laboratories of Philadelphia, Pa., was awarded the Honor Scroll of the American Institute of Chemists on January 6, 1959.

Dr. Harrisson has been national counselor for the American Chemical Society for 20 years. He was the first secretary of the American Board of Clinical Chemistry, Inc. He has served for 40 years as a member of the board of consultants of the bureau of foods of the Pennsylvania Department of Chemistry and for 20 years has been its chairman. Within recent years he has been appointed chairman of constitution and bylaws committee of the U.S. Pharmacopoeia.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of the paper Dr. Harrisson read before the American Institute of Chemists.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSULTANT: HIS CONTRIBUTION TO THE COMMUNITY

(By Dr. Joseph W. E. Harrisson, F.A.I.C., director, LaWall & Harrisson Research Laboratories)

Consultation is, in a measure, both an art and a practice that encompasses many fields of endeavor. But no matter whether a consultant serves in the broad field of chemistry, engineering, or the healing arts, he can open new paths by reason of his unfettered imagination and ability to quicken the interest in problems. Consultants are not necessarily engaged solely in private practice; consultation may be occasional and ancillary to a professional occupation.

For instance, a consultant in the healing arts aids those practitioners of medicine, who are in direct contact with the patient—here the consultant is a specialist, possibly in a phase of medical science that justifies intense study of some limited body function, an anatomical location or pathologic manifestation. Or, if a practitioner of law, he may be a specialist in admiralty law, international law, or corporate law. And, more recently, the food and drug law, because of our rapid advances in these fields. The importance of such a specialized practice is evidenced by the recent formation of the Food Law Institute.

But presently we are concerned with the consultant in the chemical or chemical engineering field. As such, the consultant whether interested in drug, nutritional, or industrial applications, is often the creator, if not the catalyst, of an advance in basic

science or in reducing its application to industrial practice. Or his assignment may be to serve an ailing industry—one which has encountered obstacles along a path that has previously been financially successful. Then, too, he may be called upon to advise whether or not a new process or venture justifies extensive financial support. The scant knowledge that was once acceptable as being sufficient to warrant investment in a new project has been replaced by cautious and critical technological and financial evaluation.

Risk evaluation is now a governing factor whether a project is directed toward the development of an industrial process that may require millions of dollars, months of planning, and years of building, or toward the creation of a fine chemical of potential therapeutic value.

Ventures are no longer job assignments but rather projects—in England, schemes—based upon predictive decisions and rarely dependent solely upon empiric methods or techniques. Yet the empiric approach is still a necessity though costly and wasteful. Methodically and hopefully it is applied even today, as evidenced by our screening of thousands of antibiotic beers—more thousands of chemicals of unknown usage—directed toward seeking a lead among the lower forms of animal life to surcease the ravages of cancer within ourselves.

In our early formative days the chemical industry grew by rule of thumb, and medicine was an art and in truth a practice. Gradually keen minds developed the basic concepts that could be applied in industry, medicine, nutrition, and the many fields of human endeavor. As the 19th century opened its book but few individuals were then capable and fewer were trained in science. No matter what the field of need or the level of their scientific ability when their services were offered to industry, it generally earned for them the scorn of the practical operator. But gradually the sheer need for sound advice created openings based upon the science of the day. Much of this need was supplied by consultants who maintained small laboratories.

THE EARLY CONSULTANTS

Few are aware of the influence consultants exerted and the contributions they made, especially during these early days of our growing industrial expansion. Often these men were respected professors or teachers in the colleges or universities wherein but little was provided in laboratory facilities. Consequently, it was in the private laboratories of these teachers that many students gained their initial and invaluable practical experience. Among these professors was James C. Booth.

Not yet 20 years of age, he went to Germany in 1832, studied under Wohler and Magnus, when it was the custom to take promising students for instruction into the private laboratories of the professors. In 1836 after visiting England and other parts of the Continent, he returned to Philadelphia. Here he opened his own laboratory, observing in his announcement that he was prepared to serve the various industries of the area. Many men who later acquired distinction were trained by Booth in this private laboratory, including John F. Frazier, professor of chemistry at the University of Pennsylvania from 1844–72, and Robert E. Rogers who had a similar post between 1853–77. Booth's laboratory continues today as Booth, Garrett and Blair, one of Philadelphia's oldest institutions and the oldest private laboratory on this continent. Booth's attainments as a chemist were internationally respected and nationally recognized for he was president of the American Chemical Society for three successive terms.

Frederick N. Genth was contemporary with Booth and also professor of chemistry at the University of Pennsylvania. German by birth, he had been a student of Gmellin, Giessen, Kopp, Liebig, and Bunsen. (Somewhat akin as if today a student had studied with Seaborg, Kendall, Saratt, and Du Vigneaud.) Upon emigrating to Philadelphia, which was then the center of the American chemical industry, he likewise opened a laboratory and accepted promising students as assistants. Thus Booth and Genth had a great influence on the University of Pennsylvania and the chemical industry in Philadelphia, and even upon our beloved Edgar Fahs Smith. Actually it was in Genth's laboratory that Edgar Fahs Smith, then an assistant to Genth, became acquainted with J. Lawrence Smith, probably the first outstanding organic chemist of the United States. These men were creative contributors to the surge of knowledge in their fields during the formative years of our chemical industry. Genth was also president of the ACS as was also Edgar Fahs Smith who, like Booth, served as president of the ACS for 3 years.

Fifty years after Booth, the American chemical industry had expanded greatly and Philadelphia was no longer the sole center of activity. Consultants were available in many areas: In Philadelphia, Henry Leffmann, later to become Leffman & LaWall, predecessors of LaWall & Harrisson; also, Samuel P. Sadtler, now Samuel P. Sadtler & Son; in Chicago, Carl Miner, who enjoyed an enviable reputation as the Miner Laboratories; in San Francisco, Albert Hanks; and in Boston, what has become the giant of independent consulting organizations—Griffin & Little of Milk Street, predecessors of Arthur D. Little, Inc. This latter group is now the outstanding independent research organization in the world, serving not only individual and corporate clients, but nations as well.

Consulting practice has now become extensive throughout the United States and it is estimated that more than 6,000 scientists are engaged in the numerous private professional organizations. Some organizations have complements in excess of 100 or more scientists; many are smaller, and some consultants practice as individuals.

Numerous organizations have been formed to establish collaboration between consultants, advance the practice of consultation and maintain a sound ethical background. Among these are the American Council of Independent Laboratories and the Association of Consulting Chemists and Chemical Engineers; as well as associations of consultants in related fields such as the professional engineers and the professional biologists.

But let us turn the pages back a bit, to Franklin Square, one of the four public squares in William Penn's plan of Philadelphia. There in a little pharmacy (still existent today) dispensing to the needs of his neighbors, worked a pharmacist-chemist, Hermann Frasch. In this green velvet spot, then centered among much of the chemical and pharmaceutical activity of Philadelphia, and brewing too, Frasch also practiced as a consultant. From behind his demure prescription counter and off the clay-bottomed cellar floor, he developed the wisdom, experience, imagination and the fumes of fancy that set the scene for his many contributions to our progress. Here was fired the intellect that made deep mining of sulfur in Louisiana, Texas, and Mexico possible, and cheap sulfuric acid a practicality. Much of today's chemical industry rests upon his work as does much of the petrochemical industry, for he was, until his death, active in the field. Hermann Frasch gained much of his ability by the experiences of a miscellany of puzzling problems in the local industries.

It can be truly said that fertile minds are incited, kindled, and quickened by challenge and use. That a pharmacist-chemist should, in the course of his work, have made outstanding contributions, was not unusual. Karl Wilhelm Scheele, in his Swedish apothecary, unfolded much about the organic acids, and Martin Heinrich Klaproth laid the first basis for today's atomic age with his separations of uranium, strontium, cerium, and other metals. In fact, Klaproth, trained in his father's German apotheke, was the first professor of chemistry at the University of Berlin (1809). Even today he is recognized by many as the father of analytical chemistry. Klaproth became known for the care exercised in his work, his detailed reporting of both results and methods, and careful checking before publishing—qualities to be admired today. These men are justly mentioned, because though they were trained in one field, they passed into another and therein made useful and outstanding contributions.

THE SATISFACTION OF SERVICE

But the most rewarding return to any practitioner of a science is neither personal success nor scientific acclaim. It is the feeling of satisfaction that develops in public or personal service. Herein the chemist, the biochemist, and the chemical engineer, whether he be a captive employee as we sometimes refer to those in industry, a teacher, or in private practice, has the opportunity and obligation to contribute fairly of his training and experience to the welfare of the community; also to stimulate those individuals who are students in the field. There is a challenge in our rapid industrialization and threatened overpopulation that brings into a critical area—pure water, adequate living facilities, nutrition, sanitation, food protection, and even sufficient clean air. How well and how economically these challenges are met in the future will be influenced by sound unbiased reasoning to which we as scientifically trained citizens can contribute a healthy atmosphere. Many areas seek new industries and look to the expansion of those they have, but they must maintain adequate natural resources and clean environments. Herein lies an opportunity for service.

As an illustration of what may be done in public service, our organization for more than one-half century has been privileged to act as consultants to the Bureau of Foods and Chemistry, Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture. To this agency is charged the responsibility of maintaining the integrity of food within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which is one of the few States that has long been noted for its high standards in this respect. This has often been a position difficult to maintain, in view of the many new arts of sophistication. My personal pleasure at having served in this consulting capacity for 40 years has been most rewarding.

The professional practice of consulting brings its rewards in its creative contributions toward new comforts for man or advances in industry; in seeing visions carried to fruition; in the many personal and scientific contacts that it develops; in the amazing and often amusing incidents that unexpectedly occur. All of these are bound to be tinged with a degree of gladness or sadness when success or failure of a venture gradually unfolds.

While today the practice of an individual professional consultant may be limited to some specialty in which the individual is particularly adept, conclusions are often

flavored and guided by others in the field or perchance in related fields. The professional consultant is indeed wisest when he accepts and seeks the advice of others. So, to effectively serve his client, he may draw upon the knowledge or experience of other privately practicing consultants or those upon the research and teaching staffs of our universities or colleges. Culmination of a venture may, therefore, represent the collaboration of men in several of the basic sciences. Their thoughts are welded together by an imaginative coordinator. In a sense, the professional consultant is the project director, building upon facts and educated intuition an answer to the problem under consideration. While in practice a consultant may serve industry by collaborating with its executive officers, he may serve best by contact with its research staff. Often this latter approach develops during a highly specialized or technical problem. Consequently, the opinions and activities of two somewhat divergent viewpoints, i.e., that of the consultant and that of the industrial organization, complement one another.

Nor does the consultant of today play any lesser part in offering an opportunity to the recent graduate, for such an association still remains a privilege and in it there is to be had a wealth of otherwise often unattainable training and experience.

Nor should individual practice be neglected by staff members of a university or college. Such opportunities should, in fact, be sought. It is true that they often serve to increase the insufficient income of the teaching profession but this should not be the measure of their value. More important, they maintain and develop a challenge, the spirit of which is conveyed by the educator to his students. Such service when rendered within the amenities of an educator's tax-favored position, and not made dependent upon the prestige of the institution, presents no unfair disadvantage to the private consultant. But surely, the chief responsibility of great teachers is not to applied research or to consultation but rather to kindle enthusiasm in the minds of their students, to spark the visions of dreams to come true.

PROFESSIONAL FREEDOM

Freedom of thought should be typical of the consultant and the teacher. By such freedom our scientific advance and our industrial strength has been sparked. Restrictions that tend to narrow a field of science tend to stifle contributions. Minds trained in one field can become great in another field only so long as we maintain freedom of action and thought.

Today opportunities for professional practice, in chemistry, biochemistry, chemical engineering or other phases of chemistry, are more creative than ever. This is equally true for the consultant who may practice individually or for those who practice jointly with others as an organized group. The consultant and his staff continues to be an intimate part of American progress. To best serve his clients he must maintain their confidence—wisely, and with careful consideration of society as a whole. Only so long as a consultant maintains his integrity and freedom of action, while preserving the rights of both the public and his client, will his professional status be maintained. He can be characterized as a homogenate of layman and scientist with a striking degree of imagination, burning energy, and a degree of courage—the latter quality often required to be applied to other people's moneys.

U.S. Strength Should Give Us Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following editorial from the July 26 issue of the Indianapolis Star:

THE POSITION OF STRENGTH

There is circulating in Washington a document which, for a change, draws a power comparison with Soviet Russia which is favorable to the United States. It is not, to be sure, an official document. It was drafted privately by a group of military officers whom Newsweek magazine identifies merely as "high ranking."

The document was drawn up in response to a grapevine report that State Department advisers were urging Secretary Christian Herter to yield the Berlin issue to the Russians on the grounds that the United States is declining in power. The document suggested that Americans try to imagine what it would be like if the tables were turned—if the power of the United States were held instead by Russia, and the strength of America were only as great as Russia's.

Here are some of the examples used. If the tables were turned, and Russia had our power, she would have four or five times as many intercontinental jet bombers as the United States has. There would be more than 2,000 modern Soviet fighters, bombers, and missiles at bases in Mexico and the Caribbean Sea. Potent Russian naval forces would be almost always to be found a few hundred miles off the American coasts. As for internal strength, there would be only a single railroad linking the east and west coasts. Half the Nation's labor force would be needed just to operate the farms instead of only 12 percent and there still wouldn't be enough food.

But this is not the way it is. It's the other way around. It is Russia which faces superior striking power, based within easy reach of its borders. It is Russia which still struggle under the handicaps of an economy which is not just years but generations behind.

In the matter of missile progress, the chief basis of the scare philosophy about Russian strength, this document says that the "missile gap" is deduced from the error of comparing what Russia could produce with what the United States will produce. In this field, too, the authors of the document find the American position the more favorable. From another source comes a recent book, "Russia and the Big Red Lie," by Lloyd Mallan who last year spent 2 months in Russia, interviewing 32 scientists and bringing back some 6,000 photographs. Among his conclusions are that "lunik" was a hoax and that Russia does not have a single operating intercontinental ballistic missile.

The Washington document presents in detail two fundamental points which seem usually to be forgotten when Russia's strength is discussed. These are the very great lag in the Russian economy, and the great geographic superiority of the American military position.

Russian strength, belligerency and ambition should be clearly understood and respected. Americans—particularly high government officials—should never for a moment lose sight of the possibility that a war could be precipitated by a mistake in judgment or a hasty action. But the American position is one of strength. There is no reason to be frightened of Russia, to back off in panic from Russian threats. America has the advantage not only of strength but also of moral right. These advantages should be exploited in full.

The Road to Ruin: Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Winnsboro News and Herald, Winnsboro, S.C., of July 23, 1959.

THE ROAD TO RUIN: INFLATION

Barring a nuclear war, which seems to become daily less attractive for all concerned, inflation is the greatest single problem which this country has to face. It can destroy the value of life insurance policies, savings, securities, and the dollar. It can wipe out the means of existence for people on fixed incomes, paralyze production and trade, and bring both political and economic collapse to the country.

Its primary cause is a government that has become far too big and wasteful and spends more than its income. One of the chief misconceptions upon which big government has been built is the idea that somebody else can be made to pay for its multifarious growth, often in direct competition with its own citizens. But in the long run, every individual in the country pays the bill as the dollars he owns become worthless. He pays the bill in taxes—not only his own but those charged to business enterprise as well.

Corporations are merely tax collectors for government. They must add the tax levied against them to the prices of the products which they sell, or go out of business. The significance of this was pointed out recently by the president of a leading southwestern electric company when he said: "* * * if we were to operate on a tax-exempt basis as public power does, we could reduce our rates 27 percent without affecting the net income of the company or the people who put up the funds to operate our company. Of course, the remaining taxpayers would have to make up the taxes we now collect. If people could be made to realize that taxes must, of necessity, be paid by the ultimate consumer, I believe that there would be more attention given to governmental expenditures especially by the Federal Government."

Only the individual can pay the bill for big government, and unless its spending is curbed the final installment paid by the individual will be his freedom. As the News and Herald has observed, once or twice before, governmental expenditures, on the town, county, and State levels, should be subjected to the closest scrutiny, also. Economy, like charity, begins at home.

Will Dairying Change?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include an editorial that appeared in the July 16, 1959, issue of the Snohomish County Tribune, a weekly newspaper published at Snohomish, Wash. For many years the dairy farmers in my district and the Nation have been faced with falling prices of milk and with continuously increasing costs.

Some means must be used to find a solution to these problems. Perhaps the dairymen of Snohomish County can show the way to solving these problems.

The editorial follows:

BIG CHANGES COMING IN DAIRYING

It doesn't take a very attentive observer to notice the rumbling and stirring that is taking place in the dairy field. The signs point toward big changes, and quite soon we judge, in the methods of marketing and selling milk. These changes will affect all dairymen in this area and they probably will affect everyone in Snohomish, too, whether they are farmers or not.

It is no secret that the regional dairy cooperatives which presently are manufacturing and distributing dairy products under the "Darigold" label are doing some serious thinking about consolidation. These are such cooperatives as the Snohomish, Skagit, Whatcom, and Lewis-Pacific Dairymen's Associations. In Snohomish County, over three-quarters of the producing dairymen are members of the Snohomish County Dairymen's Association. They employ several hundred people and own equipment valued in the millions. When organizations of this size, whose operations penetrate to the heart of their communities, discuss merger, it is a subject of deep interest to everyone.

Why merge? The farmer's greatest weakness has been his inability to control his market. To set his price, maintain it, and increase it to the point where it yields him a decent return. This is especially true of the dairyman, whose love of independence has been his greatest weakness, at least in the marketplace. The manufacturer sets his price and keeps it there through mutual agreement with other manufacturers or through fair trade laws. The labor union enforces its demands for pay scales with a number of potent weapons, including the strike, the union shop, and others. But the farmer goes his independent way, at the mercy of middleman, retailer, and the consuming public.

The cooperative, such as the one in Snohomish County, has been the dairyman's favorite method of overcoming his handicap. A membership in a cooperative gives him a share and a voice in production, processing, distribution, and sale of his produce, milk, cheese, butter, and ice cream. In numbers there is strength and, until now anyway, the Puget Sound area co-ops have been able to do an outstanding job for their members. But the talk of consolidation indicates there is reason to believe that a larger cooperative organization, embracing most of the Puget Sound milk region, would do an even better job. The more efficient use of production and distribution facilities, it has been stated, would bring a greater return to the farmer.

With consolidation, of course, would come a corresponding loss in identity that the dairyman now shares with his smaller cooperative group. What the dairyman has to decide is whether this loss in close identity with the organization will be compensated for by more money and other advantages.

If consolidation is coming, it probably will occur in the next few years. These are shaping up to be the critical years; the one when the smaller dairyman will either find the answers to his problems or be forced to give way to the large-scale operators. It almost goes without saying that consolidation would be felt, in one way or another, in Snohomish, as well as other dairy communities in the State.

Another factor in the discussions concerning merger of cooperatives is the growth of competition from the so-called cow pools or cow factories. These are privately operated enterprise where one operator or corporation performs the milking, processing, bottling, and selling at the retail level. Everything is done on a large scale, with efficiencies in operation and the elimination of the middleman suposed to enable the owner to sell for less and make more money doing it.

California dairymen took the lead in this development and, just recently, the idea took root in Washington State. The independent producers and cooperatives, alike, are eyeing this turn of events with great interest and, perhaps, some apprehension.

Floyd McKennon's large operation between Snohomish and Monroe is the foremost example of the successful cow factory. McKennon has developed a 700-cow herd, owns processing plant and bottling works, and ships to a series of milk barns in the Seattle area (he owns these) and sells milk by the half gallon for 39 cents, considerably under the average market price. He has over a thousand acres of prime grassland. These fields furnish him with feed for the huge herd and make him about as independent of outside help as any dairyman can be.

Mr. McKennon's revolutionary and apparently highly successful methods have had their impact on Northwest dairymen. If they do not actually cause consolidation, they certainly will be a factor in consolidation being given careful consideration.

So, we shouldn't be too surprised when some rather drastic changes take place in dairying. After all, some big changes already have taken place.

Captive Phrase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include an editorial, "Captive Phrase," appearing in the Boston Herald of July 25, 1959.

As the editorial, in part, well said:

Khrushchev and his colleagues are more worried than they let on about the restlessness of the satellite peoples.

The editorial follows:

CAPTIVE PHRASE

The idea of an official Captive Nations Week left us rather cold at first.

Everyone is sympathetic toward the small nations engulfed by communism. Most of them were once democratic countries, but they had no freedom to choose when the Reds took over, and they have no freedom to choose now. Americans with relatives in the captive states feel particularly strong about them.

But does it help, we asked, to announce one's sympathy and then do nothing to back it up? Did our liberation talk not actually harm the East German and Hungarian rebels who took up arms in the mistaken belief America would come to their aid?

Our attitude has been changed, however, by the official reaction of the Soviets to the President's proclamation of Captive Nations Week.

The sharp attacks on Mr. Eisenhower in the Soviet press and the repeated angry references to the captive nations issue by Premier Khrushchev, even in his face-to-face talks with Vice President NIXON, indicate that this is a tremendously sore subject with the Reds. Nor can it be put down to pride alone.

The Red party boss is far too hardened a campaigner to be disturbed by routine Western criticisms. He expects brickbats from the capitalist countries just as we expect them from the Reds.

But this goes deeper. Khrushchev and his colleagues are more worried than they let on about the restlessness of the satellite peoples. The phrase "captive" hurts in Kremlin ears because it rings true in the ear of Budapest and East Berlin and all the other east European capitals. We have gotten hold of a phrase that has revolutionary appeal—and for the Russians it is the wrong kind of revolution.

The Kremlin's wordy reaction to Captive Nations Week is not only giving the observance publicity, but it is also giving it meaning. It is proving that a phrase can be an effective weapon, too.

A Memorial for James Madison, the Father of Our Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, a growing number of newspapers and distinguished scholars and authors have offered their wholehearted support for a memorial for James Madison, the Father of our Constitution. They have written letters to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald, which initiated the long overdue tribute to our fourth President, in support of the proposal. Following are letters to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald and an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the San Francisco Chronicle:

[July 12, 1959]

A SHRINE FOR A FOUNDER

Irving Brant, whose biography of James Madison is itself one of the enduring monuments of our age, has proposed that the Nation erect a monument, memorial, or national shrine in honor of Madison, architect of the Constitution and Bill of Rights. In your issue of June 28, you endorsed Mr. Brant's suggestion and invited readers to comment on it.

It is evident that a suitable monument in the District of Columbia would have great educational value, particularly for the visitors, young and old, who come from all over the country to witness and learn the operating principles of a free republican government.

Madison does not need and can scarcely gain from any monument we may build. It is our own citizenry, present and future, who will gain most from seeing a tangible symbol of our gratitude to him and our dedication to the principles he served so ably.

There is another consideration worth mentioning. A Madison monument would announce to the world that America respects intelligence, education, culture, and spiritual refinement. These were among Madison's qualities, and we need to proclaim that as they informed our beginnings, they remain our abiding national ideals.

EDMOND CAHN,
Professor of Law, New York University.
NEW YORK.

(The author of "The Moral Decision," Dr. Cahn also edited "The Supreme Court and Supreme Law.")

I think Irving Brant's suggestion for a Madison memorial is an excellent one. If we have been remiss all these years in honoring the Father of the Constitution—and our most perceptive political theorist—we now truly have a golden opportunity to remedy this neglect.

We certainly owe Madison more than we have hitherto publicly acknowledged. A suitable public memorial would be a wonderful way of reemphasizing Madison's great contribution, in thought and in action, to the American Nation. Today, more than ever we need to be reminded of the great generation of southern leaders who were Americans first and southerners second.

Madison's dedication to union, to republicanism, to federalism, to our basic freedoms, to majority rule, and to prudent statesmanship need to be emphasized and reemphasized.

A memorial to him would not simply honor the man, but the vital and viable principles that underlie the American experiment in democratic government.

NEAL RIEMER,
Associate Professor of Political Science, Penn State College.
UNIVERSITY PARK, PA.

James Madison once wrote a correspondent, "The hand that writes this letter, wrote the Constitution." Something of an exaggeration, perhaps, but by no means a baseless claim.

Turning to the index of Max Farrand's "Records of the Federal Convention of 1787," one finds that the references to Madison's name occupy more than four columns, while those to the nearest runners-up, Mason, Morris, Rutledge, Sherman and Wilson, occupy less than three columns each. And Farrand's "Records" makes, of course, no reference to the Bill of Rights.

Much is therefore to be said for Irving Brant's suggestion. However, can we stop with Madison? Is my old friend John Marshall properly memorialized at the seat of Government? Then, of course, there are two or three generals who have been neglected, and perhaps a President or two.

Yet on the whole I favor Mr. Brant's suggestion for a special memorial to James Madison.

EDWARD S. CORWIN,
Emeritus Professor of Politics, Princeton University.
PRINCETON, N.J.

(Dr. Corwin's many distinguished books on constitutional law include, "The Constitution and What It Means Today," a standard work on the subject.)

[July 14, 1959]

HONORING MADISON

I have noted with interest the recent discussion concerning a memorial for James Madison. I wholeheartedly agree that this outstanding patriot deserves fuller recognition for his role in building the foundations of our freedom.

Madison, scholarly and judicious, buttressed the views shared by his more outspoken colleagues with careful reasoning and extensive knowledge.

From his youth he was concerned for individual liberty. At the age of 25, while a delegate to the Virginia Constitutional Convention, he fought for a clause in the Virginia Bill of Rights allowing the "free exercise of religion." Thirteen years later he told the first Congress of the United States that it should "expressly declare the great rights of mankind secured under this Constitution." The amendments which he thereupon introduced became the Bill of Rights for the Nation.

Throughout the formulation of our Constitution and the establishment of our Federal Government, Madison played a quiet but leading role.

While a delegate to the Continental Congress he clearly saw the need for a stronger central government, subsequently sought to convince his State Assembly in Virginia of this fact.

At the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, the "Virginia Plan" authored by Madison, became the foundation for the structure of Government which was adopted. Then in the fight for ratification, the Federalist Papers which he joined in writing provided solid, carefully reasoned arguments for the proposed new Government.

Having devoted himself to the establishment of a strong Federal Government, Madison became a member of the first Congress and took a leading role in the organization of the Government and the creation of the executive departments. It was at this time that he introduced the Bill of Rights.

Madison's service to his country continued, as he was selected by Jefferson to be Secretary of State, and then elected by the Nation to be its fourth President. The lifetime of service which James Madison gave to the establishment of democracy and the protection of the rights of mankind has gained for him the highest respect of all who are continuing the fight to guarantee the freedom and rights of the individual.

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Senator From Missouri.
WASHINGTON.

(Senator Hennings is chairman of the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee.)

[July 24, 1959]

PROPOSAL SECONDED

May I add another seconding vote to Irving Brant's admirable proposal for a memorial in Washington to James Madison, Father of the Constitution.

If the columns lately removed from the Capitol could be so utilized as to identify them firmly in the public mind, not as a group of discarded columns, but with the work of Madison as the key pillar of our thus far remarkably durable political structure, then no other monument, and no other use of the columns, could be more appropriate.

Surely the creation of some suitable monument to Madison is long overdue. Mr. Brant rightly points out, however, that it is we, not Madison, who need that monument.

FRANCIS L. BERKELEY, Jr.,
University of Virginia.
CHARLOTTESVILLE.

[July 19, 1959]

PILLAR OF FREEDOM

I was delighted with the suggestion of Irving Brant that the columns lately removed from the front of the Capitol be used in the construction of a memorial to James Madison. The suggestion appeals because Madison was himself a kind of pillar of our constitutional system which the Capitol with its impressive columns symbolizes.

If this particular set of columns must go to make way for additional space inside the building, it would be a happy expedient to use them to honor the man who helped make the Capitol worthwhile.

His services as a member of the Constitution Convention and the recorder of many of its proceedings, as an author of The Federalist and advocate generally of the adoption of the Constitution, as a Member of Congress implementing the written Constitution and drafting the first 10 amendments, and as a profound thinker in the field of democratic government, place him with Washington and Jefferson, and other statesmen whom we memorialize in the Capital City.

If some of his other offices, including the Presidency, brought him no added glory, the moderation of his distinction there should not be permitted to obscure his greatness as here revealed. Today, for visitors to Washington, there is a hiatus in our gallery of statesmen. That hiatus can be ended by the suggested use of the columns from the Capitol.

CARL B. SWISHER,
Professor of Political Science, the Johns Hopkins University.
BALTIMORE.

(The president-elect of the American Political Science Association, Dr. Swisher is the author of American Constitutional Development, and a standard biography of Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney.)

I wish to endorse most heartily Irving Brant's proposal that James Madison be honored with a memorial made of the columns that once graced the East Front of the Capitol. Madison's contribution to the framing of the Constitution alone would deserve some such recognition from the country which has profited immeasureably from "the rich resources of his luminous and discriminating mind."

Mr. Brant not only has illuminated the life of a great man with his scholarly volumes but has reminded us of a debt long overdue.

JOHN WELLS DAVIDSON.
CHEVY CHASE.

(The author is associate editor of a projected new edition of the public papers of Woodrow Wilson.)

[July 24, 1959]

PHILOSOPHER OF LIBERTY

Irving Brant's proposal of a memorial to James Madison is long overdue. Most students of American history would have greeted his suggestion with enthusiastic approval even before his multivolumned biography conclusively reinforced it. Madison deserves a place among our Nation's builders along with Washington, Jefferson, Marshall, and Hamilton.

Better perhaps than any one of them, Madison grasped the complex essence of free government and labored long and hard toward its implementation. As a systematic thinker, deeply grounded in history and political theory, he surpasses his eminent contemporaries.

For him, man is neither inherently good nor inherently bad. Just as man's capacity for justice makes free government possible, so man's capacity for injustice makes free government necessary. The main purpose, he said, is to defend "liberty against power, power against licentiousness and * * * (to keep) every portion of power within its proper limits."

Madison's basic philosophy of balance is somewhat at odds with Jefferson's major emphasis on limited government responsive to the popular will, as well as with Hamil-

ton's bias toward consolidated coercive power in the National Government. More flexible than most of his contemporaries, history has added to his claim, widely recognized during the formative period, to be identified as Father of the Constitution.

ALPHEUS T. MASON,
Professor of Politics, Princeton University.

BOULDER, COLO.

(In addition to major biographies of Justice Louis Brandeis and Chief Justice Harlan Fiske Stone, Dr. Mason is the author of "American Constitutional Law."

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, July 12, 1959]

FORGOTTEN FOUNDING FATHER

What of Madison—James Madison, fourth President of the United States?

Why has his extremely imposing figure faded in the memory of Americans who owe him so much? Why have his great and enduring contributions to constitutional government been so long ignored that he is rightly called "the most unhonored and unsung of the Founding Fathers"?

These questions have lately been raised in Washington—the National Capital so named, incidentally, at Madison's suggestion—with the excessively tardy proposal that a due and fitting Madison memorial be authorized and set up.

It is unthinkable that such a figure in American history should longer remain neglected, that there be no monument to him in Washington, that his home—still standing in Virginia—should not acquire the status of Mt. Vernon and Monticello.

For James Madison was truly the Father of the Constitution. He drafted much of it; he fought for its adoption; he successfully beat down the considerable opposition of such as Patrick Henry, James Monroe, and John Tyler when it was up for ratification in Virginia.

Of intimate and direct concern to Americans today, James Madison likewise wrote 9 of the 10 amendments that protect individual liberties and are known as the Bill of Rights.

Along the way, he—with Alexander Hamilton and John Jay—wrote the brilliant constitutional studies known as the Federalist papers.

Irving Brant, biographer of Madison, has most aptly suggested that 24 columns removed during recent renovation of the Capitol might be fashioned into a Madison memorial of beauty and dignity to stand with the Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln memorials.

There should be no delay in furthering such a project. James Madison has been too long neglected. As Irving Brant has put it: "We should erect a memorial to Madison, not because he needs it, but because we do."

Butler Should Resign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chester News, Chester, S.C., of July 23, 1959:

BUTLER SHOULD RESIGN

The Chairman of the Democratic National Committee has caused so much division and strife within the national party that only his resignation can give the party its maximum chance in 1960. Of course, the leftwingers in the party will not agree with this analysis, but it is an accurate one.

Butler, and some of those who are working with him, believe that if the leftwingers drive the conservatives out of the party, they can still win a Presidential election. Already the statements Butler has made, about his own party's leadership in Congress, and about the South and Southwest, insure a split in the party and a possible walkout at the Democratic convention in Los Angeles. For the good of the party, the only thing he can do is resign.

There is a strong suspicion in Washington, among some that Butler is the greatest ally the Republicans have. If he is left in charge of the Democratic National Committee, and his tactics win out, he will split the party and bring about the election of a Republican in 1960. This may be the purpose of some of those who are supporting him, although this would never be admitted.

The National Committee has been carefully stacked over recent years to support Butler. Therefore, at a showdown scheduled for September the National Committee may stick with the Indiana chairman. If it does, it will be the greatest boost for Republicans which has occurred since 1956. If Butler is ousted, and the Democratic Party remains unified, it has a better than 50–50 chance to elect its candidate as President in 1960.

Russia Versus United States: How Armies Compare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from U.S. News & World Report of August 3, 1959:

RUSSIA VERSUS UNITED STATES: HOW ARMIES COMPARE—NEW LIGHT IS SHED ON WHAT RUSSIA IS DOING TO MODERNIZE HER VAST ARMY—FROM U.S. ARMY INTELLIGENCE, PASSED ON TO CONGRESS AT CLOSED-DOOR SESSIONS, COMES WORD ON THE LATEST ROUND OF SOVIET TANKS, GUNS, COMBAT GEAR

Out of testimony before Congress by top U.S. Army officials comes this new appraisal of the Russian Army:

RED TANKS: LONGER RANGE

Gen. L. L. Lemnitzer, the Army's new Chief of Staff, told a Senate committee this in testimony just released:

Question: "Is it true that Soviet tanks have a far greater range than our tanks?"

General Lemnitzer: "Yes, sir; that is true."

Question: "We have 105-millimeter [guns] on our heavy tanks, have we not?"

General Lemnitzer: "That will be the weapon with which the M–60 [heavy tank] is equipped."

Question: "The Russians already have 120-millimeter [guns] on their heavy tanks, have they not?"

General Lemnitzer: "That is correct."

Question: "What we have gotten down to now is that the Soviets have 175 divisions; we and our allies have 21½ divisions in central Europe; and their tanks outrange and outgun us. Is that correct?"

General Lemnitzer: "Their present tanks do; yes, sir."

NEW ARMS: A SECOND ROUND

Brig. Gen. L. J. Lincoln, a U.S. Army logistics chief, then told this about Russia's "modernization" program—

"Information at our disposal indicates that the Soviet ground forces have been completely moderized since the end of World War II. * * * In quantity, they exceed our assets by a margin of about 5 to 1 * * *

"Such major Russian items as medium and heavy tanks, armored personnel carriers, trucks, and rocket launchers are now in the second round of modernization."

MOBILITY, FIREPOWER: UP

A U.S. Army report on "The Soviet Army," just made available to Congress, adds these details—

"Soviet ground forces [now show] a great improvement in mobility and firepower. Armored personnel carriers are now in mass use; amphibious vehicles have appeared in large numbers; helicopters are now widely employed.

"The Soviet Army arsenal features a new artillery system including field artillery, rockets, ballistic missiles of all ranges, and antiaircraft weapons of impressive mobility and effectiveness. * * *

"The importance of armor-protected firepower on the nuclear battlefield has been recognized, and has resulted in the production of new amphibious, medium and heavy tanks. Electronic equipment has been greatly improved, and modern communications equipment is in wide use throughout the ground forces."

SECRETARY'S SIZE-UP

Army Secretary Wilber M. Brucker concludes that—

"There is no doubt about the fact that the Russians have been modernizing their army. There is no doubt about the fact that they have been improving their tanks and their guns, that they have been given missiles that fire at great distances that I don't want to mention here, and many other classified [secret] items of equipment."

The Wolf Is Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of July 23, 1959:

OFF THE RECORD

The wolf is here: Are American cotton manufacturers merely crying wolf when they claim their industry faces ruin if this Government continues its policy of encouraging and subsidizing foreign competition at the expense of domestic mills?

Obviously, the administration in Washington thinks so. In just a few days the 6-cent subsidy on American cotton to foreign manufacturers will be increased to 8 cents

per pound. That is 8 cents less than American mills can buy this same cotton here at home. Add to that the tariff concessions, foreign aid support, and low wage levels enjoyed by foreign manufacturers competing for the American markets and future bankruptcy is not only predictable, it is inevitable.

The story of cotton textile manufacturing in Great Britain is dismal proof of this conclusion. Last April the British Government took the unusual action of allocating $84 million in public funds to the Lancashire mills in a last-ditch effort to keep them from going out of business. The money will be used to scrap some obsolete factories and modernize others.

What brought the British cotton manufacturers to the brink of bankruptcy? The causes, outlined in the May 2 issue of the Economist, are essentially the same as those influences now sapping the strength of American manufacturers.

"Lancashire's claim (for public funds)," says the Economist, "rests on two broad grounds. It contends that in both the home and export markets it is the victim of forces largely beyond its control. Since the Second World War its oversea markets have continued to shrink as they did after the First World War, owing to the growth of local industries behind tariff walls in countries that once were Lancashire's exclusive markets.

"These countries have not only become self-sufficient in textiles, but have also become substantial exporters, again at Lancashire's expense. And in recent years the industries in India and Hong Kong have been competing with Lancashire in the British market, which allows commonwealth goods in duty free.

"No other major manufacturing industry stands unprotected against low-wage competition from Asian countries. And as the Government has refused Lancashire formal protection on grounds of broad national and commonwealth policy, the industry argues that the Government must bear some part of the consequences."

Following the Second World War the United States also adopted a similar broad national and commonwealth policy in regard to Japan, the Philippines, India, and other most-favored nations. They were encouraged and assisted in developing their textile industries. Tariffs were scaled down to give them American markets. A deaf ear was turned to the cries of distress from American mills. The cotton textile industry, it would seem, had become expendable in the game of international politics.

In 1958 alone there were 118 mill closings in Lancashire as a result of the British policy. This has been matched in the last 3 years by scores of closings in the United States. American manufacturers have never sought public funds to aid them in this battle for survival. They have only asked, and are still asking, that some measure of protection be given them before they are engulfed by low-wage, subsidized competition from abroad.

Panama Economy Is Held Declining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the New York Times of July 27, 1959, written by Kathleen McLaughlin.

[From the New York Times, July 27, 1959]

PANAMA ECONOMY IS HELD DECLINING—LATIN AGENCY'S REPORT CITES NEED FOR STRONG MOVES TO BOLSTER REPUBLIC

(By Kathleen McLaughlin)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., July 26.—Short of stringent governmental measures, the economy of Panama is likely to decline in the next decade. This is the major conclusion reached by the Economic Commission for Latin America after a 2-year analysis.

Under the most favorable conditions implied by maximum adaptation of the changes outlined, the forecast is modified to indicate modest but important advances. Salient factors would be a reasonable, even if not adequate 2 percent rise in general living standards, and an increase of nearly 5 percent a year in total private consumption, accompanying a population increase of 2.9 percent a year.

Realization of these goals, the report said, would require "efforts which might appear excessive even from a strictly economic viewpoint." They were projected to meet the unusual fundamental characteristics of the country's economic structure, including a rigid monetary system, a limited market, and the impact of the integrated Canal Zone with its self-sufficient aspects.

ECONOMIC ROLLER COASTER

In the last 15 years, the survey noted, the pressure of events has kept the country on an economic roller coaster. Extraordinary boom conditions of the war years carried through to 1947. They were followed by deflation of the abnormal external demand for Panama's goods and services, with the trough of the depression occurring between 1949 and 1951, and an ensuing rapid upward recovery to 1953. Thereafter the pace quickened to 1956, the last year for which statistics were checked.

Between 1939 and 1945 Panama prospered on the influx of visitors, especially naval and merchant ship crews in its Canal Zone, who totaled 1 million a year.

But by 1947 the visitors had declined to 38,000 a year for naval crews, and to 200,000 for merchant crews. Their expenditures diminished by two-thirds.

RESOLUTE POLICY

Between these intervals of prosperity and of tight conditions, the Government's policy of fostering domestic expansion of basic capital, which had been matters of emergency, shifted to the aspect of a "resolute policy directed toward the country's internal economic development," the survey stated. It has continued in operation to the present.

Problems that have of necessity accelerated the pace of this movement are varied and difficult, the researchers conceded. The key obstacles are exchange parity between the balboa and the dollar, used in the Canal Zone for wages of U.S. personnel, for services and for imports; the long underutilized capacity of the rural areas; the absence of basic social capital; lack of incentive for private investment; inadequate roads and communications; and insufficient capacity to import and a minority of exports capable of competing on the international market.

In its asset column, Panama possesses an estimated 5,400,000 acres of arable land, of which only 44 percent is being used.

POWER CAPACITY UNUSED

Installed capacity of electric power stations has been used, at best, only to 32.4 percent, emphasizing the situation in this sector of the economy.

For years, until recently, the "campesinos" or peasants in the hinterland of Panama were frustrated in reaching their natural market outlets in the country by the disrepair of the roads and highways, 50 percent of which were impassable to motor vehicles for a good part of each year. Since 1953 a vigorous construction and renovation program, stimulated by a $5,900,000 loan from the World Bank, has materially improved traffic mobility and set off a mounting surge of agricultural development in areas once practically inaccessible.

Increased Incentives for Private Giving Through the Allowance of a Tax Credit for Charitable Contributions to Institutions of Higher Education Urged by Leading Educational Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I include here an excerpt from the speech by Dr. C. C. Furnas, chancellor of the University of Buffalo, at the 43d annual meeting of the American College Public Relations Association which was held this year at French Lick, Ind., July 13, 1959.

Dr. Furnas at that time urged increased incentives for private giving to institutions of higher education through the allowance of a tax credit. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 8356, to give $1 of tax credit for each $1 contributed to higher education. The tax credit method of financing higher education is rapidly garnering support from national organizations concerned with advancing American education.

I include here the text of my bill, H.R. 8356, as well as a major portion of the speech by Dr. C. C. Furnas who is, also, a member of the New York State Council on Higher Education.

H.R. 8356

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide funds for educational purposes by providing increased incentives for private giving through the allowance of a tax credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 39. Credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—At the election of the taxpayer there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter (subject to the limitations contained in subsections (b) and (c)) the amount of the taxpayer's charitable contributions to institutions of higher education during the taxable year.

"(b) INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, the maximum amount allowable as a credit under this section for any taxable year shall be—

"(1) in the case of any individual who has elected to take the standard deduction provided by section 141 or to pay the optional tax imposed by section 3, 10 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, computed without regard to any net operating loss carryback to the taxable year under section 172, or

"(2) in the case of any other such taxpayer, 30 percent of his adjusted gross income, computed without regard to any net operating loss carryback to the taxable year under section 172.

"(c) CORPORATIONS.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of a corporation, the maximum amount allowable as a credit under this section for any taxable year shall be 5 percent of the taxpayer's taxable income, computed without regard to—

"(A) section 170,

"(B) part VIII of subchapter B (except section 248),

"(C) any net operating loss carryback to the taxable year under section 172, and

"(D) section 922 (special deduction for Western Hemisphere trade corporations).

"(2) CORPORATIONS ON ACCRUAL BASIS.—In the case of a corporation reporting its taxable income on the accrual basis, if—

"(A) the board of directors authorizes a charitable contribution to an institution of higher education during any taxable year, and

"(B) payment of such contribution is made after the close of such taxable year and on or before the 15th day of the third month following the close of such taxable year,

then the taxpayer may elect to treat such contribution as paid during such taxable year.

"(3) CARRYOVER OF CORPORATE CONTRIBUTIONS.—Any contribution made by a corporation in the taxable year which, but for the limitation of paragraph (1), would be taken into account in computing the credit under this section, shall (at the election of the taxpayer made for the taxable year) be taken into account in computing the credit under this section in each of the two succeeding taxable years, but only to the extent of the lesser of the two following amounts:

"(A) the excess of the amount of charitable contributions to institutions of higher education which may be taken into account in computing the credit under this section under the limitation in paragraph (1) over the amount of the charitable contributions to institutions of higher education made in such year; and

"(B) in the case of the first succeeding taxable year, the amount of such excess contribution, and in the case of the second succeeding taxable year, the portion of such excess contribution not taken into account in the first succeeding taxable year.

"(d) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given to such term by section 103 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

"(e) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) AMOUNTS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—The determination of whether or not a charitable contribution to an institution of higher education may be taken into account under this section, and the amount thereof, shall be made under section 170; except that in the case of an individual any such determination shall be made without regard to any election to take the standard deduction provided by section 141, or to pay the optional tax provided by section 3.

"(2) CORRELATION WITH SECTION 170.—No amount taken into account under this section shall be allowable as a deduction under section 170. Any amount taken into account under this section shall be taken into account in computing the limitations provided in section 170(b)(1) (but not those provided in section 170(b)(2)). For purposes of provisions of law relating to amounts allowable as a deduction under section 170, any amount taken into account for purposes of this section shall be treated as an amount allowable under section 170; and any reference in any provision of law to a specific provision of section 170 shall, where appropriate, be treated as including a reference to the corresponding provision of section 39. An amount shall be treated as taken into account for purposes of this section only to the extent that, but for such amount, the amount allowable as a credit under this section for any taxable year would be decreased.

"(3) CREDIT NOT TO RESULT IN REFUNDS.—The credit allowed by this section shall not exceed the tax imposed by this chapter, reduced by the sum of the credits allowed by this part (other than this section and section 31).

"(4) ELECTIONS.—Any election provided by this section may be made only at such time, in such manner, and subject to such conditions designed to insure the effective correlation of this section with section 170, as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe."

(b) The table of sections for part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 39. Credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education."

SEC. 2. (a) The second sentence of section 170(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to charitable, etc., contributions and gifts) is amended to read as follows: "A charitable contribution shall be allowable as a deduction (or taken into account in computing the credit under section 39) only if verified under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate."

(b) Section 170(c) of such Code is amended by striking out "For purposes of this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "For purposes of this section and section 39".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to charitable contributions made (within the meaning of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) during taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

YOU CAN'T FLY ON ONE WING

(Address at 43d annual meeting of the American College Public Relations Association, French Lick, Ind., July 13, 1959, by C. C. Furnas, chancellor, University of Buffalo)

It must be admitted that the public has characteristically fallen into the habit of demanding much but paying little. Recently howls of pain have swept over the land as the public has been made aware of the size of the educational bill it is going to have to pay. Outfumbling the other fellow in picking up the check has become a fine art. The overnight experts in all educational matters are coming out of the woodwork and leveling critical blasts at everything in sight. For instance, we are educating too many. We are encouraging mediocrity and suppressing ability. All high school and collegiate curriculums are loaded with snap courses—no substance. We are teaching the kids citizenship when they should be learning algebra and physics. We should revert to the old European system of the grinding and unimaginative disciplines for the few and let those who can't take it fall where they may. If the colleges and universities were operated efficiently, they could do with what they have—they wouldn't need any more money.

If kept in a rational context this basket of criticisms is welcome and can be useful. I feel that our educational system can and must be improved. There is a lot of pap and padding in both secondary and higher education. There is an appalling lack of appropriate motivation for true learning among our young people; though a large part of the blame for that must rest with the parents. Colleges and universities certainly can be operated more efficiently than at present. When all these valid criticisms are met, we are going to have better education but—let's face it—we are not going to have cheaper education.

Not unexpectedly, many individuals and organizations have been making estimates on the size of the bill to be paid to handle the forthcoming 6½ million students. Although various approaches and different sets of assumptions have been used, the estimates all come out with surprising consistency at about $9 billion per year in 1970, as compared to the present $3½ billion per year. This estimate assumes a stable price structure, so if there is inflation, the bill will be even higher than that.

The question immediately comes to mind—why should the cost go up in greater proportion than the number of students? There are three reasons.

First, the salaries of faculty and administrative staff have lagged woefully behind the increases in cost of living and the general level of the economy in the professional fields. Rectification of this situation throughout the country is long overdue and must be remedied with dispatch. It is necessary to do this, not only for humanitarian reasons but also because impending teacher shortages are making this a highly competitive occupation and it will be necessary to raise salary scales substantially to maintain even the bare minimum number of teachers for the future.

The second reason is that there is a considerable reservoir of delayed expenditures for buildings and facilities which is just now catching up with the educational system.

Third, as is the case with everything else in modern life, higher education is becoming inherently more complicated and hence more expensive, particularly in the scientific and allied professions.

From all evidence in hand, it seems that America, if it intends to maintain its position in the world, must realistically face this tremendously large bill and not try to evade or avoid it.

When one considers that at the present time we are spending less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the gross national product on higher education, and that even the $9 billion which will be needed is less than one-fourth of the present annual budget for national defense, it would seem that the public would readily arise to the occasion to meet this critical situation, which is rapidly becoming an emergency. Those of us who are in the middle of the battle feel that this is the decade for decision and we have a real crisis on our hands, but it is difficult so to persuade the public. It is not a crisis which is punctuated with open warfare or daily casualty lists, so the average citizen feels that it may be a delusion and will probably go away. As individuals, all of us can feel very sorry for ourselves because of high taxes and the constant bombardment of appeals for gifts to this and that worthy cause. We are all victims of and at least partial participants in a high level public apathy, and something new must be added if we are going to handle the task.

Some comfort can be gained from the estimates that the gross national product will rise to some $700 billion (at 1959 prices) by the year 1970, as compared to the 1959 figure of somewhat under $500 billion. However, this projected 40 percent rise in available wealth will by no means take care of the projected 260 percent increase for higher educational costs.

The Council for Financial Aid to Education, Inc., in its pamphlet "Where's the

Money Coming From?" views the situation with considerable optimism. It has laid out the 1969–70 sources of income as follows:

	Million
Tuition and fees, 21 percent	$1,890
Support from governments, 50 percent	4,500
Private gifts and grants, 21 percent	1,890
Endowment earnings, 3 percent	270
Other sources, 5 percent	450
Total	9,000

The council contends that raising these amounts from these sources is feasible. There are two points on which I cannot share its optimism. First, the proposed $1,890 million of voluntary support of private gifts and grants should be compared with the corresponding figure for 1957–58, which has been estimated to be $411 million. Hence, the council's figures anticipate a 450-percent increase in the flow from voluntary sources—all within the span of 10 years. Although I am not a cynical individual, I seriously doubt if private purses are going to open up to any such extent as that. My attitude is admittedly tempered by many discouraging recent experiences in attempting and failing to obtain substantial gifts. Under the present tax structure the private-donation lode does not contain as much paydirt as the council visualizes.

The council has estimated an income of $4,500 million from governments, to be compared with $1,750 million from that source for 1957–58. This represents a 257 percent increase from the public purse. In view of the incipient taxpayers' revolt which is making itself evident in all parts of the country, there is considerable doubt as to whether the average citizen will vote for the necessary increases. Though the national tax bill for higher education is only a fraction of the total tax burden, it is highly visible and subject to extreme criticism and delays. It is almost certain, unless something changes radically, that the public as a whole will decide that it would rather retain its new automobiles, superhighways, and extended vacations in distant places than properly to support colleges and universities.

When Americans see a crisis clearly, they nearly always rapidly and adequately rise to the occasion. But this crisis is not sufficiently evident to cause the adrenalin to flow in adequate quantities in the public veins. When the realization does come, it may be too late—tragically so.

What is the solution?

IV. OPENING THE VALVE

Although I recognize it is no panacea, I do have one suggestion to make which I feel should be explored—that is, the opening of the valve to encourage greater voluntary support of higher education. Though it can only serve as an analogy, I would point to the control function of the Federal Reserve Board discount rate. Adjustment of the rate has proved very effective in controlling the flow of credit. Put another way, it can be said that the flow of financial resources in a desired direction is highly sensitive to and can be adjusted by a control at the top. I feel that through certain relaxations of the Federal tax laws an analogous and effective control could be exercised to induce individual citizens and corporations to give substantially increased voluntary support to higher education in a relatively painless fashion. In order to analyze the situation, let us look at the tax record for the latest year for which full complete data are available, 1956.[1]

For the calendar year 1956 adjusted gross income of the individuals who paid Federal income taxes was approximately $124 billion. Although by law these individuals were permitted to deduct 20 percent from their adjusted gross income for contributions for charitable and educational purposes, these contributions amounted to only $4,888 million—less than 4 percent.

You may turn now to the corporate picture for the accounting period July 1956 to June 1957. The taxable income of all corporations reporting was $46,885 million. According to the law, gift deductions for partial tax credit can be made for approximately 5 percent of the taxable income in any 1 year. However, the corporate contributions and gifts were only $417,996,000 or less than 1 percent of the taxable income.

Thus for this period the total contributions and gifts from individuals and corporations was $5,294 million of which only $317 million, or 5.8 percent of the total, went to higher education. The total amount which individuals and corporations could have given to charitable and educational purposes and received partial tax credit was $27,088 million. Hence, the reservoir of voluntary support legally authorized, and presumably intended to be used, was utilized to less than 20 percent of its contents. It is obvious that the valve needs to be opened a bit wider than it is at present. It would appear that this could most readily be done by revision of Federal tax legislation.

Adjustment of the tax legislation to favor higher education is not a new idea. For instance, during the current year Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, introduced House bill H.R. 2440 to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide funds for educational purposes by providing increased incentives for private giving through the allowance of tax credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education. Though this bill has never gotten out of committee, its content does indicate that some legislators are becoming interested in this approach.

When relieved of its legal verbiage, this bill essentially proposes that all contributors to recognized institutions of higher education be given the same deduction advantages as the highest income group. Under the present tax schedule this means that each dollar contributed to higher education by any individual would cost the donor only 9 cents. Each dollar any corporation contributed would cost the stockholders 48 cents.

Although this is a step in the right direction I contend, human nature being what it is, that it does not open the valve wide enough.

To solve the problem, I suggest that Federal legislation be enacted which will give tax credit to both individuals and corporations up to 5 percent of their total tax bill for contributions to the institutions of higher education which are on the list approved by the U.S. Office of Education. Individual and corporation Federal taxes in the year 1958 were approximately $60 billion. If there were the legislation that I suggest, it would mean that approximately $3 billion of annual voluntary support could be given by individuals and corporations and it would hardly cost them a cent.

We must not fall into the trap of assuming that you can get something for nothing, but it must be admitted that that would be a powerful psychological tool that would be very helpful in diverting a small portion of the national wealth into the channel where it is desperately needed—higher education.

If such legislation were enacted, it is almost certain that individual States would also revise their own tax structure in a similar fashion within a short time.

If colleges and universities worked very hard in convincing possible donors of their opportunities and obligations, they could probably realize $2 billion per year of the $3 billion potential. This would make a tremendous difference in the ready flow of money through the voluntary route. It would make it possible not only to meet but greatly to exceed $1,890 million of annual contributions in the CFFAE schedule. It would thus be possible to relieve the tax burden appreciably.

Although private institutions might well be the principal beneficiaries of such legislation, tax-supported institutions would also benefit substantially. The public institutions are finding it increasingly necessary to obtain large sums of private money, not only for current expenses but also for endowment. For example, available information (admittedly not up to date) on endowments of certain State universities show the following: University of Michigan, $25 million; University of Minnesota, $59 million; University of California, $86 million; University of Texas system, $287 million. State universities are naturally continually seeking more private funds. Both public and private institutions are essentially in the same pool of water. One type is just immersed somewhat more than the other.

It is easy to recognize and name the objections that would be raised to the legislation I propose.

First, it goes against the grain of legislators to release funds and maintain no control. In response to this, I would like to point out the following. There would be the basic control in that the money would be going only to colleges and universities. The choice of the particular institution to be favored would be left up to the donor. In America, presumably we believe in free enterprise, which implies that within substantial limits we believe in allowing individuals to use their income as they see fit. If legislators really believe in free enterprise, I think they should be consistent and rely on the judgment of individuals to choose reasonably wisely in distributing their largesse among an approved list of institutions. This represents free enterprise of free individuals.

Second, if such special treatment is given to educational institutions, there will be great political pressure to have it made available for various charities: Churches, welfare agencies, and others. It is high time that education be recognized for what it is—a highly necessary investment in the future. It is not a charity and should not be perpetually lumped in with charitable enterprises. The special treatment is highly deserved and can be well justified.

Third, it will be contended that such legislation would mean that an equal amount in additional taxes would have to be raised from other sources. This would be only partially true. The flow of money through the voluntary route would relieve the necessity of taxation to a substantial degree. Hence, though some additional tax money would have to be found from other sources, it would by no means have to be a 100-percent recovery.

In general, if we Americans, as citizens and legislators, really believe what we say—that higher education is necessary, that our institutions are in a crisis situation, that free enterprise has great virtue—then we will concede that special and favoring legislation for colleges and universities is not only possible, it is necessary. I suggest that ACPRA, through its numerous and effective channels, begin campaigning on a national scale for the type of tax legislation which will meet the situation.

Perhaps you as a group may have a better idea than the one I have propounded. There are several of us here who are of sufficient age to have vivid memories of World War I. You will remember the British cartoonist, Bruce Bairnsfather, and his famous char-

[1] Internal Revenue Service Publication No. 79 (11–58), Nov. 14, 1958, p. 35.

acter, Old Bill. You will recall the classic cartoon in which Old Bill and a very frightened rookie were sheltering themselves against a heavy bombardment, as best they could, in a too-shallow shellhole. In response to the young fellow's protestations, Old Bill said, "If you know a better 'ole, go to it."

Debt Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of debt management, I bring to the attention of my colleagues another editorial from the Washington Post and Times-Herald, July 20, 1959, as follows:

EFFECTS OF U.S. BORROWING ON LITTLE BUSINESS

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

Since business and financial planning must be completely realistic, it is beginning to take into consideration the practical effects of the prospect that Congress will not pass the legislation necessary to permit the Treasury Department to sell Government bonds at an interest rate in excess of 4¼ percent.

That thinking is already demonstrated by the fact that in its current refinancing of about $14 billion of maturing debt the Treasury Department has to offer an interest rate of 4¼ percent to borrow money for 12½ months, and the same rate to borrow money for 4¾ years. These interest rates are in sharp, and unusual, contrast with the fact that Government bonds now outstanding with maturities beyond 1966 afford a yield ranging 3.77 percent and 4.17 percent.

One practical effect, then, of the Treasury Department's enforced inflexibility is this evidence that the Government's expenditures for interest charges on this single piece of refinancing alone are probably going to be something like $70 million a year more than they would have been if the Treasury Department were free to tap the most advantageous credit markets. This increased expenditure for interest charges is the result of only this one piece of current Government refinancing. The interest charges on financing of the past few months probably have been unnecessarily higher and the same promises to be true of future financing.

Thus the taxpayers are being forced to pay a few hundred million dollars of unnecessary expense for interest charges because of a misunderstanding of the problem in Congress. Just why that misunderstanding should prevail is a little difficult to see. The situation is really comparatively simple. Because the interest ceiling bars the Government from the long-term credit market, it is being forced to borrow in the short-term credit market, where it is competing with the credit needs of business and individuals for the limited supply. As a understandable result, the interest rates are forced higher. Everybody would be better off—except the lenders—if some of these funds were obtained in the long-term credit markets where the interest rates are currently lower.

The business analyst must be strictly objective in his interpretation of the facts. There is little room in such interpretations for questions why Congress may be making decisions that seem to be illogical from every practical point of view. The latest indications are that Congress is not going to lift the ceiling on the interest rate of government bonds, and if those indications are to become the actuality, then the interpretation and the business planning has to be adjusted accordingly.

The small businessman in particular should start adjusting his affairs immediately. The lack of congressional action on this particular matter is threatening him with an exceedingly difficult problem in obtaining the necessary credit to carry his seasonally higher inventories next fall and winter. As the current situation shapes up, he is probably going to find bank after bank loaned up and, therefore, unable to supply his credit needs.

The small businessman may not be able to carry as large an inventory as he would like, to take care of the seasonal increase in his sales. If he, therefore, has to anticipate lower sales as earnings, his capacity to provide jobs will be reduced. If he has debt maturing between now and the end of the year that under normal circumstances would be refinanced, he may be squeezed to an embarrassing extent. He will then come face to face with the fact that Congress is unnecessarily forcing the Government to compete with him in his natural credit market. It will be a brutal fact the Government's credit needs will be given preference over his own.

It must be remembered that we are entering the season of rising business needs for credit, with the commercial banks' ratio of loans to deposits already at a very high level. On top of that condition we now have to envisage a continued heavy demand in that same short-term credit market by the Government. The combination threatens a credit stringency of serious proportions. As usual, small business will be hurt worse than big business, but this time it should be clear that the fault is centered in the failure of Congress to understand the foregoing situation.

Some Congressmen evidently disapprove of Treasury Department and/or Federal Reserve policies. It scarcely seems fair to let that feeling create a condition which can severely hurt the affairs of many thousands of little business people. After all, neither the Federal Reserve officials nor the U.S. Government can force lenders to invest their money in long-term bonds at 4½ percent or less if they don't want to. The lack of congressional action on this interest rate ceiling continues to force the Government to absorb short-term credit that should be left available to the little businessman. He is already paying a high interest rate, but as matters stand at the moment, he is going to be lucky if he can obtain his fall and early winter credit even at a higher rate.

Up to this point, it has been my opinion that the fairly tight credit situation would not stop sound business expansion, but would only tend to curb the excessive use of credit. That opinion had been based on the presumption that Congress would enable the Government to withdraw somewhat from the short-term credit market and tap the long-term market. If that presumption is going to turn out to be erroneous, the business analyst is going to have to start worrying about the effect on the economy of the threatened financial squeeze that seems likely to be imposed on small businesses—businesses that are small individually, but collectively are an important portion of the economy.

Roy Bedicheck—A Tribute to the Philosopher-Naturalist of the Southwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on May 21, 1959 Mr. Roy Bedichek—one of Texas' greatest men of letters—died at the age of 80 years. Few men have made so great a contribution to our people in Texas as he did; few men's presence has been so sorely missed as his.

His death touched me personally very deeply, as it hit many of our mutual friends. I have read his "Adventures With a Texas Naturalist" and "Karankaway County." I sat at a table with him for many nights in Town and Gown. He was a naturalist-philosopher reminiscent of Thoreau, W. H. Hudson, Burroughs, Muir, and other lovers of woods and wildlife and keen observers and teachers of their fellow men. It was my very great honor and privilege to have had his friendship and counsel and support in my political campaigns. One of my real regrets is that the last time he came by my campaign headquarters in Austin last summer to offer the benefit of his advice, I was out campaigning the State. He conferred, instead, with my staff, but I am still sorry that we did not get to talk personally. But the staff was lifted up and inspired by his visit, and still talk about it.

Thousands of words have been written and spoken about "Mr. Bedi," as he was affectionately known to close friends. But by far the greatest recognition given him in print was published by the Texas Observer, an independent-liberal weekly newspaper. Ronnie Dugger, the brilliant young editor of the Observer, issued a special edition concerning "Mr. Bedi's" life. It is an outstanding work, containing articles from several of Texas' finest writers, among them J. Frank Dobie, Walter Prescott Webb, Hubert Newhinney, and Mr. Dugger. I regret that space limitations will not permit me to reprint every word of this finest edition of one of the most fearless and influential weekly papers in America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to have printed in the Appendix several articles or portions of articles from the Texas Observer of June 27, 1959, notwithstanding that it is estimated by the Public Printer to make 4¼ pages of the RECORD at a cost of $344.25.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RESPECT OF INTELLIGENT MEN

This is a special issue on Roy Bedichek, who died May 21 at the age of 80.

He was born in Illinois in 1878 and brought to Texas at 5 by his teacher-parents, who tutored him until he entered the University of Texas.

For 15 years after college he bummed around the country and the world. He picked cotton in the South, peeled potatoes on a riverboat, picked berries in New Jersey, washed dishes in a Chinese cafe in New York City, tramped over the English, French, and German countrysides, assisted a fake divine in Boston, dug coal and scouted rivers in West Virginia, cut off hogs' heads in a Chicago slaughterhouse, and homesteaded a dugout in Oklahoma.

Mrs. Bedichek says he had "lots of yella' hair, and green eyes with lots of spots in them." With a wife and children, he worked as editor of a newspaper in Deming, N. Mex., secretary of the Deming Chamber of Commerce, and city editor of the San Antonio Express.

Then as the director of the University Interscholastic League of Texas, he began to affect the lives of millions of Texas children. "Hold before the young," he said, "the same great theme of superior performance and the vision of greatness it inspires." To the league's competitions in sports, speech, music, and writing he gave most of his life.

Along the way he became a naturalist, a camper, a gardener, and an intellectual steeped in the classics. With $5,000 from the Texas Historical Society and sanctuary at Walter Webb's Friday Mountain camp in his late sixties he began to write his books. In the last dozen years of his life he completed four of them: "Adventures With a Texas Naturalist" (Doubleday, 1947), "Karankaway Country" (Doubleday, 1950), "Educational Competition" (University of Texas, 1956), and a book on smells, publication pending.

About 11:30 on the Thursday morning of May 21 he asked Mrs. Bedichek for his lunch a little early as he was excursioning into the country. "I've got some cornbread almost done, you want to wait?" she asked. "Oh, I'll wait," he said, sitting on a stool. "I need southern cornbread."

"Six breaths it was over," Mrs. Bedichek says. "How could he die in seconds when he had been so strong?"

The Texas Senate resolved that he was known and loved by thousands of Texas children and had the respect of intelligent men.

ROY BEDICHEK

(By J. Frank Dobie)

I. THE NATURAL MAN

Nature is the complex of all complexities. One part of a man may be as simple and serene as the cow chewing her cud in the noonday shade of a tree a thousand miles and a hundred years away from any milking machine; and yet the whole of this same man may be as complex as the genius of Shakespeare—that is to say, the greatest genius in the world—ever penetrated. It will be a great deal easier to show Roy Bedichek in the simplicities of naturalness than to express him in the naturalness of the highest intellectual and emotional complexities.

His going to bed with the chickens in summertime and not too much later in the wintertime and getting up with the morning star at all times made his friends smile. He favored several kinds of independence common to the country. * * * He liked to cook outdoors, eat outdoors, sleep outdoors, look and listen outdoors, be at one with the unexplaining wind from the South, with the swing of the Great Dipper around the North Star, and with the first bob-whiteing at dawn. He preferred camping on a hill so that he could watch the firmament, rather than down in a shady valley by water.

The last car he bought, in 1951, was a Dodge pickup truck in which he could carry enough water to make his camp on a hill comfortable for a day or two. This pickup was for camp purposes, but he used it to run about in also, his wife owning a sedan. He got an immense satisfaction out of trucking in cow manure, also occasionally chicken manure, for his compost pile, with which he annually fertilized his garden. He got a satisfaction out of hauling his own wood in from the country; he liked especially cedar stamps that he wouldn't have to cut for the fireplace. He had complete camp equipment, including a tent-fly to go with the truck. Part of the equipment was a field guide to the flora of the country and a field guide to the birds. He always took along something to read as well as to consult; above all, he took along the most richly and variously stored mind I have known. Not for him the dream of retiring to some primitive land and mating with some savage woman to rear his dusky race. For him back to nature was not back to the primitive, there to be saved from poring over miserable books.

His father, James Madison Bedichek, an ex-Confederate soldier, quoted philosophers and talked philosophy at the family dining table. He proved up on a quarter-section of land near the village of Eddy, not far from Waco in central Texas. Here he and his wife ran what they called the Eddy Scientific and Literary Institute, dubbed the Bedichek School by the public. Mrs. Bedichek boarded and roomed some of the pupils. Roy's aptitude for books was as congenital as that for milk. The atmosphere of literature and of thought was as natural to him as the atmosphere in which a lone buzzard soars over a cedar-covered hill or in which a coyote trots through the mesquite, sniffing for a woodrat's trail. I would not call his taste exactly austere. He took pleasure in witty limericks, even though bawdy; he could talk for hours with some cedar-chopper whose literary vocabulary was limited to the printing on a bottle of Levi Garrett's snuff. I've heard him say a dozen times that he could no longer read American fiction because it is so pallid and insipid compared to the great Russian fiction rammed to the breech with vitality: Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy. He admitted Balzac into their company. During a long span of his life he read the greater part of Shakespeare about once every 2 years.

The Walt Whitman that he knew by heart and had absorbed into his very marrow was not the sentimentalized "good gray poet," but the tough poet of democracy. "He is our greatest exponent of democracy among the poets," Bedi wrote me in a letter. "The reaching hand, bringing up the laggards—could there be a more expressive phrase of the true inwardness of democracy than that?" Along with Whitman, his favorite American writer was Thoreau, acid, with the wild taste, a rebel. Bedichek gloried in the influence that Thoreau's "Civil Disobedience" had on Gandhi and India and is still having over the world.

While he was writing "Adventures With A Texas Naturalist," or maybe it was "Karankaway Country," he made a habit of reading pages of Plato with his predawn coffee. Plato helped start the day for him on a noble plane and put him into a creative mood. At this time he would not will the freshest part of the day with the littlenesses and banalities of a morning newspaper. For no man writing a book has morning ever been, to quote a 1945 note from Bedichek, a time to "stroke the furnace of indignation against numerous manifestations of fascism in this country." He never learned the Greek language, but his ideal of a balanced life, of a just proportion of the elements that make up a human being, was essentially Greek. In reading Homer, he compared several translations. As hundreds of quotations and allusions in his books and letters would show, the immortal essence of the Greeks was in his veins.

It seemed to me that the philosophy of Henry George had a more determining effect upon his economic views than any other writing. Henry George advocated a single tax and did not consider it just that an individual owner of real estate should collect the unearned increment given to it by population and labor. Bedichek believed in the single tax but would justify buying a piece of land by saying, "It's better to run with the hounds for your dinner than with the hare for your life."

Immanuel Kant's categorical imperative was his golden rule: Do only as you would have others do; or, act only as if you would have the act become universal law. The categorical imperative is contrary to the ways of greed and lust; so was Bedichek. He was as unenvying and as free from greed and jealousy as any man could be.

In the early 1920's he suffered from a rash caused, he was told, from eating too much of high proteins, especially eggs. He became for the rest of his life what Sam Houston called "a damned vegetarian." He was not too rigid, however, to enjoy latitude upon occasion. As a guest he ate of the meat set before him. He took the lead many a time in getting a few men friends to go out in the country for a meal and talk. There was always a steak, and Bedi always insisted on cooking the steak over coals. Nobody could cook it better, and he was no slacker in eating his part of it. Cooking meat over an open fire mitigated in his mind any protein poison it might have; at a hotel table I've seen him dispose of an untouched steak to somebody else who could eat a double one. He had a theory that the deeper down into the earth a plant puts its roots, the richer its fruit is. He positively gloated in dilating on the mineral and other virtues of pecans. He loved to mix a green or a fruit salad and would linger long and lovingly in detailing his recipe for such.

In theory he was against doctors; I think he wrote considerably on a book intended to expose at least several sides of the medical profession—though he believed very much in his doctor daughter, Mary Virginia Carroll. He would quote an old proverb: "A man's either a fool or his own physician after 40." He said that a sick man should have as much sense as a sick cow: She quits eating and goes off and lies down.

Sometimes it didn't seem at all natural to me that Bedi should be practical. He was a productive gardener, as his table, his deep freeze, and many a mess of vegetables he gave to friends showed. Yet he put a kind of ritualism into gardening that farmer folks wouldn't and couldn't bother with. When I drove with him in his pickup I constantly wondered how he made it through the streets—but he always made it.

He liked raw milk, believed in its virtues for himself and his family. He had a contempt for boiled and chemically treated milk, something taken out, and something else put in. For years he milked his own cow. There were vacant lots not far distant from the Bedichek home on East 23d Street in Austin, where a cow could graze. The last cow he had, about 1932 or 1933, was a 4-gallon milker. She was very gentle and very much devoted to the Bedicheks, but keeping a cow and milking her became too much of a burden, and Bedi sold her to a man out near Deep Eddy on West Sixth Street. This man saw the cow being milked. Bedi told him that she wouldn't give milk unless she were treated gently and fed well. He got up at 2 o'clock in the morning to lead her to the purchaser, thus avoiding the traffic. The purchaser hadn't had her more than two or three days before he complained that the cow wasn't giving the milk claimed for her. He wanted his money back. Bedi went out there. The cow was shrunken and showed abuse. While the man was away for a minute, his wife told Bedi that

her husband had beaten the cow. Bedi felt like beating the man but he left. He didn't give him his money back either. Anybody who knew him would as soon expect apples to fall up instead of down as for him to misrepresent a fact.

In the vigor of early manhood Bedi drank some whiskey—maybe not too much—although after he married any drinking was bad economically. I don't think he ever loved any man quite so much as he loved his college friend Harry Steger, with whom he went to Europe and who died young. He cried all day long, so Mrs. Bedichek has told me, after receiving word of Steger's death. One of his favorite anecdotes was of meeting Steger on Congress Avenue in Austin one day. They both wanted a drink but before entering a saloon swore to each other that they would take only one and then get out. They took the drink, and it was good. "Well, let's go," said Bedi. "That drink makes me feel like a new man," Steger said, and "now the new man has to have a drink." I never did ask Bedi if he joined the new man.

By the time I got to know him, he wasn't smoking the pipe or cigar he had once smoked. He took real solace in a bottle of beer along in the evening or with a Mexican meal—but virtually never more than one. Along about 1954 or 1955 in the middle of a terrible drought devastating much of Texas, I brought back about a dozen cases of Carta Blanca beer from Monterrey, Mexico. I had a devil of a time getting them past the customs ignoramuses at Laredo. I had to prove my right to pay duty on beer just as beer dealers pay it. I hadn't more than got to Austin and got a few bottles cooled than I called up Bedi. For awhile I shared that Carta Blanca beer with other people, especially when Bedi was around. When only two cases were left, I cut off everybody, including myself, and saved it especially for Bedichek. Occasionally there might be two or three or half a dozen other men; I'd offer them what they wanted to drink, and if they wanted beer they had to take Schlitz (Bedi's second choice) or something else. Then I'd bring out Bedi's bottle of Carta Blanca. He enjoyed that sort of petting.

II. TALKER AND STORYTELLER

As newspaperman, chamber of commerce exponent, and director of the Interscholastic League of Texas, Bedichek had done a vast amount of hackwork. Anybody who works for a living spends the majority of his energies in hackwork. But though he was a university man, specializing in the humanities, he had never been deflected by the Ph. D. system into the inferiorities of literature. He had spent a lifetime reading the best before he turned author with 70 just over the hill for him. While H. Y. Benedict was president of the University of Texas, I heard him say that Bedichek should be teaching literature. "Why not put him to teaching it?" I asked. "Because every Ph. D. professor of English would have a colt if I did," he replied. That was the truth. Sawdust never yearns toward vitality.

We all learn with wonder of the feats in memory performed by the Macaulays of history, but I've never known anyone else in the flesh who held in memory so precisely so much of what he had read as Roy Bedichek. He could have produced a magnificent anthology of English poetry solely out of his memory—as rich as Lord Wavell drew from his memory in "Other Men's Flowers." He had the added faculty, perhaps of a higher order, of always being able to draw from memory anything related to a subject brought up by conversation or in his own flow of thought. Sometimes he had to restrain himself from clogging his writing with allusions and "decisions that had from the time of King William come down."

Early in the summer of 1953 Jess Akin of Austin decided to paint the portraits of Bedichek, Walter Webb, and myself. He had painted mine unsatisfactorily and wanted to make another attempt. If a person is being portrayed for his significance, every effort should be made to make that significance appear on his countenance while he is sitting for the painter. I volunteered to do my best to keep Bedi's features illuminated while he was being painted. I knew that he would do more talking than I, for he was just naturally a better talker. I illuminated him for 4 half days. After Aikin was through with Bedi, he took me on, and Bedi came to brighten me. We had eight conversations amounting to perhaps 30 hours in less than 2 weeks. I can say of Bedichek as Johnson said of Burke: "That man draws out all my powers." Neither he nor I was empty or exhausted when the sittings came to an end. Sitting and talking had become a kind of occupation with us. Several times I thought I would make notes on the subjects of our talk. I did not. Naturally, we recurred occasionally to the same themes—but without repeating. Now I cannot recall a hundredth part of what either said; if I could recall all, a book would be required to hold it. Little of it was trivial. It interested us, and that was sufficient.

Will Burges, lawyer of El Paso, John Lomax, of cowboy song fame, and Roy Bedichek were the pithiest and vividest relators of anecdoes about human beings they had encountered that I have known. Despite his rich stores out of books, Bedichek in the course of conversations with his peers drew more often from actual experience. He could make any character that interested him fascinating.

He told few stories except to reveal character, to bring out some point, or to complement something else. Lots of times one merry tale would call up another.

Boswell's life of Johnson is the greatest biography in the world because it records the best talk that has ever been recorded. Bedichek often talked as well as Johnson talked—but he had no Boswell to record more than a few snatches of his talk.

As president of the Texas Institute of Letters, I had notice from judges of books published during the year 1956 that Bedichek had won the Carr P. Collins $1,000 award, to be presented at the institute's annual dinner in Dallas February 1, 1957. On the evening of January 20, I went to his home, finding him alone. I had telephoned him that I had a letter to confront him with. He was eating a salad of tomatoes, lettuce, cheese, and a little mayonnaise, moistening it down with a glass of buttermilk. He thought I should take a little something and spooned out yogurt into a bowl and put honey on it. We were both honey hounds, honey being the highest form of sweetness—natural. I could not remember having tasted yogurt before. He told me how monks in a Hungarian monastery had cultivated the yogurt germ hundreds of years ago, keeping it secret; how one escaped with the process to Canada, whence it came to California, where yogurt is now made and sold. "I get the yeast in a container every 3 weeks by airmail," Bedi said, "and make 6 quarts." He described in detail the sanitary processes for making yogurt and its bodily virtues. "Not the same thing at all," he said, "that you buy in grocery stores." I found it delicious.

After the yogurt, I confronted him with the letter. He read it aloud slowly. When he came to the point—the $1,000 award to Roy Bedichek for his book "Educational Competition," he stopped, joy on his face. We talked a little and then he said, "Dobie, you'll go away and I'll think that I dreamed you were here with this announcement.

"About 3,000 years ago a disciple of one of the Chinese philosophers came to him one morning and said, 'Master, I dreamed last night that I was a butterfly.' The philosopher looked at him hard and said, 'Sir, are you sure now that you are not a butterfly dreaming that you are a man?' "

"That word 'confront' you used over the telephone had me puzzled," Bedi continued. "You are somewhat of a precisionist, and confront bears the connotation of something unpleasant. I was wondering what sort of blackguard had been denouncing me and what you could have against me."

Thousands of words had special connotations for him. About the time I carried the good news of the $1,000 prize, the secretary of the Town and Gown Club, to which we both belonged, sent out an announcement of a paper to be read by Bedichek at the fortnightly dinner. His subject was "Water and Soil Conservation in Texas." I noticed the use of that word "confront" in a quotation from Bedi on what he was going to say:

"That which I shall write will be down—I fear far down—on the lay level. The authorities bristle with statistics which I only vaguely understand and speak in a jargon that I don't savvy except in spots. Hence my modesty may be compared to that of the Negro in the folk rime who was confronted with a medical emergency:

" 'Ah ain't no doctor nor no doctor's son
But Ah kin hol' de patient till de doctor come.' "

One time at Conversation Rock, Fred Thompson was with us when I set out anathematizing the pasteurized, homogenized, vitaminized, and otherwise bowdlerized milk now sold in pasteboard cartons, this stuff having driven natural (raw) milk out of the market. I knew Bedi would respond.

When his children were young, he said, and Austin was still just a town, he kept two cows, staking them out on vacant lots and milking them in a pen on his own premises. He "wanted the children to have clean, wholesome, natural milk." * * *

Bedichek never was the kind of person to think all virtue resides in the past and that the world is going to hell. However, the loss of natural things was a frequent theme with him.

* * * * *

I shall die regretting that I did not set down on paper a thousand passages of Bedichek talk before they faded from my mind. Here is a brief note I typed on the night of September 6, 1957. It illustrates the mobility, and homeliness too, characteristic of Bedichek's mind.

"Bill Owens, writer and teacher in Columbia College, New York, and Bedicheck's friend, came to town and this evening after a swim we sat down under the big elm in our backyard to drink beer and talk. When I brought out three cans in two hands, Bedi told this story, which, he said, came to him from an income-tax man.

"In Minnesota, it seems, there is some kind of income-tax law whereby a higher percentage is charged on income made by a joint furnishing entertainment with beer than from one that does not. Anyhow, a Swedish woman opened up a beer tavern in Minnesota and it was soon notorious for the patronage it drew. A tax man went to inspect it.

"He saw the place crowded with men. There were other beer places not far away with only small crowds. All sold the same beer. What was the attraction here? The inspector could see no dance girls, no entertainer of any kind, not even a television set. Then he saw the proprietoress emerging from behind the counter carrying four bottles of beer. She had one in each hand and one sitting on each breast, where they stood steady while she moved with energy and did not touch them. Was this entertainment?"

I keep referring to talk at Barton Springs. One day while we were sunning after a dip in

the cold water, Bedi remarked that a "farm-type of woman" he had encountered that morning reminded him of a wise old mare.

"After an old mare has had 8 to 10 colts," he said, "she gets a look of wisdom hardly seen in the eyes of the wisest philosopher."

On August 7, 1957, after a cold, cold swim in Barton Springs, we sat down about dusk to double hotness in a Mexican restaurant. This is one of the few uses of the word "Mexican" remaining active. Mexican restaurants in Texas are no longer run by Mexicans but by Latin Americans. With Bedichek and me was our younger friend Wilson Hudson.

After much good talk, Bedichek told this story:

"One time out in Amarillo they were having a prohibition election. The pros imported a highpowered speaker to convert the heathen and packed the biggest gathering place in town with an audience. This speaker quoted poetry and displayed all sorts of diagrams showing the effects of alcohol on the human organs. Then he unrolled a long linen chart and hung it up on the wall to demonstrate the waste of money on alcohol. The figgers and letters on this chart were boxcar size so that they could be read half a block away.

"But the speaker was adding emphasis by reading them out in a loud voice. Up at the top were so many millions and billions spent each year in America for food, so much for clothes, so many on churches, so many on education, and on through the catalogue. The figures were soaring the speaker's voice soared to a climax as he read out the billions and millions spent on whisky.

"'And, by God, it's worth it,' a mighty voice rang out. It was the voice of Buttermilk Jones. The announcement of his sense of values came in a way that absolutely killed the speaker's facts and figures."

"Why," Wilson Hudson now asked, "did they call him Buttermilk Jones?"

"Because he never drank buttermilk, I guess," Bedi answered.

"This putting a high value on whisky makes me think of an incident during prohibition days," I said. "Not long after the end of World War I, an Englishman and a Texan were partners trading in oil leases and royalties out in the Burkburnett field. Some bootleggers were making more than owners of oil wells. One day a big well came in on land controlled by the partners; within 15 minutes they cleared a $100,000 by selling just a fraction of what they owned, and they decided right there to celebrate the occasion.

"The Englishman rustled around and found a fifth of Canadian Club whisky for sale at $50. He bought it and took it to their room. He opened it and poured the contents over ice. Raising his glass, he said, 'Here's to whisky—the only time in my life I ever paid what it's worth.'"

Two evenings after this—and a lot of other—talk, we three met again, this time on a shady lawn. I read aloud what I had written, received a few corrections, and saw about three dozen words, sentence structures, and idea combinations to work on. Two evenings later we met again, in a darkening, air-conditioned room, fresh again from Barton Springs with fresh thirst. As we were raising our beer cans, Bedi quoted:

"A chiel's amang ye takin' notes,
And, faith, he'll prent it."

I despair at getting into print the felicity and fitness with which Bedichek was forever drawing out of his storehouse. Many writers, perhaps most, read in order to suck in something that they can feed out. During most of his life Bedi read to delight and enlarge his own mind. Now how in the devil had he come to remember those lines from Burns's "On Captain Grose's Peregrinations Through Scotland"? (He had to tell me the source.) And how in the devil could they lie down there in the cellar of his memory for a generation or two and then, just as occasion arose for their application, jump to the surface like an empty corked bottle released at the bottom of a pool?

III. MY FRIEND

On February 24, 1957, I paid Bedi a visit in his shack, taking with me for him a paperbound copy of A. E. Taylor's "Socrates, the Man and His Thought." On the flyleaf I had written:

"DEAR BEDI: I give you this book because I would be as bereft if you went away as Crito and the others were when Socrates went. As one of them said of him, I can say of you, my friend, 'the wisest and justest and best man that I have ever known.'—Dobie, February 24, 1957."

Two days later I received this letter.

FEBRUARY 25, 1957.

DEAR, DEAR DOBIE: After I had been about an hour at work this morning, I glanced up and saw the volume "Socrates" you gave me yesterday. I remembered that I had seen some writing on the flyleaf which I didn't take time to read while you were here. I had dismissed it momentarily as a "good wishes" inscription and so had let it escape my attention.

I reached up and got the volume in my hand just to see. I was affected to tears, and I don't mean metaphorical tears but a real secretion from the lachrymose glands. One got loose from the inner corner of my left eye and it felt wet and warm, so I know they were real.

The old Greeks (bless them) were not ashamed of tears. That shame was a part of the sentimentalism and masculine assumption of superiority of that romanticism which assigned tears to women. I am profoundly affected (stirred emotionally in that nervous plexus situated in the abdomen) by your placing me in a unique position in your affections. Truly. I have felt toward you a friendship I never felt for anyone else except for Harry Steger, who died 44 years ago.

Bless you for recording this where I can turn to it when sometimes: "the world is dark and I a wanderer who has lost his way."

Yours,

BEDI.

Two or three years before this, standing in a group of friends, I said to Bedi, "You are as good as grass."

"Don Quixote," he said, "once told Sancho Panza, 'You are as good as bread. Nothing but the sexton and his spade will ever part us.'"

Now the sexton and his spade have come. Something has been sheared off of me.

THERE IS AT LEAST ONE FULL MAN

(By Hubert Mewhinney)

Two things are inextricably mixed: Bedichek himself and Bedichek as a symbol.

Some of us who never spent much time with him still more or less realized ourselves in him. He was what we tried to be: Artist, scholar, and primitive all in one. He must have been well aware of this. There is a letter on the table from my old-time roommate and blood brother Ted Thompson—

"Tam lo'ed him like a vera brither;
They had been fou for weeks thegither."

telling of a debate that he and Mr. Bedi were having on a familiar theme. Ted was contending that although there was a real Socrates—a stonecutter who went barefoot in the streets of Athens and disputed philosophy with all comers and perhaps even drank all the others under the table at Agathon's banquet—the Socrates of the Dialogues is Plato's idealized image of man as the lover of wisdom.

But it does not really matter. Maybe Plato overidealized Socrates and maybe we have overidealized Mr. Bedi. Even so, we shall do better for loving the myth we ourselves have helped to make no less than the man himself.

I knew Mr. Bedi for years but because of time and chance I knew him better through Ted than by being with him myself. Only once did I spend a full day with him. That happened when I went to Austin to write a rather trivial newspaper story about Frank Dobie.

The three of us went out to a little ranch that Mr. Frank had in Burnet County. He had offered to bet that one of the wild cherry trees growing along the creek was at least a foot in diameter. For Dobie, the claim was astonishingly modest. The three of us measured his tree and found it was more than two feet in diameter. We hunted for flint chips on the creek flat—one bunch of Indians or another left flakes on nearly every creek flat in the whole Edwards Plateau country—but we found only two chips of flint and one spent .30-30 bullet.

We watched two birds having a fight. Mr. Frank and I knew that one of them was a scissor-tailed flycatcher but Mr. Bedi had to explain that the other one was a cowbird and she was trying to lay an egg in the flycatcher's nest. And I blew a dog-calling horn that was hanging on the back porch of the house, just to see if it would really blow. It would.

But the thing I remembered best is watching Mr. Bedi wash the dishes after we ate dinner and took a nap. This is a simple act. Millions of people, mostly women, wash the dishes every day. But it is not often that you see an artist, a scholar, a naturalist, and a teacher of young men wash the dishes.

Knowing how to do the simple things has got to be a sort of desperate, lost-soul cult with me in the past few years: How to use an axe, a shovel, and a hoe; how to call the dogs with blowing horn; how to climb the tree and kick the coon out; how to build a fire with one match in the middle of a thunderstorm.

So I watched Mr. Bedi wash the dishes and I thought, without ever saying so: There is at least one full man left in the world. He writes books, he reads Plato, he can name all the birds without a gun, he loves poetry, and he loves the woods, the prairies, the seashore; the hawk in the wind; the blue, blue gentians blooming at the foot of the slope; the Pointers and the Pole Star and Orion, that have shown the way at night for so many thousands of hunters and seafarers; the campfire, with its light flickering on the leaves of the trees.

"For we are lovers of the beautiful," Pericles said in the most famous of funeral speeches, "and yet with no loss of manliness."

AUTHENTIC TIDINGS OF INVISIBLE THINGS

(By Ronnie Dugger)

I

Those who have much to remember about Roy Bedichek are more fortunate than I, who am like a fool youth who might have feasted his mind on the talk of Socrates but spent his time instead in zealous plotting for a better Athens. Still, intermittently the last 4 years of his life I was one of the younger men whose intrusions Bedichek humored. He took pleasure in youth, perhaps because we illuminated his memories, and meant to him life that would go on after him, shaped by his ways; for he was an emulable man.

I have tried to emulate the way he timed his work and rest to "the rhythm of the natural day." Rising at 3 or 4, he began with an hour or two of reading "while slowly sipping a cup of weak coffee." Then he stepped out of his house and trundling down the alley to his private place took counsel with the stars.

"My hideout," his workshed, was a room and garage half a block down the alley from the house. At once on cold mornings he started his wood fire in the pot-bellied iron stove in the center of the room. He sat in a hard-back wood chair at his table; his guest took the rocker beside the stove. On his aged typewriter the keys looped up and landed on the cylinder like overhand haymakers. The walls were books, from the floor to the ceiling. I did not keep notes on the gifts he gave me there those few mornings—recitations of verse, ideas from the past, his ideas, his enrichment of my ideas—but had there been nothing but his telling me, "The most important thing a young man who needs solitude must do is get a place physically apart from his family, a place altogether his own. If only I had realized that sooner!", still he would have strengthened my life.

One morning we greeted on the southwest corner of the University of Texas campus. The grass in the sun was bright green; we sat beneath a venerable oak, on a cement bench there, and talked first of style among writers, toward which I, reluctantly aware that I had none, was vigorously venting my contempt. "Style," I enunciated, "is the man." He warmly agreed, and a little later in the conversation he advised me who had said so first. (Memory accommodating ego, I have forgotten who it was.)

I asked him his opinion on something I was doing that was troubling me. When I came across words I liked the sound of but either did not know or did not have, I was writing them down for going back to. Bedichek at once warned me that words consciously learned pop up later when they're not appropriate and tempt you to twist your meaning to fit them in. I defended myself, though uneasily, by telling him about an image I had read of Dylan Thomas gathering in words new to him like a butterfly collector, and by describing my standards for accepting or rejecting words. In my notes I find an injunction, "Don't use a word for its own sake." Mr. Bedichek had the last but kindly laugh when, in a review of his "Educational Competition," I disastrously misused a butterfly-word I had collected. He wrote me a two-page letter appreciating the review, never mentioning the mistake (which came to my attention in a nightmare I had); when I went over to apologize, he hardly let me finish and said laughing: "Don't admit it—blame it on the printer! All printers are liars anyway. Whenever I made a mistake on my paper in New Mexico, it was always a typographical error." He knew that tension about mistakes meant tension about life. Once he wrote to defend me against my self-criticism for neglecting, in part by failing to publish, a gifted but eccentric Austin writer: "I have more cause for conscience concerning this man than you have, but I don't let my derelictions, real or fancied, dog me around."

II

The last summer of the drought he took me into the hills and taught me how to camp.

* * * * *

We camped in a small grove of oak trees on a broken meadow. Across a clearing there was an abandoned 1-room log cabin, 50 or 60 years old, with whose former inhabitants we commiserated; beyond, down an incline, were mysteries Bedichek reserved for the morning. He dug a trench in the ground a foot wide and several long and built therein a strong fire. After we set up the bedding he began methodically preparing supper (he said he liked to linger over "scaring up a good meal of vittles"). This was my introduction to sardines on lettuce with a cold beer, to his celery soup, and to potatoes and apples wrapped in wet brown paper, then in wet tinfoil, dipped in the water, and steamed in the coals. He washed the fruit first, and he completely soaked the paper before wrapping it around; he put the brown paper on first because he believed tinfoil might impart harmful chemicals to the food in the baking. In just such details as these, and with patience as natural as the alternating sounds and silences of camp talk, he unanswerably reproached the clocks, traffic, agendas, vibrating appliances, fancy fishing lures, expensive boats—all the assorted urgencies of work and rest by which we mostly live.

As the night became firm around us and the stars appeared we settled into steady talk across the fire. Women; the struggle for existence; psychiatry, in which he had a deliberately naive curiosity; public men; the contamination of vegetables by sprays in the fields and on the supermarket counters; literature; his early days—his subjects mostly. Some time before we went to bed we walked out into the clearing and he named many of the stars. I remember us, an old man and a young man, standing together on that balded clearing, looking at the full heavens and wondering on the vanities and illusions of mortal life.

In the morning we began a routine we repeated the 2 or 3 days we were there. He took me around a stone field wall, past some kitchen middens (grown over since the scientists had been there), to a ravine where a spring rose. He had brought us here because of this spring, the only fresh water for many miles around, and therefore an attraction for birds and animals as well as us. The rancher who owned the land had built a small water tank, about 8 feet across and chest-high, in which to capture the flow. Bedichek said the spring had once been strong, and the ravine a flowing creek, but our visit, at the end of the drought, there was only a timid run of water from an inset in the bank, some of it trickling over ground it blackened and disappeared in, the rest replacing the evaporation from the tank. He showed me the tracks of deer and squirrels in the mud from the night before, and then stationed us behind brush and trees across the ravine. We waited, the birds came, we looked at them through binoculars.

* * * * *

III

From our talks on this trip ensued an active correspondence of a month and a half. I sent him, on a point we had discussed, a remark by Thoreau in a letter in 1848: "In what concerns you much do not think that you have companions: Know that you are alone in the world." He replied on October 20, 1956:

"Set the Thoreau quotation beside the verses I quoted to you from the Persian poet: 'Do as thy manhood bids thee do,' etc. You see both indicate the isolation of the person who means to amount to something in the world. Your man, Donne, said 'No man is an island'—quite so—every man has and must have contacts, but there are some areas, there are sacred places; 'in what concerns you much' you are alone."

The Persian's verses he had quoted from memory, and then repeated that I might set them down:

"Do as thy manhood bids thee do, from
none but self expect applause,
He noblest lives and noblest dies who makes
and keeps his self-made laws.
All other life is living death, a realm where
none but phantoms dwell—
A mind, a breath, a sign, a voice, a tinkling
of a camel's bell."

* * * * *

IV

"As to camping, Ronnie," ran the note from him the Christmas season of 1957, "I have selected a summit with a positively Pisgah lookout from which with night closing in and the stars bobbing up over the horizon we might gain authentic tidings of invisible things." Like a youth summoned by Socrates, I prepared at once to go. He was 78 then, and I was 27.

"Mount Pisgah" was a gradually rising hill, plateaued at the top, from which we could survey the hills and valley of the region, which was about 20 miles southwest of Austin. We camped down the hill, at a place where it splayed out onto a level area. Our fire was enclosed (but not closely) by oak mottes on two sides, Bedichek's Dodge pickup on a third, and on the fourth, a distance off, a windmill and water tank.

The first afternoon a steel bar which extended forehead high from the tank malignantly knocked me flat on my back. Bedichek was solicitously alarmed and I confessed a pain on my forehead. When, the next morning as we walked toward the camp from our cots, the same bar smote Bedi and he fell to his back as violently as had I, he cursed, laughed, and did not confess a pain.

A drizzle set in all night and the next day soaked us unobtrusively. We were obliged to hug the fire, toasting towels and wrapping them around our heads, structuring the wood against the morning wind, making the best of life under the unfriendly gray sky. What we lost in nature study we gained in what Bedicheck has called animal enjoyment, the smell and warmth of the fire, the comradeship against the inhospitable weather, and the steady alternation of talk and hot food.

I shall always remember the large pot of celery and potato soup he made that night, for it kept us warm and full deliciously, which is all a soup can do. I still have his recipe: "Chip potatoes, slice up the onion, slice up the celery, cook thoroughly. Thicken with a little flour and milk. Drop in a little oleo—then remove from heat when boiling and put in two beaten eggs. S. & P." Serving it up, he said, "Well, boy, if you don't like this mess, you can at least know it's perfectly good for you."

The oak, mesquite, and cedar we were burning were pungent in the fresh washed air, and he said, "I love these smokes. That's a choice smoke." All night and the next day the wind agitated the windmill, and her soft creaking and whining kept our minds stirred. * * *

For lunch in the drizzle we had celery soup, dry barbecued beef, toast, and beer. He said to the fire, to me, to the place we were: "O life is so wonderful if you just look at it right. How wonderful to be able to sit out in the open and eat a wholesome meal." With sureness and lyric feeling he recited:

"Ah! my beloved, fill the cup that clears
Today of past regrets and future fears—
Tomorrow?—Why, tomorrow I may be
Myself with yesterday's Sev'n thousand
years.

"Lo, some we loved, the loveliest and the
best
That time and fate of all their vintage
prest,
Have drunk their cup a round or two before
And one by one crept silently to rest

"And we, that now make merry in the room
They left, and summer dresses in new
bloom,
Ourselves must we beneath the couch of
earth
Descend, ourselves to make a couch—for
whom?"

"Lame Duck?"—Record Refutes It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Davenport (Iowa) Daily Times, concerning the present strong position of President Eisenhower and his firm control of the affairs of States, points up a situation which has won the acclaim of a great number of citizens to whom the lame duck label connotes ineffectiveness.

Believing that President Eisenhower is establishing a precedent which can be followed by others whose tenure is limited by law, I subscribe to the points made in this editorial, and under leave to extend my remarks, ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

"LAME DUCK?"—RECORD REFUTES IT

New Dealers have always smarted over the restriction of a President to two terms since it was a constitutional amendment enacted as a result of the unprecedented four terms of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Thus when President Eisenhower began his second term he was branded by New Dealers and correspondents sympathetic with them as a "lame duck" President.

They ignored the fact that every President until Franklin D. Roosevelt had been a "lame duck" President since the tradition of the country was to accord a President no more than two terms.

Even General Grant, who would have taken a third term, was unable to break that tradition.

But what about this "lame duck" business? So far as President Eisenhower is concerned it is shown to be a fraud.

Roscoe Drummond writes:

"These 4 years, from 1957 to 1961, are an unprecedented period because we have been testing for the first time the effect of the anti-third-term amendment upon the functioning of the Presidency.

"This 4-year period is also unprecedented because for the first time a President has been confronted through the entirety of his second term with a Congress controlled by the opposition—a Democratic Congress thrice elected with increasing majorities during a Republican Presidency. It had never happened before.

"And what has actually been happening—and why? It seems to me already amply evident that when the historians come to write the history of 1957 to 1961 they will almost unanimously agree:

"That Dwight D. Eisenhower has proved a constitutionally 'lame duck' President does not have to limp to the exit of his second term, that he can grow in power and political effectiveness, and that in so conducting himself Mr. Eisenhower has helped future Presidents faced with similar circumstances.

"The influence of the White House during Mr. Eisenhower's 'lame duck' term has increased rather than dropped. It seems not to have been hurt by the anti-third-term amendment; perhaps helped by it because of the special detachment which comes to a President when he knows he can't run again. 'I am not so much thinking of public images as I am of the public good,' he said at a recent press conference. His popularity rapidly rebounded after the Republican congressional defeat last fall. He is pretty much having his way with the Democratic Congress this year. It is a remarkable performance."

The point is that President Eisenhower is using the power inherent in his office to gain his administration's aims from Congress.

Under the regime of Sherman Adams, President Eisenhower was isolated from the stream of Republican congressional thinking. Had that continued, his success in the present congressional term would have been doubtful.

Also, Senator Dirksen of Illinois has taken the place of the unmovable Senator Knowland of California as G.O.P. leader in the Senate, and Representative HALLECK of Indiana has taken the place of the equally unmovable Representative Joe Martin as G.O.P. leader in the House.

With Adams out of the way, Dirksen and Halleck have access to the White House which makes for functioning of Republican leadership in smoother manner than ever before in Eisenhower's administration.

It is not only in the domestic field that President Eisenhower has taken personal command but also in the field of foreign relations. That was thrust upon him by the death of Secretary Dulles who, more than any other Secretary in history, made and executed policy.

The label "lame duck" is a misnomer. It is well that should be true in the first application of the constitutional two-term restriction. It has taken all the steam out of proposals that the amendment be rescinded.

Government Created Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the statements made in the following article, which appeared in the June 22 issue of Newsweek, are undeniably accurate. When is the Congress going to do something about them?

THE EGG IN POLITICS
(By Henry Hazlitt)

A crisis has developed among the poultry farmers, the result of a huge overproduction of eggs. Eggs have been selling in recent months below their cost of production for most small farmers. The result, as usual, has been pressure on the Government to solve the problem, and the Department of Agriculture has been forced to promise to step up its egg-buying program. It has already bought some 500 million eggs, dried or frozen, and perhaps the race has just begun.

Of course the effect of this program, to the extent that it is adequate, can only be to encourage continuance of overproduction. Without this Government buying, adjustments would soon set in to bring the overproduction to a halt. But, at least as far as farmers are concerned, most politicians consider the adjustments brought about by supply and demand as too callous and cruel; every farmer must at all costs be protected from them. The Congressmen who take this view do not see that what they are refusing to accept is the whole principle of the free market, which is the central principle of free enterprise.

WHAT FREE MARKETS DO

It is the principle of the free market that regulates the relative price and production of thousands of different commodities to meet the relative wants and consumption of millions of consumers. When there is too little of a desired commodity, the demands of consumers will lift its price relative to other commodities; and more of that commodity will be produced because of the higher profit margin, until the price falls again. When there is too much of a commodity, its price will fall below the previous marginal cost of production, and the highest-cost or least-efficient producers will have to turn to something else.

This sometimes means great hardship for the individuals affected. But this finely graduated system of rewards and penalties, of incentives and deterrents leads in the long run to the greatest production, growth, and general welfare provided by any economic system. And this same system which politicians think "intolerable" as applied to farmers, is in fact accepted in nearly all other fields. The annual figures of industrial failures are a constant reminder. Government studies have shown, to cite only one statistic, that only three-fifths of firms in retail trade survive their first year, and only a sixth reach the age of 10 years.

The practice of price support must involve favoritism. It simply cannot be universalized. We cannot subsidize everybody at the expense of everybody else. One of the very things that the egg farmers are chiefly suffering from, in fact, is the price supports and subsidies to the grain producers. These have raised the price that poultry raisers are forced to pay for feed. Nothing could help the egg farmers more than the termination of price supports on grain.

FIASCO IN WHEAT

The price-support program in wheat grows more and more fantastic. In a statement on June 1, President Eisenhower pointed out that the existing program had piled up $3 billion worth of wheat, a supply equal to 2½ times our annual domestic needs; that storage, handling, and interest charges alone for this wheat will cost the American taxpayers close to half a billion dollars during the next fiscal year, and that "continuation of this legislation for another year leads the wheat program one step closer to disaster."

These programs, which increase the price of feed for cattle and poultry raisers, and the price of food for city workers, are costing the taxpayers some $6 billion a year. Grain farmers are growing crops for Government storage rather than for markets. The Wall Street Journal reports that some farmers are even deliberately growing inferior-quality wheat in order to take advantage of the Government's generosity.

Secretary Benson's proposed solution is to reduce the price support to 90 percent of the average market price for the 3 years preceding the crop year. This would certainly reduce the dimensions of the problem. But any price support at all, to the extent that it is effective, must encourage excess production and storage. Today's farm problem is Government created.

The President and Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Public Works and the House Appropriations Committee spent laborious hours and days in consideration of the various items in the public works appropriations bill for 1960. In

their wisdom, based on the practical experience and knowledge of such matters, gained over the past years, they recommended to the Congress those projects meriting immediate approval. This action was not taken haphazardly but only after painstaking hearings and consideration of all the factors involved. Their work may best be described as separating the wheat from the chaff. When their work was finished and reported to this House, the recommendations of the committee were accepted by passage of the bill. It was also passed by the Senate, with some amendments, and now rests in conference.

My own State of Nebraska has several meritorious long-range projects that are urgently needed for water development and flood control. These particular projects came under the minute scrutiny of the committee and were approved as necessary to the welfare of the State and the Nation. Their construction will prevent further loss of life and property in the areas affected now by these adverse conditions.

Despite the action of the Congress, we are now informed of the impending threat of a Presidential veto. This action on a much needed piece of legislation, one that will preserve and expand our natural resources, is unthinkable in these days of the greatest prosperity in our national history. There could be no better time than now to undertake this work that is so vitally necessary and indispensable to the welfare of our people who have been waiting many years for their Government to act in their behalf.

My feelings in this matter are aptly described in the attached editorial, published in the Lincoln (Nebr.) Evening Journal and Star Journal, under date of July 23:

THE PRESIDENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

For the long-range good of Nebraska and the Nation, it can be fervently hoped that speculation of a Presidential veto of the public works appropriations bill will not come to pass. This provides money for flood control and irrigation projects on which construction is either underway or ready to begin.

President Eisenhower has waged a valiant and winning battle this year to hold Federal expenditures in line with its revenue. For this he is to be commended. But to carry this fight to the point of blocking urgently needed water development projects would be both unwise and unwarranted.

The President's most effective weapons in opposing other Federal expenditures has been that they are for programs that should be financed by private sources and that they call for much larger appropriations than asked by the administration. But neither of these arguments is valid against the public works bill.

The gigantic task of building dams and other structures to control water and put it to gainful use obviously cannot be attempted by a few individuals. Only the Federal Government can be expected to accomplish this.

On the second point, funds in the House bill were virtually identical with the administration request and the Senate bill was only $80 million larger, a relatively small amount in such a large item in the Federal budget. Mr. Eisenhower's veto-hinting remarks on the public works bill came before a Senate-House conference committee had even been picked to arrive at a final figure.

Much of the President's ire apparently stemmed from inclusion by both the House and Senate of money for what the administration regards as new projects.

To suggest that this mighty Nation, in a time of almost unparalleled prosperity, cannot afford to move forward with programs that will add materially to its future economy and to the protection of its people, is to adopt the brand of negativism which so often has hampered national progress and reacted unfavorably against the Republican Party.

In Nebraska, further delay in such flood control projects as the Salt-Wahoo around Lincoln and the Gering Valley in the Panhandle can only mean more misery and loss of property, and possibly lives, as floodwaters go unchecked.

Interruption of irrigation projects such as those in the Republican and Loup Valleys will mean deferment of economic benefits to the State—and to the Federal Government in the form of increased taxes—as well as rising construction costs due to the erratic flow of funds.

Surely the President will realize these facts and approve the public works appropriations when it reaches his desk.

That Horrid Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I am pleased to include an editorial from the Omaha World-Herald of July 19. I believe the discussion of "newspeak" will interest my colleagues in its relation to present-day affairs rather than 1984:

THAT HORRID WORD

In his grim piece of fiction, "1984," Author George Orwell predicted the collectivist language, "newspeak," would supplant all others.

In "newspeak" bad words are eliminated by using their opposites. Thus slavery becomes freedom, dictatorship becomes democracy, and a lie become the truth.

The Soviets have already made remarkable progress in that direction and some people in the United States are also making headway.

For example, Government spending is vastly unpopular with the voters and every politician and commentator is aware of it. The Johnson-Rayburn wing of the Democratic Party is most sensitive to trends and is trying to prevent the spending label from being pinned on the Democrats. Joseph Alsop, who is obviously sympathetic to their cause, explains it this way:

"In the matter of the budget, for instance, Mr. JOHNSON is by no means wedded to the President's view that the American economy will faint and fall if Government investment is substantially increased. But he rightly holds that the Congress cannot make a comprehensive new attack on the gigantic problem of Government investment.

"Congress can pass swollen appropriations bills, of course. But only the President can take the initiative to revise the tax structure. Only the President can do all the complex difficult things which certainly must be done before Government investment can be increased with safety."

Mr. Alsop is of course talking about Government spending. But spending is a naughty word, so he uses a solid, respectable word in its place.

Thus the sums squandered and allegedly stolen on foreign aid in the Kingdom of Laos, for example, are covered by the nice sounding word, "investment." Every domestic grant-in-aid program, no matter how extravagant or nonsensical, is an "investment." When the armed services pay millions more than a defense contract should rightfully cost, that's an "investment." Every subsidy, every porkbarrel measure is an "investment."

Maybe Mr. Alsop and the liberal spending brethren can get away with using their nice word to disguise spending, but we doubt it. Americans are not as stupidly complacent as some politicians would like them to be.

Government spending is still Government spending. And it is not yet 1984.

Dixon-Yates Vindicated in Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the recent action of the U.S. Court of Claims in validating the damage suit of the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. against the United States confirms our early analysis of the fragile tissue upon which certain public power proponents have based their attack on the Dixon-Yates contract.

The most significant phase of the decision upholding the Dixon-Yates proposal was the sweeping denial that there had been a conflict of interests in the action of Adolphe H. Wenzell who served as an advisor to the Government in the development of the contract at a time when he was on the payroll of the First Boston Corp., one of the financial agents for the Dixon-Yates interests. It is also extremely interesting to note that the presiding justice who handed down this decision is Judge Joseph W. Madden, an appointee of Franklin D. Roosevelt and therefore presumably without bias toward the Tennessee Valley Authority.

What we had in Dixon-Yates was an honest attempt to avoid an expansion of TVA to the detriment of the free enterprise production of public power. Most of us today are persuaded that TVA should be permitted to operate in the area now included in its network but that its operations should be wholly financed from its own revenues, subject of course to periodic review by the Congress.

In the Dixon-Yates controversy the only point at issue was the contracting for privately produced electric current necessary to compensate for that furnished the Atomic Energy Commission by TVA. Happily this matter was resolved when the city of Memphis determined to build its own municipal powerplant thereby releasing the needed extra power. Incidentally, it will be interesting to note the reaction of the citizens of Memphis when they find that they will have to pay the full cost of the electric current they may consume.

One of the weapons used in the attack on Adm. Lewis Strauss was his alleged involvement in the Dixon-Yates contract and the suggestion that he had not acted in the public interest. The Court of Claims in its decisions identifies such charges as sheer demagoguery and it is regretted that the decision had not been handed down in time to blunt the attack against this outstanding public official.

U.S. Defense at Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Hanson Baldwin, which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, July 26, 1959:

U.S. DEFENSE AT SEA—SUBMARINE HUNTER FORCE ILLUSTRATES THE RAPID EVOLUTION OF DETECTION GEAR

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Task Group Bravo, Rear Adm. R. J. Stroh commanding, which arrived in New York Thursday night, is part of the continuous watch against submarines maintained by the U.S. Navy.

The aircraft carrier *Wasp*, Admiral Stroh's flagship, and Destroyer Squadron 24, consisting of the destroyer *Blandy* and six escort destroyers, docked here for a brief visit. An attached six-plane unit of Patrol Squadron 56—six Martin Marlin P5M–2, land-based patrol planes—remained at their normal base at Norfolk, Va.

Task Group Bravo, which was former in October 1958, is the second unit of its kind in the Atlantic Fleet; the other unit is Task Group Alpha.

ON CONSTANT ALERT

One or the other of these units is always in an alert status, ready to investigate submarine contacts. They comprise the "huk" groups, or hunter-killer forces of the Atlantic Fleet, a mobile team of surface and air units trained to detect and attack submarines.

They represent part of the growing American defense against the threat of the submarine.

Task Group Bravo, which has developed a high morale and team purpose in its short life, has very little of the newest anti-submarine equipment, most of which is still under development or in process of installation aboard new or modernized ships.

But its recent performance during the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Exercise Riptide, off the Carolina coast, demonstrated that it had developed effective methods for dealing on the high seas with conventionally powered submarines.

FACES THREE PROBLEMS

There are three primary problems in ASW or antisubmarine warfare: Detection, identification, and destruction. The hardest of these, by far, is detection.

The state of the sea—whether or not there are whitecaps that can hide a periscope or a snorkel—and the temperatures of the ocean at the surface and beneath it can affect importantly the chances of detection.

No one method of detection suffices, and all of them together are not really satisfactory.

Radar does not penetrate the surface of the water. Radarscopes used against low-lying objects in the water are cluttered up, particularly in rough weather, with a phenomenon called sea return, which blotches the scope with white and hides the target.

Sonar, the sound ranging and detection, has a very limited range; the instruments must usually be within a mile or so of a submarine if there is to be much hope of detection.

A fixed-wing plane, moving rapidly through the air, cannot trail sonar gear. Surface ships can utilize sonar but at high speeds their own propellor noises or other extraneous sea noises interfere with the accuracy of the sonar.

SONAR BUOYS USED

Helicopters can use dunking sonar, and fixed-wing aircraft can drop sonar buoys that will relay information picked up in the ocean's depths by radio to the plane. But sonar, in addition to its limited range, is subject to major inaccuracy.

Ocean temperatures are by no means uniform. Sometimes, unpredictably, water temperatures will drop sharply, perhaps as much as 5° as the depth increases by 10 or 20 feet.

This sudden thermal change acts on sound as water does on light; it refracts it and the readings of the sonar become inaccurate.

Submarine commanders know this; they hunt out and hide immediately beneath a thermal layer, often protected, if the layer is deep enough, from the sonar sentinel above.

Still another detection instrument—the magnetic airborne detector—or MAD, used in fixed-wing aircraft, records the passage of the plane over any metal body in the ocean.

In deep water, its readings can provide a pretty sure indication of a submerged submarine.

But MAD's lateral range is very limited, and in shallow water it will pick up wrecks as well as submarines.

NO METHOD ADEQUATE

There is thus some major limitation to all the present standard methods of submarine detection; none of them is adequate; all must be used together.

Task Group Bravo utilizes what is generally available to the Navy today. The *Wasp* carries 20 Grumman S2F Tracker aircraft.

These twin-engined planes, with a four-man crew, carry radars, MAD gear, sonar buoys and homing antisubmarine torpedoes. They have long range and are designed for low altitude flying; they rarely search above 2,500 feet.

Fourteen Sikorsky HSS–1 helicopters, with "dunking sonars"—a sonar ball on the end of a wire cable, which can be reeled in or out, complement the fixed-wing aircraft.

The helicopters can fly rapidly to the scene of a reported contact, get into hovering position 25 to 35 feet above the sea, lower their sonar well beneath the surface and listen for the submarine.

CAPABILITY WIDENED

Six of the *Wasp*'s helicopters are equipped with automatic stabilization equipment, which when fully perfected, will give the helicopter a night and all-weather capability.

A later model of the Sikorsky, the HSS–2, will have a boat hull that permits landing on the sea, will be turbine driven and will have an improved sonar, which can be lowered much deeper than present gear permits.

The *Wasp* also carries four Douglas AD5W "guppies," or radar-equipped planes to use for communication and radar relay between the S2F's and the helicopters and the ship.

The destroyers in the task group, equipped with sonar, radar and antisubmarine weapons, take longer to reach a scene of contact, but have greater endurance.

The land-based P5M–2 aircraft, far larger than the carrier type, have better radar and navigational facilities, longer endurance and better all-weather capabilities.

All these different types of weapons are integrated into Task Group Bravo and work as a team to defeat the hidden undersea menace.

Mrs. Robert H. Mahoney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, last week in Washington, there was held the funeral of a remarkable woman. She was Mrs. Robert H. Mahoney of Hartford, Conn., who was the immediate past president of the National Council of Catholic Women.

Mrs. Mahoney's honors were innumerable, and the hundreds who grieved at the cathedral here were conscious that they were mourning an exemplary American. But I could not help reflecting on the work she had done in her home community. Metropolitan Hartford is the richer for the time and effort she contributed to solution of its social problems. She was vice chairman of the Hartford Housing Authority and chairman of the Committee on Housing for the Aged. She was active in educational studies and president of the Connecticut Conference on Social Work. While meeting her national responsibilities, she was never too busy to attend meetings of those organizations with which she had spent so much time. The story is told of one meeting in which someone who arrived early found her sweeping the floor of the hall—just a chore she had undertaken to help get ready.

The sermon at the funeral here was delivered by Archbishop O'Boyle. I believe everyone could gain an insight into the character, integrity, and leadership of an outstanding American by reading it and I commend it to all Members:

SERMON OF ARCHBISHOP O'BOYLE AT FUNERAL OF MARY HANNAN MAHONEY, ST. PATRICK'S CHURCH, JULY 24, 1959

"Therefore, by their fruits you will know them." (St. Matthew, 7: 20.)

Some 53 years ago, Mary Hannan was baptized and made a child of God in the faith of our fathers at St. Matthew's Cathedral. She was born into a family where the relationship between God and man was clearly defined and religiously observed. In such a holy environment, she learned what every Catholic child is taught, that we are placed in this life to know, to love, and to serve God and by so doing, to be with Him in the life that is eternal.

As she grew older, the Christian meaning of life took on added significance. She learned that all things earthly are passing; that we do not have here a lasting city; and that one day God will call upon us to render an accounting of our stewardship and, particularly, to give an accounting of the use of the talents with which He has endowed us. Mary Hannan Mahoney was a highly talented person, but she was also a humble soul who realized that what she had was

from God and to Him belonged the honor and glory for whatever was accomplished.

Although the church in her wisdom leaves the judgment of a soul to the infinite goodness and mercy of its Creator, I think that it is profitable to make a few observations that may be of benefit to us.

The life of this good woman was a vindication of the rewards of charity. Charity, the love of God that expresses itself in our devotion to all His creatures for His sake, was the dominant and controlling force in her life. Her education, which included an M.A. degree at Trinity College and a doctorate at Catholic University, was used to forward the work of charity in every aspect of life—personal, domestic, community, national, and even international. The use of that education ranged from conducting study clubs in her parish in Hartford to arranging programs of benefit to international groups such as the United Nations.

The mere cataloging of the activities of Mary Mahoney is an indication of the response that this charitable endeavor received from every group in the community. In her fairly short span of life, she served in high office on 15 boards of various organizations. She served, because every one of them contributed in a special manner to the spiritual, civic, and social welfare of her neighbor. Besides serving on the boards of many Catholic institutions, she was vice chairman of the Hartford Housing Authority, and chairman of the Committee on Housing for the Aged. Her active interest in the field of education caused her to be named a member of the Connecticut Council of Teacher Education, a delegate to the White House Conference on Education, and a Presidential appointee to the National Planning Committee for the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth. Her active interest in charitable organizations resulted in her being elected the president of the Connecticut Conference on Social Work.

Possibly her most rewarding work and which absorbed her interest even to the exclusion of her physical ailment was with the National Council of Catholic Women. She had long been interested in many phases of its work as well as allied fields of endeavor, such as the Catholic Association for International Peace, of which she served a term as vice president. After many years of active work, she became the president of the Connecticut Council of Catholic Women and then was elected the national president of the National Council of Catholic Women in 1957.

During her term of office, the national council prospered. Probably the greatest contribution she made to the work of the national council was her truly Catholic mind which showed concern for all peoples even in the most remote parts of the world. As the international relations chairman, she conducted an excellent educational program on the United Nations and its many specialized agencies covering many meetings at the U.N., to observe for the National Council of Catholic Women and exemplified this interest in the number of foreign visitors she entertained in her home even during her busy tenure. As national president, women from Germany, Austria, Italy, Asia, and a woman chieftain from Nigeria were among those to whom she extended a friendly and heartfelt welcome.

The Madonna program, launched under her superb leadership, extends today from the Casbah to Calcutta. Clinics having a Christian and, therefore, positive program for the well-being of mothers and children, are operating today in Italy, Korea, West Indies, Mexico, India, and Algiers because she and the Catholic women associated with her believed so strongly in preserving and not destroying infant life.

But this work was her salvation. Charity carries its own reward in this life as well as the next. It was the work of the National Council of Catholic Women that literally carried her through her illness. She knew of her illness as early as last July and by the time of the national convention in September, she could scarcely walk. The interest in the program, especially in those phases dealing with the plight of mothers and children oversea, invigorated her so much that she was able to attend the convention and carry out all her duties, which included speeches and a reception for 2,500 persons.

Charity has a strange way of evoking a response. As a school child in Washington, Mary Hannan helped in the work of the Christ Child Society established by Mary Merrick, and later, as national president of the National Council of Catholic Women, she spoke at the luncheon held in honor of the 50th anniversary of the Christ Child Society. The charity that helped Mary Merrick for so many years was the support of Mary Hannan Mahoney for the last difficult months of her life. Difficult as those months were for her, I am sure she realized they were also difficult for those near and dear to her. In her sick room, she was the most cheerful person of all; on more than one occasion, she said, "After all, the only way to go to heaven is by dying."

Naturally, we are all saddened by the death of this great and noble woman, and we extend our sympathy to her dear husband, to her devoted parents, and to the members of her family. But we must do more. Let us pray, that Mary Mahoney, who during life filled her hours and days with Christ-like works of charity, may now be led by the angels into paradise, her true and eternal home, to be with Christ and Mary, His Mother, forever.

More on Debt Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, following is another editorial which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues. It is entitled "Undermining the Dollar" and appeared in the Washington Daily News, July 20, 1959:

UNDERMINING THE DOLLAR

Funny money is the problem in congressional maneuvering over interest rates.

An insistent minority would run the printing presses to pay the Government's bills. They've been trying for years with occasional successes. Present high living costs, identified as inflation, are substantially the result of their work.

These are the people who squawk about "tight money"—meaning efforts to stop price increases by further dilution of the currency.

This "loose money" faction isn't numerous enough in this Congress to enforce its prejudices. But there are enough in Congress who don't understand, or don't care to make it dangerous.

The printing press influence is obvious in the Ways and Means Committee suggestion that it be the "sense of Congress" that the Federal Reserve, "while pursuing its primary mission of administering sound monetary policy * * * should, wherever feasible, bring about needed future monetary expansion by purchasing U.S. securities of varying maturities."

This is like telling the Federal Reserve: Go out to swim but don't go near the water. Open market bond buying by this agency—with money created out of thin air—is the direct opposite of sound monetary policy. The practice was abandoned back in the Truman administration but its evil effects live on in the high cost of living plus the constant menace of further inflation.

Any such "sense of Congress" as is proposed would advertise to the world that we haven't learned our lesson—that our responsible lawmakers are toying with the idea that the value of the dollar may be cheapened still further. This could have disasterous effect, both on prices at home and in our dealings abroad.

We hope that, whatever else Congress may choose to do about interest rates, it will eliminate this inflationary advice to the Federal Reserve.

Increasing Textile Imports, a Threat to Domestic Cotton Producers and U.S. Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture has under consideration at present a request for administrative action which could lead to a solution of the problem besetting the Nation's textile industry.

The problem, as you know, concerns the uncontrolled imports of textile fabrics and garments that exert a depressive influence on an important but declining domestic industry.

There is no need for me to recount the statistical proof of the adverse effects of imports on the industry. That was presented last year before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the U.S. Senate during a special inquiry. The facts of the case prompted the committee to make certain recommendations for remedial action.

One of the recommendations called for the establishment of quotas by specific categories for textile products. The purpose was to enable foreign producers of textile products to sell in our markets within limits which will not further endanger the existing capacity of the domestic textile industry.

This, in my opinion, is a realistic and reasonable position. It certainly does no violence to our national policies of stimulating world commerce, of helping our friends in the free world, and keeping our economy sound.

The quota recommendation can be implemented either legislatively or administratively. Inasmuch as Congress already has provided the machinery through which quotas can be established by administrative action, this machinery should be used.

We are reminded that when the Congress enacted the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, to help the Nation's farmers attain a measure of stability,

provisions were made to protect the programs and keep them effective.

One such provision enabled us to control the imports of farm commodities and products thereof. Not only was it deemed desirable, but also imperative. We were intent on supporting the earnings of our own farmers, not those of the entire world. There had to be a limitation, and the limitation was expressly provided.

Section 22 of the act was used to limit the imports of American upland type of cotton to about 29,000 bales annually. It was determined that imports in excess of that figure surely would impair the program under which the American-grown cotton crop could be supported. For more than 20 years such a quota has been in force. The raw cotton import quota arrangement serves also to protect another farm program, the one under which U.S. raw cotton may seek its traditional share of the world market.

As we all know our cotton price-support program produced a situation in which American cotton was priced out of the world market. Cotton production elsewhere in the world expanded explosively and began meeting world needs while cotton surpluses mounted here at home. We then cose to subsidize cotton exports and once again American cotton began moving abroad.

Much of this cotton, however, has been returning to this country in the form of textiles, the amount last year reaching a figure more than ten times greater than the amount of raw cotton which is regarded as interference with our farm programs.

It appears crystal clear to me that if our farm programs can be imperiled by the imports of X bales of cotton, they certainly are imperiled by the imports of 10 times X, whether the cotton is in bales or in the form of textiles.

Right now, however, we are on the eve of increasing still further the amount of the subsidy on raw cotton exports. The Secretary has decreed that on August 1 the subsidy will be boosted from about 6½ to 8 cents on every pound of American cotton sold abroad.

This means that the disparity between the price American textile mills must pay for American cotton and the price to their foreign competitors is widened further.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that some of us raise the issue of fairness?

It is significant that the request pending before the Secretary was initiated by the National Cotton Council, the only organization in the country which represents the cotton growers, the ginners, the merchants, the warehousemen, the cottonseed crushers, and the cotton spinners. It speaks for our cotton industry as a whole.

This organization recognizes that the domestic textile industry is the victim of an unfair situation. And the council in its petition said:

> The strong feeling which is being engendered by this unfairness will inevitably work injury to U.S. cotton. It undermines the confidence of the textile manufacturer in the integrity of cotton as a source of raw material supply, and it tilts his thinking in the direction of the synthetic fibers as he makes the long-range plans and commitments which will determine how much cotton is used in this country in future years.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture is being asked only to recognize the situation as it truly is. Once he faces up to it, he is required to so advise the President. Under the law, the President can then call for the Tariff Commission to make an investigation and come forward with recommendations.

It is my feeling, and that of many of my colleagues, that a thorough investigation of the cotton import problem can lead only to recommendations for a quota arrangement on cotton textile imports.

It is my hope that the Secretary will take the first steps in this direction.

Oregon Residents, Mr. and Mrs. Walter A. Woodard of Cottage Grove, Visit With Dr. Albert Schweitzer in Lambarene, French Equatorial Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Albert Schweitzer at the age most citizens of this world are taking it easy is working every day in his hospital for the native of French Equatorial Africa.

He recently spent part of a typically busy day visiting with 16 men and women who had traveled hundreds of miles to Lambarene in the hope they would get to see him. They did.

Two of these travelers were Mr. and Mrs. Walter A. Woodard of Cottage, Grove, Oreg., a city in the congressional district I represent.

Their impressions and information were put into an excellent feature story by Mrs. Kay Lundeen, women's editor of the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard. Good reporting is typical of Mrs. Lundeen.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include her story which appeared in the July 17, 1959, issue of the Register-Guard:

WOODARDS DESCRIBE VISIT WITH SCHWEITZER

(By Kay Lundeen)

A visit with Dr. Albert Schweitzer in his remote bush hospital for the native of French Equatorial Africa marks the inspirational pinnacle of 200,000 miles of travel by the Walter A. Woodards of Cottage Grove.

"Meeting Dr. Schweitzer was an unforgettable experience," Mrs. Woodard relates. "You are impressed by his utter simplicity. To think that he is such a great man, carrying on his missionary work surrounded by natives and nature, with none of the trappings of civilization that denote success—it awes you."

The Woodards, who returned recently from their second round-the-world tour in 3 years, described this week how they were members of a party of 16 who traveled by ocean liner, chartered plane, jeep, ferry and native pirogues in the hope of getting at least a glimpse of the great humanitarian.

"We had no assurance when we set out that we would ever get to see Dr. Schweitzer," said Mrs. Woodward in an interview in her spacious and charm-filled home in a secluded acreage near Cottage Grove.

"The doctor makes no attempt to answer correspondence. His nurse explained to me that it would take all of their time if they did and he'd have to have secretaries to handle it. So we had received no answer to our letter and started out recognizing that he might be too busy to see us."

CHARTER PLANE

But the 16 travelers were willing to take that chance. They left the luxury liner on which they had been cruising at Pointe Noire in French Equatorial Africa—as she puts it, "the gateway to deepest, darkest Africa—realm of forest gnomes and saucer-lipped Ubangi women, steamling jungles, gorillas and unparalleled scenic beauty."

"We chartered a plane for a 4-hour flight into the jungle, then rode in a jeep 3 miles to the ferry," said Mrs. Woodard. "We crossed the Ogowe River by ferry. It's a wide, rushing river, full of crocodiles. Dr. Schweitzer's hospital settlement is on that river.

A jeep ride took them to Lambarene where the travelers found a 30-room hotel—"the accommodations are poor, but you expect that when you travel." Then they went by jeep for a couple of miles to embark in native pirogues for the journey along the Ogowe to the hospital.

"The pirogues are canoes hewn out of tree trunks by the natives," Mrs. Woodard related. "Only two of us could travel in one boat while the native guided us along with a single paddle. The heat was terrific—only one-half degree off the equator."

They landed at the river's edge on a lovely spot where the terrain was almost hidden in dense shrubbery topped by palms and mango trees. The hospital is built on a hillside in the majestic beauty of the jungle.

"How delighted we were when Dr. Schweitzer came to the landing to meet us." Mrs. Woodard reported with a glow of happy remembrance. "He talked to us through an interpreter—a nurse who has been with him for 35 years. He was very solicitous of us all the time and was interested in hearing about our trip."

DESCRIBES DOCTOR

Now 84, the doctor is rugger in appearance and action, says Mrs. Woodard. She added:

"He's tall and gaunt with a huge shock of hair for a man of his age. He strides along like he meant it. Yet he doesn't ever hurry and is very deliberate in what he does. He's a grandfatherly sort of person and particularly fond of children—that goes with his religion. In spite of all he's accomplished he has that human touch that naturally makes a great man."

Knowing they'd be thirsty, the doctor took his guests to a screened dining-room where he served them lemonade. He answered their question freely. He showed them his piano with organ pedals where he still enjoys playing his long-familiar Bach when time permits, perhaps once a week.

"Afterward he took us on a tour of the entire hospital area that lasted more than an hour," said Mrs. Woodard. "Dr. Schweitzer goes everywhere around the area on foot, there's no other form of transportation. Several times we came to pens with animals and he'd always stop to pet and feed them. The crowning principle of his entire philosophy is a reverence for all life, even that of insects. Knowing this, before we arrived we expected to be eaten up by mosquitoes, but we weren't."

In view of the primitive area the hospital seemed quite clean to the travelers. The native patients live there with their fami-

lies, the patients occupying cells while the family lives and cooks on the ground just outside. Each family is given a ration and cooks for themselves over an open fire on the ground, sort of a one-dish meal.

"The fires apparently help to keep away the mosquitoes," said Mrs. Woodard.

"The doctor's success is in letting the natives live their native life," added Mr. Woodard who had entered the room. "He has about 300 patients in the regular hospital and 150 in the leper hospital farther on up the hill. The lepers live alone in a room and do their own cooking."

The hospital with its corrugated iron building would be classed as fourth or fifth rate over here," said Mrs. Woodard, "yet when you stop to think of what Dr. Schweitzer can accomplish there it's wonderful." She added:

"He does have a good operating table, good equipment, and good light there operated by a small powerplant. Everywhere else kerosene lamps are used. We took him presents such as thermometers, bottles, and cotton materials, and he was very appreciative. It's hardest for them to keep bottles, the small ones they use to supply pills for the natives."

Dr. Schweitzer picked bananas for his guests from a tree he had planted when he first came there nearly half a century ago. He showed them his junglelike garden, the citrus trees he planted there many years ago on account of his health. Along a secluded path he took them to the grave of his wife who before their marriage had studied nursing so that as a young wife she could accompany him on his first missionery journey to Africa in 1913.

"His own designated space is beside his wife's grave," said Mrs. Woodard. "It seemed peaceful and beautiful—a cleared spot in the jungle, the ground covered with colorful plants that grow wild there. The doctor expressed the hope that after he was gone the hospital will go on. He has several Caucasian doctors there and has trained some natives, too."

At present there are three doctors and 14 nurses in addition to native helpers on the staff—"all dedicated to their work." One American is spending a year there just for the privilege of being with Dr. Schweitzer and the opportunity of studying there and going over his notes with him.

"All the natives know Dr. Schweitzer and are very fond of him, yet he maintains discipline," said Mrs. Woodard. "On Sunday for the chapel service he stands outside and reads the Bible, then explains it to those gathered to hear him. He is an authority on the Bible, you know."

GIVES AUTOGRAPH

After touring the hospital area, the 16 guests returned to the dining room for more welcome lemonade, tea and tiny, pretty sandwiches. Dr. Schweitzer signed his autograph for Mrs. Woodard "avec mes bonnes pensées." As she described the day at the hospital, Mrs. Woodard took down the picture, now framed, from the wall of the room and also brought out a colored snapshot of the group taken with the doctor following their arrival at the settlement.

"We were sitting on the ground and I happened to be next to Dr. Schweitzer at the time," Mrs. Woodard recalled. "When someone started to take the picture, he reached over and removed my dark glasses. He wore none, but did have a sun helmet and was concerned that we all keep covered from the intense sun."

The hours at Lambarene seemed to fly by and it was time to say goodby. As Mrs. Woodard related:

"When it was time to leave Dr. Schweitzer took us to the river and sent us back in his own boat—made by himself and a great improvement over the native type. He helped us aboard with a steady hand and waved goodby as we started down the river while it was still light. It was a never to be forgotten day for us!"

She spoke thoughtfully and it seemed as though the simplicity and goodness of Albert Schweitzer shone through her words—and her memories of that day.

The Iowa Farm Bureau Federation's Position With Respect to Certain Aspects of Our Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, Howard Hill, president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, drafted a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Benson in which he outlined some of the misconceptions which are prevalent about the subsidization of agriculture and the benefactors of these subsidies. Mr. Hill also suggested areas where improvement could be made in the Government's program for agriculture.

This letter has been printed in the Farm Bureau Spokesman in Iowa, but I feel that its contents deserve wider circulation. For that reason, I ask consent, under leave to extend my remarks, to have the letter printed in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD.

JULY 8, 1959.

The Honorable EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The purpose of this letter is to express momentous concern about the following:

The present imbalance between the supply of food and fiber and the effective demand.

The immediate future prospects for farm income, particularly for the livestock producer. Production estimates give indication of catastrophic prices for livestock within the next few months.

The current effort to cast farmers as pampered and greedy wards of the Government.

We believe the Department of Agriculture has rightly called attention to the economic inadequacies and political inanities of existing farm legislation as enacted by Congress. However, this effort toward self-analysis and forthrightness on the part of agriculture has produced some serious public misunderstandings. Many magazine and newspaper articles have been written recently holding up farmers and farm programs as the horrible and evil example. We believe the following points should be forcefully called to the attention of the public:

(1) The chief benefactors of past and present Government farm programs have not been farmers, but rather, the consumer. The hours of labor necessary to earn the weekly foodbasket have constantly and consistently decreased. The American worker eats better and spends a smaller percentage of his weekly paycheck for food than any other worker in the world.

(2) That farmers have made the greatest contribution to holding down the cost of living of any major economic group, thereby assisting in the control of inflation.

(3) That a sizable portion of the Department of Agriculture's budget is for loans on commodities, to rural electric cooperatives and others, rather than expenditures. These loans are no more a subsidy than are FHA housing loans and dozens of others of a similar nature.

(4) That the outright subsidies in the Department of Agriculture, while possibly too large, are indeed small when compared to the total subsidies now provided and proposed for other segments of the economy—such as urban renewal, aid to cities in sewage disposal, aid to depressed industrial areas, production payments for mine operators, aid to city commuters, fast tax writeoffs for the oil industry, subsidies to the merchant marine and airlines, subsidies to public housing, extended unemployment benefits, welfare programs, the most of which is expended in cities, and others.

(5) Agriculture's bargaining position must be strengthened if it is to compete successfully with industries' protective tariff and labor's monopoly exemptions.

We believe the agriculture situation to be grave. Farmers have readily and effectively adapted their business to new methods and technology. They are now confronted with a prodigious transition and reorganization task. We resent being made the subject of public denunciation and a political stamping ground while receiving less actual assistance in meeting our problems than that afforded other economic groups.

We direct our criticism toward no one in particular, but respectfully suggest an immediate and extensive study by organizations, the Department of Agriculture and other appropriate agencies into ways and means of helping agriculture develop the countervailing position necessary for successful competition and for agricultural independence. We suggest investigation and study of the following:

(1) The reduction or elimination of all Government reclamation and other programs which actually increase agricultural production.

(2) A land retirement or set-aside on a scale sufficient to balance current production with demand accompaniesd by an end to price-fixing attempts. As a government policy this is fully as justified as the mihimum wage, the 40-hour week, oil production quotas and numerous other artificial regulations now in effect.

(3) The use of present surplus agricultural commodities in a practical program designed to bring permanent benefits to our allies and long-term improvement in our foreign relations. Such a program would have to be carefully planned and skillfully executed if it is to accomplish these objectives.

(4) A sizable transfer of Department funds to develop a significant research program to find new industrial uses for agricultural commodities. The money now being spent to convert saline water and other similar programs might better be expended for the above purpose.

(5) A thorough study of the impact of the United States and the British Commonwealth joining Western European countries in Common Market. American farmers are not afraid to compete with other nations if business and labor will do likewise.

(6) The elimination of labor exemptions from antitrust legislation.

Farmers, as a group, have an unshakable faith in the private enterprise capitalistic system. They believe that Government programs should be so designed as to assist economic groups to make adjustments so that these programs need not become permanent. Farmers are in favor of a minimum of Government regulations and subsidies. However, these same principles providing for a maximum of free competition must be applied not only to agriculture, but also to labor and industry. Farmers invite business and labor to join them in minimizing

artificial Government regulations, unwise subsidies and unjustified protection and barriers.

Sincerely,

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
IOWA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
E. HOWARD HILL, *President.*

The Kremlin's Economic Offensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we realize that until now, the Geneva Conference has not been fruitful in producing any real agreement between the East and West, which would lessen tensions and promote peace.

Currently, the delegates are reviewing their stands and shaping up proposals for a "last round" at the conference.

As yet, there have appeared no promising signs either at Geneva or Moscow that the Kremlin is willing to accommodate itself to proposals that will serve other than its own communistic purposes.

We should, however, continue relentlessly, as we have in the past, to probe, and explore, for grounds for agreement that would ease tensions and lessen the threat of war between the Communist and free world powers.

With a dim outlook for far-reaching agreements at Geneva, however, it is necessary now that we look beyond the conference. Recognizing the dangers resulting from unresolved East-West differences, we must look to our policies, programs and strategies for the years ahead.

We can be assured of one thing: The Communists are not sleeping.

To the contrary, they are increasing their many-pronged penetrations throughout the world—economically, ideologically, and in many other ways—that will serve the Communist cause.

My colleagues will recall that earlier in this session, I introduced a bill, S. 2080, aimed at enabling us more effectively to deal with the Communist economic offensive.

Among other things, the measure would establish a council to better coordinate our economic policies at home and abroad, not only to counter the Communist offensive, but to lay a solid foundation for our own domestic progress, as well as better integrate our economic policies with those of friendly nations around the world.

In view of the fact that we are currently seeing continuously new efforts at economic penetration by the Soviets, I believe that our Nation definitely needs a better-coordinated, more-effectively designed economic policy to serve our needs, both for progress and security.

Recently, I was pleased to have forwarded to me by Mr. Edgar R. Baker, managing director, an article from the international edition of Life magazine, entitled "The Kremlin's Economic Offensive," by Edward Crankshaw.

The article, I believe, again reemphasizes the multifaceted ways in which the Kremlin's economic plans—in many cases specifically tailored for each nation—are penetrating areas around the world.

After reviewing the broad-scale efforts of economic penetration by the Communists in India, Egypt, the Middle East and elsewhere in the world, Mr. Crankshaw, and those associated with him in developing the article, significantly recommend a more effective U.S. economic offensive.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the international edition of Life magazine, July 6, 1959]

THE KREMLIN'S ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE—BATTLEGROUND: INDIA'S PLAINS, SHORES OF NILE—THE KREMLIN'S ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE NOW SPREADS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

(By Edward Crankshaw)

On a wide, empty, sun-baked wilderness 156 miles from the nearest city in India the night skies are lit by the blast furnaces of a huge, busy steel mill. This is the Bhilai mill, a joint effort of India and Russia. The Soviets have lent the money and provided the know-how for the mill, and the Indians have supplied the manpower. But to hear the Russians—and many Indians—talk about it, you would think the entire project was a spectacular display of Soviet magnanimity, instead of a straight business deal carefully obscured by the embroidery of cold war propaganda.

The West Germans, in fact, are building another steel mill in India, using 800 German engineers. The British are building a third, employing 400 Britons and 29,000 Indians; British banks lent $32.2 million and the British Government lent $42 million to make the project possible. Americans are doubling the million-tons-a-year capacity of India's Tata mill. But the Russians have talked the most and they treat the Indians as they like to be treated. Everyone in India has heard of the Bhilai steel mill because Nikita Khrushchev and the Soviet economic general staff have made sure that they heard. Bhilai represents the Russians' deepest salient in an offensive that has developed with remarkable speed on a number of fronts. In the long run, the offensive could fail. But there is no doubt at all that the immediately desired effect is being obtained: for the smallest possible outlay of resources, the heaviest possible impact is being made on parts of the globe where the Russians are newcomers.

THE STAGING AREA

You can see the troops in this offensive almost any day at Vnukovo airport on the outskirts of Moscow. There, the TU–104 jets stand in rows. In the airport building one witnesses scenes that bring back memories of the days when almost every second European seemed to be headed for America, by ship. There are the same family groups with bundles and shabby suitcases, the same wailing farewells. But these voyagers are not striking out into the unknown to seek their fortunes and never return. They are simply traveling salesmen for the Soviet Union, perhaps alone, perhaps with family, waiting to be called for the next flight to Cairo or Delhi.

In hours they will have crossed the deserts of Arabia or the high Himalayas and will be settling down to fight the Kremlin's economic war on the West. In a year or two, most of them will be back at Vnukovo, having helped to build one more steel mill, one more bridge or power station or railroad or factory in a world desperately hungry for such things.

In the same aircraft as the Soviet engineers and technicians—the traveling salesmen of Khrushchev's Russia—there will be a sprinkling of diplomats and officials with briefcases, on the way to arrange for still other building projects. There may also be a few Indians, Syrians or Egyptians, returning home to build for themselves after a short and intensive course of training.

"We declare war on you * * * in the peaceful field of trade," Khrushchev told an American editor in 1957. "The threat to the United States is not the ICBM but in the field of peaceful production * * * it will prove the superiority of our system."

The troops the Soviet is using in this war are trained to the minute. Most of them know little or nothing of political warfare, and they care less. But they know they belong to an army, and they know what they have to do. They are not concerned, as so many in the West imagine, with espionage or missionary work for Marx. The Kremlin does not waste good engineers on cloak-and-dagger exercises or agitation. Their job is for the greater glory of the Soviet Union and the benefit—they believe—of backward peoples, to build their dams, their factories, their hospitals faster and better than the Germans, the British, the Americans build theirs. They know that if they do their jobs properly they will get all necessary backing from Moscow, and never mind what it costs. One thing they must avoid: they must never, never suggest that the enterprise on which they are engaged is anything but a business partnership between equals. They must live simply and modestly in cantonments, and keep to themselves without seeming to belong to a lordly and exclusive white caste. They must show that they can drive bulldozers, too, and they must make the people they work with feel more at home with them than the same people would with Britons, Americans, or Germans.

These precepts guide the nearly 1,000 Soviet engineers and technicians working day and night with 64,000 Indians at Bhilai. The Russians are putting up the plant and will get it working, using Soviet materials and tools. The Indians are responsible for preparing the site and building the townships called into being by the enterprise. The trucks and bulldozers the Indians are using came from the United States, but the bulldozers will go away, and the mill itself will remain. The mill is no gift; India's wage bill alone for the Soviet engineers will come to $10 million. The Indians are paying for Soviet know-how and Soviet materials in hard cash, so they feel no sense of obligation and they surrender to Moscow nothing of their dignity and nothing of their freedom. But there is a story behind the hard cash the Indians are paying.

The mill is being paid for out of a Soviet loan of $133 million, repayable in 12 years from the date of the project's completion, at 2½ percent interest. The loan was made by the Soviet economic general staff, which has wonderful freedom of action in the war that Khrushchev declared. It can lend what it likes, where it likes, as quickly and as cheaply as it likes, for as long as it likes. In underdeveloped areas the Russians build what the local governments think they want most, even if the Russians doubt the local governments' wisdom. They move fast: there is no long-drawn-out discussion, and everything they do is designed to obtain the largest possible measure of credit for the Soviet Union. Besides its deals in India, Russia (with help from China) has extended 2½ percent, 12-year loans in the last 3 years to Egypt (at least $500 million); Syria ($167

million); Iraq ($138 million3; Ceylon ($60 million); Indonesia ($100 million over 15 years). It is not easy for an individual, capitalist firm, no matter how large, to compete with the financial dirigisme of the Kremlin. Even the World Bank asks more than 2½ percent interest, and insists that the money be spent only on projects it considers useful. And if they think it necessary, the Russians are ready to cut prices even lower to get the business.

Actually the impact of the Soviet economic offensive is out of all proportion to its weight. But the Russians have a way with figures, especially when they are reporting on trade, another phase of the offensive. In the last few years Soviet trade with India, for example, has increased fortyfold. That is the sort of figure, like the percentage figures in the Soviet's domestic 5-year plans, that the Russians delight in flinging about. A thousand washing machines turned out this year represent an impressive increase in percentages, if no washing machines were made last year. The fortyfold increase in trade with India is this sort of figure. Total Russo-Indian trade in 1956 was 401.6 million rupees, but it was only 10.9 million in 1952. Even the 401.6 million figure represents only 2½ percent of all India's foreign trade. Last year, for comparison, British trade with India was more than three billion rupees. U.S. trade with India was over 2 billion rupees. Japan's was about 600 million rupees.

It is the same in other vulnerable parts of the world; the real figures are low, but the Russians make sure that their decibel value, and some other values too, are high.

The plan does not work perfectly. Egypt was badly let down by some inferior locomotives from Hungary. Indonesia had its eyes opened by a consignment of 4,500 faulty imitation jeeps from the Soviet Union. Sometimes Moscow's eagerness to pull a fast one in one part of the world blights carefully cultivated good will in another part. The Russians upset Indonesia when they started buying rubber heavily from Malaya too. The dumping of tin in Europe dealt a nasty blow to the Bolivians, whom Moscow was ardently wooing. Sometimes, too, active politics cuts across the trade routes. Thus, when all the world thought Moscow had a stranglehold on Egypt, Moscow's political game in Iraq and Syria—and in Egypt too—drove Colonel Nasser to assert his independence.

But on the whole the Soviet methods answer well enough to current Soviet needs. What impresses most is not the weight of the offensive but the speed with which the attack has developed on widely separated fronts. On some of these fronts, as in Latin America, and in Africa apart from Egypt, the weight is negligible, and looks as though it would be negligible for some time to come. But meanwhile the Kremlin gets its considerable propaganda value from the repeated vague promises and suggestions, the apparent eagerness to talk business, the complete absence of visible strings, and the dispatch with which Moscow fulfills small requests that cost nothing—like sending off an irrigation expert to the end of the world in the time it takes to fly him there; the British or the Americans would need months to find such a man, detach him from his job, and persuade him to go.

Some Western nations, not in need of technical aid, have learned a good deal about Soviet trade. British business with the Soviet Union last year stood between $70 and $84 million worth of exports and $160 million worth of imports—a fleabite in Britain's total oversea commerce. For years the Russians have been agitating about increasing this trade spectacularly and many British firms have been eager to do so. But when it comes to firm agreements, little happens and that happens slowly. First, the Russians blame the embargo on strategic goods. When the embargo is lifted on many commodities, the Russians say it is too late: the embargo has forced them to develop their own resources. Trade missions are exchanged and huge target figures suggested. Then the Russians say that they cannot buy much from Britain unless Britain will give long-term credits; they imply that they would be doing Britain a favor to accept her credits and thus help her out of her recession. The recent, highly advertised trade agreement between Britain and Russia was signed only after arrangements had been made for Soviet purchases to be financed through the British Board of Trade's credit guarantee department.

Whether or not the Russians believe everything they say during such negotiations, it is all useful propaganda. Britain lives by trade, and it is always worthwhile to suggest to the British that political considerations are keeping them from turning an honest penny. Thus America's McMahon Act, which gave the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission a virtual monopoly over atom power, was a godsend to the Kremlin, which was able to shout repetitiously that American Government policies were disrupting the natural pattern of British trade, endangering the free British economy.

But when the Russians really want anything from Britain, such as copper, or equipment for the Dnepropetrovsk rubber tire factory, or machinery for such pet Khrushchev enterprises as the manufacture of prestressed, precast concrete units and the production of cellulose acetate yarn, they find a way to pay for it.

The point is that in those Western countries where the Soviet Union could do a roaring trade there is much talk and little action. The same is true, to even greater degree, of Latin America. Brazil, for example, has been doing a good deal of shopping behind the Iron Curtain, for steel, rails, chemicals, tractors, ships (14 freighters from Poland), to save dollars. Red China is in turn Brazil's biggest sugar customer. But the reality has been nothing like the talk. Promised oil from the Soviet Union took a year to be delivered, 9 months of which were taken up by negotiations. The Brazilian Communist press has been full of reports of offers up to a billion dollars for trade and technical aid. But no offer has matured. The satellites in particular have been actively trying to undercut American and British and German goods. There are 18 separate Communist bloc missions in Latin America but their activity has been much greater than their weight—except politically.

In the Middle East, however, we find an entirely different situation. It is here that the Soviet deploys the main weight of its effort at economic penetration. Here the traditional pattern of trade has been truly upset by Soviet action. This action began almost immediately after the summit conference in Geneva in 1955. It broke through on a broad front in 1956 with the Western change of mind about financing the Aswan High Dam, the nationalization of the Suez Canal, and the Anglo-French reprisal.

Russia's trade with Egypt has increased tenfold in the last 2 years. In 1958, the Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc between them took nearly 60 percent of all Egyptian exports. The exact total of Soviet and Soviet bloc credits to Egypt (on the 2½ percent over 12 years basis) is not known, but is believed to be at least $500 million.

Credits became lures; but the Russians have also used pressure. The Soviet's object has been to entangle the Egyptian economy inseparably with her own. Thus when Russia and her satellites bought the bulk of the Egyptian cotton crop in 1957 at a high price, much of it was resold in the West at below cost. This deprived Egypt of foreign exchange and compelled her to turn to Russia for mining equipment, oil, textiles, chemicals, ships.

The most publicized item of Soviet aid to Egypt, of course, is the Soviet contribution to the ineffable symbol of Egyptian renaissance, the Aswan high dam. But Moscow has been more profitably occupied in other ways. It is in Egypt, as well as in Syria (and now in Iraq), that Moscow has worked hardest for immediate political ends, infiltrating men and ideas, exercising direct political pressures, arranging things so that installations built with Soviet help could be run only by Soviet-trained technicians. There are no fewer than nine Russian-established training centers in Egypt. When Germany had virtually completed negotiations to build an Alexandria shipyard, Egypt gave the job to the Russians—influenced, it is believed, by Soviet advice that only Russians could build and staff a shipyard designed to repair Soviet ships already supplied to Colonel Nasser.

Syria was delivered into Russian hands by the 1958 crop failures. She had no foreign currency, could earn none. The World Bank offered a 5 percent loan on condition that it had supervisory control over the spending. Moscow offered $157 million on her usual terms—and no control. The Syrians had only to say what they wanted, and Moscow would supply it. Some of the things they asked for: a 450-mile railway from Latakia on the Mediterranean via Aleppo to Kamishly on the Turkish border; their first oil refinery (which the Czechs are building); bridges across the Euphrates and the Khabur; a 2½-billion-cubic-meter dam on the Euphrates; and dams and power stations on the Orontes River. In the campaign to develop the country, four Soviet Ilyushins made a complete aerial survey for a geological map. The negatives are now safe in Moscow.

The Iraqis' $138 million credit dates only from February of this year. But the circumstances in which it was negotiated were wonderfully flattering to Iraq. It will be remembered that one day in February Mr. Khrushchev announced that he would be unable to fly to Kiev with the British Prime Minister, Mr. Macmillan, because he had to see his dentist. He may or may not have seen his dentist, but on that very day he certainly saw the leader of the Iraqi trade delegation, Dr. Ibrahim Kubba. The agreement followed at once. It provided, among other things, for an aerial survey of Iraq to be carried out by the Russians. The open-skies idea has finally caught on with the Kremlin.

Having said that much, we have said the worst. The Russians have only a foothold in world trade. They and the satellites and China are feverishly active all over the place, in Asia, in Africa, in Latin America. But they are being selective about the follow-through. In Africa, apart from Egypt, Sudan, and South Africa, the actual trade is small. All through 1958 Khartoum was promised a trade mission from Moscow; it did not turn up until this year. The Russians were off the mark more quickly in Guinea, when Guinea broke away from France: 30 percent of Guinea's total trade is now with the Soviet bloc. Russia is paying more than the market price for Guinea's produce—she is in effect replacing the former French subsidies—and since Russia can stop at any time, Guinea is at her mercy. The Chinese and the Russians do a modest trade with French West Africa, Morocco, Tunisia, and Rhodesia—just enough to keep their names in the news. But, apart from the Middle East, their only other major effort has been in southeastern Asia, particularly Indonesia, where Soviet shipping swiftly responded to the needs of interisland traffic when the Dutch packed up.

These examples illustrate the general pattern of Soviet economic penetration. Five years ago there was nothing: now there is a great deal of miscellaneous trade and aid, spread rather thinly over the greater part of the world, with certain significant concentrations. There is also a wonderful amount of propaganda.

How will it work out? I think the demands of an increasingly critical and educated population at home make it impossible for the Soviet Union to launch an immediate all-out economic offensive. This is why there are still far more promises than deeds in the field of trade and aid. The Soviet trade offensive, though impressive in range and colorful in detail, is tiny compared with the normal trading activities of the decadent West. But the offensive exists. It is conducted with flexibility, imagination, and, where this seems desirable, with extreme care for the susceptibilities of underdeveloped nations. We have to pay the most serious attention to it. As Soviet production increases, the capacity to export material and engineers will increase. The Western democracies are inhibited by their free markets from meeting Russia's state-centralism on its own ground. But there is plenty of room for imaginative cooperation between the democracies to shape a new pattern for trade and development in the neglected countries and with each other. Some Western nations, especially Germany, are already developing techniques to enable them to outbid Moscow planners, meet the demands of Asia and Africa, and still insure individual firms against loss. This is an excellent idea. But it would be a pity if the Western democracies, in their individual efforts to keep their traditional markets, started cutting each other's throats as well. This is what Mr. Khrushchev confidently expects us to do, and he can be expected to spread his net wide to entangle Western competitors in it, stimulating rivalries between us from which only he can profit.

If we avoid this trap, and if, as individual nations and as a group, we show imagination and flexibility, sympathy and dispatch in meeting the sometimes tiresome demands of poverty-stricken countries which want the moon, we have nothing to fear. We have nothing to fear because, as a group, we are stronger and more fruitful and more experienced than the Soviet bloc can become in any foreseeable future. And we are also more honest. Finland knows that trade is a political weapon in the hands of Moscow. So does Iran. So does Yugoslavia, on a rather different level. In all those countries Moscow has, at one time or another, built up trade only to cut it off with the deliberate intent to wound, or to produce political changes in her favor. Egypt is now finding this out for herself. Other countries will find it out. We should be there ready and waiting to help.

On the other hand, if the Soviet Union should change her attitude, and embark on developing international commerce without fell intent, again we should have nothing to fear. The world is large and largely underdeveloped. If Russia can help to develop it, well and good for us all.

Until further notice, however, we must take Mr. Khrushchev at his word and think in terms of economic warfare. The Soviet Union has made a good start, but only a good start. All we have to do is to recognize that the tactics and strategy of this economic war are not the same as the tactics and strategy of past economic wars. This war is total. There can be no limited victories. We must learn the new strategy and tactics fast. What we need first is an international economic general staff to match the economic general staff in Moscow. And for that we need men who know what the battle is about.

Dave Cummings, of Wilkes-Barre, Sets Record for Tenure in Office With United Mine Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following feature article from the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of July 26, 1959:

CUMMINGS SETS UNION RECORD FOR SERVICE TO MINE WORKERS

Dave Cummings, reelected president of Lance Colliery Local 1174, United Mine Workers of America, is setting a record for tenure in office unsurpassed by any other member of the United Mine Workers. He has served Lance local for 48 years and at the termination of his present term will mark a half century in office.

For most of his years with the mine workers, Cummings has been president of the Lance union. His popularity has been proved by the fact that he has been without opposition for president the past quarter century.

TURNS BACK SALARY

Although elected secretary-treasurer of district 1, following appointment to that position in 1951 by John L. Lewis, international president, Cummings continues to retain leadership in the local. His salary as president is turned back to the union treasury.

The outstanding mine union leader was first elected trustee of Lance local in 1911 and then served as financial secretary and recording secretary until 1922, the year he took office of president. He has been president of Lance for 37 consecutive years and was reelected without opposition last June 26.

According to officials, no other officer in the entire membership of the UMWA can match the record of service.

ON WAGE COMMITTEE

Cummings has also represented Lance local at numerous district, tridistrict, and international conventions, and also served on the policy committee during wage negotiations with anthracite operators.

He has served as the mine workers' representative on many public projects, was chairman of the Mines Division of Wyoming Valley Community Chest, and a committee to promote sale of anthracite. He took the initiative to form several policy committees to promote anthracite and discourage substitute fuels in the coal regions.

HOISTING RECORD

In his earlier days, Mr. Cummings worked at various jobs in Lance colliery, first with Lehigh & Wilkes-Barre and later Glen Alden when the companies merged. He served as shaft engineer for many years and holds the record for hoisting 1,050 cars of coal in an 8-hour shift at Baltimore Shaft.

"The lifetime of service to local 1174 is only part of the story," according to Hugh Haughney, recording secretary of Lance local. "It is apparent that Dave also has worked steadily with Lance colliery for over 50 years because a boy just does not start to work and hold union office. He is a fine person, held in high esteem by all of us at Lance, and is a credit to the UMWA. He is an excellent example of leadership, taking time to mingle with the men who grew up with him, despite his many duties."

Economic Growth and the Government's Role in Fostering Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on July 24, 1959, the Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson, appeared before the Joint Economic Committee. I believe his statement merits the attention of each and every one of my colleagues and it is for that reason I have asked permission to have it inserted in the RECORD. The study which has been conducted by the joint Treasury-Federal Reserve study group is an important one and I call attention to part I of the group's factual report as well as parts II and III.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ROBERT B. ANDERSON BEFORE THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, FRIDAY, JULY 24, 1959

Our national economic objectives can be summarized under three broad headings: (1) Continuity of employment opportunities for those able, willing, and seeking to work; (2) a high and sustainable rate of economic growth; and (3) reasonable stability of price levels. Each of these objectives is important; each is related to the others.

The rapid upsurge in economic activity of the past 15 months provides an appropriate background for your study of these national economic goals and the best methods of achieving them. The recent resurgence in output, income, and employment to record levels has once again demonstrated the basic strength and resilience of our free choice, competitive economy. Thus, we visualize the task with which your committee is confronted not as one of devising drastic changes in our techniques for achieving our economic goals. Rather, it is to evaluate, within the perspective of developments of the past few years and during the postwar period as a whole, the existing techniques toward the end of sharpening their use. There may perhaps be weapons not now in our arsenal that should be developed; there are no doubt ways in which existing techniques can be improved. But the performance of our economy supports the judgment that basically our economy is sound and healthy.

Much could be said about Government economic techniques, their nature, interrelationships, strengths, and shortcomings. I am sure, however, that your committee will explore these matters thoroughly, drawing both from current thinking and from the vast body of earlier study performed both by committees of the Congress and by private individuals and organizations.

Before discussing the Treasury-Federal Reserve study of the Government securities market, in which you have expressed particular interest, I should like to consider briefly economic growth as a goal of public policy.

Some in our country express a belief that the Government should undertake the primary role in promoting economic growth. It is my belief that in our system the Government is not the predominant factor in our Nation's economic advancement. It must foster and facilitate economic progress—it cannot force it.

What we all seek is sound, sustainable growth—not any kind of growth, or growth at any cost.

Should our efforts to spur progress lead to inflation, it will bring only disappointment and hardship. But, when growth is in terms of goods and services that people need and can buy, it will bring great rewards.

Only within the past decade has economic growth been explicitly recognized as a major goal of public policy. This recognition, coupled with considerable public discussion of the importance of growth to our economy, provides an important reason for taking a careful look at growth as a national economic objective. What is economic growth? What determines the rate of economic growth in a free choice, market economy? And, finally, what is the proper role of Government in promoting a high and sustainable rate of economic growth?

WHAT IS ECONOMIC GROWTH?

The most commonly cited definition of economic growth is in terms of the annual advance in real gross national product; that is, growth in the dollar value of total output, adjusted for changes in price levels. For some purposes this is a good measure of economic growth; for others it is not.

An over-all measure of growth tells us nothing about its nature. For any period, we must get behind the broad figures to determine what type of growth has taken place. This is simply another way of saying that promotion of growth for its own sake may well result in either fictitious or unsustainable growth. An increase in output, to be meaningful, must consist of the goods and services that people want and are able to buy. It is not enough to select some hypothetical maximum of growth; the actual growth that occurs must consist of useful and desirable things as opposed to unwanted or undesirable goods.

Thus, in trying to decide whether growth over a period of years was at an adequate rate, we would first have to look within the total—to get behind the figures—and try to determine the characteristics of the growth. Some of the questions we would ask would be: How much did personal consumption expand relative to Government use of goods and services? Within the Government component, what portion consisted of defense spending as opposed to schools, highways, and other public facilities? How much of the increase in output consisted of goods the people did not want, and thus ended up in Government warehouses, being given away, or destroyed? What portion of total output was devoted to investment in the instruments of production, to modernization of plant and equipment, and to research? How much of our effort had to be devoted merely to maintenance of our productive plant, as opposed to net new additions?

There are other important questions. How were the fruits of the growth in output distributed among various groups in the economy? Did the growth carry with it certain imbalances that would hamper future growth? To what extent was temporary growth fostered by reliance on actions that impinged directly on the free choice of individuals and institutions?

These are but a few of the questions we should ask. They indicate that economic growth, in terms of a broad, aggregate figure, is not necessarily an end in itself. It must be growth of the right kind; it must be sustainable growth.

WHAT DETERMINES THE RATE OF ECONOMIC GROWTH?

The role of public policy in fostering a high and sustainable rate of economic growth in a free choice, competitive economy can be properly assessed only on the basis of an understanding of the determinants of growth.

The factors influencing the rate of growth are manifold and complex. Among those of major importance is the pace of technological advance. No one can study the economic history of this or any other advanced industrial nation without being impressed by the vital contributions of the inventor, the innovator, and the engineer. A stagnant technology is likely to be accompanied by a stagnant economy. Man's ingenuity in tackling and solving his problems lies at the heart of the growth process.

This is perhaps another way of saying that growth and change are inseparably intertwined. If we would enjoy maximum growth, we must not only be willing to improve the production process through accepting new ways of doing things, but we must also actively seek out such techniques. Moreover, the integral role played by change and technological advance in the growth process contributes to unevenness in growth over time. Technological advance does not come at a steady, constant rate. Thus we cannot expect growth, to the extent it reflects such forces, to proceed at a steady rate, year in and year out.

Technological advance, however, cannot alone assure a high rate of growth. The best ideas and the best techniques are of little benefit if the means are not available to translate them into operating productive processes. This requires real capital, which can only grow out of saving and productive investment. Thus, real capital formation—which consists of the machinery and instruments of production, tools of all sorts, and new plant buildings—is a basic ingredient of economic growth. An economy in which additions to the stock capital equipment are small cannot be a rapidly growing economy.

The importance of an adequate rate of capital formation in the growth process deserves special emphasis. Broadly speaking, current output can be directed either into consumption goods, represented by durable and nondurable consumer goods and services, or into investment goods, represented principally by new industrial plant and equipment. So long as our economic resources are being utilized close to capacity—as has indeed been the case almost continuously since 1941—the more of our output we devote to capital formation, the less that is available for current consumption. The more we consume, the less we can devote to capital formation.

This is a basic but, apparently, little understood principle of economics. There appear to be some observers who believe that, on top of providing adequately for national defense and devoting a considerably larger volume of current output to public projects, we can still achieve uninterrupted future growth in the private sector of the economy at a rate higher than ever before realized in this country. Perhaps this is possible; but it seems clear to me that it can occur only at the expense of current consumption. It can take place, in other words, only if we are willing to accept a lower current standard of living. With our pressing needs for adequate national defense, we cannot have an ultra-high maximum rate of economic growth in the future, requiring as it does heavy current investment in plant and equipment, without restricting current consumption. We cannot "have our cake and eat it too."

A third important requisite for a high and sustained rate of growth is reasonably full, efficient, and continuous use of our economic resources. Economic recession is the No. 1 enemy of sustained growth in this country. Idle manpower and idle equipment represent production that is irretrievably lost. Moreover, inefficiencies in use of resources can also carry a heavy toll in terms of lost output.

It is important to emphasize that success in achieving high and sustained employment, and in providing useful job opportunities for our growing population, is closely related to our success in promoting an adequate rate of capital formation. In our highly industrialized economy, workers must have the machines with which to work. These machines will come into existence only to the extent that productive investment takes place.

In short, economic growth in a free choice, competitive economy tends to vary more or less directly with the pace of technological advance, the rate of capital formation, and the extent to which economic resources are effectively employed. To be effective, any Government program designed to foster growth must operate largely through these basic determinants.

GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN FOSTERING GROWTH

Government can play an important role in fostering a high and sustainable rate of economic growth. One basic principle should be clear, however. In an economy in which major reliance is placed on individual initiative and decisions, and in which the alternative uses of economic resources respond, through the market mechanism, primarily to consumer demand, Government can and should play only a facilitating, not a predominant, role in the growth process.

The moving forces which promote growth in a free choice, market economy are basically the same as those that account for economic progress on the part of the individual. Thus the individual's desire for a higher and more secure standard of living for himself and for his family is the basic stimulus. This is the prime mover. To this end he studies, plans, works, saves, and invests. He searches out new ways of doing things, developing new techniques and processes. Where such instincts as these are strong, the forces promoting growth in society as a whole are strong. Where they are weak, the impetus for growth is also weak.

The first role of Government in promoting growth is to safeguard and strengthen the traditions of freedom in our economy. Stated differently, the proper and effective role of Government is to provide an atmosphere conducive to growth, not directly to attempt to force growth through direct intervention in markets or through an improvident enlargement of the public sector of the economy. Indeed, governmental efforts to promote growth that rely on, or subsequently lead to, excessive intervention in and direction of market processes can only impede growth in the long run.

The case for this approach to promoting growth is strengthened by the fact that technological advance flourishes in an atmosphere of freedom. Basic to technological advance is pure research; and a fundamental belief in our society is that pure research makes its greatest contribution when minds are free to meet the challenges of the future.

Government can also promote rapid, healthy growth by fostering competition in the economy. Competition sharpens interest in reducing costs and in developing more efficient methods of production. It places a premium on skills in business management. It stimulates business investment, both as a means of economizing in the production process by use of more efficient machinery and by enlarging capacity in order to capture a larger share of the market. Healthy and widespread competition, in short, is the primary stimulant to efficiency in use of our economic resources, both human and material, through technological advance and by stamping out waste and inefficiency in productive processes.

Our tax system may hamper growth in a number of ways. One of the objectives of the study recently initiated by the House Ways and Means Committee, and in which the Treasury is cooperating, is to determine what changes can be made that will be conducive to healthy and sustainable economic growth. I am hopeful that this study will lead to significant results.

All of these methods of aiding growth are important. I am convinced, however, that

Government can make a most significant contribution to growth primarily by using its broad financial powers—fiscal, debt management, and monetary policies—to promote reasonable stability of price levels and relatively complete and continuous use of our economic resources.

As noted earlier, a high rate of saving is indispensable in achieving a high rate of economic growth. Under conditions of near-capacity production, resources can be devoted to capital formation only to the extent that they are freed from output of goods for current consumption. This, in turn, is possible only to the extent that saving occurs.

In the years since the war, incentives to save in traditional forms—in savings accounts, bonds, and through purchasing insurance—have been somewhat impaired by the conviction of some that inflation is inevitable. In my judgment, this is a mistaken conviction. But the fact remains that if we allow a lack of confidence to develop in the future value of the dollar, the desire to save will be weakened.

Full confidence in the future value of the dollar can be maintained and strengthened only by a concerted, broad-gage attack on all of the forces and practices that tend to promote inflation. Some of these forces and practices may be new and thus require further study before they can be identified and before appropriate policies to control them can be devised. But there should be little doubt in our minds as to the proper role of general stabilization policies. Under present-day conditions, with production, employment, and income advancing rapidly to record levels, such policies should be directed toward self-discipline and restraint. This requires Federal revenues in excess of expenditures, to provide a surplus for debt retirement; flexible management of the public debt; and monetary policies directed toward preventing excessive credit expansion from adding unduly to overall demand for goods and services.

Some observers have argued recently that we are not now confronted with monetary inflation, or with a situation in which "too much money is chasing too few goods." They point to the high degree of price stability during the past year as proof of this contention. This same argument could well have been made in mid-1955, when that recovery was also merging into the boom phase of the cycle. At that time, the Consumer Price Index had actually declined slightly during the preceding 18 months; the wholesale price index has been stable for about 30 months. We failed to recognize at that time, just as we may be in danger of failing to recognize now, that the high levels of demand generated in the recovery had sown the seeds of later increases in prices. Thus, wholesale prices rose moderately in the last half of 1955, at a steady and relatively rapid rate throughout 1956, and moderately during 1957. Consumer prices, exhibiting the customary lag, did not begin to advance until the spring of 1956, but thereafter rose steadily until early 1958.

The important point is that effective control of inflation requires actions to restrain inflationary pressures at the time that such pressures are developing. To wait until the pressures have permeated the economy, and have finally emerged in the form of price increases, is to delay action until the situation is much more difficult to cope with.

Effective stabilization actions to limit inflationary pressures during this period of rapid business expansion, in addition to promoting stability of price levels, will stimulate sustained growth in still another important way. Such policies, by helping to assure that the current healthy advance in business activity does not rise to an unsustainable rate and then fall back, would promote relatively full and continuous use of our economic resources. I am firmly convinced that the degree of severity of a business recession reflects to a considerable extent the development of unsustainable expansion in the preceding boom. By exercising restraint and moderation during periods of prosperous business, we can keep booms from getting out of hand and, in so doing, minimize the impact of later adjustments.

Appropriate current governmental policy to promote growth must be consistent with long-range objectives and not resort to quick expedients that endanger sustainable development. We must reject the arguments of those who would attempt to force growth through the artificial stimulants of heavy Government spending and excessive expansion of money and credit. If we would foster growth—not of the temporary, unsustainable type, but long-lasting and rewarding—we need first to reinforce our efforts to maintain reasonable price stability and relatively full and continuous use of our economic resources. Both logic and experience demonstrate clearly that heavy reliance on Government spending and monetary and credit excesses during a period of strong demand, rather than promoting growth, can lead only to inflation. Inflation tends to dry up the flow of savings and leads ultimately to recession—the No. 1 enemy of growth.

We live in what is basically a free choice economy. Within rather broad limits, we are free to dispose of our labor, property, and incomes as we see fit. In disposing of our incomes, we are free to spend or to save, to invest or to hoard. So long as we maintain the basic freedoms that foster competitive enterprise and stimulate technological advance, and so long as we use our broad financial powers to promote stability in the value of our currency and to avoid the extremes of economic recession, I am confident that economic growth will proceed at a high and sustainable rate. The strength of our economy lies in its very reliance on the integrity, wisdom, and initiative of the individual. We must not weaken this basic strength.

THE GOVERNMENT SECURITIES MARKET STUDY

I will now make some brief observations on the Treasury-Federal Reserve study of the Government securities market.

Our national economic objectives are, of course, fundamental. It is only in relation to the successful achievement of these objectives that the financial policies pursued by our Government can have real meaning. Furthermore, fiscal, debt management, and monetary policies can make their maximum contribution to national economic goals only if they can operate in a market which is responsive to policy actions both in terms of basic understanding of those actions by the investing public and in terms of the efficiency and maximum usefulness of market organization.

The Government securities market is the largest financial market in the world, with a daily trading volume of more than $1 billion. It is an extremely complex market and is sharply competitive. It is very responsive to trends and expectations as to business activity, Government policies, and international developments.

Its responsiveness and competitiveness, under widely varying circumstances, mean that it can provide the proper environment for the successful flotation of the tremendous volume of frequent Treasury security offerings to the public, which last year alone totaled almost $50 billion, exclusive of the rollover of weekly Treasury bill maturities. Simiarly, it can provide an efficient mechanism through which Federal monetary policy can operate. Moreover, it must provide for the smooth transfer of large amounts of Government securities among investors as liquidity and investment needs are satisfied.

The Treasury, the Federal Reserve, and the entire business and financial community, therefore, have a joint responsibility, collectively and individually, to encourage the market to resist any forces which threaten to impair its maximum performance. If market techniques become distorted or restrictive practices arise, the consequences can extend far beyond any immediate impact on investors, speculators, or suppliers of credit. It can undermine the basic contribution which a smoothly functioning Government securities market should make to the national welfare.

It is with this realization of the importance of the Government securities market that the Treasury and Federal Reserve last spring undertook their joint study of the way in which the market operates, with particular reference to the market's performance around the time of the reversal of the economic downturn a little more than a year ago.

A study of market mechanisms is necessarily technical. The results of any such study are understandably less dramatic than studies of the broad aspects of fiscal, monetary, and debt management policy which, together with general economic trends and expectations, provide the environment in which these market mechanisms operate.

Our joint Treasury-Federal Reserve study group has been working continuously toward the objectives which were laid out when the project was announced on March 9, 1959. Part I of the study group's factual report is now in final form; parts II and III are only in preliminary form. All three parts are being made available for public release on Monday morning.

Your committee already has a joint statement by Chairman MARTIN and myself relating to the study. The virtual completion of the factual study by the study group provides a background which Federal Reserve and Treasury policy officials can now carefully review as we work toward official conclusions and recommendations growing out of the study.

These conclusions cannot be prejudged. Treasury and Federal Reserve officials have been following the progress of the study group with great interest, but because of the late completion of the report, we have had little opportunity to examine the factual material which the study group has assembled.

As Chairman MARTIN and I state in the concluding paragraphs of our joint statement, markets are dynamic institutions which require adaptation to changing needs. The public interest is served only if the study of these adaptations is continuous, even though it may be intensified from time to time as in the present study.

We both recognize, and I want to emphasize it again, that improvements in market mechanisms, helpful though they may be, cannot be expected to solve the basic financial problems which our Nation faces—the problems of fiscal imbalance during prosperous times, the tendency for the public debt to grow shorter in its maturity structure, the need for continuous flexibility in adapting monetary policies to varying circumstances, the need to encourage increased savings to finance soundly the Nation's heavy capital requirements, and the problem of the instability of financial markets as they react to turning points in economic cycles.

These are basic problems. We are glad to work with your committee in seeking their solutions in the best interest of the public.

Health Insurance Program for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my statement in support of a health insurance program for Federal employees, given before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on July 21, 1959:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. LANE BEFORE THE HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, IN SUPPORT OF A HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, JULY 21, 1959

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government has been backward in providing the wages, and fringe benefits that are accepted as routine obligations throughout American industry. In fact, some corporations have voluntarily provided life insurance and health insurance programs for their employees because they understand the economics right of workers to these benefits, and because they know that such consideration for the welfare of their employees promotes the mutual confidence that inspires better morale and better efficiency.

A hospitalization plan for Federal employees has been studied—and restudied—for many years. Meanwhile, private industry has been moving forward with the times. Its prosperity has been paralleled by simultaneous economic and social progress on the part of its employees. But the turnover among Government employees continues at a disturbing rate that is both wasteful and inefficient. Why?

As Government employees compare their lot with those who work for private industry, they see all too clearly that their relative position is steadily deteriorating. They are discontented because they do not believe that the Government is being fair with them. While the Government marks time on studies, private industry is gradually improving the status of its own employees. There are many companies with lesser programs, but I will simply outline four of the best ones.

B. F. Goodrich Co. provides 120 days of hospitalization in a semiprivate room, and with a $250 maximum for surgery; Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., 140 days up to $15, full cost of hospital services, with a $300 maximum for surgery, Armstrong Cork Co., 180 days up to $10, with further provisions for additional care, and a $200 maximum for surgery, American Sugar Refining Co., 365 days of hospitalization at full cost, with a $300 maximum for surgery.

In each case, the company pays the full cost, not only for the employee, but for his dependents, and for retired employees and their dependents as well. The steel industry and the automobile industry have 50–50 contributory programs for their employees, and this is the formula contained in Senate bill 2162, which is called the health benefits program for Government employees.

The Federal Government is the Nation's largest employer. Under the terms of this bill, more than 2 million Federal employees, plus their dependents, would become eligible for the protection enjoyed by most of those who are employed in private industry. The Government will withhold from employees' salaries, and annuity checks, sums to be matched equally by the Government. The individual Government employee or annuitant, would pay $1.75 biweekly. The Government employee with a family would pay $4.25 biweekly.

Progress on this type of legislation has been delayed for many years due to sharp disagreements, but in S. 2162 we have a bill that has united the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, Blue Cross-Blue Shield, Federal Employee Unions, and group practice plans in support of it.

It is unfortunate that the bill as passed by the Senate does not cover presently retired Federal employees and it is my hope that the House will make provision for them. We are morally bound to do so because we cannot cast adrift those who gave the best years of their lives in loyal service to the Government, and have now reached the age where they have greater need of hospital, medical, and surgical protection.

Passage of this bill at this session will mark another milestone in our efforts to make employment with the Federal Government attractive and rewarding. Health insurance for Federal employees will be one of the most constructive pieces of legislation to be enacted at this session.

Public Opinion Poll, 10th District of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the following questionnaire was mailed to every post-office boxholder, rural and urban, in my district. It was also reproduced in the Charlotte Observer, the newspaper with the widest circulation in the district.

There are six counties in the 10th district, extending from the mountains of western North Carolina to the industrial Piedmont. Interests range from mining in the mountain counties to agriculture, manufacturing, and marketing in the industrial and commercial sections of the district which include Charlotte.

Although the responsibility for any votes I cast in Congress must necessarily be my own, I feel that the views of my constituents are important and that I should know them. By this method I sought to give the voters in my district an opportunity to express their opinions on a wide variety of subjects.

The response to the questionnaire was gratifying and replies were received from every county in the district and from urban and rural communities. They came from farmers, workers, housewives, executives, merchants, and professional men and women. The results were surprising in some instances indicating that the people of the district are thinking for themselves and are giving thoughtful consideration to current problems.

I should like to share the results of this questionnaire with my colleagues and under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix include the questions and answers on a percentage basis:

Public opinion poll tabulation from Charles Raper Jonas, Representative in Congress, 10th District, North Carolina

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Number the following issues in the order of their importance to you:			
(a) Balanced budget	17.2		
(b) Civil defense	3.8		
(c) Farm problem	3.3		
(d) Foreign policy	7.4		
(e) Federal aid to education	3.3		
(f) Inflation	13.5		
(g) Labor union legislation	9.5		
(h) National defense	24.2		
(i) Social security	4.4		
(j) Reduction in Government spending	13.4		
2. Under existing conditions at home and abroad, do you consider a balanced budget—			
(a) Essential	40.1		
(b) Desirable	52.2		
(c) Unimportant	5.8		
(d) No opinion	1.9		
3. Would you favor increasing any taxes (income taxes, gasoline taxes, excise taxes, or postage rates) if necessary to balance the budget?	50.4	46.0	3.6
If so, please specify which you would favor increasing:			
(a) Gasoline	13.2		
(b) Excise	16.6		
(c) Postage	17.4		
(d) Income	4.9		
(e) No answer	47.9		

	Yes	No	No opinion
4. Which of the following courses do you favor?			
(a) Continued Government spending at current levels even if this results in deficit financing	11.3	51.5	37.2
(b) Reduction in appropriations to match expected revenue	80.5	5.9	13.6
5. If you answered (b) "Yes," where would you cut?			
(a) Defense Department funds	7.9	15.7	76.4
(b) Domestic programs other than military	51.2	2.8	46.0
(c) Mutual security programs	22.2	8.2	69.6
(d) Across the board	35.2	9.1	55.7
6. If all other efforts to halt inflation fail, would you favor wage, price, and rent controls?	65.3	28.1	6.6
7. Do you think the Federal Government should spend more than it is spending for—			
(a) National defense	27.7	50.7	21.6
(b) Welfare	12.2	67.3	20.5
(c) Schools	35.2	49.7	15.1
(d) Housing	11.6	67.2	21.2
(e) Hospitals	24.2	56.8	19.0
(f) Agriculture	9.0	70.4	20.6
(g) Veterans	14.0	66.6	19.4
8. Do you agree with those who argue that labor unions are becoming too powerful and more stringent Government controls should be imposed?	87.6	9.9	2.5
9. Do you agree with those who argue that present labor laws (Taft-Hartley) are too oppressive against unions and should be repealed or liberalized as recommended by union leaders?	7.6	87.6	4.8

Public opinion poll tabulation from Charles Raper Jonas, Representative in Congress, 10th District, North Carolina—Continued

	Yes	No	No opinion
10. Should proposed union reform legislation cover the problems of secondary boycotts and "blackmail" picketing?	82.2	9.1	8.7
11. Do you favor repeal of sec. 14-B of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits States to enact right-to-work laws?	26.9	64.1	9.0
12. Do you favor increasing the Federal minimum wage law above $1 per hour?	37.4	57.9	4.7
13. Do you favor extending the coverage of the Federal minimum wage law?	55.4	33.8	10.8
14. Do you favor Federal aid to education for—			
(a) School construction	42.7	47.8	9.5
(b) Teachers' salaries	31.8	55.5	12.7
(c) Other general aid	20.9	58.9	20.2
15. Do you favor hospital and surgical care for social security beneficiaries to be financed by increased social security taxes?	33.1	61.7	5.2
16. Do you favor—			
(a) The present farm program under which the Government supports prices of certain farm commodities at a percentage of parity and imposes stringent acreage controls	17.8	65.8	16.4
(b) Basing price supports more closely to market prices	38.2	29.4	32.4
(c) Elimination of price supports and production controls	57.1	22.7	20.2
17. Do you favor increasing the interest rate on Government loans to REA cooperatives from 2 percent to the average rate the Government pays on its own bonds?	80.0	12.4	7.6
18. Do you think more federally administered programs should be turned back to the States and local governments?	81.4	12.9	7.5
19. Do you favor long-term, low-interest loans by the Federal Government to local communities to finance public works projects?	49.9	42.0	8.1
20. Do you favor Federal aid to depressed areas to finance plants and public works to attract industry?	42.5	49.3	8.2
21. Do you approve our firm stand with respect to the Berlin situation?	94.2	3.0	2.8
22. Considering world tensions, should we continue our mutual security aid to friendly nations?	77.4	12.0	10.6
23. Should the emphasis be on—			
(a) Military assistance	46.4	18.8	34.8
(b) Economic aid	54.4	13.7	31.9
24. Do you favor gifts and sales (for local currencies) of surplus farm commodities to underdeveloped countries?	80.5	10.4	9.1

How Powerful Uncle Tom O'Brien Landed Prison for Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Sun-Times of July 26, 1959:

HOW POWERFUL UNCLE TOM O'BRIEN LANDED PRISON FOR ILLINOIS

(By Tom Littlewood)

WASHINGTON.—This is the tale of Uncle Tom's pen and how it came to be.

Starting soon, for completed construction in about 3 years, will be a new maximum-security Federal penitentiary in Williamson County, southern Illinois.

Set in one corner of the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge about 5 miles south of Marion, the prison will bring a payroll of $1,500,000 annually to a once active coal mining region now hard hit by lack of jobs.

Altogether, the institution will cost about $10 million and eventually will house some 1,000 convicts.

Quite naturally, such a project was a succulent morsel floating in the congressional pork barrel.

How the penitentiary landed in Illinois rather than in Missouri or Kentucky or someplace else is a striking testimonial to the quiet, unobtrusive personal power wielded, when need be, by an 81-year-old Chicagoan in the Congress of the United States.

Furthermore, the squaring off for the site resulted in an almost unprecedented defeat for a crotchety old man from Elsberry, Mo., who, with a scratch of his red pencil, can advance or stop atomic aircraft carriers and gigantic missile projects.

KNOWN AS UNCLE TOM

The triumphant Chicagoan was Representative THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, known by the largely bloc-voting 14-man Illinois Democratic House delegation over which he presides as "Uncle TOM."

TOM O'BRIEN went to the Illinois General Assembly 53 years ago, in 1906; was elected to the U.S. House in 1932, where, except for 4 years as Cook County sheriff, he has stayed since.

He seldom makes speeches and is hardly a profound statesman. Yet a firm friendship with Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, cemented by political events of 22 years ago, and his control over 14 disciplined House votes makes O'BRIEN an astoundingly important figure.

The vanquished Missourian was 80-year-old CLARENCE CANNON, House Appropriations Committee chairman for 18 years and described by no less than Mister SAM the Speaker as "the most powerful man in this House."

President Eisenhower's budget this year provided $9,870,000 for the prison, which had been planned by the Bureau of Prisons, at an unspecified location, for 4 years.

IN STEPS CANNON

Representative KENNETH J. GRAY, West Frankfort Democrat, tried to nail the Illinois location into the bill. Committee Chairman CANNON wanted to do likewise for Missouri.

Failing in his objective, CANNON flashed his pencil and the entire item was cut out of the omnibus appropriation. CANNON is proud of his ability to slash billions of dollars out of presidential requests.

GRAY then went to his Illinois mentor, Uncle TOM, and asked for a hand.

O'BRIEN had a chat with CANNON who, like most influential Congressmen, was an old friend of his. Only 12 Members who were in the House when O'BRIEN came to Washington still are here. One is CLARENCE CANNON.

During their conversation, CANNON told O'BRIEN: "How can I say no to you, TOM?"

O'BRIEN left with the impression that CANNON had backed down. But, as he found out later, CANNON hadn't said yes either.

O'BRIEN FURIOUS

So when CANNON renewed his efforts to scuttle the prison, O'BRIEN was furious. Ordinarily he would probably have acceded to the committee chairman.

The test came when a $2 million appropriation was restored to the bill on the floor. O'BRIEN beat CANNON by a 2-to-1 margin on the floor vote, although no location was specified.

Moved over to the Senate, the bill went to a subcommittee which agreed to a $1 million appropriation.

Then, in a very strange development, Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, declared that the specific Illinois site should be incorporated into the measure.

Senators JOHN SHERMAN COOPER and THURSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky, the latter Republican National Committee chairman, objected. They wanted the prison for Kentucky.

JOHNSON, of course, won. He added that he, as majority leader, would "look favorably" upon a supplemental appropriation to continue construction of the penitentiary after the original money runs out.

JOHNSON UPHELD

A conference committee later upheld JOHNSON and the Senate version of the bill.

It was rare for a Cannon-deleted item to find its way back into an appropriation. It was rare for the majority leadership to depart from the recommendations of its committee. And it was rare for the Texas Senate leader to take such interest in this type of measure.

Why?

O'BRIEN works together closely with RAYBURN and Democratic Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and had their help. Mister SAM and LYNDON JOHNSON also coordinate their activities to a remarkable degree between the two Houses.

Uncle TOM has been around a long time, has done favors for many people, and is well liked. He lives by a simple but strict code. He is forthright, never breaks his word, and never forgives anyone who does, which is why "CANNON used to be a friend of mine."

FRIENDSHIP SEEDED

The RAYBURN-O'BRIEN friendship was solidified back in 1937. RAYBURN, now 77, then was fighting for the floor leadership. His opponent had lined up Chicago support from Cook County Democratic Leader Pat Nash.

Nash consulted O'BRIEN about it, and O'BRIEN convinced him that the Chicago bloc of votes should go to RAYBURN.

Such was the seeding of a beautiful friendship which still blooms perennially in such forms as a prison for southern Illinois.

Strike by Physicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, 1959, the Chicago Tribune carried an article by Joseph Cerutti entitled "Britain Faces Mass Strike by Physicians." This merits attention of my colleagues and I have requested permission to have it inserted in the RECORD

in order that they may be aware of the possibility of strike by physicians.

BRITAIN FACES MASS STRIKE BY PHYSICIANS—DOCTORS WOULD OPEN PRIVATE PRACTICE

(By Joseph Cerutti)

EDINBURGH, SCOTLAND, July 16.—The British Medical Association Thursday threatened a walkout by the 40,000 hospital and family physicians employed in the National Health Service if the Government rejects their demands for increased pay.

Five hundred delegates attending the association's annual meeting overwhelmingly approved a resolution supporting a strike against the Government service.

Britain currently spends more than $2 billion yearly on its health service. Since its inception in 1945, doctors have been awarded two small pay increases.

NOW AVERAGE $6,793

The average income of 21,000 family doctors employed by the Government is now $6,793 yearly. Pay rates for hospital doctors vary from $1,277 yearly for junior physicians to $15,678 for top consultants.

A commission set up by the Government to consider doctors' remuneration recently concluded hearings but has not issued its report. The doctors, through the British Medical Association Council, are urging at least 10 percent increase.

Submitting the strike resolution, Dr. R. B. Illing said, "We want a vote that will leave no doubt in the mind of the general public, of the political parties, and of the ministries that the medical profession will follow behind the council on this matter."

DOUBT FULL SUPPORT

Some delegates doubted the medical council would obtain support of 80 percent of all doctors which it considered necessary for a successful walkout. Some said young doctors could not afford a strike.

"Women doctors are absolutely opposed to it," said Dr. E. C. Dawson, of Derby. "We are not trade unionists. We are not disciplined."

Illing deplored use of the word "strike." He said the doctors would provide an alternative to the existing health service.

Courageous Edith Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, almost anyone can disagree with his or her enemies. It is when you disagree with your friends that you need moral fiber. EDITH GREEN, my colleague from Portland, possesses energy, intelligence, and courage. The latest demonstration of these qualities occurred with respect to the labor-management reform bill hearings in the House Labor and Education Committee of which she is an influential member.

EDITH GREEN is a true friend of working men and women in Oregon and elsewhere. She is a strong supporter of unions, their leaders, and their members. But, in her book and mine, this does not mean that union legislative representatives and union leaders are always right when questions concerning labor-management reform legislation come up.

These are complex matters, many of them full of disguised dynamite and unexpected twists. Persons of good faith can disagree about them. One provision can swing at Hoffa, miss him completely and end up harming good unionism. Another can on its face seem to be entirely justified but in fact not be based firmly on thorough investigations and hearings.

Union leaders and their legislative representatives are, almost all of them, experts acting in good faith for the interests of their membership. But, I point out, EDITH GREEN and many of her colleagues are also experts in this type of legislation. Disagreements are not reasons for recrimination or reproach. Friends can argue and still be friends.

Pressure tactics are something else: letters and telephone calls from the district, visits by delegations in our offices. These are fine if they have to do with the merits of the legislation but brazen if they seek to intimidate.

Under unanimous consent previously given, I am including an article by A. Robert Smith from the Portland Oregonian, July 23, 1959:

MRS. GREEN FEELS PRESSURE AS LABOR BUCKS REFORM BILL

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—It is touch and go within the House Labor Committee this week as the pressures for and against an effective anti-racketeering labor bill mount. If the battlelines hold steady, a bill designed to curb some of the abuses disclosed by the McClellan committee will be approved today. But big labor is putting on a last minute high pressure campaign in an effort to water the bill down.

For 5 weeks, the 20 Democrats and 10 Republicans argued and maneuvered in secret sessions following Senate passage of the Kennedy reform bill.

In the maneuvering, GOP efforts, led by Representative KEARNS, Republican of Pennsylvania, to toughen the bill against unions were defeated generally by the votes of 18 of the 20 Democrats. Chairman BARDEN, Democrat of North Carolina, and Representative LANDRUM, Democrat of Georgia, voted with the Republicans, but still left a wide gap in the 18–12 voting lineup.

Democratic efforts led by LUDWIG TELLER, of New York, and JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, to water it down with a Teamster list of 59 amendments were opposed by the 10 Republicans and BARDEN and LANDRUM—plus a small contingent of liberal Democrats who customarily are sympathetic to labor's aims and purposes.

This group included Representative EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, FRANK THOMPSON, of New York, STEWART UDALL, of Arizona, CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama, and JAMES O'HARA, of Michigan. The Teamsters spearheaded by a sharp lawyer, Sidney Zagri, put on a high pressure campaign. One tactic employed on Mrs. GREEN was for Zagri to telephone Portland teamster officials and get them to telephone, wire, and write her—and to threaten to hold a protest meeting at the Labor Temple unless she went along with their proposals, which she felt would have virtually killed the bill.

Incidentally, a mimeographed sheet circulated by Teamsters under the title "Suggested Letter From Individual in His Own Handwriting" that was to inspire letters that would flood Congress, carried this interesting plea: "We don't need any amendments to the Taft-Hartley law because it is OK as is. I, therefore, ask that you vote against all of these bills."

Portland Teamster officials were brought in from time to time, but with Mrs. GREEN the strategy backfired. She got so irritated she told Zagri where to go.

Then, Tuesday of last week, the AFL–CIO, which had been sitting on its hands letting the Teamsters do the dirty work, invited this group of liberals into a conference which turned out to be a heavyhanded "You're either for us or against us" type ultimatum. Mrs. GREEN stalked out, after expressing her strong distaste for this move to water down what she regarded as necessary reform legislation.

At an earlier conference, George Meany pounded the table and demanded that Democrats strip the measure of its bill of rights and hot cargo bans. The Teamsters had pressured other unions into opposing the hot cargo ban by saying they wouldn't recognize picket lines if this ban went through.

Monday night the AFL–CIO called another meeting, didn't invite Mrs. GREEN, and tried to sell a new bill with fewer reform provisions. The heaviest pressure is being exerted against these four liberals, whose votes made a final draft possible last week, 17 to 13.

If they capitulate, the balance of power in the committee will make it possible for the reform bill to be scuttled. If they hold the line, their act of high courage will help give workingmen and the public at large needed protection from the sort of scandals Bob Kennedy and JOHN MCCLELLAN have been unfolding for over 2 years.

For Air Safety Stop Serving Liquor Aboard Planes in Flight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my statement before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on July 28 in support of my bill, H.R. 169, to prohibit serving of alcoholic beverages to passengers on aircraft in flight:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, to those who have never been up in a plane, and their number is diminishing daily, a visit to a major airport makes an impression that they will never forget. This is the gateway to the new world of air transportation that is developing with such speed, volume and complexity that the air is no longer free. Air traffic has already reached such proportions that strict discipline is required through inspection, regulation and control to insure the safety of planes and passengers.

Every big airport is suffering from growing pains. The crowded terminals, and the planes that are sometimes stacked in the sky waiting for room to come in, bear witness to the phenomenal expansion of the air transportation industry.

With the advent of faster jetliners, the need of further precautions for the protection of plane crews and passengers becomes urgent. It is the paradox of our times that, with the improving quality and dependability of machines and instruments and guidance systems, the incidence of human miscalculation or failure seems to increase.

In the realm of air transport where State boundaries are invisible and where an overwhelming percentage of the flights are interstate, and international, it is the responsibility of the Congress to recognize the

obvious dangers (within the airspace of the United States), and to pass those laws which are required in the interest of public safety.

Aviation experts agree that, in spite of all the amazing electronic equipment presently in use, the safety of planes especially in the vicinity of airports, depends upon the eyes, the reflexes and the judgment of the human being who is not an automatic pilot. Even under the best of circumstances, this demands a high degree of concentration and a sure skill. His efficiency would suffer if his attention were divided by distractions and dangers in the passenger cabin behind him.

Air discipline is an important factor, and there are solid reasons for it. When a plane is about to take off or land, and the sign in front of the passengers lights up with the warning: "No smoking. Fasten safety belts," responsible people obey. The stewardess makes a further check to make certain that no one forgets. This is no place for anyone not in his right senses, who rebels against restrictions and insists on having his own way in defiance of all safety measures.

Even though these two requirements are not in effect when a plane is airborne and on course, except when the weather is stormy, or flying conditions are rough, the inside of a plane at 7,000, 12,000 or 20,000 feet above the earth is no place for any rock and roll conduct on the part of inebriated passengers.

As far back as August 21, 1955, I asked the airlines to discontinue the practice of selling alcoholic beverages to passengers on aircraft in flight. I thought that the airlines should be given the opportunity to abandon this dangerous custom, by voluntary agreement among the various carriers. Over 3½ years have passed since then without corrective action by the airlines or the Civil Aeronautics Board. I think that they have been given sufficient time to do something about this problem. Their failure to do so leaves us with no alternative but to pass a law that will forbid this practice.

I do not base my argument in support of this bill merely on my own observations as a patron of the commercial airlines, or on the testimony of airline officials, or members of the regulatory agencies. I consider it most important that those most directly concerned with the safety of a plane, the crew members themselves, took the initiative in requesting this legislation. It is they who must contend, not with a theoretical possibility, but with actual, disagreeable, and dangerous incidents caused by passengers whose irresponsible behavior is due to the alcoholic drinks they have been served while the plane is aloft.

The Airline Stewards and Stewardesses' Association, and the Airline Pilots' Association have called for an end to this commercial airline policy, involving the major domestic carriers, of serving liquor to the passengers. It is difficult to understand why the airlines, that are so scrupulous regarding every other safety factor, are so careless regarding this one. In fact, by serving liquor, they encourage the unpredictable behavior of drunken passengers. This could lead some day to the inevitable tragedy that would have been prevented by the legislation which I propose today.

Many old people, the children, and sometimes infants are passengers on today's airliners. Their right to every reasonable protection is paramount, as even the indulgent few (to whom the airlines cater with bartender service) would admit in their sober moments.

Liquor has its place, but it should not be served aboard public carriers up in the clouds where customers, deranged by drink, could be the cause of a major air tragedy.

I earnestly submit that Federal legislation to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to passengers on aircraft in flight, as called for in H.R. 169 which I have introduced for your consideration, be recommended by this committee, for the safety of the millions who travel by air.

What Makes the "Farm Problem"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting article has come to my attention and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues. The article is written by Murray R. Benedict and appeared in the New Republic of July 27, 1959.

Mr. Benedict, professor of agricultural economics at the University of California since 1931, has served as consultant on farm problems to both public and private organizations and is the author of many pamphlets, articles, and books, including "Farm Policies of the United States, 1790–1950" and "Can We Solve the Farm Problem?"

He states the problem well. I would now like to see someone come up with the solution.

The article follows:

WHAT MAKES THE FARM PROBLEM?

(By Murray R. Benedict)

It is hard for our highly urbanized society to understand the underlying causes of the farm problem or why, after nearly four decades of argument and expenditure of many billions of dollars, it has not been solved. In the first place, this is not primarily a party issue; party differences here tend to be matters of degree or direction rather than of basic concept. Even in the 1920's, the congressional approaches to the farm problem were surprisingly nonpartisan. In the very first years of that decade, the farm bloc was causing political headaches for a Republican administration backed on most issues by a predominantly Republican Congress. Much later, in the 80th Congress, the bills put forward by the House and Senate committees, both headed by Republicans, differed more than did the positions traditionally taken by spokesmen for the two major parties.

The depression of the 1930's brought fairly general agreement that something drastic had to be done to help the farmer. Generally speaking, farm-State Congressmen and farm leaders of both parties worked together to devise workable programs. And what they did, in the main was to give the administration almost a free hand to try any or all of the plans that had been seriously proposed. In its basic elements the current program is still essentially the one that took shape in that period. However, the setting has changed and the program has been subjected to severe distortions that grew out of wartime needs and legislation.

In the 1930's, the major cause of farm distress was a drastic decline in demand. Farm production was not badly out of line with the needs of the people of this and other countries. But with millions of workers unemployed and other millions on low or uncertain incomes, a normal flow of farm products could not be sold at prices that seemed fair either to farmers or to those responsible for making legislative and administrative policy. The impact of depression was not the same in the farm and nonfarm sectors of the economy. Nonfarm workers and businesses had to take their punishment in the form of unemployment and sharply reduced average incomes. Industrial production was cut back quickly and drastically. Agriculture, an atomistic and highly competitive industry, tended to maintain output and to take its losses in the form of sharply reduced prices.

It would have seemed logical to encourage agriculture to continue to produce the food and fiber needed and to restore quickly the purchasing power of consumers so that these needed supplies could move at prices the farmers could live on. But restoring demand after a severe depression, like the recovery of strength after a severe illness, is a slow process.

Meanwhile, farm prices were virtually at alltime lows and the overriding demand, both in business and agriculture, was for action on the price front. In agriculture, this took the form of efforts to cut back production in a variety of ways ranging from the plowing up of cotton and the slaughter of little pigs to the imposition of arceage controls and the subsidized destruction of fruits. But controlling production in highly competitive agriculture is by no means easy. This was not a situation in which boards of directors could decide how much to produce and could allocate resources accordingly. Neither was it one in which strongly organized unions could induce, or coerce, workers to refrain from working at less than standard rates. Instead, it was one in which there were at that time more than five million independent entrepreneurs, each making his own decisions as to how much to produce and most of them with strong incentives to produce as much as possible.

Production controls were thus only moderately successful, perhaps fortunately, so far as the economy as a whole was concerned. For if agricultural production could actually have been reduced enough to restore farm prices to the levels considered appropriate, it would have meant throttling down all of the economy to the low tempo then prevailing in the nonfarm parts of the economy. Consumers would have had less to eat and the cost of living would have been significantly higher. Farm prices did improve some though they were still low as late as 1940. Meanwhile, there was an abundance of food for those who had even a modest amount of buying power. Up to that time there was no clear indication of the great technological revolution that was to come later.

Yields of most of the major crops hadn't changed much in the 75 years for which records were available. Hence the effort to cut down production by reducing acres planted seemed logical. But the great agricultural machine had within it as yet unsuspected potentials for rapid expansion of production. The incentives for full use of these potentials were lacking, and parts of agriculture were being deliberately held down to keep output from expanding.

That situation was suddenly changed by the outbreak of World War II. Demand strengthened; prices began to improve; and underemployed labor was rapidly drawn out of agriculture. The coming need for more and more food, which a fully employed labor force would be abundantly able to buy, soon became apparent. Government policy shifted from an attempt to keep the lid on production to a positive effort to lift it. Outlets were assured; price incentives were provided; and production goals replaced quotas. Farmers had almost every incentive to put the industry into high gear and to produce as much as they could. Furthermore, there was a substantial reservoir of new machines, new techniques, and new knowledge that had

not been drawn on in the two preceding decades of low prices and capital starvation.

The results exceeded the most optimistic expectations. In spite of a growing scarcity of labor, agricultural production increased by more than 20 percent between 1939 and 1944, though it was already high in terms of past performance. Even under war conditions, and with heavy demands from abroad, U.S. per capita food consumption increased by more than 6 percent in the same period. Vast quantities of food were supplied to the Armed Forces and to our allies. Thanks in part to the effective response of agriculture and in part to favorable weather, consumers were spared the tight rationing and austere diets that most European countries had to contend with during the war years. The surplus problem was temporarily a thing of the past, and it was not to reappear until the end of the decade.

But in the effort to encourage all-out production and partly in response to the strong political power of agriculture, high levels of price support for farm products were written into the laws during the war years, including promises that these levels of price support would be continued for at least 2 years after the war. Later they were extended throughout the 1940's and into the 1950's. Agricultural production continued to increase and, at least until the end of the decade, this increase was needed.

As well as supplying the strong domestic demand, it enabled the United States to come to the rescue of a battered Western Europe on a scale never previously approached even in wartime. Much of Europe was stripped of livestock and short of machinery, fertilizers, and manpower. Its processing and transportation facilities had been destroyed or damaged and, to add to the difficulties, it encountered a 1946–47 winter of almost unprecedented severity and an extremely severe and widespread drought in the summer of 1947.

Our response was effective and generous. It was made possible by two things, continuing high production in U.S. agriculture and the special financing provided by the Marshall plan. Even during what some Europeans refer to as "the hungry period" minimum requirements for survival were provided. In 1948 alone we exported more than half a billion bushels of wheat, almost all of it to Western Europe. At the same time our own people were eating more and better food than ever before.

This abnormal need had slackened by 1950. Troublesome surpluses were in fact beginning to appear in some lines as early as 1949. The demand for farm products was revived temporarily, and largely speculatively, by the outbreak of war in Korea but soon slacked off and the era of ever-mounting stocks of storable agricultural commodities was upon us.

As a result of 10 years or more of strong incentives for all-out agricultural production, forces had been set in motion that were to plague us from 1953 on. Agriculture was geared for high production. Immense amounts of capital, in the form of machinery, organization, soil fertility, and know-how had become available. As yet, there was little incentive for farmers to slow down production. Farm prices, on what was virtually a free market basis, had been well above parity in the late 1940's and early 1950's. Parity itself is a generous yardstick, one that for two decades was looked upon as something to be hoped for but probably not to be achieved.

In the speculative boom of 1951, farm prices rose to alltime highs, thus giving further impetus to the technological revolution that had already gained a good deal of momentus. The new administration coming in in 1953 and faced by rapidly mounting surpluses urged som easing down of the wartime price incentives then in effect, but there was not only strong political opposition to such a course but very real doubt that lower prices would actually bring about the desired easing off of production. Once production capacity has been built up in agriculture it takes a very drastic decline in prices to cause it not to be used.

Labor was being withdrawn from farms and acreages were being held down, but the technological revolution could not be stopped. For American agriculture it was perhaps as fundamental and difficult to deal with as the industrial revolution that had unsettled Western Europe so profoundly in the period around 1800. No longer are American farmers accepting new ideas reluctantly and slowly. They are welcoming them eagerly and reaching out for more, that is, for new forms of organization, improved strains of crops and animals and new production techniques. Once such a process is underway, improvements that may at first be undertaken as a means of improving profits must be adopted as a way of reducing losses. Consequently, they tend to spread throughout the industry very quickly. The farmer who does not "go modern" soon drops hopelessly out of the running. Greater productivity would seem not to be something to be deplored, but so far as food is concerned, once a nation is as well fed as ours now is demand can grow only about as fast as population grows. If production increases faster, prices fall to unacceptably low levels or unused stocks pile up. Since our policy has been to support prices, the imbalance shows up in the form of burdensome and costly stocks held by the Government. This relates mainly to a fairly small number of products but they are important ones; for example, wheat, the feed grains, cotton, tobacco and, potentially, hogs. The products directly supported probably do not account for more than 35 to 40 percent of the total output of agriculture, but if these are cut back the problem spills over into other lines that are now managing fairly well without Government price support. The prices of beef cattle, fruits and vegetables, poultry products and, as of now, hogs are not supported by the Government.

But if we have more production capacity than we need, it is reasonable to ask why we don't simply withdraw enough of it to bring the situation into balance. That process has been going on for quite some time, but the upsurge in productivity has been at an even faster pace. Farm output in 1956 was more than 40 percent above that of 1939. The average number of persons employed in agriculture has declined markedly, from 12.7 million in 1935 to 7.9 million in 1956, and it is still going down. In 1910 the number so employed was 13.6 million though the total population of the United States was then only 91.9 million, scarcely more than half what it is now. In most countries, well over half the population is engaged in agriculture. Here, about 12 to 13 percent of the employed labor force produces agricultural products so abundantly that we are concerned as to how to make effective use of them.

But, even so, this does not explain why we should not reduce the number of farm workers still further if we still have too many. Part of the difficulty arises from the distribution of skills and resources within agriculture. The most efficient half of the agricultural labor force produces about 90 percent of the agricultural products that go to market. This leaves another 1.5 to 2 million farmers who not only do not fare well but cannot easily shift from agriculture to something else. Many are past middle age and have no other skills. Family and community ties hold them where they are. Pulling up stakes and relocating takes money and some little courage, especially if one has a family. Many of the younger farm people are, however, shifting to other occupations as is abundantly evident from the figures given above. But to make fully and quickly the adjustment that appears to be needed would involve more hardship and more drastic measures than society appears to be willing to countenance. Hence the process of human readjustment seems almost certain to be a slow and difficult one. A similar problem on a smaller scale has long been evident in the soft coal industry.

Much more significant is the fact that migration away from agriculture of small-scale, low-production farmers will not solve the problem. They will not take their farms with them, and the most likely outcome is that such lands will be merged into the larger, more efficient farms and will then produce more than they do now. However, the spread of industry and other lines of business to the rural areas has enabled hundreds of thousands of these small-scale farmers to supplement the returns from their farms with other income, and their average financial situation has, in fact, improved materially in recent years despite the fact that their income from agriculture has remained almost constant since 1945.

Though the overall results do not reflect it, the adjustments made in U.S. agriculture have actually been far more impressive than most people realize. Last year's record-breaking wheat crop was grown on an acreage that was nearly a fifth smaller than the 1947–56 average. It was 30 percent under the peak acreage of 1949. The cotton acreage harvested in 1958 was less than 12 million. In the 1925–30 period we were growing almost four times as many acres of cotton. The story is similar for many of the other crops. In 1958 we grew 3.8 billion bushels of corn on 73.5 million acres whereas in the early 1930's we were growing around 2.5 billion bushels on more than 100 million acres. The appallingly wasteful potato crops of the period around 1950 were actually grown on an acreage that was less than half what was considered normal and necessary in the early and middle 1930's.

I cite these figures not as either a defense or condemnation of current or past programs but merely to explain why adjustment has proved so difficult. The factors that go into agricultural production are land, labor, capital, organization, and technology. Of these, only the land factor can be brought under effective control, and even that is far from easy. Land taken out of one crop tends to be shifted to some other crop. Under American conditions, improved technology, once it is developed, tends to be adopted quickly and widely. Also it tends to feed on itself and to continue to grow. Capital investments are extremely difficult if not impossible to control. Labor will shift only as it has inducements and opportunities that make such shifting attractive. This leaves the burden mainly on the land factor. Hence the acreage control schemes and soil conservation programs of the 1930's and the soil bank plan of the present period. But land can't be taken out fast enough to offset wheat yields that have moved up from around 14 bushels in the pre-World War II period to 27.3 bushels in 1958, or a cotton output that averaged less than 200 pounds per acre prior to the middle 1930's and is now well over 400 pounds. Similar but less easily measured improvements have been occurring in the livestock industries.

Clearly we do not want to go on producing and storing things for which we have no use. But as in most other major economic adjustments, peoples' lives, homes, investments, and skills are involved. If we are to avoid very great hardships to very large numbers of people, changes are bound to be somewhat slow and halting. The stocks we have built up do not consist of the kinds of things most needed either in our own economy or in the world at large, but we need to find ways to make more effective use

of them and, as soon as possible, to stop building them up unless we do have use for them either here or abroad. There are political obstacles to be overcome as well as economic ones, and the problem may become more troublesome before it gets better. But we are at least coming to have a better understanding of the nature of it, which is an essential step toward solution. In the meantime, we can console ourselves to some extent by keeping in mind that an economy of overabundance is far easier to live with than one of extreme scarcity.

PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE REMEDIES

Congress and the President have reached an impasse of farm legislation. On June 25 Mr. Eisenhower vetoed two bills approved by Congress governing wheat and tobacco production, and there seems little chance that a compromise will be reached in this session. The President said in his veto that the proposed new wheat program providing tighter production controls and higher price supports was neither realistic nor constructive. By returning to "the discredited high rigid price supports," he said, it "would hasten the complete collapse of the entire wheat program." And Congress' proposal to stabilize price supports for tobacco, the President said in vetoing that bill, "would not prevent further losses" in foreign markets.

Senate and House Agriculture Committees are now examining alternative bills. But the outlook for agreement is bleak.

In reopened hearings held in the House since June 25, Ezra Taft Benson has simply reiterated the President's recommendations of last January. "You won't budge 1 inch," Representative POAGE, Democrat, of Texas, chided the Secretary. And Benson admitted under questioning that he would again advise veto of "any legislation that would raise price supports by one penny." The committee chairman in turn pointed out that "not a man from a wheat district on this committee agrees with that philosophy."

What Is Castro Trying To Prove?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of July 26, 1959.

WHAT IS CASTRO TRYING TO PROVE?

Whatever his aptitude for the hard daily business of governing, Fidel Castro is supremely talented at arousing the Cuban populace. He now seems, unfortunately, to be exercising his principal talent rather than attending to the country's urgent needs.

It would be hard to interpret as anything other than a grandstand play the coy waiting game that has followed his dramatic resignation as Premier. Now that his supporters have whipped up popular pressures, he has declared that "we'll let the people decide on the 26th of July" whether he should return to office. In other words, he's ready to come back but he wants to be coaxed.

He undoubtedly will get his wish. A half million Cubans, including hundreds of thousands of "campesinos" brought in from every part of the island, some of them bedded down in the presidential palace, are expected to scream for his return at today's Havana celebration of the revolution's anniversary.

It's less clear why he wants to be coaxed, or what he expects to prove by it. Public adulation is a heady thing on which Castro obviously thrives. He may expect the fervency of the demonstrations to persuade his critics that he is the revolution, and that the revolution is Cuba's future. He may want to answer charges of dictatorship with dramatic evidence of popular support.

But support could be shown more convincingly at the polls than through organized spontaneity. And the criticism of Castro's rule stems not from doubts of his popularity, but from doubts of his ability to provide a stable and responsible government. His performance this past week, unfortunately, has offered little reassurance on this score, while this week's general strike testified better to the already demonstrated strength of his popular support than to his capacity, which has yet to be shown, to lead his country in orderly progress toward freedom and prosperity.

Special News Note: China Is China Not Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, China is China. Formosa is Formosa. Olympic athletes from Formosa should not pretend to represent China. Olympic athletes from China should not pretend to represent Formosa.

This was all Avery Brundage and the Olympic Games Committee decided recently. There was no "Communist infiltration" of the Olympic Games.

China is China, not Formosa. Even Chinese Nationalist Ambassador George Yeh has affirmed this fact and that the Olympic Games Committee was right in its decision on that basis.

It is no wonder that a committee of the other body concluded, on a second thought, to call off hearings on this subject. Drew Pearson with his usual perception and resourcefulness tells the story in his column in the Washington Post and Times Herald, Sunday, July 26, 1959, which, under unanimous consent previously granted, is appended hereafter:

A PROBE THAT DIDN'T EXPLORE

(By Drew Pearson)

The Senate Internal Security Committee, which started to investigate Communist infiltration into the Olympic games, sheepishly dropped the whole thing last week in order to prevent the biggest fiasco since the late Senator Joe McCarthy investigated the Army.

Chief Counsel Julian Sourwine, who sees the Red menace in any field that offers headlines, had jumped into the middle of the controversy over ousting the Chinese Nationalists from the Olympics. He saw in this a subversive plot to substitute the Chinese Reds.

Eagerly he subpenaed Avery Brundage, president of the International Olympic Committee, to explain why his committee kicked out Chaing Kai-shek's athletes. Brundage was rarin' to testify last Wednesday when he was suddenly canceled.

At the last minute, Vice President NIXON's former chief assistant, Bob King, persuaded committee members that bad publicity for the Olympic games would also hurt the winter Olympics, which are scheduled next February in California. King happens to be executive director of the Winter Olympics Committee.

But the clincher was provided by Senator TOM HENNINGS, Democrat, of Missouri, who warned that Brundage's testimony would make the Senate look foolish.

For here is what Brundage planned to say: "That the Nationalists weren't kicked out because of politics but because they erroneously claimed to represent the Chinese mainland; that no less than Chinese Nationalist Ambassador George Yeh had acknowledged the committee was right; that Nationalist athletes probably would be allowed to compete as Formosa's representatives, and that the Chinese Reds had been kicked out of the Olympics earlier for claiming to represent Formosa.

This was hardly the deep, dark conspiracy Sourwine had hoped to expose. HENNINGS convinced Senator TOM DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, of this, and DODD used his influence inside the Internal Security Committee to call off the whole probe.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following newsletter of July 25, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

As adjournment nears, some major legislative hurdles have yet to be cleared.

HIGHWAY FUNDS

The highway financing problem is twofold: (1) How to provide the money for work already contracted to pay our bills; and (2) To analyze and permanently correct the road program itself, to prevent progressively increased costs resulting from improper estimates of the known problems. To pay our current bills, we have but two alternatives—To raise taxes (for example, the proposed 1½-cent hike in gasoline taxes) or to spend money from the Treasury's general fund. Those of us who oppose any tax increase maintain stoutly that this is the same problem we face throughout Government. If we're to make ends meet, a careful and comparative analysis of all Government expenditures is called for, so that we can eliminate the less necessary ones. On the second point, revising the road program itself, it's important to know why cost estimates have risen sharply in just 2 years—from about $25 billion to $37 billion. Some components: (1) A 12-percent increase in construction costs; (2) Location of highways closer to cities and towns than originally planned, requiring more complex interchanges, additional lighting, etc.; (3) Cost of relocating utility lines now figured 50 percent higher than earlier estimates; (4) Wage setting by the Federal Government (Davis-Bacon Act) has added 5 to 7 percent to wage costs. Acquiring right-of-way has cost far more than anticipated, due to the 90–10 cost-sharing setup. After all, 90 percent of the dollars used by States and localities to buy right-of-way has been other people's money.

HOUSING

Once again the meritorious FHA insurance program is being held as a sort of hostage by those in Congress determined to jam through controversial spending plans for urban renewal, public housing, and the like. In an effort to escape disapproval of a budget-conscious administration, Congress lumped these programs together in an all or nothing package with the almost universally approved FHA programs. Rebuffed by a Presidential veto, which specifically called for a scaling down of urban renewal grants and no new public housing authorization (over 100,000 public housing units already authorized are as yet unbuilt), leaders in Congress are presently marking time, as FHA runs out of insuring authority. The odds are that there will be a housing act of 1959, but as in 2 of the last 3 years, it will be a rush-rush no time to argue affair presented during the closing hours before Congress adjourns. When the House last year refused to be stampeded in this manner, there was no omnibus housing bill at all. This time, however, the innocent hostage, FHA, would be out of business.

LABOR

There will undoubtedly be a labor "reform" bill of sorts, simply because few legislators can afford to return home without having voted for something in this field. Despite avowed labor opposition, just what "reforms" the Senate-passed Kennedy bill would accomplish are hard to imagine, and the bill approved by the House committee this week is a decidedly weakened version of the same thing. Floor debate, still weeks away, will see several substitute bills with some backbone offered. By "backbone," I mean at least provisions which: (1) Safeguard workers' money in union treasuries; (2) guarantee every man, worker or employer, his day in court by eliminating no man's land gap between Federal and State law; (3) protect rank-and-file members by guaranteeing democratic procedures in unions and prevent reprisals against members by union officers; and (4) outlaw the indefensible use of secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing.

FOREIGN AID

The mutual security authorization has already passed; but we have yet to appropriate the money. I can imagine few Congressmen who could be said to be for or against foreign aid, as such. Many of our military assistance programs are wholly justified, and that's true, too, of some ventures in the field of purely economic aid. In the broad ideological struggle going on today, however, I'm at a loss to know why U.S. taxpayers should have to help finance the undertakings of Communist governments (as in Yugoslavia and Poland) and to subsidize Socialist experiments of others the world over. Moreover, to assert that the requested amount is the rockbottom figure acceptable is to ignore innumerable reports by the Comptroller General and others who have pointed out appalling waste and mismanagement in the program. Like the housing bill described earlier, it comes down to how much outrageous boondoggle one is willing to accept in order to continue other admittedly good programs. For one, I'm convinced the foreign aid appropriation can and should be pruned considerably.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Another rights bill is in prospect, though the Commission set up by the bill passed 2 years ago is still gathering information on which to proceed. The necessity for going any further now strikes me as entirely political. Balked in their drive for more free-spending Government welfare programs, many of the superliberals feel they can't go home without a liberal record of accomplishment. The papers have been full of their dissatisfaction with the majority leadership. They feel another rights bill is a minimum must. No one has yet defined or specified the rights we're supposed to be protecting, but apparently Congress is going to protect them more stringently.

Limitation of Power of States To Impose Income Taxes on Certain Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I introduced today a bill to limit the power of the States to impose income taxes on income derived exclusively from the conduct of interstate commerce.

Senators BUSH and KEATING have introduced an identical bill in the Senate. It is intended to eliminate a chaotic condition created by a recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court which held, by a 6 to 2 vote, that the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States does not prevent a State from taxing a foreign corporation's net income derived from sales within that State even though such transactions are exclusively in interstate commerce.

The decision, handed down February 24, 1959, in the cases of T. V. Williams against Stockham Valves & Fittings, Inc., and the Northwestern States Portland Cement Co. against Minnesota, has thrown the commercial world into confusion. Businessmen are apprehensive that they may be forced to pay income taxes in every State in which they sell their goods. It has opened up a Pandora's box of difficulties and harassment for all businesses, especially the smaller ones. It will take lengthy study to determine its full implications. There can be little doubt, however, as to the serious implications which the decision holds for firms engaged in interstate commerce who now, in each State to which they ship goods, find themselves open to possible liability for income tax levied by that State on profits derived from sales attributable in some fashion to that State. Hitherto, such firms had come to expect that such profits were not taxable by a State unless the firm was engaged in intrastate business or otherwise legally domiciled therein. Also, there is the very serious possibility of double taxation of profits from the same transactions.

In the application of the Supreme Court decision we find that the mere fact that a company sends a salesman into a particular State for the solicitation of business may subject that company to income taxes by that State.

My bill is designed to provide at least a partial remedy. It is not a total solution to the problem but it will, if enacted, afford relief to those companies engaged in interstate commerce whose only activity in other States is sales solicitation and where no stock of goods, plant, office, warehouse, or other place of business is maintained therein.

I feel that the bill is of sufficient urgency that the House make a special effort to bring it to a vote in this session of Congress.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, after the date of the enactment of this Act, no State, or political subdivision thereof, shall have the power to impose a net income tax on income derived by a person exclusively from the conduct of interstate commerce, solely by reason of the solicitation of orders in the State by such person, or by an agent or employee of such person, if such person maintains no stock of goods, plant, office, warehouse, or other place of business within the State.

Legalized Blackmail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a copy of a letter which the Teamsters Union has sent to Chicago trucking companies announcing the start of organizational picketing.

The letter demonstrates more graphically than any explanation how legalized blackmail is employed by the Teamsters to extend their empire.

It should be noted how carefully the letter is phrased to stay within the limits of the law. There is nothing in it which would lay the Teamsters open to any legal difficulty under present statutes.

Yet, read in its entirety, the Teamsters' letter say to the employer:

Either you get your employees to join our union, or we promptly put you out of business.

It does not matter whether the company's employees desire another union, or in fact, whether they desire no union at all. Under present law as it is used by the Teamsters, those employees will join the Teamsters or they will be out of a job.

Notice the stress placed by the Teamsters on the fact that the purpose of the picketing is solely educational "to call to the attention of union members and supporters of organized labor that your office and clerical workers" are not members of the Teamsters Union. Yet, note, too, the threat of the "economic detriment" which the employer will sustain as the result of the withholding of patronage from his concern by union members and sympathizers.

How will this economic pressure be applied? Simply by throwing up a stranger picket line around the company's place of business, which union members will not cross, ending the company's operations.

The employer has little choice. He will either act as a recruiter for the

Teamsters Union, persuading his employees to sign as members, or his company will go out of business.

The employees have little choice. Either they sign up with the Teamsters or they lose their jobs.

There is little wonder that James Hoffa and his Teamsters are fighting tooth and nail against any restriction on blackmail picketing, or on any of the other practices, such as hot cargo clauses and secondary boycotts, which form the very basis for the corrupt power they wield without regard for the public interest.

I do not think the American people will long stand for the deprivation of their basic freedoms at the hands of any unscrupulous organization, labor union or otherwise. It is time the Congress woke up to that fact.

The letter follows:

LETTER FROM TEAMSTERS LOCAL 710 TO CHICAGO TRUCKING COMPANIES

Local 710, I.B.T., has decided to embark upon a campaign to organize your office and clerical employees. To induce your employees to join this union, we shall begin to picket your establishment on or about the 11th of May 1959. We assure you that the picketing will be entirely peaceful. We have instructed our pickets not to threaten, intimidate or coerce anyone. If there is any violation of those instructions, please advise us and we shall see to it that corrective action is taken immediately.

We wish to make it clear to you that local 710 does not at this time represent and of course we do not claim to represent, a majority of your office and clerical employees. Local 710 does not ask you to recognize it as exclusive bargaining representative for your employees or, indeed, ask you to recognize it for any purpose at this time. The purpose of our picketing is solely to call to the attention of union members and supporters of organized labor that your office and clerical employees are not members of local 710.

We hope that the demonstration of support of local 710 in its efforts to organize, which this picketing will produce, will persuade your employees to become members of our local union. When they do, they will join the thousands of other employees who are affiliated with the great International Brotherhood of Teamsters. In engaging in this picketing campaign, we are speaking for the members of our organization who are employed in businesses like yours and who feel the brunt of the unfair competition of your unorganized employees.

This point we must emphasize, we are not making any demand upon your company at this time to agree to or execute any contract with our union covering any of your employees. Under the law your company is permitted to recognize and bargain with our local union only after a majority of your employees have authorized the union to represent them. Therefore, even if your company should now or hereafter offer to recognize our union or enter into collective bargaining with us our union would refuse such an offer and we would continue to refuse until your employees lawfully authorize us to represent them. Should your employees desire to join our union, they may apply for membership at the office of local 710, 4217 South Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill., or ask one of the pickets for a membership application card which they can fill out and return to him. When we have received applications from a majority of your employees, we will contact your company further.

You should also understand that it is your right under the Constitution of the United States and under the National Labor Relations Act to advise your employees of the economic detriment which you and they will sustain as a result of the withholding of patronage from your concern by union members and sympathizers as long as they remain nonmembers of our union.

You may, in the exercise of your lawful rights, explain those detriments to your employees and urge them to apply for membership in the union and thereby acquire for themselves and for your company the goodwill of our union and its friends. You may not, and we are sure that you will not, threaten to take economic reprisal against your employees, or grant them benefits, to coerce their choice in this matter. However, we feel sure that if your employees, who have been carefully taught to look to you for leadership on matters affecting their employment, are convinced that it is your sincere desire that they join the union, they will quickly realize that acquisition of union membership at the earliest opportunity is in their best interest.

Yours very truly,

LOCAL UNION NO. 710,
JOHN T. O'BRIEN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

H.R. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there has been a good deal of debate and discussion relative to H.R. 3 as passed by the House on June 24, 1959. During this debate reference was made to the rural electrification program and some discussion took place relative to a letter from Clyde T. Ellis of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association of June 16, 1959. This letter recommended that H.R. 3 be rejected by the Congress of the United States. As a followup of this discussion, I received on July 22, 1959, a letter from the White River Electric Cooperative in Branson, Mo., from which I quote the following:

Because of your recent direct association with rural electrification cooperatives of the United States, plus your interest over the entire life of the rural electric program, we address this correspondence and enclose an excerpt from the minutes of our regular board of directors meeting, July 16, 1959.

The board and I ask that you endeavor to get a copy of the excerpt into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In view of this request, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask that the following resolution be included in the RECORD.

EXCERPT FROM MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, WHITE RIVER VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., BRANSON, MO., JULY 16, 1959

Whereas we unanimously agree that rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws should be established;

Whereas, as we understand H.R. 3, which was passed by the House, June 24, 1959, by a vote of 225 to 192, will establish such rules if enacted into law;

Whereas we believe in the following as basic relative to labor laws:

1. State jurisdiction if not preempted by the Federal Government.

2. Bill of rights for union members themselves.

3. Picketing, designed to force or coerce employees into unions against their will, should be regulated.

Now therefore, we, the board of directors of the White River Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., do hereby

Resolve, That in the best interest of our approximately 30,000 electric consumers, request and urge that our U.S. Senators concur with the House action on H.R. 3 and hasten the day when such bill will become a law on our Federal statutes. We unanimously feel that this is in the best interest of our members and the general welfare of the citizens of the great State of Missouri.

We strongly disassociate ourselves from the opinion voiced against the bill by Mr. Clyde Ellis, general manager of NRECA as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We further urge that the members of the Missouri congressional delegation disregard the statement against the bill for the reason that this entire matter had not been considered by the membership of NRECA before Mr. Ellis voiced his opinion.

Furthermore, we feel that such an expression by him without our knowledge and approval is not in the best interests of the rural electrification program.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following newsletter of July 18, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

A PREVIEW OF SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

H.R. 4700, the Forand bill, would again increase social security taxes (already scheduled to double during next 10 years) and extend hospitalization, nursing-home care, and surgical service to recipients of social security benefits. The prospect of socialized medicine is no less controversial now than before. Many arguments have been presented for and against. I find little to commend compulsory health insurance and much that condemns it. Therefore, I shall present the arguments of witnesses against the Forand bill, which, in total, comprise an overwhelming body of material to discredit such compulsory health insurance, even though any one or a combination of these arguments themselves could be eliminated from consideration, according to each individual's judgment.

Constructively, there are far more sensible alternatives, some now in effect, to provide medical care for the aged. These include the rapid growth of progressively better voluntary health insurance plans. The present State and local public assistance programs already provide free care for those unable to pay. Those on State welfare rolls and the "medically indigent," while a community problem, hardly justify a vast compulsory insurance program covering all of those over 65 on OASI. Of the 15 million people over 65 today, 6 million are excluded under this bill, since they are not eligible

for social security; 9 million others are already covered under voluntary medical programs. This leaves about 3 million individuals who might benefit from H.R. 4700. True, new and better insurance plans need to be developed, not nullified and killed by Federal compulsory insurance, alongside which no private plan could survive. Better medical care is more certain to result from the normal incentives of free society than Government regimentation and compulsion.

Specific criticisms include:

1. Compulsory Federal insurance will kill voluntary insurance programs, an irreversible step.

2. The Forand bill does not cover those who need medical help, but only those over 65 now covered by OASI.

3. The cost of this program is not known, though estimated to be between $1.126 and $2.3 billion per year at the outset, then going up.

4. As the HEW report states, "The existence of a problem does not necessarily indicate that action by the Federal Government is desirable."

5. Those now over 65 immediately will receive medical care free, without any contribution, the cost charged to wage earners of the future.

6. Since no needs test is included, those not wanting this Federal insurance will be forced to accept it and pay for it.

7. Health problems of the aged are varied, while this plan would provide for but a few of them.

8. The Forand bill is a "foot in the door," its expansion necessarily will follow, only because of its own inequities; the age requirement will be removed; all those covered by OASI will be included; and finally all citizens, for complete socialization of medicine.

9. The alleged free choice of the Forand bill is a misnomer: (a) There is no choice whether or not you want this compulsory health insurance or whether you pay, and (b) there is no freedom of selection of doctors, hospital and nursing facilities, only a choice of those presented to you. This is not a free choice.

10. If medicine is socialized then other services and industries will be socialized.

11. There is no "right" to have free medical care, food, clothing or other necessities (unless the voters so choose).

12. Medical and hospital care is now available to those who need it and cannot afford to pay.

13. The story of Federal control and regimentation is this—Federal administration, certification of doctors, hospitals and nursing homes, fixing of fees and costs, promulgation of regulations, and enforcement with fines and jail sentences. These total socialized medicine without recourse.

14. The search for better insurance plans and medical care will also be discouraged by Federal regimentation.

15. Diagnostic service, internal medicine and other forms of medical aid are not covered by the Forand bill, thereby creating an inequity.

16. Where health facilities and services are provided free of cost, a tendency can be expected toward excessive utilization resulting in overcrowded facilities, malingering and indigency, the normal human reactions (the end result ? poorer medical care). Britain's socialized medicine can teach us the lessons we need to know about the unhappy effects of socialized medicine on all the people, lessening the quality of medical care. Let us benefit from their experience.

17. A Government program normally follows this pattern: The cost is underestimated and the Government overcommits itself in extending service.

18. No Government program is justified until the voluntary plans have been found inadequate.

19. No Federal legislation should be forthcoming until the findings of the White House Conference on Aging in 1961 are known and studied.

20. And many others. The great overriding danger in the consideration of a compulsory Federal program is always the same. Does the recognition of a "need", in this case that sick people need medical, immediately presuppose a Federal solution. I suspect that politicians are afraid that "being against the proposed Federal legislation" will be confused in the voters' minds with "being against the need itself", in this case helping the aged getting medical care.

Peoria Journal Star Editor in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to submit herewith the third and fourth in a series of articles written by the editor of the Peoria Journal Star upon his return from a recent trip to Russia.

REDDISH HAIR, GREEN EYES: THAT'S SVETLANA

(Editor's Note.—Charles L. Dancey, editor of the Journal Star, returned recently from a month's tour of the Soviet Union and at present is attending a National Strategy Seminar in Washington, D.C. Because of heavy censorship restrictions, Dancey made no effort to send dispatches from Russia. His daily articles, however, will be carried under dateline of the areas he visited.)

(By Charles L. Dancey, editor, the Journal Star)

ODESSA.—As of now, I am stuck with a guide-interpreter as forecast—a girl in her twenties, Muscovite, not Ukrainian, with reddish hair, green eyes, a very pretty face, and an accent like Gregory Ratoff.

Her name is Svetlana.

She showed me around town, most of the time riding in a car driven by a rugged Ward Bond type who solemnly minds his own business. This sort of thing isolates a person pretty well.

All I saw was the beautiful opera house (prerevolution) with its many statues of the Greek muses. The Germans stabled their horses in this magnificent building when they took Odessa. The city hall also has two huge Greek statues on either wing. This is a far cry from the appearance one associates with Soviet cities—and the biggest statue in the biggest square is not Stalin or Lenin but of the poet Pushkin.

Odessa gets its name from an ancient Greek city on or near the site of the present city. In fact, the Russian spelling of the name and pronunciation is almost identical with the title of Homer's classic Odyssey.

The Greek theme has been maintained throughout, although my guide seems to have no knowledge of the city's heritage or even of the Greeks themselves.

Visiting a sanitarium I saw my friend of the plane trip sitting on a bench. When we had parted at the airport he had shaken my hand in both of his and presented me with his one-way mirror sunglasses. I went up and shook hands with him, but he seemed as stiff and formal today as he had been demonstrative before.

Svetlana seemed upset by this meeting until I explained that we had sat together on the plane. She refused to interpret my first question to him which I made in English in her presence, while she fired questions at me. And she cut the whole thing short preemptorily.

She said as we walked away, following her rapid-fire exchange with the man in Russian which I couldn't begin to follow, that he was being rested in Odessa and would be there for about a month.

He was just sitting on a bench, fully clothed, doing nothing. It did not look like a very exciting vacation by our standards, but maybe it is sensible. I must say, however, that he looked plain bored to me.

In the evening, I was permitted to go to the summer theater alone * * * but they obtained the ticket for me in advance, complete with row and seat number. It was the Don Cossacks in an open theater in a park not unlike the St. Louis municipal theater setup.

The Cossacks were, of course, terrific, especially the dancing—and I was front row center for about $1.70 in our money.

At intermission, a man walked straight up to me in the crowd again and said, "You speak English." (I hadn't said a word.) He said that he was a writer and a translator of books. He spoke excellent English.

He said he is now translating Rousseau's works into Russian for the first time. I asked how many languages he speaks.

He said French, English, German, and Russian.

"What is your native language?" I asked. (He didn't sound like Gregory Ratoff.)

He replied: "They say that a Jew has no native language."

He smiled when he said it, but the smile only exposed the open wound more clearly.

I wonder what else they say.

BALLPOINT PEN BEAUTIFUL TO YOUNG RUSSIAN

(By Charles L. Dancey, editor, the Journal Star)

ODESSA.—Svetlana and I took the boat to Fontana Beach and passed Arcadia Beach on the way. I halfway expected the next one to be called "Al Fresco Beach."

En route, I told her I met an English-speaking man at the theater.

"Oh," she said. "And did he walk back to the hotel with you?"

(He did walk back to within a half block of the hotel at about midnight the night before—and Svetlana and I had met about 9 a.m.)

On the boat, Svetlana broke out in goose-pimples from the cool breeze and went up to the bow to sit in the sun. I stayed on the stern. Three teen-age crewmen immediately came up to me.

They knew a little—very little—English. We talked. I talked in Russian when I knew the right words and trying English words when I didn't. They talked in English when they knew the right words, and tried Russian when they didn't.

They asked about Louie Armstrong, Benny Goodman, and Van Cliburn, and wondering if "rock 'n roll" is still very "bolshoi" (big) in America.

They asked about TV and said they have a station in Odessa but it is experimental but assured me there are two stations in Moscow.

I told them we have an Odessa, Tex.—also a Moscow in the United States. And that I live in Pekin—"nyet kitai" (China). They laughed loudly at the thought of a Pekin, U.S.A.

I told them about our vending machines, showing them a U.S. dime, and telling them what could be bought with it automatically.

I wanted to give them a ballpoint pen but they wouldn't take it. Finally, I got them to "match" coins, and awarded the "winner" the pen.

He just sat looking at it and kept repeating: "Eta kraseevee, kraseevee." (It is beautiful, beautiful.)

Svetlana returned and the boys melted away, one of them giving me the wink as he turned into the wheelhouse. A moment later the public address system tuned up and out blared, "St. Louis Blues."

We arrived at the beach and found it crowded—although as usual more sunning than swimming. Svetlana asked if women are "fat" in America. I told her it is fashionable to be slender. (There was a real beef trust on the beach.) She sniffed and said: "It is fashionable to be slender here too." (She is slender.)

On the way back from the beach she asked about my house, and was stunned when I said it has seven rooms. I explained that is is an old house, but this meant little to her. I said a lot of people actually build their own homes.

"But not the rich," she said. "The rich have them built for them by the poor."

I told her nobody can get anything built for them unless he pays these "poor people" more than 30 rubles an hour.

I told her that 100,000 people pay 5 rubles a week for our "gazyeta" (newspaper) in an area of about 400,000 people.

"Almost every family?" she said—still looking for those masses of poor people when by Russian standards we are all rich.

After repeated demands by me, we finally went to the stores. I badly wanted to buy something for a friend whose family came from Odessa originally—and I wanted a swimming suit to take a dip in the Black Sea.

I found that she had good reason to resist. The stores were dingier and the merchandise cheesier than of any store in Peoria at any time in my memory—and there were no swimming suits, or much of anything else.

Then she wanted to go to a movie—a very good one was playing—so we went. There were wooden chairs in a large room, and a Hungarian film was shown about an evil boss who tempted the poor working girl with a new dress so that she abandoned her poor unemployed lover for the capitalistic boss.

The one love scene in this film would make Brigitte Bardot look like a Sunday school teacher.

I learned Svetlana had seen it three times and thought it was fabulous. This is appalling.

Obviously these people can't even imagine what America is like.

Achievement Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by Herbert S. Edwards, a young man who participated as a delegate from Colorado in the Junior Chahmber of Commerce National Award and was successful. This speech was given at the banquet and Mr. Edwards received the high honor for presenting the outstanding speech. The speech is as follows:

In this age of unrest and uncertainty, security is foremost in almost everyone's mind. I believe we have placed too much emphasis on the material aspects of life, security being one of these. It seems to me that my true security is not tangible. Material security is always in danger from fire, flood, decay, and all other means of destruction. Thus, I think a person who depends for his security on material bases such as wealth or physical strength has no true security, for he has only temporal resources to cope with loss, defeat, and disaster. Lasting security cannot be guaranteed. If material and physical security are so important, what would happen if one should lose them? After all, is a guaranteed, secure future really as safe and important as so many think? Prison inmates have complete economic security.

One's self-reliance will be built up only by forcing himself to take the initiative and become a nonconformist in the sense of standing by what you believe in the face of criticism. Today's desires to belong to a group and to follow the crowd certainly relieve a person of self-reliance and the need for intiative. Many people place themselves in a clique for security, only to find themselves lost in the group. A person who balks at following the crowd or questions its authority, may find himself on the outside, looking in. A group can take away security just as fast as it can give it. A person who has depended upon a group for all his security, and has either been rejected or become separated from his group is certainly without any means of self-assurance. To belong to a group may give one temporary security, but to become detached may result in permanent insecurity and disappointment. Where, then does true security lie, and how can one find it?

I believe that my true security is in the realm of the mental and spiritual phases of life. True security is not attained except when one relies on himself and his own resources of character and the Spirit for his future. We can build up our resources if we can develop self-reliance and self-confidence in ourselves and our work. Self-reliance, in turn, may be developed by relying upon our own initiative. Progress is made because of insecurity. Complete material security may discourage initiative and self-reliance. Therefore, I believe that if one's true security is placed in self-reliance, initiative and resourcefulness, he has a lasting security which will assist him in overcoming or effectively dealing with adverse circumstances whenever they arise. My true security, then, is not to be found outside myself in the temporal things of life, human or otherwise, but can be built up only within myself.

On the Square—With P. Wendell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting a column, "On the Square—With P. Wendell," carried in the July 9, 1959, issue of the Newark (Ohio) Advocate, a fine newspaper published in my 17th Ohio Congressional District.

I understand that Paul Reed, editor of the Advocate, writes this column. In any case, I congratulate the author for his penetrating insight into public business and affairs.

As you and I know, Mr. Speaker, we in Congress receive many, many communications from many fine individuals. Unfortunately, in many instances, some people are not informed on public issues, and indeed, they realize their paucity of knowledge and their lack of qualification to render sound judgment on pressing public questions. I do not dispute anyone's right to have an opinion, however erroneous it may be, but I believe that we should encourage the dissemination of information by people who are in a position to get facts, and then have the background of knowledge needed to interpret the significance of those facts.

It is heartening to me to see the author of this column showing such discrimination and taste in the use of his words and his views. It is plain that he has put a finger on many sensitive, and oft-overlooked, spots in our public picture. I commend this column to the considering of my colleagues. The material follows:

[From the Newark (Ohio) Advocate, July 9, 1959]

ON THE SQUARE—WITH P. WENDELL

Harvesttime is here again, the season of the year when the good earth yields its rich bounties.

Grain fields that spread acroes the countryside like seas of restless gold are now being shorn into stubble.

And corn that stood knee high by the Fourth of July is gaining bold stature soon to burst into heavy silken ear.

By strange circumstance typical of the times, bumper crops will contribute little toward checking the spiral of prices.

The farmer's profits will show scant increase and the cost to the consumer to spread a bountiful board will not be reduced.

Riding the crest of prosperity, the American people will continue to eat high off the hog but they will pay a fancy price for the experience.

Another bumper harvest will inevitably aggravate a vexing situation pouring new streams of surplus crops into costly storage.

The taxpayer will catch the full impact of a farm aid program that adds billions to the Nation's tax burden and strikes a heavy blow against every private purse.

Price supports show little evidence of helping the small farmer, rather, a magnanimous gift to the large-scale operator who needs little help.

It is difficult to explain the towering surpluses, bought and stored at fantastic cost to the taxpayer and impoverished segments of society going hunrgy.

The Nation's crop surplus is one of the major reasons why taxes are soaring skyward and only a comparative few reap the benefits.

Foreign aid is another festering thorn channeling billions overseas to rebuild foreign countries into a strong competitive position on the world market.

Restored by American taxpayers' dollars these nations are now threatening the economic survival of a benevolent people who succored them in their postwar distress.

A tax-burdened citizenry takes a dim view of the new taxes that will be imposed before Congress and the Ohio Legislature adjourn.

The President loudly decries the profligate spending of the current Congress and he threatens to veto extravagant measures.

Yet the President and his staff cost the taxpayer more than $5 million a year—eight times the amount spent in 1938.

His Democratic predecessors were denounced for using the presidential yacht *Williamsburg*, yet little is said about the President's luxury airliners.

The White House has at its diposal a fleet of planes, helicopters, cabin cruisers, and limousines at a fabulous upkeep cost.

Crushed by taxes, the public has a right to cry out for economy and an exemplary place to start would be the White House itself.

Centennial Year Opens for the Oregon Shakespearean Festival in Ashland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Oregon Shakespearean Festival's company opens its 19th annual season today, July 28, in Ashland.

The four plays in 4 days schedule of the famed company offers playgoers "Twelfth Night," "King John," "Measure for Measure," and "Antony and Cleopatra." There is also this year an Elizabethan-style production prepared especially in honor of Oregon's centennial year. It is "The Masque of the New World."

Many people deserve credit for this continuing festival, first of its kind in the United States. This year the plays will be given in a new home made possible by loyal supporters who financed construction of the theater, which is like that used by William Shakespeare. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial which appeared in the July 20, 1959, Portland (Oreg.) Journal, "Ashland Geared for Shakespearean Fete":

ASHLAND GEARED FOR SHAKESPEAREAN FETE

"All the world's a stage,
And all the men and women merely players.
They have their exits and their entrances;
And one man in his time plays many parts,
His acts being seven ages."

These magic words won't be heard when the Oregon Shakespearean Festival's company opens its 19th annual season on July 28 in Ashland, but they will be borne out by many of the actors and actresses who will appear in "Twelfth Night," "King John," "Measure for Measure," 'Antony and Cleopatra," and "The Masque of the New World," an Elizabethan-style production prepared especially in honor of Oregon's centennial.

Rehearsals are well underway for the four dramas and the masque, with several men and women returning who have charmed audiences in the past by portraying Shakespeare's characters in keeping with the traditions of the stage of his time. From auditions held in June, Angus L. Bowmer, the theater's founder and producing director, has selected casts which should make this season one of the best.

In addition, the plays will be staged for the first time on the new Elizabethan stage. The structure, financed by donations from the theater's international patronage, has been completed. It replaces a building which was condemned several years ago as a firetrap.

Since 1935, its first year, the festival's fame has grown until it now bears an international reputation for the excellence of its productions. Those who enact some of the "seven ages of man" deem it a privilege and an honor to be selected for one or more parts. And it speaks well for the management that many players are eager to return year after year.

In these days of filmed entertainment one finds welcome relief in watching living men and women bring to life the characters which the greatest of all playwrights used to mirror human emotions. We wish all success to those who make their exits and their entrances in Ashland's 19th annual revival of the bard's works.

Bank for Rural Electric Co-Ops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in supporting Secretary Benson's proposal to establish an REA Bank, Earl W. McMunn in the June 20, 1959, edition of the Ohio Farmer commented succinctly and sensibly on the absurdity of our Government lending money to going organizations at lower rates of interest than the Government itself has to pay in order to borrow the money in the first place:

BANK FOR RURAL ELECTRIC CO-OPS

Secretary of Agriculture Benson's recent proposal that REA systems have their own bank makes a lot of sense. In making the proposal, the Secretary pointed out that REA and the rural electric cooperatives have now come of age. They are strong enough and mature enough to begin to stand more on their own feet. The facts seem to indicate that the Secretary is right.

What Secretary Benson proposes is a permanent financing plan for REA with less dependence upon direct Government loans. He'd like to see Congress set up a lending institution much like the Farm Credit Administration. Directors would be nominated by rural electric and rural telephone borrowers.

The idea is that it was perfectly proper for the Government to make low-cost loans to start REA co-ops. But, after they're started and have built up equity, they should go out in the money market and pay the going rate of interest, the same as any other business. Farm credit followed that path. And, they've been successful. In fact, as Secretary Benson points out: The farmer members and their cooperative service organizations now borrow nearly $3.5 billion annually from their own farm credit institutions. That's almost as much every year as the whole 24-year total of REA loans.

Of course, the proposed REA Bank would gradually cut down on the supply of money which rural electric co-ops are now able to get from the Government at 2 percent interest. That rate has been continued even though the Government is now forced to pay a much bigger rate to get the money which it loans.

But, the records show that many rural electric co-ops can now well afford to pay the going rate for money. One indication is the fact that the net worth of REA electric borrowers has more than doubled in the past 6 years.

Of course it would block one avenue to easy money which many rural electric co-ops are now enjoying. That's the practice of continuing to borrow Government money for 2 percent and then accumulating surpluses to invest in other securities which pay a much higher rate of interest. Rural electric co-ops already have millions invested this way. Who wants to quit when you have a good thing going for you?

But, the fact remains that the REA program has accomplished great good. Almost all the farms in America are now electrified. The big future need will be for loans to meet increasing load demands. Half the power sales of REA borrowers is now to nonfarm consumers. New nonfarm consumers now outnumber farm consumers 3 to 1. These facts make it even more difficult to justify complete dependence upon cheap Government loans as aid to farmers who can't afford to pay the cost.

The Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration are about the same age. Both have been in existence about a quarter of a century. During that period the Farm Credit Administration has almost completely removed itself from dependence upon Government financing. There is plenty of evidence that REA is well able to make a start in the same direction.

Secretary Benson says it well when he declares: "I consider it politically, economically and morally wrong for successful organizations like REA borrowers, with sizable reserves and increasing revenues, to keep dipping into the Federal Treasury at the taxpayers' expense to the tune of millions of dollars per year for interest payments alone." If we believe in honesty and integrity in government, we can't quarrel with this position, can we?

Poison in Your Water—No. 146

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of May 31, 1959, entitled "The War on Pollution."

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, May 31, 1959]

THE WAR ON POLLUTION

There are 18 miles of bathing beaches in the New York City area. And Robert Moses says that pollution has created a dangerous situation for bathers on most of them. The Moses warning has prodded the city's commissioner of public works to call for a doubling of the sewer rental charge to raise funds to fight the pollution menace. Mayor Wagner has already established a Committee on the Elimination of Sources of Marginal Pollution.

The New York City area has plenty of company when it comes to water pollution—and the problem is one of serious concern to the U.S. Public Health Service. Indeed, the Federal Government says there are 22,000 major sources of water pollution in the Nation, one-half of which are municipal sewer outlets, and one-half from private waste outlets. Streams and rivers are already so widely polluted, says this service, that they simply can no longer take the load of pollution we are putting on them.

Rear Adm. Carl F. Espe, commandant of the First Naval District, raised the question of water pollution by cities last year when

the Navy was criticized for contributing to the situation. "Don't most cities dump their sewage into the ocean?" he asked. Unfortunately, many of them do, and that includes Boston which daily releases thousands of gallons of raw sewage into the ocean from its pumping station at Columbus Point.

New York's beaches, familiar to millions, are priceless assets for health and recreational purposes. Moses has long been interested in cleaning them up, and those who enjoy the beaches are all for that. But, meanwhile, Boston, and the rest of the country, must tackle the problem boldly and soon. The fight against pollution is a nationwide one.

Nix on Dixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following four fine letters which have been written to the Washington Post and Times Herald by readers commenting on a vituperative column by "humorist" George Dixon—a column which launched a bitter, apparently personal attack against my colleague, the distinguished and widely respected senior Senator from Oregon, WAYNE MORSE:

[July 28, 1959]

MR. MORSE'S LIBERALISM

I like to write letters to the Washington Post about issues, not about columnists, but George Dixon's incredible attack on WAYNE MORSE ought not go unanswered.

Maybe someone should recall for Mr. Dixon a scene in the Senate last summer: It was around 4 a.m., Sunday, August 24. For days a small band of Senators, sparked by WAYNE MORSE, had been waging a lonesome battle to stop the passage of a whole raft of anti-Supreme Court bills.

The uphill fight appeared to be won until a majority of the Senate conferees caved in and accepted a bill to reverse the Supreme Court's Mallory decision (the Mallory decision prevents the use in evidence of confessions obtained while Federal officers are unlawfully delaying arraignments).

One Senator, bone tired after a full session of Congress and a week's battle fighting off the attacks on the Supreme Court, longed to be home like most everyone else. But there was one more job to be done early that Sunday morning and that was to hold the line in defense of the Court and the Mallory principle. His desk was piled high with law books and periodicals and draft speeches and he was prepared to risk his health to see that the Mallory principle should not be lost forever.

That Senator, of course, was WAYNE MORSE. No columnist should be permitted to call that kind of devotion to liberalism a "pose" or a "gimmick" without having the whistle blown on him.

Mr. Dixon owes WAYNE MORSE an apology; whether he is man enough to give it remains to be seen.

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.

WASHINGTON.

[July 28, 1959]

After many years of observing and participating in the political scene, I think I've become rather thickskinned about the verbal and written give-and-take that has become the American custom. George Dixon practices the art of plain talk with usually commendable and refreshing down-to-earthness.

But his recent column about WAYNE MORSE is completely inexcusable. It violates every standard of kindness, fairness and just plain good taste that should guide anybody—not excluding political writers.

Dixon writes that "most true liberals are embarrassed to be seen talking to Morse." I'm not quite sure what a true liberal is these days, but I want to assure Dixon that I'm quite proud to be seen talking to WAYNE MORSE. We don't always agree when we talk, but it is always a stimulating and satisfying talk.

HYMAN H. BOOKBINDER,
Legislative Representative, AFL–CIO.

WASHINGTON.

[July 25, 1959]

MR. DIXON'S DIG

Having often found George Dixon's column highly amusing, I was more than shocked to read the anything-but-amusing attack on Senator WAYNE MORSE in Mr. Dixon's column of July 20. This was as intemperate and unwarranted an attack as one may ever find in a responsible newspaper. Mr. Dixon must have written it in an unrestrained heat of anger.

We who live in a democracy are often distressed by comments of responsible citizens to the effect that they would never engage in political activity and would not even think of seeking to be elected to public office. If there are readers of Mr. Dixon's column who have any leanings whatsoever in this direction, the attack on Senator MORSE would certainly discourage them completely.

Everyone in public life should properly be exposed to thorough scrutiny and should expect criticism. However, the bounds of propriety were certainly exceeded by Mr. Dixon and this kind of attack truly undermines the dignity and stature of all Senators.

As far as Senator MORSE is concerned, his record on behalf of constructive public issues needs no defense. He has certainly been a nonconformist and he has often expressed different views from those with whom he is usually in agreement. He is truly an individualist.

As one who has known Senator MORSE well for many years, I would not try to predict his position on each specific issue but I am convinced that on all principal issues he determines his stand on the basis of principles. He is an outstanding liberal and his contribution to forward-looking and constructive legislation ever since he first appeared on the Washington scene has been truly outstanding. His policies and his determined and documented fight for sound legislation warrant our indignation over such a personal attack.

History will credit Senator MORSE for a great many outstanding achievements, whereas Mr. Dixon's column will soon be forgotten. Nonetheless, those who know Senator MORSE's record cannot allow such a column to go unanswered.

ROBERT R. NATHAN.

WASHINGTON.

[July 25, 1959]

"Fools rush in," it is said, but George Dixon has overstepped the jester's license in his vindictive and abusive attacks on Senators PROXMIRE and MORSE. When he steps into serious political affairs, he is over his depth.

The good Senators can answer for themselves. Their records in public service are their best defense. In the finest tradition of American politics, they have not hesitated to raise their voices for what they thought was right, even when they were in the lonely minority. So did George Norris and Robert LaFollette, who are now remembered with honor long after those who abused and ridiculed them are forgotten.

Senator MORSE's long battle for the public interest in Hells Canyon will be remembered along with Norris' fight for TVA. So will his many battles on behalf of civil liberties and due process, in which he has demonstrated a devotion to constitutional rights and a skill as a constitutional lawyer which—though they may escape Mr. Dixon's notice or understanding—are rarely matched in the Senate.

No one grudges Mr. Dixon his right to quiver with indignation at anyone who criticizes Senator JOHNSON, but let him then answer the criticism on its merits and not by personal abuse.

REGINALD H. ZALLES.

BETHESDA.

Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of the housing bill has, among other things, dealt a most serious blow to the strenuous efforts our institutions of higher learning are making to keep our country strong in the educational field.

I should like to place into the RECORD a letter I received from Clanton W. Williams, president of the University of Houston, who is not only a close friend, but is also one of the Nation's most respected educators. President Williams has intimate knowledge of the serious situation facing our colleges and universities, and he expresses in no uncertain terms the need for providing adequate loan funds so that our colleges and universities can provide the classrooms and laboratories and the educational plant which our national security demands.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON,
Houston, Tex., July 20, 1959.

Congressman ALBERT RAINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RAINS: In your consideration of housing legislation I most earnestly urge that this line of thought be emphasized:

1. Colleges and universities, especially the non-tax-supported institutions, are striving now against odds to meet a tremendous social, economic, and defense responsibility.

2. If we are to double our enrollments, we must double our capacity.

3. "Capacity" is twofold:

(a) An adequately paid faculty—not one which is subsidizing the education of our youth through abnegation.

(b) Plant facilities.

4. "Plant facilities" involves simultaneously housing and teaching facilities; one without the other will not get the job done.

5. We are not asking for handouts here, but we do have a responsibility to America to ask that we not be told that hard-pressed schools must pay high interest to those who are able to lend. The very least that Uncle Sam can now do is to make available to us at cost to the Government moneys which in turn we will immediately inject into the GNP while moving otherwise to strengthen every facet of American life.

Most sincerely yours,

CLANTON W. WILLIAMS,
President.

Banks, Interest Rates, the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, in 1929 a depression that lasted 12 years started in this country. It affected the life and well-being of every American citizen. Whether bankers, stock manipulators or others would admit it or not, Federal Reserve Bank operations and the contraction of credit had much to do with the cause of that depression. These banks were free; they were independent of government control—yet 4 years after the start of the depression, many of them lay prostrate, victims of the depression for which their own policies were to a great extent responsible. A bank holiday was declared and although they were free of government control, they were not opposed to accepting government help in order to continue in business. Congress hurriedly passed special laws to aid the banks. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was organized in order to create confidence in the public in our banking institution and in order to protect depositors' money in the future. Many banks, even with this help, were forced out of business or operated under receivorships for a long period of time. In many cases depositors lost money.

The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank today is pursuing the same policies, with some variation, that led up to the 1929 depression. In the June 15 issue of U.S. News & World Report, Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board, told the world that he was going to tighten the supply of money and make everyone, the U.S. Government included, compete on the money market for an insufficient supply of money. He is going to let the interst rate go up and up and up, and if as he says, this means unemployment—another word for depression—he will accept the unemployment. If it means business failures or as stated failure to the least economic businessmen, that is a result he will accept. This is another way of stating that if the small businessmen of the nation are forced into bankruptcy, that is a result he will accept. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank and its Board are not responsible to the will of Congress, and Congress, without the passage of legislation amending the Federal Reserve Act cannot impose its will on the policies of the Federal Reserve Board. The Bank is jealous of its independence of Congress and has made this crystal clear in many ways.

The President of the United States appears to be in favor of the policies of Chairman Martin and the directors of the Federal Reserve bank and has joined the Federal Reserve bank in asking that the interest rate on long-term bonds be increased. The existing increase is already costing the taxpayers in added interest, $6 billion a year. This amount will, in all probability, be doubled if the interest rate is removed from the Federal long-term debt. Do you want this to happen? Do we represent them and are we thinking of the people back home, or do we represent those who would give in to the demands of the Federal Reserve bank?

Is it inflationary to increase the interest rate on the public debt? I believe it is the most inflationary thing that this country could do. It will carry along a corresponding interest increase on the private debt. The private interest increase is already $13 billion, meaning that on the public and private debt $19 billion additional dollars annually is being paid, over what was paid before the interest rise commenced.

Are we, as Members of Congress, going to represent the interests of the people back home or are we going to represent the interests of the bankers and moneylenders in voting for an interest increase?

Health and Hospitalization Program for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the health and hospitalization program for Federal employees now under consideration by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is particularly significant to the people of my State of Alaska. I commend S. 2162, the so-called Neuberger bill, which recently passed the Senate by an overwhelming majority, and its House counterparts introduced by members of this body.

The fact that S. 2162 and related bills have the support of the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the insurance industry, Blue Cross and Blue Shield, group practice plans, and the various Federal employee unions certainly speaks for the quality of the bill. In fact, it might be said that this bill is well worth the many years it has taken to produce it.

As I view the bill, it is a most significant piece of legislation. If enacted, Federal employees would at long last achieve the status already enjoyed by about 100 million employees of private industry who are now covered by various prepaid health insurance plans. In short, it will mean that about 2½ million American citizens, plus members of their families, will be able to have low cost effective medical insurance.

Alaska, because of its former territorial status, has long had more than the usual proportional number of Federal employees, most of whom will remain in the expanding Federal programs to be carried on in our rapidly growing new State. These people have been good for Alaska. They helped it grow in stature to the point that statehood became a reality. I am particularly glad that these fine Alaskans and their families—be they employees of the executive, judicial, or legislative branches—would be afforded the opportunity of partaking in any one of the three low-cost plans which this legislation provides.

Cardinal Cushing's Statement on Lord's Day Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a thought-provoking statement by His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, which appeared in the Pilot, Boston, Mass., on January 17, 1959:

BUSINESS UNUSUAL: CARDINAL'S STATEMENT ON LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE

(By Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston)

In recent months we have become aware of a concerted effort to create the impression that business as usual on Sunday should be a permanent policy in our social life. I need not remind you that such a policy is contrary to the spirit of the church's legislation for the sanctity of the Lord's Day. It would also have a harmful effect upon a longstanding custom, which has provided for the great majority, a day of wholesome relaxation and respite from the ordinary burdens of their lives. Sunday has been traditionally a day of rest, as well as a day of religious observance. If it becomes just another civil holiday, it will lose not only its religious character, so essential for the sustaining of our spiritual life, but also the sacred associations within which we have safeguarded our bodily strength against the exhausting demands of continued labor.

We have little hope of our being able to keep Sunday sacred by legislative measures. Existing laws requiring the observance of Sunday have fallen more and more into disuse and are often disdainfully referred to as blue laws. What is really needed to reverse the tendency to profane the Lord's Day is not legislation but rather a change in the attitude of those who believe in what the Lord's Day represents.

It is on this front that we must attack the problem. For this reason I am appealing to our Catholic people to bring their thinking about Sunday into closer conformity with their religious beliefs. I fear that many of us may have to make considerable effort in this direction. For large numbers the observance of Sunday has been limited to finding the nearest church in which mass may be heard in the shortest possible period of time. More of us than we like to admit are not averse to missing mass for the slightest reason, or for no reason at all.

Let us think of Sunday not merely as a day on which we must hear Mass, but as a day which we must keep sacred in it entirety to honor the Lord. Let us not think of Sunday as destined primarily for our own enjoyment and only incidentally for the worship of God.

We are not advocating a return to the former practice of forbidding on Sunday every form of nonreligious activity, even those which would be thoroughly compatible

with our religious duties; I am urging merely that we all work together to curb the growing tendency to profane Sunday by unnecessary commercial activity. Let us buy on Sunday only what we actually need; let us confine all other purchases to the remainder of the week. If we all follow this simple rule, we shall have gone a long way toward restoring Sunday to its rightful function as a humanizing and sanctifying influence in our lives. There will be no business as usual on Sunday if there are none who are willing to do business on Sunday.

This is the best answer to the problem. Let us all adopt it, in conscientious deference to the precepts of our blessed Lord and of His holy church. Sunday is the Lord's Day.

Red China Prospers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extremely interesting editorial comment in the Capitol Journal, Salem, Oreg., by Mr. George Putnam, the outstanding dean of Oregon editors, on the situation prevailing in Red China:

RED CHINA PROSPERS?

The official Peiping radio has announced that 37 major cities in China would begin growing their own food to overcome food shortage, which seems to conflict with their previous claims of phenomenal increases of food supply as the result of the success of the communes system which enslaved all peasants and their families and completely destroyed the ancient Chinese way of life.

The decision to make city residents into farmers was reached at a Communist Party conference held June 17–23 in Shanghai, presided over by Deputy Premier Li Hsiennien, attended by 165 leading party officials, representing the cities involved. Li is the leading economic expert of the Red regime.

The conference decided that urban centers in China would henceforth begin "a fundamental and long-range policy of raising food for their own consumption." The program has been made possible by the cities' recent annexations of huge sections of surrounding countryside.

The Peiping radio did not go into details, but said the program "encourages peoples' communes on the outskirts of cities, government organizations, army units, schools, and ordinary city dwellers to engage in such production." According to reports, many of the business leaders long since were sent to labor in the communes.

At the Shanghai conference, the urban food growing plan followed recent reports of food shortages in China, attributed to floods and other natural catastrophes as well as increased food demands by peoples' communes.

The implication is that the communes either could not or would not sacrifice production for the millions in the cities. It indicated that either food shortage and production demands made on the communes system had brought them near the breaking point or that Red leaders had recognized that communes could not carry the burden of the heavy industrial program without new sources of food production.

Establishment of the communes created bottlenecks in distribution that demoralized business in the cities, but the Chinese people are getting what they seemingly wanted and if anarchy follows terrorism, they can only blame themselves.

To paraphrase Bret Harte,, "For ways that are dark, and for tricks that are vain, the Marxian Chinese is peculiar."

Migrant Farmworkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently many Members of Congress received correspondence concerning migrant farmworkers.

For many years I have followed this phase of our national economy, both as an observer and as a Member of the legislative body, whose duty it was to try to pass corrective legislation.

This matter has more or less been left to the various States with the result that the National Consumers League, in calling for the passage of minimum Federal labor standards, makes the following statement:

These proposed labor standards are moderate to the point of being inadequate. They nevertheless represent an attempt to cope with the problem of the tremendous poverty and exploitation which is now the lot of American farmworkers. Therefore, these standards deserve support.

As you undoubtedly know, workers on corporate farms—and especially the migrant workers—are the most depressed and poverty stricken group in our society. Wages for them go below 40 cents an hour, child labor is common, employment is at best sporadic. A first step to help them, such as these meager standards, is therefore necessary.

Even so, we find the same profit hungry groups that are determined to undermine the overall labor standards of American workers again lining up to destroy even these low plateau standards suggested by Secretary of Labor Mitchell.

It is hardly conceivable that in this year of our Lord, 1959, we can visit agricultural areas where migrant workers live under conditions and in circumstances that would put some of our pre-Civil War slave quarters in the luxury class.

Hunger and need are no strangers in America, in spite of our high standards and high cost economy. There are still many of our people living on low and sub standards in housing, medical care, clothing and education.

The one remaining block that can be localized as a unit is the group labeled, "Migrant Farm Workers".

This move by the Secretary deserves the support of every decent and humane citizen and especially those of us entrusted with the legislative power and authority to protect the health and well-begin of our entire citizenry.

The New York Times in covering the fatal crash in Arizona lately had this to say:

The highway smashup in Arizona that took the lives of 16 migratory farmworkers from Mexico and injured 32 others, some crtically, seems an unmitigated tragedy. But perhaps it will shock the public into realization of the desperate need of better protection for migrant farmhands, foreign and native, not only in their transportation but in their living and working conditions.

The bus in which the Mexicans were riding was a medium-sized truck, with canvas sides and no windows, and its only exit, in the rear, was blocked by baggage and a water barrel. Those killed were asleep on the floor or trapped near the front of the bus. The driver had dozed off at the wheel. Evidently the most obvious requirements of safety, both as to the vehicle itself and its operation, were flouted.

Migrant farm labor is subject to three classes of regulations: by treaty, as in the Migrant Labor Agreement with Mexico embodied in U.S. Public Law 78; by Federal laws and orders of executive agencies, and by State laws and departmental rulings. Public Law 78, applying to Mexicans, and orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which apply generally, contain detailed minimum safety and health requirements for vehicles transporting migrant workers. Only a handful of States have such regulations, however, even though State authorities have been urged to incorporate ICC standards in intrastate transportation.

The Arizona catastrophe should spur an immediate checkup on the enforcement of these controls and stimulate their enactment by States that don't have them now. It should also encourage adoption of Secretary Mitchell's proposed revisions in the Labor Department regulations on recruitment and placement of farm workers through the Public Employment offices, designed to give these workers more adequate protection.

How many times have we passed these canvas-covered trucks—loaded with their human cargo with about as much dignity and comfort accorded to hogs on the way to the slaughterhouse.

Of course, the Secretary can do something about it if Congress and the administration want to clamp down, particularly on farms receiving farm program benefits.

I am sure that if the American people were privileged to vote on this question, the following inadequate and yet basic standards, would be adopted by an overwhelming vote:

Employers of farm labor would have to meet the following standards before being able to use the services of the U.S. Employment Service to recruit out-of-State workers.

First. Recruitment: Employers must make a reasonable effort to secure local workers before asking the U.S. Employment Service to supply workers from outside the State.

This standard would accomplish two purposes: (1) Prevent use of out-of-State workers to depress wages in any locality; (2) relieve local unemployment of farmworkers.

Second. Housing: Housing provided by employers for workers recruited through the U.S. Employment Service must meet certain standards: (a) For families—housing must conform to standards developed by the President's Committee on Migratory Labor; (b)

for single males—housing must be as good as that required for single males under the international treaty between United States and Mexico for importation of Mexican workers; (c) in States having and enforcing housing standards comparable to (a) and (b) above, proof of compliance with State standards would be acceptable.

Third. Transportation: The employer must provide transportation not less favorable than that generally provided by other employers who have successfully recruited out-of-State workers.

Fourth. Wages: Wage rates offered should not be less than the prevailing wage rate paid in the area to domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

Sunday Change Shocks God Fearing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article on the need for Sunday observance by His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, which appeared in the Pilot, Boston, Mass., on June 27, 1959:

SUNDAY CHANGE SHOCKS GOD FEARING

(By Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston)

Some weeks ago I issued a statement on the need of a careful reappraisal of the point of view on Sunday observance which is imposed upon us by the law of God, and which has been confirmed by the existing laws of the Catholic church. The recent court decision in which State laws regulating commercial activities on Sunday have been declared unconstitutional brings this matter once more to our attention and indicates its seriousness in relation to the functioning of the church in the direction of our daily lives toward God.

I think we have all been shocked to learn that, in the minds of many modern statesmen and jurists, Sunday has lost its religious significance and has thus lost the right to protection from profanation which has up to now been afforded to it by the law. In our American tradition, Sunday has been a day of prayer and rest. In its origins, as the history of jurisprudence reveals them, the observance of Sunday has been inseparably associated with the worship of God. Sunday has not been a civic holiday. The laws whose validity is being questioned today reflect the belief of those who formulated them in a personal God and their acceptance of the age-old tradition that one day in seven should be set aside as the Lord's Day.

It is extremely disturbing, therefore, to be confronted with this new trend of thought, according to which Sunday is to become legally recognized only as a day on which people may, if they choose, seek respite from their ordinary labors, and on which they may engage in whatever activities may be pleasurable and profitable to themselves. I am not concerned directly with the purely legal aspects of the problem, which I leave to those who have professional competence. I am, however, seriously alarmed about the attitude toward Sunday which is generally prevalent today and which I am convinced is reflected in the decision of the court to which reference has been made.

I cannot conceive of any court in this Nation presenting, even 50 years ago, a decision such as the one which has become a subject of controversy. Fifty years ago the great majority of our people thought of Sunday as a day on which a visit to the church was in order, and cessation of the ordinary activities of the business world was a necessary condition for the proper fulfillment of religious duties. Even those who did not attend church were influenced by the predominantly religious observance of Sunday, and they seized the opportunity which Sunday afforded to gain greatly needed rest from their customary occupations.

A change of drastic proportions has come over our thinking, and has worked itself into our way of life. Only thus can we explain the readiness of the courts to promulgate a decision so completely at variance with the traditions of the past and so inconsistent with the purposes of the Sunday observance as they have been implied in our previous legislation.

I wonder if the majority of our people are prepared to accept the new definition of Sunday as it is proposed to them in a court decision which questions the constitutionality of our existing laws regulating the observance of Sunday? Do we want Sunday to become the kind of day that it is in Soviet Russia, where days of rest are appointed by governmental decree and religious activities are officially excluded from all programs of social planning?

It is in this direction that we are heading once we disassociate Sunday from the remnant of religious significance which it still retains among ourselves. Once we allow business as usual on Sunday, it is but a short step to the complete secularization of the day that was once known as the Lord's Day. When this point has been reached, and Sunday has become but another day of the week on which work of any kind may be done, it will become easy to argue that religion itself has become obsolete, and that the religious activities which have become so closely associated with the sanctification of Sunday should be abandoned in favor of the amusements and secularistic diversions to which Sunday is now, in point of fact, so largely devoted.

Let us react strongly to the danger before it is too late. The courts will not take Sunday away from us unless we ourselves make it possible for them to do so. We must prove that it is the wish of the great majority that the observance of Sunday, as it has become traditional in our community, be retained, and safeguarded from attack by those who would destroy religion in the name of democracy. To do this it is imperative that we bring our actual observance of Sunday back into conformity with the thinking from which our existing legislation has proceeded.

Let us not speak contemptuously of the blue laws which prohibit on Sundays many forms of activity which are inconsistent with the truly religious observance of the day which our forebears, in the spirit of faith, dedicated to God. Let us restore Sunday to its proper status as a day of prayer and rest. Let us ourselves eliminate from Sunday the unrestrained commercialism which the courts, in deference to what they interpret to be our own wishes, are attempting to legalize.

Let me remind our Catholic people that there are laws of the church relating to the sanctification of Sunday which they are bound to observe. It is not enough simply to attend Mass on Sunday. The church commands us also to avoid unnecessary servile work; and God Himself has formulated the general principles from which the church's legislation proceeds. For Catholics, Sunday is neither a day for business as usual, nor a civic holiday, to be given over in its entirety to recreation and amusement. Sunday is the Lord's Day. Only by keeping the day sacred to God can we assure for future generations the benefits which have been gained in the past through the association of prayer and rest.

Dick and Pat Nixon Are Doing All Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Vice President RICHARD NIXON and his attractive wife, Pat, are envoys extraordinary of peace. DICK and Pat have been doing an exceptionally good job on their visit to the Soviet Union. The American people are 100 percent behind them as they search for common grounds of understanding to improve American-Soviet, and Soviet-American relations.

An editorial which appeared in the Evening Star for Monday, July 27, 1959, does a fine job of summing up the Vice President's progress so far on this difficult assignment. We are proud of the fine job Pat and DICK NIXON are doing. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial for my colleagues in Congress and for the American people.

DOING ALL RIGHT

It may be that between now and next Sunday, when he will leave the Soviet Union for a 2-day visit to Poland, Vice President NIXON will stub his toe in one way or another, but the possibility seems remote. At any rate, judging from the reports thus far, he has been carrying out his difficult mission with a fine mixture of personal grace, dignity, articulateness, and good-humored informality of a sort that has elicited spontaneous and hearty applause from the Russian man in the street.

In fact, despite their somewhat sharp remarks to each other at the opening of the American exhibition in Moscow, Nikita Khrushchev himself appears to have been very favorably impressed by Mr. NIXON, and he has gone out of his way—at his dacha and elsewhere—to play the role of a good and friendly host. Of course, in terms of easing international tension and improving relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R., this may mean much or little; it all depends on whether anything worthwhile results from the Premier's and Vice President's private talks on such questions as Berlin and a possible summit conference.

As to that, only time will tell. Meanwhile, Mr. NIXON—together with his wife, who has been playing an admirable role at a different level—has a full week ahead of him in the Soviet Union. Thereafter, on invitation from the Polish President, he will go to Warsaw. This is a surprise addition to his itinerary, and it may have more than a little significance in relation to Moscow's indignant complaints about our dubious and poorly timed Captive Nations Week. After all, Poland is classified as such a nation, but we are giving it a considerable amount of aid as a Communist-ruled land that has won a measure of independence from the Kremlin.

Accordingly, since his projected Polish trip thus involves delicate diplomatic shadings, and since he faces several more days of visiting and talking in the U.S.S.R., Mr. NIXON

may yet run into some difficulties. But he has been doing all right up to now, and even better than all right, and the world has reason to hope that the net effect of his efforts will be an improvement in American-Soviet relations and some progress toward a decent peace. If he succeeds in that sense, our politicians here at home, in both parties, will have quite a figure to reckon with.

She Worked in Sweatshops To Win Oregon Wage Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor will soon turn to the question of the extension of the minimum-wage laws. This legislation is long overdue and badly needed. This morning there crossed my desk a copy of the Oregon Labor Press, one of the outstanding weekly newspapers of my State, and one of the finest of labor's publications. On the front page of the Labor Press for July 24 there appears an article by Mrs. Emsie Howard describing the life and work of Sister Miriam Theresa. Sister Miriam Theresa, before entering the religious life, was a leader in the struggle to enact Oregon's ground-breaking Wage and Hour Act. This legislation marked a turning point in the fight for the recognition of the principle that people cannot be treated like machines, to be worked until they wear out. The Oregon act itself was tested before the U.S. Supreme Court and figured in the basic decision of that Court which upheld the right of the States to legislate in this area.

As the Congress again begins to consider minimum-wage legislation, the stirring story of Miss Caroline J. Gleason, now Sister Miriam Theresa, is an informative and inspiring part of the historical background of this continuing fight. I ask unanimous consent that the Labor Press article be printed at the conclusion of these remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SHE WORKED IN SWEATSHOPS TO WIN OREGON WAGE LAW

(By Emsie Howard)

Forty-six years ago—in 1913—Oregon became the first State to enact an enforceable wage-hour law to protect women and minors who work for a living. Oregonians are proud of this distinction. But few of them know the erect and graceful woman who, more than any other individual, was responsible for it.

Her name then was Miss Caroline J. Gleason. Her name today is Sister Miriam Theresa. She is head of the department of social sciences at Marylhurst College, on the west bank of the Willamette River near Portland.

Sister Miriam Theresa's eyes are full of wisdom and kindness. And these eyes twinkle with merriment when she recalls some of the methods she used almost half a century ago to achieve her goals of social justice for women workers.

Looking back to 1912 she says, "I never, never dreamed that I would live to see a Federal minimum wage law!"

It was in 1912 that Miss Gleason directed a survey of the wages and working conditions of women working in Oregon stores, factories, canneries, and industrial plants.

To assure the accuracy of the survey, she herself went to work in some of the worst factories. This took courage. The work was hard and dirty—and many employees considered her an enemy and a spy.

Miss Gleason was appointed to make the survey by the Oregon Consumers' League, a group of citizens struggling to bring some kind of social justice to women who were being cruelly exploited in factories and stores. She herself was a member of the league's board of directors. When the challenge came to make the pioneering survey, she did not refuse.

The completed survey was so devastating, so accurate, so appalling that the 1913 session of the legislature passed Oregon's first wage-hour law.

The law established the Industrial Welfare Commission and made it unlawful to pay women wages lower than those needed to maintain decent standards of health. It gave the commission authority to set those standards and to set a maximum workweek for women.

The first weekly minimum was set by the commission at $8.25 for a 54-hour week—slightly less than 16 cents an hour.

Sister Miriam Theresa recalls that organized labor opposed the law, fearing that it would hamper the growth of unions.

The wage-hour bill was introduced on the opening day of the 1913 legislative session. Employers descended on the legislature to lobby vigorously against this outrageous, socialistic measure.

"It will drive industry from the State * * * It will reduce the wages of men * * * It will throw women out of work because, if they are forced to pay higher wages, employers won't hire so many women." These were some of their arguments.

Hot on their heels to lobby just as vigorously, but more effectively, came Caroline Gleason.

Employers were claiming that the conditions revealed in her survey "simply do not exist."

Miss Gleason quietly replied: "If you would like the names and addresses of the firms where these conditions prevail, I shall be glad to give them to you."

Silence. No one asked for the names.

Miss Gleason had the facts. She got them the hard way. She had worked in the plants.

Her first job during the survey was in a paper box factory in Portland. Sister Miriam Theresa remembers:

"Our job was to paste labels on the ends of shoe boxes. We sat at a long table with a huge glue pot in the center. A gas jet burned under a pot to heat the glue. The resulting odors were something less than pleasant.

"After two or three labels our hands were covered with glue and had to be washed. But there was no hot water. We carried 5-gallon pails to another part of the plant where live steam was pouring from a pipe. We held our pails under the pipe until the steam had heated the water.

"You must remember that this was piecework and all these preparations took time. In 3 days I earned $1.52."

During her lunch hour Miss Gleason wandered casually through the plant to observe the appallingly unsanitary conditions and fire hazards.

This was the way the survey was made. This was how Oregon's pioneering wage-hour law was born.

Caroline Gleason was well equipped to direct the survey. A graduate of the University of Minnesota, she came to Oregon in 1908 to teach Latin and English. But her compelling interest in social conditions took her to the University of Chicago in 1910 for graduate work in social studies. This interest had been stimulated earlier by social work in Philadelphia, Baltimore, New York, and other large industrial centers.

She speaks with sincere modesty of the survey. "Compared to the scientific methods employed in similar studies today, our survey seems a very small effort," she says. "But we had the facts."

The validity of her work was proved when an employer challenged the new law in the courts. (The employer was the owner of the paper box factory where Miss Gleason took her first industrial job.)

A brilliant young lawyer named Louis Brandeis came out from the East to volunteer his services in defense of the law. Brandeis used Caroline Gleason's survey as a basis of his defense before the State supreme court. He won. The court upheld the law.

Both Louis Brandeis and the Oregon wage-hour law went on up to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Court upheld the law's constitutionality. And Brandeis later became one of the great liberal Justices of the highest court in the land.

Another notable contribution made by Miss Gleason was a housing survey in Portland. Again the Oregon Consumers League called upon her to direct the survey. She trudged on foot many miles a day to inspect the living conditions of working people. The frightful conditions disclosed in her survey resulted in a new city ordinance based on the model tenement housing law of the Housing Association of New York.

Before this survey was completed, Miss Gleason became a Roman Catholic nun. "I knew from the time I was a girl that some day I would enter the church," she said. Her conviction that education of youth was one of the best means of achieving improved social conditions was decisive. In 1916 she entered the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, a teaching community.

Sister Mariam Theresa's interests are by no means limited to the classroom. Of unions she has this to say: "I certainly believe in the trade union philosophy. Without unions, the conditions of working people would be almost indescribable."

The complete background of Oregon's first minimum wage law will be available to students when Sister Mariam Theresa finishes the article she is now writing for the Oregon Historical Society.

It will be one of the proudest chapters in the history of our State.

Expensive Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal policies of the Republican administration are receiving increasing attention as debate on the requested increase in interest rates of Government bonds continues to receive daily attention in the newspapers, on the radio and television, and on the floor of Congress.

A report just issued by seven top American economists criticized the Government for falling short of its responsibility to guide the economic destiny of the United States. They concluded that "at the present time, the country has no adequate Federal policy to pro-

mote economic growth and stability and no meaningful anti-inflationary policy." Also the report stated:

It is a rudderless ship drifting on what is at the moment a rising tide of economic activity. Without a firm policy we will descend again in the future into a trough of economic stagnation and retrogression. We reject the notion that the government governs best which governs least.

The concern expressed by these economists is felt by every American. The following article describes how the administration's tight money policy affects the homeowner, the home buyer and the prospective new car buyer. I respectfully submit an article by Sidney Margolius in the July 20 issue of the Midland (Minn.) Cooperator at this point:

TIGHT MONEY IS HERE AGAIN—BORROWING BECOMES MORE COSTLY

(By Sidney Margolius)

Tight money is back, and you'll have to protect your family income accordingly.

"Tight money" means that there's a shortage of lending money and interest rates are rising.

But the effects of tight money are dangerous. It affects broad problems such as employment, and specific problems such as whether you can buy a new house this year or sell your old one, how much your monthly payments will be on a car you hope to buy, and what your taxes will be.

In a time of tight money, Federal, State, and local governments, boards of education and sewage and water districts all must pay a higher interest rate for the funds they borrow.

You pay that increased cost in your income and property taxes, and sales taxes. The most noticeable effect is to boost property taxes in the new communities that need to build schools to keep up with rising population.

But the most dangerous effect of tight money is on employment.

Remember the tight-money period of 1956, when the Federal Reserve Board boosted interest rates in an unsuccessful attempt to tame inflation? Then tight money forced many consumers to stop buying and businessmen to quit building. This was followed by the recession of 1957–58.

Both the administration and such large banks as First National City Bank of New York are plugging hard for higher interest rates. They want the Government to pay investors more interest on the large Government bonds they buy.

One obvious effect is to raise the Government's borrowing costs, and keep income taxes high. But increased interest rates also have a tendency to inflate all living costs.

In general, tight money benefits people who have surplus income to invest. But it forces a reduction in the living standards of people who generally need to borrow to finance the costlier equipment for living, such as houses, cars and appliances.

Here is how the new tight-money trend will affect you in the months ahead:

Home seekers are particularly affected. Mortgage interest rates are rising. Particularly, the rate on GI mortgages has been raised to 5¼ percent from 4¾ percent. This is the third increase in GI mortgages since 1953 when the rate was 4 percent.

On a 25-year mortgage, the new boost increases the payments $2.91 a month. Thus, on a $12,000 mortgage a homebuyer will pay back a total of $21,574 instead of $20,527 as under the 4¾ percent. If you take a 30-year mortgage your total repayment will be even greater.

In shopping for a mortgage, note that the new GI 5¼ percent rate is still better than the FHA rate of 5¼ percent plus one-half of 1 percent insurance premium. The FHA rate is better than a straight conventional mortgage at 5¾ percent, since you may get a small part of the one-half of 1 percent insurance premium when the mortgage is paid up. But the FHA 5¼ percent plus one-half of 1 percent rate is not as good as a conventional mortgage at 5½ percent, which still may be available to homebuyers in some areas except the Far West, Southwest, and South.

Homeowners are affected in a different way. Their present mortgages, at lower interest rates than now available, add value to their present homes.

Car buyers will feel an immediate effect from higher interest rates. The three leading independent finance companies have increased the interest rates they charge dealers to finance their inventories. Since credit costs are a major expense to an auto dealer, trade-in allowances and discounts will be shortened accordingly.

Borrowers in some cities where banks charge less than the usual 12 percent a year (1 percent a month) on personal loans, will find they have to pay higher rates this year. And while the banks will still make lots of loans, you can expect them to ask more questions about your income in comparison to your other debts, and why you want to borrow.

In general, it's best to avoid borrowing in a period of tight money except for critical needs. Credit unions will continue to hold their interest rates to present levels since they are controlled by their members.

From Here to Obscenity and the Evils on the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. RAINS. Every community in the country should be alerted to the traffic in obscenity which the Post Office Department says has doubled in the last 5 years. The youth of our land should be protected from this heinous practice and in order to protect them parents and teachers as well as postal officials must scrutinize advertisements and solicitations which the filth merchants peddle.

I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which outlines the Post Office Department campaign against this evil practice. This editorial appeared in the Gadsden (Ala.) Times on July 21, 1959.

The editorial follows:

[From the Gadsden (Ala.) Times, July 21, 1959]

FROM HERE TO OBSCENITY AND THE EVILS ON THE WAY

Anything for a buck, and it doesn't matter about the harm it may cause, or the degradation of the soul.

This is the attitude of filth merchants who peddle their obscenity by mail to the youth of the Nation.

While Gadsden and Etowah County may not have been struck by the racket as heavily as other areas, the heinous practice poses a threat which we should be prepared to stamp out.

Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield says good progress has been made toward solving the problem but action on a nationwide scale will be necessary for a long time to come.

Filth racketeers, in large part, aim their garbage at children, and the traffic in obscenity has doubled in the last 5 years, Summerfield says. If American parents do not take the initiative in their own communities the evil will grow.

What can parents do? Summerfield offers an eight-point program of action. Here it is:

1. Alert parents should be on the lookout for solicitations through the mail to purchase obscene literature and photographs.

The postal service must honor the privacy of first-class mail. Therefore, the post-office can only act after evidence of the mail has been put into its hands.

Parents are urged to do two things—save all the material, including the covering envelope—put it promptly into the hands of the local postmaster either personally or by mail.

2. Parents can join other parents, local law enforcement officers, and civic groups in drawing public attention to the menace * * * forming plans to combat it locally, and mobilizing community support for their representatives in Congress considering legislation to help Post Office Department stop the mail-order obscenity racket.

3. Parents can work closely with teachers to detect obscene materials in the possession of children and to determine the origin of such material.

4. Parents and teachers should make a special effort to impress upon the community the fact that even children who are never exposed to the obscene material may be victimized by sex criminals whose minds have been debauched by it.

5. Perhaps most importantly, parents can cooperate with the schools in taking positive, long-range steps to help their children develop wholesome interests in good literature and art.

6. Through civic organizations the attention of the great majority of adult citizens can be concentrated on the menace represented by the mail order traffic in obscenity.

7. Civic groups can bring about the establishment of a decent literature committee. Such a committee can carry out informational activities such as "Clean Literature Week," maintain a survey of the extent of the illegal traffic in obscenity in the community, and can support appropriate action by the Post Office Department and local law enforcement agencies.

8. Local judges, law enforcement officers, and representatives of the police force can be invited to talk before civic groups about the problem.

The ultimate aim of all concerned, the Post Office Department believes, should be the forging of an active continuing relationship by which the community can present a united front in its determination to stamp out the purveying of mail-order obscenity to children.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

Address by Hon. Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota, Before Annual Convention, District of Columbia Department, the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] recently addressed the annual convention of the District of Columbia Department of the American Legion. He presented so many important and thoughtful matters on that occasion that I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION WAY IS THE WAY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(Address by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, before annual convention of the District of Columbia Department of the American Legion)

Mr. Commander, my fellow Americans, it is always a pleasure and a challenge to address an American Legion convention. On several occasions, I have had the privilege of addressing our own South Dakota Legion convention and about 10 years ago I had the high honor of addressing the National American Legion convention in Los Angeles.

Consequently, when your invitation reached me, I simply could not resist the temptation to accept it.

A few months ago, a friend of mine was having dinner at the Metropolitan Club here in Washington. Before dinner, he joined some friends in a few cocktails; during the dinner, he drank a few glasses of wine; after dinner, he had a couple of glasses of champagne. As a result, when he left to go home, he was slightly under par. When he got into his car he headed it the wrong way down one of our Capital City's numerous one-way streets and before going very far a motorcycle policeman waved him over to the curb and asked him that well-rehearsed question used by traffic cops across the years, "Say, where do you think you're going anyhow?" My confused friend, rolled down his window and called back, "I haven't got the slightest idea in the world but wherever I'm going I must be awfully late—everybody else seems to be coming home."

It is because the American Legion never travels any wrong-way streets or espouses any off-color causes that I am especially happy to be your speaker tonight. Frequently, over the past 20 years, I have found myself allied with the Legion in sponsoring and supporting public causes. It has been a pleasure working with you in your great program of service to disabled veterans and to the widows and orphans of America's fighting men; I have joined the Legion in its consistent crusade to keep America strong and to develop and maintain our military posture; over the years I have been encouraged and gratified by the manner in which the American Legion has fought steadfastly against communism both at home and abroad. Even when opposing Communist subversion at home was scoffed at as witch-hunting, the Legion continued to press for action against communism in this country and against the units of fellow-travelers who attracted many naive but innocent dupes to their membership rolls.

Just about 24 hours ago, as a matter of fact, on the floor of the U.S. Senate, I was leading a legislative battle to support the American Legion position that the funds of our National Education Defense Act should be protected against perversion through making them available to Communists and their agents in this country. This was a senatorial contest, I am glad to report, which we won and your support played an important part in this victory.

Tonight, I desire to talk with you about some trends and conditions in our present-day American life which I am sure represent the type of activities in which the American Legion retains a prevailing interest and in the correction of which the Legion can play a predominant part.

Two of the greatest dangers confronting the American people today are complacency toward the threats of the Communist conspiracy, and moral decay resulting from abandonment of disregard of our great religious and historical heritages.

Complacency toward communism largely results from failure to understand what communism is and what it does to people. In these days of the cold war in which we are involved in the greatest ideological struggle of all time—when the lines between freedom and oppression are clearly drawn—too many of us are being lulled to sleep on the sweet notes of a false security. It is a false security based on the belief that simply because we are right we will achieve success in this cold war.

We need only remember the events of history—present and past—to know that the dangers confronting this Nation and the free world are no less today than they were after World War II when we first discovered that in Communist Russia we did not have a worthy ally but a most formidable adversary striking out at our way of life. They were striking out to destroy those liberties which were so hard won in the days of George Washington and fought for time and again by the dedicated men of America on far-flung battlefields.

Let us understand what communism is by looking to the record—a tragic record of oppression, deceit, and corruption—oppression of the human body, deceit of the human mind, and corruption of the human heart.

How can we reconcile communism with our way of life when we recall these tragic events:

Ruthless suppression in Hungary and East Germany evidenced to the fullest in riots of only a few years ago.

The rape of Tibet of only a few months ago when the Chinese Reds stormed this center of a religious culture which they want to destroy.

The insidious workings in the Middle East in the attempt to create turmoil and further stifle any opportunity to bring democracy and opportunity to those poverty-stricken peoples of the desert lands.

The attempts to infiltrate and destroy legitimate governments in South America, or, as in the case of Cuba, using the Castro revolution as a steppingstone for their own aims of seizing power and control in the Western Hemisphere.

And to bring it close to home, who can forget—but many apparently have—the agonies of the Korean war?

Communism may be a glittering display in New York City, or a friendly smile from a traveling diplomat—but communism is also the anguish of Heart Break Ridge, the torture of the prison cells and death marches of North Korea and Red China, and the timelessness of the most savage browbeating we have ever known, the depredations of the brainwashers of Chinese communism, another type of communism given an Oriental twist.

Only by understanding communism—and this can be done by comparing our system of government to the Red brand and what each does, either for or to its people—can we rid ourselves of the disease of complacency that eats away at our fortitude and determination to remain free.

Basically, the differences in communism and democracy lie in two little words: "for" and "to." In communism, the question of the hour is what it does to the people. In our way of life, it is what democracy does "for" its people and what the people do "for" democracy. You will note I have left no alternative for communism—that is, what the people can do "for" or "to" communism. That is because there is no alternative in communism, it is a one-way street of subjugation and therefore cannot place within the people the responsibility of individualism, self-assertion, and personal enterprise.

Who of communism will stand up in the open forum to compare the Red system against the democracy of this great Nation? What can they say about religious freedom? Where do the trade unions stand in their so-called workers paradise? And does communism foster education on the precept of developing it for the greatest good of the individual and mankind? What does home life mean to the Moscow family—does it mean breaking bread around the table in prayerful thanks for the Lord's blessings, or are children greeted with silence from their parents because they know not whether their offspring will turn them in to the Secret Police?

Communism and the society which it creates serves only one purpose—the materialistic, aggressive, selfish needs of the Kremlin masters who are intent only on personal power and glory. In communism we are witnessing a reincarnation of the monarchist system in its worst form, minus the royal trappings.

To understand communism is to understand what we are fighting for and to understand why each of us must dedicate ourselves to this fight. This, of course, does not mean we are to run to the nearest Army recruiting office, but it does mean that we must be fully aware of the aims of communism and the techniques employed to undermine the welfare of this Nation and her people.

The second danger which I mentioned lies in the question of what road, we, as a nation, will take, in relation to the moral standards of our people. Too often in recent days, I have heard the comment, as no doubt you have: What has happened to the people of

America—are we becoming a bunch of chiselers who have lost our respect for everything that is decent and good?

I am not sure that I can say what has happened, but I can say this, the evidence before us is not good. I need not relate the crime statistics, nor discuss the divorce rate. These things are before us constantly in our newspapers, on the radio and over our television.

What needs to be discussed, and to be worked out by our people, is how we can turn the tide against the materialistic and restore our thinking and our actions on a sound level of moral principle before it is too late.

If the abandonment of home and family life, the rejection of responsibility in being a creative, contributing member of a free society, the abuse or disregard of church life, the casting aside of patriotism, and the tendency to forget the sacrifices of those who fought to preserve our freedoms, is continued, we will forfeit those things which we are so desperately trying to defend in the face of a conspiracy that has engulfed half the world.

These are the two problems which I think should be of serious concern to every American—what we can do to end this complacency concerning the dangers of communism, and how we can foster a resurgence of morality in both our private and public activities.

I think the motto of the American Legion, "For God and Country," contains for each of us the essential elements needed to perpetuate and enhance the concept of freedom which has served as a foundation of this Republic.

However, this is something that must be practiced as well as preached.

I think there are four areas in which Americans can develop programs of positive action to overcome the difficulties confronting us. I do not pretend that these suggestions are all-inclusive, but I do offer them as constructive steps which can be helpful and serve as greater incentive for further efforts:

1. We must be alert to fight against those things which undermine America. For example, obscene literature has become a menace to all America because of the serious effect it has on our children. We can help stamp out this racket by cooperating with those officials who are striving to put an end to the operations of these people who obviously form a lower order of humanity. What kind of an individual is it that breaches all the codes of ethics and morality by sending pornographic literature into the American home? Obscenity strikes at the moral fiber of the Nation. This is the type of thing that concerns every father and mother, and the only way we can stop the purveyors of filth and trash is for the people of America to put a stop to it. Government can go only so far. The final action must come from the public, who by refusing to cooperate with the merchants of smut through rejection and through reporting receipt of this indecent material to authorities, can stamp out this one example of the type of thing that is having such a bad influence on our young people.

2. We must preserve and protect the constitutional rights of all our people. The American people have just as much right to protect themselves from the Communist conspiracy and from the racketering activities of thugs and hoodlums who have corrupted certain labor unions as do these people who cloak themselves in the priviliges of the Constitution. This can be done at Government level through legislative action designed to protect the liberty-loving free American while at the same time putting an end to the subversive and gangster activities of those who abuse the privileges of a free society. One such step is now before the Congress—the labor reform bill. Adoption of effective labor reform legislation can put an end to the corrupt activities of those who have wrested control of unions from the rank and file workers.

3. As individuals, we must make democracy work at all levels, both in and out of government. One of the best ways I know of to make democracy work is to understand it—what it means, how it can be preserved and why it must be preserved. The day has long since passed when we could say politics is something for the other fellow to worry about. Politics concerns each and every one of us, and the only way to ensure the type of government that we want to keep is for individual citizens to learn about government and participate in its activities. This means more than just getting out the vote. It means getting out an informed vote for one thing. Too often I have heard an expression of disgust at the mention of the word "politics." There wouldn't be such an expression if each citizen made it a point to be interested in politics. The best definition I can think of in reference to politics is an old one which has been repeated many times, and perhaps is a little trite—yet I think it is most applicable. "Politics is either good or bad depending on what the public wants."

4. In fighting the evil of communism, the greatest assistance we can give is to understand how it works and what it does. Here again, the key is becoming fully informed. With the knowledge of what communism is, and with the understanding of what democracy is, we arm ourselves with the political ammunition needed to bring communism to halt, to prevent it from encompassing the entire free world. With understanding of this problem, we are better equipped to lead the moral force and public support to those programs which are so necessary to the maintenance of a free society.

No other organization is better equipped of more aptly suited to the correction of conditions which weaker America and aid and abet atheistic communism than the American Legion.

I hope all of you read in a recent issue of the American Legion Monthly the challenging article by National Commander Preston Moore dealing with these very conditions and challenges. I believe his article was entitled "The Training We Need for This New Type of War," or something very similar to that title. Commander Moore presented us with an agenda of action which should appeal to every red-blooded American. Now, as always, freedom is everybody's fight, and I urge you to continue your great record of protecting and promoting those actions and those institutions which are vital to America. Unless we succeed here the hope for freedom will fade quickly everywhere.

Our Weak-Willed Conservatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the conservative voter today is asking: "What's the use? A conservative candidate today hasn't a ghost of a chance of being nominated, let alone elected. Both parties are dominated by liberals, and conservatives are afraid to speak out in the face of the liberal trend today. What's the use of voting?"

The kind of defeatism expressed in the above quote is made to order for minority groups. The only way a minority group can get into positions of political power is by default. COPE achieved success in the 1958 election by default—the conservative voters did not vote.

Conservatives are still in the majority in America. They can, if they decide to do so, elect to Congress men who believe in sound money and a balanced budget; men who are against inflation and a Socialist-labor government; men who are for States rights and local responsibility for education and municipal improvements.

We must not forget that only those who put up a fight, who defend what they consider to be the best interests of the country, can hope to stop the trend toward national socialism and national bankruptcy. That is the duty of the conservative citizen as well as the conservative officeholder. Defeatism has no place in today's battle for a sound dollar and a safe and sane government.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am including as a part of my remarks an editorial from the August 1, 1959, issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Conservative Candidates Can't Win by Aping the Liberals":

CONSERVATIVE CANDIDATES CAN'T WIN BY APING THE LIBERALS

(By John Chamberlain)

Conservatives in this country have been losing votes because they themselves have been building up a false image of the power of a few labor bosses.

According to the cliche which the conservatives have been so industriously circulating, labor is unbeatable at getting out the vote. Not only does it have its own money—collected by the AFL–CIO's Committee on Political Education, or COPE—but it also can claim credit for the welfare funds distributed by the Federal Government.

Because of the power of this cliche, Republicans as well as Democrats have fallen over backward to show a high score on the CIO's list of what constitutes a good voting record in Congress.

The cliche, however, is hardly in accord with the election-day facts which Mr. Rogers C. Dunn, of the Dunn Survey of Washington, D.C., has been busy collecting and reducing to a few telling graphs and generalizations. Recently Mr. Dunn went into the State of Delaware. What he discovered there was in accordance with what he had discovered in labor centers such as Pittsburgh and New York City: The power of the labor leader to roll up big majorities by superior footwork at the polls is largely illusory.

In his Delaware survey Mr. Dunn has collected election figures for the entire State, for the metropolis of Wilmington, and for the various counties, going back to 1936. His statistics on the fates of Republican candidates for Congressman—Delaware has only one Representative—and Senator are extremely suggestive.

A conservative Republican, J. Caleb Boggs, was elected Congressman in 1946, in 1948, and again in 1950. Later Boggs was elected Governor. Governor Boggs did all this without benefit of labor support. In 1947 he voted for the Taft-Hartly Act. In the 81st Congress Boggs scored 91 percent wrong on the CIO–PAC list.

In 1958 a liberal Republican, Harry Haskell, Jr., who had made a record in the House of Representatives that was 58 percent acceptable to labor's political committee, lost in his campaign for reelection. On the other hand, the conservative Republican, Senator

JOHN WILLIAMS, who had a CIO-PAC score that was 100 percent wrong, won his reelection by a majority of more than 10,000.

The Delaware facts, then, would seem to show that when Republicans run a "me too" candidate they lose because their potential supporters stay at home. The labor-Democratic vote, increasing slowly with the growth of population, is sufficient to gain the day any time the conservative forces lack a candidate whom conservatives approve.

The inference is that it isn't the labor bosses who have been doing the job. It is Republican failure to provide a fighting opposition. In Delaware, a representative State, the Republicans have done well whenever they have stuck to candidates who have a true Republican flavor.

Address by the Korean Ambassador to the Girls Nation of the American Legion Auxiliary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last evening it was my privilege to hear an address by Dr. You Chan Yang, Korean Ambassador to the United States. He spoke before the Girls Nation of the American Legion Auxiliary.

Dr. Yang is highly esteemed in this country. His address was an excellent one, and afterward I was very happy to be able to tell him so.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS GIVEN BY DR. YOU CHAN YANG, KOREAN AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE GIRLS NATION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY ON JULY 28, 1959, AT THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

Director Glynn, Miss President, Miss Vice President, and young ladies of Girls Nation, for the third consecutive year, you have pleased and honored my country and me by inviting me to be your guest and inaugural speaker. Again I am delighted to be able to congratulate, in person, your newly elected president and vice president and to congratulate each and every one of you for the splendid accomplishment of learning the democratic processes better.

I suspect that this year, as in previous years, I, too, shall learn from you. The last time I spoke at Girls Nation, I was struggling with the meanings of the teen-age vocabulary of 1958. Now will you help me "dig" the new 1959 vocabulary? I don't want to be accused of having "smog in the noggin" and I don't want to "bug you." Is this "kookie"?

But probably with your help even I could never understand another 1959 phenomenon—the rise of the "beatniks." Now it is one thing to be modern and sophisticated and quite another to practice fruitlessly the ritual of revolt, as do the beatniks. For them, there is no tomorrow. They do not see the shadow of the mushroom cloud and the threat of mass extinction. They disdain completely all of the institutions of civilized society in a neo-Bohemianism. They simply refuse to shoulder any of the normal responsibilities of human beings. I am sure that none of you will ever be beatniks; you are too concerned with the fate and future of America and the free world.

Just as I am disturbed, like all fathers in America, about the beatniks here, I am disturbed as a diplomat about those international beatniks, the Communist warlords. They, too, shun international responsibilities, scorn the institutions of marriage, home and the rearing of children, and behave in an undisciplined and barbaric way.

Also, because of its seeming unorthodoxy and its obvious peculiarities, the Communist, like the beatnik, frequently fascinates the naive. I am concerned about the Communist appeals to the young people of this country as well as in other parts of the world. I don't consider myself a "witchhunter," but a grave menace does exist, in my opinion, in the constant overtures made to American youth by the slick and sick international beatniks.

According to one American news weekly, going to Moscow this summer is quite the fad. Almost everyone, it seems, who is anyone in New York is going to Russia—fashion models, students, writers, businessmen, daughters of prosperous businessmen. The magazine estimates that around 15,000 to 20,000 Americans will be piercing the Iron Curtain. What a strange fashion of the times.

Some are actually lauding this latest travel development, saying that it portends a warming up of the cold war and a step forward in a people-to-people rapprochement between the Soviet Union and the United States. What nonsense. Those American tourists will be seeing only what the Communists wish them to see. The Russians they contact will be either plants or dupes of their Communist masters. The answers parroted by the Russian citizens to questions by the innocent American tourists will have been predigested by the Communist propaganda apparatus. Instead, the Americans will be waylaid with provocative and misleading questions. They will be embarrassed or ignored whenever possible. They will be drawn into one-sided arguments. You will remember that last week even your great Vice President NIXON was not accorded a proper reception when he landed in Moscow, that the average Russian did not even know he and his lovely wife were visitors, and that NIXON himself was baited—without the opportunity of explaining his position broadly to the entire Russian people via radio, television, press conferences, and the newspapers. This is in stark contrast to the hospitality and freedom of speech and movement accorded to Mr. Kozlov just several days previously here in the United States. The red carpet treatment obviously has a reverse meaning in the Soviet Union.

Now, as always, the Communists are preparing an alibi of sorts for their boorish behavior. Khrushchev has taken the occasion of Vice President NIXON's visit to blast the United States because of President Eisenhower's proclamation of Captive Nations Week on July 17. Khrushchev is angrily declaring that Senate resolution and Presidential proclamation is interference in the internal affairs of the Communist bloc.

Obviously, this is just a Communist trick to obfuscate the real intent of Vice President NIXON's visit—to open the American exposition and to search for a solution personally to the deadlocked Geneva talks. It is obvious that the Communists must have to throw some kind of smokescreen up to becloud the popularity already obvious at our exposition in Moscow and your Vice President's earnest honesty. If the Communists had not been able to use the "Captive Nations Week" theme, they would have found some other excuse for intransigence. For logic or reality does not matter to them; human feelings are beside the point; and the fate of whole nations is immaterial. Any excuse would have been used by the Communists for their irresponsible and vicious behavior.

What is, actually, the Captive Nations Resolution and Week? Democratic Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and Republican Senator JACOB JAVITS jointly sponsored a resolution in the Senate emphasizing a point in American foreign policy extant since 1945: That captive nations can look forward to a time of liberation from tyranny. The resolution quickly passed both the Senate and the House of Representatives here without debate and was quickly proclaimed by President Eisenhower.

Now I, as the representative of the Korean people, have been keenly interested in this vital message. After all, our people in the northern part of Korea are held captive by the Communists. Slim hope though the resolution is, it is hope nevertheless. Further, it is to us vital proof that we have not been forgotten. Together with organizations of refugees, from other nations absorbed by force within the Soviet orbit, the Government of the Republic of Korea enthusiastically welcomed and approved the resolution and proclamation. We reason that the American pledges of liberation have not been entirely forgotten. We are reassured that the several millions of our brothers, sisters, mothers, fathers, and friends in the northern part of Korea may look forward to their eventual release from the bloody tentacles of communism.

The Communists would like to have you, and all Americans, forget about Hungary, Tibet, and Korea. They would like to toss down George Orwell's "1984" "memory hole" the historical facts of their seizure of all of Eastern Europe since 1945. They are eager to have the world forget its moral obligations, if such were ever possible. Naturally, they are upset when Americans—whose forebears largely came from captive nations—are pointedly reminded of the true state of conditions under Communist rule.

Let me direct your attention to Korea, a good case in point. When the Communists seized control of the northern part of Korea in 1945, there were approximately 10 million of our people living there; 20 million Koreans were living in the southern part. By the time of the formation of the Republic of Korea, in 1948, several million people escaped from the north and sought freedom with us in the Republic of Korea. Several more million Koreans risked their lives, relinquished all their worldly goods, and left their hometowns to escape from their Communist masters by the time of the Korean war. During that war, and since, the Communists have ruthlessly carried out a deliberate policy of genocide—the systematic destruction of a whole people—just as they have done in Tibet. In the captive area of northern Korea there now remains only 3 million souls. These 3 million are our people, our families, our relatives. Every day those of us who live in freedom in the Republic of Korea are reminded sharply of the task yet before us. We cannot be indifferent to the fate of our brethren. We cannot be deaf to their piteous pleas for liberation. Nor can you. And that is why the Communists fear so greatly the momentous reminder of the Captive Nations Week.

The Communists fear also the signs of strength and growing stability in all contiguous free world areas. The Republic of Korea is a show-room of the free world in Asia. Under the wise and courageous leadership of President Syngman Rhee, we have reconstructed a devastated nation. Our economic achievements have been of historical moment—factories rebuilt, communications restored, transportation refurbished, and schools and homes springing up everywhere. And it has all been done without the com-

mune system, without collectivization, without commissars.

With our own hard work and dedication to freedom, and with the generous aid of the United States, we have performed an economic miracle. We have halted the ever-spiraling rate of inflation and we have stabilized the price index and money supply. The standard of living has risen steadily to new heights.

Meanwhile, the Communists promise paradise, but deliver a living hell. In the northern part of Korea, under the puppet Communist masters, only baroque monuments to Red heroes have been built, only airports for deadly attack have been constructed, and only peasant communes permitted to operate. No wonder my people in the north cry out daily for rescue. Small wonder that the Republic of Korea's Government and President Syngman Rhee sometimes may seem to you to be impatient in our demands for reunification of the peninsula.

Now the comfortable thing to do is just to close your eyes and ears. You can argue that the East-West struggle is pretty much of a draw. You can repeat the geopolitical slogan of "containment." You might even say, "Well, let the Communists live their way and we will live ours." Another comforting argument these days is: "Well, as time passes the Communists and our systems will gradually meld together into some kind of a socialist society anyway." You can pin your hopes upon a few straggling visitors, bemused and restricted to a tight little circle of Moscow, to generate somehow true understanding among the entire Russian people.

But such thinking and such action will not save the captive peoples and will certainly sentence you to their fate, too. Khrushchev told you bluntly: "We will bury you." While we, or at least our armchair theorists, seek excuses for Communist behavior and look for easy ways of agreement, the Communists simply say: "We will bury you."

Whether it is your wish or not, one side is going to win the other destroyed. The struggle is not of the making of the free world; the Communists have chosen the battle, determined to end it in their own perverse and final way.

The great historian Toynbee once warned: "Where the frontier between civilization stands still, time always works in the barbarians' favor." It is up to us to make sure that the frontier of the free world does not stand still. You can help tremendously by joining hands in the liberation of captive nations. You can help expose the blandishments of the Communists for the false hopes they are. You can stimulate public opinion in your own communities so that it isn't lulled into a slumber of false security with phrases like "containment," "coexistence," "building bridges of friendship with trade," etc.

You are the cream of the crop of this Nation's teen-age girls. You are bright, hardworking, dedicated young ladies. I salute you. I ask you to join the crusade of millions of youth everywhere, including those of the Republic of Korea, to crush the menace of the Communists, the international beatniks of 1959. Remember, they are no laughing matter. Their gang motto is: "We will bury you."

Let us live instead. Let us be strong and wise. Let us fight to win. Let us be frontiersmen, determined to push back the borders of darkness and anarchy. Let us build a better and stronger America and a freer world.

I thank you.

Belated Honor for a Medical Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, "Belated Honor for a Medical Hero, Dr. R. P. Ames," which appeared in the Dixie magazine section of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Sunday, July 26, 1959:

BELATED HONOR FOR A MEDICAL HERO

Burning with yellow fever, Dr. Roger Post Ames of New Orleans lay in the General Hospital outside Havana, Cuba. Suddenly his assistant rushed into the room.

"Doctor, one of the volunteers is very sick with the fever," gasped Pvt. Gust E. Lambert of the U.S. Army Hospital Corps. "Could you come see him?"

"That's the most absurd request I ever heard," the doctor's nurse said. "Dr. Ames is a very sick man. Private Lambert, leave the room at once."

As one would a mosquito, Dr. Ames waved the nurse away. "Lambert, get another man and carry me down there in my bed."

Following his superior's orders, Lambert and a companion carried the sick doctor three city blocks to the patient.

"The post surgeon," primly said the nurse later, "was not at all pleased."

But the doctor did pull the patient through and gradually he, too, recovered from the disease, contracted while treating yellow fever patients.

Wednesday in Washington, D.C., the physician's widow, Mrs. Jessie Daniel Ames of Washington, D.C., is scheduled to receive from Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson a gold medal commemorating her husband's selfless work.

Dr. Ames died in 1914. The posthumous presentation of the medal was made possible by the recently passed House bill 7544, sponsored by Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana. The bill includes Dr. Ames in the roll of honor of the men who conquered yellow fever.

The New Orleans physician went to Cuba after the end of the Spanish-American War with a team of physicians under Maj. Walter Reed. A graduate of Tulane medical school, he had served at Charity Hospital and was later visiting physician at Charity and Touro Infirmary. He had fought yellow fever in New Orleans. In Cuba this unassuming young man, who seemed embarrassed by his designation as a "yellow fever expert," was put in charge of an experimental camp, later named Camp Lazear, near Columbia Barracks outside Havana.

During the war Spanish bullets killed far fewer Americans than disease—290 against 2,565. Of all diseases, yellow fever was the most deadly.

Dr. Ames was in complete command from the time the experimental camp was established in July 1900 until it was disbanded March 1, 1901. To him is due much of the credit for the success of the experiment.

Years later, in 1929, Congress officially recognized the work done by Major Reed and his associates. A total of 22 persons was chosen for a roll of honor. Dr. Ames was not on the list. In 1956, Gust E. Lambert of Hazelcrest, Ill., "Ames' man Friday," was added to the roll. Lambert and the family of Dr. Ames worked for almost 30 years to have the doctor given the recognition other yellow fever workers had won.

At the beginning of the 20th century very little was known about yellow fever or how it was transmitted. Dr. Ames, however, was convinced it was not contagious and believed correctly it was transmitted by a mosquito. Says Brig. Gen. Albert E. Truby, a member of the medical group. "He was constantly playing practical jokes on members of our staff, jokes aimed at driving away any fear about the contagiousness of yellow fever."

When Dr. Ames arrived in Cuba men were still dying by the scores every day. Clerks burned sulfur candles on their desks as they worked.

When a man died of yellow fever, his home was often burned to the ground to destroy the presumably infected furniture, clothing, and other personal effects. As the deaths multiplied, this became a rather expensive proposition. And it didn't do any good.

To test whether the disease was contagious or was transmitted by a mosquito, two sets of volunteers were put in specially constructed buildings. One was the "Infected Clothing and Bedding Building." In this, volunteers slept on pillows and sheets soaked with blood and vomitus of yellow fever victims.

The other building was divided in two by a screen. On one side lived volunteers completely free of mosquitoes. On the other side, soldier John J. Moran exposed his body to the bites of 15 infected mosquitoes.

When none of the volunteers in the infected building or in the mosquito-free section of the second building developed yellow fever and when Moran promptly came down with the disease, the doctors knew for a fact yellow fever was not contagious, that it was transmitted by a mosquito. They proved this with many similar experiments.

Such was the soldiers' fear of the disease and its swift, ghastly death that the experiments probably would have been stopped if just a few volunteers had died. But not one of the nearly 70 volunteers succumbed.

In the course of his work, Dr. Jesse W. Lazear, of Baltimore, Md., acting assistant surgeon and third member of the yellow fever board, was hit by the disease. But he did not report his sickness until it was too late and died September 25, 1900, a martyr to medical science. The experimental camp was named for him.

Its problem solved after just 8 months' work, the board disbanded Camp Lazear. With precise knowledge the authorities were able to clear Havana of its old scourge in 3 months and to begin eliminating it from other parts of the world.

Failure of the Mandatory Farm Price Support and Production Control Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address delivered by Mr. Don Paarlberg,

of the White House staff, on the subject of agriculture.

I have been advised by the Public Printer that the address is estimated to make approximately 2¼ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $182.25. Notwithstanding this cost, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DON PAARLBERG ON THE OCCASION OF A BANQUET SPONSORED BY THE NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, AND THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FOOD CHAINS, ITHACA, N.Y., WEDNESDAY EVENING, APRIL 29, 1959

In this speech I intend to make three points:

1. The mandatory farm price support and production control program is a demonstrated failure.

2. This failure is to be attributed primarily to outmoded legislation, not administrative shortcomings.

3. The remedy lies in corrective legislation along lines recommended by President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson.

I

The failure of the mandatory farm price support program, after 25 years of trial, is now clear to anyone who is willing to examine the record.

I am not speaking of price supports at moderate levels such as are in use for soybeans and some other crops. Nor am I speaking of marketing agreements and orders as for milk and certain specialty crops. Nor am I referring to the purchase of surplus crops and their diversion to the school lunch program and to needy persons. Properly administered, all of these have proved helpful. Certainly I am not speaking of the worthwhile programs related to research, education, credit, and the conservation of our soil, water, and timber resources.

What I am speaking of is the mandatory system which requires price support for a few favored commodities at artificially high prices, and couples that support with a half-hearted and ineffective production control effort. This is the system which has failed. The failure has perhaps been most clear with respect to wheat, cotton, and corn, and less so with respect to other crops.

This program came into being during the disastrous days of the great depression, when drastic action was called for. The error lies in that a depression-oriented program was carried forward with relatively few changes first into a time of war, then into a time of postwar prosperity, and now into a time of technological revolution.

To charge the program with failure is a serious matter. I shall cite evidence in support of this judgment.

1. Farmers who grow the regulated crops have lost markets

Cotton has been the subject of more solicitude in the way of price support and acreage control than practically any other crop. What has been the result?

During the 5 years, 1925–28, before the program began, the United States produced 56 percent of the world's cotton. During the last 5 years, this percentage fell to 31. From 1925–29 to 1954–58, production in the United States fell 16 percent. In the countries outside the United States production more than doubled. Instead of exporting cotton we exported the right and the opportunity to produce it. And we gave encouragement to man-made fibers at home and abroad.

Wheat is another crop which has been the subject of much regulation and support. During this same span of years, the United States' share of world wheat production fell while surplus stocks accumulated.

Formerly the largest tobacco market in the world was at Wilson, N.C. Today it is in Northern Rhodesia, in Africa.

It is easy to demonstrate that for a given year, other things equal, a short crop of cotton or of wheat will bring a higher income than a large crop. This is the basic idea underlying production control. The important fact, however, and the fact often overlooked, is that other things do not remain equal. Other suppliers come forward and substitutes are offered. Thus, while we pursue our shortrun self-interest, in the long run we do ourselves grave injury.

While supported and controlled crops have steadily lost markets and fallen behind as income earners, that segment of agriculture which has avoided control has continued to expand and win new markets.

Livestock production is not controlled. Livestock producers not only were able to find markets for the natural growth of their industry, but managed as well to market the production from the acres taken out of wheat and cotton. From 1925–29 to 1954–58, per capita consumption of beef, pork and poultry combined rose 25 percent.

During a quarter century of support and control, the share of our farm income earned by cotton fell from 12 to 7 percent. Meantime, the share of farm income earned by uncontrolled hogs, cattle, poultry, and eggs increased from 34 to 39 percent.

2. Most of the dollars are spent in support the production of a few large producers of a few crops

The favored basic crops have been singled out from some 250 farm commodities for special treatment. Though these six crops bring in only a little over 20 percent of farm income, they account for 85 percent of the Federal inventory of price-supported commodities.

Contrary to popular opinion, most of agriculture is free of controls and most farm products are sold in competitive, unsupported markets.

Also contrary to popular opinion, the price-support program affects primarily the large rather than the small farmers.

Nearly a million and a half farms produce wheat. Ninety percent of the expenditures for price support on wheat result from production on about half of these farms—the largest ones.

Nearly a million farms produce cotton. Seventy-five percent of the expenditures for cotton price support result from production on about one-fourth of these farms—the largest ones.

For wheat, cotton, and rice producers who have allotments of 100 acres or more, the net budgetary expenditures per farm for the present fiscal year are approximately as follows:

	Per farm
Wheat	$7,000
Cotton	10,000
Rice	10,000

A frequently quoted rationale for the price-support and acreage-control program is that it is needed to make operations profitable for the small producers. But the large producers get many more Governemnt dollars than the small producers, giving them an added competitive advantage.

3. Surplus stocks continue to grow

Mandatory price supports are at a level which stimulates production and chokes off markets. The control program fails to check the rising surplus.

Despite acreage allotments, despite a soil bank program, and despite massive surplus disposal, Government investment in surplus farm commodities is at a record level, approximately $9 billion, and is still growing.

Just to store this vast hoard costs more than a billion dollars a year.

We already hold such huge stocks of wheat that if not one bushel of the oncoming crop were harvested, we would still have more than enough for domestic use, export sales, foreign donation and needed carryover for an entire year. And, the oncoming crop is estimated at 1,220 million bushels, the fifth largest in history.

4. The program is excessively costly

During the present fiscal year, the net budgetary outlay for programs for the stabilization of farm prices and farm incomes will be $5.4 billion. Not all of this goes to farmers, of course. Part of it goes to commercial warehouses for storage. There are charges for interest and administration, which do not go to farmers. Some unpredictable part of this outlay will be recovered through disposal operations. But, the net realized cost is certain to be large.

Not a bushel of wheat and not a bale of cotton is presently exported from the United States without a substantial subsidy.

Budgetary expenditures of the Federal Government for programs primarily for the support of farm prices and farm incomes now are the largest non-defense-related item in the Federal budget. They run well in excess of $1,000 per farm. Net farm income in 1958 was $13.1 billion. The net budgetary outlay for the support of farm prices and farm incomes, $5.4 billion, is thus equal to 40 percent of net farm income.

As has been said, not all of this money goes to farmers. Insofar as disposal operations serve foreign policy and relief needs, costs arising therefrom should not be attributed to the price-support program.

But even after making appropriate revisions of the budgetary figure, whatever they may be, the outlay attributable to the support program directly is very great. These heavy costs might be justifiable if they were temporary, if they were solving the problems of our farm people, and if they were leading to a better balance of supplies and markets. But, unfortunately, this is not true.

II

As I said at the outset, the farm price-support and production-control program may now be judged to have been a failure.

Whose failure is this?

The question is asked not in an effort to fix the blame but in order to learn where we may look for a solution.

It is not a failure of our farm people. They are stalwart, self-reliant, and resourceful. They have done an outstanding job of producing efficiently. From the standpoint of technology they have advanced more rapidly in recent years than any other major sector of the economy. They have in fact responded to the price incentive as farm people—and other people—traditionally have.

Certainly the failure cannot be laid at the door of those farmers, a majority of the total, who earn their income from unsupported livestock, poultry, fruits, and vegetables, who have steadily fought all efforts to support the prices of their commodities.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, largest by far of all farm organizations, has worked long and hard to get the Congress to relax its legislative grip on farm prices and farm production.

The failure of the farm program is not a failure of the farm people.

Nor is it a failure of Secretary Benson.

The program now in effect is not the program recommended by Secretary Benson. It is a program first enacted a quarter of a century ago, only slightly modified since that time.

In 1954 Secretary Benson asked Congress for legislative changes, and was given part of what he asked.

In 1956 the Secretary asked the Congress for the authority to make further adjustments in the level of price supports. This authority was denied. He asked that the Congress consider placing a dollar limitation on the amount of price support to any one producer. This was not done.

In 1957 the Secretary asked Congress for authority to eliminate the preferred treatment accorded to the so-called basic crops. This was not provided.

In 1958 the Secretary asked for authority to scrap the legal formula which set the stage for increased levels of price support. He was given a part of what he asked—and several harmful provisions which he did not request—for corn, cotton, and rice. Nothing important was done with respect to the other crops.

In 1959 the Secretary tried a new approach. He suggested alternative solutions. Three months have elapsed and the Congress has not even considered these alternatives.

The President has sent to the Congress four special messages on agriculture, all pointing to the necessity of reducing the price incentives which lead to the production of crops for which there is no market.

This long series of recommendations was not based on some whimsical notion of the President or the Secretary. It was based on the widest review of farm policy ever undertaken in this country. It was based on the findings of many competent research and advisory groups, among them the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, a bipartisan group of 18 men, the majority of whom are farmers.

Meantime, the Congress has given the Secretary many things for which he did not ask, legislation aggravating the problem rather than working toward a solution.

Acreage allotments have been increased, raising surplus stocks even higher.

New crops have been added to the list which must be supported.

The production-stimulating payments provided by the agricultural conservation program have consistently been forced upon the Secretary in excessive amounts.

The Secretary has been forthright in pointing out what needs to be done. He has waged an educational campaign that may yet succeed.

The Secretary has thus dealt courageously with a problem not of his making. Though dedicated to economy in Government, he has had to witness a doubling and a redoubling of the cost of programs he could not change but had to administer. Though a believer in the capability of farmers to make their own decision, he has had to impose burdensome Government controls.

The failure of the mandatory price-support and production-control program is not a failure of the farm people or of Secretary Benson; it is primarily a failure of the Congress.

In making this flat statement, I want to acknowledge the good record of the Congress as regards price-support legislation for most farm products, the commendable action with regard to surplus disposal, and the many excellent continuing services provided for our farm people. I want to acknowledge the directionally correct but insufficient steps taken by the Congress in years past to reduce price-support levels. The onrush of farm technology has been so rapid as to swallow up the effect of these modest downward adjustments.

The truth is that the pace of the scientific revolution in agriculture has been more rapid than either the executive or the legislative branch anticipated. Both should feel regret for having underestimated the bounty of nature and the sharp advance in technology.

The chief failure of which I speak is the present inactivity in Congres in the face of irrefutable and widespread evidence that the mandatory support program has been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

Those Members of the Congress who make the strategy decisions apparently have decided that any real solution to the price-support problem will be most difficult, quite lacking in political dividends. Rather than face up to this problem, they foster the illusion that the failure of the farm program is attributable to Secretary Benson. They count on the difficulty which the public has in distinguishing between legislative and administrative responsibility. They hope to turn public dissatisfaction regarding the farm program toward Secretary Benson, who must administer it, rather than toward the Congress which authored it.

The farm program now being offered by the Congress is a one-point program: "Belabor Benson."

Secretary Benson has taken an oath to administer the laws enacted by the Congress, and this he is doing to the best of his very considerable ability. That certain of these laws are a failure is no fault of his. But, if he can be made the scapegoat, this has, in the eyes of some, the twin merit of safely explaining the failure and postponing the difficulties involved in its solution.

Meantime, while the Congress delays, surpluses mount, costs rise, markets disappear, and dislocations increase.

Agriculture's public relations deteriorate as costs and surpluses rise. The goodwill of the public, one of the most important assets which our farm people enjoy, is steadily being drawn down. As the farm population becomes a smaller percentage of the total, the need for good public relations steadily increases.

III

What is the solution?

The solution is to be found in legislative changes which provide, for the commodities receiving mandatory price support, treatment similar to that provided for all other farm products, most of which are in reasonably good economic position.

The solution is to be found in returning to our farm people a larger role in deciding what they shall plant and how they shall market their crops.

The solution lies in programs which build markets, not destroy them, which channel farm products into use, not into storage. A warehouse is not a market and a storage bin is not a customer.

On the basis of the record, strict production controls are not the answer. The evidence of 25 years is that the Congress will not enact, the Secretary cannot administer, and the farm people will not accept the kind of production controls needed to balance supply and demand at the price objectives specified in present law.

If farm products are to be abundant, they cannot be priced as if they were scarce.

It would be well to deal with this problem legislatively now. It would be well to make now the reasoned and gradual changes which are the product of rational thinking, rather than to wait and invite the abrupt and painful dislocations which could come when and if the public patience is finally exhausted.

Back in 1950, the public suddenly lost its patience with potato price support and Congress outlawed the entire program. Potato producers, who are relatively few in number, went through a difficult readjustment. To subject millions of wheat and corn and cottongrowers to this abrupt kind of adjustment would be a grave matter indeed. It would be better not to test the public patience to the breaking point.

The President outlined a course of action and called attention to the urgency of this matter in a special message 3 months ago. The Secretary of Agriculture followed up with various alternative recommendations within the framework of the President's statement.

The solution need not be precisely the one the administration has recommended. But it must acknowledge the fact that we should no longer, through incentive prices, encourage the production of crops for which there is no market.

If nothing is done, we shall soon be committed for another crop year to the program which causes so much difficulty.

This is a wealthy country. If it were not, changes would have been forced long ago in the farm price support program.

But even a wealthy country cannot continue to waste its substance in the endless accumulation of surplus stocks, particularly when it needs its resources in a struggle for economic leadership with the countries of the Soviet bloc.

Some people have come to say that there is no solution for the farm price-support program. A better statement would be that there is no easy solution. A 25-year hunt for an easy solution has produced only new disappointments.

Even if needful changes are made now, surplus stocks would continue and costs would remain very high for a long time. Commodities which have been sheltered for 25 years cannot quickly be returned to the rough-and-tumble of the market place. Our farmers cannot quickly crawl out from under a $9 billion stockpile. The return to a more orderly program must be a gradual process. We have started in that direction. The movement must not stall.

Correction of our price-support legislation is retarded by folklore and fairytales. One of these is the idea that the administration wants to do away with price supports. There is no intention to take away from farmers the right to legislation which protects them from the excesses of unfettered competition. These rights have been fought for and won, and I applaud the victory. The thing I am saying is that these hard-won rights should not be squandered in the continuation of a self-defeating program.

Another block to constructive action is the erroneous idea that as prices fall farmers will increase production in order to maintain income. This notion is refuted by all objective research. It is refuted by the Congress itself, which as recently as 1958 extended the Wool Act, based on the correct principle that production increases result from high prices, not low prices.

Still another obstacle is the attempted justification of the present program on the basis that other groups are subsidized and other groups have price protection. The question is not whether farmers, like other groups, have a right to helpful legislation; they do. The question is whether the legislation in question is truly helpful. On the basis of the record the answer must be "No."

The time will come when the penalties for temporizing further with this grave problem will be greater than the problems involved in dealing with it directly. And that time may be sooner than some people think.

The People Want the Farm Mess Solved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, people keep writing from all over the country

in favor of my four-point program to end the farm mess. It involves stopping subsidies, selling off surpluses, and using proceeds to reduce the debt and taxes. Here are some more extracts from letters asking that this course of action be taken:

The present farm mess from the very beginning was the most nonsensical idea ever to be conceived by any one or any administration. If a farmer cannot live without Government aid, how can anyone else live without it? He can always raise enough to eat at any time. Not so the ordinary laboring man, or mechanic. They have nothing to fall back on but their ability or tools.

Please end that farm mess now. I have always been against it. It is so ridiculous to pay the farmers big sums of money, for not working.

With regard to the farm mess, I wholeheartedly agree with your program in principle.

I agree with you on the farm mess, it's terrible, wasting a billion a year for storage.

We agree with you 100 percent on the farm mess. Think it is time for the Government to quit paying people to not work.

Re your program to end the farm mess—I am 100 percent behind you—there is no excuse at this time for subsidy to any business and the quick sale of surplus wheat stocks is most wise and economical.

I fully agree with you on the farm mess. I hope the time will soon come when the Federal Government will stop farm subsidies as well as all other subsidies. The sooner we return to the free-enterprise system the sooner taxes and unfair expenditure of public money will stop.

I feel that something should be done to end the farm mess. The payment of subsidies only encourages more production which in turn increases the subsidies to be paid. The fact that surpluses have increased to such gigantic proportions illustrates the folly of trying to insulate a selected group of people against the painful readjustments necessitated by progress, in this case, progress in methods of farm production. Somewhere a real start has to be made to solve the problem, not just to appease it and pass it on to the next session of Congress. I believe the program you have outlined will do this.

I hope you can really see this farm-support mess as you say and every opportunity that is given you will try to vote these subsidies to cease. This, in my opinion, is one of the saddest things in U.S. home government that I have seen. It sums up, we pay a subsidy so that we can pay higher prices. Isn't there some way that these vote-crazy legislators can see beyond their noses and quit such stupid voting?

I am very much in favor of your stand on the farm program.

I wish to congratulate you on your proposed solution to the farm mess. I hope that enough support will be forthcoming to bring about enactment into law.

I certainly appreciate your concerns regarding the present farm program and concur with your proposals to eliminate this fantastic tax burden.

I think your solution to the farm mess is a dandy—let's do it.

I am certainly glad to hear something is going to be done about this farm mess. Surely there must be a better way to spend billions and help the farmers too.

Farm mess—$1 billion to store $9 billion in surpluses, need more be added?

Forest Products Industry in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, processing of timber into lumber and a multitude of other forest products is the leading industry in the State of Oregon. The need to preserve and maintain our State's basic forest resource is recognized by both private and public owners of forest areas in our State. A thoughtful column by Mr. Dewey Rand, editor and publisher of the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Press, comments upon the now-prevalent attitude in the lumber industry, which favors sustained-yield cutting practices and sound forest management policies. I ask unanimous consent to include Mr. Rand's column in the Appendix of the RECORD along with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Press]

PASSING IN REVIEW

(By Dewey Rand)

How important are the forest lands and timber to the economy and recreation of the Northwest? What are the problems of this vast complex of public and private resources and industry, and what does the future hold? These questions were discussed by the top authorities in this field at Reed College last week.

The event was called the Citizens' Conference of the Pacific Northwest Forest Resources. It was sponsored by the Reed College Forest Endowment and the forest industries and arranged by a citizens' committee headed by Chairman Robert S. Miller, Portland attorney. The three broad subjects covered were forests in the economy, forests capacity to meet future demand, and forest resources management and use.

There are few people in this region who are not conscious of the importance of timber and the lands on which it grows. But there are not too many who have a comprehensive knowledge of their present economic value and of the enormous future potential. It was the obvious purpose of the conference to draw the broad picture and it is safe to say those who attended would agree that in this the conference was successful.

Problems of private and public ownership, taxes and protection, conservation and public use for recreation, watershed preservation and general forest management were discussed and the solutions proposed. All these are important and the public is all too little informed on the subjects. But what impressed this visitor to the conference is the fact that forests of the Northwest can be a perpetual source of revenue and recreation that will increase and not diminish if properly handled. Unlike oil or coal deposits, but similar to falling water, our forests can produce forever.

The U.S. Forest Service is taking a leading part in this long-range, multiple-use program. Richard McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service, told the conference the timber cut on Northwest Federal forests can be increased by 4 billion feet annually if the program of the Service is followed. The Federal forest plans, as outlined by McArdle, include planting 627,000 acres in trees, improving 1,800 miles of fishing streams, and building 13,400 new family units in camp and picnic areas. The Service also plans reconstruction or the supervision, if others do the work, of thousands of miles of access roads. The Forest Service is not forgetting the sportsman and recreationist while planning for perpetual timber production.

Private owners of forests, too, have abandoned the "cut and get out" methods of the past and the ever-increasing value of timber is making it practical for them to "farm" their timberlands. Tree growing has taken enormous strides in recent years and large and small owners of timber are now managing their forests with the future, and not a quick profit, in mind.

Oregon's great reliance on timber is often deplored, especially when the market for forest products softens as during the recent recessions. The great industry based on timber faces many problems, as speakers at the conference pointed out. Still, timber means to Oregon what oil does to Texas or coal to Pennsylvania. Unlike these two natural resources our timber need never be exhausted and Oregon has more timber than any State in the Union, not excepting Alaska.

And the most important point made by the speakers at the conference was, we thought, that both the private owners of timberlands and those who are the custodians of the State and Federal holdings have adopted the long-range view of this resource. For the most part, both private and public ownership seem determined to make this resource a perpetual benefit.

E. Kent Swift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply touched and profoundly grieved to learn of the passing on Friday of last week, July 17, of a cherished friend and a great business leader and philanthropist, E. Kent Swift, of Whitinsville, Mass., in my district.

I join the Whitinsville community and the many associates and friends of Mr. Swift in extending deepest sympathy to his family: Mrs. Howard S. Whiteside of Milton, Mass., Mrs. Thomas P. Almy of Pelham, N.Y., Mrs. John E. Sawyer of New Haven, Conn., and Mr. E. Kent Swift, Jr., of Whitinsville.

For many years, Mr. Swift had been recognized for his enlightened leadership and his almost limitless contributions of every character to our business life, the community, and the Nation.

Kent Swift was a man of most exceptional personal qualities. He was amiable and gentle and deeply interested in his fellow man. He was most gracious and courtly of manner, considerate and generous of impulse yet possessed of traits of

character which readily identified him as a man of action and doer of good deeds.

I will not attempt here to outline the many precious, immeasurable contributions which he made during his long lifetime to our business affairs, to the community, the State, and the Nation in the humblest and very best sense.

Kent Swift was a great, inspiring leader in every field to which he gave his talented attention. He was a man possessed of highest and noblest character, inflexible of purpose, strong of conviction, and loyal to the many causes which he embraced. He was a patriot and an American of the highest order, a shining symbol of our widely heralded free enterprise system under which he worked his way to the very top of his proud calling.

Kent Swift was a man of impeccable personal moral and intellectual integrity, devoted to lofty ideals, conscientious motives, and humane instincts. He was a devoted family man, a warm, loyal friend, and a great American. With word of his passing, his community was plunged into deep sorrow and grief and many heartfelt tributes were paid to this stalwart, noble figure, who by his good works, his constructive life, and his many good deeds, had preeminently won the respect, admiration, and affection of all those who knew him and the many who knew of his outstanding achievements.

A brief word upon his life is appropriate. Born in Eau Claire, Wis., December 10, 1878, he was descended from a long line of distinguished New England ancesters who lived years ago in the beautiful town of Falmouth, Mass., on famed Cape Cod. The family was engaged in the shipbuilding industry, then operating at a high peak, and subsequently became interested in extensive lumbering operations. As this great industry moved westward, the Swifts moved with it and Kent Swift passed his early years in the great State of Wisconsin. He attended Beloit Academy in that State and then returned to Massachusetts to take up his college studies at distinguished Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., from which he was graduated in the year 1900.

It was his original intention to matriculate at the world-famous Massachusetts Institute of Technology where he would work for a degree in mining engineering. However, his cousin, Mr. Marston Whitin, then head of the Whitin Machine Works, persuaded him to enter the employ of that growing company.

He started to work for the company as a mechanic and because of his ability, diligence, attention to duty and alert, creative mind, soon won the approval and confidence of Cousin Marston.

With each passing year, the bond of friendship and mutual confidence between Kent and Marston became closer and closer and the head of the company turned more and more toward this brilliant young man who was impressing everyone with his ability to master the intricate details of the technical business in which he was engaged.

His progress and advancement were marked. He rapidly rose from mechanic to supervisory duties and in 1906 was appointed assistant treasurer of the company. Kent was only 28 years of age at the time when he was promoted to be second in command of the Whitin factory, taking over full responsibility whenever Marston Whitin was away.

Five years later in 1911, he married gracious Katharine Leland Whitin, third daughter of George Marston Whitin, then treasurer of the company. As a wedding present, Mr. Whitin built the magnificent "Galesmeet," a lovely Georgian home on Northbridge Hill, largely built by Whitin craftsmen.

By 1913, Mr. Swift had taken over many of the management details of the business and 1 year later he became general manager.

In 1920, Mr. Swift was elected treasurer, continuing his duties as general manager. He served as president from 1933 to 1946, at which time he became chairman of the board of directors, a position he held at the time of his death.

It is during this period that the Whitin Machine Works grew in strength. A fully integrated main plant is located in Whitinsville, employing some 3,500 people, largely from the immediate area. A branch plant is located in Charlotte, N.C., and a wholly owned subsidiary, Fayscott Corp., is located in Dexter, Maine. In recent years, Whitin Machine Works began to diversify its operations. The company recently purchased the Landis Machine Co. of St. Louis, Mo., a well known and respected name in the shoe repair equipment field.

Harvey-Wells Electronics, Inc., of Southbridge, which is also in my district, is now owned by Whitin. American Type Founders Co., Inc., of Elizabeth, N.J., is another recent acquisition of the company in its diversification program. Other branch plants and subsidiaries are Whiten of Canada, Ltd., Toronto, Ontario, Canada; Whitin-France, Paris, France; Whitin Business Machine Corp., Whitinsville Water Co., and Deutsche Whitin Gesellschaft, M.B.H., Wiesbaden, Germany.

Mr. Swift, down through the years, maintained a live and vigorous interest in all activities of the Whitin plant. It is said that no other executive of the company could take a visitor on a more comprehensive or more complete tour of the factory with stops made periodically for talks with workers whom Mr. Swift knew by name.

His warm friendliness with employees was an important ingredient of the Swift success story. He was always available to employees and never was it necessary to make appointments. The door to his office was always open. Thus, minor office or shop difficulties were settled immediately.

While Mr. Swift managed a large company with a multitude of problems and activities, he was never too busy to listen to his employees. As a result, the company has a rather unique and unusual employee service record for an enterprise of its size. Mr. Swift always pointed with pride to his own long service record and that of many of his employees. More than 260 have been with the company for 40 years or more. Of these, 20 have more than 50 years of continuous service.

The experience and knowledge of such an employee group over these long periods of time have resulted in an unexcelled esprit de corps and a craftsmanship and workmanship recognized throughout the textile world as being second to none.

Mr. Swift was especially proud of the Whitin employees during the war years when a skilled labor force might well have been dispersed. The company turned to defense production with achievements that still prompt a deep sense of pride in many of the older employees.

Equipped with a large foundry and many skills, the Whitin plant convinced the Maritime Commission that it could turn out auxiliary steam engines for liberty ships. Each ship needed five engines which contained many cast iron parts. The Whitin production record amazed the Maritime experts, who were reluctant to place the initial contract. Whitin produced about 11,000 such engines, almost 90 percent of the entire national production, to the extreme gratification of the Maritime Commission.

Whitin also turned out during the war some 73,000 B–24 magnetos, an intricate device, in another demonstration of the ability range and versatility of its workers, production facilities and management.

Among Mr. Swift's community accomplishments was the erection in 1923 of the recreational center as a memorial to George Marston Whitin. The Whitin community gymnasium housed a swimming pool, gymnasium, shooting gallery, billiard rooms, ballroom, and social rooms. A disastrous fire last April left only the swimming pool untouched. A community campaign is underway to rebuild the gymnasium.

Mr. Swift's business career, in addition to his 59-year association with Whitin Machine Works, included 39 directorships, 6 presidencies, and 8 miscellaneous other titles with various large concerns, many of them textile companies in New England and the South.

At the time of his death, he was a member of the board of directors of the following companies: American Mutual Liability Insurance Co., Ashworth Brothers, Inc., Boston Manufacturers Mutual Insurance Co., Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., Mutual Boiler and Machinery Insurance Co., Pepperell Manufacturing Co., Scott Lumber Co., Seaboard Foundry, Second Bank-State Street Trust Co., Whitinsville National Bank, Whitinsville Savings Bank, Whitin Machine Works, and Harvey-Wells Electronics, Inc., a subsidiary of Whitin Machine Works.

Today, largely due to the leadership of Kent Swift, the Whitin Machine Works is the world's largest maker of textile machinery to the point that practically every textile item produced is processed at some stage by a Whitin machine. These items include bedding, garments, and even tire cords.

As I stated before, Kent Swift was a progressive-minded and enlightened industrial leader who deeply felt, not only his responsibility to management, but also his responsibility to labor and the community. Under his sound, wise guidance, various employee welfare and housing programs were developed and medical and health services inaugurated. Indoor and outdoor recreational facilities were provided, many of them, not only for his own workers, but for members of the community as well.

He took a lively active interest in the affairs of his town and for many years served as chairman of its important finance committee, passing and advising upon a multitude of municipal expenditures to serve the indispensable purposes of town government. He interested himself continually in town affairs—religious, patriotic, civic, recreational and charitable. His counsel and advise was sought by many of his fellow citizens, and his door and generous heart were always open to those who sought his counsel and assistance.

Kent Swift was a broad, tolerant man with friends in every walk of life, in every religious and racial group. He truly loved his fellowman and was eager to serve and help him. A man of simple tastes and habits—congenial, discreet and approachable, he deplored and shunned provincialism and narrow-mindedness and retained his balance and conviction with a superb poise and soundness of judgment that was the envy of contemporaries in every calling.

The personality, character, life and contributions of Kent Swift will long be remembered by a grateful people. He has left an indelible impression upon our times. He has fought the good fight for the principles and ideals in which he believed. He has demonstrated in his lifetime that there is a nobler and unselfish side to every great man and that truly illustrious leadership cannot be confined within narrow boundaries.

In the continuous stream of life which covers generation after generation, many people have contributed to the progress of our Nation. Certainly no one has contributed more unselfishly, constructively and with more noble impulses, and few indeed have ever contributed with such outstanding results.

The name of Kent Swift will remain for very many years to inspire and to strengthen those who love our country and who are willing to dedicate themselves to making it a better place in which to live.

The world is better because of men like Kent Swift, and as we mourn his passing, we may at the same time, express our deep gratitude that he lived among us so long and gave so generously of himself to his friends, his fellow citizens and his beloved country.

A truly great man and a cherished friend passed to his heavenly home. May he find peace and rest in his eternal reward.

Thompson Spurns Teamsters' Dictation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, with the hurtling of charges in the public press and elsewhere about concessions to Hoffa-like dictation in endeavors to pass labor-management reform legislation, it is worthwhile to note, I think, the kind of resistance which such attempts meet. In an article from a recent issue of the Trentonian, there is described a visit from one of the Teamsters' attorneys to the office of Congressman FRANK THOMPSON of New Jersey's Fourth Congressional District. Knowing THOMPSON's long friendship with labor, the Teamsters' man had recommendations for a labor bill with the thought in mind that the Congressman would accept his version. This version, however, did not fit in at all with the stronger measures supported by Congressman THOMPSON—and he rejected the recommendations. That this rejection was not lightly taken soon became evident when Congressman THOMPSON was informed that a mass meeting was in the making to consider what his stand meant—with the implied suggestion that such publicity could be very unfortunate. But how ridiculous these kinds of tactics are was revealed almost immediately through a statement from the lips of an assistant to President Meany who said:

> Congressman FRANK THOMPSON always approaches all legislation with the people's welfare in mind. He is extremely fair minded * * * I anticipate he'll show the usual good judgment in the pending legislation.

I think this clearly demonstrates that such reprehensible efforts on the part of a few individuals have little effect. I am glad to know that when a labor bill is forthcoming, it will be with the help of men of such outstanding caliber as FRANK THOMPSON. I am proud of my good friend, who, as outlined above, is giving such outstanding representation to the people of his congressional district, to the State and to the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOMPSON SPURNS TEAMSTERS' DICTATION
(By Cyril J. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—The hand of Hoffa which tapped legislators on Capitol Hill recently was named Sidney Zagri, Teamster attorney.

In touch with Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, pro-labor, labor-backed and labor-praised, Zagri was dissatisfied. THOMPSON would not buy Zagri's version of what a labor racketeering law should be. THOMPSON wanted sterner measures. But then THOMPSON had a good armor of consistent friendship with labor and he could play independent of Hoffa's recommendations. Zagri left the office, unhappy.

Soon a note from the Mercer-Burlington area proved that Hoffa or Mr. Zagri had a long arm. The Congressman was advised from home that there might be a mass meeting in Trenton to consider THOMPSON and his stand. Generally, it could be bad, especially on publicity—unless you had a long record, strong enough to make the threat ridiculous.

And apparently this was the case. From headquarters of the AFL–CIO, almost on the same day as the threat-letter, came strong support from Andrew J. Biemiller, assistant to President Meany and CIO–AFL legislative department head.

Biemiller said: "Congressman FRANK THOMPSON always approaches all legislation with the people's welfare in mind * * * He is extremely fair minded * * * I anticipate he'll show the usual good judgment in the pending legislation * * *."

PRODUCING LABOR BILL INTENSIVE WORK
(By FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Member of Congress, Fourth New Jersey District)

On July 23, following 5 weeks of work as intensive as any I have ever known, the House Education and Labor Committee reported to the House its version of the Kennedy-Ervin reform bill.

Working against a background of threats which included everything from "getting your head knocked off" to "we'll get you the next time you run," and in the midst of heated opinions and frayed nerves, the committee steered a course between the shoals of bitterness on both port and starboard sides. The left-hand shoal was defiance of the Nation's obvious demand for reform legislation—the course was to kill the bill. The right-hand shoal was defiance of the Nation's working people's right to bargain collectively—the course was to report a bill so tough as to destroy our great labor movement.

By virtue of hard work and appeals, the committee finally achieved successful passage through the treacherous channel and ended up with a bill which deserves the support of all fairminded people, who believe that an effective labor reform bill should be enacted at this session of Congress. In this report and in my report of next week, I shall endeavor to describe the legislation and its background. It is my belief that the subject of labor reform is the most important domestic issue before the Nation at this time.

Your Representative's actions and votes will have no appeal to either those who insisted upon no legislation at all or to those who wanted punitive legislation. Some weeks ago in this report I stated my position. I adhered to it strictly and, therefore, cannot understand why so many representatives of both labor and management appeared to be surprised by my middle course votes.

Teamster boss Jimmy Hoffa dipped into the St. Louis Teamster organization and brought to Washington as his chief lawyer and lobbyist, an attorney named Sidney Zagri. Zagri's activities have been well documented by Time (July 27), Life (July 27), and in a host of other papers and journals.

The Teamster hired hand appeared in my office on two or three occasions early in the game. On one of his visits he was accom-

panied by a dozen or more New Jersey Teamster leaders. Starting his conversations reasonably and smoothly, in lawyerlike fashion, Zagri appealed for support for some 50 pages of amendments to the 70-page Senate bill.

When he realized that I was not sympathetic, lawyer Zagri discarded his attorney attire and suddenly became some sort of political boss. Talking as if he had at his disposal an election certificate, he indicated that I had better do his will. One or two other labor leaders used the same approach, each with the same lack of success.

What Zagri and other Washington lobbyists fail to realize is that those of us who are elected Representatives are known to our people. We are here because of majorities received in free elections conducted by secret ballot in which freemen expressed their will. Hoffa and Zagri disdain free elections and secret ballots—they want no part of democracy in their union and I want no part of Hoffa or Zagri. I have given them to understand that I would rather be defeated than to be indebted to them for being in Congress. In this connection, I can state honestly that not one Teamster from the Fourth Congressional District has threatened me in any way. Two of their leaders have been to Washington to see me and both complained about the bill, but both were entirely reasonable and fair.

In the July 17, 1959, issue of the Indiana Labor Tribune, that State's Teamster paper, Sidney Zagri has a signed article in which he attacks Indiana's brilliant freshman Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS. The basis of the attack is a flattering one, for it says that BRADEMAS' "voting has largely followed the lead of the Thompson-Udall Democrats, of ARIZONA, group." Zagri is a busy fellow. He's doing his smear job on a nationwide basis.

On the opposite side from the Teamsters those fighting against the committee bill are the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Their vehement opposition, including the usual election day threats, is based upon the fact that our bill will not break the back of organized labor.

All in all, the opposition to the reported bill makes even more clear the fact that it is an effective, strong document. Some labor elements are opposed because they know it will bring reform. The management elements are opposed because it will allow the continued and necessary process of collective bargaining. Fairness is a great American tradition. In this case, the path of fairness is clear—it is represented by the committee's version of the Kennedy bill. I am confident that the Congress will choose the fair path.

Next week I shall analyze the major provisions of the labor legislation and will set forth some of the alternatives. I would appreciate the views of anyone who cares to write. Please address mail to: Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., room 452 Old House Office Building Washington, D.C.

Food, Freedom, and a World in Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the July 1959 issue of the Reporter magazine printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article was written by a distinguished Californian, Mr. Lionel Steinberg. Mr. Steinberg is a member of the California State Board of Agriculture and a practical and successful farmer in his own right. He has traveled throughout the world and, in my opinion, is qualified to discuss the important subjects included in the article.

FOOD, FREEDOM, AND A WORLD IN REVOLUTION

(By Lionel Steinberg)

Some one should tell us that it's 1776 all over the world, and that Russian communism is not the last hurdle to continuous peace. World chaos will continue throughout the remaining years of this century even if all the communists in the world were to suddenly and unaccountably drop dead. The world revolutions—not Russia—are the sign of the times.

Two-thirds of the people of the world go to bed hungry every night of their lives. Some two billion of them live on less than $100 each a year. In fact, most of the world's people suffer from conditions which are the basis of the greatest revolution in history: hunger, poverty, disease, the pressure of increasing population, limited supplies of food, foreign exploitation, the alienation of natural resources for quick profits, colonialism, bondage, absentee ownership of most of the land, corruption of officials, oppressive taxation, no access to capital, disastrous interest rates, no freedom of speech, no freedom of press, no freedom of assembly, no right to vote or hold office.

Almost a decade ago Justice William Douglas warned upon returning from Asia, "There are professional agitators who stir this brew of discontent but the force comes from the masses. I have not seen a village between the Mediterranean and the Pacific that was not stirring uneasily."

In the past 6 years, almost by default, Russia has taken over world leadership from the United States. David Lawrence's conservative U.S. News & World Report gave a detailed account (October 3, 1958) of how the Russians are operating in 72 countries. The magazine reported a global war by the Communists, fought on Communist terms, with Russia on the offensive almost everywhere: in Latin America, Europe, Africa, the Far East, South Asia, the Middle East. The Russians are shrewdly waging war on the United States by every means short of shooting.

Khrushchev bragged recently, "We declare a war we will win on the United States—in the peaceful field of trade. We will bury you."

Here in the United States at the head of the Nation is an affable but tired general with a country club mentality elected and reelected by a people, that according to our psychiatrist friends, see in Eisenhower a father image. There is a Secretary of Agriculture with a surplus psychosis who is petrified by a year's surplus stock of wheat, corn and cotton, who between falling prices and rising costs, has presided over the liquidation of 600,000 farms and forced 4 million Americans off their farms. American farmers, the most productive in the world, copied by all nations, now make up 12 percent of the U.S. population and yet receive only 5 percent of the national income. In the past 6 years realized net farm income in the United States has dropped 25 percent. In 1957 returns to farm owners for their labor and management reached a low of 69 cents an hour.

The Department of Interior is led by men who apologize for the TVA and have evolved a new power concept of "partnership" with the private utilities. This partnership has been described as one in which the Government feeds the cow and the utilities sell the milk.

Aldous Huxley in his new book, "Brave New World Revisited," describes modern Western man as lulled by tranquilizers, swayed gently into conformity by the bought witchdoctors of Madison Avenue, led softly into a world of dreaming and docility by television and the other devices that sell vicarious living, and on the verge of being kneaded into a universal and mediocre dough.

We Americans maintain a stiff upper lip as we fearfully continue a $40-billion a year defense budget and engage in a feverish race with Russia to control outer space. We Americans spend $5 billion annually on liquor and $5 billion a year on beer and wine. Gambling is a $10 billion a year bite on the American people. Our liquor budget is 10 times larger than the amount we spend on basic research. It is twice the cost of foreign aid, and half again as much as we spend on schools.

The revelation of Russia's atomic prowess and other scientific achievements has finally awakened American educators and parents to the inadequacies of the American educational system, in which most talented children go untended and only those who can afford a higher education get one.

AFRICANS EDUCATED IN RUSSIA

Russia is educating thousands of young Africans in European universities with the sure conviction they will return eventually to lead colonial administrations. Latin American countries, hard hit by the fall in commodity prices, are tempted with Russian offers to buy wool, hides, and coffee. The Russians also make proposals to develop the natural resources of these underdeveloped areas. The same tactics are used in the Middle East, with Russian support for Nasser's growing Arab empire. The Russians offer to swap Communist arms for cotton, vote $100 million initial appropriations for the development of the Aswan Dam, and capitalize on the Arab hatred of Israel while shrewdly seeking control of Middle East oil. In south Asia, Russia promises loans and aid, infiltrates and woos Afghanistan, Thailand, Burma, Laos, and Cambodia. Everywhere they raise the "Ugly American" image.

They move swiftly into readymade crises—unemployment in Italy, Algerian terrorism in France, angry fishermen in Iceland.

Japanese workers and businessmen are promised big new trade with Red China and India gets steelmaking equipment.

Not only the Russians, but the Chinese Communists, are remolding world history today. With a staggering crash commune program, China seeks to feed 650 million Chinese, trying to accomplish in a decade what Russia did in 35 years. In less than 1 year, all farms have been collectivized and 500 million Chinese peasants have been reorganized into 26,400 peoples communes. The Chinese refer to their commune as an entirely new organization for the masses—pure socialism. The communes range from a few square miles to the size of an average U.S. county and from a few thousand families to 150,000 members. They embrace collective farms, factories, schools, stores, and every other facet of rural life in one self-contained unit, organized along military lines.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE COMMUNES

The speed of the commune drive has astonished western observers who can scarcely conceive of human engineering on such a vast inhuman scale. Hundreds of thousands of peasants' homes have been burned to make way for communal barracks that house male and female members separately. Children live in communal nurseries or boarding schools and see their parents briefly over weekends. Commune workers serve in labor battalions; they work in fields, factories, on roads or dams, or irrigation projects. They work at fixed wages with a bonus system for extra labor. Information from China is scarce because our Government has forbidden newsmen to go there, but it has been reported that the Chinese communes offer

some medical care and other necessities to millions who had nothing before. If true, what impression are the communes making on non-Chinese Asians? And what alternative has been suggested by the West?

Since beginning this article, I have attended a World Farmers' Convention in Israel where some 400 farmers and agrarian leaders and agricultural officials from 31 countries had an opportunity to study and live and work in the communal and cooperative villages of Israel, known as the Kubbutz and Moshav. They came from Asia, Africa, South America, North America, and Europe.

I did not speak to a single delegate who did not share my own tremendous enthusiasm and admiration for the democratic processes, the group-living techniques, and proficiency of the 700 Israel cooperative and communal villages which have helped expand Israel's agricultural production fivefold in a decade, making it possible to house and feed a population which has grown from 600,000 to 2 million since 1948. In 1948 80 percent of the food was imported, today 20 percent.

Of particular interest was the social and cultural achievements, for each village is administered democratically by committees selected by vote from the 150 families that make up the average cooperative settlement. Most Kubbutzim have their own libraries, music rooms as well as schools. Many have auditoriums where music and theater groups entertain each week.

Although some of the delegates from Europe and the Western Hemisphere noted the superior productive records of the Israel commercial private farms, those from Burma, Ghana, Ceylon, Dahomey and India saw much that would be of vast benefit in the less developed areas of the world. The Israel Kubbutzem admirably meet the needs of countries with frontiers to settle and protect, where there is a shortage of capital and experienced farmers, for equipment and facilities and technicians can be shared.

Perhaps in little Vermont-sized Israel may be found the alternative to the totalitarian communes of China. Israel governmental leaders proudly state their main export in the coming decade will be experts. Many farm delegates from the neutral countries said they feared both Russian and American strings attached to help offered.

THE FUTURE—IF MAO SUCCEEDS

It may come as a surprise to some Americans that Mao Tse-tung seeks seriously to make China the world's No. 1 power. China's original slogan, Surpass Britain in 15 years, has been modified to 5 years. Red China did not turn out a single tractor in 1957. In 1958, they claim 20,000 were produced. The goal for 1959 is 200,000. Coal and steel production goals double yearly. They boast ability to feed 5 billion people if necessary.

Provinces ravaged annually by floods now have systems of dykes that were erected by battalions of 20,000 men. Radio Peiping has announced that 40 million peasants are now working on irrigation and dam-building projects.

Western journalists report the frantic pace is bringing national exhaustion with Chinese officials dazed with fatigue. Sixteen to 20 hours a day, 7 days a week of work were required in some communities. Peking Peoples Daily warned recently, "We must see that the workers get sufficient rest for the sake of their health. By doing so they will be available to maintain their labor enthusiasm indefinitely."

If Mao succeeds even partially, his use of human masses as a short cut to rapid industrialization will without doubt capture the imagination of the leaders of the uncommitted nations of Asia and Africa.

On January 20, 1949, President Harry S. Truman recognized the world ferment. He said, in the memorable fourth point of an address which could have made world history:

"We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas."

Tragically, the program never really got off the ground under the Democrats and has suffered from neglect, misunderstanding, and finally abandonment by the Eisenhower administration.

The Soviet Union has seized upon the boiling unrest that exists in the underdeveloped countries as a means of spreading its influence and power. In cities, villages, and on the farms, the Soviet Union spreads promises of peace, plenty, and freedom and calls on the people to accept Soviet leadership in a revolutionary struggle against "decadent" western democracies.

Chester Bowles has said, "We cannot expect to live peacefully in a world slum overflowing with tension and hate; nor can we impose peace and understanding on such a world with atom bombs."

But time is running out for us. Sociologists estimate world population will reach 6 billion by the year 2000, almost double that of today. Each year another 45 million infants are born throughout the world. Even in the United States, population by the year 2000 may reach 400 million with a maximum potential of 1 billion people in the year 2050.

Collectively, the world has the resources, the labor, and the genius to live abundantly in peace and freedom.

The United States must accept the challenge with a world blueprint for the future. We must make it clear to the world that the American people realize that peace and freedom cannot long survive want and hunger. Nothing less than a brandnew cabinet level department can dramatize to ourselves and to the world the seriousness and the scope of our intent.

Such an agency might well be titled "The Department for World Development," intertwining the resources of the Departments of State, Agriculture, Interior, and Commerce.

We should be prepared to offer the world our technicians, scientists, administrators, and engineers to help nations willing to participate in vast overall programs.

It has been estimated that a 20-year united world redevelopment program would take at least $500 billion. Half should come from the undeveloped nations, with their yearly contributions increasing over the years as their income rises. The other half should come from leading countries of the United Nations.

Ten percent of the military budgets of the United States and our allies could easily finance this gigantic program to bring two-thirds of the peoples of the world from the middle ages into the 20th century, from revolution into peace.

The grim alternative to bold American leadership is world revolution led by the Soviet Union and China and ultimate American isolation.

Industrial Development Abroad: Threat or Opportunity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the United States is facing some serious challenges in development of a realistic trade policy.

Among the major questions we face in this field is included: "Is technological industrial development abroad a threat or an opportunity?"

Recently, the Committee for a National Trade Policy came to the conclusion that "technological and industrial advancement in both underdeveloped and industrially mature countries results in an expansion, rather than an obstruction, of international trade."

Conversely, there are those who feel that the increase in industrial capacity abroad represents a threat to U.S. enterprise; particularly those who find outlets for their products in foreign markets.

We are well aware, of course, that with our higher standards of living, wage scales, cost of operation, and other factors, we are at a competitive disadvantage with manufacturers in a great many other countries.

Recognizing that not only our foreign trade, but a substantial segment of our domestic economy, depends upon finding markets for U.S. products elsewhere in the world, this situation is of course of increasing importance to us.

A recent edition of Trade Talk, published by the Committee for a National Trade Policy, contained an article reemphasizing, among other things, the growing challenge to the pioneering, competitive spirit of American industry in international trade. As a reflection of this particular side of the question, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ABROAD: THREAT OR OPPORTUNITY?

Technological and industrial advancement in both underdeveloped and industrially-mature countries results in expansion, rather than contraction, of international trade.

This finding was reached in a survey, just published by Committee for a National Trade Policy, entitled "Industrial Development Abroad—Threat or Opportunity?" Prepared for the Research and Education Committee for a Free World, the report was undertaken in the light of the increasing attention being given to the effects, at home and abroad, of public and private U.S. investment overseas.

The survey shows that investment in productive enterprise overseas does not result in loss of market outlets at home or abroad for U.S. manufacturers but, on the contrary, opens the way to greatly increased sales of manufactured goods.

Industrially mature countries are today their own best customers for each others' exports of manufactured products, the survey holds. Except in highly abnormal periods, the rise in volume of manufactured goods produced in countries in process of industrialization has invariably been accompanied by an increase in the volume of imports of manufactured goods—including imports of consumer goods. As the per capita incomes rise with increased productivity in the industrializing countries, the latent demand for a greater variety and volume of manufactured goods for home consumption can be increasingly satisfied, and total imports of manufactured products therefore tend to increase.

As to future possibilities, the report recognizes that, while some particular indus-

tries may be adversely affected, the overall effect of industrialization abroad can and should be a further marked expansion of market outlets for U.S. manufactures. Even a very small annual percentage rise in the incomes of the underdeveloped countries would result in large increases in imports of manufactured goods from the United States and other countries. Considered indispensable for the realization of these possibilities are: continued growth in the industrially-advanced countries; commercial policies that encourage the growth of international trade; flexibility in adjusting to, and taking full advantage of, changing competitive conditions on the part of the industrialized countries.

The ultimate outcome, according to the study, will turn largely on whether the pioneer, competitive spirit of American industry, its great resourcefulness in innovation and adaptation to changing conditions, continue to predominate.

Thus, the survey states, the question becomes one, not of capabilities, but of spirit and attitude. If the economic development and industrial growth of the underdeveloped countries is looked upon as an opportunity for exploiting to the full our latent capabilities for technological and industrial progress, we can greatly profit from it. "If, on the other hand, our Government reacts to the new conditions by succumbing to pressures to preserve the industrial status quo in the midst of fundamental world economic change, it will have lost a great opportunity. And losing it, the traditional pioneer spirit of which we have been so justly proud will have succumbed to a new attitude that can lead only to eventual economic stagnation."

In conclusion, the study emphasizes the vital importance, from the standpoint of national security, of policies which encourage economic growth in the free world. In the midst of the cold war and of the "revolution of rising expectations" in the newly independent nations, this becomes crucial. "Our only security, our only hope for prosperity and happiness, lie in adaption to change, in seeking to direct change to our advantage and to that of the whole free world. The surest way to impoverish ourselves and lose our freedom is to hoard our investment capital at home, to build national walls against competition, and to protect and perpetuate inefficient methods and outmoded products."

The survey was written under the direction of economist Lynn R. Edminster, former special assistant to the Secretary of State and Vice Chairman of the U.S. Tariff Commission; assisted by David J. Steinberg, economic consultant, and Gizella Huber, statistical consultant.

Copies of the study, containing 20 tables and charts, may be obtained on request.

Neville G. Penrose, Chairman of the International Good Neighbor Conference, Is Helping Ambassador Hill Maintain Good Relations With Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this country has long enjoyed the most excellent and friendly relations with our good neighbor to the South, the Republic of Mexico.

The International Good Neighbor Conference is one organization which is helping to maintain these good relations and to promote even more understanding and cooperation between the two nations. Mr. Neville G. Penrose of Fort Worth is the organization's chairman.

The book "History of the Texas Good Neighbor Commission" by Nellie Ward Kingrea tells of Mr. Penrose's fine work in the interest of neighborliness between the United States and Mexico.

Recently, Mr. Penrose was host to Robert C. Hill, able and diligent U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, and the meeting provided many Texans with more insight into the mutual cooperation of the two countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Horace Craig which was printed in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram for Sunday, July 26, 1959, entitled: "Bracero Situation Reviewed—U.S. Envoy Praises Mexico."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRACERO SITUATION REVIEWED—U.S. ENVOY PRAISES MEXICO

(By Horace Craig)

Robert C. Hill, U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, said in Fort Worth Saturday that the United States and Mexican Governments are working together to solve difficulties in the bracero program in Texas.

"The program is very important to the economy of Mexico, as it is to the United States," he said.

"We are in touch on the bracero situation almost weekly."

Some West Texas towns—particularly Lubbock—were blacklisted recently from participation in the bracero program.

The Lubbock ban, lifted recently, came when a Lubbock beauty shop refused service to Mexicans.

Hill pointed out that some 445,000 braceros work on U.S. farms and ranches each year, adding $40 million a year to the Mexican economy.

He added that Mexico is anxious to continue the program and that "cooperation from the Mexican Government has been excellent."

Hill has been Ambassador to Mexico since May 1957, and previously was Ambassador to Costa Rica and El Salvador.

He was honored at a luncheon Saturday at Shady Oaks Country Club. Neville G. Penrose, Chairman of the International Good Neighbor Conference, was host.

Saturday night, Hill addressed a Dallas meeting of business and civic leaders in the interest of increased tourism to Mexico.

In the earlier interview, Hill said Texans have a stake in Mexican tourism because "it's not a oneway street."

He noted that most tourists to Mexico enter that country from Texas points, thereby adding to the prosperity of the State.

"Tourism is the No. 1 industry in Mexico," Hill said. "They've built new hotels and facilities, and they want to fill them."

He said Mexico has an average of 600,000 tourist visitors who spend $600 million annually.

The country has developed its facilities now to handle 750,000 tourists each year—not including border traffic.

But, Hill added, the border traffic is important too.

He said 25 million persons enter Mexico each year at Juarez. A third bridge will be dedicated next month to relieve the congestion there.

With a national population of only 33 million, Hill said the Juarez entry figure is even more impressive. Tourism, however, is not the country's only economic support.

"Mexico has a strong economy," Hill said. "It is the only country in Latin America which has complete diversification of its economy * * * they've had the foresight to industrialize."

Of Mexican food, Hill said his family eats it 4 days out of 7—and thrives on it.

Of the siesta, Hill said he enjoys that custom, too.

"But Mexico is not the land of 'manana,'" he explained. "They put in a long day and they work hard down there."

The ambassador explained that a Mexican's work day may begin at 11 a.m. and last until 2 p.m.—when he takes off 3 hours for lunch.

"But he comes back to work at 5 p.m. and works until 10 p.m.," Hill explained.

Of the universal problem of communism, Hill said "Mexico deserves great credit for the way they've handled the situation."

He said there is no chance for a Castro-like uprising in Mexico, and noted that the country has been at peace 30 years.

Before leaving Fort Worth, Hill put in a plug for Mexico's Pan American Fair being planned for next year. He said the country is going all-out to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Mexican Revolution, and the 50th anniversary of its success.

Labor Reform Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch on July 6, 1959, entitled "On Whose Side?":

ON WHOSE SIDE?

After more than 6 weeks the House Labor Committee is still struggling with the writing of a labor reform bill. The committee is under intense union pressure. Every member of it, and, of course, every Member of the House, must face the voters next year. Union leaders are making the most of their concentrated power, especially in city districts, to affect the results of congressional elections.

So it is not surprising that the reports from the committee speak of a steady drift toward weakening one clause after another of the Senate-passed bill. The Senate bill itself, in our opinion, does not meet the public demand for a genuine and effective reform measure which adequately corrects the abuses exposed by the McClellan investigation. To water it down still further would represent a humiliating defeat of the public interest by organized group pressure.

Inevitably, the question is now arising: Would not half a loaf be better than none? A bill which carried out some of the needed reforms might very well be preferable to no legislation at all, but individual Representatives must be judged by their individual contributions to the final result. A Congressman who votes and works for a watered-down bill instead of a truly effective and comprehensive one must be prepared to go before the voters as a candidate who placed the union lobby's interest above the public interest.

It is not difficult to tell where the public interest lies. It lies, first, in reasonable but effective reform of internal union organization: in public accountability for union welfare funds and other finances, in protecting the rights of union members from usurpation by union bosses, in making the leaders more directly answerable to the rank and file. Secondly, the public interest demands effective legislation against secondary boycotts and "blackmail" picketing.

The first general objective can be attained by adopting the Senate bill's provisions on financial accounting and its bill of rights for union members, preferably with a stronger enforcement clause. The second objective requires rewriting of the Senate measure as it applies to "hot cargo" and blackmail picketing.

The House could find no better guide to legislation on the latter points than Secretary of Labor Mitchell's proposals. Mr. Mitchell is not trying to outlaw legitimate secondary boycotts—those, for example, which are directed against a company's performing struck work—nor is he trying to outlaw legitimate picketing. His proposed amendments would strike only at the kind of boycott by which a union wages a dispute with one employer by penalizing an innocent one, and at the kind of picketing which permits "top-down organizing" aimed at intimidating the employer instead of persuading the employees.

These are the minimum standards of an adequate labor reform bill, and Congressmen will be judged by whether they fight to protect or to tear down these standards. There is no public interest in legislation designed to weaken the right of collective bargaining. There is a strong public interest in legislation to curb the excesses of unscrupulous union leaders like Jimmy Hoffa. Every Congressman should be prepared to let his constituents know whose side he is on.

Civil Defense: So What Is Money?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial, "So What Is Money?" which was published in the Springfield Daily News, a leading Ohio newspaper, on July 5, 1959.

I believe that the editorial points out once again the waste of the taxpayers' money on our obsolete civil defense program. It cites as an example the misuse and mismanagement by civil defense officials of Federal surplus property donated to a county in the State of Ohio. I commend this to my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO WHAT IS MONEY?

Another of the many examples of loose management by civil defense authorities, resulting in the loss of tremendous sums of money contributed by American taxpayers, has turned up in Ohio. State civil defense headquarters in Columbus has called upon Champaign County officials to return thousands of dollars' worth of civil defense equipment which that county is said to have received last year. Improper use of this equipment is charged.

Regardless of circumstances, one can hardly blame the Champaign County officials for trying to get their share of this equipment. After all, citizens of that county pay Federal taxes and have helped to provide the funds with which such equipment was originally purchased. Throughout the Nation, various political subdivisions have been participating in this distribution of so-called surplus property.

Gen. Loren G. Windom, adjutant general of Ohio, says that it was a mistake in judgment that permitted the Champaign County representatives to obtain unlimited amounts of the surplus equipment. One or two such mistakes could be forgiven, but they have been turning up here and there in innumerable instances. Aside from those disclosed on various occasions by U.S. Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, many others have been brought to light by newspaper and other private investigations into civil defense operations.

No one can condone, of course, the use of any Government equipment by private individuals for private purposes, but there is question as to why any Government surplus items should be stored merely to rot away if they can be put to advantageous use for the citizens who footed the bill for the equipment in the first place.

The trouble appears to be that the Nation has permitted itself to be frightened by possibilities of nuclear warfare into dumping huge sums of money in any sort of thing that at first glance would appear to offer some sort of defense in case of attack. So much of the Nation's wealth could be wasted in such fruitless efforts that if war did come we would be ill prepared economically to cope with it.

What is needed is a down-to-earth study of the entire defense situation with a view of putting it on a practical basis both as to its operations and its costs. Certainly America wants to be prepared against any eventualities, but there is a vast difference between actual protection and spending ourselves bankrupt buying sand with which to cover our heads.

Murrow Questions State Department's Right To Restrict Travel of American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on June 11 of this year, Mr. Edward R. Murrow, a most distinguished member of the world of news, devoted a major portion of his broadcast to the matter of rights of Americans to travel abroad.

His comments revolved around the case of a reporter, Mr. William Worthy, Jr., and the U.S. court of appeals decision upholding the restrictive policy of the State Department.

The comments made by Mr. Murrow deserve, in my opinion, the widest possible dissemination and I am most pleased, therefore, to insert them at this point in the RECORD.

EDWARD R. MURROW WITH THE NEWS, CBS RADIO NETWORK, JUNE 11, 1959

The right of Americans to travel abroad is in the news again. The case involves reporter William Worthy, Jr. In 1956 he went to Communist China and to Hungary, countries for which his passport was not valid. When he came home the State Department lifted his passport, but offered him another if he would agree to accept the restrictions. Worthy refused, and went to court to plead his right as a newsman to go where he pleases.

A three-judge U.S. court of appeals has upheld the State Department's action—has in effect said that the Secretary of State, acting on behalf of the President, can at his discretion deny American citizens the right to travel to specific areas. The court said: "In foreign affairs, especially in the intimate posture of today's world of jets, radio and atomic power, an individual's yen to go and to enquire may be circumscribed." And it went on to say: "A blustering inquisitor, avowing his own freedom to go and do as he pleases, can throw the whole international neighborhood into turmoil."

This curious doctrine may come as a surprise to foreign correspondents who have worked for many years under dictatorships without either blustering or creating turmoil.

The court held that the Constitution gives the President the authority to evaluate the military and political exigencies in foreign countries. The courts are the least able of all organs of Government to make such evaluation, and they are wholly without authority to make them. Judgment of what course of action will promote our foreign relations has been entrusted to the President, not to the courts, journalists, scholars, or even public opinion. So the court ruled against Mr. Worthy.

It will now be for the Supreme Court to decide whether this is the last word on the rights of unrestricted travel, for the case has been appealed. It is a simple issue. The Supreme Court has already ruled that the State Department cannot deny a citizen a passport because of his political affiliations or associations. This question is not raised in the Worthy case. The question at issue is whether the Secretary of State may say to a reporter or any other citizen: "You may not visit the following countries * * *."

The State Department has revised its policy about American reporters going to Communist China. The Department has agreed to give passports for Red China to representatives of a number of periodicals and agencies normally dealing with Foreign news. The number has now risen to 44. But the Chinese are insisting on reciprocity—that an equal number of Chinese correspondents be permitted to enter this country. The presence of these reporters in China would be no more a peril to peace, nor more a cause of turmoil than the presence of Mr. Worthy. And the President would be just as incapable of guaranteeing their safety. So what Mr. Worthy strove for has been going on even if he goes on losing. But the principles involved in this case have not been satisfied by the revised rules for newsmen in Communist China. The State Department is still saying "No" to everybody else who wants a passport to go to the forbidden areas.

It is clear that if the present ruling stands—if it is not reversed by the Supreme Court—then this administration may continue to ban travel to certain areas of the world. This would mean that it would also be possible for any future administration to ban travel to any other part of the world. It would, for example, be possible for a future Secretary of State—whatever his reasons, or for no reason—to ban travel to Latin America, or to Italy, or to the Middle East. He could, in fact, prevent all of us from leaving the territory of the United States. What the court of appeals has said is that the President, through the Secretary of State, has the power to forbid travel

abroad. That is the court's interpretation of the Constitution. That is the law, says the court, and we can't do anything to prevent it.

It seems to this reporter that more is involved in this case than just Mr. Worthy's right to go where he pleases. His ability as a reporter is not in question. Whether he is a "blustering inquisitor" or a mild, scholarly man, has no bearing. What is most at stake is the public's right to know, not only in China but everywhere, any place at any time. A close reading of the court's ruling does not reveal any mention or recognition of this right. It is perhaps fantasy to suggest that at some future time some future Secretary of State could lock us all up in his country, could deny the right of exit, but under this ruling it could happen.

This is Ed Murrow. I'll be back in a moment with the word for today.

G. K. Chesterton once said: "I sometime think it is a pity that people travel in foreign countries—it narrows their minds so much." But Samuel Johnson was nearer the mark when he said: "The use of traveling is to regulate imagination by reality, and instead of thinking how things may be, to see them as they are."

Urban Renewal Pays Dividends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we have had ample evidence as to the worthwhileness of urban renewal as an investment which will return a dividend to the cities affected, and also to the Federal Government itself.

There recently appeared in the July 1959 issue of the official publication of the Alabama League of Municipalities an article entitled "Urban Renewal Pays Dividends." I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

URBAN RENEWAL PAYS DIVIDENDS

Urban renewal should occupy a top position in any future program to make Mobile a greater, more progressive city.

Like other cities throughout the Nation, our town is swiftly expanding far out into what used to be cow pastures and woodlands, with the result that it is developing into a sprawling, loosely integrated city to accommodate a population that could double in the next quarter century.

Traffic problems which hound us now will seem minor when compared to those of 1975 unless there is instituted soon a vigorous program of renewal in the central business and blighted areas of the city.

No single group in the community can accomplish this task. It will require the cooperation of government, private capital, and numerous civic organizations.

Some may say that a program of this nature is too costly. Actually, these people have not stopped to count the costs of failure to undertake the task of urban renewal. They have not taken time to figure out what good business it is to replace blighted, deteriorating areas with up-to-date new apartment houses, homes, and business establishments. They perhaps haven't realized that the day is fast approaching when people are going to get fed up with driving long distances to the suburbs and will begin looking for housing near the central city where public transportation is accessible and convenient.

Just as sure as the clock's pendulum swings, there lies ahead today a swing away from the distant surburbs to residence in close proximity to the city's heart.

This trend, we believe, will apply as well to industries. Some big companies over the Nation that have established plants on perimeters of cities are finding these locations less advantageous than they appeared on paper. The city still provides advantages of the bigger labor pool, superior transportation facilities and closer proximity to communications and business associates.

But a program of this nature must have dynamic leadership. It needs not only planners but doers. The leadership must be forthcoming if Mobile is to meet the challenge of the future.

Peoria Journal Star Editor in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to submit herewith the fifth and sixth in a series of articles written by the editor of the Peoria Journal Star upon his return from a recent trip to Russia:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, July 24, 1959]

BEACH 'NUT' SVETLANA MEETS HER MATCH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Charles L. Dancey, editor of the Journal Star, returned recently from a month's tour of the Soviet Union and at present is attending a national strategy seminar in Washington, D.C. Because of heavy censorship restrictions, Dancey made no effort to send dispatches from Russia. His daily articles, however, will be carried under dateline of the areas he visited.)

(By Charles L. Dancey, editor, the Journal Star)

ODESSA.—We visited a collective farm today—obviously a model one that even had its own beach, filled with stocky people and beautiful children.

There are huge fields of grades (mostly for wine) and also other crops, many buildings, some good, some very bad, and one "palace." The name is certainly appropriate and so they call it.

The driver became very easy and jolly out in the country and Svetlana seemed very gay, which is unusual. My lighter quit, and the driver stopped the car, hopped out, pulled a jug out of the trunk and filled it with benzine.

Several times Svetlana would suddenly call out, and he would slam on the brakes and they'd leap out of the car and pick wild flowers.

In the country we passed a road gang building an asphalt road mostly by hand, with shovels. They shovel on crushed rock and then tar and then rock. Many of the workers are women.

We also passed many rickety horse-drawn carts and wagons and one old woman bent double under a load of wood on her back.

At all the beaches one sees the same statues made from the same molds, the same basic set-up for sunning and swimming.

We visited more beaches than I can count. Svetlana is a sun nut. We also went through the defense museum, where you get the full propaganda treatment but while it includes both ridiculous tilts to laud the Communists specifically, by and large the sales pitch is one of intensive nationalism, and they have groups going through constantly.

Odessa, of course, is one of the "hero" cities, where there was a long siege and bitter fighting both when the Germans took it and when it was eventually recaptured.

I walked across from the hotel, lit my pipe, and a fellow who was lighting up a cigarette looked me up and down, straight in the eye, and said "Nemyets?" (German?)

I said: "Nyet. Ya Amerikanyets."

His stern face broke into a big smile, and he said: "Horoshow." (Good.) We talked pidgin Russian for a while, and then he invited me down the street for a beer. The beer was very good. It has a touch of the solid flavor of Pabst original that is out now—the old-fashioned touch.

The kids here are crazy for pennies. I only had two. The kids all study English and while they can't speak it, they do learn the alphabet and can read laboriously.

They study the pennies intently. Did you ever look at a penny closely? That is quite a message it carries in five little words.

Another time in the park, this time with Svetlana, a gypsy came up and wanted to tell her fortune. The gypsy said something about she would be going to Moscow soon. Svetlana got very upset, and she and the gypsy barked back and forth at each other, and finally much to my surprise, Svetlana lost her command of the situation and said, "Let's go." We walked away.

The gypsy stood mimicking her, "Lez go. Lez go."

It is hard for anyone to appreciate the boldness of this gypsy, unless you have been around and seen how everyone kowtows to Intourist.

My time in Odessa is running out, and I have been advised that I may have trouble on the ship to Yalta even with simple matters, and that it can be arranged for Svetlana to accompany me to Yalta and in all my travels as a great convenience to me.

This, of course, was the original stipulation. I took the position that this came as a complete surprise to me, and that it would be scandalous to Americans for a man alone like myself to travel such a long time and over such a wide area accompanied constantly by a young woman. I suggested that I would go to Yalta alone "and see how much trouble" it would be, and if it didn't work out well, I would request a guide when I got there for the rest of the trip.

They didn't push it.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, July 25, 1959]

LAD, 11, CHERISHES STAMP WITH STATUE OF LIBERTY

(By Charles L. Dancey, editor, the Journal Star)

YALTA.—The trip by ship from Odessa to Yalta was a total loss as far as I was concerned, simply because they took such wonderfully good care of me that I didn't get to talk to anybody. It was a large seagoing ship and the first class accommodations in this "classless society" were sheer luxury—greater than that available on most "capitalist" ships. I don't know how the other half lived below docks.

I had a fancy cabin, shared with an American doctor from the University of Chicago, and there were four other Americans aboard. The rest were all "silk shirt" Soviet-type citizens, and these left us strictly alone.

But at Yalta it was much different.

Here a new guide, Natasha, showed me the "palace" where Churchill lived and where a Russian noble built a beautiful park unique for its natural, wild appearance and its tremendous size. I was told that this was barren ground, and the whole thing was synthetic from the water falls and ponds to the tumbled rocks of swarming foliage. They say it was built by the labor of thousands of serfs.

Here too was the "palace" where Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill met and where Roosevelt lived (because of his handicap). It is fanastic in size, luxury, art objects and architecture—also built originally by a Czarist noble.

Then we went to visit the one-time home of the great playwright, Anton Checkov. It was closed because of a holiday. Our driver, however, insisted on climbing over the high wall and going in.

The director of this house-museum came out and unlocked the great iron gate and showed me through personally—the piano where Chaliapin played for his friend, the pen and desk where Checkov wrote "The Cherry Orchard," etc.

He was especially proud that Checkov's nephew came to the United States and became a very successful movie producer—and he advised Natasha that there "are more Russians in New York than Moscow."

Back at the hotel, however, is where things really began to happen. There on the esplanade I was befriended by a melting-eyed little 11-year-old named Yuri, who spoke no English.

He wanted a souvenir from America, and I gave him a stamp which he cherished for its Statute of Liberty, and a ballpoint pen. He went away and came back with a little book containing an accordian series of pictures of Yalta. On the way back he stopped and talked to the militiaman (police officer) on the esplanade, and the officer came over, smiling, offered me a cigarette, and talked for a few minutes.

Yuri then wanted me to go swimming with him. The beach was just beyond the esplanade, and I had to explain that I had no suit yet.

The next thing I knew he took me by the hand, led me about 100 yards from our beautiful hotel and through a little gate. Now, until this time, nothing was visible but beautiful buildings against a natural mountain and ocean bay setting which no less a traveler than Mark Twain described as the most beautiful spot on earth.

Inside the gate there was a surprise. A little dirt courtyard swarming with people, and surrounded by rickety frame stairs into a series of homes.

Yuri took me up a plain, dangerous stairway, pulled aside a heavy lace-like curtain and into a neat and clean room. In the room were three cot-like beds, a small square table with four chairs and a cupboard.

A man and woman met me smiling, took a bottle of applejuice out of the cupboard and served me. We talked as best we could for a little while, and meanwhile the neighbors kept drifting in smiling, chattering and talking.

It was repeatedly told me that the one impossibility in the Soviet Union is to get inside a private home, and here I suddenly was. The people were pleasant, curious and openhearted, with much joking and gaiety. The home was very neat and clean.

Yet obviously it was a living room, dining room, bedroom and pantry for the family. I understand that kitchen and bathroom facilities are shared then by three to five families.

This fits other information as to housing conditions.

But an even more interesting experience awaited me in Yalta.

Fiftieth Anniversary of Camp Dawson, Kingwood, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege on Saturday, July 25, 1959, to participate in ceremonies commemorating the 50th anniversary of Camp Dawson, near Kingwood, W. Va. Likewise, it was Governor's Day at the half-century-old West Virginia National Guard camp in Preston County.

The official program for the occasion included an interesting, informative, and well-prepared historical background summary of Camp Dawson by Maj. William E. Miller, assistant adjutant general of West Virginia.

Following the presentation and inspection of troops and the presentation of awards to individual guardsmen and units, the Honorable Cecil H. Underwood, Governor of West Virginia, responded to his introduction by Maj. Gen. William E. Blake, State adjutant general.

In his remarks, the Governor noted that "the National Guard of West Virginia is stronger and more modern today than ever before," and he said that "the goal of our reorganization has been achieved—units having been retained in every community which had a guard unit before the reorganization." There are 35 units in 31 communities, said the Governor, and he added:

These units are the most modern in the Army structure, including special forces at Huntington. * * * As you well know, and by your efforts, Camp Dawson has been reactivated and this year is celebrating its 50th anniversary. Once again, our guard units are conducting field training within the borders of West Virginia.

Governor Underwood also commented that "the West Virginia National Guard went to field training this year only 27 men short of its authorized maximum strength," and observed that "such a record of manpower obviously indicates the high morale within our guard units and their high prestige within the State."

He also appropriately stated that during his administration he had dedicated several armories and other military facilities, and stressed a significant opinion in his remarks, addressed especially to the troops:

One point which I am gratified always to mention in these messages is the debt owed by the guard and the State of West Virginia to the local communities for their support and encouragement of guard activities. All of you guardmen know just how essential such public endorsement is. It contributes to the manpower of our units and to the atmosphere conducive for their military effectiveness. I am sure that you are grateful for the personal support which each of you has received and for the general enthusiastic reception accorded the National Guard. * * * Cooperation is a two-way process; it requires giving and taking by both parties. West Virginia has given its National Guard her support; * * * you have given West Virginia an effective military organization.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD in connection with these comments and quotations a partial review of the historical background of Camp Dawson by Major Miller to which I referred earlier.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND—CAMP DAWSON
(By Maj. William E. Miller, assistant adjutant general)

For over 200 years the Cheat River bottom land, on which Camp Dawson is located, was known as Dunkard Bottom. It was so called by three brothers named Eckerlin, who settled there near the outbreak of the French and Indian Wars. They were members of the Dunkard faith, or Church of the Brethren.

In about 1756, this frontier settlement was raided by Indians under the leadership of a French officer. Two of the Eckerlin brothers were captured, while the third was at Fort Pleasant, in Hardy County, trading furs.

After the close of hostilities in 1763, the bottom land was without settlers until about 1776, although the great Indian war trail, a west to east path, crossed the river opposite the mouth of Morgan's Run, traversing the entire length of the camp along the river. A few miles downstream the path turned eastward across the mountains. This path was used by white settlers who journeyed eastward during the Revolutionary War.

In 1784, George Washington planned to use Dunkard Bottom as the overland portage terminal for a canal to connect the East and West via the Potomac River, Cheat River, and Monongalia River. A few years later, the historic Winchester-Clarksburg Pike crossed the river at this point. A ferry operated there for many years, until the present Caddell Bridge was built by the Preston County court in 1906–7.

After the War of 1812, a company of men were discharged from service at Dunkard Bottom, and during the Civil War various details of men of the 6th West Virginia Volunteer Infantry camped on the present site of Camp Dawson.

On May 7, 1909, a tract of 196½ acres was purchased by the State of West Virginia on Cheat River, in Preston County, for use as a State military camp.

It was named "Camp Dawson" in honor of former Gov. William M. O. Dawson, a native of Preston County, who served from 1905 to 1908 as the 12th chief executive of West Virginia. The naming of the camp was announced by Brig. Gen. Noyes S. Burlew, the adjutant general, in General Order No. 17, dated June 22, 1909, Adjutant General's Department, State of West Virginia.

The sum of $10,000 was paid to Florence V. Elliott, her husband, Felix, and Rupert E. Vickery, for the Dunkard Bottom site, which is located approximately 4 miles southeast of the town of Kingwood. The purchase was authorized by the State legislature.

Troops of the 1st Infantry, West Virginia National Guard, trained on the site during the summer of 1909, while under command of Col. Harry R. Smith. Battalion size units of the 1st Infantry Regiment trained from July 7 through August 4, 1911, and again in 1913 from July 6 to 26, inclusive. The West Virginia State rifle team also held a 4-day training period during July 27 to 30, 1913, prior to the national matches.

In 1914, both the 1st and 2d Infantry Regiments trained at Camp Dawson, in conjunction with Regular Army troops.

During World War I there was no activity at Camp Dawson, and the camp was abandoned as a training area until 1928, when

Gov. William G. Conley appointed Carleton C. Pierce, of Kingwood, Preston County, as the adjutant general, and Governor Conley agreed to reestablish Camp Dawson as a training center.

In 1929, the 201st Infantry Regiment, commanded by Col. Earl Smith, of Fairmont, held summer training at Camp Dawson. The following year (1930) Col. Charles G. Robison, of Morgantown, was commander of the 201st Regiment, and returned with his troop to Camp Dawson for summer maneuvers.

For the next 5 years, 1931 through 1935, the 201st Infantry Regiment held their training at Camp Dawson during the summer months. In 1936 the troops trained at Fort Knox, Ky. The following three summers, 1937, 1938, and 1939, the troops returned to Camp Dawson for training.

Camp McCoy, Wis., was the site of training for the 201st Infantry Regiment from August 11–31, 1940. Less than 6 months later, on January 6, 1941, the 201st was inducted into active Federal service at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., for service during World War II.

It was not until 1945–46 that Camp Dawson was used again as a training area. The 1st and 2d Regiments of the State Guard held their final training prior to inactivation during August 5–19, 1945, and from July 21–28, 1946. Col. Michael Y. Heath, Jr., of Fairmont, was commander of the 1st Regiment, and Col. Paul V. Myer, of Charleston, commanded the 2d Regiment during this period.

With the reorganization of the West Virgina National Guard following World War II, range firing was held at Camp Dawson by individual companies during 1947 on weekends. Since the National Guard had been reorganized into one regiment in 20 cities, with several additional separate batallions, Camp Dawson was no longer large enough, nor were the required training facilities available to support a summertime encampment of the entire West Virginia National Guard. The first postwar training for troops was held at Fort Knox, Ky., from July 21 through August 8, 1948. During the next 10 years, Camp Dawson was used exclusively for weekend range firing, and in addition became the home station of Service Battery, 201st Armored Field Artillery Battalion, which was activated on June 5, 1947, and has been a continuous unit at Camp Dawson since that time.

Since the original purchase in 1909, two additional tracts of land have been purchased by the State of West Virginia. On June 14, 1932, 1.43 acres were purchased from Felix Elliott for the sum of $500, and 235.57 acres were purchased during July 1945, also from Felix Elliott, for $8,500. This brought the total acreage of Camp Dawson to 434.5 acres.

During World War II, Camp Dawson was leased by the U.S. Government for $1 per annum, effective August 1, 1942, for the purpose of establishing an Italian prisoner-of-war camp. During this period, one Interior Military Police Battalion and two Interior Military Police companies, U.S. Army, were stationed at Camp Dawson. The site was returned to State control on September 1, 1944.

In order to further develop the facilities of Camp Dawson as a training site, plans for training at least part of the West Virginia National Guard there annually were developed by Maj. Gen. William E. Blake, the present Adjutant General. The original plan was presented initially to the Chief, National Guard Bureau, Department of the Army, in 1957. The Bureau approved the plan, and in the summer of 1958 the 1092d Engineer Battalion (C) (A), veterans of Korea, whose homes were in the vicinity of Parkersburg and Salem, came to Camp Dawson for their traditional 15-day summer training. They established a large lake, built additional roadways, range facilities and did general repairs to the camp. Preliminary plans for the construction of a new one-unit Armory and Motor Vehicle Storage Building, at a cost of $223,600, are now awaiting final approval in Washington, D.C. Martens Associates, architects of Charleston, W. Va., are designing the buildings.

Summertime activity during 1959 will include a 15-day training period for the 1092d Engineer Battalion, of Parkersburg and Salem; State Headquarters and Headquarters Detachment, of Charleston and Point Pleasant; the 130th Ordnance Company (DAS) of Williamson, and the 249th Army Band, of Fairmont. In addition, the first and second classes of the West Virginia Military Academy (officer candidate school), will be at Camp Dawson during the period July 19 through August 2, 1959.

It is particularly fitting that the tempo of activity be increased during this 50th anniversary of Camp Dawson on Dunkard Bottom.

Cuba: Bastion of Infiltration?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address to the House on July 7, 1959, I emphasized the threatening situation now developing in the Caribbean area as constituting a challenge to the Monroe Doctrine. Did I overemphasize the processes of penetration and infiltration by which these threats were created? Far from it. Instead, they were rather understated.

As further documentation on the Caribbean question, I quote a news story summary of recent testimony by the former chief of the Cuban Air Force before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security as published in the July 18, 1959, issue of the Tablet of Brooklyn, N.Y.:

FORMER AID SAYS PREMIER CASTRO IS A COMMUNIST—CHARGES MANY OFFICIALS OF CUBAN REGIME ARE ACTIVE IN RED CONSPIRACY—AGAINST ALL RELIGION—FORMER CHIEF OF CUBAN AIR FORCE TESTIFIES BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE

WASHINGTON.—The former chief of Cuban Premier Fidel Castro's air force charged here that Castro and leading members of his regime are Communists.

Maj. Pedro Luis Diaz Lanz told the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that the Castro regime is attempting to turn Cuba into a base for Communist activity in Latin America.

NAMES RAUL CASTRO, GUEVARA

Major Diaz, who fled Cuba secretly June 29, identified Premier Castro, his brother Raul, commander in chief of Cuban armed forces, Ernesto "Che" Guevara, an intimate of the Castro brothers, and other high ranking government and armed forces officials as members of the international Communist conspiracy.

Major Diaz' testimony was interrupted minutes after it had begun by an announcement from subcommittee chairman Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, that a very reliable source had warned him that an attempt will be made to injure the witness and his party.

Senator EASTLAND ordered the hearing room cleared for 40 minutes, while police and hastily summoned Army Ordnance experts searched the room for a bomb. They found nothing.

When the hearing resumed, Major Diaz told the subcommittee that he originally joined the Castro revolution late in 1956, "because I believed he would bring back freedom to my country." Instead, he added, "he brought Communists to my country."

Major Diaz, a handsome, 32-year-old man with an actor's profile, was accompanied by his attractive wife, Tania, and his half-brother, Sergio Diaz Brull, who served occasionally as the major's translator when his English failed him.

Major Diaz said the three of them had fled from Cuba with a fourth man in a sailboat chartered by Mr. Diaz Brull. The major's whereabouts in this country were kept secret prior to the hearing. However, informants let it be known that the Internal Security Subcommittee had heard him at least once—and possibly oftener—in secret session before scheduling the public hearings.

SUSPICIONS BEGAN IN JANUARY

The witness said he had been a copilot with a Cuban commercial airline for 5 years before joining the Castro movement. During the revolution his principal assignment was to fly guns and ammunition to the Castro forces.

He said he first began to suspect that Castro and those close to him were Communists early in January, when the Cuban Premier refused in radio and television broadcasts to "attack Communists." Subsequent words and actions by Premier Castro confirmed his suspicions, he declared.

He stated that he had heard Castro say in private that he plans to establish in Cuba an even more thoroughly communistic system than that of the Soviet Union.

He said Castro once told him regarding his projected agrarian reform, that he would first seize the land of supporters of ousted dictator Fulgencio Batista, and then "I'm going to take the land of everybody." On another occasion, he said, Castro stated that "some day the banks will disappear."

Major Diaz asserted that Communist members of the deposed Batista regime had been installed in his government by Premier Castro. He gave a long list of names of alleged Communists who have been given important posts in the government and the armed forces by the Premier and his brother Raul.

Leading Communists in Cuba, he said, include Augusto Martinez, Minister of Defense, Armando Hart, Minister of Educaton, David Salvador, a prominent labor leader, and Raul Castro's wife.

CALLS REGIME ANTIRELIGIOUS

Describing himself as a practicing Catholic, Major Diaz branded the Castro regime as antireligious. He said the word "God" had been removed from the new Cuban constitution because communism does not agree with the church—with religion." Major Diaz said Premier Castor had publicly avoided answering questions on this point.

The major said political indoctrination schools for the armed forces established by the Castro government had been infiltrated by Communists. He said that at one of these schools the recent Hollywood film "The Defiant Ones," whose theme is racial discrimination, was exhibited to those attending. Afterward, he said, the teacher in charge of the class gave a lecture in which he said the movie gave a typical picture of race relations in the United States.

Major Diaz charged that anti-U.S. propaganda is being distributed freely in Cuba by the government. Premier Castro often refers in public addresses to "imperialist Yankees" and warns that the nation may someday have to defend itself against invading U.S. Marines, he said.

The witness stated that numerous Soviet agents have arrived in Cuba since the Castro regime took power. He said he believes the government is getting "some sort of scientific help" from the Soviets.

Major Diaz said the Red Star, a Communist symbol, is being painted on all Cuban military vehicles. He charged that the government is distributing arms to Communists. On May Day of this year, he said, he saw Raul Castro give the Communist clenched fist salute to a group of armed workers in a parade.

As chief of the Cuban air force, Major Diaz said, he accompanied Premier Castro when he visited Venezuela earlier this year, shortly after coming to power. During the visit, the Premier had a conference of "close to 2 hours" with Gustavo Machado, head of the Venezuelan Communist Party, he declared.

RUSSIAN SUBMARINE

Major Diaz said he had been told by a friend that during the revolution an unidentified submarine appeared off the coast of Cuba's Oriente Province, where the revolutionary forces were directed by Raul Castro. Observers said the crew of the submarine were speaking an unidentified language which sounded like Russian.

The major said it is his opinion that the submarine was carrying arms for Raul Castro and his troops. Raul Castro's forces did not get many supplies from the usual sources, he declared, but "he had a lot of men and weapons—I don't know from where."

He added that other Russian agents have taken many photographs of Cuban textile industries in Matanza Province. On one occasion, he said, two Russian agents appeared in Santiago wearing Castro uniforms. They were placed in jail, but were freed at the Premier's orders.

Members of the subcommittee pointed out to Major Diaz that since this flight from Cuba, he has been called a traitor by Cuban officials, incluuding Premier Castro, and has been accused of being merely a disgruntled "soldier of fortune" who fell out with the regime after being demoted for inefficiency.

However, Major Diaz denied that he had ever been a soldier of fortune, or had been engaged in smuggling arms to Latin American revolutionaries before joining the Castro movement.

He also denied published reports that he recently crashed in a Cuban swamp after recklessly taking off in an ungassed airplane. He said the crash took place while he was piloting a helicopter, and was the result of a mechanical failure.

As for Premier Castro's charges that he is a traitor, the major said, "my conscience is clear. I believe he is the traitor, not me." During the revolution, he said, Castro promised the Nation democracy, but now "he has given Communists the control of the country."

He described the accusations made against him as typical Communist smear tactics, designed to "destroy the reputation of a man who is against them." He said Premier Castro uses similar tactics to control the Cuban press, by charging that newspapers which oppose him are actually taking money from the former dictator Batista.

Herbert G. Klein Vice President Nixon's New Special Assistant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a press release issued concerning Mr. Herbert G. Klein, the new press assistant to Vice President NIXON:

NIXON TRIP IS FIRST TEST FOR NEW PRESS AID KLEIN

(By Alan Masters)

WASHINGTON, July 20.—For a revealing glimpse of what White House press policies may be after 1960, keep an eye on Herbert G. Klein.

In Washington less than a month, the newly named special assistant to Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON already is up to his eyebrows in one of the roughest assignments ever to face a high-level press officer.

This month Klein is shepherding 60-odd reporters behind the Iron Curtain to cover NIXON'S travels in the Soviet Union. Even Presidential Press Secretary Jim Hagerty hasn't had to cope with that one.

The trip comes at a tense period in East-West relations. Its measure of success and the tone of its press coverage will be pivotal in the Vice President's career.

No one doubts that boyish, 41-year-old Klein, known to reporters as able and astute, will be NIXON'S press secretary if the Vice President succeeds to the White House.

On leave from his job as editor of the San Diego Union, Klein has complete authority to speak for the second highest official in the United States.

He is much more, however, than a conduit of information. High professional competence and 13 years of friendship with NIXON entitle Klein to his rank as a top policy adviser.

Nevertheless, he insists on viewing his job as a newspaperman:

"My objective is to get news out accurately and honestly," Klein says. "I can save time all around because I know the Vice President well enough to anticipate many of his reactions. I'm lucky because he understands my problems completely."

In his Washington office Klein is separated from another staffer by a Jerry-built partition. He occupies a room adjoining NIXON'S suite in the Senate Office Building, and the freshly painted walls are hung with souvenir gavels and cartoons of the Vice President. When he returns from Russia Klein hopes to have a news ticker beside his littered desk.

MET NIXON IN 1946

As a political reporter for the Alhambra (Calif.) Post-Advocate, Klein first met NIXON in 1946 when he covered the young Whittier lawyer's first race for the House of Representatives. Both men were Navy veterans and Klein still holds a commander's Reserve commission.

A warm friendship developed as NIXON'S political star rose and Klein moved up in the world of journalism. His newspaper career was checkered with leaves of absence for Nixon campaigns.

In 1952 Klein directed publicity for the Eisenhower-Nixon campaign in southern California. In 1956 he served as NIXON'S assistant press secretary. Again in the 1958 whirlwind tour which sped the Nixon caravan as far as Alaska, Klein went along as press secretary.

His relaxed look, reporters have learned, is just a look. Klein thinks and acts fast in a crisis.

In 1956, for example, he ran a Florida hotel for 2 hours. Clerks had carelessly given out two sets of keys. When the press plane disgorged a load of tired, irritable reporters, slotted in mixed-up hotel rooms, there was bedlam. The manager simply threw up his hands.

Klein took over the desk, redistributed keys, took in laundry, and gave out mail. His thoughtfulness shows in his refusal to tell the name of the hotel. "Wouldn't want to hurt their business," he says.

If Herb Klein moves into the White House with his boss, he'll be no Jim Hagerty.

Temperamentally the men are opposites—Hagerty's temper trigger sharp, Klein's disposition even.

Klein in the White House probably would not exercise the type of backstage authority Hagerty is credited with wielding. NIXON listens to his staff, relies heavily on them, but in the end makes his own decisions.

A reporter for a rival California paper called Klein the "best man any candidate in any party could have. He gives the press what they want, from sharpening pencils to providing important story background, at the same time doing right by his boss. Herb has tact, patience, never panics, or gets nervous."

So far Klein has kept his working day to a hectic 10 hours, spending most evenings with his wife Marjorie, their daughters, 13-year-old Joanne and 10-year-old Patricia, and Pat's pet hamster. He has one big complaint: There's no place in Washington for his favorite sport—skin diving.

Atlantic Air Rivalry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 16, several of my colleagues and I joined in urging the establishment of a merchant marine of the air. This was based on many factors. Principal among them being the increasingly strong competition for our transatlantic airlines from government-owned and highly subsidized foreign carriers.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of July 27 carries a most illuminating article written by Mr. George Horne which reemphasizes several of the points my colleagues and I made on July 16, plus introducing several most interesting additional facts of his own.

An example of how the U.S.-flag carriers share of transatlantic air traffic is deteriorating is Mr. Horne's statement that Pan American World Airways, despite the introduction in 1958 of jet service last fall, carried only 26.4 percent of transatlantic travel during 1958. Despite the fact that Pan American's jets are now operating more than four round-trips daily between the United States and Europe, Pan American's share of passenger business during the first 3 months of this year was only 32.3 percent. The figures applicable to TWA are even more striking. In 1953 TWA carried 24 percent of all transatlantic air business in both directions but in the first quarter of 1959 TWA's share of the total air passenger business was down to 11 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it is no wolf cry which threatens TWA and Pan American across the North Atlantic. It is rough, tough, coldblooded competition which the foreign carriers are providing. It is additionally unfortunate, as Mr. Horne points out, that some of our State Department officials seem to feel that they have obligations to give our foreign competitors

choice routes throughout the United States while asking or expecting very little in return.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Horne has apparently done an outstanding research job. His accumulated facts and his most interesting figures should be brought to the attention of every Member of this body. Under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Horne's article "Atlantic Air Rivalry Up," from the New York Times of July 27:

ATLANTIC AIR RIVALRY UP—PAN AMERICAN AND TRANS WORLD WARN OF TRAFFIC GAINS BY FOREIGN CARRIERS

(By George Horne)

Foreign carriers on Atlantic air routes are steadily nibbling at the share of U.S.-flag airlines in this major travelarea. Although the bulk of transatlantic air travel is American, foreign competition is on the increase, and future prospects are that it will take more and more of the business, according to executives of the two American companies, Pan American World Airways and Trans World Airlines.

In 1958 the percentages of U.S.-flag carrying relative to total transatlantic volume reached a 5-year low. Pan American, in the years up to 1958, had carried from 30.5 to 32 percent of the total Atlantic traffic, but it was down to 26.4 percent last year.

The introduction of jets on Pan American services late last year and in the first months of 1959 helped the line maintain its position. However, despite the fact that the jets carried better than 91 percent of capacity, the line's share of carryings during the first quarter of this year was only 32.3 percent.

Trans World Airlines, in the first quarter of the year, carried 11 percent of the traffic on scheduled airlines. This line carried 24 percent in 1953 and has won a declining share each year, with 18.1 percent in 1957 and 15.2 percent in 1958.

ALARMING FACTORS CITED

Both airline concerns believe that several alarming factors will make the next few years a period of crisis for the air-transport industry. They are:

Indications that existing foreign airlines will make every effort to strengthen their competitive positions on the lucrative Atlantic routes.

The definite possibility that the Soviet Union's swift rise in commercial air power will make itself felt over the Atlantic.

The continuing policy of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Department of State in granting liberal route rights in this country to foreign airlines.

Last year, not counting traffic to and from Canadian airports, the Atlantic lines handled more than 1 million passengers. Approximately 80 percent of these travelers were American citizens. The total traffic figure will be higher this year, by all indications.

As an example of what the foreign-flag lines are gaining in this reservoir of traffic, the companies reported that the British Overseas Airways Corp. in the first quarter of this year took 13.6 percent of the transatlantic business, surpassing Trans World for the first time.

TO SPUR SALES EFFORT

B.O.A.C., it is noted, was flying jets in this period, and Trans World will not get its jets until later this year. However, nine foreign-flag carriers will be flying the business-getting turbine equipment by the spring of next year and are expected to increase their share of traffic.

The American lines are planning to intensify foreign sales efforts to offset the successful drive of foreign competition. Trans World, for instance, has established a new international sales development division to be headed by Richard Mazzarini, as vice president. He has had extensive experience abroad. The line is also bringing home several foreign area sales managers to map new sales tactics here.

Both lines consider it quite likely that the Soviet will enter the transatlantic trades before long with the new turbo-propeller TU-114. This plane, which recently flew from Moscow to New York in 11 hours, may be a dangerous competitor and, as one executive put it, "a major weapon in the economic cold war."

On the subject of handling foreign applications for flying rights in this country, the airlines contend it is the apparent policy of this country to grant foreigners anything they ask at the expense of American flag lines.

Thirteen foreign lines now operate to seven U.S. cities. Some have additional rights through the United States to Latin America and the Orient. Under bilateral air agreements, of course, American lines have equal rights to enter foreign nations. But the markets at this end and at the foreign ends of the routes are vastly different.

IMBALANCE IS NOTED

As an example, Air France serves Chicago, Boston, and New York, with combined populations of more than 12 million. The opposite line, Pan American, serves Paris and Nice, with a combined population of some 3 million.

This imbalance is true of other lines, such as KLM, Lufthansa, B.O.A.C., and Irish Airlines, which may tap a far greater market in this country than the markets offered to American carriers in their countries.

The official Federal policy in granting foreign airline rights here has been a major factor in the deterioration of the position of this country's airlines in foreign trade, in the opinion of Pan American and Trans World officials.

Behind the official U.S. support policy for air development is the acceptance of a strong civil air arm as a necessary "merchant marine of the air." Apart from its role in serving industry and commerce, its planes and men afford an available reserve in time of emergency.

The question the airlines raise is: Where will this reserve be if competition continues to dilute the trade on which it must live?

United States Is Prodded on Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under law to extend my remarks, I include a news article from the July 28 issue of the New York Times in the Appendix of the RECORD, following my brief remarks.

There is a growing realization that the problem of civil defense in the nuclear age is of pressing importance to the survival of our Nation. The civil defense committee of the National Association of County Officials meeting in Detroit on July 27 passed a resolution containing a 17-point program calling on the Federal Government to assume its constitutional responsibility to protect the civilian population from enemy attack in the event of a nuclear war.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES IS PRODDED ON CIVIL DEFENSE—CONVENTION OF COUNTY AIDES SCHEDULES CALL FOR NEW FEDERAL DEPARTMENT

(By Clayton Knowles)

DETROIT, July 27.—The National Association of County Officials began applying pressure today to get more forceful Federal action on civil defense.

Meeting here 1,800 strong, the organization mapped a program that calls on Washington to provide more in the way of leadership, educational effort and money for protection against nuclear attack.

The 17-point program urges establishment of a full-fledged Department of Civil Defense. The agency would cooperate with but be entirely separate from the military Defense Establishment.

The resolution embodying the program conceded that all levels of government have a role to play in civil defense but that the National Government should provide leadership and the Congress should provide adequate funds to carry out the duty of the Federal Government to provide this leadership.

FULL APPROVAL ASSURED

The resolution, framed by the association's civil defense committee, was quickly approved in committee and is assured passage by the convention Wednesday.

The program asks speedy implementation of a national defense shelter program. It calls for construction of 100 prototype shelters across the Nation and incorporation of shelters in all new Federal buildings.

Elliott R. Jackson, civil defense committee chairman, had praise for Governor Rockefeller, of New York, saying that he had "pumped new life into the civil defense effort and won thousands of friends all across the country."

Mr. Jackson, who is civil defense director of the Atlanta, metropolitan area, added: "If that Rockefeller gets a compulsory program through in New York the whole Nation will sit up, because he studied the situation and he's Governor of our biggest State."

Mr. Jackson declared that the Federal program up to this point had not even scratched the surface.

The committee action came after the convention had heard Gunnar Lannaeus, cultural attaché at the Swedish Embassy in Washington, tell about Sweden's $180 million 10-year program of public shelter construction. The program was initiated last month.

SCOPE OF SHELTER PLANS

Mr. Lannaeus emphasized that the accent still was on evacuation of cities, but that, under the program, public shelters would be built in every city of 50,000 or more. All shelters will have peacetime uses, some as factories and some as garages or other service facilities.

Mr. Lannaeus reported that Stockholm already had four huge shelters, but that they would accommodate only 50,000 of the city's 750,000 population. These shelters, he said, are for those who in an attack must stay at essential jobs or serve in civil defense and salvage work.

He said that the public program supplemented a 1945 program that required private enterprise to incorporate shelters in all multi-family housing and office buildings.

The convention was welcomed by Gov. G. Mennen Williams and by Mayor Louis C. Miriani, Edward Connor, Wayne County supervisor, and other local officials.

Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, declared in a speech that efforts toward nuclear disarmament should be con-

tinued, but he urged that, regardless of the political climate of the hour, any pact in the field contain provision for both inspection and enforcement.

"You cannot rely on a Russian promise," he said.

Statement of President Clarence N. Sayen, Air Line Pilots Association, on Legislation To Prohibit Liquor Service Aboard Airplanes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the very interesting statement of Mr. Clarence N. Sayen, president of the Air Line Pilots Association, before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on the bills to prohibit the serving or consumption of alcoholic beverages on aircraft engaged in domestic air transportation:

STATEMENT OF CLARENCE N. SAYEN, PRESIDENT, AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION, INTERNATIONAL, BEFORE THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND AVIATION, ON H.R. 1075 AND RELATED BILLS

My name is Clarence N. Sayen. I am president of the Air Line Pilots Association, International. We are pleased to have the opportunity to appear in support of H.R. 1075 and related bills which would prohibit the serving or consumption of alcoholic beverages on aircraft engaged in domestic air transportation. A statement of my qualifications is attached hereto.

We were privileged to appear before this committee in support of similar legislation then pending in the 84th Congress, 2d session and we are pleased that the committee and the House of Representatives acted favorably on it. Most of what we had to say in favor of this legislation at that time is still applicable. If this statement, therefore, appears familiar to some of the members of the committee it is because, in our view, the same arguments which have persuaded us to strongly support this legislation for the past several years are applicable today. This legislation was originally introduced in the Congress when a few airlines began to sell or give alcoholic beverages to their passengers during flight. The real or imagined competitive pressure of this action by a few carriers caused other airlines to also begin the practice; when we testified on this legislation a few years ago the number had grown to eight airlines who were either selling or giving alcoholic beverages to their passengers on some of their flights. This number, we believe has now expanded to 12 carriers, 7 of whom sell liquor to passengers and 5 who provide it without charge. This practice, of course, has also spread to additional routes.

In 1957 this legislation was viewed and considered in light of the various aircraft then in use in air commerce. Those transports weighed less than 140,000 pounds, carried only 60 to 85 passengers, at speeds not much in excess of 300 miles per hour, and at altitudes up to 22,000 feet. Present-day jet aircraft transport passengers at speeds in excess of 500 miles per hour and at altitudes up to 35,000 feet. They cost over $5 million, weigh up to 300,000 pounds, and carry as many as 112 passengers. In the near future, similar aircraft will be transporting as many as 179 passengers at even greater speeds and higher altitudes. The problems of handling large numbers of people of diverse personalities in a confined space have thus been magnified, the dangers of emergency decompression at the higher altitudes enhanced, the risk in unscheduled landings to unload an inebriated, sick, or emotional passenger has grown. The time of the crew in these high-speed, complex aircraft is occupied with flight duties and should not be spent playing nursemaid to inebriated passengers.

We are not supporting this legislation in any attempt to endorse an overall prohibition against the consumption of alcoholic beverages or a feeling of responsibility to regulate the personal habits of air travelers. The interest of the airline pilot in regulation or legislation that would curtail the consumption of alcoholic beverages on aircraft while in flight stems from three primary areas of concern:

1. The compromise with safety introduced on board the aircraft.

2. The additional burden imposed upon the pilot who must bear the ultimate responsibility for the safe and honorable conduct of his passengers while at the same time operate his aircraft safely.

3. The assumption of responsibility for the maintenance of order and harmony and for safe conduct among passengers permitted to consume alcoholic beverages.

We will discuss these three points in order.

1. Compromise with safety. There is little doubt that the unregulated consumption of alcoholic beverages by passengers in aircraft constitutes a compromise with safety. When an aircraft leaves the ground for flight with a load of passengers it contains a large group of people of diverse backgrounds, physical capacities, experience, and habits, sealed in a metal tube in close proximity to each other and with no avenue of escape except when the aircraft is again brought to earth. Some of the passengers may have overcome any apprehension about flying and be completely relaxed in this mode of travel. Others may be under considerable nervous tension and be repressing anxieties and fears. Some may have a capacity for a considerable consumption of alcohol with no effect. Others may react suddenly to small quantities of alcohol. There is no way of knowing what the reaction of any individual passenger will be prior to the beginning of the flight.

There are many things that an irresponsible or intoxicated person can do in an aircraft that may endanger the flight or other passengers. One of the greatest fears of all pilots is fire in flight. The careless use of cigarettes or matches by an inebriated passenger may be a source of fire. It is extremely difficult for one or two cabin attendants to completely monitor as many as 100 passengers in one aircraft. An apprehensive passenger relieved of his inhibitions by alcohol and panic stricken through some in-flight emergency may attempt to enter the cockpit and interfere with the operation of the aircraft by the flight crew or with delicate instruments or radio necessary to the conduct of the flight.

In the event of an emergency in flight, survival of the passengers is often dependant upon their good judgment, alertness and cooperation with the crew members and other passengers. No pilot contemplates with pleasure forced evacuation or ditching of an aircraft with a load of passengers who may be even slightly under the influence of alcohol.

2. Additional burdens placed on the pilot. The operation of a large and complex modern transport aircraft occupies all of the attention of the flight crew. Under instrument operation in complex traffic areas, in adverse weather or other difficult flight situations, the flight crew's time is fully occupied. However, in addition to the responsibility for the operation of the aircraft, the pilot must also assume the ultimate responsibility for the safe and orderly conduct of his passengers. If a safety or social situation arises among the passengers which may jeopardize continuance of the flight or cause discomfort to the passengers, the final recourse of the cabin attendants is to request the captain to come out of the flight deck to maintain order or remedy the situation. It is then necessary that the pilot take whatever measures are necessary for the safety of the flight and welfare of his passengers. This may include drastic measures if necessary. There have been instances where it has been necessary for the pilot to physically subdue passengers. Had the pilot been injured, the flight would be deprived of his services and an emergency created.

There is little doubt that the consumption of alcoholic beverages by passengers has increased the frequency with which situations requiring the attention of the flight crew in the passenger cabin is required. To this extent the social problem engendered as the result of the consumption of alcoholic beverages on board aircraft takes the pilot away from his duties and may become a safety problem.

3. Responsibility of the pilot. As previously stated, the pilot of an aircraft bears the ultimate responsibility for the safe operation of his aircraft and the safe conduct of his passengers. If passengers are to be permitted to consume alcoholic beverages in flight, the pilot must assume the responsibility for coping with any hazard created or the consequences of his actions taken to maintain order, alleviate a social situation which may arise, or eliminate a hazard.

If a passenger under the influence of alcohol becomes dangerous to other passengers on board an aircraft, it is the responsibility of the pilot to bring the dangerous situation under control. This may require drastic measures including bodily harm to the uncontrollable passenger.

Part 40.351(c) of the Civil Air Regulations provides:

"Responsibility of pilot in command: The pilot in command shall during flight time be in command of the airplane and crew and shall be responsible for the safety of the passengers, crew members, cargo, and airplane."

In addition, the Civil Air Regulations provide—

"Use of liquor, narcotics, and drugs. A pilot shall not permit any person to be carried in the aircraft who is obviously under the influence of intoxicating liquor or drugs, except a medical patient under proper care or in case of an emergency."

This regulation places the responsibility on the pilot for not carrying individuals under the influence of alcohol. For many years, pilots have carried out their responsibility to refuse to carry passengers who are under the influence of alcohol under the impression that this was their responsibility and they were enhancing the safety of air transportation. However, it is impractical to prevent passengers who have been drinking from boarding the aircraft when it is the intent to make alcohol available to them after they come aboard. It is difficult to prevent passengers from bringing alcohol aboard aircraft when the airline furnishes the accessories for their drinking during flight. The sum total of this situation appears to be that the airlines are willing to interpret the foregoing regulations in such manner as to permit drinking aboard aircraft so that individuals may come under the influence of intoxicating liquor. The responsibility for maintaining order and carrying out a safe operation despite this compromise is placed on the pilot.

The association is skeptical that the pilot can effectively carry out all of his responsibilities if the additional problems created by permitting the consumption of alcohol aboard aircraft are added to them; therefore, the air line pilot has been reluctant to assume, in addition to all of his other responsibilities as an aircraft commander, the responsibility of being the guardian of a group of passengers under various flight conditions who are permitted to consume alcohol.

An airline pilot, in the course of completing a day's flight assignment, may cross the boundaries of many States. Laws vary from State to State. For example, some States prohibit the sale of alcohol as do parts of some States. In many instances, the pilot is not certain whether the dispensation of alcohol on his aircraft is legal in the particular airspace which he is occupying as of the moment. In addition, we may have a situation where a pilot who lives in New York State is flying an airplane owned by a Delaware corporation over the State of Ohio and find it necessary to take drastic action against a passenger from California. It is the opinion of the association that the consumption of alcohol aboard aircraft, if permitted to continue, necessitates a very clear enunciation of the legal authority and responsibilities of the pilot in dealing with passenger problems under the various legal jurisdictions through which he must operate. This has not been accomplished to date either nationally or internationally.

All of these problems were considered by the board of directors of the Air Line Pilots Association at their 13th convention in November 1954. Such consideration resulted in the adoption of a resolution which reads as follows:

"The Air Line Pilots Association is opposed to the serving of alcoholic beverages aboard aircraft, the providing of setups aboard aircraft, or any other practices which will encourage drinking alcoholic beverages on board aircraft."

When the airlines first began serving alcoholic beverages to passengers on domestic flights, the association called these problems to the attention of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Air Transport Association and urged that the industry take voluntary action to terminate or regulate this practice. This correspondence, addressed on August 27, 1954, pointed out that in the opinion of the association the service of alcoholic beverages is not in the best interests of the air transportation business for many reasons, among which are:

1. It is a compromise with safety by creating an additional hazard on board aircraft.

2. Intoxicated passengers create embarrassing situations on board aircraft which discourage people from flying. It is not a comforting thought to be strapped in your seat next to an inebriate for many hours.

3. A competitive situation is being created under which airlines are being forced either to serve liquor on board aircraft or to provide setups for people who bring their own liquor.

4. In some instances, Federal subsidy moneys are being expended for these purposes.

We expressed the hope that the air carriers might solve this problem among themselves and urged that such action be taken as soon as possible to prevent competition from causing the serving of alcoholic beverages becoming widespread on all air lines. It is our understanding that the Air Transport Association did attempt to limit the service of alcoholic beverages on board aircraft by its members and has adopted an industry code. However, to the best of our knowledge, no effective agreement has been reached to date that would eliminate the serving of alcoholic beverages on board aircraft. Air carriers continue to utilize liquor service as an enticement to air travelers. This is regrettable since, in our opinion, it would be a constructive demonstration of self-discipline in the public interest if the air transportation industry could voluntarily abolish the undesirable practice. However, we are very skeptical that this can be attained.

We do not believe that the majority of air carriers favor the sale or service of alcoholic beverages on board their aircraft and, on the contrary, are fearful that the spread of the practice as a competitive device will force them to adopt it against their better judgment. To the best of our knowledge, 12 carriers now sell or serve alcoholic beverages in domestic air transportation on some of their routes at the present time. Of these 12, 7 sell liquor to passengers and 5 provide it without charge. The remainder of the carriers have resisted the practice even though placed under competitive pressure. We are convinced that the spread of the practice has resulted from competitive pressure and that some of the carriers now forced into the practice would gladly abandon it if a uniform rule was in effect which relieved them of such pressure.

The Federal Aviation Agency has recently proposed a regulation concerning the use and consumption of intoxicating beverages aboard air carrier aircraft. We are pleased that the FAA has recognized that serious safety problems exist in this area, and that the use and consumption of such beverages must be controlled to provide adequately for safety in air commerce. This proposed regulation provides:

"(a) No person shall drink any alcoholic beverage aboard an air carrier aircraft unless such beverage has been served to him by the air carrier operating the aircraft"; and

"(b) No air carrier shall serve any alcoholic beverage to any person aboard an air carrier aircraft if such person is or appears to be intoxicated."

Under this regulation, a passenger who drinks an alcoholic beverage aboard an air carrier aircraft without being served such beverage by the air carrier will be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed $1,000. Correspondingly, an air carrier which serves an alcoholic beverage to an intoxicated passenger will also be subject to such a penalty.

We feel that this proposal is a step in the right direction, however, in our opinion, it is not adequate nor will it eliminate the recognized hazard for many reasons, including:

SOME DEFECTS OF SUBSECTION (A)

1. Enforcement is impractical. Picture, if you will, the passenger who boards the aircraft along with 100 other passengers after drinking but without outward appearances of intoxication. Now place this passenger in a sealed tube and in an environment where apprehension may develop, and reduce the pressure of the oxygen supply available to him by one-half by climbing the aircraft to 35,000 feet. By this time, the passenger shows some slight signs of intoxication but the whisky cart comes down the aisle to serve drinks to the other 100 passengers. The stewardess now comes to this passenger who, by now, is yearning for a drink. Even under the ATA Code, he is entitled to two 2-ounce drinks, or 4 ounces of alcohol. We believe that under these circumstances, the stewardess will find it almost impossible to deny this passenger a drink while all others are drinking. However, the additional 4 ounces of alcohol may turn this passenger into a flight hazard and social problem.

2. The difficulties which will be incurred in apprehending and prosecuting passenger violators renders the proposal unworkable.

(a) Passengers from foreign countries could not be prosecuted after departing from the jurisdiction of our courts.

(b) U.S. prosecuting attorneys would find it impractical to file complaints and carry out a prosecution against a passenger residing in one State in those cases where the flight crew witnesses are far removed and are based in other States.

(c) Flight crews exposed to pay losses resulting from required appearances in court to testify against passenger violators would be hesitant to cause the instigation of such proceedings.

3. Air carriers exposed to adverse publicity resulting from prosecution and trial of their passengers would be hesitant to report violators to the Administrator.

4. Flight crewmembers exposed to employer discipline resulting from questionable conduct and judgment in enforcing this regulation would not be prone to police and apprehend passengers.

5. Flight crewmembers exposed to lawsuits and legal liability in cases of passenger trial and acquittal of such charges would not be prone to report such violations.

6. Apprehension of passenger violators may result in altercations and disturbances hazardous to air safety.

7. Cabin design, seating configurations, aircraft passenger capacity are factors which renders the policing and apprehending of violators extremely difficult, if not impossible.

8. The evaluation of intoxication has always been a difficult undertaking even for experienced full-time officers of the law. In this case, enforcement will fall largely on cabin attendants who must assume this responsibility in addition to their normal duties.

9. Flight deck crewmembers should not be required to assume such additional duties, nor is it practical for them to do so for obvious reasons.

The foregoing points are not all of the defects which are inherent in this proposal. In the first and final analysis, this proposed regulation would not prevent passengers from consuming their own intoxicants; it would not and cannot prevent passengers already under the influence from being served or sold intoxicants by air carriers; it does not prevent passengers from becoming intoxicated on board air carrier aircraft.

We believe that it is the proper responsibility of Congress to protect the public interest in this matter. The time and place for the consumption of alcoholic beverages has always been a matter of legislation by the appropriate authority whenever a threat to public safety or a social problem is known to exist. There is probably no one place more inappropriate, from a safety and social standpoint, for the sale or service of alcoholic beverages than on board an aircraft in flight where every precaution must be taken in the interest of safety, and where people confined in a sealed tube are deprived of any ability to move away from obnoxious social situations. Also, the modern airplane may cross many municipal, county, State, or even international boundaries in a single flight making regulation by the normal methods impractical. It, therefore, falls, in our opinion, to the Federal Government to protect the public interest in this problem.

We have previously advocated in testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives that the proposed legislation should prohibit the service of alcoholic beverages on domestic flights only. This would leave U.S. carriers who must compete with foreign airlines free to serve alcoholic beverages, if necessary, in the interest of competition. While we recognize this necessity in international aviation, there is no such necessity in domestic operation where the prohibition will apply to all carriers and no competitive position among air

carriers will be lost. It is hoped, however, that steps can be taken in order that international carriers will adopt necessary measures of control so that if it is necessary in the interest of promoting our international aviation to permit this practice to continue, it will be done within prescribed rules and regulations.

We have previously furnished the Congress with examples of incidents that have occurred in flight and provided detailed information on the problems which they created. Such incidents continue to occur. It would merely prolong our statement by repeating them here but we would be happy to furnish them if the committee desires.

We appreciate the opportunity to appear in connection with this legislation and will be happy to make available any further information in our possession that may be of help to you in connection with it.

QUALIFICATIONS OF WITNESS CLARENCE N. SAYEN, PRESIDENT, AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION, INTERNATIONAL, AND INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATIONS

The Air Line Pilots Association is an association of the professional airline pilots of the scheduled U.S. air carriers. At present, it has a membership of over 17,000 active and inactive members employed by 52 certificated airlines. The association represents airline pilots in all aspects of their professional life. It is their bargaining agent under the Railway Labor Act, maintains an extensive air safety organization in 147 councils scattered throughout the United States and a number of foreign countries, and is spokesman for the airline pilot in his relationship with municipal, State, Federal, and international organizations.

The International Federation of Air Line Pilots Associations is a federation of the pilot representing organizations of 34 countries and represents the professional pilots of practically all civil aviation in the world outside the Iron Curtain countries.

By way of personal background, I hold B.A. and M.A. degrees in geography and economics and an honorary doctor of science degree. I have been a teacher and an airline pilot. Some current activities include membership on the Committee on Operating Problems of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; Executive Committee of the National Air Transport Coordinating Committee; War Air Service Pattern Committee of the Defense Air Transportation Administration; Executive Committee of the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics; the Chicago Aero Commission; and Industry Advisory Committee of the Interdepartmental Aviation Manpower Committee.

Spending, Inflation, and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, there are definite signs of a public awakening to the realities and dangers confronting the country as a result of the dual threat of communism and governmental spending at every level.

Day by day, the American people are showing increased interest in and awareness of the menace of communism and inflation and the sad fact of increasingly excessive public spending.

While we must constantly be on guard to prevent the possibility of armed attack, and to serve the paramount need of safeguarding the national security, it would be a supreme folly indeed to ignore the possible, disastrous effects of huge spending programs, lack of economy and efficiency in Government, and the ghastly damage that could come to our free enterprise system and the well-being and prosperity of the American people from runaway, unregulated inflation.

Communism and public spending are twin specters lifting their ugly heads in the body politic threatening our way of life. They are related factors in our current national posture, since inflationary pressures further diminishing the purchasing power of the dollar, increasing the cost of living, and bringing hardship to millions of Americans could conceivably produce social conditions in this country which might easily give rise to radical theories of government and vigorous demands for revolutionary organic changes in our entire system.

The plain facts of financial, fiscal, and economic developments in the Government during the past few years give rise to great concerns. The national budget for the fiscal year just finished was unbalanced by more than $13 billion. The steadily rising cost of Government and living has produced understandable anxiety among all thoughtful people.

It is clear that current trends must be checked if we are to have any real hope whatever of stabilizing economic and social conditions, of bringing down the high cost of living and putting the fiscal affairs of government on a sound basis.

Over a period of years, annual appropriations and expenditures have been steadily rising until today, they have reached the highest peacetime peak in history. The general public has become very much disturbed and is sending a barrage of protests to Members of Congress and the executive branch, urging a return to sound principles of economics and prudent budgetary and financial policies—an end to improvident spending wherever it exists.

In recent days and weeks, I have received many communications from my constituents and other people pleading for economy, efficiency, and stability in the Federal Government. Frankly, I have believed for a long time past, and have sounded warnings on numerous occasions, that unless we found ways and means to balance the budget, reduce the national debt, decrease onerous taxes and declare war on extravagance, waste and unecessary spending that we would be unloosing in this Nation a frightful monster that would possibly cause the most disastrous consequences for the Government, the economic system, and the people.

Many factors have been responsible for this situation and I shall not attempt to assess the blame for current conditions. For several years we have been under great national stress and strain and in the midst of one crisis after another. First, we had a great World War II, which was tumultuous and bloody, and extremely costly in terms of wealth, property, and human lives.

In the aftermath of this war, we had many extremely difficult problems to solve. We were faced at once with the machinations of world communism preying upon hundreds of millions of helpless people wracked by industrial and economic stagnation and hunger and pestilence.

It was necessary for us to try to combat these forces.

Whether we did so intelligently and wisely is a question that I have discussed on other occasions.

No doubt, many of the policies we pursued and many of the things that we did either caused or contributed to the severity of the very serious problems confronting us on the world scene.

For example, while the overall program of foreign aid was commendable and necessary at the time and could have been wisely and prudently directed, our Government over a period of years passed out huge sums of taxpayers' dollars in an imprudent, wasteful and extravagant manner. This has been an administrative nightmare.

At the same time, in our zeal to promote lasting peace, we appeased and compromised with those who were conducting Communist conspiracy, aggression, infiltration, social disturbances, violence and wars in many parts of the globe. This policy of appeasement and compromise was continued through the Korean war and even thereafter. Our spending policy overseas became more lavish and grandiose and billions and billions of dollars were spent without proper audit, checks and balances, and suitable accountability for either need or expenditure.

Consequently, it was a happy circumstance that during the period between 1947 and 1952 when this lavish spending was running at a high rate and the Korean war was on that we were able to balance our budget at any point, let alone pay off $3 billion on the national debt which we were able to do. Yet that was done during those years.

When we consider that this period covered the costly Korean war, it is all the more remarkable that we were able to make such a substantial payment of more than $3 billion on the national debt, and I think we could all agree that President Truman and his administration deserve to be commended for the fact that they were able to make such substantial reductions of the national debt during that time.

Since that time, however, for one reason or another, mostly because of the rising costs of defense and national security and the increased cost of general government, the national debt has vastly increased by many billions of dollars—well over $20 billion. This at a time when Government revenues had increased over the previous period mentioned between 1949 and 1952 by more than $152 billion.

When I cite these figures, I feel a sense of frustration and helplessness before the furious pressures of superspending and improvidence which are

causing budgetary deficits and alarming inflationary effects.

There is only one answer to my mind that this Congress can give to these very challenging current fiscal and financial problems and that is to make even greater efforts day by day to install in the Government that degree of prudence, economic management and administrative efficiency which will, if diligently and vigorously pursued, promote huge annual savings for the U.S. Treasury and for the harassed and long-suffering taxpayers.

I think that the Congress has been deeply impressed by recent popular reactions demanding a balanced budget, demanding reduced taxes, demanding reduction of the national debt, and demanding war on inflation.

Of course, there are some areas in which until international tensions subside, Congress cannot safely make substantial cuts. There are, while strict economy is required, essential services of defense and general government that must continue, some of them perhaps with even increased tempo.

Defense, of course, is basic and we cannot cut back at the expense of national security. The regular Government services must be prudently maintained to keep pace with economic, social, and cultural progress. All kinds of new developments and demands incident to growth, change and readjustment are taking place. We cannot afford to turn our backs on the inevitable progress of the Nation nor can we ignore the needs of the fabulous space age.

But we can and must dedicate ourselves these days with all our hearts to the urgent tasks of bringing expenditures into balance with revenue, to eliminate needless, wasteful appropriations, of standing squarely and unequivocally for every possible measure of economy and efficiency in Government affairs.

We cannot always eliminate many appropriation items entirely, but we can always insist that the moneys appropriated are appropriated thoughtfully, spent judiciously, checked and accounted for wisely, and that none of the taxpayer's hard-earned money paid into the Federal Treasury is wasted or imprudently expended.

It is my deep concern that, notwithstanding the attitude of the Treasury and even some Members of Congress, that this Congress must reduce current onerous taxes on our citizens and on business. There should be reduction this year, in my opinion, to lift some of the heavy burdens from the backs of the people and to give enterprising businessmen, especially the small businessman who needs it so desperately, the fresh opportunity and new encouragement to tackle their current problems and expand their activities and try to put their business on a satisfactory income-producing basis.

I realize that there are many Members of Congress who do not favor tax reduction this year, and I highly respect their views even as I disagree with them. It is my opinion that if taxes were reduced, greater impetus and encouragement would be given to business, our cherished high American standard of living would be refortified against present crushing taxation of the people and thus, the economy and the people as a whole would be better off.

As a consequence, I believe that Government revenue would materially increase enabling the balancing of the budget. I personally do not believe that petty considerations of politics should be allowed to enter the settlement of these vitally important issues. The present situation in all its aspects, foreign, domestic, social, and economic, is far too serious to permit the presence of partisanship in matters which affect the destiny of this Nation and free mankind.

Both President Truman and President Eisenhower have shown ability, courage and patriotism in tackling the weighty and very challenging problems of their respective administrations. The problems facing the President and facing the country and the world today are truly stupendous and incalculable.

Digging up financial and political skeletons of the past and present will not provide a solution for our present plight. Only a vigilant, determined Congress and a cooperative executive department, working unitedly and wholeheartedly without regard to partisan political objectives, can effectively tackle and ultimately solve the great financial, political, and economic problems that are confronting the Nation and the world today.

I hope that we will have that kind of sincere cooperation and that kind of wholehearted jointer of effort, that wholesome collaboration between all great branches of the Government that is needed, if we are to check ruthless communism and dangerous inflationary trends and insure the unquestioned financial soundness and economic stability of the U.S. Treasury and the Nation.

The elimination of waste and extravagance and the curbing of lavish spending is one of the greatest problems before the country today. It is up to the Congress to tackle it, thus insuring a sound Government and real prosperity for the entire country.

The best defense against communism, high prices, and inflation is a sound dollar, a balanced budget, a reduced national debt, lower taxes for the American public, and efficiency and economy in the Government.

Is there any valid reason why Congress cannot work for these objectives? I think not, and I believe we must do so.

Mutual Security Appropriations, 1960

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8385) making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as I see it, this debate on the reduced and reasonable continuation of our mutual security aid program should begin with a concrete demonstration of our deepest concern for our overburdened American taxpayers.

That legislative concern should be even more concentrated and emphasized because of the factual evidence in the record, by the Draper Committee, the Comptroller General, himself, and our congressional committees, "of waste and extravagance—a pattern of loose, lax administration through the entire complex of foreign aid—and refusal of the ICA to provide information."

Mr. Chairman, the only sensible way to keep people from wasting money and indulging in needless, worthless, extravagant projects is not to give them the money.

I earnestly hope that in the phases of the program where this extravagance and waste has been displayed the recommended reductions will be approved.

The divisions of this program which appear to have been operated and projected in the best interests of ourselves and the advancement of our foreign allies are the technical assistance and velopment Loan Fund extensions. I hope that these features will be adequately supported as their worth has been substantially proven.

Mr. Chairman, considering our economic and financial difficulties and the fact that this program has been in existence over many years and through many billions of the hard earned money of our American taxpayers, I submit that the end of the major aspects of it ought to be kept in sight; certainly the giveaway features should be eliminated entirely now since most of the recipient countries have made steady progress in their rehabilitation development.

As we look and work toward the conclusion of this program, in the interests of our own American people, let us strive today to conscientiously enact a measure that will provide reasonable assistance to our allies, in the fields where such help is most needed, while we ensure elimination of those parts of the program which have been proved wasteful and worthless.

Fit for a King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the folks back home are worried about taxes, deficits, and unnecessary expenditures. It is only natural and proper that expenses of the legislative branch should be studied as well as expenses of the executive branch. One newspaper

editor, John McCarroll of the Wickenburg Sun, has made such a study. Here are his comments.

FIT FOR A KING

Anyone who thinks Congress will be careful with his tax dollars without prodding from the homefolks needs only to look at Capitol Hill to be disillusioned.

The House of Representatives is going ahead with a new $84 million office building which will house only part of its Members. This figure has been worked out at $192,000 a room, and each Representative will have three rooms.

And so each Representative's quarters will cost about as much as three dozen new homes that his constituents might build to house their families—if they could afford it.

Of course, it's unfair to compare office building costs with homebuilding costs, so look at it another way. For little more than half what the Congressmen are spending on their quarters—$46 million—Union Carbide is putting up a block square 52-story office building on New York's plush Park Avenue. But, we suppose such austere quarters would not be good enough for our lawmakers.

It seems they must function amid splendor in the capital, even though the old front porch may be good enough office quarters back home.

When Congress is so indifferent to prodigal spending which it can view from the windows of the Capitol, is it any wonder that Federal money wasted in far-off Oregon or Laos fails to excite our lawmakers.

It looks like the voters are the ones who will have to get excited.

The Fable of Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Wall Street Journal, which further points up some of the inherent difficulties involved in attempting to go beyond the proper Federal role of providing the incentive to our cities to go a long way toward solving their own urban renewal problems.

THE FABLE OF FEDERAL AID

A great many of the mayors of America, who find it more difficult to raise local taxes than to spread the fable that somehow Federal aid is free, appear exceedingly disturbed by the President's veto of the Federal housing bill.

None, however, that we read about was quite as disturbed as Mayor Richardson Dilworth, of Philadelphia, who, admittedly, has a great number of tough problems on his hands. Not only does Mr. Dilworth think that Uncle Sam can cure the plight of every troubled city, the Philadelphia mayor says that Washington has an obligation to do so. "Our cities," he told the Conference of Mayors, "must be renewed."

Now, putting aside for the moment the question of whose responsibility it is when a city becomes so rundown that it must be renewed, Mr. Dilworth's statement poses a vast problem for the country. Must a city that is perhaps so out of joint with the times that the economy has passed it by be renewed? But that sort of thing has happened all through history; cities grow and cities wither as patterns of living change and people move about. It is not too much to say that some cities could not possibly be renewed, except maybe as museum pieces, no matter how many billions the Federal Government took from the taxpayers.

The Federal Government cannot put life and vigor into any city, except temporarily. And any mayor who goes home and tells his constituents that it can do so is not telling all of the story.

The fable that Federal aid is somehow free might be partly true if only one mayor out of every thousand, say, got Federal aid for his city; his citizens would pay only part of the cost of the help. But it doesn't work that way, for the other 999 will get it, too. In the end, the people of the 1,000 cities and all the rest of the country will pay the whole bill, for unless Government runs deeper into debt it can only get the money it spends by taxing all the people.

We hope these remarks will not be taken as unsympathetic to the cities or to the men the people elect to handle their affairs. The cities and all the mayors have a great many problems.

One of them, as all the mayors are quick to point out, is that after Uncle Sam has wrung the pockets of the taxpayers there isn't a great deal left for the mayors.

But the way to straighten out the problems is not to run to Washington with their hats in their hands and the fable of Federal aid in all their speeches. The way to change it is to demand that Washington cease doing the things for the cities that the cities ought to do for themselves.

Remove Wheat Controls, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared on July 23 in the Des Moines Tribune, a reprint from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. For those who are concerned with the farm question, this editorial asks some significant questions. For example—

What sort of folly is it to advocate a corn program for wheat, when there is already a $3 billion wheat surplus?

Referring to a statement which Secretary Benson recently made in the House Agriculture Committee I highly recommend this provocative editorial for the reading of this body:

[From the Des Moines Tribune, July 23, 1959]

REMOVE WHEAT CONTROLS, TOO?

(An editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch)

It has long been evident that U.S. farm policy is bankrupt. Department of Agriculture forecasts of the biggest corn crop in the Nation's history serve only to confirm that fact.

This is the first year corn has been free of acreage controls under an administration-sponsored program that permits corn farmers unlimited production with lower price guarantees.

The support level is $1.12 a bushel, a figure derived from the average of corn prices for the last 3 years. It is 6 cents lower than the price under the old parity system, which Secretary Ezra Benson now wants Congress to abandon for wheat as well as for corn.

WHEAT SUPPORT

Recently Benson went before the House Agriculture Committee and asked Congress to enact before the end of July an administration wheat program which would gear price supports to 75 percent of the average market price of the last 3 years.

What sort of folly is it to advocate a corn program for wheat, when there is already a $3-billion wheat surplus?

No wonder Chairman HAROLD COOLEY, Democrat of North Carolina, of the Agriculture Committee told Benson:

"Not a man on this committee from a wheatgrowing State agrees with that philosophy; I wish you would give us some kind of wheat bill this committee can pass." He might have added: "And which President Eisenhower will not veto."

THE EXPECTED CORN CROP

Benson knows as well as anyone that the expected corn crop of 4,200 million bushels means serious political trouble next year in the Midwest, heartland of Republican strength.

Abundant corn means cheap hogs. Already down 36 percent from last year's peak, hogs are expected to go lower this fall and even lower next year at a time when political campaigning will be in full swing.

Some economists are predicting candidates will be eating 39-cent-a-pound pork chops. That price is around half the current figure.

The Gallup poll reports a new low point for Republican congressional fortunes in the 12-State Midwest region. Benson had better think fast.

PROPOSE A SUMMIT

Representative COOLEY and Representative CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Republican of Iowa, top Republicans on the Agriculture Committee, have proposed a White House summit conference on the wheat impasse.

The plan would be to bring together the leaders of farm organizations and top agricultural experts in and out of Government to try to find at least an emergency solution.

Certainly no evil could come of this. Yet Benson is reported unenthusiastic and there is no word of Mr. Eisenhower's reaction.

RADIO-TV SPEECH

Recently William M. Blair wrote in the New York Times that Mr. Eisenhower was reported preparing a radio-television speech to arouse public sentiment on the farm issue and to pin on Congress the sole responsibility for the failure of farm programs to overcome the surplus crop problem.

Blair said the talk was planned for delivery late this month or early in August.

If the President is indeed considering such a speech why should he wait for 2 or 3 weeks?

To do so would be tacit recognition that there is not going to be any legislation to relieve the surplus problem at this session, and that the whole matter is to become a political football next year.

MISTRUST OF BENSON

Farm problems cannot be separated entirely from politics. But they cannot be solved solely on political grounds, either.

Mr. Eisenhower may gain something politically by using the airwaves to berate Congress, but he will not get farm legislation.

One of the basic difficulties remains—congressional mistrust of Benson. Until that is resolved in the public interest, little is likely to happen.

That is why Mr. Eisenhower should work for a temporary compromise that will hold until a new administration takes over in 1961.

Welfare State in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a reprint from the Indianapolis Star, March 21, 1959, edition, entitled "Welfare State in Action."

The article describes the failure of the welfare state program administered by the Federal Government for the Indian people. I agree wholeheartedly with its conclusion that the only way we can help the Indian people, and all citizens, is through the principles and practices of individual initiative. My "Operation Bootstrap" for Indian reservations is based on this principle that we can help people most by letting them help themselves.

[From the Indianapolis Star, Mar. 21, 1959]

WELFARE STATE IN ACTION

A picture of Indians of the Six Nations picketing the White House probably attracted no more than a curious glance. But the next time you are traveling in a part of the country where there is a major Indian reservation, give it more than a curious glance. Give a thoughtful look. There, but for the grace of God, sit you, or we.

But for the grace of God—and the independence of a lot of ancestors who figured they would work things out for themselves rather than look to the Government to take care of them.

The Indians were not given as much choice about it. For more than 170 years—though considerably less in the case of some tribes which were less tractable than others—the all-providing guardian of the reservation Indians has been the U.S. Government. In any case, since well beyond the memory of any living elder, the reservation Indian has been the beneficiary of a cradle-to-the-grave welfare state administered in Washington.

What is the result?

In Missisippi, the Jackson Clarion-Ledger and Daily News recently looked to the Choctaw Indians, whose reservation is there, for an answer. A missionary called the Choctaws the most poverty-stricken group in the Nation. The only serious challenge we can think of to that statement might come from those who would claim that the distinction belongs to some other reservation tribe. This condition has been developed under generation after generation of management of economic affairs by Federal "experts." It is to such management as this that the welfare enthusiasts want to turn over the entire American economy.

The missionary critic said the adult Choctaws average a second grade education. An Indian Agency official said this wasn't so, that the Choctaws have a fourth grade average. The Federal Government, from the beginning, has been responsible for providing education for the reservation Indians. This is the same Government which the Federal aiders say must plunge into all American public education at once, to save it from disaster.

The last school census showed some 91,000 Indians of school age. A third of these were in public schools, off the reservations. Nearly 8,000 were in mission schools. About half of the rest were in federally provided schools. On the Navajo reservation alone, in the Southwest, there were 15,000 school age children not in school. School facilities were not available for them. It is to the Federal Government, which has had the responsibility for reservation schools from the beginning, that the Federal aid enthusiasts now want the whole country to look for money and example in providing adequate schools. What an example.

The tuberculosis death rate among the Choctaws is put at five times the national average. The infant death rate is termed three times the national average. The Federal Government is and has been responsible for hospitals and medical care for the reservation Indians. The welfare staters want to turn over the health of the entire Nation to the mercies of a bureaucracy with a record like this.

These are, to be sure, examples from the worst of the Indians' experience. Many Indians, either in groups or individually, now live just as well as anyone else. But they haven't done it under the care and feeding of the Federal Government. These are the ones who have succeeded in taking over the management of their own affairs or who have left the reservations or who have been so fortunate as to have oil turn up under their tribal lands.

Take a long and thoughtful look at the tribal groups which have continued to depend on the wisdom and benevolence of Federal paternalism. You will see what all America would be like a few generations from now if the welfare state planners should succeed in taking over.

Let's not let it happen. Let's chuck the welfare state, with its security and its benefits, into the ashcan where it belongs. Let's go back to the principles and practices of individual initiative. They built a nation out of a wilderness. They can keep the Nation going forward to ever greater heights of freedom and progress.

Job Competition From Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of July 27, 1959:

JOB COMPETITION FROM ABROAD

European industry finally has learned from adversity a lesson it now is using with astonishing success. Our reporter, Charles Lucey, after weeks in Europe, reports about this spectacular rebound from wars and inflation.

What the Europeans have done is copy us. They are using our mass-production methods, our automation. This, in substance, is the system which gave us the highest living standards in history, and world leadership in industry. The Europeans are on their way.

Almost overnight they have become primary competitors instead of primary customers. They are stronger as allies against communism but also are a threat to American markets and to American jobs.

In this they have one telling advantage. Their wage costs are lower. This is a factor in their successes, such as:

In 1953 the United States exported 186,000 autos and bought from abroad fewer than 30,000. Last year we sold only 126,000 overseas but our people bought 431,000 foreign cars. This year the gap is widening.

Another example: Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, recently noted that industries in his State had transferred part of their production to Europe "with a loss of more than 2,000 Wisconsin jobs."

At the root of our trouble is inflation which has forced up prices along with wages thus placing our industry at a competitive disadvantage without giving our workers any substantial improvement in the purchasing power of their wages.

Additionally, from a competitive standpoint, six European nations have knocked down their interior tariff walls, encouraging mass production by providing a relatively free market roughly comparable in size to the United States.

Competition is good for us. It is justly termed the life of trade. But we have to compete successfully if we are to maintain and improve our living standards. We can't compete by pricing ourselves out of the market. Europe has learned the hard way, through adversity. We still have a chance to learn before adversity sets in.

American Citizens of Italian Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives an outstanding editorial that appeared in the July 12, 1959 edition of Il Progresso Italo-Americano.

This editorial expresses the thought that the dignity and high reputation of American citizens of Italian descent is being endangered by the irresponsible activities of many television and movie writers and authors of books and articles, who persist in portraying gangsters and other evil characters as almost exclusively Italian or of Italian type.

This unfortunate practice at best, reflects on the writers as innocent of all literary imagination; at worst, it constitutes an unfair, unjustified disparagement of those of our fellow citizens who happen to be of Italian origin. That the descendants of a nation which has contributed so much to the richness of the culture which we all now enjoy should be thus misrepresented by screen and press ought to be a weight on the conscience of every thoughtful American.

Perhaps those who take great delight in belittling the Italian people and our own citizens of Italian descent have forgotten the men who wrote the Roman law; or the great painters like Michelangelo; or the poetry of Dante; or the great music of Puccini or Verdi. And of the utmost significance to all of us, was it not the imaginative Italian, Columbus, who sailed across an unknown ocean to discover our beautiful American Continent?

The creativity, the intelligence, the sensitivity, the strength that finds expression in great men like these is the common cultural inheritance of all the proud descendants of the Italian nation.

Without question they deserve our highest respect and our best efforts to prevent the defamation of their good name.

Restoration of Central Credit Union Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee on July 29 granted a rule on H.R. 8305, and this rule will probably come to the floor on Thursday, July 30.

In the interest of informing Members, and speaking for the Banking and Currency Committee members who signed the supplemental views on the Federal Credit Union Act in House Report 696, I wish to here insert the amendments that will be offered tomorrow to restore Federal central credit union authority. These amendments simply restore to H.R. 8305 the language which was in the bill as it left Subcommittee No. 3 on its way to the Banking and Currency Committee, except for one clarifying technical amendment. These amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO RESTORE CENTRAL CREDIT UNION AUTHORITY

Page 2, line 3, strike out the semicolon and insert a comma and the following: "and includes a cooperative association (hereinafter called a 'Federal central credit union') whose members are Federal credit unions and credit unions organized in accordance with the provisions of law of any State, the District of Columbia, the several Territories and possessions of the United States, the Panama Canal Zone, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and located within a well-defined geographical area, and whose members may also be directors and members of the supervisory and credit committees of such credit unions;".

Page 2, line 16, strike "natural".

Page 8, line 13, after the word "surplus" insert the following: ", but this limitation shall not apply to loans by Federal central credit unions".

Page 8, line 13, strike out "or"; and in line 15, after the semicolon insert the following: "or (E) in shares of Federal central credit unions, in a total amount not exceeding 25 per centum of its paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus. Payments to, and withdrawals from, such central credit unions by a Federal credit union must be specifically authorized by the board of directors of such Federal credit union;".

Page 10, line 10, after the word "that" insert the following: ", other than as provided in section 2(1) with respect to Federal central credit unions,".

Page 10, line 14, after the period insert the following: "A Federal credit union may, by authorization of its board of directors, become a subscriber to, or organizer or member of, a Federal central credit union or other central credit union."

Page 11, line 4, after the period insert the following: "Federal credit unions having membership in a central credit union may be represented at annual or special meetings of the central credit union by one member duly authorized by the board of directors of the member Federal credit union. To the extent permitted by the articles or certificate of incorporation or bylaws of the central credit union, such representative shall have one vote and shall be eligible for office in the central credit union the same as though he were a member as an individual of such credit union."

Page 11, line 10, after the word "members" insert the following: "(which, in the case of Federal central credit unions, shall be deemed to include the duly authorized representatives of the member credit unions)".

Page 15, line 8, after the word "or" add the following: ", except in the case of a loan by a Federal central credit union to a member credit union,".

Mr. Speaker, the views of the members of the full committee who support Federal Central Credit Unions are set forth on pages 8 through 14 of the Report. The heart of the agreement is found on the last two pages thereof, and is as follows:

The proposed Federal central credit union was designed to fulfil two significant functions:

(1) Federal central credit unions would act as a clearinghouse for surplus credit-union funds, receiving funds from credit unions with a temporary surplus and lending these funds to other credit unions experiencing heavy loan demands. The smaller credit unions with fewer sources of credit tend to experience greater problems when attempting to borrow funds than do the larger credit unions. Although the larger credit unions may have excellent financial relationships with commercial banks or other financial institutions, many smaller or medium size credit unions experience undue delay, excessive cost, or, in many cases, face outright refusal in having their borrowing requests fulfilled by existing financial institutions.

Federal credit unions may now borrow from others only by a lengthy, time-consuming, and difficult process. These provisions will relieve officers of this groundless and burdensome work.

There are a number of specific reasons why Federal credit unions need to have this additional source from which they can borrow funds.

(a) Most Federal credit unions experience seasonal and cyclical needs for additional funds, even with a membership composed of individuals who enjoy regular incomes. For instance, credit unions organized in industrial plans where employment is regular and where the membership receive their incomes regularly, still face seasonal demands for loans (at Christmas, Easter, etc.). These credit unions need to be able to borrow additional funds to meet these legitimate loan demands.

(b) Many Federal credit unions are organized among groups which receive irregular incomes such as those serving farmers or teachers. In addition to the normal seasonal needs for extra funds, these credit unions, to function effectively, need additional sources of funds to cope with the problems of large swings in their total share accounts and loan demands.

(c) Other reasons are: an industrial plant within which a credit union is organized is temporarily shut down, or there are layoffs of a substantial number of employees, or there may be some sort of disaster such as a flood or fire in the local community. In these cases members will be withdrawing shares from the credit union, while at the same time, the credit union is experiencing increased loan demands because of the financial difficulties of its members. In these types of cases it is often very difficult for these credit unions to be able to borrow the funds they need to serve their members effectively.

On the other hand many credit unions have chronic surpluses of funds. Many such credit unions operating under State charter are presently investing some part of these surplus funds in State chartered central credit unions and providing the capital for the effective operation of these central credit unions.

(2) Federal credit unions would provide mechanism for meeting the borrowing needs of credit union officers whose indebtedness to their credit unions is presently limited to the amount of their share accounts. The bill ordered reported by the Banking and Currency Committee would permit credit union officers to borrow from their credit unions up to the amount of their shareholdings, plus the total unencumbered and unpledged shareholdings in the credit union of any member pledged as security for the obligation of such directors or committee members. This seems to be a reasonable restriction upon the directors and committee members of a credit union. However, by accepting a position as an officer in a credit union, the member in effect gives up some of the privileges of membership in that credit union. With Federal credit unions having a rather extensive officer turnover the limitation on officers borrowing deters many members from accepting the responsibility of being a credit union officer. Thus, it is obvious that there is need for some type of credit union which can serve the credit needs of credit union officers. While Federal credit unions to serve officers have been chartered ("officer credit unions"), they have frequently been unable to attract adequate funds to serve their officer members' credit needs because of the restrictions against Federal credit unions investing shares in the central credit unions.

The testimony before the subcommittee was overwhelmingly on one side of this issue. The experience of the States which have central credit unions is overwhelmingly favorable. The same safeguards which apply to the operations of local credit unions would also apply to central credit unions. There is no reason for the Federal law to fail to include permissive provision for such central credit unions. These central credit unions are serving useful purposes in those States where they are now in operation; they would serve similar useful purposes for Federal credit unions, their members, and their officers.

We see no reason to delay consideration of this amendment. In the first place, it has already been thoroughly considered by the subcommittee. In the second place, this entire bill has been viewed as a recodification of the Federal Credit Union Act. If these provisions are considered later in a separate bill, it will take amendments at eight separate places in the recodification to replace what was deleted by a close vote in the committee.

The delays and difficulties in the path of considering this matter in separate legislation are too well known to need amplification here. The time to wrap up a complete Federal credit union code is now, at the time of recodification.

We believe that the measure should be amended to reinstate provisions for the chartering and operation of Federal central credit unions.

WRIGHT PATMAN.
HENRY S. REUSS.
JOSEPH W. BARR.
CLEM MILLER.
BYRON L. JOHNSON.

Captive Nations Year Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week. My resolution was identical with the resolution introduced in the Senate. The resolution was adopted by the Congress and the President issued his proclamation on July 17.

Under leave obtained, I insert in the RECORD an article by David Lawrence entitled "Captive Nations Year Needed."

CAPTIVE NATIONS YEAR NEEDED—FAINTHEARTED IN UNITED STATES AND SOVIET CRITICS ARE REMINDED OF AMERICA'S POLICY

(By David Lawrence)

Maybe there ought to be a "Captive Nations Year" instead of a "Captive Nations Week." Then the protest will be continuous instead of once a year.

Evidently those fainthearted in our midst who think it was a bad idea for the Congress of the United States to proclaim American ideals to the peoples of the world and utter words of sympathy to the oppressed don't know that similar protests have been perennial in American history. Or else they are so afraid of offending Khrushchev that they are willing to appease him still more by criticizing what Congress did.

A glance at the record will show that the Democratic and Republican Parties have for more than 70 years inserted from time to time planks in their national platforms expressing the sympathy of the American people for oppressed peoples abroad. It has become so natural for this to be done by both parties that the Congress earlier this month spent only a few minutes debating the joint resolution which subsequently aroused the ire of the Communist imperialists in Moscow.

In 1892, both the Republican and Democratic platforms condemned the Russian Government for the mistreatment of its people. The Democratic platform plank, entitled "Sympathy for the Oppressed," read as follows:

"This country has always been the refuge of the oppressed from every land—exiles for conscience sake—and, in the spirit of the founders of our Government, we condemn the oppression practiced by the Russian Government upon its Lutheran and Jewish subjects; and we call upon our National Government, in the interest of justice and humanity, by all just and proper means, to use its prompt and best efforts to bring about a cessation of these cruel persecutions in the dominions of the Czar, and to secure to the oppressed equal rights.

"We tender our profound and earnest sympathy to those lovers of freedom who are struggling for home rule and the great cause of local self-government in Ireland."

The Republican national platform in the same year, under the title "Championing the Oppressed," had this plank:

"The Republican Party has always been the champion of the oppressed, and recognizes the dignity of manhood, irrespective of faith, color, or nationality. It sympathizes with the cause of home rule in Ireland, and protests against the persecution of the Jews in Russia."

In 1896, the Republican platform had a plank saying: "The Armenian massacres (by the Turks) have aroused the deep sympathy and just indignation of the American people, and we believe that the United States should exercise all the influence it can properly exert to bring these atrocities to an end."

Then, in 1900, the Democratic platform had a plank expressing sympathy with the efforts of the Boers of South Africa to gain "liberty and independence" from British rule.

In 1920, the Democratic national platform contained a plank "expressing its active sympathy with the people of China, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Yugoslavia, Poland, Persia, and others who have recently established representative government." Another plank expressed sympathy with the efforts of the Irish people to get their freedom, and still another plank called on the American Government to "render every possible and proper aid to the unfortunate people of Armenia."

The year 1944 saw the first plank from the Republicans calling for a free democratic commonwealth in Palestine. Then, in 1948, the Democrats had a plank, too, looking forward to the admission of the State of Israel to the United Nations. The Republicans in their platform that year also had a plank proclaiming friendship with the people of Palestine.

The 1956 Republican platform said:

"We shall continue to seek the reunification of Germany in freedom, and the liberation of the satellite states—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and other once-free countries now behind the Iron Curtain. The Republican Party stands firmly with the peoples of these countries in their quest for freedom. We are confident that our peaceful policies, resolutely pursued, will finally restore freedom and national independence to oppressed peoples and nations."

The 1956 Democratic plank said in part: "We declare our deepest concern for the plight of the freedom-loving peoples of Central and Eastern Europe and of Asia, now under the yoke of Soviet dictatorship. The United States, under Democratic leaders, has never recognized the forcible annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, or condoned the extension of the Kremlin's tyranny over Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Albania, and other countries. We look forward to the day when the liberties of all captive nations will be restored to them and they can again take their rightful place in the community of free nations."

It's an old story with America, but somehow Nikita Khrushchev hasn't heard of it.

U.S. Route 51 Should Be Included in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 15

Whereas the existing public highway route marked as U.S. 51, commencing near the important shipping port of Duluth on the shore of Lake Superior and extending in an approximately straight line to the great shipping port of New Orleans, transverses the heart of the industrial, agricultural and mining areas of the State of Illinois and is hereby one of the most important avenues of this Nation in the transport of personnel, goods, wares, merchandise and foodstuffs essential to the health, welfare and defense of this Nation; and

Whereas it is the sense of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois that such highway route in this State is a more heavily traveled and a more important pathway of communication than some of the routes that have been designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and should therefore be included as part of such National System of Interstate and Defense Highways provided for by the Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, (the Senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is urged to take appropriate action to provide for the inclusion of the route of the existing public highway marked as U.S. 51 in the State of Illinois in the system of highways now provided for by Federal law and known as the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and that an appropriate copy of this resolution and its preamble be forwarded by the Secretary of State to each Member of Congress from this State.

Adopted by the house, February 16, 1959.
PAUL POWELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
CLARENCE BOYLE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.
Concurred in by the senate, June 8, 1959.
JOHN WM. CHAPMAN,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

Gold Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the heavy drafts upon the gold supply of the United States as the result of adverse foreign trade balances, monetary and currency readjustments and the like, it is interesting to note the mounting pile of gold bricks in the vaults of Moscow's Gosbank, the state bank of the Soviet Government as reported in a recent news article from London by writer, Mr. Peter Grose. In this dispatch the view was expressed that some British financiers suggest that this increasing Russian gold supply may be a new weapon in Soviet economic warfare which could be unleashed against the capitalist countries at any time and disrupt their economies.

These experts, the article continues, can see no other plausible explanation for the quiet but steady Soviet accumulation of gold reserves at great cost to the Soviet economy. A leading British authority on international commerce, Mr. Paul Einzig, believes that the Soviet Government is determined to hoard a

large gold stock for the sake of the economic and political power the possession of such a reserve entails. He declares that how the Soviet intends to use that gold is anybody's guess.

At the end of 1958 the Soviet Union was believed to hold between $7 and $8 billion worth of gold, a reserve second in the world only to the U.S. stockpile.

The pertinent question is: Why does the Soviet Union pile up this gold? They never spend it for foreign purchases if they can help it.

Experts are quoted as saying that there is little doubt that a sudden well planned dumping of large amounts of new gold into the delicately balanced world economy could wreak havoc.

If this should occur, dire consequences are feared. Trade payments would be upset. Prices in the free world could skyrocket. Banks might have to close their doors against a runaway demand for cash. Currency systems could be fatally debased by a galloping inflation, it is asserted.

Mr. Gross states that some international financiers say that it is farfetched to expect the Soviet Union to act in this way. The Soviet economy, they say, would suffer along with capitalistic countries from an overturning of international finance.

The fact remains that the Soviet is giving top priority to their own gold production, inefficient and expensive though it is. A British expert estimates that it costs the Soviet Union $166 to produce each ounce of gold—nearly five times the $35 an ounce gold is worth in this country.

Since there are marked disparities between the price of gold that prevails in the United States and various world market prices, and the drains on our gold supply still continue, the appropriate committees of the Congress should immediately look into this vital matter in order to ascertain all the facts and determine whether changes in American policy with respect to the use of our gold supply are not indicated by the growing Russian supply of gold and the declining U.S. supply of gold.

Our committee should also address themselves, I strongly believe, to a careful and close analysis of the reasons lying behind present transfers of the gold supply, particularly with reference to the impact of current American trade policies upon this situation, and the official policy of the Government regarding gold, monetary and currency problems.

I want to make it abundantly clear that I do not believe transfers of gold reserves per se are necessarily injurious or harmful to the economy of this country. I do feel, however, and believe this view is supported by authorities in the field that we cannot afford to view with complacency the marked increase in the Russian gold supply at a time when our own gold supply is materially decreasing, nor can or should we ignore current unfavorable trade balances.

Personally I believe that Congress cannot act too quickly to develop a more complete understanding of this entire situation and take such action as may be indicated by the result of its studies.

Illinois General Assembly Urges Continuation of Construction of Interstate Highway Program Without Interruption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 9, 1959

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 143

Whereas it was declared by the Congress in the Federal Highway Act of 1956, to be essential in the national interest to provide for the early completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, to meet the needs of local and interstate commerce, the national and the civil defense; and

Whereas the Congress has committed the Federal Government to the program of completing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways by setting forth the authorizations for appropriations for a 13-year period in the 1956 act and making subsequent appropriations therefor; and

Whereas the State of Illinois, along with the components of the highway construction industry, consisting of labor, contractors, material producers, and equipment manufacturers, have at great expense enlarged their facilities to accomplish the task within the time limit set by Congress; and

Whereas after 3 years of intense effort the State and the many components of the highway construction industry have reached a point where the program is being executed expeditiously and economically; and

Whereas it has come to the attention of the House of Representatives of the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois that no provision has been enacted by Congress for financing the apportionment of Federal interstate funds authorized for fiscal year 1961; and

Whereas if no apportionment of Federal interstate funds for the fiscal year 1961 is made within the next 2 months the award of contracts for interstate construction in Illinois will be suspended after September 14, 1959; and

Whereas the economic impact of the suspension of contract awards will be disastrous to the components of the highway construction industry consisting of labor, contractors, material producers, and equipment manufacturers, who have enlarged their facilities to accomplish the program; and

Whereas the interruption of the program will result in delaying the completion of this vitally necessary System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and will also result in widespread unemployment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That the 86th Congress of the United States be respectfully requested and urged to take the steps necessary to insure the continuation of the program for constructing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways without interruption and without stretch out; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is directed to send a copy of this preamble and resolution to each of the Members from Illinois in the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the house, June 24, 1959.

PAUL POWELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
CLARENCE BOYLE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

World Peace and World Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the excellent editorial of Thursday, July 23, 1959, contained in the Pittsburgh Catholic, the official publication of the Diocese of Pittsburgh, Pa., serving the counties of Allegheny, Beaver, Butler, Greene, Lawrence, and Washington, Pa. It is published by the Pittsburgh Catholic Publishing Associates; Most Rev. John J. Wright, D.D., president; Rev. Daniel H. Brennan, secretary; and John G. Deedy, Jr., editor.

This editorial entitled, "World Peace and World Law," effectively comments as follows:

Our goal is a real peace, and a peace with any degree of permanency can best be achieved through a code of law and justice which, while it protects the claims of national patriotism, effectively removes the international tensions which breed discontent and spark wars.

The full editorial follows:

WORLD PEACE AND WORLD LAW

Sixteen House Members introduced into Congress last week a resolution aimed at promoting world peace through world law. Senate Concurrent Resolution 52 calls for a revision of the United Nations Charter so as to develop and guarantee a rule of international law "in the limited field of war prevention." The resolution, which was presented by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, on behalf of his Senate colleagues, askes that a conference for the reviewing of the charter toward this end be held not later than December 31, 1962.

Despite its restricting phraseology, Senate Concurrent Resolution 52 is bound to stir up the antagonists of all who see any type of world court or world law as a threat to the sovereignty of the United States. But the fact of the matter is that good or not, the resolution reflects thinking in a direction that is inevitable. Disputes between nations must be settled by rule of law, not rule of war; the question is no longer whether world law is necessary, but how.

The late Senator Robert Taft documented this point of view in commenting once on some of the problems of an international organization. "I d not see how we can hope to secure permanent peace in the world except by establishing law between nations and equal justice under law," Senator Taft declared. "It may be a long, hard course, but I believe that the public opinion of the world can be led along that course, so that the time will come when that public opinion will support the decision of any reasonable, impartial tribunal based on justice."

Vice President NIXON, in a talk last April 13 before the Academy of Political Science, spoke his conviction that "the time has now come to take the initiative in the right

direction of establishment of the rule of law in the world to replace the rule of force." Mr. NIXON commented that this logic reflected "the steadfast purpose of the President and the wholehearted support of the Secretary of State and Attorney General."

Church officials as well as political leaders have also given their blessing to an international legal system. Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, some months ago told a regional conference of the American Bar Association's World Peace Through Law Committee that the committee's objective "may well be the most significant of our times, for it can set the pattern of the future of the world."

We review these statements now, not by way of extending blanket endorsement to Senate Concurrent Resolution 52, but to second that which it seeks to accomplish, a rule of law in the world community. We feel that this end can be realized without jeopardizing one's independence or sacrificing one's prerogative to settle in one's own courts any and all domestic problems. Whether Resolution 52 is the ideal or even adequate means to this end is something we leave to our legislators and their advisers. We wish merely to reemphasize that the time has come to put aside hatred and distrust of the past. Our goal is a real peace, and a peace with any degree of permanency can best be achieved through a code of law and justice which, while it protects the claims of national patriotism, effectively removes the international tensions which breed discontent and spark wars.

Poison in Your Water—No. 147

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Allentown (Pa.) Call-Chronicle of April 26, 1959, entitled "Oil Pollutes Creek, Trout Kill Severe":

OIL POLLUTES CREEK, TROUT KILL SEVERE

Fuel oil from a broken pipeline was held responsible for killing an unknown number of trout in Little Martins Creek north of Easton yesterday.

Miles D. Witt, Hellertown R. 1, area fish commission representative, called the fish kill severe in Little Martins Creek. Some fish were believed to have died in Martins Creek below its junction with Little Martins Creek, he said, but he was uncertain whether the oil had affected aquatic life in the Delaware River below the creeks.

The pollution forced a temporary shutdown of the Easton water filtration plant on North Delaware Drive at 5 p.m. Friday when the State sanitary water board advised the city of the condition.

SITUATION CLEARS

The situation had cleared by morning and plant operation was resumed early yesterday afternoon, Robert E. Crawford, Easton city chemist, said. There was no perceptible water shortage since plenty of water was available in the city reservoirs, he said.

Although the oil could have caused a distinct odor and taste in the water, it would have had no poisonous effect, Crawford said. Fortunately, it was eliminated before it got into filter beds.

Witt said a 6-inch underground pipeline carrying No. 2 fuel oil broke Wednesday on the farm of Frank Barbas, north of Martins Creek. The break was caused by a bulldozer owned by Joseph Beers, Richmond contractor, as it was cutting a road into a field. The line is owned by Tidewater Oil Co., according to Witt.

The Facts About the Chamber of Commerce Statement on the Labor Reform Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, within the next few days the House of Representatives will vote on one of the most important issues before Congress this year, labor-management reform legislation.

Because of the importance of this legislation, Members of Congress will naturally want as honest and factual a presentation of the issues involved as they can get.

As one of the members of the Committee on Education and Labor, which for several weeks worked on this problem, I was distressed to see the recent Washington report, dated July 24, of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States concerning H.R. 8342, the bill reported by our committee and introduced by the able gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

The chamber of commerce report, which was inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 27 by Senator GOLDWATER, gives a serious distortion of the bill reported by the House Education and Labor Committee. Each sentence contains a faint germ of truth slanted to give a completely false impression. The following memorandum therefore takes up each assertion in the report and provides the facts concerning it:

Assertion: "The bill fails to outlaw organization picketing. * * *"

The facts: H.R. 8342 does outlaw much organizational picketing. It outlaws all organizational picketing for 9 months after the employees have had a chance to vote in a union election. The bill also outlaws organizational picketing during the term of a collective bargaining agreement with another bona fide union which represented the employees when the contract was negotiated.

Assertion: "The bill fails to outlaw * * * secondary boycotts. * * *"

The facts: Secondary boycotts are already unlawful under the Taft-Hartley Act. H.R. 8342 closes the major gap in the present law by outlawing "hot cargo" clauses between common carriers and the Teamsters Union.

Assertion: "The bill sanctions boycotts in the construction industry."

The facts: Most secondary boycotts in the construction industry remain unlawful. The only change made by the bill is to permit construction employees to engage in picketing at the scene of a labor dispute—a privilege now enjoyed by employees in other industries.

Assertion: "It nullifies the hot cargo ban in the Senate bill by providing that a common carrier may refuse to provide service where there is a labor dispute."

The facts: This statement is inaccurate for two reasons. First, H.R. 8342 does not change the meaning of the "hot cargo" ban in the Senate bill. Second, H.R. 8342 does not authorize a common carrier to refuse to provide service anywhere. The chamber of commerce report has distorted a proviso which provides that the bill shall not be construed to compel employees to cross primary picket lines. The proviso does not apply to secondary boycotts. Common carriers would continue to have a common law and statutory duty to provide service.

Assertion: "It sweeps aside all State jurisdiction and requires the National Labor Relations Board to handle all disputes even those involving firms which have only a single employee."

The facts: H.R. 8342 does not change the existing rule concerning State jurisdiction. Under the present law States may not take jurisdiction over labor cases which affect interstate commerce. The NLRB has jurisdiction today but it refuses to handle cases involving very small employers and employees with the result that they have no tribunal to which they can take their cases. H.R. 8342 corrects this unfairness by directing the NLRB to hear such disputes.

It is also untrue to say that the NLRB is required to take cases involving only a single employee. The Board has never certified one man bargaining units. Nothing in the bill affects this rule.

Assertion: "The bill destroys the right of a member to sue a union or its officials by requiring the member first to exhaust his remedies under the union's rules unless there is no decision for 6 months."

The facts: The bill does not destroy any right which a union member now has to sue his union. Section 603 reads, "nothing in this act shall take away any right or bar any remedy to which members of a labor organization are entitled under * * * other Federal law or law of any State."

There are only two exceptions: (i) cases in which the member voluntarily chooses to proceed under the new law to invalidate a trusteeship and then loses, where it would be unfair to allow a second suit; and (ii) challenges to past union elections.

It is true that some of the new remedies provided by the bill cannot be asserted until the member has invoked his remedies within the union and gotten no relief for 6 months. What the chamber of commerce report does not tell the reader is that this is a rule which the courts have applied to every kind of organization for a hundred years or more without the six months' limitation. Its purpose is to encourage responsible self-government giving the organization's officials a chance to straighten out any wrong. If they refuse, then the member may go to court.

Assertion: "* * * the bill does not permit the Secretary of Labor to require sound accounting practices in the [financial] reports."

The facts: Section 208 reads: "The Secretary shall have authority to issue * * * rules and regulations prescribing the form and publication of reports * * *." Obviously this does permit him to require reports on an approved form. The grain of truth which the chamber report has distorted is that the bill does not authorize the Secretary to impose a system of accounting upon labor unions. There are many sound methods of accounting. There is no more justification for imposing a uniform set of accounts upon all labor unions than there is to prescribe the form in which all businessmen must keep their books.

Assertion: "The bill imposes no standards on a union regarding its financial dealings."

The facts: The bill does impose the highest fiduciary standards on union officers in their financial dealings (sec. 501(a)). It also requires the union itself to disclose how its money is spent. Regulation of authorized union expenditures is not in issue.

Assertion: "The bill limits a member's access to union reports by permitting the union to make the information available to him in any fashion the union chooses."

The facts: The fact is that the bill gives each and every member not only unlimited access to reports but also a right to examine all union books and accounts for purposes of verification. Section 201(c) requires every labor organization to "make available the information required to be contained in such report to all its members. * * *" Section 208 instructs the Secretary to issue regulations governing the publication of reports; thus the Secretary would decide the form in which a report must be published to the members.

The statement that the bill limits a member's access to union reports is untrue for a second reason. Section 205(a) reads, "the contents of the reports and documents filed with the Secretary * * * shall be public information." It is obvious, therefore, that no member's access to a report can be limited by the union. Furthermore, section 205(c) requires the Secretary to furnish copies of any report filed with him to any person upon payment of the trifling cost of preparing the copy.

Section 201(b) puts every labor union and its officers under a duty to permit any member for just cause to examine any books, records, and accounts necessary to verify such report.

Assertion: "The bill permits a union or an employer to pay the cost of defending any official charged with violating the act."

The facts: This statement is true. Of course, it is also true that corporations are permitted to pay the defense costs of officers charged with violating the Sherman Act or the Fair Labor Standards Act. Union members will be free to decide whether they wish to pay these costs or not.

Assertion: "The penalties for violating the reporting sections are made ineffective by the requirement that they must be willfully false."

The facts: The foregoing statement is a half-truth. The criminal penalties apply to wilful failures to file a report. The bill also punishes as a crime any false statement made by a person who knows it to be false and any knowing omission of information. Would the chamber make it a crime to file a report which the union officials believe to be true but which turns out to include an unintentional misstatement?

Assertion: "While purporting to eliminate 'blackmail' picketing, it merely restates weakly some of the prohibitions already contained in the Hobbs Act."

The facts: This assertion is based upon a deliberate distortion of the term "blackmail picketing." Secretary Mitchell and others call any picketing for organizational purposes "blackmail picketing"; then, because the bill does not forbid all organizational picketing, they say that the bill does not prohibit "blackmail picketing." Blackmail implies some kind of extortion. The bill does forbid any picketing about the premises of any employer "* * * as part of any extortionate plan or conspiracy for the purpose of taking or obtaining any money or other thing of value from any employer." Therefore the bill does prohibit blackmail picketing in any true sense.

The provisions in the bill regulating organizational picketing were explained above.

Assertion: "The bill fails to establish any standards for conducting an honest union election at the intermediate or national union levels except for the requirement of a secret ballot."

The facts: This is obviously not the case. The bill imposes the following requirements:

1. Section 401(d): "A reasonable opportunity shall be given for the nomination of candidates."

2. Section 401(d): "Every member in good standing shall be eligible to be a candidate and to hold office (subject to * * * reasonable qualifications uniformly imposed) and shall have the right to vote * * * without being subject to penalty, discipline, or improper interference or reprisal of any kind."

3. Every member is guaranteed 45 days' notice of the time and manner of making nominations and also of the place and date of the election (sec. 401(d)).

4. No member whose dues have been checked off by his employer may be denied the right to vote because the employer has not paid the money over to the union (ibid).

5. In an international election the results of the voting in each local must be published separately (ibid).

6. All records pertaining to the election must be retained for 1 year (secs. 401(d) and (e)).

7. Union money may not be contributed or applied to promote the candidacy of any person (sec. 501(f)).

8. Each candidate is given the right to have an observer at the polls in a local election (sec. 501(b)).

9. Each candidate is given the right to have an observer at the counting of the ballots in a local election.

10. In addition to the foregoing requirements it will be a violation of the Federal statute for the union not to conduct the election in accordance with its constitution and bylaws. The chamber's assertion, "The union constitution and bylaws govern * * *" is another half truth. Section 501(d) provides that they shall govern insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this title.

Assertion: "There is no provision giving candidates access to membership lists in elections at the international level or for an honest count of ballots."

The facts: This is a very technical interpretation. The bill gives every bona fide candidate a right to the list of members of a labor organization subject to a union shop agreement. The bill also gives every candidate the right to have an observer at the polls and at the counting of the ballots. These requirements are in a section the first sentence of which deals with local union elections. A fair-minded statement would have pointed out that the second and third sentences might also be held applicable only to local union elections and would have suggested that the mistake in draftsmanship should be corrected.

Assertion: "A union member is required to exhaust internal union remedies for at least 6 months before going to court to upset a fraudulent election."

The facts: It is a familiar legal principle that members of a church, club, labor union, or other voluntary association must invoke their remedies within the organization before going to court. This rule is designed to encourage responsible self-government. If officers of a local union conduct an unfair election, the proper course is to appeal to the international union whose more experienced officers may have expected to correct any wrong. If they fail to act promptly, then is the time to go to court. Furthermore, the requirement does not have to be met where the internal remedy would do no good because those to whom the member would have to appeal have been engaged in the wrong.

Assertion: The bill does not bar all criminals from union office.

The facts: We do not think that every man who commits a felony should be barred from his livelihood. For example, the chamber report complains of the failure to include manslaughter in the list. A man may be convicted of manslaughter because of an automobile accident. The list was drawn up with a view to including those crimes which are related to misconduct as union officials.

Assertion: "The fiduciary responsibility of union officials is limited to take into account the special problems and functions of a labor organization."

The facts: The bill imposes upon labor union officials the responsibilities of a fiduciary. The exact application of general fiduciary principles always takes into account the nature of the enterprise. A corporate director is not judged in exactly the same fashion as a family trustee, but both are subject to the highest standards of fiduciary responsibility. The bill establishes exactly the same test for union officials.

Assertion: "A union official is left unaccountable for profits reaped while using his office (not union funds) to his personal advantage."

The facts: This is a complete misrepresentation. Section 501(a) explicitly requires union officials "to account to the organization for any profit received by him in whatever capacity in connection with transactions conducted by him or under his direction on behalf of the organization." The same section also forbids a union officer "from holding or acquiring any personal interest which conflicts with the interests of such organization." Section 501(b) authorizes an individual member, when these rules are violated and the union fails to sue, to bring a suit "to recover damages or secure an accounting or other appropriate relief for the benefit of the labor organization."

Assertion: "The bill sanctions a virtual closed shop in the building trades, circumventing State right-to-work laws."

The facts: This too is a misrepresentation. Section 702(b) explicitly provides that nothing in the section to which the chamber refers shall be construed to override any State right-to-work law. Furthermore, the bill does not change the Taft-Hartley provisions outlawing the closed shop.

Assertion: "The bill permits lawfully replaced strikers to vote in representation elections."

The facts: This statement is true. We think that a worker who is on strike has a sufficient interest in the choice of representatives to vote in a labor board election. President Eisenhower has also recommended a change in the present law.

World Refugee Year

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8385) making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the House included the item for the World Refugee Year in the mutual security appropriation bill.

Among the many supporters of this program is the American Jewish Committee. I believe the committee's statement, as adopted at its 52d annual meet-

ing in New York on April 19, 1959, is worthy of the attention of every citizen and include it below:

STATEMENT ON WORLD REFUGEE YEAR BY THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE AT 52D ANNUAL MEETING, APRIL 17–19, 1959

By a resolution adopted on December 5, 1958, the General Assembly of the United Nations declared the year beginning July 1, 1959, as World Refugee Year. It laid down the following as the goals of the year: (a) To focus interest in the refugee problem and to encourage additional financial contributions from governments, voluntary agencies, and the general public for its solution; (b) to encourage additional opportunities for permanent refugee solutions, through resettlement or integration, on a humanitarian basis and in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the refugees themselves.

It asked the member states of the United Nations and the specialized agencies to cooperate, in accordance with the national wishes and needs of each country, in promoting a World Refugee Year as a practical means of securing increased assistance for refugees throughout the world.

In issuing the call for World Refugee Year, the General Assembly directed attention to the plight of all refugees throughout the world. It sought thereby to awaken the world's conscience to the need for urgent measures to solve or alleviate the problems of 30,000 in European camps, where some have spent a whole decade; 100,000 Europeans, likewise unsettled, though not in camps; a million Palestine Arab refugees; a million refugees from the Chinese mainland in Hong Kong; 60,000 or more Chinese in Macao; 170,000 Algerians in Tunisia and Morocco; 9,500 Europeans still trying to get out of Communist China; Jewish refugees from Egypt; Chinese refugees in Thailand and Laos; Tibetan refugees in India and Nepal; and displaced millions in India, Pakistan, Korea, and Vietnam.

The whole world is heartened that the United Nations has directed attention in this dramatic way to the sufferings and problems of the homeless victims of political and social dislocations and upheavals. We pledge our support toward realizing the aims of the Year, and urge that our Government and citizens organizations throughout the country do likewise.

We are pleased by the manifestation of support in the recent formation of the U.S. Committee for Refugees. That committee has called on our Government to appropriate additional funds and allocate surplus commodities for refugee aid programs, and on voluntary agencies to raise funds for their own refugee aid programs over and above their present budgets. It has also called upon our Government to admit annually 20,000 additional refuges outside existing quotas. Preliminary press reports indicate that the Government's program will be more modest than that urged.

These proposals exemplify the kind of measures governments and voluntary organizations can undertake for implementing the goals of the year. We welcome these proposals, limited though they are, but we hope that the Government and the public will make contributions that are more generous and more significant.

We feel that only if the nations introduce fundamental changes in their immigration policies will the refugee problem near solution. Therefore, we express our regret that our own Congress has failed up to now to embody in our law revisions along the lines urged by the President of the United States and by leading Members of Congress of both parties. These recommended revisions are based on the recognition that our present immigration laws reflect an attitude of distrust toward aliens, discriminate unjustly on grounds of the racial and national origins of aliens, and impose a self-defeating rigidity on efforts to promote our foreign policy and to perform effectively our role as leader of the free world.

We reaffirm our dedication to the goals of an enlightened and liberal immigration policy, and we hope that Congress will in the near future take such action as is necessary to bring this vital aspect of our policies into consonance with traditional American ideals. This would be the wisest and most dramatic contribution our country could make to the observance of the World Refugee Year.

Banks—Interest Rates—The Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, the Government sold 1-year notes at an interest rate of 1⅛ percent; now it is paying 4¾ percent. It is predicted that the rate will go to 5 percent in the near future.

The interest rate of the Federal Reserve bank was recently increased from 3 to 3½ percent. It is said that the date has already been set for the Federal Reserve bank to raise the interest rate from 3½ to 4 percent. This is only a few months away. Interest rates for private and commercial borrowing are rising. Interest rates to municipalities are rising. The Treasury Department is paying $6 billion a year more at the present rate of interest to finance the public debt than it did a year and a half ago. The Treasury Department is asking to have the interest ceiling removed which would result in added interest of at least $6 billion more.

David Lawrence, in his column of last week, stated that the Democratic Party Members in Congress are blocking this action. I am proud to be one of those Democrats. Interest rates on mortgage money for home building now requires higher interest rates and it is going higher. This can bring the building boom to a sudden stop and cause great unemployment and a turndown in the building industry. Many banks are already charging 7 percent interest on private loans. Increases in wage rates are being demanded to meet increased costs. This Congress is being asked by our Chief Executive to feed the present inflation by authorizing an increase in the public debt interest rate.

The Chief Executive has made no patriotic call to the citizens to use their savings to purchase Government bonds. The bankers and moneylenders are benefiting from the added interest. They are giving nothing additional in services or commodities for the extra money they are receiving. The high interest dollars paid to them are inflationary dollars. The Federal Reserve Bank is increasing the interest rate to its member banks. The effect is an increase in the interest rate throughout the country. The Federal Reserve Bank is insisting that all people compete with each other, with the Federal Government and with municipalities for an insufficient supply of money in the money market. The only result can be that many people will be unable to get needed money for their business or personal needs. This may well result in business failure and bankruptcy on a wide scale and the present boom can turn into a bust. It was only a short time ago that here in Congress we were worried about a depression. Now we seem to think that prosperity is here to stay.

While we talk about prosperity, we still have many unemployed. We have depressed areas and the depressed area list continued to grow rather than get smaller. We well know that if it were not for the $40 billion defense program that there would be more depressed areas in this Nation. The income of the farmer is many billions of dollars less than it was a few years ago and many farmers are finding it impossible to continue their operations. Small farmers and businesses across the country are being forced out or are being absorbed through mergers with larger concerns.

The people back home in our districts realize these facts while we here in Washington are told about the great prosperity that exists. We here in Washington are asked to feed an inflation in the face of these facts by permitting higher rates of interest to be paid by our Government to the tune of $6 billion a year. I say that the people of this country are opposed, in overwhelming numbers, to the interest increase. It is the bankers and the moneylenders who demand this increase. If we are voting in the interests of our constituents, we should vote against an increase in the interest rate on our national debt.

Poor Mouth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the Machinist:

POOR MOUTH

We hear it every time we go into negotiations; management tells us how poor the company is. Rich relatives tell us how broke they are—for fear we'll touch them for a loan. We hear it when somebody is taking up a collection. It's called poor mouthing. And, we're going to be hearing a lot more of it from Washington. We're going to hear that the richest nation on earth is too poor.

We heard it from President Eisenhower last week when he vetoed the housing bill. He said the country couldn't afford to continue a major slum clearance program. He and others in Washington have decided that poor mouthing is good politics.

They want us to believe that the country is too poor to repair our public school system, too poor to expand our airports, too

poor to organize a decent hospitalization program for the aged, too poor to continue building better roads.

Of course, they dont "poor mouth" what they believe in. Take foreign aid, for example. They believe in foreign aid, as we do too. We can afford that. But, they don't believe our Government should also spend money on projects to help the American people live better. They tell us we can't afford them. They feel that if a person wants to live better he should work harder, write a book, buy stocks and bonds, or inherit a fortune—like they did.

So they poor mouth us with a thing called the balanced budget. We all know about family budgets; we know our family budget has to balance or we'll go broke. They tell us we have to balance our Government budget or the country will be bankrupt.

What they don't tell us is that when they balance the Government expenditures against income, they don't give a nickel's credit to Government assets. The Government spends money to build a big dam, a public housing project, or a school. They want all those capital improvements paid for out of current income.

That's not the kind of budget balancing they use for industry. When a corporation wants to build a new plant or buy out a competitor, it usually borrows the money by selling stocks or bonds. They don't call it deficit financing, they call it raising capital.

The national debt is no more a sign of national bankruptcy than the stock market is a sign of business bankruptcy. A company is successful and sound when its customers are pleased; a government is successful and sound when its people are well cared for and happy. The richest nation on earth can afford to clear its slums and any other Government service its people want. Let's not let them poor mouth us out of it.

Congressman and the Polish Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, last month my good friend, Francis Mleczko of Webster, Mass., gave a courageous and forceful speech on the Polish cause over Radio Station WESO in Southbridge, Mass.

In his eloquent remarks, Mr. Mleczko touched upon my humble efforts over the years in behalf of the gallant Polish people and their fight for freedom and liberation. I am indeed thankful to him.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the text of Mr. Mleczko's address over WESO on June 7, 1959.

The material follows:

CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN AND THE POLISH CAUSE

Ignace Paderewski, the excellent Polish statesman and world renowned pianist, with his political wisdom and with his enchanting music, exerted tremendous influence on President Woodrow Wilson during First World War and also after its conclusion. Under the influence of Paderewski's music, President Woodrow Wilson constantly pondered in his mind the Polish villages and cities, which were drowning in tears and blood under the burden of years of bondage, devastated with sword and fire by their greedy and selfish neighbors: Prussia, Austria, and Russia.

Sensitive of human plight, President Woodrow Wilson, a statesman with a just and noble heart, learned about the country of our forefathers and grandfathers, and, when the time of decision arrived, he gave his friend Paderewski and his countrymen the greatest of all gifts: Poland—free and independent Poland. He guaranteed the freedom and independence of Poland in the Versailles Treaty in the famous 13th paragraph reintroducing Poland into the international arena after well over 100 years of bondage. President Woodrow Wilson became the idol of the Polish people. Faith in historical justice and the deep confidence that all evil some day will find its end, finally triumped. Every Polish child of school age had a great admiration for the American Nation and everlasting esteem and honor for its great and noble President. President Woodrow Wilson had occasion to visit the capital of Poland, Warsaw. The result of his visit was material help and food from the United States of America so vital to Poland's continued existence in the world of free nations.

After 20 years of fantastic rehabilitation, the young Polish state once again was subjected to humiliation by the same greedy and selfish neighbors, Germany and Russia. In 1939 Poland was again crucified and ferocious ravens tore her flesh swiftly even as her last breath of life was ebbing.

The epic of the tortured Polish nation immensely impressed President Roosevelt. President Roosevelt, in his manifest, calling for mobilization of all powers against Teutonic tyranny and barbarism, declared Poland the inspiration of all nations and asserted that such a nation cannot perish. Unfortunately, after a few years the greatest drama, the greatest tragedy in world history took place. The same President, for reasons, which only history will read, either under the burden of his sickness or under the influence of his ill-advised White House staff, failed to realize the greed and rapacity of Stalin, and, disregarding the fact, that the Polish soldiers fought valiantly in all sections of the front, allowed Poland to be seized once again by the Red communistic hand of Stalin.

Therefore, we are looking today to the friends devoted to Poland, friends who could achieve an insight into her situation as well as into the situation of other countries in Europe, similarly occupied by Russia, and who could in the right moment follow the sample of President Woodrow Wilson.

Our researchers are at constant work. We scrutinize every word spoken in defense of Poland by individual Senators and Congressmen.

With pleasure we state that among the proven and warm friends of Poland we can rely on our Congressman from Massachusetts, PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

Congressman PHILBIN, well known from numerous movements in the Polish cause during World War II, does not stop his work for Poland's welfare and on every possible occasion gives deep understanding of the exceptional situation in which the Polish nation now exists. What is more, he sees clearly the injustices which the Allies have done to their truest and most faithful partner.

During the past few weeks, Congressman PHILBIN asserted himself honorably on two occasions on the floor of Congress for the Polish cause.

By his speech in the House of Representatives he saved from deportation 60 Polish sailors, who, 4 years ago, escaped from a Polish ship to Formosa and then found asylum in United States of America. This year all these seamen were notified about pending deportation to Poland because of the present progressive improvement in the general situation, because of the so-called communistic thaw in Poland after October 1956.

Congressman PHILBIN, as an experienced statesman, demonstrated in his speech the communistic government imposed upon Poland, upon the Polish people known for their love of peace. In that speech he pointed out that the individual living conditions in Poland are deteriorating from day to day, contrary to the news spread by false propaganda. Individual rights, which are so jealously guarded here by the Constitution are there brutally and ruthlessly trodded upon. Here the highest law is the Constitution; over there the law of the mailed fist. He recalled among other things: (1) The recent unprecedented raid on Jasna Gora, the monastery of the Pauline Fathers in Czestochowa, (2) the ban to distribute by church auspices the gift packages received from America from the National Catholic Welfare Council, (3) the removal of crucifixes from schools and public buildings, (4) the suppression of rights of speech and press.

As a truly great friend of Poland, Congressman PHILBIN concluded his remarks with an unusually strong appeal to the President of the United States of America and to the Government to abandon threats and proceedings about deportation of the Polish sailors and to continue the principle of offering asylum for the brave and unfortunate people of oppressed nations.

The day May 18, is a great day for all Poles scattered all over the world. It is a day on which the Polish soldier conquered the seemingly unconquerable German fortress on Monte Cassino in Italy 15 years ago. Congressman PHILBIN kept that in mind, too. On that day he delivered a flaming speech in the House of Representatives. He reminded all Congressmen that, thanks to the sacrifices of the Polish soldier, the final victory over the Germans was accelerated, but Poland herself went from one bondage to another.

Congressman PHILBIN in his daily work helps individual Poles in an apparent and friendly way. A wise philosopher says: "The friend in need is the friend indeed." Congressman PHILBIN has proved to be a true friend, indeed. Moreover, his frequent efforts in the Polish cause encourage us to feel that Congressman PHILBIN, like President Woodrow Wilson, in his nobility and righteousness, has before his eyes the vision of a free and independent Poland.

May the Almighty God bestow upon him health and give him inspiration in his valiant fight for the righteous cause of Poland.

May God grant him wisdom and courage so that he may continue in his efforts to curb these cruel injustices against God and humanity.

Air for Candidates on Sensible Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, our House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has given a great deal of study to the troublesome problem of equal time for political candidates on radio and television. Recently the problem was brought into sharp focus by the ruling made by the Federal Communications Commission in its interpretation of section 315.

The committee has held a number of hearings, has discussed the subject fully,

and has reported out a bill to remedy the present situation. I hope that prompt approval of this legislation will bring about a workable solution.

A recent editorial in the Dayton Daily News calls attention to the two impossible choices existing under the present ruling. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this thought-provoking editorial:

[From the Dayton Daily News, July 20, 1959]

AIR FOR CANDIDATES ON SENSIBLE BASIS

The furor over equal broadcasting time can and should be settled in Congress.

In the now famious Lar Daly-Richard J. Daley case, the Federal Communications Commission ruled that any appearance of a candidate on television constituted a "use" that must be matched with equal time for all other candidates.

This seemed to border on the ridiculous when it involved a mayor seeking reelection and when his TV appearances in question were news items lacking any element of campaigning.

Broadcasters were left with two impossible choices by the FCC interpretation. One possibility was to assume that every political officeseeker, from President down to dogcatcher, deserved the right to make a political speech every time the corresponding officeholder made news. The other was to have a news blackout on all incumbents standing for reelection.

The proposed remedy, approved by the Senate Commerce Committee, would amend the Communications Act so the equal-time rule would apply specifically to "political use." It may be argued that even straight news, by publicizing a man's name, enhances his political chances. There is an element of truth in this, but it has its own built-in equalizer; namely, that a man in office, being under constant public scrutiny, is much more vulnerable than his opponents.

The amendment is a proper one and should be acted upon promptly. Then attention should be focused on a more serious issue of equal opportunity for candidates, the laws governing campaign expenses. Present laws are so unrealistic and, for that reason, so blinked at, that the public interest easily may be compromised by election fund-raising practices.

The Mayors of America Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, the entire country has been reading in the past week of Vice President NIXON'S visit to Russia and has been made aware by the excellent news reporting, of the attitude of the Soviet officials toward the United States and its representatives. One of the most caustic and completely erroneous statements was attributed to Premier Khrushchev, who in commenting on Vice President NIXON'S arrival in Moscow said "a representative of the panic-stricken Americans has just arrived in Moscow." This and other remarks attributed to Mr. Khrushchev indicate that he does not realize the solidarity of Americans and the unanimity of approval of our people favoring President Eisenhower's stand in relation to Berlin.

I am happy, therefore, to bring to the attention of the Congress of the United States a resolution adopted on Wednesday, July 15, 1959, at the U.S. Conference of Mayors held at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in Los Angeles, Calif.

This resolution clearly indicates that the mayors of approxiamtely 300 cities of 50,000 or more population representing as they do, both major political parties and a cross section of our people, are 100 percent behind the President and the Vice President's stand in relation to Berlin.

This should be clear evidence to Mr. Khrushchev and all of Russia of the solid backing of Americans in relation to our foreign policy.

It is interesting to note too, that this resolution was unanimously adopted and was the first of 29 resolutions submitted by the resolutions committee.

I am personally happy that the resolution was prepared by and introduced by the Honorable Alfred R. Pierce, mayor of the city of Camden, N.J. I commend Mayor Pierce and all of the mayors attending the Conference of Mayors in Los Angeles on the action taken by them. This is a clear and decisive and complete answer to Mr. Khrushchev. The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE 1959 ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS WEDNESDAY, JULY 15, 1959

BERLIN

Whereas the peace of the world may well depend upon the events occurring in the near future at a city far removed from this conference, the free city of West Berlin, Germany;

Whereas we strongly believe that in this age of astounding scientific development that the beliefs and determinations of our Government should be clearly understood so that no foreign government may misunderstand its intentions;

Whereas we believe that any foreign government will appreciate that an expression of opinion from this body is an expression from a group that daily meets with the people at all levels, and thus is not concerned only with matters of State or foreign policy;

Whereas we further believe that world peace should not depend upon governmental leaders playing guessing games as to another nation's intentions, respecting bluffing or nonbluffing as to foreign policy; and

Whereas we are convinced that this Nation should continue to constantly strive for world peace, but to do so by negotiation and not by appeasement; to refuse to be intimidated by threats knowing full well that though the ominous specter of atomic warfare is always present, but yet we desire to live as free men; and to have others enjoy their freedom.

Whereas, though we here assembled represent various political parties, and views, yet we serve notice that internationally we stand together as Americans on international policy of peace and good will and friendship: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, That we fully support the policy expressed by the President of the United States of America concerning the free city of West Berlin, Germany, and that we believe that people, cities, or nations are not to be discarded or abandoned because some nation believes itself powerful enough that it may dictate to free men and thus to the world. Freemen remain freemen because they are willing to stand for right. This we are willing to do.

Indochina After 5 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable unfavorable publicity lately regarding American expenditures in Vietnam. Unquestionably there have been errors, some of them serious. However, when I spent some time in Vietnam 6 years ago, I recall that the conditions seemed hopeless. I doubted, at that time, that it would be possible to save this area for the free world. I was again there 2 years ago and while conditions were not perfect the improvement made during those 4 years was most outstanding and encouraging. While it is important that the public be informed of the mistakes that our Government makes, it is equally important that the public be made aware of that which is good. This has been well pointed out in an editorial in the Washington Post for Sunday, July 26, 1959, which, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including.

INDOCHINA AFTER 5 YEARS

Five years ago the filthy war in Indochina came to an end with the armistices at Geneva. The infant nations of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, which had attained only limited independence from France during the protracted struggle with the Communists, were on their own. The wonder 5 years later is not that these countries have been plagued by contradictions, handicapped by lingering colonial resentments and beset by occasional abuses in American aid programs, but that they have survived and prospered as independent nations.

Whatever their economic and governmental deficiencies, the three countries have not fallen to communism, a fearful danger in 1954. To a large extent this is no doubt the result of the allied military shield. But in considerable measure it also is the result of conscientious efforts to promote stability by building internal security and fostering economic improvement.

Cambodia, perhaps the most tranquil of the three, has gone through several changes of emphasis in its neutrality, but there can be no doubt of Prince Sihanouk's genuine wish to bring education and more representative government to his people. American aid has contributed a highway to a new port on the Gulf of Siam which should be of much economic importance. Laos, the least developed country, has never been completely free from Communist harassment. Inefficient government and maladministration of what at times has seemed profligate American aid have created difficulties; but a strong Cabinet under Prime Minister Phoui Sananikone now seems to be giving the country a sense of direction. Both Cambodia and Laos stand to benefit from international projects on the Mekong River.

Vietnam, which is the focal point of some current concern about American aid, has in many ways been in the most difficult posi-

tion of all. Divided at the 17th parallel, it had to overhaul its economy, absorb nearly a million refugees, develop a national identity under President Ngo Dinh Diem and build a government—all while protecting itself against the double menace of external Communist aggression and internal terrorism.

American military and economic aid programs in Vietnam have been very large. It is hardly surprising that in the process of readjustment there have been bumbles, even scandals. The swollen Military Establishment has had perhaps exaggerated emphasis; certainly it has impaired normal economic and political development. Some Americans tend to congregate primarily with other Americans instead of becoming part of the community. American agencies have sometimes seemed to jostle each other in competition to inaugurate programs. The annoyance of Washington-trained bureaucrats with the "locals" has sometimes made enemies rather than friends.

But it also is necessary to look at the accomplishments. Internal security, land reform and refugee resettlement efforts have, in the main been successful. Vietnam's economy is expanding. What is bad about the American aid program stems occasionally from the wrong kind of people, but in considerable part from red tape, an excess of restrictions from Washington, and a tendency to mastermind everything. One conspicuous shortcoming is the failure to place more American advisers in Vietnamese ministries where their help would do the most good. One of the prices of the independence this country is trying to encourage is that local officials sometimes will see things differently.

As Congress is implored to look critically at the aid programs, we hope that it also will keep a sense of perspective. It is easy to become outraged at what appear to be inexcusable waste and boneheaded blunders. Undoubtedly reforms are needed; many of them. But none of these young countries can be judged fairly by American standards of efficiency, development or even political liberty. The shortcomings ought to be stated but the essential counterpart is a recognition of what might have happened but for timely and friendly help.

Cross Country With the On-to-Oregon Cavalcade—XI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Oregon wagon train was nearing the Oregon border when the account from July 6 through July 12 was written by Rudy Roudebaugh of Drain. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the account, as follows:

INDIAN RAIDS, DUST, HEAT, FREE MEALS, LOTS OF "PIONEERS"

(By Rudy Roudebaugh)

July 6, 5:55: We're shoving off and is it ever cold; the wind is going right through us. We had our last visit with the Duncans Sunday having lunch with them. Ki done up our laundry at their house. Jan has started on her third set of shoes, and Doc has started with his second set of new shoes on the front. 6:13: Going through the small town of Chubbuck. 7:30: Crossed the Portneuf River. 7:35: Entering Power County and leaving Banook County. 7:57: Going by Fort Hall Indian Reservation. 9:50: stopped for water. They passed out fruit and candy.

9:05: We are on our way again. 10:52: Leaving Fort Hall Indian Reservation. They grow potatoes, wheat in this part of Idaho. They irrigate their wheat with sprinkling system. The traffic has been very heavy today. 12:50: Entering American Falls, population 1,847. 1:35: Arrived at camp under the falls. It's nice and shady and we really needed it as it sure is hot. At 6:30 we were given a turkey dinner by the C. of C. Some time in the night the Carnines from Camas Valley rejoined us. Sunday I had some relatives visit me that I hadn't seen in 25 years. Mr. and Mrs. Bert Foreman of Idaho Falls. Made 25 miles today.

Rudy Rojas and his family were also visitors Sunday. He formerly taught in Dram and has taught the last 3 years in Albany. He is now attending summer school at Idaho State College. Pocatello is his hometown.

July 7, 5:12: Left camp. Guess they are going to make an endurance contest out of this. 5:42: Hit highway 30 going along the Snake River. 7:55: Stopped at Massacre Rock and had breakfast given by the Massacre Rock Cafe. Several riders came out to meet us and brought us in.

On August 10, 1862, a band of Shoshone Indians ambushed an emigrant wagon train and killed nine white men and wounded six others.

9:01: Westward again. Janell and Claudia are driving and I'm going to try to sleep. 10:20: Four-lane highway. 12:10: Entering Casin County leaving Powell County. Poor wheat crop around here. 1:10: Arrived at camp at Rafter River and the wind is really blowing. This part of the country is called Suitcase Farmers. Ki was on cook shift today.

July 8, 5:58: Sitting here waiting again. It's sure cold, but clear. 6:10: Going west again. 6:16: Crossed Raft River. 6:27: Waited 10 minutes for Dave (Gastman) to change saddle horses. Doc got two new shoes on his hind feet last night. Land is rocky along here and very little sagebrush. 7:01: Sagebrush is beginning to be higher and thicker, but still rocky. Ki is on cook shift today. 8: You can see where they have cleared part of the ground and broke it up and planted grass, but it isn't doing very good. 9:30: Janell has been driving the last hour. I can see a few trees ahead. They look mighty good. 10:06: Stopped to water. 10:29: On our way again.

10:36: A car just went by from Yoncalla and yelled to me "I sure enjoy reading your reports in the Drain paper." Here comes two men on horses to meet us. They are ahead of the chamber of commerce of Rubert.

11:11: Leaving Cassia County and crossing the Snake River and entering the Minadoka County. 11:15: Met by the Rupert Saddle Club, the biggest group that has met us so far. 12:06: Pulled into Rupert rodeo grounds. The Rangers' wives served us dinner and the merchants furnished the food. In the evening they gave us a show at the grounds. It was the largest turnout in Idaho.

July 9, 5:55: Ready to roll. 6:05: Going west. 6:14: Crossed the Minidoka Canal. Ki and Janell are still in bed. 6:21: Entering Rubert, population 3,750. The weather has been nice and warm this morning.

Around here they grow sugar beets, potatoes, beans, peas, corn. Boy. The people are sure out taking pictures this morning. 7:55: Entering Heyburn, population 559. 8:01: Here comes the Minidoka County sheriff's posse to escort us into Burley. 8:14: Crossing Snake River again. 8:16: Entering Cassia County and also Burley, population 5,924. 8:45: Stopped for breakfast. While eating we were introduced to Miss Idaho of 1959, Joanne Ashby. The breakfast was given by the merchants of Burley.

The Latter Day Saints sang a hymn while we were eating. 10:09: Leaving Rubert. 10:29: Crossing the Snake River from Cassia County back into Minidoka County. 10:35: Challenge Gerome Corp. Creamery gave each wagon one dozen ice cream bars. We passed them out to children along the road. 11:15: Stopped to water, but Doc and Jan drank very little. 11:35: Leaving our rest period.

12:02: We are entering the reclamation area that was opened for homesteaders. The women all got together at the last minute and had potluck dinner for us. I mean they really had wonderful food. I would say they are about 300 to 400 homesteaders. They have developed this ground in the last 3 years. Wheat makes 100 bushels to the acre and other crops are also doing well. This land used to be sagebrush. We are on gravel road. 1:20: Entering Jerome County leaving Minidoka. 1:25: Arrived at camp at the M. Palmer farm. Talk about dust after the cars and wagons and mules done a little stirring up we really had a mess and we still haven't got it out of our beds and clothes.

July 10, 5:57: Waiting on Roy again this morning. 6:10: Going west. 7:09: Leaving the homestead area, going on highway 25. 7:37: Crossing Milner Canal. 7:54: Going by Greenwood Service Station. 7:59: Crossing north side of canal. Looks like half of the water from the Snake River is running in the canal about 75 feet wide. 8:03: Pulled off highway 25 on gravel road. Weather clear and warm with no wind. 9:48: On oil again. 10:13: Stopped to water on the Albertson ranch. Doc and Jan drank two pails of water each. 10:29: Westward again. 11:44: On highway 50. 11:25: Leaving Jerome County going over Hansen bridge which spans a 375-foot canyon with Snake River at the bottom. Ki was really scared, but Janell is getting to be an oldtimer like me. It didn't bother her at all, and the mules made out just fine. The bridge is held up by 6½-inch cable. Entering Twin Falls County. 1:06: Arrived at camp at the Bruce Luloff farm.

We went to town and had baths in tubs at the Park Hotel. The Daughters of the Utah Pioneers are serving us dinner. All pools and theaters are free for the whole wagon train personnel. We have a beautiful campsite, shady and lots of water around us. Made 24 miles today.

July 11, 6:25: They are holding us up a half hour this morning because two Indian chiefs flew here to give us word the Indians would be friendly in Pendleton and we'd have safe passage. 7:29: Entering Twin Falls, population 20,500. We have been escorted by the Twin Falls sheriff and deputies all the way from camp. They also will take us to camp today. 7:55: The Indian chiefs met us at the 12th Avenue. Shoshone Carol Chugg rode with me today. She wore one of Ki's dresses and the Indians tried to take her from the wagon. 9:15: Here comes Carol's husband to pick her up. 9:31: Going over the old bridge over Cedar Creek. 10:16: Stopped to water. Jan and Doc drank two buckets of water apiece. It's about 97°. Ki is in town doing the laundry. 11:10: Left the oil. 11:47: You can see where the Oregon Trail went through the fields. 12:37: Back on the oil roads. 1:22: Entering Buhl, population, 4,670. We had an Indian raid right in town. The lead wagon and mine ran away about five blocks. 12:40: Arrived at the Buhl labor camp. It's a real pretty place, right across the street there is a swimming pool which is free to all of us.

July 12 (Sunday), LeRoy White an old schoolmate of mine came out and looked me up. Took us out to his place for dinner. He also took us out to the Snake River Trout Co. It is the largest independent hatchery

in the world. Trout sells for 90 cents a pound. We went to visit the Niagara Crystal Falls which were beautiful. We've had a large crowd here today. I've given away about 1,500 letters and answered 40,000 questions.

Appreciation for Our Spanish Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate indeed that Congress should recognize the 23d anniversary of the original effort of General Franco to eradicate Communist infiltration in Spain and check the Communist conspiracy in that historic country.

In our own country, we are irrevocably committed to the principles of free constitutional government, because we feel that under this form of government man has achieved a great measure of freedom, as well as a larger measure of prosperity, than under any other system. It could be said, therefore, that as Americans we unalterably favor free, representative, democratic institutions.

Notwithstanding that fact, most of us must be deeply impressed with the determined fight that General Franco and his government have made against the organized, world Communist conspiracy that was so intent upon fastening its ruthless talons on the Spanish people. Theirs was not an easy task. It was fraught with bloodshed, sacrifice, and internecine strife characterized by brutal and bloodthirsty outrages against human decency and by persistent schemes and plans to impose the Communist system upon the entire Spanish people.

This campaign employed every means of strategem and trickery, deceit, misrepresentation, and violence to destroy the forces of religion, order, and stability in the Spanish Government and nation. If it had succeeded, Spain and its noble people with their great heritage of faith and devotion to the spiritual values of Western civilization would have been forcibly taken into the fold of the Communist world movement and would have been unceremoniously dragged behind the Iron Curtain, so to speak.

This result would have been tragic, not only for Spain, but for the world. We can, therefore, express our gratitude to those who successfully beat off the attempts of Communists to infiltrate and capture Spain.

We have other reasons for gratitude in that since that time the Spanish Government, although it is not modeled on the lines of democracy that we ourselves embrace, has loyally stood by our side in the great world conflict against communism which will determine the destiny of free men and decide whether or not mankind will henceforth live under institutions of liberty or in a state of debased serfdom.

Spain is strategically located on the European Continent. It has wholeheartedly collaborated with us in establishing necessary defenses against Communist encroachment and aggression. Our Nation has, in turn, done much to bolster the military and economic strength of Spain and thus we not only have a willing ally, but an ally that is possessed of growing power and strength to withstand Communist infiltration and attack, and to join with the other free nations in checking the gigantic scheme to make all peoples of the world captive to Marxist domination.

I join with other Members of the House in congratulating General Franco and the Spanish Government upon its successful fight against communism and upon its undeviating loyalty and allegiance to the cause of the free world which our own great Nation represents.

I desire to express my compliments and appreciation also to my esteemed, able, and distinguished friend, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] for arranging on July 16, the special occasion upon which the Members of the House might express their views on this subject matter.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the resolution (H.J. Res. 115) to reserve a site in the District of Columbia for the erection of a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to provide for a competition for the design of such memorial, and to provide additional funds for holding the competition.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, we do not have to wait for the verdict of history. One hundreds years from now, when scholars sift all the objective evidence of the stirring events that occurred during the emergency years from 1932 to 1945, they will merely confirm what we now know to be true; that Franklin Delano Roosevelt was a national and a world leader of enduring fame.

Being human, he made mistakes, even as you and I, but they were the passing errors made by a pioneering leader who was not afraid to dare and do as he faced up to the unknown and inspired the American people to rise from the bleak pessimism of economic catastrophe, to victory in affirmation of their freedom. No other President faced this double threat, one following closely upon the other.

Our Nation emerged from these inner and outer challenges to its very existence, stronger in substance and purer in spirit, thanks to the indomitable courage and resourcefulness of one man: Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The reckless greed of the twenties had plunged the Nation into a paralyzing depression that spread fear throughout the land, as the confident young Governor of New York began his campaign for the Presidency. His smile, his encouraging tone of voice, his proposals for dynamic action, radiated his complete faith in the ability of a free people to lift themselves from the morass of economic stalemate and to develop new instrumentalities for progress.

Here was a leader in the best American tradition, directing us toward the new horizons waiting for discovery, and saying: "Come. Let us go forward. There is nothing we cannot accomplish if we blend our individual creativeness with group cooperation."

It seemed as if the spirit of history itself had ordained these testing periods for this democracy-in-a-republic, to determine if we were merely coasting on the accomplishments of the past, or if we could live up to the values and the responsibilities of freedom in order to cope with the new challenges of our times.

Franklin Roosevelt understood the real danger, and the people responded to his call for trail-breaking action. The fault was within ourselves. Could we learn to make freedom work in all fields, and for other peoples as well as for ourselves?

With the rare foresight, and courage, and the willingness to try new ways and means, that characterizes genuine leadership, F.D.R. brought us through the struggling years from massive unemployment and the depths of economic despair to the summit of economic and military victory. Without him, where might our Nation be today? Locked in the sterile status quo of entrenched privilege that forever exploits the people, or a captive nation that declined because it had neither the spirit nor the intelligence to work and fight for the expansion of freedom?

We remember the minority that opposed the economic and social reforms of President Roosevelt and those who cravenly rationalized that we can do business with Hitler.

But Roosevelt knew that freedom is life itself. It cannot breathe and grow if it is gripped by the dead hand of yesterday, held tight by the rigor mortis of defunct procedures and policies.

Without vision, a nation perisheth. Roosevelt had that vision in abundance, and the practical genius of experimenting so that we could make freedom realize in fact, more and more of its great and inexhaustible potentialities.

Fourteen years after his death in the service of our country, and in the service of freedom for humanity, we are honored by this opportunity to build a beautiful memorial that will perpetuate his gallant spirit, his achievements, and his confidence in mankind.

Thanks to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, we face the future unafraid.

Appendix

Distress Resulting from Stoppage of Steel Production Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we tend to forget, when we read the graphic headlines, that there is individual distress in the big, nationwide strikes. This is beginning to show up already in the stoppage in steel operations. It is not widespread, but there are people who are looking forward to an immediate future of uncertainty.

Helen Dudar, of the New York Post, illustrated this graphically in a story, printed on Tuesday, of what one individual family involved in the steel strike is doing to tighten its belt.

I ask unanimous consent that this very fine story be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Post, July 28, 1959]

STEEL STRIKE IS BEGINNING TO PINCH THEIR SAVINGS

(By Helen Dudar)

LEVITTOWN, PA., July 27.—The second week of the steel strike has been a week of decision for Frank and Harriet Dzurinko.

They decided not to make their mortgage payment for the month of August and they made in Frank's casual report, "our first drag on the savings."

They are a proud couple, accustomed to stinting to house six growing children and loathe to sound either self-pitying or immersed in the pleasures of economic martyrdom. They would like to have more money, but they get along on what they have without grievous complaint.

DON'T WANT RELIEF

"We could have made a payment," said Mrs. Dzurinko, "but why should we use up our food money? We might have to go on relief and I wouldn't want to do that."

The first dent on the savings was a $50 withdrawal. "I could have used that," she added lightly, "to buy a dresser for the girls' room upstairs."

When the Dzurinkos were interviewed by the Post last week, they reported that thanks to the near-record outpouring of steel during the first half of the year they had been able to save several hundred dollars.

The forced savings program was adopted, they said, in anticipation of a long period of strike idleness.

The Dzurinkos would be more solvent now if the Fairless Hills mills—unlike most of the other steel plants involved in the nationwide strike—had not found that it was unable to pay the 2-weeks' wages earned for the men before the start of the strike, for lack of personnel.

CAN'T MAKE OUT PAYROLL

"The white collar workers are on strike, too," Dzurinko explained, adding angrily, "The company's got 250 supervisory people living in that plant—eating and sleeping there—and they claim that 250 educated, responsible management people can't make out a payroll."

At work, Dzurinko handles stock inventory in a unit that operates between two processes of steelmaking; he hasn't had a chance to miss it.

As captain of what his 7-year-old calls the "pickle line." (Dzurinko used to work in a steel-pickling process, and Francine sees a mysterious connection) he has been too busy these past 2 weeks tending to gate-policing assignments to relax.

"He hasn't even gotten to do things he was planning to do around the house during the strike," Harriet said.

MANY KIDS VACATION

The older children have felt the impact of the strike chiefly on their playtime activities. Many of their friends, children of steelworkers in this lower Bucks County industrial area, have gone with their families to "vacation" without expense at homes of relatives for the period of the strike.

The Dzurinkos have no such cushion to fall back on. Dzurinko's father is a retired steelworker and his three brothers are all steelworkers, idled by the strike back in his hometown of Monessen, Pa.

The major immediate financial problem will be the $14-a-month utility bill (unlike the local tradesmen, the utility company doesn't extend credit) and school clothes for the four older children.

"Marlene's got $13 saved up from baby sitting," Mrs. Dzurinko said, "so she should be able to get something for school, but she's afraid it'll look funny buying clothes while the strike is on."

"Well, won't it, Mommy?" demanded 11-year-old Marlene, oldest of the six.

"Spend it before I have to," her mother advised.

Dzurinko interrupted, jokingly, "Well, I don't know. We may have to pool our money."

"I gave Frank $3 to buy us food for dinner the other night and told him he couldn't spend any more and he came back with steak," his wife reported proudly.

" 'Steelworkers' prices,' " Dzurinko explained. "I got steak at the local market for 95 cents a pound."

It is a family of controlled appetites. Two pounds of steak fed all of them; the remaining $1.10 bought the rest of the meal.

"We get awfully tired of hamburger," said Harriet, "and of eggs and potatoes for dinner."

But there's a bright side to everything.

"I'll tell you one thing about this strike," she added. "The children never would eat potatoes before, but they're learning."

Veterans Should Back Teague Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the Shelby Daily Star, Shelby, N.C., carried an editorial on July 29, 1959, concerning the veterans' non-service-connected pension bill recently passed by the House of Representatives.

The editor of the Star has made a very able analysis of the provisions of the bill and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Shelby (N.C.) Daily Star, July 29, 1959]

VETERANS SHOULD BACK TEAGUE BILL

One veterans' organization (World War I Veterans) has been seeking an across-the-board pension of $100 a month for men and women who served at least 90 days in the First World War.

This pension would be received by all, regardless of need.

The organization has bombarded Members of Congress with mail in support of the monthly pension plan, with no income limitations for its recipients.

The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has wisely and courageously kept this proposed bill from getting on the floor for a vote. If it advanced that far, chances are—politics dictating the course—that it would be approved.

A much wiser, fairer, and more sensible bill is H.R. 7650, the Teague bill, which establishes a level of need for all pensioned veterans and their dependents. It would pay pensions on a graduated scale, increasing them as outside income declines.

Under present law disabled veterans are subject to an "all or nothing" pension plan. They receive the full pension if their income from outside sources does not exceed $1,400 a year. But if they have only 1 cent of income over $1,400 they receive nothing.

Under the Teague bill, all income limits will be raised. The veteran with the greatest need will get the greatest help. Veterans with dependents will get the greater help. Veterans with dependents will get increased pensions. The bill will bring onto the rolls additional pensioners now barred by lower income limits.

This is a bill that veterans of all wars should welcome and urge their Senators to support. No one now on the rolls would go off, and a majority would get more money. Pensioners could choose the old or new scale, whichever was higher.

Where present pension law has only two rates, $66.15 or $78.75 per month, and two income limits, $1,400 for single persons and $2,700 for those with dependents, the Teague bill will have three pay intervals giving:

1. More money where the need is greatest.
2. Less for new pensioners where the need is least.
3. Pensions to many now barred because their income exceeds $1,400 or $2,700.

Few veterans and their families seem to realize that the Teague bill will increase pensions for 80 percent of all single veterans on the rolls, for 62 percent of all married veterans and for 70 percent of all widows and orphans now drawing pensions.

Seventy percent of all pensioners will get more money and the remaining 30 percent will be protected from a decrease by the "grandfather clause," allowing them to elect the old or new scale.

No pensioner would receive less than he is now receiving.

In considering the Teague bill, veterans should be careful to make a distinction between compensation and pension.

Compensation is given for disability incurred or aggravated during wartime service. Pension is given for disability which occurs after the veteran's discharge from service. And it is intended for those veterans and families who are in real need.

The request that World War I veterans get a flat $100 a month, regardless of need, is indefensible. Why should a veteran who is well off financially and who does not have a service-connected disability receive a monthly grant from the Government?

If we start that kind of pensioning, there will be no stopping place.

OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas, chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and author of H.R. 7650, is a man who has the veteran at heart. He is one of the most-decorated combat infantry officers in our country today and was wounded several times in service. Veterans' affairs are in good hands with Congressman TEAGUE.

We consider H.R. 7650 a real break for veterans of all wars and their families who deserve pensions because of need. It is far more acceptable than the flat pension proposal for the veterans of one war.

The House has passed this bill and it is now in the hands of the Senate Finance Committee. It deserves the support of veterans and their families, not their condemnation.

Award to and Dedication of Atlantic Research Corp. Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, on July 18, 1959, Rear Adm. Paul D. Stroop, Chief, Bureau of Ordnance, Department of the Navy, awarded to the Atlantic Research Corp. of Alexandria, Va., a certificate of commendation for the outstanding service this northern Virginia corporation has performed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this certificate of commendation and the address made by Dr. Arch C. Scurlock, president, at the opening of the laboratory of this corporation.

There being no objection, the certificate of commendation and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF ORDNANCE,
July 18, 1959.

Certificate of commendation awarded to Atlantic Research Corp. for outstanding service to the Bureau of Ordnance, Department of the Navy, in advancing significantly the state of the art of solid propellant rocketry. In the course of 10 years of solid propellant and rocket research and development under sponsorship of the Bureau of Ordnance, Atlantic Research Corp. has made a series of marked contributions including the development and application of Arcite plastisol propellants; the development of high-performance, end-burning rocket motors; the effective utilization of aluminum as a high-performance propellant ingredient; the development of plastisol double-base propellants; and the establishment of a technique for rigorous theoretical calculation of propellant performance. These achievements are regarded as significant contributions to the accomplishment of the overall mission of the Bureau of Ordnance. It is in recognition of this outstanding service that this award is presented.

PAUL D. STROOP,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy, Chief, Bureau of Ordnance.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY DR. ARCH C. SCURLOCK, PRESIDENT, ATLANTIC RESEARCH CORP., AT DEDICATION CEREMONY, JULY 18, 1959

Fellow employees and friends of Atlantic Research. This is to me certainly a great and heart-warming day. And I am sure it is also to many, many others of you with whom I have worked shoulder to shoulder to build this fine organization and to conduct successfully our many technical programs during the last 10½ years.

From very meager beginnings and an initial staff of exactly two souls, Atlantic Research has grown in 10 years to become, I believe, the largest independent research and development organization in the area of Metropolitan Washington. Our staff presently totals over 600, and our annual payroll now exceeds $2½ million. Rapid growth has always been the rule with us, rather than the exception, and our organization is presently operating at an annual expenditure rate of approximately $8 million—a seventy percent increase over last year at this same time. Of this $8 million, production accounts for about 25 percent and research and development for the remainder.

Our company is presently conducting substantial research and development efforts for every branch of the military service. Work is also progressing for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, and a number of other sponsors.

Sixteen different rockets are now either in production or under development by Atlantic Research, and our rockets are finding wide use in a variety of military and space applications. The most recent Atlantic Research rocket to move from development to production is the Arcas, a technologically advanced high-altitude sounding rocket developed under Office of Naval Research sponsorship to carry a 12-pound payload to 200,000 feet. On June 23 at White Sands, the Arcas, carrying a 12-pound payload achieved an altitude of 245,000 feet. Production of Arcas by yearend is scheduled to reach 100 per month.

Atlantic Research is accustomed to growth, but so also is this area here in which we live. And this great metropolitan area of Washington is as certain to continue its rapid growth as any place on the globe. With this growth, an even greater expansion of scientific, educational, and cultural activities will surely take place. World capitals throughout history have always grown to be great centers of learning and culture—Athens, Rome, Paris, London. Thus also has grown the once-raw Capital City of Washington with its original swamps and pastures. And it will grow still larger in the future.

For many reasons, perhaps foremost being that Washington is the seat of our Federal Government and headquarters for the many Federal agencies concerned with direction of Government-sponsored research and development efforts, the Washington area is very well suited as a location for R. & D. organizations like Atlantic Research. I predict that many such new organizations will spring up here during the next 10 years; and that most of those now here, including Atlantic Research, will continue to enjoy rapid growth and prosperity.

If this area possesses any single major weakness as a research and development center, it could probably be said to be its inadequate facilities for technical training at the graduate level. Importing scientists and engineers from afar, of course, presents more problems for an organization like Atlantic Research than would getting production of such people right out of the plant backdoor. An M.I.T., a California Tech, or a Harvard in this area would certainly be a giant step forward.

Regarding the cold war and its implications to Atlantic Research; although it looks like an end to this Nation's competitive struggle with Russia is nowhere in sight, it does appear likely (at least to this party) with both countries coming nearer to possessing the capability for almost total push-button annihilation of the other, that the competition is likely to shift, to some extent, to more peaceful pursuits. The conquest of space offers profitable competitive opportunities which are now beginning to be exploited by both countries. This is an area where Atlantic Research has much to contribute. There are almost unlimited additional scientific and technological areas which, while perhaps not quite so glamorous to the general public as space-oriented programs, also offer challenging opportunities for technological advance and for competition on an international scale. Such other areas include the medical and biological sciences, particle physics, computer technology, exploration of the earth's core, and direct conversion of nuclear to electrical energy to mention only a few.

We are presently in an era of breathtaking technological advance, the end of which is not now in sight, but which is likely to lead within a few years to almost unbelievable achievements in every branch of science. Atlantic Research stands ready to participate and to be a leader in the continuation of this great technological revolution. Now on behalf of Atlantic Research I wish to thank the Bureau of Ordnance and Admiral Stroop for the fine recognition they have accorded us on this day. It is with great pride that I accept from the Bureau of Ordnance this citation for a job well done. I myself look upon the technical achievements cited not only as giving credit to our capable staff, but bringing equal recognition to the dedicated and competent civilian and military personnel of the Bureau of Ordnance with whom we have worked for so many years, and without whose constant assistance, cooperation, and encouragement these happy achievements would probably never have seen the light of day. In technical competence certainly the Bureau of Ordnance is second to none. I wish also now on the occasion of the dedication of this handsome new building to salute the fine members of the Atlantic Research staff to whom most of the credit must really go for our present successes. It is the product of your brain and your muscle that has done it. I hope that all of you good people of Atlantic Research, just as I do, take great pride in the contribution we have made working together to build this young organization into the substantial enterprise and national asset that it is today.

We must recognize as members of this organization, on the other hand, the increased responsibility we now have to mankind and to our great Nation as a not insignificant contributor to world technological advance and national military strength. We must bend every effort to remain as efficient and as productive in the future as we have been in the past. We must continue to maintain our high standards of technical competence and our shirt-sleeve approach to problems. We must continue to welcome hard work.

It is appropriate also at this time to give thanks to our many good sponsors and customers for their continued support over the years. It is hoped that this new building will further help us to become more efficient and continue to give a dollar and a half of results for a dollar.

Eisenhower's Cabinet a Magnet to Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the July 23, 1959, issue of the Saginaw News regarding the nomination of Frederick H. Mueller to be Secretary of Commerce. I know the nomination of this outstanding Michigan man will be supported by all those people devoted to the cause of good government:

EISENHOWER'S CABINET A MAGNET TO MICHIGAN

Michigan Republicans are faring much better via the appointive route than at the popular polls, and the plums they harvest rate among the Nation's choicest. Latest proof is the nomination by President Eisenhower of Frederick H. Mueller of Grand Rapids to be Secretary of Commerce.

The furniture executive, who has been Acting Secretary in the Commerce Department since 1955, is the fourth Michigan man to be named by Mr. Eisenhower to a Cabinet post. Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield still is in the Cabinet, Charles E. Wilson was Mr. Eisenhower's first Secretary of Defense, and George M. Humphrey was his first Secretary of the Treasury. Other top spots held by Michigan men in the Eisenhower team have gone to Army Secretary Wilber M. Brucker, and to Frank G. Millard, Army legal counsel.

There have been numerous other men from Michigan serving this administration, some with political backgrounds, but most simply identified as active Republican laymen. Mr. Mueller served for 13 years on the State board of agriculture, governing body of Michigan State University. While he lost this elective post in the 1957 Democratic sweep, it had been for him more an assignment in public service which had no connection with his 1955 arrival at the Commerce Department. In fact, only Mr. Summerfield reached his Cabinet rank by way of active politics.

The Grand Rapids industrialist counts himself a conservative in philosophy. He is willing to go further in defining that philosophy as "a viewpoint you reach by experience rather than by theory." Secretaries Wilson and Humphrey embraced similar philosophies, and for similar reasons—they learned their businesses in commerce before entering the service of their Government.

Since Mr. Mueller has held full responsibilities of the Department as Under Secretary since last fall, he appears well fitted to slip into the top roll without hitch in the complex operation of this 4,500-staff Department. His nomination last October was approved quickly and without debate, and Senator MAGNUSON, Democratic Chairman of the Commerce Committee, already has indicated that Mr. Mueller undoubtedly will be confirmed as quickly for the full Secretary's position. The Senate, especially Democratic Senators, removed from the scene the controversial Lewis L. Strauss and are more than content with that victory over the administration.

Unlike Mr. Strauss, Mueller has been a popular official who knows how to get along with Congressmen, inspires effort and goodwill within his staff and wastes no time with red tape or reaching decisions. He finds the challenges of Government stimulating and says he actually thrives on them. This is in sharp contrast also to the reactions and experiences of many good men who have left private business life in response to a call for their talents from Government. Some in the Eisenhower administration felt so frustrated at red tape and so unable to sublimate executive authority to the necessities of legislative consultation and compromise that their experiences in Washington were nothing less than miserable. Some left quickly and unheralded.

Mr. Mueller was both a business and civic leader back in Grand Rapids, where he enjoyed wide associations and led joint undertakings in both. For him, busines life is stimulating but Government is even more so.

If temperament and attitude are important adjuncts of experience, we judge that Frederick Mueller is going to bring greater administrative success to the Commerce Department in his role of middleman between U.S. business and the Government than has been seen during those first 6½ years of the Eisenhower administration.

Removal of the tensions and unpleasantnesses that have prevailed during one of the most historic contentions between Congress and the White House should do much for Department morale. Mr. Mueller strikes us as the kind of man who can harmonize differences if anyone can. As Michiganians, we all can take pride in his nomination.

Operation of Radio and Television Stations in the United States and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared on July 29, 1959, in the Wall Street Journal, entitled, "The Guide That Can't," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 29, 1959]

THE GUIDE THAT CAN'T

"We reject the notion that that government governs best which governs least."

A forthright statement, at any rate. The repudiators of Jefferson are seven prominent economists, including J. K. Galbraith and Gerhard Colm, who came out with a report the other day on what should be done to fix up this rickety old country.

For, as the group sees it, the United States today "is a rudderless ship drifting on what is at the moment a rising tide of economic activity. Without a firm policy we will descend again into the trough of economic stagnation and retrogression. * * * The Federal Government is our only instrument for guiding the economic destiny of the country."

The panel offers specifics as well. Among others, proposed price and wage increases would be subject to compulsory Federal "fact finding"; the Government could say no and make it stick. "Expansion of investment in the public sector," that is, lots more Federal spending. Studies designed to get away from "tight" money and high interest rate policies. And other Government action to try to make the economy grow 4 to 5 percent every year.

This is a program for Government guidance all right—and with a vengeance. So it is perhaps pertinent to ask just how good a guide any government is.

In this country we have by now had considerable experience with it. We had the benefit of Washington's guidance (and spending) throughout the thirties, only it didn't quite guide us out of the depression. We have had guidance in the form of vast public investment and cheap money, and the result of that was inflation. To counteract inflation we have these repeated proposals, like the present one, for some form of price-wage control even though experience suggests it is impossible to control inflation merely by trying to control some of its symptoms.

A spectacular current example of Government guidance is the farm program. No segment of the economy has been more wrapped up with Washington, and nowhere has the defiance of all reason been more bizarre.

Other countries' experience is also instructive. Britain in the postwar Socialist era suffocated under official rules, regulations and bureaucracy; recovery began when the socialists left power. West Germany's miraculous recovery started when the people were permitted to junk their inflated currency and wartime and occupation economic controls. Russia's economy, one of the most "guided" (regimented), is also the most unbalanced among industrial nations.

Surely not all of this can be coincidental. Why does government, time after time and place after place, prove such a poor guide?

When people work without this guidance they certainly can make mistakes, but the mistakes affect themselves and relatively few others. Set up a ministry of the economy, however, with a bureau of steel, a department of automobiles, a national refrigerator agency and so on and on, and the mistakes will be colossal, for they will affect all those in an industry and all those in any way related.

Moreover, the mistakes will be inevitable. Government officials cannot run an economy well. It's not so much that they often lack experience as that they must interfere with and disrupt the marketplace; to do so is their excuse for existence. They substitute their judgment for the collective judgment of millions of individuals, and it just is no substitute.

Many of the bureaucrats' judgments will not even be economic at all but political because they are political creatures subject to political pressures. For that and other reasons, a government-guided economy is bound to be an inflationary economy. Inflation's appeal to politicians is notorious, and quite understandable since they can almost never raise enough taxes to do all the "public" investment and whatnot they want.

Economists who clamor for government guidance are echoing Lord Keynes' misplaced faith in officialdom; they naively assume that bureaucrats, once an economy is delivered into their hands, immediately become saints and repositories of total wisdom.

And this is also something worse than naivete. It is not only saying they know better than Jefferson, although that is saying a good deal. It is saying they know so much they can reject the guidance of history itself.

Nixon-Khrushchev Debate—Getting Down to Brass Tacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

NIXON-KHRUSHCHEV DEBATE—GETTING DOWN TO BRASS TACKS

There was good reason for Nikita S. Khrushchev's jaw to drop open in astonishment when he engaged Vice President NIXON in verbal debate. In Mr. NIXON, for the first time, Mr. Khrushchev was faced with a man who not only got down to brass tacks—but seemed perfectly willing and able to get down to brass knuckles if necessary.

Other free world visitors to Moscow have failed to make a dent in the crusty shell of the Red dictator. Their subtleties, their diplomatic finesse and their attempts to avoid rocking the boat played Khrushchev's hands.

Mr. Khrushchev delights in blackjacking his visitors with insults—all the while smiling. As a consequence they have—barring Mr. NIXON—been off balance, intimidated at the start. Mr. NIXON realized from the first that he was up against a tough, bullylike world figure who mistakes finesse for softness, niceties for cravenness. So Mr. NIXON smiled and poked his finger in the Khrushchev chest to stress a point. He hammered at him with facts, and the facts found their marks.

Blow by blow was demanded in the Khrushchev-Nixon meeting. And that is what has happened. The two protagonists have not been swayed from their beliefs. But they understand each other. And it is highly probable that at last Mr. Khrushchev is realizing that Mr. NIXON is the amplifier of American unity and resolution. Certainly the Russian dictator must know now that Mr. NIXON represents American public opinion and American determination to hold fast, regardless of political belief. The American people and their Government are not separate entities.

Mr. NIXON is very much on balance in his fencing with Mr. Khrushchev. He has a strong case, and he has stated it well. He has put the record straight for the Russians. Nothing he has said has supplied the Kremlin with propaganda weapons. The same cannot be said for other naive Kremlin visitors.

The story of Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover and the Russian atomic ice-breaker demonstrates Mr. NIXON's firmness. The admiral, an outstanding authority on atomic submarines, at first was denied access to the Russian vessel. Mr. NIXON told him to stand fast, reminding his Russian hosts that Frol Kozlov had been permitted to inspect freely in the United States. The admiral stood fast, just as we are standing fast at Geneva, Berlin, Quemoy, and every other site of Red intimidation.

Mr. NIXON caused the Red leadership to reassess its distorted and warped picture of America.

The Vice President has told Khrushchev the things our people have yearned to tell him for years.

Fleet of Mercy Ships To Help World's Sick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], with two editorials referred to in his statement.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLEET OF MERCY SHIPS TO HELP WORLD'S SICK

Earlier this year I was happy to have an opportunity to add my name to a bill known as the Food for Peace Act, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, Senator HUMPHREY. Its objective is to help build essential world conditions of peace through use of our agricultural commodities for the relief of human hunger. This presented, to my mind, a really effective means of promoting our foreign policy objectives. And now to broaden this whole concept has come a most imaginative proposal as a sort of followup to the food for peace idea. I refer to the proposal of Comdr. Frank Manson, of the U.S. Navy, to send mercy ships—grain ships, hospital ships, education ships—as a great white fleet designed to make the benefits of the free-enterprise system available to the entire human race.

Obviously, we have no illusions that such a fleet will bring peace to the world in one sweeping movement but again, it is another step in our progress toward peace—a bit at a time. As Commander Manson says: "American leadership can prevent the people of the world from losing hope."

I submit that this proposal will have great dramatic impact and will, I believe, capture the imagination of every American. As evidence of how this thought has already caught hold, Senator HUMPHREY has introduced legislation in this body to provide two such white fleets.

We are presented here with an unique and challenging opportunity which will hold much good for America and for the entire world. I attach hereto editorials from the July 25 Daily Home News, of New Brunswick, and the July 29 issue of the Asbury Park Press.

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Daily Home News, July 25, 1959]

FLEET OF MERCY SHIPS TO HELP WORLD'S SICK

With so much talk of war and destruction, it is refreshing to read of the historymaking food-for-peace program before Congress and described in today's Allen-Scott report, and the plan of youthful Comdr. Frank Manson of the U.S. Navy to send mercy ships around the world as revealed in this week's Life magazine.

We will let Robert Allen and Paul Scott describe for you how U.S. food surpluses could be used in undeveloped countries and explain Manson's idea which grew out of the things he witnessed, as did thousands of other American servicemen, at the close of World War II.

"I saw diseased, destitute, and poverty-stricken people living on the rimland of Asia, Europe, and Africa * * * some actually dying on the streets of starvation and disease," he said. For 10 years these sights were relived in Manson's mind until on a December afternoon in 1957 the plan evolved as he was thumbing through a photographic file in his Pentagon office. This includes pictures of auxiliary and hospital ships.

Why not, he mused, have an entire fleet of mercy ships—grain ships, hospital ships, education ships, power ships—a fleet designed to make the benefits of the free enterprise system available to the entire human race. It was one of those large and simple ideas which, once formulated, surprises you that it wasn't thought of sooner.

Manson, who is now on duty with U.S. Navy headquarters in London, has no illusions that a fleet of mercy ships will bring peace to the world in one sweeping movement. But he is convinced his plan will bring people closer to people and therein lies a road to peace.

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.) Press, July 29, 1959]

A NEW WHITE FLEET

Fifty-two years have have passed since that day in 1907 when President Theodore Roosevelt sent 16 U.S. battleships on a tour around the world. Many shore residents will recall the day of the ships' return when, gleaming white and flag-bedecked, they steamed past Asbury Park and headed for New York harbor. The impressive armada became known throughout the world as the Great White Fleet.

Five decades later a naval officer, Comdr. Frank Manson, seeks to re-create this fleet and use it, in a different way, to impress the world. This time we would not seek to awe the world with our display of might but rather demonstrate our love of peace and our spirit of good will toward other nations. We would take this fleet from mothballs and commission it as an angel of mercy. Instead of armament it would carry food and medicine and it would visit any port of call which asked for its services. It would show the world that our New White Fleet is just as powerful as its prototype of 1907 and that good will can win as many battles as force.

There can be no doubt of the preeminence of the United States in the fields of manufacturing, engineering, science, medicine, agriculture and a dozen others. But in the realm of propaganda we have lagged. We have talked at length of our good will toward less fortunate nations and we have backed our words with millions of dollars. Yet, somehow, we have failed to win the friendship that should be ours and, in the propaganda war, Russia, which has never given away anything without first attaching a good strong string, seems to have excelled us. Truly, our failure has been compounded not of a lack of generosity or friendliness, but, rather, of shortcomings in our methods of bestowing our assistance.

The new White Fleet, in our opinion, would do more to spread the peaceful intentions of the United States than any other single thing we can do. It would be a dramatic demonstration that the United States accepts its responsibility to its neighbors and assumes an obligation to aid those less fortunate than ourselves. It would be an unforgettable example of the U.S. creed that those in trouble are to be succored, not exploited and enslaved.

Commander Manson's dream has received congressional support. A bipartisan group composed of Senators AIKEN, of Vermont, and HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Representatives BATES, of Massachusetts, and EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, is sponsoring a resolution urging President Eisenhower to put

the new White Fleet in operation. Few projects are capable of firing one's imagination as this one. It is an undertaking combining humanitarianism with practicality and offering a generous dividend in good will. Few proposals are more deserving of support. We commend it to our readers and urge them to write Senators CASE and WILLIAMS and Congressman AUCHINCLOSS soliciting their endorsement.

Responsibility of the Flight Engineer for Passenger Safety in Commercial Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the Flight Engineers' International Association are making every effort to increase the passenger safety in commercial flying. Considerable responsibility rests with the flight engineer as he is responsible for the ground repair that must be done to an aircraft at each landing while on a flight plan or schedule. Not only must the flight engineer, under FFA regulations, identify the various mechanical repairs that must be made on the ground other than the routine ones, but it is basically his responsibility ascertain whether these repairs have been made before the aircraft is again taken into flight.

As an example of the effort of the Flight Engineers' International Association effort to improve the skill of the members of their profession, I want to include an address made by the association president, George R. Petty, Jr., at a seminar on jet safety held in Washington on July 29, 1959. The recent mechanical difficulties developing as a result of the increased number of jet-propelled craft on commercial airlines has emphasized the responsibility of the flight engineer and his effort to better discharge that responsibility:

We have had many glowing reports in the press and trade publications about the wonderful public acceptance of the jet airplane in commercial use.

We read where each jet flight has a waiting list; where the load factors have boomed to 90 or more percent—this even in the so-called off seasons.

And yet, we cannot help wondering what would have happened had the public understood that the jet era, as the airlines like to call it, was one man away from being a complete fiasco—financially and safetywise.

What would have happened had there been innumerable delays and cancellations, what would have happened had there been innumerable scare stories similar to the Chinese fire drill which took place at Idlewild a few weeks back?

The memory of the Comet failures has not faded completely from the public mind and a few incidents with our own jets could very easily have brought it back.

This is why we say the jet era stood one man away from fiasco. This man we maintain is the flight engineer. Ever since the jet has been introduced this man has had to compensate through his skill and background for poor or inadequate maintenance, design faults in some components and systems of the airplane and, on some airlines, an utterly miserable training program. Let me list a few examples:

Before Pan American took delivery on its first 707 a test flight was flown from Boeing Field in Seattle to Mexico City with a Pan American flight engineer aboard, as well as several Boeing flight engineers. The purpose of this flight was to discover how to keep an accurate record of fuel consumed in long-range operation. It was found by the Pan American flight engineer that the fuel gages at his station were completely unreliable for such a purpose and that only by minute-to-minute calculation of fuel consumed could the flight engineer insure a reliable figure for fuel remaining when the plane reached its destination. In making these calculations, he had to utilize the miniaturized fuel flowmeters on the pilot's instrument panel, making accurate reading difficult, if not impossible, from the engineer's station. Flight engineers have been performing this function for close to 30 years in airline operation and as a result of this flight they found it even more necessary and critical on jets.

Shortly after taking delivery of the 707, Pan American experienced several failures of the engine accessory drive gear box. In one instance, the aircraft landed in the Azores with a full load of passengers and maintenance was not prepared to cope with the situation—and the Azores are not an out-of-the-way or off-line station. The flight engineers aboard, one of whom is here tonight, took the gear box apart, cut out the failed gears with a hacksaw, reassembled the parts to prevent oil leakage and certified the aircraft as airworthy under their aircraft and powerplant licenses and the airplane was flown back to New York with a minimum of delay.

Later, in 1958, a flight engineer during a preflight inspection in Paris, discovered damaged compressor blades in an engine of an aircraft that had been on the ground for 8 hours and had undergone maintenance inspection required at a Paris turnaround. The engine was found unserviceable and was removed as a result of his discovery. Takeoff or flight with this engine damage undetected, could have led to the disintegration of the engine in flight.

On another occasion during a takeoff from Paris, in icing conditions, two engines of the jet flamed out when the engine anti-icing system was operated. The aircraft was heavily loaded and the captain decided to dump fuel to reduce weight. The flight engineer suggested it would be safer to try for an aerial relight of the engines. By assisting in the proper relight precedures the flight engineer made both engines operative and the flight continued to New York—and the Eiffel Tower remained intact. Investigation of this incident led to the detection of a fault in the design of the water injection system. It has since been corrected.

On many occasions the flight engineer has been called upon to repair or compensate for the failure of the autopilot while the aircraft was in flight. The operation of the autopilot is a vital factor in the efficient handling of the huge jets.

You have seen the slides which show the complex nature of this system.

You are probably all familiar with the unfortunate 30,000-foot nosedive of the 707 over the North Atlantic several months ago, and the penalties imposed upon the pilots in that incident. But no mention has ever been made of the part played by the flight engineer aboard the plane. It was the fight engineer who first called attention to the impending trouble. During the dive, the flight engineer electrically deactivated the malfunctioning autopilot and operated the manual stabilizer controls to assist the captain in regaining the control of the airplane.

FAA investigators on returning from the initial interrogation of the crew were high in their praise of the actions of the flight engineer and felt that he had performed a critical part in saving the aircraft from destruction.

On many occasions the pressurization and air conditioning system of the jets has been repaired after having failed in flight. Failure to have done so would have made a turn around mandatory.

It is interesting to note at this point that all of the jets now in commercial use are carrying flight engineers who possess an aircraft and powerplant license. This means simply that these men have the background and training necessary to make these repairs and corrections. If they did not, the jet age would have gotten off to a slow start to say the least.

But what about the training?

Training programs for engineers on most airlines are woefully behind the actual delivery of the aircraft. On some airlines, the training programs of engineers have been dictated to the companies by the Air Line Pilots Association. On Eastern Air Lines for example, the original training period for the Electras was to be 12 weeks. This was cut to 6 when the pilots demanded "equal time" in training. After getting their "equal time" period of 6 weeks, the pilots further complained that the course was too long and it was subsequently cut to 4 weeks. This was done over the protest of the flight engineers department and the flight engineers union.

Training failures have not only occurred in the initial stages: at least one major airline is under fire from the FAA for not giving sufficient recurrent training to its engineers. On one airline some 15 violations have been found in the recurrent training program which is required by law.

Because of the weaknesses of the training programs, the flight engineers union has had to establish its own training program, given on members time and paid for with their money. We have had to write and distribute our own courses on jet engines, and we are now in the process of doing the same thing for the complicated electrical and electronic systems of the jets.

Flight engineer local groups have coordinated with State adult educational programs in California and New York to obtain additional jet engine and electrical training.

In addition, in at least five cities around the country local flight engineer groups have established courses taught by manufacturers' representatives.

Because of the obvious dangers inherent in the operation of jet aircraft, the Federal Aviation Agency has been acting rapidly and with muscle to punish offenders. In the past few weeks it has received some criticism in the press and I would like to take this opportunity to urge you as representatives of the public concerned with aviation problems, to support the courageous efforts of Pete Quesada and his staff to deal with the problems of our new jet era.

Memorial Address by Hymie Greenspan, of Dallas, Tells of Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, every American needs to pause at intervals and reflect on the heritage which is his. I believe a recent memorial address

delivered by Hymie Greenspan of Dallas, Tex., national vice commander for the seventh region of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, helps call to mind the principles and ideals of our country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the talk delivered by Mr. Greenspan at the Jewish war dead memorial of Dallas Post 256 in the Shearith Israel Memorial Cemetery at Dallas, Tex., on May 31, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HYMIE GREENSPAN, OF DALLAS, NATIONAL VICE COMMANDER, SEVENTH REGION, JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ON MAY 31, 1959, AT THE JEWISH WAR DEAD MEMORIAL OF DALLAS POST 256 AT THE SHEARITH ISRAEL MEMORIAL CEMETARY AT DALLAS, TEX.

Today, Memorial Day 1959, as we place the flag of our country upon the final resting places of our comrades, we must pause and realize the principles for which these men fought and died upon the fields of battle. The heroism, the sacrifices, and the unselfish devotion to duty of Americans of all creeds, during the time of war, were offerings placed upon the altar of human equality, liberty of conscience and American democracy.

We, the Jewish War Veterans of Dallas are proud of the distinguished record of the men of our faith upon the battlefields of every war in which our country has participated. They have woven the pattern of their patriotic and loyal devotion into the very fabric and structure of our American way of life. They, who have gone before, have thrown to us the torch of service and patriotism so that we might carry it forward against the benighted powers of bigotry and the dictatorships of the world.

Today, more than ever before, all Americans must realize that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." This eternal vigilance it is our purpose to keep, in order that we may pass on to American generations yet unborn, undimmed and undiminished, their God-given rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Let us remember the grim and bitter lessons of other wars; let us remember the sufferings and the sacrifices that were made; let us remember the destruction and the devastation that they brought upon mankind: let them be a constant reminder that America must win the peace as well as the armed conflicts, so that, Americans who laid down their lives upon the battlefields of the world, shall not have died in vain. That we, who remain today, shall rededicate ourselves and our lives to the true principles of our American way of life and live by those principles for which the men and women to whom we pay tribute; and those, whom we memorialize today, so unselfishly laid down their very lives.

U.S. Farm Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a letter to the editor of Life magazine on farm subsidies from the Deer Creek Pilot, Rolling Fork, Miss.:

[From the Deer Creek Pilot, July 24, 1959]

FARM ECONOMIST ANSWERS LIFE EDITORIAL ON U.S. FARM SUBSIDIES

EDITORS, LIFE MAGAZINE,
Chicago, Ill.

SIRS: Your editorial, "A Tax Cut You Can Aid," is typical of many appearing these days in that it presents only a small part of the total subsidy picture, and, as usual, points the finger of scorn at agriculture. It is replete with distortions regarding Federal farm programs designed to turn city people still more against farmers. It is time more was said in defense of the American farmer. You owe it to your readers to present a more complete picture of subsidies and farm programs.

The subsidies-in-reverse, from farm people to city people are seldom publicized or editorialized. The flow of farm youth, raised and educated at the expense of rural communities, from farms to city jobs is a subsidy to our economic growth impossible to measure in dollars. Increasing farm production and improved marketing have benefited consumers more than farmers and are the second important subsidy in reverse. Never in any time or in any place have so few farmers produced so much high quality output for so many people at such reasonable prices.

The cost-of-living index has been quite stable since last June, courtesy of the American farmer. Food prices have been declining enough to offset rising prices for other good and services. Lower food prices in the retail store mean lower prices received by farmers for their products. Marketing costs have not declined. Yet you blame price supports for the high cost of food and clothing. If wheat farmers donated the wheat for making bread, the cost of a 25-cent loaf of white bread would be only about 2 cents less. The cost of a $4 man's dress shirt would be reduced by only 30 cents if cotton were free.

Farm subsidies have been widely publicized and criticized. Little is known or said about the hundreds of nonfarm subsidies which have benefited business, industry, and the general public since this Nation began. Those who are so ready to criticize agriculture are often doing very well with subsidy arrangements of their own.

For example, if you are so interested in reducing taxes, you might show the way for other newspapers and magazines by paying your own way through the mails. A special study on subsidies, published in Department of Agriculture appropriations for 1959, hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 85th Congress, 2d session, pages 152–166, shows that Life enjoys an estimated annual postal subsidy of $9.5 million or 7.5 cents a copy. This is several times the wheat and cotton loans cited in your editorial as having been received by two corporation farms. Note that these were loans secured by the farm commodities upon which the loans were made; the taxpayers at least have something to show for their money. This study also reports that second-class mail subsidies (newspapers and magazines) amounted to $3.2 billion from 1932 through 1956. Third class mail (advertising circulars, catalogs, etc.) was subsidized $1.8 billion in this period.

Other important nonfarm subsidies include: business war reconversion payments during and after World War II, $43.3 billion (agriculture helped win the war too); maritime organizations, $3.5 billion, 1938–57; airlines, airports and facilities, $362 million in 1958 alone. Depletion allowances on petroleum, natural gas and minerals provide billions in subsidies to firms engaged in exploiting these natural resources. These are just a few of the many direct and indirect subsidies to nonfarm businesses and individuals such as tariffs, patents, copyrights, grants, tax concessions, and supplying goods and services at less than cost. The important point is that farmers are not the only group in our society receiving subsidies.

You state that the farm support program has cost taxpayers $18 billion in the past 25 years. This apparently ignores the recovery of much of the Government's investment in farm commodities.

The USDA in a report, "Commodity Credit Corporation Charts," November 1958, shows a cumulative net loss of $5.7 billion for 1933–58. Losses will increase in 1959 and subsequent years unless production can be brought more into line with use. We cannot indefinitely accumulate stocks of farm commodities. It should be noted, however, that twice in the past 20 years our burdensome farm surpluses suddenly became strategic reserves.

Another common misconception is that all USDA appropriations are direct-to-farmer subsidies which increase taxes and food costs. Actually many USDA activities benefit the rest of us more than farmers. Programs to expand farm commodity exports make an important contribution to keeping the free world free but the entire fiscal 1958–59 cost of over $850 million is charged to agriculture. The research and educational activities benefit industry and the public as well as farmers. Meat inspection cost $17 million last year to assure the public of a clean, wholesome supply of meat; it's administered by USDA. The school lunch program subsidized 22 million (mostly city) school children in 1958 but cost $100 million, included in USDA appropriations. Over 50 million vacationing Americans visited the national forest last year; the Forest Service appropriation of $120 million comes under USDA.

PROPER PERSPECTIVE

It is not my purpose to defend farm price support programs as they now exist or to justify farm subsidies on the grounds that others get them, too; but rather to place them in their proper perspective. Present programs have not solved farm problems. But the only solution you and other critics have to offer is to do away with farm price and production controls, get the Government out of agriculture and set the farmer free to produce, market, compete—and go broke.

Even if farmers are willing to accept this approach, can the Nation afford to ignore the effects of the attendant consequences upon the rest of the economy? We can get adjustments in agriculture in this manner—adjustments of the type farmers went through in the 1920's and 1930's. Keep in mind that the free market would be free on one side only. Prices farmers receive would be free to drop to disaster levels; farm costs, on the other hand would decline little if any, and then only for items farmers buy from other farmers. Most nonfarm industries have rather effective methods of their own for controlling production and maintaining prices. This would put farmers through the financial wringer with resulting bankruptcies, mortgage foreclosures, tax delinquencies, etc. Lower farm incomes mean reduced purchases of industrial products by farmers.

These are the consequences which are usually ignored in the current loose talk about "getting the Government out of agriculture." So long as the farmers are not effectively organized, they must look to the Federal Government for economic and political bargaining power comparable to that of big business and big labor, which do not operate under the one-sided free market conditions being adovcated for agriculture.

EVERETT E. PETERSON,
Agricultural Economist, University of Nebraska.

Capital Times of Madison Denounces Military Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] recently delivered a hard-hitting attack in the Senate on the waste and extravagance in our Military Establishment and the failure of the military to provide any kind of an adequate opportunity for small business to share in the multibillion dollar national defense program. I was particularly impressed by the Senator's speech because a few days before it was delivered, competent and convincing witnesses before the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee had testified to exactly the same thing.

At that hearing I asked these witnesses whether, in their judgment as businessmen who had been dealing with the Defense Department successfully for years, a greater share of defense could be bought by our Government on a cost-saving, competitive bid basis, the area where small business and the taxpayer both have a chance. Their answers shocked and surprised me. They told me that with any kind of real determination in the Defense Department the present distribution of 85 percent negotiated and 15 percent competitive bidding could be if not reversed, at least drastically changed to a 25 percent negotiated and 75 percent competitively bid. And these were businessmen speaking in a congressional hearing, not theorists or politicians stirring up the home folks in the heat of an election campaign.

Mr. President, the Capital Times of Madison spells out the extent of the cost of this give-away procurement program in an indignant editorial of a few days ago; and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASTE AND INEFFICIENCY IN NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, Alabama, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, made a blistering attack Monday on the waste and inefficiency in the Defense Department which is costing the American taxpayers millions of dollars.

But this significant speech will get little attention in the press which likes to talk about economy in government.

Senator SPARKMAN drove hard at the point that big business preference in the awarding of contracts is a primary cause of the waste. Twenty large companies, he said, are getting 50 percent of the defense contracts.

"To a large degree we have turned the small businessman out to pasture as far as military procurement is concerned," he said.

There is a myth existent in this country that big business is far more efficient in the production of military goods, so very little is said about the fact that 85 percent of defense work is let on negotiated contracts rather than on competitive bidding.

The folly of this myth is well illustrated by some findings of the Sparkman committee published in the current issue of the Progressive magazine:

In spite of the administration's lipservice to the free enterprise rule of competition, 85 percent of the $23 billion the Pentagon is spending this year for weapons is being spent on negotiated contracts—without competitive bidding. What this means in dollars is brought out graphically by a few of the many examples provided by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, speaking as a member of the Senate Small Business Committee:

When the Navy ordered a gear assembly from Westinghouse on a noncompetitive basis it paid $277.44 on competitive bidding. Glove Gear, a small company, supplied the same gear for $27.50—a saving of 90 percent.

The Navy paid General Electric $82 per unit for carbon packing. On competitive bidding it got the same item for $15.

Bearing sleeves cost $425 when purchased from Allis-Chalmers on a negotiated basis—$189.50 on a competitive bid by the Waukesha Bearing Co.

Michigan's Democratic Representative MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS estimated that "if we cut out cost-plus contracts and used competitive bidding, we could save $5 billion. Someone from the Pentagon called me and said 'You're wrong; we could save $7 billion'."

It is this kind of waste that is draining the American taxpayer dry, but it is the feeble social welfare programs that get the blame.

House Labor Comes Through

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, since the introduction of the Elliott bill, H.R. 8342, the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, as written by my Committee—the Committee on Education and Labor—there have been opinions on the part of management organizations and labor organizations expressing disssatisfaction with the bill. On the one hand, it is called weak and ineffective. On the other, it is called union busting. Others call it watered down, or a compromise.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the Elliott bill is none of these. We all recognize, I am sure, that we must pass legislation this year which will effectively curb the racketeering and abuses which exist in this field of labor-management relations. We all recognize the need for some changes in the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. The great majority of unions are honest and well conducted and will have no difficulties living with the provisions of this bill. I believe that the Elliott bill steers a sound middle course between legislation which is effective in correcting the abuses in some labor unions without crippling the legitimate operations of trade unions in their most important economic and social functions.

Mr. Speaker, 30 members in my committee have met almost daily for the past 5 weeks trying to write a labor-management reform bill that would be in the best interests of our country as a whole. Some on the committee favored an extremely strong bill; others a weak bill; and some of us urged moderation between the two extremes. There were many individual shades of opinion on that committee. The result of the deliberations is the Elliott bill which to me most nearly represents the most desirable course of action to be taken by this Congress.

Many newspapers and magazines throughout the country have taken a dim view of the Elliott bill terming it "weak" and "watered down." I believe these charges to be unfair and untrue. The following editorial from the Washington Post reflects, I believe, a sober, objective analysis of the labor problem facing this Congress:

[From the Washington Post, July 20, 1959]

HOUSE LABOR COMES THROUGH

It is not yet possible to appraise all the 90 or more amendments attached to the Kennedy-Ervin bill by the House Committee on Education and Labor. Some of these changes would doubtless have the effect of weakening the measure. Some others would make notable improvements. In at least two respects the committee has done well: It resisted the temptation to bottle up the bill and let it die, and it refused to eliminate some of the provisions that some unions and their friends fought most vehemently.

Among the improvements made in the bill two stand out very prominently. First, the committee knocked out the ineffectual and troublesome provision of the Taft-Hartley Act requiring non-Communist affidavits from union leaders. The Senate had extended this oath requirement to employers, thus compounding the folly. The House committee dealt more directly with the problem by forbidding Communists to hold union offices. Second, the committee rejected completely the Senate's unworkable solution of the so-called no man's land dilemma.

Cases in the no man's land are those over which the National Labor Relations Board has jurisdiction but which it has never been able to handle for want of time and manpower. The Senate would let the States decide these cases, providing they applied Federal law as interpreted by the NLRB. This curious farming out of a Federal administrative chore to boards responsible to the States (and many States have no such boards) could lead only to chaos.

The House committee would wisely require the NLRB to do its own work and give it more manpower and decentralized machinery to make that possible. It would increase the board's membership from five to seven. As the board operates in panels of three in many cases and as each member has a substantial staff, this would add materially to available manpower. Even more important, the committee would allow representation election cases to be handled by regional offices of the NLRB. This would keep representation matters in the hands of officials closer to the scene, and would allow the Board in Washington to concentrate on unfair labor practice cases. It should not be difficult to convert the Senate to this notable improvement in its bill.

Other substantial achievements are the acceptance of the Senate bill's hot cargo and picketing provisions in the face of tremendous pressure from the spokesmen for organized labor. To be sure, the hot-cargo provision aimed chiefly at the Teamsters

Union was amended so that under its terms an employer could not discharge an individual truck driver who refused to cross a picket line for the delivery of goods to a second firm that might be engaged in a labor dispute. Some of the experts say this only make explicit what the Senate bill intended; others say it rips a hole in the Senate's hot-cargo safeguard. But, in any event, the committee showed a good deal of courage in retaining the provision in any form. The Senate's curbs on organizational picketing were left unchanged.

The committee also resisted efforts to kill the so-called bill of rights, merely changing the enforcement mechanism from criminal penalties to injunctions for the protection of individual union members. This may be an improvement. On the whole, the committee is entitled to congratulations for a good piece of work. It has immeasurably improved the chances of getting a sound labor reform bill enacted.

Post Office Gamble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, it is always pleasant to see recognition—especially public recognition—accorded to a job well done. During the past year, the Baltimore post office, under Postmaster William F. Laukaitis, inaugurated an experiment dealing with late evening pickups of mail which, after receiving extensive private acclaim, has now been praised in a newspaper editorial.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the July 18 edition of the Evening Sun, of Baltimore, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun, July 18, 1959]

POST OFFICE GAMBLE

So much criticism is turned upon the Post Office—sometimes justified, sometimes not—that the public's chance to offer a congratulatory word ought not to be missed. Last fall the Post Office saw there might be an unmet need for more late evening pick-ups. Some businesses, particularly small ones, might be cleaning up the mail as late as 8 or 9 in the evening. Some ordinary citizens might dash off a quick letter after supper. Both might want to see their mail speeded on its way without going to the trouble and expense of running to the Post Office itself.

Without knowing how the scheme would work out, the Post Office decided to try designating 185 selected mail boxes as late-hour collection points and marking them plainly. It worked. In only 9 months—and it sometimes take quite a while for such things to catch on—the public has been responding enthusiastically. The collections made from the express boxes between 9 and 10 in the evening range from 150 to 1,000 or more pieces and the Post Office is thinking of expanding the system. Everybody concerned is happy.

The pleasant feature of this trial is that the Post Office wasn't afraid to try something it was uncertain about. It took a small but imaginative gamble—the kind of thing that private business often does and Government businesses are frequently accused of not doing. Postmaster William F. Laukaitis says he is "very highly pleased." So, we presume to say, is the public.

Opposition to Downtown Routing of the Interstate Highway System Through Reno, Nev.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to submit a copy of a letter that I have addressed to the President.

For 2 years I have opposed a downtown routing through Reno, Nev., of the Interstate Highway System. I have done this because I object to the reckless spending of Federal funds at the instance of the Bureau of Public Roads to acquire expensive property and to build elaborate superstructures which actually defeat rather than implement the spirit of the Federal Highway Act of 1956.

In Reno alone if the freeway were routed around the city rather than through it the Government would save approximately $20 million. If there are 1,000 Reno's throughout the country the savings would be in the billions of dollars rather than millions. At this time when the administration has called upon Congress for more money with a warning that unless Congress acts promptly highway work must cease, I feel that my letter is most timely. The complete text follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1959.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I note with considerable concern that your administration has warned that contracting for new interstate highways will be halted for a number of months if Congress does not act soon to provide more money.

If what has taken place in the planning of an interstate highway through the city of Reno, Nev., is an example of how the Bureau of Public Roads is spending Federal funds, to say that I am not surprised that they are out of money is a gross understatement. For more than 2 years I have done everything within my power to prevent the routing of this highway through the very center of downtown Reno, thus bisecting the city and causing irreparable damage to its industrial growth. I have written to the Bureau of Public Roads and charged that they coerced the board of county commissioners in the selection of a route from the California-Nevada State line to Lawtons, which is a point 7 miles west of Reno. This point lies south of a solid rock saddle automatically forcing the freeway through Reno instead of following the north rim course which the citizens of Reno endorse.

As you know, whenever a transcontinental highway is routed through an urban area, the law requires that the economic impact of such routing be considered. There was a congressional investigation of this matter held in Reno early this year by a special subcommittee of the Commtitee on Government Operations, chairmaned by JOHN BLATNIK.

On page 19 of House Report No. 292, which is attached for your convenience, you will note that the committee concluded that the consideration of a route and its economic impact upon the community in which the route is located should be based upon more than the removal of property from the tax rolls.

On page 14 under "Comments of the Committee," it is noted that "except for some testimony on the tax revenue loss to Reno as a result of approval of the Third Street route, the record contains little discussion of the economic effects of route selection. There is some testimony concerning economic effects with respect to the Sparks area presented by witnesses supporting the routing in that area, but testimony of local and State officials is silent on this point." Here, clearly, is a failure to comply with the provisions of law.

Now, considering my charge that the Bureau of Public Roads coerced the board of county commissioners in their ratification of the highway routing from the California-Nevada State line to Lawtons, please read their comments on page 17 that the "county officials who had not personally examined line J in Verdi prior to their initial approval of the line, reversed themselves after such examination, and subsequently reinstated the initial approval following realinement that met their objections." You will note the State approved line J in advance of the public hearings and that the Bureau of Public Roads had acquiesced in State approval in advance of these hearings

Back in 1957 Frank Turner, of the Bureau of Public Roads, sent a telegram to a Mr. Farin, regional engineer for the Bureau in San Francisco, stating that no Federal funds would be made available for any route other than line J from the California State line to Lawtons. The following day Farin transmitted this wire to William Howard Smith, State engineer for the Bureau of Public Roads, who in turn wired Mr. Peterson, chairman of the board of county commissioners, Washoe County. At the same time, Mr. Turner also phoned Commissioner Peterson. The following day he held a special meeting of the board of county commissioners, at which line J was again ratified. You will note the report states that the telegram originally sent by Frank Turner and the other two noted above was obviously designed to influence action that accorded with earlier State and Bureau of Public Roads approval of line J, and that a local body faced with a telegram that line J is the "only location acceptable for the expenditure of Federal interstate funds" has little room for deliberation.

Why was the Bureau of Public Roads so determined to follow line J, which would necessitate building a trestle over a ravine 125 feet deep, when they could have selected a route around the northern mountain slopes continuing north Reno and across the meadows east of Reno which would follow the natural contours of the north rim and require no superstructures? We are now talking about spending Federal funds.

At the public hearings required by State law an employee of the Bureau of Public Roads made it very evident that the Bureau would not consider any route outside of the city limits of Reno. Mr Turner also informed the Governor of my State that he would not consider a proposal skirting Reno to the north.

Before comparing cost estimates, let me first direct your attention to page 10 of the Blatnik report. Back in 1955 a firm of consultants were employed to make a study of both local, and through traffic. From this

study benefit-cost ratio factors were assigned to six proposed routes. A so-called northern bypass route was assigned a benefit-cost ratio of 6.9. Third Street (elevated) as submitted to the Bureau of Public Roads by the State highway department had a benefit-cost ratio factor of only 5.1. Now, if you will note below "Additional Bureau of Public Roads Estimates," the Bureau estimated a benefit-cost ratio of 1.1 for the north rim. I might say here that the northern bypass and the north rim lines are probably no more than six blocks apart and the north rim route is only approximately 17 blocks from the center of Reno. It is absolutely ridiculous to even assume that line F would yield approximately six times the benefit that line R would yield. In the first place, highways form new traffic patterns and either improve the economic growth of a community or depress it. So-called benefit-cost ratio factors are nebulous and absurd and still the Bureau of Public Roads from the very beginning refers to the north rim 1.1 factor as a product of the consultants' study. Right here in my office Frank Turner, on several occasions, told me that the north rim could not be considered since it only carried a benefit-cost ratio factor of 1.1 while the Third Street line carried a benefit-cost ratio of 5.1.

Now let's consider cost. As I have said, the city of Reno is but a speck on the map and is located in a bowl formation. To the north of Reno are gentle mountain slopes. A highway following this contour could be prepared for laying concrete with a couple of bulldozers in 30 days. I have traveled every inch of this route on foot and I would say today that the entire distance from the California line to the meadows east of Reno could be traveled by jeep. In contrast, I have already mentioned that line J, as approved, would necessitate building a trestle 125 feet in the air. Line O through Reno crosses the Truckee River several times and one Y-shaped bridge diagonally crossing the river at the police station would conservatively cost at least $3 million. The Bureau of Public Roads admits that the north rim route could be completed for about $17 million. It would cost many millions more to run a highway through the center of town.

I will not quote figures because at best all figures quoted are no more than learned estimates. It is a simple fact that its costs money to build an elevated highway and it also costs money to build underpasses and overpasses. This is why the Brueau of Public Roads is now crying for more money. I would be reluctant to support any appropriation or gasoline tax bill until there is a thorough investigation of the Bureau of Public Roads. I do not understand why a small bureaucratic governmental agency can force an interstate transcontinental highway through the heart of a city as small as Reno, knocking out millions of dollars of personal property, and dislocating business establishments which employ thousands of people, against the will of the citizens of Reno. I say against their will advisedly, because I have in my office some 17,000 names on petitions opposing a downtown routing.

According to a plan presented to the Bureau of Public Roads by the State highway department there are 13 turns within the city limits, a stretch only 5 miles long. It was described by an expert as a loop-to-loop, shoot-to-shoot affair that would give a hot rodder a cheap thrill driving 40 miles per hour. Why the turns? To miss certain pieces of property predestined not to be disturbed. There is no bottleneck traveling through Reno from east to west. There is from north to south, because of the railroad crossing adjacent to Third Street.

The original plan called for two railroad underpasses, which were rejected by the Bureau of Public Roads. Now the State plans to divert urban and secondary funds to build these underpasses. In other words, it would be the biggest swindle ever perpetrated in the State of Nevada—a steal of all funds allocated to the State from all other counties to build a 5-mile elevated concrete superhighway through 5 miles of Reno. This reckless spending cannot be justified. If Reno is an example of highway planning throughout the country, and I believe it is, it would cost our taxpayers billions of dollars in excess of a reasonable program cost figure and would still not accomplish the intent of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

I understand that you have asked that the program not be bogged down through the purchase of expensive personal property in urban areas. I know there are highway scandals in the shadows of the Capitol which will be brought to light by those other than myself. I urge, Mr. President, that immediate steps be taken, not only to investigate present activities of the Bureau of Public Roads, but also to regulate its future conduct, and that they be forced to curb their excessive spending as a step toward balancing our national budget.

To expressly reflect the attitude of the Bureau of Public Roads in this regard during the John Blatnik investigation, I specifically asked Mr. Turner if he was willing to spend three to four times as much Federal moneys to route the freeway through downtown Reno as it would cost to skirt the city, and he replied that he was, and when I asked where the money would come from, he quipped you are the Congressman, that's your job.

As a result of their support of the proposed Third Street routing of the freeway we now have a new Governor, a new comptroller, and a new attorney general, who constitute the State highway board. We also have a new mayor, a new city council and, with the exception of two members who did not commit themselves, a new board of county commissioners. It has just been called to my attention that the mayor and the new city council now definitely oppose the Third Street routing and that the State highway board would be willing to reconsider the entire matter if the Bureau of Public Roads indicated that this was their prerogative. This should be done by a letter from the Bureau of Public Roads to the State highway department. I strongly urge that you so instruct the Bureau of Public Roads and that Mr. Frank Turner withdraw his statement that Federal funds could not be made available for the north rim route since the benefit-cost ratio of 1.1 was merely a "guestimate" assigned by the Bureau of Public Roads and completely unrelated to the traffic study made in 1955.

I respectfully request a reply to this letter at your earliest convenience.

Respectfully,

WALTER S. BARING,
Congressman for Nevada.

(NOTE.—Line F, northern bypass; line O, Third Street (elevated); line R, north rim; line J, California line to Lawtons.)

Campaign Against Tuberculosis in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], with an Associated Press release of July 18 referred to in his statement.

There being no objection, the statement and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The battle against disease throughout the world has attracted considerable attention in the Senate and House this year, and with good reason. From small town councils to the specialist committees of the United Nations, a new optimism about final victory over affliction is in the making.

Dr. Roscoe P. Kandle, who became the New Jersey State Health Commissioner this month, had some very interesting things to say recently about the possible victory over tuberculosis in that State. His interview with an Associated Press reporter also deals with other matters. I attach hereto an Associated Press release of July 18 from the Atlantic City Press.

STATE HEALTH CHIEF SEES DEATH OF TUBERCULOSIS

TRENTON.—New Jersey's new health commissioner thinks tuberculosis in this State can be completely wiped out.

And he thinks his department needs to make the same sort of intensive drive against polio by getting everyone vaccinated.

Dr. Roscoe Kandle, 50, of Pitman, a soft-spoken, slightly balding man with a varied health work background, has been on the job since July 1.

He replaced his close personal friend, Dr. Daniel Bergsma of North Haledon.

Bergsma resigned after 10 years in office to become associate medical director of the National Foundation (for infantile paralysis).

In some ways it has been old home week for the new director. He was head of the department's division of preventable diseases for a year in 1947. Many of his friends are still on the job.

SOUTH JERSEY POST

Before that he was southern district health officer, responsible for Camden, Cumberland, Gloucester and Salem Counties.

Kandle said in an interview his fondest wish is to finish the job of tuberculosis control.

"I'm tremendously impressed at the progress we've made," he said, "but we need to settle down and ferret out each source case.

"Our aim is complete eradication—and I think it will come."

The Pitman native said that on polio it gets harder to sell vaccination as the nonimmunized group gets smaller.

"People ought to want to protect their own children," he added, and pointed out they can get free shots at many clinics if they can't pay a doctor.

Kandle said diphtheria was brought under control when 65 percent of the people had been vaccinated, but polio may require 90 percent vaccination.

OTHER POINTS

On other points, he said:

1. Prospects are not so good for effective air pollution control because of automobile exhaust and other fumes. "I don't know how clean the air is going to get," he said, and both New York and New Jersey are "sinners."

2. The department can work on malnutrition in babies and older folks as a way to cut down some mental illness.

3. While Bergsma wanted a big program of State aid for health agencies, Kandle feels "you have to live within your budget."

Since leaving the New Jersey Health Department 10 years ago, Kandle has been in many positions around the country, including field director of the American Public Health Association.

He feels New Jersey's health services to its 5,600,000 citizens are better than the average in the United States.

Kandle operates out of a modernized air-conditioned headquarters in midtown Trenton—at 129 East Hanover Street.

Kandle and his wife are now seeking a home in the Trenton area.

They have three children—George, a Princeton Seminary student; John, Eastern New Mexico University student, and Catherine, 9.

American Labor's Growing Role in Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of introducing into the RECORD today an article which appeared in the Chicago Daily News on American labor's growing role in diplomacy.

This article is of particular importance at this time when all American labor leaders are being blanketly indicted by many enemies of the labor movement because of the defalcation of the few.

Mr. Milt Freudenheim of the Daily News wire service quite appropriately points out that American labor union men, with their counterparts abroad, may be crucial in holding the vast underdeveloped nations friendly to the free world.

I think we Americans do a great disservice and a great injustice to the decent men of the American labor movement who have fought hard to preserve democratic principles in this country and who have given of their time and effort to help our State Department develop contacts abroad simply because a few representatives of labor have gone astray.

Only recently, Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, and a large delegation of other respectable labor leaders returned from an international conference of labor spokesmen from all over the world, which was held in Europe. Their mission to Europe has been highly praised by those seeking a better understanding among all nations.

I wish to call attention of this article to the Members of this House at this particular time, when in a few days we, as Members of Congress, must give serious thought to the entire question of how far do we want to tie the hands of the American labor movement and its legitimate spokesmen.

I hope that my colleagues will ponder the full impact of this article as they proceed to make their ultimate decision. Those who have been advocating extremist labor reform have made capital only of the abuses in the labor movement and very conveniently overlooked the fact that the trade movement of America has indeed produced great and dedicated leaders who have worked steadfastly not only to raise the standard of living in our own country to the highest in the world, but within the framework of our free enterprise system, have bravely fought off those who would try to sell communism and other foreign ideologies to our people.

Are these the men that we want to drive out of the labor movement through punitive legislation, which goes clearly beyond the scope of labor-management reform?

I think it is high time that we showed the American people that not everything in the labor movement is bad but that, to the contrary, by an overwhelming majority, those truly dedicated to the principles of trade unionism have served their country well.

Mr. Speaker, the Daily News article follows:

AMERICAN LABOR'S GROWING ROLE IN DIPLOMACY

(By Milt Freudenheim)

NEW YORK.—Contacts by American labor union men with their counterparts abroad who wield great political power may be crucial in holding the vast underdeveloped nations friendly to the free world.

George Cabot Lodge, U.S. Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs, calls for stepping up these contacts, using American assets to beat the Communists at one of their favorite games.

Writing on "Labor's Role in New Countries," in Foreign Affairs Quarterly, Lodge says worker groups in the newer nations are a crucial force and often are the only leadership aside from the educated elite.

He believes that the United States must be prepared to make the same effort in behalf of worldwide economic progress as we have exercised in building military strength to deter aggression.

"The Communists have increased substantially their influence in the labor movements of Asia, Africa and Latin America," notes Lodge, son of the U.S. Ambassador at the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge.

They concentrate on key industries, such as steel in India, inviting large numbers of young labor leaders to Moscow each year for a highly developed course of indoctrination.

In areas where anyone who has taken a plane ride to a faroff country is looked upon with awe, these Moscow visitors return to find eager listeners for their far-flung promises of "easy money and full bellies * * * by the shorter Russian route of totaltarianism."

But American union leaders also carry tremendous prestige in the same countries. They are innocently credited with "singlehandedly" wresting the high standards for American workers from "capitalist" hands.

Lodge calls for renewed support for the Government exchange program which annually brings 900 trade unionists to the United States from abroad for from 3 to 9-month stays.

"The leaders and members of foreign workers organizations can see firsthand the extent to which American labor has confounded the 100-year-old prediction of Karl Marx," Lodge points out.

He also urges increasing the present 48 labor attachés now serving with American embassies abroad, and maintaining U.S. support for the International Labor Organization (ILO).

In ILO, he says, not government spokesmen but workers have been most effective in spotlighting Communist totalitarianism for the delegates of new nations to see.

"The day has long since gone," Lodge says, "when relations with other countries can be effectively carried on solely in the traditional 'diplomatic' way at the usual 'diplomatic' levels.

"The power of Africa and Asia is often not in the hands of government officials, but rather in the hands of relatively obscure native leaders who first appear on the national scene as leaders of a workers' organization," Lodge concludes.

MATS Must Be Ready at All Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a very excellent summary of the case for MATS which was discussed at length on the Senate floor during the consideration of the Defense Appropriation Act for fiscal 1960 appeared in the July 28 issue of the Greenville News, a newspaper published in Greenville, S.C., in an editorial entitled "MATS Must Be Ready at All Times." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, July 28, 1959]

MATS MUST BE READY AT ALL TIMES

Almost every American has heard of SAC, our Strategic Air Command which is our first line of defense against an atomic attack by an enemy. SAC is on 24-hour alert and in times of suspected emergency has planes in the air, armed and ready to deliver a counter blow on order from the proper authorities.

Fewer people know about STRAC, our Strategic Army Command composed of two airborne divisions and two infantry divisions which are trained and ready to go to any part of the world on command and fight a limited war. Some of these troops were dispatched to Latin America a few months ago when Vice President NIXON ran into trouble. Many of them, a whole battle group in fact, were airlifted to Lebanon when things were threatening to blow sky high in the Middle East.

Even fewer people know that these two vital forces, SAC and STRAC are dependent on adequate airlift in the event that they are called on for any sort of sustained action in any part of the world.

Let us state at the outset that both of these forces are prepared and ready for quick action in an emergency.

SAC can mount a counterattack almost instantly. STRAC can move the first elements of a combat-ready division in 2 hours and can have a whole division ready to move in a few more hours. And, if the need arose, the U.S. Air Force, working through the Military Air Transport Service could cancel all other commitments and move them.

MATS keeps enough planes in reserve at all times to start such a movement, but what probably would happen after that is part of the subject of this editorial.

Back to SAC for a moment. It is contemplated that the initial counterattack would be mounted from bases within the continental United States. Extra fuel needed to get the planes to their targets and back would be provided by Air Force tankers.

But, after that initial counter attack, things would be different. To move in on the enemy, we would have to establish bases closer to his borders. This would mean a vast movement of men, fuel, equipment, armaments and other supplies in a hurry. This means airlift.

The same goes for STRAC operations. It is one thing to drop the initial assault forces in to a combat area. It is quite another to reinforce them, to resupply them with food, ammunition and all of the equipment needed to maintain a division or an army in the field.

This would mean still more airlift, because we no longer can wait for weeks while those men, equipment and supplies are loaded aboard ships and laboriously convoyed across thousands of miles of submarine-infested ocean.

We are less familiar with the problems of sustaining a naval operation, but we understand enough of the overall principles of logistics to know that keeping a fleet in combat would entail the same sort of requirements in terms of airlift.

If war comes again, global or local, it will come swiftly and it will be fought swiftly. Without adequate airlift, we can expect to be defeated in a hurry in either event.

This is where MATS—and Donaldson Air Force Base, a MATS base, come in.

For the fact is that MATS is being held back and eroded. It does not have enough of the most modern aircraft.

We first ran into this a few months ago when we had occasion to observe at close hand a massive maneuver of one of the Nation's crack airborne divisions. One of the few things the commanders of that division were reluctant to talk about (as a matter of fact they refused to talk about it at all, except to discuss how fast they could move the first elements and be ready to move the others) was the availability of air transport.

The problem was spotlighted during recent days in columns by Holmes Alexander on this page when he told of flying with military people in outmoded aircraft long since abandoned by private airlines.

Senator STROM THURMOND focussed the light again when he sought to persuade the U.S. Senate to cut back on its use of civilian airlines and put the funds into MATS operations.

We have no objection to military use of civilian airlines. In fact, in limited movements of personnel and equipment, it is feasible to use private lines. But it is hard to mesh military and civilian operations. And when MATS crews are flying empty or nearly empty planes in order to maintain their flight proficiency and to continue their training (and this has to be done) waste results.

Furthermore, Representative MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, in a recent address in the House, revealed that fly-by-night airlines are being created by the operators of obsolete planes for the sole purpose of getting military air transport business. If war came, as Mr. RIVERS said, these lines would be useless.

MATS presently depends on the C-124 Globemaster, a fine airplane capable of long flights with heavy loads. But there aren't enough of them and they are relatively slow and becoming obsolete. The service also has a few C-130's and C-133's, faster turboprop craft also capable of carrying heavy loads and having the added capability of landing almost anywhere.

But there aren't enough of these.

That is what Holmes Alexander, the newsman, STROM THURMOND, the Senator, and MENDEL RIVERS, the Representative, are saying. And all three are in position to know what they are talking about.

Our great civilian air fleet, owned by private companies, is a nice thing to have in reserve. But these planes could not be converted to military use fast enough to meet a sudden emergency.

As MENDEL RIVERS says, the determining force in the next war, if it comes, will be the force that is in being when the first shot is fired.

Interest Rate Ceiling Limitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will mark the lapse of 7 weeks since the Committee on Ways and Means concluded public hearings on legislation requested by the administration 8 weeks ago to permit more flexible debt management. The administration requested the repeal of statutory interest rate ceilings on savings bonds and marketable bonds in order to facilitate efficient and economical debt management and to prevent any further erosion of the dollar from mounting inflationary pressures.

After the conclusion of those hearings 7 weeks ago the committee held extensive executive session on the administration's legislative request. Approximately 3 weeks ago we reached the point in those executive sessions where the majority of the committee had approved several controversial amendments and had instructed the chairman of the committee to introduce legislation embodying these tentative decisions. No further action has occurred.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the "sit and wait" policy of the Democratic House leadership that has been applied to many other urgent legislative matters has been extended to include this most serious of all matters involving public confidence at home and abroad in the integrity of the national credit. The Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means have made repeated efforts to have the Democratic leadership abandon its ostrichlike sit-and-wait policy in favor of a straightforward position of responsible action to give to the Secretary of the Treasury the necessary tools to safeguard against national financial crisis. On July 22, 1959, the Republican members of the committee joined in addressing a letter to the Speaker pointing out the urgent considerations that required prompt action on the administration's legislative proposal. We indicated that our reason for writing directly to the Speaker was in recognition of press statements attributed to him that "the legislation would not receive House consideration in the absence of administration concurrence in the amendments tentatively approved by the majority members of the committee." In our letter to the Speaker the Republican members of the committee also called attention to the fact that the majority-approved amendments were inflationary, destructive of public confidence, and costly in terms of debt management.

On July 27, 1959, I received in the mail a carbon copy of a document that appeared to be a statement by the Speaker issued to the press responding to our letter of July 22, 1959. Neither I nor any other Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means has received any direct comment on this matter from the Democratic House leadership. So that the membership of the House may be informed in regard to this statement by the Speaker I will at this point in the RECORD insert the text of that statement.

SPEAKER RAYBURN'S STATEMENT IN REPLY TO THE LETTER SIGNED BY REPRESENTATIVE SIMPSON AND OTHER REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, JULY 23, 1959

The Committee on Ways and Means moved promptly on the legislation to remove the statutory ceiling on the interest rate of long-term bonds, because it was aware that the request of the President deals with one of the most important issues facing us. Both the committee and I are fully aware of the gravity of the problems involved.

In substance, the committee gave the President the flexibility which he requested in the management of the public debt. The committee added two provisions to the legislation requested by the President.

First, instead of removing the ceiling permanently, the committee placed a 2-year limitation on the authority granted to the President.

Second, the committee required that before bonds could be issued at rates of interest above the existing ceiling, the President must make a finding that it is in the national interest to do so.

The only other provision which the committee added to the legislation was a declaration of the sense of Congress relative to the management of the public debt. This section states the concern of the Congress over the continuing rising costs of financing the public debt. It expresses the hope that further increases in interest rates can be avoided or minimized without interfering with efficient debt management and the Federal Reserve's efforts to preserve a sound currency.

Here is the language in question:

"It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Reserve System, while pursuing its primary mission of administering sound monetary policy, should to the maximum extent consistent therewith, utilize such means as will assist in the economical and efficient management of the public debt and in so doing the System should, where feasible, bring about needed future monetary expansion by purchasing U.S. securities, of varying maturities."

This is what the language does. It expresses the sense of Congress that the Federal Reserve System should assist the Treasury in the management of the public debt in a way that is consistent with the System's primary mission of administering a sound monetary policy. This language further expresses the preference of Congress that when it is necessary for the Board to carry out its function of expanding the supply of money and credit, this could be done whenever feasible by its purchase of U.S. securities. This language does not require or even urge any expansion of the credit supply that would not be desirable and necessary for economic growth. The language of the bill says simply that it is the sense of the Congress that wherever feasible this needed growth of the money supply could be provided through the purchase of Government securities. There is nothing new, unreasonable, or irresponsible in this procedure. I

need only to point out that the Federal Reserve banks already hold $26 billions of U.S. Government securities.

I have been forced to the conclusion that the Federal Reserve authorities have reached a point in their thinking where they consider themselves immune to any direction or suggestion by the Congress, let alone a simple expression of the sense of Congress. It appears that the fault of the suggested committee bill was not that the language itself was wrong, but that the Congress dared even to speak to the Federal Reserve, a creature of Congress.

The failure to move this bill is the failure on the part of the administration to understand that the Congress cannot be expected to be unconcerned about what might happen in the exercise of the authority granted to the President under the bill. It is the failure of the administration to accept the right of the Congress to express its concern within the statute, that this authority should not be exercised in ways which are not in the public interest. It is the failure of the administration to accept the right of Congress to place a time limit upon the exercise of this very substantial authority so that the Congress may, from time to time, reexamine the way that the authority is being exercised.

Since the responsible solution of this problem is of great importance to the country, it is disappointing that the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means have decided to play politics with it, particularly at a time when conferences were being held with responsible administration officials in an effort to resolve this problem. Every Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means must have known of the efforts on the part of the leadership of the Congress and the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means in meeting with representatives of the administration seeking a solution to this problem. They must have known that I, along with others, have been making every effort to resolve this problem in a way that is of the best interest to our country. We are not wedded to the language suggested by the committee, and despite the political activities of the committee minority, we will continue to make every effort to develop an effective solution to this problem. In my opinion, this is a matter far too important to get involved in partisan politics.

Mr. Speaker, having read in the press on the evening of July 23 the reaction of the Democratic leadership to our letter of July 22 charging unwarrantedly that our letter was a political play instead of a responsible request for responsible action, I issued a statement on July 24, 1959, responsible to the charge of the House Democratic leadership. So the record may be complete on this point I will also place my statement in the RECORD at this point.

The Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, ranking Republican Member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, today expressed regret that the Speaker of the House of Representatives had unwarrantedly chosen to characterize as a political play the pledge of support from the 10 Republican Members of the Committee on Ways and Means to assist in obtaining favorable House action on the administration's request for legislation to remove statutory interest rate ceilings to facilitate economical public debt management.

Mr. SIMPSON stated that the Speaker's reaction to the Republican joint letter of July 22, 1959, is an indication of the Democratic House leadership's vulnerability to the charge that if the Democratic leadership continues to thwart House action on this measure the Democratic majority in the House must accept the responsibility for the consequences of failure to act on a measure that involves the soundness of the Nation's currency and the integrity of the Nation's credit. Mr. SIMPSON noted that while neither he nor any other Republican Members of the Committee on Ways and Means had received a reply from the Speaker to their letter of July 22, the Speaker had claimed in a press statement "the leadership of the Congress and the Democratic Members of the Committee on Way and Means are seeking a solution to this problem." Mr. SIMPSON acknowledged encouragement from the fact that the Democratic House leadership reccgnized the matter as a problem but he said "I find difficulty in reconciling that statement by the Speaker to a press statement of July 16, 1959, attributed to the Speaker saying 'we can sit here and wait'."

Mr. SIMPSON said that one of the considerations that had prompted the committee Republican members to urge action on this important legislation is their concern that the Democratic House leadership had decided to sit and wait in taking action on this important measure in the same way "the Democratic leadership has been sitting and waiting on effective farm legislation, a suitable housing bill, and a labor bill that will protect the rights of all American citizens." He went on to say, "The Democratic leadership in the Congress seems to have effectively adjourned the Congress without the awareness of the Members."

Mr. SIMPSON said: "I presume if and when the Democratic House leadership makes its decision as to what is good for the Nation with respect to public debt management, it will permit the entire House membership to vote on legislation meeting the approval of that leadership without regard to the President's recommendation."

Mr. SIMPSON noted that the Speaker's criticism of the Federal Reserve Board was totally unwarranted and constituted a rebuke by a highly placed Government official of other Government officials who are earnestly doing their patriotic best to fulfill their responsibility as prescribed by law.

In connection with his statement Congressman SIMPSON released the text of a letter he had received from the Honorable William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System on the Democratic proposed amendments to the administration's legislative proposal

The complete text of Mr. SIMPSON'S statement follows along with the text of Mr. Martin's letter:

"TEXT OF THE STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE RICHARD M. SIMPSON

"I sincerely regret that the Speaker of the House of Representatives has unwarrantly chosen to characterize as a political play the pledge of support from the 10 Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means to assist in obtaining favorable House action on the administration's request for legislation to remove statutory interest rate ceilings to facilitate economical public debt management.

"It is a matter of public record that a substantial cleavage exists among House Democrats on this legislative proposal and our pledge of unanimous support by Republican committee members and the expression of expected supports from at least 140 Republican Members of the House were intended to give encouragement to the House Democratic leadership to break the existing stalemate and deal forthrightly with this important issue involving confidence in the soundness of our dollar and in the integrity of our credit.

"While neither I, nor to my knowledge any other Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means, has received a reply from the Speaker to our letter of July 22, the Speaker apparently has said to the press that the leadership of the Congress and the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means are seeking a solution to this problem. I am encouraged that the Democratic House leadership has recognized and is seeking a solution to this problem, but I find difficulty in reconciling that statement by the Speaker with a press statement of July 16, 1959, attributed to the Speaker saying 'we can sit here and wait.'

"One of the considerations that weighed persuasively with the Republican membership of the Committee on Ways and Means in urging the Speaker to end the committee bottleneck was our concern that the Democratic House leadership had adopted a 'sit and wait' policy on this important matter in the same way that the Democratic leadership has been "sitting and waiting" on effective farm legislation, a suitable housing bill, and a labor bill that will protect the rights of all American citizens. The Democratic leadership in the Congress seems to have effectively adjourned the Congress without the awareness of the Members. I presume if and when the Democratic House leadership makes its decision as to what is good for the Nation with respect to public debt management, it will permit the entire House membership to vote on legislation meeting the approval of that leadership without regard to the President's recommendation.

"The Speaker has unjustly expressed criticism of Federal Reserve authorities. This criticism is totally unwarranted and constitutes a rebuke by a highly placed Government official of other Government officials who are earnestly doing their patriotic best to fulfill their responsibility as prescribed by law. The Speaker in seeking to cast responsibility for this Democratic caused stalemate on the Federal Reserve authorities is criticizing recognized monetary authorities who are conducting themselves with impeccable propriety on this important issue. In his criticism of the Federal Reserve the Speaker seems unmindful of the virtually unanimous criticism expressed by financial writers of the amendments tentatively approved by the Democratic Majority on the Committee on Ways and Means. An example of such criticism appears in the July 13, 1959 publication of Aubrey G. Lanston & Co. Inc., who are foremost specialists in Government securities. An excerpt from that publication states the following with respect to the amendment which would require the Federal Reserve to peg Government bond prices:

"Some things, however, are clear. The management of money, credit and debt is an art the practice of which is replete with complexities. The means by which these arts are practiced very definitely are not matters in which Congress can afford to meddle whimsically or for purposes of advancing partisan objectives. The manner in which, and the methods by which Federal Reserve open market operations are conducted may not be subjected to black-and-white analyses. But, certainly, the national interest dictates that the choice of methods be left to the experts, and that the actual decisions with respect to these matters be left to the experts who are charged with the responsibility. Certainly, too, Federal Reserve officials know better than the House Ways and Means Committee what the Fed can and cannot do in the Government market if the public interest is to be served."

The Speaker in stressing what he interprets as the permissive character of the proposed amendment also seems unmindful of statements made on the House floor by Democratic House Members indicating that perhaps the amendment would be mandatory on the Federal Reserve.

On July 13, 1959, I addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Honorable William McChesney Martin, Jr., at the request

of several members of the Committee on Ways and Means asking the Chairman to evaluate the amendments that had been tentatively adopted by the House committee majority. Because I was uncertain as to the scheduling of subsequent activity by the committee on this legislation, I asked that Chairman Martin expedite his reply. His answer contained nothing that he had not previously brought to the attention of the committee before the Democratic majority had approved these amendments. I consider that his answer contained his earnest and patriotically expressed views on this very serious matter.

In view of the aspersions that have been cast upon the Federal Reserve authorities, I feel it only proper that the text of Chairman Martin's reply to me should be released at this time. It is appropriate that the American people should be permitted to judge whether he is acting as an obstructionist as has been alleged or instead is constructively working as a responsible Government official who is knowledgeable in monetary affairs to find a correct solution to a very grave national issue.

(There is attached the text of the letter to the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON from the Honorable William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System).

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, July 14, 1959.

The Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SIMPSON: This response to the request contained in your letter of July 13 puts in writing the gist of the comments I made in the executive session meetings of the Ways and Means Committee on the amendments to the legislative proposals originally offered by the administration.

It is my considered judgment we are facing a serious financial situation. The limitation on interest rates is unrealistic in the light of present market quotations and denies the U.S. Treasury the tools essential to effective balanced handling of its borrowing needs. By statute the Treasury is now limited, because of the ceilings, to the issue of short-term securities which under present conditions of rising prosperity is dangerous. These short-term obligations can readily be converted into money at the option of the holder. In effect, they are a substitute for money, and thus could swell the flow of money far beyond that needed to purchase available goods and services at current price levels. The threat of a money flow out of hand has a major impact on the cost of living and places a burden on all of us.

It serves no useful purpose at the moment to argue whose fault it is that we are in our present predicament. The fact of the matter is we are in it. The committee is not being asked to vote whether interest rates should or would go up or down, but merely to grant the Treasury authority to exercise its best judgment in meeting an existing problem. We are discussing a crucial matter—the credit of the United States. Failure to deal with this could (and I was careful not to threaten or assert that it necessarily would) have the most serious implications. It was my duty to warn of this, much as I disliked the task. These are the basic facts with which we were dealing and any amendments must be considered in this light.

The amendment to retain the statutory ceilings but permit them to be disregarded if the President found the national interest so required did not seem to me to present unworkable problems. Accordingly, I did not raise objections, although I prefer the original.

The sense of the committee amendment is quite a different matter. I object to this on principle. The Open Market Committee and the Federal Reserve Board are given the responsibility under the Federal Reserve Act for regulating the money supply. If the Congress wishes to spell out the means of doing this, it should amend the Federal Reserve Act and not tack this on to a debt management bill.

Furthermore, under present conditions, I am convinced that this amendment, when stripped of all technicalities, and regardless of whether the language is permissive or mandatory, will cause many thoughtful people both at home and abroad to question the will of our Government to manage its financial affairs without recourse to the printing press. To me this is a grave matter. We are here dealing with trust and confidence which is the keystone of sound currency. Therefore, I must oppose this proposal as vigorously as possible, as I did during the hearings.

The amendment limiting the President's authority to 2 years is, in my judgment, unsound. It could be a source of embarrassment to both the next President and the then Secretary of the Treasury.

I have tried as faithfully as possible to summarize what I actually said during the hearings, and not to introduce new ideas. May I, in conclusion, thank you and all the members of the committee for the courtesy and consideration shown me and my associates throughout the meetings. I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Chairman MILLS.

Sincerely yours,

WM. MCC. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when effective leadership must be brought to bear in obtaining floor consideration of this important administration request for legislation. It is no coincidence that financial writers and editorial comment have been virtually unanimous in criticizing the committee-approved amendments to this legislation. Political machinations and leadership equivocation have no appropriate place in this consideration. We are confronted with the fact of grave consequences assuredly detrimental and potentially disastrous if we do not provide the Secretary of the Treasury with the authority he must have in managing a public debt of $285 billion and in refinancing the $75 billion of Federal obligations that will mature in the next 12 months.

Mr. Speaker, as the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means indicated to you in our July 22 letter, the Republican administration and the Republican membership in the Congress are willing to accept the responsibility for removing the statutory ceilings on interest rate on Government securities to facilitate the economical management of the public debt. The Democratic majority in the House must accept the responsibility for unwise action or no action at all; the American people will bear the brunt of the consequences if the Democratic House leadership persists in "sitting and waiting."

There is legislation before the House, H.R. 8304, which I have introduced as ranking Republican on the Committee on Ways and Means carrying out the administration's recommendations in this area. It is urgent that the House be allowed to work its will with respect to this legislation.

Surplus Power From Bonneville for Atom Smasher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the eminent Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] who serves with distinction as chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, as well as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, is ever alert to the needs of the West in particular and the interest of the U.S. taxpayers in general. I wish to commend him for his understanding of the water and power needs of my State and for his effective leadership in our efforts in Congress to meet these needs.

A current case in point was reported in the Washington Daily News of July 27, 1959, under the heading "Maybe Senator ANDERSON Saved Us Taxpayers a Few Millions." This has to do with the plans of the Atomic Energy Commission to build a $105 million linear electronic accelerator at Stanford University. Initially, at a capacity of 10 billion electronvolts, the accelerator would require 60,000 kilowatts of electric power; ultimately, enlarged to 45 billion electronvolts, the accelerator would, of course, require a great deal more electric power. Senator ANDERSON has pointed out that the proposed Federal transmission line intertie between the Bonneville power system of the Pacific Northwest and the Central Valley power system of California could be the means of delivering some of Bonneville's current surplus power to Stanford for the AEC installation.

I ask unanimous consent to have the news article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAYBE SENATOR ANDERSON SAVED US TAXPAYERS A FEW MILLIONS

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, may have discovered a way by which the Government can save millions of dollars a year in operation of its proposed linear electron accelerator at Stanford University.

When Senator ANDERSON's Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held hearings on the accelerator, Stanford witnesses testified it would cost $15 million a year to operate, much of which would go for purchase of electric power from a private utility company.

This power cost could be quadrupled under ultimate plans for the accelerator.

But Senator ANDERSON then recalled hearings over which he presided last spring, in

his capacity as chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Senate Interior Committee.

These had to do with a proposal to carry surplus power from the Bonneville Dam in the Pacific Northwest to northern California.

The same private utility that wants to sell power to Stanford was negotiating with Bonneville for its surplus. Senator ANDERSON has called attention to Bonneville's surplus power and the proposal—discussed in 1952 and then abandoned—for a Government intertie line.

"If the intertie were constructed," Senator ANDERSON wrote AEC Chairman John McCone, "it could make at least some power available to Stanford at 'dump' rates below the presently quoted rates from private sources," possibly saving enough on the accelerator's operation to pay for constructing the high-voltage intertie transmission lines.

Rural Development: A Program That Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, there appeared early in June in the Christian Science Monitor the first and second in an important series of articles on the national rural development program, now going forward in some 200 counties in 30 States. Two of these pilot counties are in my congressional district in southeastern Ohio. The Monitor, which is one of the most highly respected and independent newspapers in the Nation, terms rural development "a program that works."

In view of our deep concern over the problems of the Nation's agricultural areas and the intensive search for effective, long-term solutions to these problems, this independent account of what the national rural development program has accomplished deserves the closest study. This approach, originated by the present administration, may well turn out to be one of the most significant steps taken in recent years to solve the farm problem—once and for all.

I wish to commend the Monitor's excellent review of the program to the Members of the House:

RURAL TEAMWORK SPURS FARM GAINS

(By Helen Henley)

WASHINGTON.—In many rural areas where farmers are hard pressed to earn adequate incomes, new hope is appearing.

That hope has blossomed through efforts of many citizens working together in the rural development program. This project was launched 3 years ago by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, but in great degree it owes its expanding success to the cooperation of citizens in each community. If the Federal Government has supplied the basic machinery, local workers might be said to have supplied the gas.

Throughout 200 counties in 30 States, rural development projects in various stages include such things as: New market opportunities for local produce; new educational opportunities; improvement in farming practices, to yield more income; construction of new business facilities; opening of new roads; and in short, better utilization of whatever resources a community has. Although initiated to aid low-income farmers, the program is rejuvenating entire communities.

HOW PROJECTS OPERATE

The way these projects operate is indicated in a report from Park Rapids, Hubbard County, Minn., which reads:

"An invisible little pig market is having some plain-to-be-seen results here in northern Minnesota. It's invisible in this respect: There are no stockyards, no holding pens, no market-owned trucks or cattle cars. Instead, the market is a listing service for farmers who have pigs to sell. A local office keeps the list for buyers who then go out to the seller's farm to do business.

"Simple as it sounds, this market has sold some 2,000 little pigs—worth about $25,000—since it started operations in April. Farmers here call it the best thing ever to happen to the pig business in this area.

"One of the eight key rural development committees in the county—the farm management committee—developed the idea for the pig market. But they didn't rush into it blindly. They first surveyed local farms and decided from the results there would be enough volume to warrant a marketing association."

INCOME BOOSTED

Now, says the report, the 50 association members, who each pay an annual membership fee of $2, have received $1 to $2 per head above the going price "which has added about $2,500 to the local income."

Other developments in Hubbard County, Minn., include "a vegetable market operation at Nevis during the past two summers * * * an effective antilitter campaign in the tourist country. * * * Work is underway on development of a 5,000-acre bog area into a wildlife refuge and public hunting ground. And some intensive studies have been made of other local conditions, including industrial and small business credit needs, youth camp proposals, and needs for scholarship programs."

Down in Berkley County, S.C., where lack of proper drainage and flooding of roads perennially caused problems, a whole area was lifted out of the muck when a new weatherproofed road was built, with culverts and proper drainage structures throughout the region. Everybody helped with this—the county agent, special rural development program workers, the Soil Conservation Service, the South Carolina Highway Department, and farmers who granted the necessary rights-of-way.

WASHOUTS AVERTED

"Farmers can get into the fields earlier this spring, and save crops formerly washed out," commented the Southern Planter.

A new produce market in Bertie County, N.C., locally financed and managed, handled during its first year $170,000 worth of watermelons and yams, and now has extended its operations to include other produce. To finance this market, local business leaders formed a corporation and sold stock, while specialists of North Carolina State College and extension agents helped with technical aspects.

In a statement to Congress March 25, 1959, Representative WILLIAM H. NATCHER, Democrat, of Kentucky, said of his own district:

"The initial impact of the rural development program has been partly responsible for many improvements in Butler County, Ky. It has aided in many accomplishments, namely, a new health unit, an increase in local employment, erection of three modern buildings on the main street of Morgantown, the county seat, a new post office building to be erected in the near future, construction of new homes and business houses, improvement of roads and schools, a building erected for use as a meeting place for the rural development group, improvements generally in living conditions on the farms, and better acceptance and use of farm programs offered throughout the county, as well as overall progress in the city of Morgantown."

But the most important benefit of all, perhaps, was pointed out by the Southern Planter: "* * * the program has succeeded in focusing attention on low-income rural families as people needing jobs, or more farm know-how, or better educational opportunities, rather than as economic units producing 'X' number of bales or bushels."

RURAL DEVELOPMENTS A PROGRAM THAT WORKS

(By Helen Henley)

WASHINGTON.—Squabbles on Capitol Hill about farm programs that don't work have largely drowned out some good news about a farm program that does work. The plan which, in a brief 3 years of pilot operation, has begun to show sturdy signs of its effectiveness is not, strictly speaking, exclusively a farm program, though it was originally inspired by the needs of marginal farmers. Known as the rural development program, the project helps entire rural areas to solve their problems largely through local efforts, though certain forms of Federal aid are available.

A workshop meeting at Weston, W. Va., in mid-May spotlighted some amazingly substantial gains made through the rural development program in its first 3 years.

Some of the farmers most needing help in this age of technology are counted among some 2,700,000 small-scale, part-time and residential farmers who, although they make up about 56 percent of the farm community, produce only about 10 percent of the farm products marketed, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson told the workshop meeting.

From the standpoint of economics these small producers might be considered expendable. But "low income rural areas are rich in human resources," Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse, Chairman, Committee for Rural Development Program, declared in a workshop address.

INDIVIDUAL HELP OFFERED

It was to channel these human resources into their most effective use that Secretary Benson, with President Eisenhower's blessing and a small appropriation from Congress, launched the rural development program 3 years ago to help rural families make whatever adjustment their situation requires for their own well-being.

This might mean staying on their farms and finding jobs in industry nearby to supplement their income. It might mean learning better farming practices to increase their income. Or it might require moving away from the farm entirely. In any case, the farmer makes his own decision concerning his future, and can call on both Federal and local agencies in the rural development program to help him.

The pressing need for such a program had first been clearly defined in a year's study of rural areas which was summed up in a report by Secretary Benson to Congress in April 1955, entitled "Development of Agriculture's Human Resources." This documented the plight of almost 3 million small farmers who receive no benefit whatsoever from the Nation's expensive price-support programs.

The original 20 counties selected as pilot counties for the rural development program have been expanded now to include 200 counties in 30 States and Puerto Rico, with activities rapidly spreading even beyond these.

More than 350 projects are now in various stages of development, including such things as new industries to supply jobs, conserva-

tion and land drainage to improve farming practices and income, better marketing procedures to facilitate sale of produce; added educational and training opportunities to prepare young people for off-the-farm careers.

Local leaders are, in short, getting together to make the most of their regional resources, to keep people on their own farms when that is desirable, and to improve their own communities.

"The rural development program is presently emerging from the pilot or demonstration phase and becoming a permanent, long-term approach to the improvement of opportunities in rural areas," said Secretary Benson at the workshop.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture is making grants to States to pay the salaries of agents devoting their time to the RDP, and these State-Federal coordinators help local groups to "iron out the kinks." But each community tackles its problems in its own way, sometimes with a whole trading area working together rather than just a county. Bankers, businessmen, ministers, women's clubs, farm organizations, extension workers—all interested citizens—join in the effort.

APPROACH OUTLINED

Mr. MORSE outlined the approach in this way:

"States have formed rural, resource, or area development committees—with broad representation. Counties or areas have development committees—with project or subcommittees as needed.

"There is a national committee at the under secretary of sub-Cabinet level. This committee for rural development program represents Department of the Interior; Department of Agriculture; Department of Commerce; Department of Labor; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Small Business Administration; Council of Economic Advisers. Dr. Harry J. Reed, former dean of agriculture at Purdue University, is the coordinator."

The Small Business Administration has been especially helpful in making loans to start or expand regional industry, but many projects have been locally financed.

What such coordinated efforts can mean to an entire region was summed up in a report from the American Bankers Association which, commenting on rapid industrial expansion which has increased off-the-farm employment opportunities and has tended to insure a balanced economy between agriculture and industry stated:

"A U.S. Chamber of Commerce report on the relationship between industrial growth and general community development measures the effect of new industrial jobs to a community. The report indicates that 100 new factory workers meant the following in their communities:

"Two hundred ninety-six more people; 112 more households; 51 more school children; $590,000 more personal income per year; $270,000 more bank deposits; 107 more passenger cars registered; 174 more workers employed; 4 more retail establishments; $300,000 more retail sales per year; 31 fewer agriculture workers."

The rural development program attacks only one aspect of the total farm problem—that of rural families with substandard income or living conditions. It is still a small-scale operation, and has not yet reached many areas needing help. But step by step it appears to be proving effective and to be pointing the way toward solution of some of the farm problems weighing most heavily on the conscience of a nation.

Some specific rural development program projects now underway in various States will be described in succeeding articles.

Hope for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, one of our outstanding national religious leaders and clergymen, wrote an article entitled "Hope for the Future," under the column "Confident Living," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, July 26.

Dr. Peale in this article tells of a most interesting dinner party, at which there was not just the usual fellowship, but a deep sense of the presence of God among those in attendance.

It is an excellent article, which discusses in general the program of the International Council for Christian Leadership and the great affect this organization can have on the future welfare of the nations of the world.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be made a part of these remarks and inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFIDENT LIVING

(By Dr. Norman Vincent Peale)

HOPE FOR THE FUTURE

It was a gay and exciting dinner party. The food was superb, the conversation brilliant, the laughter uninhibited * * * then an unforgettable climax. Suddenly our hostess rose and quietly asked me to offer a prayer. The fellowship deepened. The sense of God's presence was definite. A strangely moving unity prevailed as we all stood around the table.

This happened in a gracious home on the Rue Faubert, Paris, only a stone's throw from the Invalides and Tomb of Napoleon. Our hostess, Anne Marie Christine la Contesse de Gontaut-Biron, petite and gentle, was one of the most inspiring personalities of the French Resistance. Fifty times she crossed the Swiss border incognito to secure funds for starving refugees in Paris.

She was eventually seized by the Nazis and interned for 2 years at Ravensbruck, the infamous concentration camp. Only 15 out of 500 people in the last convoy to Ravensbruck returned alive; and the contesse and her daughter were among the fortunate 15 who came through that harrowing experience.

A fascinating group was gathered about her dinner table. Opposite me sat Minister of Justice Edmond Michelet. Second ranking minister to Debre, Michelet is very close to De Gaulle and is regarded by many as a potential premier. He, too, was a leader in the resistance and suffered at Dachau. Deputy Pierre de Chevigny, a brilliant conversationalist in French and English, and other government leaders were also present. Two of the most gracious ladies of Europe lent their charm to the party, the Contesse de Leusse, international hostess, and Mme. Lansberger, Polish noblewoman.

All were ardent De Gaullists. At mention of the general's name an almost reverential attitude seemed evident. They were deeply appreciative when we voiced our admiration of the French leader. "He is like Lincoln to us," one said.

This dinner party was much more than a social affair. It was part of a reception given by the International Council for Christian Leadership. This organization is headed by Rev. Dr. Abraham Vereide, secretary general; Rev. Wallace Haines is president on the Continent, and Senator FRANK CARLSON here. Its members include some of the most distinguished political, business, and professional leaders of many countries—both Catholic and Protestant; its objective is to assure a deeper penetration of Christian ideals and practices into international affairs as well as in personal living. The strong Christian "cells" developed by I.C.L. are doing much toward creating not only better understanding among free peoples, but deeper unity as well.

The depth of spiritual fellowship evidenced in this Paris meeting was one of the most impressive of my entire experience. It could actually be said that the Christian love and faith felt that evening surmounted all differences of language, nationality, and those between Protestant and Catholic. It was a group where the main desire was to follow Christ and make Him uppermost in all of life.

The amazing strength of the spiritual movement abroad is not fully realized on our side of the Atlantic, and it is most encouraging to see that all over Europe people of great influence are being drawn into effective groups to study how Christianity may be implemented practically in our life today.

A day later, in Rome, I saw further evidence of the upthrust of spiritual unity. I visited the dynamic spiritual and educational leader, Father Felix A. Morlion, president of the International University of Social Studies Pro-Deo (under God). Pro-Deo's program is based on the belief that freedom and free enterprise can best assure economic and social progress and allow unlimited development of human possibilities.

This university is an amazing experiment in interfaith activity. Its board of distinguished laymen consists of 12 Catholics, 12 Protestants, and 6 Jews. The student body numbers 1,600 students from many countries and is composed of Moslems, Hindus, Buddhists, Jews, and Christians.

Father Morlion, who has the blessing of Pope John XXIII, is training leaders "under God" who will have the dedication and know-how to make religion and freedom the guiding forces of the future in politics, business, and personal living.

So, take heart, reader, really take heart. God is on the move. The economic and political life of the free world is truly alive under God.

Objective of Long-Range Economic International Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by George C. McGhee before the International Economic Policy Association's National Conference on the U.S. Economy and International Relations, Washington, D.C., June 30, 1959:

OBJECTIVES OF LONG-RANGE ECONOMIC INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

It is a great pleasure indeed to appear before this National Conference of the International Economic Policy Association, which has considered in its meetings today "The U.S. Economy and International Relations." I have followed with interest your program. The discussion on Government aid programs are of particular interest because of my work as a member of the President's Special Committee To Study the U.S. Military Assistance Program (and related economic programs)—the so-called Draper committee. Although it is difficult in the limited time allowed to cover such a broad field, I will attempt to emphasize some of the considerations which have been a part of our studies.

In our first interim report issued March 17, 1959, the Committee confirmed that "The Communist military threat is greater than ever. The Communist economic and political efforts are expanding."

We stated as the issue "whether we intend to seek survival in isolation—state of siege—as the world continues to shrink." And we said further that "the only alternative we can see to the interdependent allied free world, strengthened by our aid where needed, would be the Fortress America concept—taking our first stand in the last ditch."

The Committee confirmed its confidence that the mutual security program both in its military and its economic aspects is a sound concept and concluded that "the mutual security program is now and will remain an essential tool of foreign policy."

The Committee, in particular, endorsed the amounts of economic aid requested by the administration for fiscal year 1960. It further stated that "As an order of magnitude, we believe that loans for economic development under the mutual security program will probably be needed at the rate of at least $1 billion a year by fiscal year 1961." This compares with a request by the administration for $700 million for fiscal year 1960.

Before proceeding, let me just summarize for a moment where I believe we now stand.

The dominant fact of life in the world since the end of World War II has been the clear intention of the Soviet Union to extend its political domination over the entire world. This threat has, and rightly so, constituted the basis for most of the actions and reactions of the governments of the free world throughout this period. Unfortunately, since the threat not only continues but is increasing, we and the other free world nations must continue to give to it a large measure of our attention.

Our preoccupation with the Russian threat, however, has served to obscure another world problem of the first order of magnitude. This problem arises out of the historic transition of a large part of the world from the colonial era to one of free and independent nations. The colonial system, which made important contributions in its day, did, however, mask from the attention of the world the great disparity in economic opportunities existing among the peoples of the world. It muted the voice of those who would have drawn this problem to the world's attention.

We and other free world nations have, however, in recent years, become increasingly aware of the problem and of its magnitude. We have already made an important contribution in assisting the underdeveloped countries in their drive for economic progress. We have perhaps not even yet, however, grasped the full scope and significance of the problem, the tremendous difficulties to be faced, and the urgent necessity for enlisting the support of other free world nations who can contribute if satisfactory progress is to be made. Under Secretary of State Dillon recently said in his speech at Harvard, that this is a problem we will face for the next 20 to 30, or perhaps 50 years.

Inequality of conditions and opportunities have always, and probably will continue to exist in the world. What we can and must do, if we expect the continuation of a group of free world nations in which we can achieve our own national objectives, is to assure the people of the less developed countries that we are conscious of their problems and will make an effort to help them, perhaps not as much as they would like, but an effort in some way commensurate with our ability.

One problem in this regard, however, is that the desire for progress on the part of the underdeveloped countries is more universal than the wisdom to develop wise plans, the determination to carry them out, and the available material resources upon which progress can be based. We are only in the beginning stages of understanding the dimensions of the problem, much less the means of overcoming it.

Unfortunately, there is no example of an underdeveloped country which has, as a result of outside assistance made an important economic breakthrough or shown sustained accelerated development which makes it possible for that country to move forward without foreign aid. The future will probably reveal that the achievement of this breakthrough will in most cases take much longer than we have envisaged. In many countries, because of climate, population growth, lack of resources, unstable governments, and many other factors, there may be no satisfactory progress for a very long period of time. In other countries progress made as a result of forced or artificial means may turn out to be illusory, and only after disappointing setbacks and readjustments will sustained progress be made.

But why, one might ask, do we provide assistance to these countries? Why are we willing to make this great effort? The answer to me is very clear. It is necessary for our continued growth as a nation, even possibly our survival.

The United States and the other developed nations of the free world cannot continue to enjoy their present rate of economic growth and prosperity in isolation. As an example: the United States is already dependent on foreign sources for more than 80 percent of 11 important raw materials (nickel, platinum, antimony, bauxite, natural rubber, tin, chrome, industrial diamonds, manganese, cobalt, and abaca) and to a lesser extent of numerous others; and this dependence will increase in the years to come. At the same time, export markets account for one-third to one-half of total markets for four of our major agricultural crops (cotton, rice, wheat, and tobacco), and are highly significant for many industrial products. Our future prosperity will increasingly depend on such markets. The free nations of Europe and Japan are dependent to an even greater degree upon the raw materials and markets of the underdeveloped countries. We need the rest of the free world as it needs us.

The recent internal economic achievements of Russia, and more especially those reported by China, have brought the problem of the underdeveloped countries sharply into focus. China and Russia are pursuing a totalitarian and brutal method of achieving rapid economic growth, at a tragically high cost in the loss of human life and freedom. Since these costs are not everywhere clearly understood, the Communist system seems to many to offer an alternative to the present slower rate of progress in the underdeveloped countries of the free world.

In the underdeveloped countries there is urgent need to move toward the achievement of a more acceptable rate of economic progress in order to decrease the possibility of Communist political and economic domination. Defection of the underdeveloped world or any significant segment of it to the Communist bloc would have seriously damaging consequences for the United States and the rest of the free world.

Moreover, there is a definite moral responsibility to do what we can, along with other countries who can help, toward achieving this end. Not to do so would be contrary to our national tradition. Only if we continue to do our part in this general international effort can we fully realize the ideals and purposes which should inspire us as a nation as we play our proper role in the world of the future.

I would, in conclusion, just like to summarize a few of the principal factors that should be kept in mind in connection with our programs of economic assistance.

1. Provision must be made for longer range planning. We must recognize that in most countries economic development is a long-range problem. We can no longer afford the luxury of a year-by-year piecemeal approach to the problem. Longer range planning will require both legislative and organizational changes.

2. The countries being aided must take the initiative in the planning and execution of their own development programs. They must take stronger measures to solve their own problems, and must work toward internal reforms along lines that have made development possible in other countries. Our aid programs must emphasize the assumption of this responsibility by the countries receiving aid.

3. The distribution of resources in the world is quite different from that after World War I, when the United States had to bear the whole burden. The Western European countries and Japan, together, have a capacity of assisting the underdeveloped countries roughly comparable to our own. They are already providing assistance on a large scale. In 1958 they extended through loans and grants more than $700 million for economic development. We must, wherever feasible, approach the problems of the underdeveloped areas on a multilateral basis to assure participation by those willing to help. We should seek no monopoly in aid to others.

4. An increased role must be played by free enterprise. The resources and skills of our free enterprise system are one of our most valuable national assets. The Russians are using their total national resources in their efforts abroad. We are not competing to the maximum extent that we can unless we use all of our resources.

The report "Expanding Private Investment for Economic Growth," prepared by Mr Ralph I. Straus, and the report by the Committee on World Economic Practices, of which Mr. Harold Boeschenstein was Chairman, are both excellent and point in the direction we should take. We can literally bind the world to us in mutual self-interest through the bonds of free and expanding trade. If we are disturbed by the $1 billion of economic and military credits extended by Russia in 1958, even in comparison with some $4,386,000 in total assistance extended by the U.S. Government in fiscal year 1959, one is heartened by the fact that Sino-Soviet trade with the underdeveloped countries was only 3.5 percent of the trade between those areas and the rest of the free world ($1.8 billion versus $51 billion). This great volume of trade serves the free world interest just as our aid programs do.

There are even further steps that our Government can take to mobilize the resources of free enterprise in this country in the task of assisting the underdeveloped countries. I anticipate that the Draper committee will have some important recommendations on this subject in its final report.

5. If we are to make the most effective use of our total resources, both government and private, we must further perfect our government organization through which we

extend aid. The diffusion of responsibility in the foreign aid field among the various departments and agencies makes it difficult to marshal our available resources for assisting particular countries into an integrated and well balanced program. This also is a necessity to which the Draper committee is giving careful attention.

These are merely highlights—there is much else to be said. The important thing, however, is a recognition on our part that the United States is in this affair on a large scale and for a long period of time. We have no acceptable alternative. No matter what the scale of effort we allocate to the task we must make that effort the best the American people and government can do and then, and only then, will these efforts be successful.

Thank you very much.

Our China Policy Needs Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on May 21 I addressed the Senate on the need for a revision of our China policy. I have been gratified by the response to that speech from my own State of California and from other sections of the country. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some of the editorial comments on my proposals for a new look at our China policy.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, June 7, 1959]

CLAIR ENGLE STRIKES KEEN BLOW AT U.S. CHINA POLICY

Any criticism, even constructive, of this Nation's Red China policy has been treated much as one might approach a carload of nitroglycerin jolting over the Burma Road.

It is to the singular credit of U.S. Senator CLAIR ENGLE, of California, that in a Senate floor speech he has brought our China policy out of the realm of fantasy and untouchability into that of rationality.

In what may be the first frank official challenge to the Eisenhower administration's Red China policy in more than 6 years, ENGLE boldly stepped over that nightmare threshhold where any advocacy of a possible change in such policy virtually has been equated with treason.

Papier mache illusions have controlled the State Department's Red China policy—the illusion Red China was on the verge of collapse, that, as President Dwight D. Eisenhower has maintained, any forthright dealing with Red China would cause the rest of Asia to tumble into the Communist camp like "falling dominoes," that Chiang Kai-shek might some day return to the mainland from Formosa, that any lifting of the present news blackout between Peiping and Washington would give Red China such a buildup that millions of Asiatics would turn to Communism, that China was ever ours to lose and that former Secretary of State Dean Acheson's policies turned mainland China over to communism.

Such illusions are a backwash of the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's terror that paralyzed the Nation and the State Department. They have also been cultivated by that loose amalgam of groups called the China lobby. Some members of this lobby are sincere in trying to get Chiang's forces back to the mainland. Some are wealthy Chinese who want to get back to resume their lush pickings at the expense of the people.

ENGLE, while supporting all our defenses in Asia, called for an end to the news blackout, for making it clear the United States would support no military adventure from Formosa against Red China, that at some stage in our return to reality, we negotiate with Peiping at a level higher than the present ambassadorial talks in Warsaw and that we put trade with Red China on the same basis as that with the Soviet Union.

Even the late former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, while indignations were high against Red China because of the Korean war, wrote in his book "War or Peace," "all nations should be members of the United Nations" without appraising whether they were good or bad. ENGLE merits great credit for his pioneering for a return to rationality in discussing the Nation's Red China policy.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 7, 1959]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR CHINA POLICY—CALIFORNIA SENATOR URGES A BEGINNING ON NEGOTIATIONS WITH MAO

(By CLAIR ENGLE (Democrat) in a Senate speech)

If we recognize, as I think we should, that our present Chinese policy is not adequate, we should be prepared to negotiate for some specific changes. Our policy, and what we propose, should be flexible, depending to some degree upon how far the Red Chinese are willing to make concessions in our interest in the Far East.

These steps should be taken one at a time and we should not be in too big a hurry about it. But there are certain areas in which we should be willing to negotiate and talk with the Red Chinese with a view to concessions to be made on their side.

As a start, we should be willing to negotiate the entrance of Chinese correspondents to the United States on a basis of reciprocity and equality with United States correspondents admitted to Red China. We should be willing to place the issuance of visas to the Chinese on the same basis and under the same controls as now apply to the citizens of the Soviet Union provided that the Chinese are willing to admit American correspondents to the mainland of China.

Second, we should be willing to discuss with Red China the possibility of placing our trade with Red China on the same basis as our trade with the Soviet Union. Why should they be different? There are many concessions with reference to trade in the Far East that might be advantageous to us and our friends if this kind of an arrangement is carefully negotiated.

Third, we should make it plain that although we intend to maintain our treaty obligations with reference to Formosa, we have no intention of supporting military adventures against the mainland of China—with its consequent danger of setting off a major war. This kind of discussion could be the basis of relaxing the military tensions in the Far East.

Fourth, we should assume the initiative in placing the defense of Formosa on a broader international base than it is at present and lay the foundation for the long-range status of Formosa.

Time is running out. Both Chiang Kai-shek and his soldiers are growing older and sooner or later we have to face up to a new status for Formosa. Why should we not place the matter squarely before the United Nations, offer to refrain from participation in the discussions if the other interested parties in the Far East stay out also, and ask a committee of the United Nations comprised of Asians, or on which Asians are predominantly represented, to come forth with some positive suggestions?

Fifth, we should consider the possibility at some stage during these proceedings, especially if the Mao government shows any willingness to meet us halfway, to negotiate with the Mao government on issues of substance at a level higher than the present ambassadorial talks in Warsaw. This, it is true, would lead us nearer to practical recognition of the Mao government, but it is still one or two steps removed.

Finally, all these negotiations throughout should be on a quid pro quo basis, and we should make it clear that our determined aim is to halt any Communist aggression in the Far East. We should give substance to this determination by continuing to strengthen military and economic defenses, but at the same time we should permit the countries of Asia to participate with us in progress made in economic and cultural relations with China rather than follow our past practice of penalizing and frowning upon such efforts.

This is not an easy program to undertake. It proceeds from the assumption that our present policy is getting us nowhere and that we ought to try new means and new methods. It presupposes the active and good faith cooperation of the Red Chinese themselves in a step-by-step exploration in each of the separate areas I have mentioned. It will take time and patience but it can be done and eventually the necessity of doing it has to be faced, and so let us face it now.

The challenge to our foreign policy in the next decade is to prevent the total marriage of China and the Soviet Union. The resulting economic, political, and military colossus would include nearly one-third of the world's population. Stretching in one unbroken, tightly controlled Communist federation from Berlin to Canton, it offers a chilling prospect.

Some people think that has already occurred, but I do not agree. I think there are basic ideological frictions at the present time. China is in no sense a satellite of Soviet Russia, as are Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Rumania. China is big enough and important enough to stand alone, and the Chinese leaders know that. Our policy should move in the direction of preventing a complete dependence of Red China on Soviet Russia and a total marriage of the two on the basis of the Chinese necessity. Our present policy does not move in that direction. For those reasons, I raise these questions and make these suggestions in the hope that we can get started now with a new and more vigorous approach to a policy that will move in the right direction.

[From the Riverside (Calif.) Press-Enterprise, June 14, 1959]

CLAIR ENGLE ON OUR CHINA POLICY

A recent Senate speech by CLAIR ENGLE did not receive nearly the attention his subject or his comment deserved.

"If we recognize," Senator ENGLE said, "as I think we should, that our present Chinese policy is not adequate, we should be prepared to negotiate for some specific changes. Our policy, and what we propose should be flexible, depending to some degree upon how far the Red Chinese are willing to make concessions in our interest in the Far East."

California's junior Senator wants first of all for the State Department to negotiate an exchange of news correspondents with Red China. Greater effort in this regard is being made by the Department under Secretary Herter than under his predecessor.

Second, he believes "we should be willing to discuss with Red China the possibility of placing our trade with Red China on the same basis as our trade with the Soviet Union."

Third, "we should make it plain that although we intend to maintain our treaty obligations with reference to Formosa, we have no intention of supporting military adventures against the mainland of China."

Fourth, "we should assume the initiative in placing the defense of Formosa on a broader international base than it is at present and lay the foundation for the long-range status of Formosa."

Fifth, "we should consider the possibility at some stage during these proceedings, especially if the Mao Government shows any willingness to meet us halfway, to negotiate with the Mao Government on issues of substance at a level higher than the present ambassadorial talks in Warsaw."

Sixth, "all these negotiations throughout should be on a quid pro quo basis, and we should make it clear that our determined aim is to halt any Communist aggression in the Far East."

Much of this many Americans will find unpalatable, at least upon first consideration. Too many of us are in a rut on what little thinking we do on Communist China. Across the page today Marquis Childs discusses one of the men most responsible for the staleness of our China policy. Given Walter Robertson's dedication to duty, his retirement, now imminent, should signal a reevaluation of the policy for which he has been so much responsible.

Senator ENGLE, among others, has provided food for thought the palatability of which increases when its realism is given its due regard.

[From the Redding Record-Searchlight, June 19, 1959]

ENGLE PROPOSES A NEW LOOK

(From the Milwaukee Journal)

In the days when former Senator Knowland, Republican, of California, held sway, there was little talk about our policy toward Communist China in Congress, except calls for stiffening it. The China lobby (Nationalist) rode high.

Now the man who replaced Knowland, Senator CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of California, has demanded a new look at our China policy—with the aim of putting some sense into it. He is not advocating recognition, or Communist China's admission to the United Nations. He admits that "conditions of hostility" prevail still. But he doesn't see much sense in treating Communist China so much differently than we treat other Red countries.

He would admit Chinese Communist newsmen to this country on the same basis that we admit Russian newsmen, and open the way for our own newsmen to go to the China mainland. The total embargo on trade with Communist China makes no sense to him. Why not permit it on the same basis as we permit trade with Russia? Truth is, ENGLE said, that China can get what it wants of most of our goods through middlemen.

Why not make it perfectly clear that we do not intend to permit—or to help—Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist forces to attack the mainland? Why not end the pretense that Communist China doesn't exist, and seek high level talks on the differences between us—in particular talks aimed at the release of Americans held in China? Such talks, ENGLE believes, should be on higher than the present ambassadorial level.

ENGLE has at least opened the door toward realistic discussion of our China policy—something that has been practically taboo in official Washington.

[From the Modesto (Calif.) Bee, July 20, 1959]

CHINA POLICY NEEDS DISCUSSION

(From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch)

On the Senate floor recently Senators HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and GORE, of Tennessee, talked at some length on a subject that only a few years back would have been impossible to mention without the risk of a major controversy. What they discussed was Communist China and whether it would be necessary to include it in a proposed system of control stations set up throughout the world in connection with possible agreement to stop nuclear weapons tests.

The unusual aspect of the dialogue was not the ideas advanced by either of the participants, but the fact that no McCarthy and no Knowland arose to denounce the very suggestion that the United States may have to negotiate with Peiping on this issue. The inclusion of Red China has not been mentioned publicly in the American-British-Russian test bar negotiations at Geneva.

This is not the first time that the subject has come up in the Senate and, of course, it will not be the last. But it is encouraging that there is increasing readiness to discuss in this country the relationship of Red China with the rest of the world. What the policy of the United States should be toward the 600 million Chinese living under communism is a matter for argument. There can be no valid argument against public discussion. In what other way can a correct policy be formulated?

Senator CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of California, urging that a start be made on negotiations with the Red Chinese, proposes discussions on the reciprocal admission of correspondents, trade, Formosa policy, and other issues of substance. The authorship of these proposals is interesting. Last November ENGLE, certainly no wild-eyed radical, was elected to the Senate seat vacated by William F. Knowland. Knowland was the Senate's most ardent supporter of the Chiang Kai-shek Nationalist Government on Formosa and a man to whom talk of possible dealings with the Chinese Communists was anathema.

Anyone who views the last few years of United States China policy objectively can note a slow but inexorable shift dictated by the practical realities of the situation. It was less than 10 years ago that Chiang fled from the mainland to Formosa, an event that was followed shortly by the rise of Senator McCarthy, of Wisconsin, and the degradation of diplomats whom McCarthy and his followers held responsible for the "loss" of China to Mao Tse-tung.

The gradual change in attitude toward Red China is dictated by awareness of the fact that the regime will not go away because we do not look at it. China unquestionably is driving ahead, even though at a cost of great human suffering. The workers have been told they will be expected to raise industrial and agricultural production this year 40 percent above 1958, the year of the "great leap forward," Lord Boyd Orr, president of the British Council for the Promotion of International Trade, who visited China recently, has forecast that China will become the world's most powerful nation in 30 years.

The fact should not be overlooked, of course, that the U.S. change in attitude toward discussing Chinese problems has not been accompanied by any discernible alteration in the Chinese attitude toward us. It remains hard and uncompromising.

That is no reason, however, why there should not be the widest discussion, in Congress, in the executive branch, and among the people, of what we are going to do about it. The time is most certainly coming when major decisions will have to be made on United States and Western policies toward Red China. It is essential that the people understand the alternatives and be in a position to act in their own best interests.

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS, MAY 22, 1959

Time has a way of changing all things. A few years ago it would have been virtual political suicide to challenge publicly the administration's China policy. Short months, even weeks, ago it was not a subject of any intensive discussion on Capitol Hill. But yesterday in Congress, U.S. policy toward Communist China was the target of an exhaustive, carefully reasoned attack. Current historians with a taste for the paradox may savor the fact that the attack was mounted by the freshman Senator from California, CLAIRE ENGLE, a Democrat, the very man who supplanted in the Senate the loudest, most ox-stubborn defender of that policy, William F. Knowland, once unflatteringly called the Senator from Formosa.

ENGLE'S criticism will not be popular. It won't cause any immediate change. He recognized himself that he probably would be misunderstood, misinterpreted and strenuously criticized. But with no little political courage he observed that "we have to start somewhere." His most devastating thrust against the administration attempt to seal off the Peiping regime in a kind of Never Never land was his substantial argument that it had failed, all but utterly. During the past decade, he said, we have not prevented the Mao government from fastening its control over the mainland. We have not been able to influence or affect Peiping's gargantuan efforts for economic change. And we have been unsuccessful in bringing about any kind of split between China and the Soviet Union.

"The challenge to our foreign policy in the next decade," Senator ENGLE said, "is to prevent the total marriage of China and the Soviet Union. The resulting economic, political, and military colossums would include nearly one-third of the world's population. Stretching in one unbroken, tightly controlled federation from Berlin to Canton, it offers a chilling prospect."

ENGLE did not hold with the view that this union already had occurred. As a matter of fact, many other observers believe that the pressures and frictions between Moscow and Peiping as China's population swells to a billion by the end of the century will profoundly influence history yet to be made.

Evidence continues to accumulate of the bursting activity of building and reforms in China. Under cruelly oppressive measures or not, the people are busy with massive projects, dams, railways, housing, government building. A Canadian scientist recently brought back color photographs he had taken on a long journey through the interior of China. They were still pictures but they showed scenes of quivering movement almost everywhere he went.

This does not mean a Marxist millenium is infallibly in the making. There are great problems. Britain's Boyd-Orr, former head of the United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organization, said after his latest trip to Communist China he thought they were licking food shortages—considered by some to be the key to success or failure of the Peiping regime. ENGLE doubts this. If they do fail to raise enough food to feed the burgeoning population he believes they must do one of three things, get it from Russia, trade with us or push farther into Southeast Asia. He thinks the third the most logical alternative. How do we meet that threat? Certainly not with troops. We must, he concedes, help Asians maintain their territorial

and political integrity against such Communist expansion but on the critical issue of food he sees some possible bargaining room for the West with the Chinese leadership.

At least we must recognize the failure of our rigid policy to date and search for better ones. ENGLE has no patented package. He opposes recognition or a U.N. seat for Peiping now. He realizes we are committed to the protection of Formosa—but certainly not to any reconquest of the mainland by Chiang Kai-shek. Senator ENGLE's main contribution has been in raising the China issue, thoughtfully, dispassionately in public. It is one of the most urgent issues extant.

The State Department's blessing to two such worldly citizens as Vincent Sheean and Averell Harriman in their efforts to get to China is encouraging, if fragmentary, evidence that it is unbending. Peiping itself may not unbend to these travelers. Whether it does or not, the issue of China is there to be grappled with. And it won't go away.

The D.C. General Hospital in Nation's Capital Shows That a City Hospital Is the Ideal Institution for Development of Medical Knowledge and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, a city hospital is the ideal institution for the development of medical knowledge and the enhancement of medical education because no other institution has either the great numbers or variety of clinical material and pathology. In addition, patients with challenging problems can be studied intensively by physicians. Those physicians attracted to a city hospital environment are primarily interested in teaching and research, and the stimulus provided by concomitant medical education makes it imperative that each patient be worked up completely and his disease processes thoroughly understood.

Because of the tremendous interest in teaching and research in a city hospital, the standards of medical care provided the indigent patients are probably much better than those received by the middle-income group and even the wealthy; indigent patients not only have the benefit of being treated by the most outstanding physicians of the community attracted to the hospital, but also receive the latest and most advanced types of medical care because of research which is conducted. As a result of the above considerations, for many years the contributions of city hospitals to medical research and education have been tremendous, and they have played a leading role in providing our citizens, rich or poor, with the highest standards of medical care available anywhere in the world.

Although there have been many significant contributions to medical knowledge from the District of Columbia General Hospital, and many outstanding physicians have worked at this institution, there has never been any formal support for research activities. On the contrary, certain Members of Congress have directed their attention to discouraging research and have questioned the utilization of space at the hospital for such purposes, even making incriminating implications regarding the financing of research projects at the hospital. Money has never been requested from Congress to support research at the hospital because there have never been sufficient appropriations for even the maintenance of decent standards of patient care, and the money obtained through outside sources has been used not only for research, but also to supplement the diagnostic and therapeutic facilities necessary but lacking because of the insufficient appropriations.

It should be clearly evident that an institution so necessary for patient care and teaching must encourage research in order to function effectively, if only to keep abreast of the rapid advances in medicine. Since no appropriation has been available to provide equipment or personnel necessary to introduce modern diagnostic and therapeutic facilities, the District of Columbia has relied completely upon the tremendous interest of the individual medical officers responsible for the operation of the various hospital services. The use of the artificial heart which permits cardiovascular surgery for the large number of patients with congenital heart disease has only been possible through the research efforts of the medical officers and financial assistance from research grants. Likewise, refrigeration techniques required in certain surgical procedures have also been introduced because of private incentive. The pulmonary function tests, radioisotopes, virus studies, and many others indicated by the enclosed publication list from the hospital, have been made possible only under similar circumstances.

There is obviously a great need for the initiation of a program which will support research at the city hospital of the Nation's capital and which receives encouragement and support from our legislators.

The university hospitals of the District of Columbia, including Georgetown and George Washington University Hospitals, are becoming more and more dependent, not only for their educational programs, but also for research opportunities, upon the city institution. The high cost of medical care has made it exceedingly difficult for the university hospitals to utilize or reserve beds for indigent patients for teaching and research purposes. The tremendous costs of space also make it prohibitive to establish research laboratories within the university hospital. It becomes increasingly apparent, therefore, that the entire future of medical education in this city is dependent upon increasing the opportunities for teaching and research at the District of Columbia General Hospital. The indigent patients will in turn benefit from a closer association with the university hospitals since with improved teaching and greater emphasis on research the standards of medical care must necessarily be raised. The community will profit not only because of more efficient care to the indigent population, but also from the research accomplished at the institution.

It would not take much of an investment, considering the great returns, to provide the support required to improve the teaching and research programs at the District of Columbia General Hospital. This could be accomplished primarily by the construction of a building devoted exclusively for research located in close proximity to the presently available clinical facilities. Specific areas of this building could be set aside for each of the affiliating university hospitals and one area for independent physicians who are interested in pursuing their research interests at the city hospital. The equipment and personnel required for the operation of this building could easily be procured by the universities with money available for research purposes. Construction of such a building exclusively for research purposes has many precedents, and one need only cite Cleveland, Boston, Philadelphia, as examples.

It is hoped that Congress will have the vision to make it possible to utilize the tremendous resources of the District of Columbia General Hospital and establish in the Nation's Capital a city institution that will set high standards for other similar institutions throughout the country in inpatient care, teaching, and research.

Proof of the pudding is in the eating, and proof of the many significant contributions to medical knowledge and education by the District of Columbia General Hospital is shown by such things as the 293 articles written during the last 5 years by the members of the hospital's staff.

I include here as part of my remarks a bibliography of the 84 articles written during the years 1957–58 alone which eloquently attest to the splendid work which the District of Columbia General Hospital, has done and is doing.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF 84 ARTICLES WRITTEN BY THE MEMBERS OF THE STAFF OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GENERAL HOSPITAL DURING 1957–58 ARRANGED BY DEPARTMENTS

ANESTHESIOLOGY

Albert, C. A. Thergaonkar, R. D.; Henley, E.E.; Bain, M.; Raffii, A.; Albert, S. N. "The Value of Blood Volume Determinations in Surgical Procedures." Surgery, Gynecology and Obstetrics, 107: 685–689, December 1958.

Albert, S. N.; Spencer, W. A.; Boling, J. S.; Thistlethwaite, J. R.; "Hypothermia in the Management of the Poor-Risk Patient Undergoing Major Surgery." Journal of American Medical Association, 163: 1435–1438, April 20, 1957.

Albert, S. N.; Shibuya, J.; Knight, J. F. "A simple Cooling Unit for Hypothermia." Anesthesia and Analgesia; Current Researches, 36: 73, July–August 1957.

Albert, S. N.; Spencer, W. A.; Shibuya, J.; Coakley, C. S.; Thistlethwaite, J. R. "Observations on Fluctuations in Blood Volume as Determined with Radioactive Isotopes." Anesthesia and Analgesia; Current Researches, 36: 54–61, Spetember–October 1957.

Albert, S. N.; Spencer, W. A.; Albert, C. A.; Shibuya, J.; Henley, E. E. part I. "Blood Volume Determinations with Radioactive Isotopes and Observations on Blood Volume Fluctuations." Part II. "Index of Cardiac

Clearance." AEC Technical Information Service Extension, Oak Ridge, Tenn., March 1958.

Barter, R. H.; Albert, S. N.; Winshel, A. W. "The Use of Hyphothermic-Hypotensive Technique in Fulminant Toxemia of Pregnancy." Obstetrics and Gynecology, 76: 1062–1070, November 1958.

Henley, E. E.; McPhaul, J. J.; Albert, S. N. "Anaphylactic Reaction to Dextran." Report of a case. Medical Annals of the District of Columbia, 27: 21–22, January 1958.

Spencer, W. A.; Thistlethwaite, J. R.; Albelt, S. N. "A Simplified Method for Blood Volume Determinations Using Radioactive Isotopes." Surgical Forum, 7: 3–6, 1957.

Thistlethwaite, J. R.; Spencer, W. A.; Albert, S. N. "Blood Volume Fluctuations Determined by Radioisotopes of Chromium and Radioactive Iodinated Serum Albumin." Surgery, Gynecology, and Obstetrics, 105: 34–38, July 1957.

Winshel, A. W.; Nelson, J. H.; Albert, S. N. "Puerperal Gas-Gangrene." Obstetrics and Gynecology, 9: 481–485, April 1957.

MEDICINE

Alman, R. W., and Fazekas, J. F. "Disparity Between Low Cerebral Blood Flow and Clinical Signs of Cerebral Ischemia." Neurology, 7: 555–558, August 1957.

Braun, W. E., and Shnider, B. I. "Alcohol-Induced Pain in Hodgkin's Disease." Journal of the American Medical Association, 168: 1882–1885, December 6, 1958.

Ehrmantraut, W. R.; Ticktin, H. E.; Fazekas, J. F. "Cerebral Hemodynamics and Metabolism in Accidental Hypothermia." A.M.A. Archives of Internal Medicine, 99: 57–59, January 1957.

Ehrmantraut, W. R.; Shea, J. G.; Ticktin, H. E.; Fazekas, J. F. "Influence of Promazine and Methylphenidate on Cerebral Hemodynamics and Metabolism." A.M.A. Archives of Internal Medicine, 100: 66–69, July 1957.

Fazekas, J. F.; Ticktin, H. E.; Shea, J. G. "Effects of L'Arginine on Hepatic Encepha- of Patients with Hepatic Encephalopathy." American Journal of the Medical Sciences, 234: 145–149, August 1957.

Fazekas, J. F.; Ticktin, H. E.; Shea, J. G. "Effects of L'Arginine on Hepatic Encephalopathy." American Journal of the Medical Sciences, 234: 462–467, October 1957.

Fazekas, J. F.; Shea, J. G.; Ehrmantraut, W. R. "Convulsant Action of Phenothiazine Derivatives." Journal of the American Medical Association, 165; 1241–1245, November 9, 1957.

Fazekas, J. F.; Ehrmantraut, W. R.; Shea, J. G.; Kleh, J. "Cerebral Hemodynamics and Metabolism in Mental Deficiency." Neurology, 8: 558–560, July 1958.

Fazekas, J. F. "Pathologic Physiology of Cerebral Dysfunction." American Journal of Medicine, 25: 89–96, July 1958.

Fazekas, J. F.; Ehrmantraut, W. R.; Kleh, J. "A Study of the Effectiveness of Certain Anorexigenic Agents." American Journal of the Medical Sciences, 236: 692–699, December 1958.

Finnerty, F. A., Jr.; Guillaudeu, R. L.; Fazekas, J. F. "Cardiac and Cerebral Hemodynamics in Drug Induced Postural Collapse." Circulation Research, 5: 34–39, January 1957.

Gorman, J. T.; Shnider, B. I.; O'Connor, T. "Hypertrophic Osteoarthropathy.—Report of a Case Associated With Lymphosarcoma." Medical Annals of the District of Columbia, 27: 242–245, May 1958.

Kleh, J.; Ehrmantraut, W.; Fazekas, J. F. "Who is Deliquent?" Medical Annals of the District of Columbia, 27: 593–595, November 1958.

McCurdy, P. R.; Rath, C. E.; Meerkrebs, G. E. "Parenteral Iron Therapy—With Special Reference to a New Preparation for Intramuscular Injection." New England Journal of Medicine, 258: 1147–1153, December 12, 1957.

McCurdy, P. R. and Rath, C. E. "Splenectomy in Hemolytic Anemia—Results Predicted by Body Scanning After Injection of Cr^{51} Tagged Red Cells." New England Journal of Medicine, 259: 459–463, September 4, 1958.

Parrish, Alvin E.; Kleh, J.; Fazekas, J. F. "Renal and Cerebral Hemodynamics With Hypotension." The American Journal of the Medical Sciences, 233: 35–39, January 1957.

Rath, C. E.; McCurdy, P. R.; Duffy, B. J., Jr. "Effect of Renal Disease on the Schilling Test." New England Journal of Medicine, 256: 111–114, January 17, 1957.

Shea, J. G.; Schultz, J. D.; Lewis, E. Jr.; Fazekas, J. F. "The Clinical and Cerebral Action of Promethazine and Methylphenidate Hydrochloride." The American Journal of the Medical Sciences, 235: 201–205, February 1958.

Shnider, B. I.; Frei, E.; Tuohy, J.; Gorman J.; Freireich, E.; Brindley, C. O.; Clements, J. "Toxicity Studies and Preliminary Clinical Evaluation of 1, 2, 4-Triazine-3, 5-Dione (6-Azauracil)." Proceedings of the American Association for Cancer Research, 2: 249, March 1957.

Sugar, S. J. N. "Clinical Experience With More Than 100 Patients Treated With Orinase." Medical Annals of the Distirct of Columbia, 26: 293–297, June 1957.

Sugar, S. J. N. and Thomas, L. J. "Treatment of Diabetes Mellitus With Tolbutamide." Medical Times, 26: 981–991, August 1958.

Sugar, S. J. N.; Thomas, L. J.; Tatlier, S. "Management of Diabetes Mellitus with Chlorpropamide—Preliminary Report." Medical Annals of the District of Columbia, 27: 445–451, September 1958.

Ticktin, H.; Epstein, J.; Shea, J. G.; Frazekas, J. F. "Effect of Methylphenidate Hydrochloride in Antagonizing Barbiturate-Induced Depression." Neurology, 8: 267–271, April 1958.

OBSTETRICS

Barter, R. H.; Fealy, J.; Myles, T. J. M. "Reflections on the Management of 2,500 Breech Presentations." Southern Medical Journal, 51; 711–719, June 1958.

Fealy, J.; Nelson, J. H. "Adenocarinoma in One-Half of a Uterus Didelphys." Medical Annals of the District of Columbia, 26; 76–77, February 1957.

Nelson, J. H.; Rovner, I. W.; Barter, R. H. "The Large Baby." Southern Medical Journal, 51: 23–26, January 1958.

Winshel, A. W.; Nelson, J. H.; Albert, S. N. "Puerperal Gas Gangrene—Report of a Case." Obstetrics and Gynecology, 9: 481–484, April 1957.

OPHTHALMOLOGY

Fine, B. S.; Gilligan, J. H. "The Vogt-Koyanagi Syndrome: A Variant of Sympathetic Ophthalmia: Report of Two Cases." American Journal of Ophthalmology, 43: 433–440, March 1957.

PATHOLOGY AND LABORATORY MEDICINE

Fusillo, M. H.; Weiss, D. L. "Intermediary Metabolism of Antibiotic-Resistant and Antibiotic-Sensitive Staphylococci—I: Pyruvate, Glucose and Acetate." Proceedings of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine, 94: 212–213, 1957.

Fusillo, M. H.; Weiss, D. L. "Intermediary Metabolism of Antibiotic-Resistant and Antibiotic-Sensitive Staphylococci—II: Oxidaton of Glucose Intermediates and Reversal of Resistance Under Anaerobiasis." Antibiotics and Chemotherapy, 8: 21–26, January 1958.

Fusillo, M. H.; Weiss, D. L.; Possehl, C. D. "Mg Inactivation of Antibiotics—I: Clinical Laboratory Applications and Theoretical Interpretations Regarding Antibiotic Synergy." American Journal of Clinical Pathology, 27: 534–538, June 1957.

Dozier, S. M.; Fusillo, M. H.; Woodham, G. E. "Demonstration of Circulating Antibodies to M. Tuberculosis in Humans—I: Technique. Theoretical Considerations and Development of a New Concept of Antibody Assay as Applied to Tuberculosis." American Review of Tuberculosis and Pulmonary Diseases, 75: 949–953, June 1957.

Fusillo, M. H.; Weiss, D. L.; Dozier, S. M. "Demonstration of Circulating Antibodies to M. Tuberculosis in Humans—II: Clinical Laboratory Studies—The Existence of Specific Circulating Antibody in Patients With Active Tuberculosis." American Review of Tuberculosis and Pulmonary Diseases, 75: 954–957, June 1957.

Fusillo, M. H.; Weiss, D. L. "Considerations of False Positive Reactions in the Globulin Titration Technique as Applied to Tuberculosis." American Review of Tuberculosis and Pulmonary Diseases, 76: 507–508, September 1958.

Reiner, M. "The Role of Electrophoresis in Medicine." International Record of Medicine, 170: 374–387, July 1957.

Weiss, D. L. "An Approach to an Atherogenetic Factor—Transintimal Perfusion." Journal of the Mount Sinai Hospital, 24: 1346–1351, November–December 1957.

PEDIATRICS

Asteriadou-Samartzis, E.; Leikin, S. "The Relation of Vitamin K to Hyperbilirubinemia." Pediatrics, 21: 395–402, March 1958.

Leikin, S. L.; McCoo, J. W. "Sickle-Cell Anemia in Infancy." A.M.A. Journal of Diseases of Children, 96: 51–57, July 1958.

Leikin, S. L.; Rheingold, J. J.; Sites, J. G. "Frequency of ABO Erythroblastosis." Pediatrics, 22: 65–71, July 1958.

PHYSICAL MEDICINE AND REHABILITATION

Buchanan, J. J.; Sexton, M. (collaborators). "Strike Back at Stroke." Public Health Service Publication No. 596, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958.

PULMONARY DISEASE

Berman, I. B. and Katz, S. "Kanamycin Nephrotoxicity." Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 76: 149–156, September 30, 1958.

Donohoe, R. F.; Katz, S.; Matthews, M. J. "Aspiration Biopsy of the Parietal Fleura—Results in Forty-Five Cases." American Journal of Medicine, 22: 883–893, June 1957.

Donohoe, R. F. "The Role of Pleural Biopsy in the Study of Patients with Pleural Effusions." Bulletin of the Georgetown University Medical Center, 10: 183–188, July 1957.

Donohoe, R. F.; Katz, S.; Matthews, M. J. "Pleural Biopsy as an Aid in the Etiologic Diagnosis of Pleural Effusion: Review of the Liteurature and Report of 132 Biopsies." Annals of Internal Medicine, 48: 344–362, February 1958,

Katz, S. "Actinomycosis." GP, 15: 94–95, January 1957.

Katz, S. "Coccidioidomycosis." GP, 15: 107, February 1957.

Katz, S. "Superior Sulcus Tumor (Pancoast Tumor)." GP, 15: 93, April 1957.

Katz, S. "Intralobar Pleural Effusion." GP, 16: 92, July 1957.

Katz, S. "Linear Atelectasis." GP, 16: 108–109, August 1957.

Katz, S. "Bronchogenic Cysts." GP, 16: 97, September 1957.

Katz, S. "Intralobar Bronchopulmonary Sequestration." GP, 16: 112–113, October 1957.

Katz, S. "Artefacts." GP, 16: 96–97, December 1957.

Katz, S. "Accessory Lobes of the Lung." GP, 16: 85, December 1957.

Katz, S. "The Azygos Vein." GP, 17: 120, January 1958.

Katz, S. "Congenital Diaphragmatic Herniation of the Liver." GP, 17: 130, February 1958.

Katz, S. "Parasternal Hernia." GP, 18: 109, August 1958.

Katz, S. "Septal Lines." GP, 18: 86, September 1958.

Katz, S. "The Sign of Patent Bronchus." GP, 18: 132, October 1958.

Katz, S. "Traumatic Saccular Aneurysm of the Thoracic Aorta." GP, 18: 147, November 1958.

Katz, S. "Some Infreqently Emphasized Causes of Pleural Effusion." GP, 18: 138, December 1958.

Katz, S. "Current Concepts in Therapy: Antibiotics—VIII: Chemotherapy of Tuberculosis." New England Journal of Medicine, 259. (1) 536–538, September 11, 1958; (2), 732–734, October 9, 1958; (3), 976–978, November 13, 1958.

Leonard, J. J.; Katz, S.; McCormick, G. "Recurrent Military Tuberculosis." New England Journal of Medicine, 256: 435–441, March 7, 1957.

Leonard, J. J.; Katz, S.; Nelson, D. "Calcification of the Left Atrium; Its Anatomic Location, Diagnostic Significance, and Roentgenologic Demonstration." New England Journal of Medicine, 256: 629–633, April 4, 1957.

Moser, K. M. "Intramuscular Injection of Trypsin: Its Value as a Thrombolytic and Anti-Inflammatory Agent." New England Journal of Medicine, 256: 258–263, February 7, 1957; 303–309, February 14, 1957.

Moser, K. M. and Shea, J. G. "The Relationship Between Pulmonary Infarction, Cor Pulmonale and the Sickle States." American Journal of Medicine, 22: 561–579, April 1957.

Peabody, J. W.; Katz, S.; Davis, E. W.; Stone, J. C. "The So-Called Tuberculoma—A Reappraisal." Bulletin of the Georgetown University Medical Center, 10: 141–146, May 1957.

RADIOLOGY

Gondos, Bela. "Observations on Periarthritis Calcarea." American Journal of Roentgenology, Radium Therapy, and Nuclear Medicines, 77: 93–108, January 1957.

Gondos, Bela. "Tennis Elbow: A Reevaluation." American Journal of Roentgenology, Radium Therapy, and Nuclear Medicine, 79: 684–691, April 1958.

Donahue, J. K.; Hunter, C.; Balch, H. H. "Significance of Fluit Levels in X-Ray Films of the Abdomen." New England Journal of Medicine, 259: 13–15, July 3, 1958.

SURGERY

Donahue, J. K.; Balch, H. H. "Calcifying Epithelioma of Malherbe: Report of a Case." Bulletin of the Georgetown University Medical Center, 11: 74–77, January 1958.

Donahue, J. K.; Hunter, C.; Balch, H. H. "Significance of Fluid Levels in X-Ray Films of the Abdomen." New England Journal of Medicine, 259: 13–15, July 3, 1958.

Spencer, W. A.; Thistlethwaite, J. R.; Albert, S. N. "A Simplified Method for Blood Volume Determinations Using Radioactive Isotopes." Surgical Forum, 7: 3–6, 1957

Thistlethwaite, J. R.; Spencer, W. A.; Albert, S. N. "Blood Volume Fluctuations Determined by Radioisotopes of Chromium and Radioactive Iodinated Serum Albumin." Surgery, Gynecology, and Obstetrics, 105: 34–38, July 1957.

Thistlethwaite, J. R. "The New Hormone-Producing Tumors." West Virginia Medical Journal, 54: 329–335, September 1958.

Wilkes-Barre General Hospital Breaks Ground for New Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of July 22, 1959, as well as an editorial and a news story from the Wilkes-Barre Record of July 23, 1959:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader, July 22, 1959]

HOSPITAL MILESTONE

The ground-breaking ceremony at Wilkes-Barre General Hospital this afternoon for the proposed $3 million new building and other improvements is a milestone for the community as well as for the institution itself which has served Luzerne and adjoining counties since 1872.

From an humble beginning in a rented building, the hospital, which started with a modest 20 beds, will emerge, when construction is completed, into a modern institution with 500 employees and a medical staff of 104. This truly represents progress for the hospital and for Greater Wilkes-Barre.

In proceeding with the ground-breaking, directors of Wilkes-Barre General Hospital indicate confidence that the $125,000, needed to put the $2 million drive over the top, thus qualifying for $1 million from the Government, will be forthcoming from the public. We are certain the community will not let the institution down.

Future generations will have cause for gratitude to those who have given so freely of their time, talent and resources to provide these facilities for the use of the public. It will be an enduring monument.

[From the Wilkes-Barre Record, July 23, 1959]

HOSPITAL CEREMONIES

Groundbreaking ceremonies held yesterday at Wilkes-Barre General Hospital were, as some of the speakers pointed out, a high point in the hospital's history.

First, the new $3 million hospital remodernization program marks the first major construction at the hospital since 1928. Architectural plans call for making it one of the showplace medical institutions in America.

When completed, 580 days from now, the new hospital will make all of Wyoming Valley proud, yesterday's speakers stressed.

A second historic high point in the hospital's 85-year record, the speakers held, is the widespread level of community support given to the building program.

The public made no fewer than 25,000 pledges to the hospital's four-way fund campaign. Contributions and pledges came from all areas of the valley.

Galvanizing all this was an army of volunteer workers who gave of their time and money freely.

Historic highlights, indeed. They prove, once again, that the people of Wyoming Valley love their community, and will exert themselves inspiringly to its betterment when called upon.

The public of Wyoming Valley, which contributed 25,000 pledges totaling $1,875,000 to the Wilkes-Barre General Hospital building fund campaign, was thanked for its magnificent response, at groundbreaking ceremonies for the new hospital held yesterday afternoon at 2 at the hospital grounds.

Participating in the brief impressive ceremonies were: F. E. Parkhurst, president of the board of directors, who dug the first shovelful of ground; Dr. Lewis T. Buckman, chairman of the first phase of the hospital's campaign drive; Dr. Samuel T. Buckman, chairman of the general fund campaign; Samuel M. Wolfe, Jr., chairman of the building committee, and who was master of ceremonies. Rev. John O. Lindquist, pastor of Trinity Lutheran Augustana Church, gave invocation. Benediction was by Rev. R. E. Larkin, pastor of St. John's Roman Catholic Church. Both churches are neighbors of General Hospital.

Also participating in the groundbreaking ceremony was Marlene Butry Noxen, president of the General Hospital Student Nurses' Association.

Mr. Parkhurst, terming the groundbreaking "a great date in local history," lauded what he described as the "wonderful loyalty and cooperation" received from everyone. He cited the Women's Auxiliary, the Nurses' Auxiliary, the doctors, board of directors, employees, and the entire community for the inspirational way they have helped make the new showplace hospital a reality.

The hospital president gave special praise to Dr. Samuel T. Buckman and Dr. Lewis T. Buckman for their campaign leadership, and saluted two specified friends of the hospital who were in the audience. They included Mrs. William Conyngham and Dr. Edward W. Bixby.

Dr. Samuel T. Buckman addressed his thanks to the workers and the thousands of public-spirited contributors. The new hospital, he declared, "will make us all better people."

Laudatory remarks were expressed also by Dr. Lewis T. Buckman, and Mr. Wolfe.

Yesterday's groundbreaking marked start of actual construction work by Ramon R. Hedden Co., Nanticoke, holder of the contract for general construction.

It is expected the new hospital, planned as one of the showplace medical buildings in America, will be completed in 580 days.

At that time, Mr. Parkhurst stated, there will be a second and much more extensive ceremony.

The groundbreaking was a high point in General Hospital history. Last major construction was in 1928. The new hospital was made possible by the first public appeal for capital funds for construction in the hospital's 85-year history.

Hospital officials said the new general hospital, when completed, will represent one of the most modern and beautiful hospitals in the Nation.

New construction will replace four of the oldest buildings scheduled to be razed, and also provide modern facilities for all departments. Approximately 100,000 square feet of space will be affected.

The present private patient building will be connected with the new construction to form one completely unified modern establishment.

Following are highlights of new construction plans:

Ground floor will contain sections for emergency and outpatients, physical therapy, medical records, administrative and business offices, main lobby, gift and hospitality shop, chaplains' office, and a religious meditation room.

First floor will include a central supply and pharmacy, surgical suite, X-rays, and doctors' library and lounge.

Second and fourth floors will provide patients' bedrooms, nurses' stations, utility rooms, baths, serving kitchens and day rooms.

Third floor, transformed with most up-to-date equipment and facilities, will be for maternity patients and new born infants.

The newly constructed hospital will provide 132 beds to replace the 130 now deemed obsolete.

Hospital building committee includes: Samuel M. Wolfe, Jr., chairman; Frank W. Anderson, Dr. Samuel T. Buckman, F. E. Parkhurst, Dr. Carlos E. Rodriguez, and William O. Sword.

Ellerbe & Co. are architects for the new hospital. Local associate architect is Robert A. Eyerman.

The new hospital was under consideration for 10 years. Campaign to raise funds for remodernization was decided following announcement by the Federal Government that a $1 million Hill-Burton Grant would

be available if the hospital raised $2 million on its own.

Last summer a four-way campaign was started. First phase was an unpublicized drive among the general hospital family itself. Advance gifts campaign was launched January 7, followed by the general campaign February 4.

Operation Windup, final stage, is underway to complete solicitation of prospective contributors and reach the $2 million goal. Upon attaining $2 million the additional $1 million will be forthcoming in Federal funds.

Connecticut's Successful Rocketeers and Archeopterex I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day this year, four young men from Branford, Conn., saw the successful culmination of a year's work when they were given an opportunity to fire their amateur rocket—Archeopterex I—at Camp A. P. Hill in Virginia.

The firing was a successful one, and four elated young men went home to begin plans for their second rocket.

These four students, all about 16 years of age, have demonstrated a remarkable talent and interest in amateur rocketry. Under the guidance of their instructor, Mr. Chester Carlow, and the advice of Dr. George Wheeler, professor of physics at Yale University, these four designed, built, and succesfully fired their 6-foot rocket. They applied the principles of the classroom to the practical business of building a rocket.

All four—Richard Griffin, David Harrison, Robert Underwood, and Thomas Hines—are students at Branford High School. They have been an inspiration not only to their fellow students, but also to their teachers, parents, and everyone in their community and State who can appreciate the thoughtful work these boys have put into the building of their rocket.

The local newspapers, however, tell the story much better than I, and I should like to quote from them. These articles and editorials express the feelings we hold for these enterprising young men:

Al Callan, reporter for the New Haven Journal-Courier, writes in his eyewitness account of what happened at Camp A. P. Hill:

The bright-red, 6-foot-long rocket soared upward faster than the eye could follow—disappearing into clear blue skies.

Army officials said the launching was "The best we've seen—and the most successful ever," at Camp A. P. Hill.

The successful launching came at 12:02 p.m.—after two dramatic failures earlier in the day.

No one could say exactly how high the rocket had gone. Two experienced Army ordinance men who watched the launching from a vantage point a half-mile away, estimated its maximum altitude at 5,000 to 6,000 feet.

The reaction of the four Branford High School youths who built the rocket, their instructor-counselors, and the relatives present, was summed up by 16-year-old Dick Griffin:

"Holy cow, did you see that thing go?" he gasped.

In this moment of triumph they shared the emotions felt by scientists at Cape Canaveral and Alamagordo.

The New Haven Evening Register, in an editorial on May 18, remarked—

The Camp Hill launching is evidence that the armed services are interested in the work of schoolboy scientists in rocket projects—if they are competently supervised and conducted under proper controls. So, a salute to the Branford Rocketeers for making the grade.

The New Haven Journal-Courier editorialized on May 29—

Area readers, impressed and laudatory on the homeside science coverage of the Journal-Courier series, will be cheering on the young rocketeers in the Camp Hill experiments. And their interest will be whetted by the knowledge of what it takes to get a schoolboy rocket off the ground—under competent, controlled conditions. The boys and their advisers deserve and rate an extra salute for going about their project in the responsible way they have.

Throughout, it is made clear that the success of these boys could not have been made possible without the guidance of Army officials. Clearly, the cooperation and interest on the part of Col. A. B. Cushing and the many other Army officials helped give these young men an opportunity in this free country of ours that few others in the world have today.

It is refreshing to see these young men take on the responsibility of augmenting their education through practical application; not to rest on their laurels after one successful attempt, but to go on to improve their own knowledge and to apply what they have learned from Archeopterex I by building another and larger rocket.

The attitude of the Connecticut community is best summed up in an article written by Reporter Al Callan of the Journal-Courier on June 2. This article, Mr. Speaker, reflects the pride and interest that the people in their community have taken in the four rocketeers, and I would like to quote it here in full:

[Reprinted from the New Haven Journal-Courier, June 2, 1959]

BRANFORD ROCKETEERS PLAN NEW THREE-STAGE ROCKET

(By Al Callan)

BRANFORD.—Elated by the spectacular success of their first rocket, the Branford High School Rocketeers today are making plans for "Archeopterex II."

The club's first rocket, "Archeopterex," meaning primitive bird, was launched Saturday at Camp A. P. Hill, Va., Army authorities said it was the best amateur rocket ever launched at the base.

PLAN NEW ROCKET

The four 16-year-old high school juniors now hope to build a three-stage rocket (the other had one stage) with a nose cone containing a live mouse, a parachute to return the mouse safely, and a radio transmitter to radio back altitude data as the rocket speeds skyward.

Army authorities have promised to cooperate.

Speaking to a Journal-Courier reporter after Saturday's launching, Base Commander Col. A. B. Cushing said, "Send us more groups like this one."

Branford club members praised the Army for its hospitality and cooperation.

"The Army people were wonderful to us," said Chester Carlow, Branford High math teacher and counselor of the club.

Meanwhile, the four rocket-builders were patted on the back by their schoolmates and teachers.

CITES INTEREST

"We are very proud and interested in the boys," said Ernest Hatfield, principal. "It's quite an honor for the youngsters and for the town and the school. I believe their success with the rocket has created more interest in science among the student body."

The rocketeers will be guests of honor at the Branford Rotary Club's luncheon next Monday.

John E. Loeb, a Rotary Club member, said the boys' "scholarship and initiative ought to be recognized."

"Archeopterex II," now being planned, will be a three-stage rocket approximately 15 feet in length. Rocket club member Tom Hines (the others are Dave Harrison, Bob Underwood and Dick Griffin) said, "It should reach 50,000 feet."

The boys' first rocket, 6 feet long, went up an estimated 5,000 to 6,000 feet. Since the rocket passed out of sight, its sulfur-and-zinc fuel mixture may have propelled it to even greater heights.

The boys expressed regret that they will have to build the new rocket without Carlow's personal guidance. He has received a 1-year fellowship from the National Science Foundation to study math at the University of Minnesota. He and his family will leave June 19. He expects to return to Branford.

AID FROM WHEELER

However, the boys expect further assistance from Dr. George Wheeler of Yale, a nuclear physicist. Professor Wheeler helped the boys with Archeopterex the first and accompanied them on their trip to Camp A. P. Hill.

The boys hope the Army will fly them to Fort Sill, Okla., for the launching of their new, bigger rocket. Camp A. P. Hill handles only rockets with a potential altitude of 20,000 feet or less, because of airline traffic at 22,000 feet overhead.

Because of the nationwide interest in amateur rocketry, and President Eisenhower's desire to stimulate do-it-yourself science experiments by high school students, the Army is now setting up a new range for amateur rockets at Fort Knox, Ky.

There are over 5,000 amateur rocket societies in the United States, with 40,000 members. With the aim of channeling this enthusiasm into the proper direction, the Army began making plans for its first amateur rocket range at Camp A. P. Hill, Va., in July of 1958.

Seventy amateur rocket groups, mostly from high schools in the eastern United States, took part in a 2-day launching program last February 28.

Although many of these rockets were successfully launched, none was as successful as the Branford group's rocket of last Saturday.

The next mass launching at Camp A. P. Hill will take place September 28. Larger rockets will be launched during the summer at Fort Sill.

Coal Consumers in Anthracite Areas Pay Over $55 Million for Fuel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Wednesday, July 29, 1959:

COAL CONSUMERS IN ANTHRACITE AREAS PAY $55,339,000 FOR FUEL

Consumers of anthracite in the regions in which it is produced last year used an estimated $55,339,000 worth of coal, according to Anthracite Institute.

In the Wyoming, or local region, consumers paid $25,832,000 for coal. Consumers in the Schuylkill region paid $23,203,000 for coal and those in the Lehigh region expended $6,304,000.

Sales at the mines in the three regions last year amounted to $38,105,000. In addition, sales from silt banks without preparation, largely to electric utilities, totaled $2,893,000 last year, bringing sales to $40,998,000 for the 4,780,000 tons sold locally.

While accurate figures are not available as to transportation or dealer charges, it was announced a reasonable average would be $3 a ton of all sizes, which would result in the additional expenditure of $14,340,000 last year.

In the local region anthracite sales at the breakers last year were estimated at $19,279,000, an increase of $328,000 or 1.7 percent compared to sales of $18,951,000 in 1957. Pea size is the most widely used in the producing regions. Last year regional consumers paid $11,033,000 for this size.

Pennsylvania anthracite deposits underlie a surface area of approximately 484 square miles, divided by trade usage into three regions and by geologic conditions into four fields. Wyoming region, the local area, is coextensive with the northern field. Lehigh region is made up of the entire eastern middle field plus that part of the southern field lying east of Tamaqua. Schuylkill region includes all of the western middle field plus that portion of the southern field west of Tamaqua.

Approximately 20,500,000 tons were produced by the industry last year. Northern, or local field, produced 7,657,201 tons or 37.4 percent of the total; western middle field, 5,982,747 tons or 29.2 percent of the total; southern field 5,086,583 tons or 24.9 percent of the total and eastern middle field 1,738,555 tons or the remaining 8.5 percent of the total. Preceding figures include underground, stripping, and culm bank production but do not include semianthracite produced in Sullivan County or recovery of coal from river bottoms by dredges.

MOST DEEP MINING LOCALLY

Greatest concentration of deep mining last year was in the northern, or local field. Comprising approximately 176 square miles the underground production in this field last year was 30,040 tons a square mile. Stripping operations resulted in production of 10,340 tons a square mile while 3,130 tons a square mile were taken from culm banks, making the regional total last year 43,510 tons a square mile.

Eastern middle field ranked first in concentration of stripping and bank operations but the western middle field had the highest overall production a square mile of any of the four fields. Western middle field production of all types reached 63,650 tons a square mile. This field extends roughly from Mahanoy City westerly through Shenandoah, Frackville, Girardville, Centralia, Ashland, Mount Carmel and Shamokin to Treverton, a distance of about 35 miles. In this relatively narrow strip production last year averaged one ton of anthracite for every 438 square feet of surface.

CANADA EXPORTS IMPROVE

Signs anthracite export trade to Canada is showing improvement compared to last year are definite, the Institute said. While Canadian receipts of Pennsylvania anthracite were not as high in April as in March they were substantially higher than in April 1958, according to the Institute. They also showed a sizable gain in the first 4 months of this year as compared to a year ago.

British anthracite on the other hand, continued its declining importance in the Canadian market. In April Pennsylvania anthracite industry shipped 65,485 tons of coal to Canada, an increase of 14,513 tons or 28.5 percent compared to tonnage sent to Canada in April 1958. For the first 4 calendar months of this year anthracite shipments to Canada were 58,092 tons or 15.7 percent greater than the same months last year. Shipments of British anthracite to Canada during April dropped 2,918 or 72.9 percent compared to shipments in April 1958.

Railroad originations of anthracite in June were 17 percent ahead of May and within 2 percent of June 1958. This brought the first quarter of the current coal year to 1.5 percent ahead of 1958–59.

Railroad originations of pea and larger sizes of anthracite destined for regular markets in the United States and Canada were down only 4 percent from the 12 months ending June 30, 1958.

Commercial production for the week ending July 25 was estimated at 284,000 tons, bringing production since January 1 to 8,449,000 tons.

Conclusion Also Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, there has been much speculation recently as to the general feeling on debt reduction. For a reaction from rural Ohio I offer the following editorial from the Daily Chief-Union at Upper Sandusky, Ohio. I am certain that it expresses the overwhelming sentiments of grassroots thinking, namely, that in times of prosperity it is wise to pay off our debts.

CONCLUSION ALSO OVERDUE

President Eisenhower this week asserted at a press conference that there can be no thought of cutting taxes until some payment on the huge national debt has been made. He hinted that a cut in the debt is overdue. This, we believe, is a conclusion that also is overdue. The president has urged a payment on the debt before. Others in Government, including Senator BYRD of Virginia, have been pounding at this issue.

Since World War II, the Federal debt has been cut only three different years. By 1946 it had risen to over $269 billion. The following year it was cut to $258 billion and in 1948 was cut to $252 billion. It then rose to $257 in 1950 and again during the Truman administration was cut slightly to $255 billion. The first two cuts mentioned were largely the result of appropriations unspent as the war ended. The debt has gradually increased since 1951 with the exception of 1956 when it was reduced $1.6 billion.

President Eisenhower pointed out that the interest alone on the Federal debt a year hence will amount to $8.7 billion, or more than double the last two reductions. It must be acknowledged that the cold war has to all practical purposes made any efforts at cutting Federal spending and the Federal debt almost impossible. With current prosperity and if there had been no past wars to pay for, and little prospects of future conflict, such a debt could be paid off quite easily within a few years. This is a wealthy and prosperous Nation and it is difficult to believe that a debt of even such proportions is impractical. However, it should not be allowed to increase in peacetime.

Other nations have been forced to labor in sweat and tears to restore wrecked economies. This Nation has gone merrily on its way as if there were no dangers facing it in the future. Economic ruin does not seem likely, but it is a possibility. We definitely would be in trouble should a depression strike. Prosperous times offer great opportunities for preventing such dangers.

Senator Smathers and Hemisphere Economic Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there appeared in today's Washington Evening Star an article by Constantine Brown entitled "The United States and Latin America." In this column Mr. Brown pays great and due credit to the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who has been a long-time and consistent friend of Latin America, and who has made great efforts in seeking to foster better relationships between the countries of this hemisphere.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 30, 1959]

THE UNITED STATES AND LATIN AMERICA—VALUE OF HEMISPHERE ECONOMIC PLAN BACKED BY SMATHERS IS EMPHASIZED

(By Constantine Brown)

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, chairman of the Latin America Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, believes that the formation of a Western Hemisphere Economic Community is vital to the future of our Nation. The facts seem to bear him out.

The 20 nations of Latin America share a basic political philosophy with the United States. To a large degree our economies are complementary rather than competitive.

From a defense standpoint, the interdependence of the countries of the Western Hemisphere becomes even more apparent in the missile age. Actually, it is doubtful whether the United States could even con-

tinue to operate the missile center at Cape Canaveral, Fla., without the full cooperation of our neighbors to the south.

Senator SMATHERS, a Florida Democrat, believes many Americans have been so propagandized about the importance of Europe and some sections of uncommitted Asia that they know little, and care less, about what is happening in our own back yard.

Few persons realize that 26 percent of our exports go to Latin America and almost 28 percent of our imports come from that area.

In view of our adverse trade balances in other areas, these figures assume great importance. Almost every material designated by our Government as strategic—that is, vital to U.S. security—is represented in our imports from Latin America.

As of January 1958, U.S. private capital had invested $8.8 billion in the economies of Latin American nations. This represents almost one-third of our private investments abroad.

Senator SMATHERS points out that the 20 Latin Republics, whose population now is 175 million, are expected to have 300 million people by the year 2000—just 40 years away.

Considering the mutual benefits to be derived from a closer economic union with Latin America, it seems remarkable that in the fiscal year 1958 the United States granted $223 million to Vietnam, where the taxpayers' money was scandalously mismanaged, and only $117 million to all of the American Republics.

It is easy to justify the Vietnam expenditures by the old cliche, "If we don't support their economy, they will go Communist." On the other hand, if a country is going to be Communist, would we rather it be Vietnam or, for example, Guatemala?

In Senator SMATHER'S opinion, which more and more is being shared by others in Congress, the United States had better increase its efforts to develop the expanding Latin American market. Otherwise, we will lose it to our European and Japanese competitors.

It is time we dismiss the storybook myths of Latin American indolence and inefficiency and realize that American businessmen must travel south with sample cases containing good products at reasonable prices and convince our neighbors that they can get the best deal with us.

According to the Florida junior Senator, we need more trade missions, assisted by the Commerce Department and the State Department wherever possible, and fewer good will visits devoted to cocktail parties and fashions.

In essence, the American salesman had better get back to work or he is going to lose the best bet of the century.

We must return to certain of the commercial practices which made us what we are, and stick to a policy of business is business, whether it is across the street or below the equator. If we want it, we are going to have to go out and get it. If we don't, somebody else will.

The People Know What They Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, shortly after this session of the Congress convened, I sent a questionnaire to virtually every home in my district—regardless of party affiliation—inviting thoughts and ideas on 15 key questions which would likely come before the Congress.

The response was exceptionally good, with better than 20 percent of the questionnaires returned. They were returned, not only as individual views, but as the combined expression of the views of husbands and wives, of entire family units, as the projects of high school classes, and as the majority views of groups in civic clubs who made the questionnaire their projects for an evening.

I feel that the views of the people of my district—which represents a good cross section of our citizens, since it includes the residents of a city, several boroughs, farming areas and suburban communities—should be interesting to all of us at this time. Consequently, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herein the questions and a report on the answers so returned to me:

FAVORED

(1) Economy in Government.

(2) An increase in postal rates if necessary to balance the budget.

(3) A strong labor-management reform bill.

(4) A gradual reduction in Federal aid to certain forms of local activities.

(5) Discontinuance of price supports for farm products.

(6) Admitting fewer immigrants to the United States.

(7) Keep up our efforts to ban nuclear tests.

(8) A firm no retreat policy in West Berlin.

(9) A tax reduction.

(10) Allowing the President to veto financial items individually.

While favoring by a slight margin the proposal to increase postal rates in order to balance the budget, the residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania were resoundingly opposed to an increase in the Federal tax on gasoline for the same purpose. Sixty-five percent said "no" to the question of a gas tax increase with only 25 percent favoring a boost.

Here is a breakdown of the questions, and the reactions to each:

Question No. 1: "The budget submitted to Congress by the President for the 1960 fiscal year proposes to stay in balance, even though it is high by past standards. Still, it is opposed by some who contend that it is not large enough to meet the Nation's needs. How do you feel?" Here was the response: 76 percent said "we favor a balanced budget"; 5 percent thought "it should be larger"; 10 percent wrote "should be smaller"; 7 percent opined that "balancing the budget is not important"; the remaining 2 percent had no opinion.

Question No. 2 was: "To balance the budget, it's been suggested that postal rates be revised to bring in $350 million more revenue. Also, an increase of 1½ cents a gallon Federal tax on gasoline is proposed. Do you favor an increase in postal rates?" Fifty-one percent said "yes"; 41 percent, "no"; the remainder had no opinion. The second part of the question asked, "Do you favor an increase in the Federal tax on gasoline?" No, 65 percent; yes, 25 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

Question No. 3 asked: "Some kind of labor-management reform legislation seems certain to be enacted by this session of Congress. The big question is how far the changes will go. Do you favor a strong reform bill with teeth?" (Eighty percent said they did.) "Only moderate change?" (Twelve percent went for this.) "No changes from present law?" (Just 4 percent favored the status quo.) The remaining 4 percent had no opinion.

Question No. 4: "Area redevelopment and urban renewal are subject of much discussion in Congress, particularly with respect to how far the Federal Government should go in helping defray the cost of clearing slum areas in larger cities, developing new residential and industrial sections in blighted neighborhoods, etc. Do you think the Federal Government should (a) bear most of the cost" (only 4 percent in favor of this); (b) "share the cost with others" (32 percent for this); (c) "just make loans to be repaid later" (62 percent were for this). Two percent voiced no opinion.

Question No. 5: "In order to encourage State and local governments to assume responsibility for certain public needs now mostly financed by Federal aid, it has been proposed that Federal grants for such activities as vocational education and construction of waste treatment works be discontinued starting in fiscal 1961. How do you feel about this?" Thirty-two percent felt this kind of Government spending should be discontinued; 17 percent were for continuing it, and 49 percent would like to see this kind of Government spending reduced gradually. Two percent did not comment.

Question No. 6: "To encourage more interest in higher education, science, and mathematics, Congress authorized the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate a program of repayable contributions to loan funds for college students and for grants-in-aid to States. One hundred and fifty million dollars is provided in the 1960 budget for this purpose, but there is legislation before Congress to spend much more than this. Do you think (a) the present program of loans is adequate?" (52 percent agreed to this); "we should spend more" (29 percent favored this); (e) "spend less" (15 percent). No opinion—5 percent.

A new farm plan was the subject of question No. 7. "It appears that a new farm plan will be introduced to pay direct subsidies from the Federal Treasury to farmers, covering the difference between the market price for their products sold in this country and a so-called fair price set by Congress. This would replace the present system of price supports. What is your attitude?" Here was the response: 8 percent favored direct subsidies with 9 percent against direct subsidies; 7 percent prefer the present policy of price supports; 18 percent would reduce present list of price-supported crops, and a definite majority of 51 percent were against price supports of any sort. Seven percent gave no opinion.

Question 8, in two parts, brought out these feelings: Question 8A: "It has been recommended that the mutual security program, designedto help strengthen the defense of free nations, be given $3.5 billion next year, or about 20 percent less than fiscal 1959. What do you favor?" Reducing mutual aid by this amount, 54 percent. Keeping it at least as high as it was in 1959, 22 percent. Cutting it more, 21 percent. No opinion, 3 percent.

The reaction to 8B was decisive. In answer to the question, "Do you think we should give economic assistance to countries like Poland and Yugoslavia, which are governed by Communist-type forces, or restrict it to countries not so governed?" 81 percent would restrict giving, with only 13 percent in favor of giving to any country. Six percent did not express their views.

The ninth question brought a more clear-cut reaction than any of the others. "Under present procedures, the President has to accept or reject or appropriation bill in its entirety. I have introduced legislation that would enable the President to consider a separate item on its own merits, thereby making it possible for him to eliminate unnecessary or unjustified appropriations. Congress would still retain its constitutional

power to override any specific veto. Do you favor this?" Ninety-two percent said "Yes"; 4 percent opposed, and 4 percent did not give an opinion.

Question 10 asked: "Interest payments on the national debt are expected to rise $495 million to $8.1 billion in fiscal 1960. In other words, payments for interest on the public debt alone represent more than 10 percent of our total Federal budget. Are you in favor of putting a realistic ceiling on the amount of Federal debt which now stands at $285 billion?" Favor putting ceiling limit, 44 percent; would not restrict, 9 percent; would reduce debt, 41 percent. No opinion, 6 percent.

On immigration, the question was: "There is some sentiment to revise our immigration laws on the grounds that present laws are outdated. What do you favor?" Fifteen percent were for more immigration; 41 percent for less immigration, and 38 percent in favor of permitting the same number as by present law. Six percent did not express their views.

Question 12 asked: "The United States is faced with a decision on whether it should push forward or pull out of disarmament negotiations with the Soviet Union. Talks in Geneva on a nuclear weapons test ban seem to have bogged down. There are many persons who are much concerned about the danger of fallout from such nuclear tests. What do you think we should do?" Forty-four percent said to "tell Russia to show good faith or break off talks at Geneva." Another 44 percent were in favor of continuing working to ban nuclear tests. 9 percent would give up the idea of banning tests. Only 3 percent did not comment.

The constitutents were emphatic in their feeling for a "no retreat" policy in West Berlin. The 13th question was: "The situation in West Berlin and East Germany could lead to a very strained series of events which will have a strong effect on the future U.S. role in Europe. What do you favor?" A "no retreat" policy in West Berlin, 85 percent; partial, or "token" withdrawal of American soldiers from Germany, 7 percent; full withdrawal from Germany, 3 percent. No opinion, 5 percent.

The replies left no doubt in answer to question 14. "The President has held out the prospect of a tax reduction if the budget can be balanced and spending can be held down. Do you believe we should (a) Aim for a tax reduction?" (78 percent favored this); (b) "Resign ourselves to higher Federal spending and no tax reduction" (14 percent checked this). No opinion, 7 percent.

There was divided opinion on the final question. "There is much discussion now going on about continuing certain so-called excise or 'luxury' taxes originally enacted during World War II. These include taxes on transportation of persons, local telephone calls, furs, luggage, and jewelry. Do you favor the repeal of such taxes?" Yes, 48 percent; no, 45 percent; no opinion, 7 percent.

Address of Robert Y. Garrett Before Camden, N.J., Rotary Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, Charles A. Wolverton, who served with distinction in the House of Representatives for many years from New Jersey's First Congressional District, has called my attention to a speech given in Camden, N.J., recently by Robert Y. Garrett. Mr. Garrett, a leading citizen of Camden, presented his address before a meeting of the Camden Rotary Club. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks, which describe the history, goals, and achievements of Rotary International, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY ROBERT Y. GARRETT AT MEETING OF CAMDEN ROTARY CLUB ON JUNE 16, 1959, HELD IN WALT WHITMAN HOTEL, CAMDEN, N.J.

It is a pleasure to say a few words of welcome to you new members of Camden Rotary. The speaker customarily designated to deliver this message is usually a past district governor or other officer of equal rank. In the preparation of these few words I had a feeling of inadequacy and a deep consciousness of my limitations.

What is Rotary? Paul Harris, the founder of Rotary described it this way. "It is easier to note what Rotary does than to say what it is. If Rotary has encouraged us to take a more kindly outlook on life and men; if Rotary has taught us greater tolerance and the desire to see the best in others; if Rotary has brought us pleasant and helpful contacts with others who also are trying to capture and radiate the joy and beauty of life, then Rotary has brought us all that we can expect."

Paul Harris started the first Rotary Club in Chicago on February 23, 1905. It was founded on the theory that many successful businessmen are lonely. Harris was born in Wisconsin, spent his boyhood with his grandparents in Vermont, went to college at the University of Vermont and Princeton and took his law degree at the State University of Iowa.

Paying his way by whatever job came to hand, he spent 5 years in seeing the world. He worked as a raisin packer in Fresno, an actor in Denver, a cowboy in Colorado, a night clerk in Florida, and a deckhand on a cattle boat to France, and finished off by touring Europe as a marble buyer.

After completing his studies at Princeton, Paul Harris went to the University of Iowa. En route he spent a week in Chicago where the unrest and wickedness of this hustling city possessed him with a weird fascination. It was so different from his New England valley. But he sensed something vital in it all. Why were some good and others bad? Why did some make sacrifices? Did they pay? If so, how? Why were others wasteful of their physical, mental, and moral resources? Was there wisdom in grandfather's precepts or was he simply a well meaning but deluded old fogey?

In 1896 he began the practice of law in Chicago and for a number of years things went poorly. Weekdays his practice kept him from thinking about himself, but Sundays and holidays were days of sorrow. He would go down to one of the churches in the morning but during the long afternoons he said "I was desperately lonely. Oh, for the green fields of my New England valley and the voice of a kindly old friend." There is no place like a city park on a Sunday afternoon to feel one's loneliness; the very presence of so many strangers accentuated it more than boundless expanses of land and water could do.

Blessed with characteristic New England kindness and friendship it is not difficult to understand how this young lawyer yearned for something more than clients in the vast city of Chicago. Everywhere there were people but nowhere a familiar face. Recalling a line from Emerson, "He who has a thousand friends has not a friend to spare." Paul Harris said: "I had neither the thousand nor the one." With this background, is it difficult to understand why high in Rotary program is the development of acquaintance as an opportunity for service. Rotary seeks to bring people together through friendship with each other to participate in community betterment, promote high standards in business and professional life, and advance international understanding, and goodwill and peace.

A bachelor without roots, unacquainted in a big strange city, he was lonely. His few acquaintances were businessmen. He began to think in terms of a club that would cure lonesomeness. After planning for many months, Harris revealed his idea to three other men, a coal dealer, a mining engineer, and a tailor. All of the present essentials of our club today were there including classification the rule that a club could only admit one member of any business or profession. By August the club had 21 members—mostly men who had been raised in small towns. They wore badges, used first names, read papers on business and public affairs, but unlike Rotary of today the early drafts of a statement of objectives had a mutual assistance clause and the first few secretaries had to keep a book on how much business was transacted between members each week. Before long that practice was dropped and emphasis placed on the ideal of service and integrity in business—at home—in the community—in all things.

Rotary is not a religion nor a substitute for religion but it does concern itself with the moral and the ethical which go hand in hand with deep religious conviction. Rotary's program is to encourage and foster the ideal of service as a basis of worthy enterprise and in particular, to encourage and foster—

(a) The development of acquaintance as an opportunity for service;

(b) High ethical standards in business and professions, the recognition of the worthiness of all useful occupations, and the dignifying by each Rotarian of his occupation as an opportunity to serve society;

(c) The application of the ideal of service by every Rotarian to his personal, business, and community life;

(d) The advancement of international understanding, good will, and peace through a world fellowship of business and professional men united in the ideal of service.

Early in my Rotary life the fellowship of this club made a deep impression on me and afforded me an opportunity of winning the friendship of many men whose lives made an everlasting contribution to the social and political life of this community. Many people are Rotarians in spirit although not actually enjoying the privileges of belonging to this great worldwide movement. This fact, however, should not deter us as a club but should spur us on to greater and higher achievements because as a unit we should be better able to furnish the materials and the unity to accomplish far more than is possible by individual effort.

As we honor these new members of our club let us see just how the club through its members can become a part of the answer to the problem of our time. Someone has said: "The most pertinent prayer I think is ever heard goes like this: 'Lord, help me to be part of the answer instead of part of the problem.'"

All of us envison a better tomorrow. But are we willing to work for it, to do something? It just will not happen; it will need implementation or there will be retrogression and stagnation.

Rotary was founded originally as a panacea for lonesomeness. As a result of persistence and sincerity, friendly contacts

have been made among all nations and creeds the world over. Now that the atmosphere has been set, perhaps our current drive should be to make men appreciate their potentials.

As Rotarians we have privileges beyond those enjoyed by many men. We operate on a high level. We have vision and faith. We believe in the future and especially so when we know that men like you, men of high purpose, will follow after us. Our task now is only to show you the way, put you to work. Quickly, you, too, will catch this vision of service and carry forward in the spirit of Rotary.

Isn't it significant that throughout history the talents for great and inspiring leadership have been reserved for only a very, very few men? Along the way some of you will hear the complaint: "What can I or a few of us do against such great odds?"

Rotary's membership when compared with the world's population is almost infinitestimal. Yet the influence it wields, the prestige it enjoys constitutes a tremendous voice for good. By precept and example we as community leaders are constantly showing the way.

I for one am thankful that Paul Harris didn't quit in disgust, or despair, or discouragement. Here we have the evidence of a relatively unknown, unsung man who had a vision out of which came a world fellowship founded on respect and understanding each man of good will for his neighbor.

And lest there are those among us who say that such men are not for our fast moving, competitive century, I think as Rotarians we cannot listen often enough to the simple, clean, and very electrifying story of Albert Schweitzer. Instead of saying, "There was a man," we can rejoice that there is a man.

With a reputation as one of the great organists of Europe and a recognized authority on Bach he combined talents which made him one of the world's foremost physicians. Everything lay before him: fame, riches, worldly pleasures and comforts, the applause of his fellows.

But his heart, his conscience, his soul were to be reckoned with. Out of a heart of love and a desire for selfless service he gave up everything, or so it would seem, to go to an obscure, primitive section of Africa, there to live and minister to savages. Today his stature as a man has almost reached the proportions of sainthood. When he wrote something back that "you don't live in a world all your own. Your brothers are here, too," he sounded a clarion call which you in Rotary will hear over and over again.

Listen to it. Do something about it. "Service above Self" will echo time and again through your Rotary experience. Pay attention to it for from now on service is your business.

Welcome and may you grow and prosper yourselves as you serve your fellow men.

Should Unemployed Have Census-Taking Jobs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Norman Anderson of West Fargo, N. Dak.:

WEST FARGO, N. DAK.,
July 29, 1959.

FARGO FORUM.
KINDRED TRIBUNE.
CASSELTON REPORTER.
HUNTER TIMES.

DEAR EDITOR: As a representative of the United Packing House Workers of America I am very much concerned for the welfare of more than 300 former employees of Armour & Co. who were made jobless as a result of the Armour plant closing at West Fargo. Most of these employees live in the 9th, 10th, and 11th Legislative Districts of Cass County. The employment situation in this area is not good and many of the Armour employees have been forced to leave their communities and seek employment in other States. Therefore, I am deeply concerned with an article written by Gifford Herron, State editor of the Fargo Forum in the Sunday Fargo Forum of July 26, 1959, stating the method by which census workers are to be hired in Cass County.

According to the article as many Republican precinct committeemen as possible are to be appointed as census workers. This is against Government regulations. The article states a subterfuge by which GOP officials will get around the intent and meaning of the law. Republican precinct committeemen will resign while they have a census job and then will be reappointed afterward. These census takers can make as much as $15.50 for an 8-hour day, plus car expense. Many of the Republican precinct committeemen are successful business and professional people and do not need the jobs to support their families. The article further states that Lee Brooks, of Fargo, Arlo Lindsay, of Mapleton, and Harry Wadeson, of Alice, are to make sure that only Republicans are hired.

This sounds unethical to me and like a scheme to get an army of Republican workers into every home in Cass County and get certain personal information, which census takers may get, and have it paid for by all the taxpayers. In addition, appointment of census takers purely as party politics is going to hamper the census. People will resent giving personal information necessary for the census if they feel the census taker might use the information for the benefit of any political party.

It shouldn't make any difference what party an unemployed person belongs to if he is qualified to do the job, and by giving him the job the entire community can benefit. In the face of the present unemployment situation of our Armour workers it is wrong to give these jobs to people who don't need them.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the members of the North Dakota congressional delegation and the Census Bureau in Washington, D.C.

NORMAN ANDERSON.

Letter From Gov. Orval E. Faubus to the Little Rock School Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include a letter of enlightenment for those who are now speculating upon the reopening of the schools in Little Rock. This is a copy of a letter forwarded to the Little Rock School Board by the Governor of Arkansas, the Honorable Orval E. Faubus:

JULY 28, 1959.

Although I have received no communication of any nature whatsoever from the Little Rock School Board, I have noted from the press that the board, by a majority vote on a resolution, has challenged me to present any suggestion that I might have for a solution to the current segregation-integration controversy in the city. I do have definite and specific suggestions to make, and I am adopting this means of conveying these suggestions to you. However, in order to avoid any misunderstanding of my position, I am prefacing my suggestions with the following remarks.

Those who advocate the forcible integration of the schools on the theory that it is the "law of the land" have a very weak case, indeed. A citizen is bound no less by the laws of his own State than by the Federal law.

Our State constitution provides as follows:

"AMENDMENT NO. 44

"Section 1. From and after the adoption of this amendment, the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas shall take appropriate action and pass laws opposing in every constitutional manner the un-constitutional desegregation decisions of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955 of the United States Supreme Court.

"Said opposition shall continue steadfast until such time as such un-constitutional invasions or encroachments shall have abated or shall have been ratified."

This is the language of the 44th amendment to our State constitution, an amendment which was initiated by petition of the people, and adopted as a part of our State constitution by a large majority vote of the people at the general election in November 1956.

This amendment to our constitution has not yet been challenged in any court, and, therefore, stands today as the law of our State by the unquestioned will of our people.

Pursuant to this constitutional mandate from the people, the general assembly enacted and I approved early in 1959, Act 236, which reads in part as follows:

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States predicated its school integration decision upon the psychological effect of segregated classes upon children of the Negro race, and, at the same time, ignored the psychological impact of integrated schools upon certain white children who observe segregation of the races as a way of life; and

"Whereas legislation is necessary in order to protect the health, welfare, well-being, and educational opportunities of such white children: Now, therefore, be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas:

"SECTION 1. No person eligible to attend public schools shall be required to attend a school with students of another or different race in order to exercise his right under the constitution of this State to receive gratuitous instruction."

I attach great significance to the fact that as arrogant as the NAACP may be, it has not had the effrontery to attach the validity of this statute under the constitution of our State, or of our Nation. It is quite apparent that the agitators in this group and other integrationists realize that any attack on this statute will raise a question of the fact that they cannot successfully meet, and I refer to the "phychological impact of integrated schools upon white children who observe segregation of the races as a way of life."

Also, we have our Federal Constitution, and the 10th amendment thereto clearly states: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Among these powers—the powers not delegated to the Federal Government, nor prohibited by it to the States, and reserved to the States, or to the people—is the complete and unfettered power of each State to control the public schools within its borders.

This amendment still stands and has not been repealed or modified by any subsequently adopted amendment to the Federal Constitution.

On the other hand, we have only a decision of he U.S. Supreme Court, based almost wholly upon theories of sociology and psychology found in certain books on such subjects, the principal author being Gunnar Myrdal, a Swedish Socialist. There was the merest passing mention of the 14th amendment to the Federal Constitution in the opinion filed by the Court.

Of the law of the land theory based on this decision, former Congressman Samuel B. Pettengill of Indiana recently wrote:

"But more important than integration or segregation is the preservation of the Constitution against the brainwashing of the American people now going on, to support the curious notion that a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court—any decision—is law."

It seems to me that it should be plain to any local, district, or State official as to which of the above more clearly reflects the will of the people of Arkansas, and which should be more binding upon him in his responsibilities as a public official.

It is plain to anyone that the great majority of the people of Arkansas prefer segregated schools, and they have that right under the Federal Constitution and the laws of the State.

Even so, it has been clearly demonstrated that the people of Arkansas will accept the freedom of choice, on a community basis, of either segregated or integrated schools. This is amply evidenced by the non-interference with the operation of integrated schools at Charleston, Fayetteville, and other places in our State.

In a large school district such as Little Rock, where the problem is more complex and difficult of solution, I believe the people would accept a plan of school operation based upon an individual choice between segregated or integrated schools.

This brings me to my first suggestion—a plan which I believe will come most closely to winning acceptance, and, thereby, bring about peaceful integration in the Little Rock schools.

I suggest that the school board ask all the parents who wish their children to attend integrated schools, or who will allow their children to attend integrated schools without undue objection, to come forward and so state.

After you have determined the number of students available for integration, as evidenced by the voluntary actions of their parents, assign half the White students to Horace Mann High School and half to Hall High School. Do the same with the Negro students. There would then exist two integrated schools, leaving the other facilities available for those students whose parents are unwilling to accept integration.

I predicate this suggestion on the following:

(1) It is clear that a majority of White parents do not desire integration (see vote results for special election of September, 1958.) Central High School has approximately three times the capacity of Hall or Horace Mann, thus meeting the requirement for more space for those desiring segregated schools.

(2) The facilities of Hall and Horace Mann are located in the areas where it has been clearly indicated that the most sentiment exists for the acceptance of integrated public schools.

(3) This will make available the newest and most modern facilities for the use of integrated schools, and will eliminate any possible complaint about the facilities of integrated schools. I believe those who observe segregation of the races as a way of life will be willing to accept the less modern, and, in some respects, inferior facilities at Central, in order to preserve their way of life.

I suggest further, to forestall the inevitable increase of moral problems which have always come with integrated schools, that the board send all boys to one school and all girls to the other.

Transportation will be no problem, because of the short distances involved; and, if necessary to use buses, the same vehicles can carry students both ways. In any plan of integration, the board will eventually face this problem. In New York, Philadelphia, and other integrated cities, students have been transported from the very door of one school to facilities miles distant, in order to bring about mixed schools in true ratio to racial numbers in the population of the whole area. Therefore, there can be no valid objections to the plan because of transportation difficulties.

As an alternative, in the event a substantial number of White parents do not volunteer for this plan, the children of the small number who do volunteer may be assigned to Horace Mann High School with the Negro students. It would then be unnecessary to assign any Negro student to any other school. All Negro students would be attending an integrated school. In the language of the U.S. Supreme Court, no Negro "would be separated from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race (which) generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone."

No sincere integrationist can object to this plan—either to the integration of both Hall and Horace Mann, or to the integration of Horace Mann alone. They would be practicing what they preach—they would be demonstrating a live faith. For does not the Scripture teach that "faith without works is dead."

Any sincere integrationist must be willing to accept this plan, because it will afford an integrated status in the public schools for Negro students, and will avoid for Negro students the segregated status which, in the language of the U.S. Supreme Court, "has a detrimental effect upon the colored students."

This plan will not affect adversely any sincere segregationist in his immediate concern for his children. It allows full freedom of choice for all those of either viewpoint.

Such a plan will also afford a wonderful opportunity for sincere integrationists of both races to demonstrate to all by action and concrete evidence, whether or not any good can come from the integration of the races in the public schools. They should welcome the opportunity to show their faith in their viewpoint.

In the words of the great American jurist, Mr. Holmes, in one of his famous opinions, it will be an opportunity to set forth the fundamental truth—"that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market."

I believe that the acceptance of this plan by the school board and the integrationists of Little Rock will bring about an immediate solution to this grave problem. Fear, uneasiness, and animosity should rapidly subside. With friction removed, the propaganda wars, boycotts, and counter-boycotts would almost immediately be forgotten. We would have reason to hope that the gulf of distrust and hatred which has been created between the races by the arrogance of the NAACP and the police-state methods of the Federal Government would begin to fade away.

I am convinced that any plan of integration—token, limited, or otherwise—which is evolved from the pupil assignment plan, or any other plan, which forces parents to send their children to integrated schools against their will, will have the opposite effect on the feelings and sentiments of the people.

Your public statements indicate that the school board intends to make use of our school assignment laws. The plan I have outlined can be executed within the framework of these two school assignment laws. I know that this plan is in keeping with the spirit and the letter of amendment 44 to our State constitution, and act 236, both of which, I reiterate, stand unchallenged by the integrationists.

Adoption of this plan—the voluntary integration of some schools, leaving a freedom of choice for all—could result in a permanent solution of this problem in Little Rock. The same plan could be carried step by step through all other grades in the public schools of Little Rock.

These suggestions do not indicate in any way any change in my attitude in opposition to the usurpation of the people's rights or the State's powers by the Federal Government. I have all along recognized the right of voluntary association. I have opposed and will continue to oppose association by compulsion. I will continue to defend the right of the State and its communities to control the locally and State-supported educational institutions. I hope the time will soon come when the Federal authorities will cease the illegal usurpation of State and local rights, thus relieving you and me, and the people, of burdens which are unnecessary—burdens cast upon us by a U.S. Supreme Court that has no respect for established precedent—a Court that has earned (by its disregard of our constitutional rights) a growing disrespect of the people of our Nation.

Respectfully,

ORVAL E. FAUBUS,
Governor.

The American Journey: The Trail to the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the July 1959 issue of Think magazine has been dedicated to the American journey, which began on July 4, 1776, and we trust will continue through the indefinite decades and centuries ahead.

One of the most thoughtful and provocative articles in this outstanding issue of Think magazine is entitled "Growth in the Northwest," and it heralds the resourcefulness and valor of the explorers and settlers who pioneered the Oregon Trail to the Pacific Northwest. The author of this article is one of our country's

most distinguished historians and collectors of folklore, Mr. Stewart H. Holbrook, noted Oregon author and fellow resident of my native city of Portland. In this centennial year for our State of Oregon, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Holbrook's stirring article from Think magazine for July 1959 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROWTH IN THE NORTHWEST

(By Stewart Holbrook)

One of the most cherished myths of westerners is to describe this or that region where we live as a piece of the last frontier. We do it in the old Oregon country. It is a harmless brag, and it helps us to identify ourselves with the pioneers.

Time has made a desirable asset of pioneers. They stand fairly high in the Valhalla of national heroes. And if we of the Pacific Northwest have no *Mayflower*, our symbol comparable to the Pilgrim vessel is the covered wagon. It matters little that those wagons were not all covered, or that they were numbered by the many hundreds, or that they rolled westward continuously from 1843 until well after the railroad arrived. They have long since separately dissolved to merge into the classic vehicle.

Let it stand, this pioneer figure walking beside the covered wagon. He was seen in full stride by Francis Parkman, the historian, who made man and wagon into an image that has become an icon, fit for statues in parks and murals, in capitols and barrooms. The pioneer is useful in other ways. Chambers of commerce use him to immortalize the courage and determination with which the old frontier was imbued; while an unsuccessful real estate operator or industrialist can blame him becaue he "exhausted all our natural resources and opportunities." I often hear this complaint.

Yet, we still have our dreamers, men who hear trumpets blowing at dawn, who see the morning before it is scarcely light. They believe there is no end to opportunity, so long as man is free to dream. I shall come to them in a moment, but first let us not forget our dreamers of the past who conjured up the Northwest corner and called it the Oregon country.

Dreamers are difficult to dramatize for the history books, yet no doer had more influence on our region than Hall Jackson Kelley, a strange and dedicated prophet, the Lord's own messenger in respect to the Pacific Northwest when it was, at best, of doubtful sovereignty. At the time Kelley began to dream, in the 1820's, our region was virtually a trapping and trading preserve of the hoary Hudson's Bay Co. Clive of India himself was no more a spearhead of empire than these gentlemen adventurers in tartan caps seeking skins.

Yet, without asking anybody about it, Kelley, who had never been west of the Hudson River, suddenly felt called upon to cry, "On to Oregon"—then to organize the American Society for Encouraging Settlement of the Oregon Country. Until then, the few Americans who had been there were mostly sea captains; and, of course, the Lewis and Clark party. But now here was Kelley, an impecunious New England schoolmaster, to write and somehow publish a remarkable pamphlet calling for an exodus to Oregon.

His was no modest proposal. Kelley's Oregonians were to number 5,000 in the first wagon train. Five hundred trained and armed men were to compose a uniformed guard. He had the whole business planned; the organized groupings of the emigrants according to trades and abilities; the supplies and equipment; the discipline of the trail—everything. Above all Kelley's pioneers must be moral people.

Kelley's imaginative proposal and recruiting campaign, carried on from Boston headquarters, created a tremendous interest. It faded quickly when Congress, which he had petitioned for aid, remained cool. The press attacked Kelley, the bemused dreamer, with the ridicule so often used against unconventional characters, and his wondrous plan blew away into the mists.

It turned out, however, that Kelley had touched off a sort of apostolic succession of enormously effective doers. He had made a convert of young Nathaniel Wyeth, who promptly sent a cargo of goods around the Horn, then struck out overland to establish a trading post on the Columbia River. Though this specific venture was to fail, Wyeth in turn attracted Rev. Jason Lee, who accompanied him across the continent to found a settlement and mission school for the Indians. Lee also had some purposeful ideas. He soon showed up in Washington and presented to Congress a petition signed by a handful of allegedly American settlers in Oregon urging the recognition of territorial status. Nothing hapened just then, and Lee returned to Oregon, this time leading a party of 50 new settlers which went into history, significantly, as the great reenforcement.

Now the covered wagons began to roll, rutting the Oregon Trail so deep that portions of it can be seen more than a century afterward. Their numbers virtually assured American sovereignty of the region.

It was to be the longest trek in our history, this journey into the mysterious sinister void which the very maps designated as the Great American Desert of, worse, simply as unknown. Here was the biggest sun and the biggest moon in the biggest sky any had even seen. In their agonies of travel it came to seem as if both horizon and their goal beyond it were moving in unison, always keeping 10 miles ahead of them. The wind never ceased. Weeks on end it blew straight from the hottest corridors of the Equator, then shifted to blow from the top of the world.

There was the sun, and from the endless glare of that immense and hated thing there was no hiding place. Mirages danced and flickered, bringing a handsome blue lake, shimmering cold and inviting, only to sink into the ground. The wind, the sun, the savages. This unmarked road through the hell-wrought desert beat all manner of things out of and into human beings. Men and women displayed prodigies of courage and self-sacrifice to meet the almost daily crisis. The Sioux, the Blackfeet, were ever-present dangers. The worst threat of all was time. When one morning ice was seen on the waterhole, the emigrants knew something must be jetisoned, lest winter catch them in the mountains. Thus, the Oregon Trail was soon marked with fine old chests, with massive bureau and claw-foot tables. They were not discarded lightly.

THE PROMISED LAND

By the time the survivors reached their promised land, they were fit to cut the first logs, make the first clearing, plow the first field; they were ready to fight the first Indian war, to build the first blockhouse. All together, they took the wilderness in hand and from it carved out three great Commonwealths for the Republic.

In their wake came wave after wave of more pioneers, many with dreams to fulfill in this last frontier. Opportunity? No genuine pioneer, no matter the times he was born to, ever failed to recognize opportunity. Merely as a reporter I watched while a city was dreamed up and built, to shine like a star on the edge of night in the Douglas-fir immensity on the north bank of the Columbia. This was no housing development, but a real town which in 30 year grew to its present population of 30,000 people, and has become the queen of all lumber cities, anywhere—Longview, Wash.

Longview was founded on the startling proposition that timber is a crop to be harvested in cycles from a managed forest. It was a dream, an idea, so unique that its downfall and end were predicted regularly by nondreamers. But no longer. From Longview today comes not only lumber but an astonishing variety of forest products made from what, in former times, was called wood waste and destroyed as fast as it could be conveyed into the gigantic burners that were hallmarks of the sawdust cities of the era. The vast managed forest that feeds Longview's plants is harvested on a sustained-yield program. Growth equals cut.

America is always to build, sang the poet, and man will ever dream of man's fulfillment. One of these men was Billy Clapp who, when I first met him less than 30 years ago, was a short, plump, cheerful attorney who operated his law business, such as it was, from a two-by-four shack in the desolate, sun-baked hamlet of Ephrata in central Washington.

For many years, Lawyer-Dreamer Clapp brooded about Grand Coulee, the monstrous dry canyon in this desert. It was 1,000 feet deep in places, and some 50 miles long. "Why," he mused aloud one day, "why couldn't we build a big dam at the far end of her and make the Columbia run right down the Coulee to give us all the water we want?" In that remark was the genesis of the vast project that came to fruition more than two decades later.

Almost every American must have heard of Grand Coulee by now. Here in the midst of volcanic and glacial wastes, hundreds of thousands of acres are being made into lush farmlands that will astonish. It has come to pass that the mountains have dropped down new wine, that the hills flow with milk and honey, and all the rivers flow with waters. The visitor will invariably recall dim Biblical passages about oases, where the desert was made to blossom like the rose.

One looks and is prepared to believe that each of Grand Coulee's irrigation canals is longer than the Potomac—that the main canal alone could hold the flow of Niagara. When all the canals and laterals are completed, some years hence, they will stretch 4,500 miles. The Grand Coulee Dam also supplies power which, pooled with electricity from other Columbia River projects, is carried to all parts of the Pacific Northwest, including the great mysterious complex called Hanford Engineer Works, a corporate title which few if any other corporations can match in the way of euphemism; Hanford is where the United States makes the essence known as plutonium 239.

This is the same surging and once lonely river that moved an early poet, William Cullen Bryant, so powerfully. Some of his lines caught its majesty. They will be quoted so long as men remember the stream was formerly called the River Oregon—"the continuous woods where rolls the Oregon, and hears no sound, save his own dashings."

Woods and water. They have played mighty parts in the American dream in the Pacific Northwest. Longview and Grand Coulee will do as symbols, not only for our region but for all dreamers who like to believe America is never accomplished, that it is always still to build.

On Not Interfering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, commenting on the most important bit of

legislation to face this or any other Congress within a decade, Henry Hazlitt in the current Newsweek stresses the tremendously important but unappreciated fact that the basic problem we face is entirely one of Congress' own doing. Under leave to extend my remarks these thoughts are herewith included.

ON NOT INTERFERING

(By Henry Hazlitt)

President Eisenhower has said that he will not interfere in the steel strike at this stage. And certainly he has not interfered in the sense, for example, that Mr. Truman interfered when he seized the companies in 1952 and tried to impose big wage increases on them. Mr. Eisenhower is ostensibly following a "hands-off" policy, to permit "free voluntary collective bargaining." Yet the Federal Government has been in fact interfering, and interfering every day, on the side of the union leaders and of greatly increasing the effectiveness and coercive power of a strike. It is interfering through the Federal labor laws already on the books (with the help of lack of local law enforcement against union coercion and violence).

The Norris-La Guardia Act, for example, in effect prevents employers or nonunion employees from going to the Federal courts for immediate relief from irreparable injury. Mass picketing is tolerated, and has proved in fact so intimidatory that the steel companies have not even attempted to carry on production in any of the six national steel strikes that have been called since the end of World War II. As one news item matter-of-factly put it a few dayes ago: "Any 'back-to-work' drive under company sponsorship would touch off picket-line violence of a type that has been unknown in the steel industry since the strikes of 20 years ago." Even in the present strike, picket lines stranded an estimated 500 supervisors in three Jones & Laughlin plants. The stranded personnel was made up of a standby corps to prevent deterioration of equipment, maintain essential utilities, and keep a fire watch.

COMPULSORY BARGAINING

Government interference, in fact, began long before the strike. The phrase "free voluntary collective bargaining" has become a mockery. The employer's bargaining is neither free nor voluntary. He is compelled by law to recognize and bargain with one specific union. No matter how unreasonable the demands of that union may be, he is forbidden to deal with anybody else with whom he might make a more acceptable voluntary agreement. This is a discrimination that the law does not make in favor of any other private group. It supplies corrupt or ruthless labor leaders with a weapon of extortion and shakedowns. Moreover, an officially recognized union, though it may originally have represented only 51 percent of a given group of employees, is legally granted exclusive bargaining rights for that group. This means that dissenting individuals or minority unions are denied the right of freely bargaining for themselves.

ONE MAN'S POWER

And so it comes about that one man, one private individual, has the power to bring practically the entire steel industry to a halt overnight. And other single individuals can bring the automobile industry, or the coal industry, or the aluminum industry, or the railroads, or the airlines to a halt. And then the country is helpless. There seems no way of ending the paralysis except by forcing the employers to give in, to grant the union demands, so that union leaders will permit us to start producing steel or aluminum or coal again. No way is even contemplated of resuming production without their consent.

The Government's impotence, of course, is of its own making. But what, meanwhile, does Congress do? It acts as if the whole situation did not exist. It is now tinkering with a labor bill that deals with none of the primary or central problems, but only with secondary and peripheral problems, and even for most of these it proposes the wrong remedies. Congress acts as if there were only one problem—the corruption of some labor-union bosses, or their excessive power over rank-and-file members. Any injustice or harm to nonunion employees, or to employers, or to the public is treated either as if it did not exist or as if it did not matter—as if nobody but union members had any rights that anyone was bound to respect.

This is the ideology behind present Federal law and its discussion. It forgets, finally, that industrywide unions cannot raise wages by coercive strikes except at the cost of bringing on either unemployment or additional inflation. The steel union did both by its strike in 1956.

Banks, Interest Rates: The Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD T. FLYNN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, who should have the power to determine policy when the welfare of our country is at stake? The Federal Reserve bank or the Congress?

The welfare of our country is at stake when we are threatened with an inflation which can consume all of us. To pay added interest charges on the public debt is inflationary. The Federal Reserve bank refuses to support Treasury bonds at the maximum interest rate now permitted. The Federal Reserve bank high-handedly rejects the advice of Congress when it suggests passing a resolution to the effect that it is the sense of Congress that the Federal Reserve bank support the bond market. The members of the Federal Reserve bank system were helped by Congress in 1933 and now, being beneficiaries of the fruits of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, have declared their independence not only of the will of Congress but their rejection of even an expression of opinion by Congress on a money matter which has at stake not only the welfare of the banks but the welfare of the entire country and our economic system. If you believe, as I do, that fighting inflation through increased interest charges leads to a speedy and serious depression, and to an increasing spiral of inflation in other fields, then the advice and wish of Congress should be heard and heeded by agencies created by this Congress, such as the Federal Reserve bank. Yes, the private banks of this country should not be unmindful of the advice of Congress. Where the interest of the people is at stake, this Congress cannot afford to forfeit its power or influence or to compromise the people's convictions or principles. If we believe that the welfare of the people can be jeopardized through a rise in interest rates, through further inflation and by the failure of the Federal Reserve bank to support the current bond market, then I feel it is our duty, as Members of Congress, to refuse to knuckle under to those who demand increased interest rates. The well-being of the people of the country comes ahead of the well-being of the banks and money-lenders. Congress should protect the people and should not forfeit, even its right to express an opinion, to the banks who are hiding behind the sacred veil of a statement to the effect that banks should be free of the control of politicians. I say that it is our responsibility as Congressmen, politicians if you will, to protect the interests of our constituents who sent us here.

First the bankers wanted the Vault Cash bill—then the ceiling lifted on the national debt—then an increase in the interest rate on Government bonds and now they are bold enough to tell Congress, through the President, that Congress should not pass a simple resolution expressing its feeling that the Federal Reserve bank should support the bond market of the Treasury Department. The Federal Reserve bank has refused to buy Treasury bonds at the interest rate offered by the Secretary of the Treasury. We have, in effect, a strike by the Federal Reserve bank against the Treasury—a strike against the people of the United States.

Can any of us go home at the end of this session if we vote for an inflationary increase in interest rate and face the family farmer, the corner grocer, the white-collar worker, the laborer, the veterans, the teachers, and the pensioners living on fixed incomes? Let us forget about the hypothetical individual who states that the cause of the inflation is because Congress, or the Democrats in Congress, are spending too much. There is little difference between the spending bills of the Republicans and the Democrats. There is, however, a big difference between the policies of the Republicans and the Democrats. What we need is a balanced economy. If we have a balanced economy, a balanced budget will automatically follow. Let us vote in the interests of the people back home—let us vote against inflation by refusing to increase the interest rate on the national debt.

Cost of Producing Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the American dairy farmer still finds himself caught in a cost-price squeeze. Despite high costs of operations, equipment, taxes, and labor, the dairyman still receives a disproportionately small

part of the retail price of milk and milk products. For example, he may receive only 6 or 7 cents per quart for milk sold within 24 hours for 22–26 cents.

Despite a wide variety of efforts, it has not yet been possible to correct this situation.

A great many theories, of course, have been advanced as to just how this should be accomplished. Among these has been the idea of lowering the costs of production of milk.

As we know, these costs vary, depending upon a wide variety of factors, including: (1) herd size; (2) milk production per cow; (3) labor charge; (4) cost of feed; (5) efficient management; and other factors. Even though realistic efforts have been made to improve efficiency, however, the outlook has not sufficiently brightened.

DAIRY INCOME IN WISCONSIN

In 1958 Wisconsin dairy farmers received an average of about $3.11 per hundredweight for 3.5 percent milk at the farm. At this price, a 20-cow herd—averaging 8,000 pounds of milk per cow—would enable the farmer to pay current market prices for feed, cover production costs, return 4 percent interest on the dairy investment, but leave only 73 cents per hour for labor.

At such a price level, nearly one-half of Wisconsin's dairy farms did not receive enough income to cover all their nonlabor costs, including interest on investment, with no return for operator labor. Less than 10 percent paid all costs and returned $3,000 for the operator labor and management.

IS LOWERING PRODUCTION COSTS THE ANSWER?

The question arises, however: Is lowering the cost of production really the answer?

Naturally, it is advantageous for any individual farmer to lower his costs of operation. However, costs per unit are most effectively lowered by expanding production. If there is widespread expansion of production, the resulting volume of milk flowing into the market then has the effect of lowering prices that offset the gains of lower production costs.

Thus, while lowering the costs of producing milk is desirable for the individual farmer, it is not the whole answer; instead, additional efforts must also be made to attain more effective distribution and greater consumption—with the dairy farmer receiving a fairer share of the retail price of milk.

Recently, the members of the staff of the College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin Extension Service, prepared a special circular entitled "The Cost of Producing Milk."

Recognizing that cost of production is one of the major factors that must be taken into consideration—if a successful effort is to be made for brightening the outlook for the dairy farmer, however, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the circular printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COST OF PRODUCING MILK

"How much does it cost to produce 100 pounds of milk?" This question is of widespread interest to farmers, farm organization leaders, public representatives, and consumers.

"What would dairymen have to get for 100 pounds of milk in order to earn for their labor the average weekly wage or hourly pay which industrial workers receive in Wisconsin?" This queestion is significant to those who believe that dairymen can reasonably expect as large a return on an hourly or weekly basis as factory workers.

Both questions are difficult to answer satisfactorily, because no single figure applies to all or to even a majority of dairy farmers. Yet these questions are being asked, and in response to them this analysis is made.

Production costs vary widely among individual dairymen. Many produce at less than the average cost for all dairymen—many others produce at greater than average cost. Production efficiency and size of operations are two important factors bearing on cost. Other considerations are the labor charge and whether the feed is home produced and charged at the cost of producing it or whether it is bought and charged at market prices.

Twenty cows producing 8,000 pounds of 3.5 percent milk per cow approximates the 1958 average Wisconsin dairy herd. If feed and all other items needed for milk production (exclusive of labor but including overhead interest, depreciation, etc.) as given by reliable research reports are charged at 1958 rates, the net cost per hundredweight of milk sold from this average Wisconsin herd is $2.22.

How is this cost arrived at?

First, all feed (including pasture) is charged at current local market price, rather than at the cost of producing it. Second, only those costs directly associated with the dairy herd and young stock are included. Third, costs are based upon requirements for this specific herd size and productive level, rather than upon farm account records. Average efficiency in the production of grade B milk is assumed. This method of determining cost permits viewing the dairy operation apart from the rest of the typical farm business, which includes raising crops and supplementary livestock.

The following costs are included, both for the milking herd and young stock: Feed at average 1958 market prices; bedding at 1958 costs; interest on the dairy investment (livestock, barn, dairy machinery and equipment) at 4 percent; depreciation on the barn, dairy machinery and equipment based on estimated useful life; taxes on the barn and livestock over 4 months of age at the 1957 Wisconsin tax rate; building and equipment repair costs; breeding, veterinary and miscellaneous cash expense.

Ignoring labor cost for the moment, the above items total $5,331 for this 20-cow herd plus young stock.

Deducting $1,952.60 from this total as the current value of veal calves and cull cows sold and manure available for field application, the net cost would be $3,378.40 for the herd. In turn, the net cost per hundredweight of milk sold (7,600 pounds per cow assuming 400 pounds are used for calf feed) is $2.22. In other words, the price of 3.5 percent milk at the farm (hauling costs are not included) would have to be $2.22 per hundredweight in order to cover operating costs plus interest on the investment, but with no return for labor. Costs of producing grade A milk might be somewhat higher.

WHAT RETURN FOR LABOR?

A 20-cow herd with typical facilities and average work efficiency require about 1,840 hours of labor per year. If labor is charged at $1.05 per hour (the average 1958 hourly wage for Wisconsin farm workers without room and board), the labor cost would be $1.27 per hundredweight of milk sold. Added to the other costs, this gives a net cost of $3.49 per hundredweight.

Actually the 1958 average price for 3.5 percent milk at the farm was $3.11 per hundredweight in Wisconsin. This is the average price for grade A and grade B milk sales. At this milk price, the average Wisconsin dairyman earned 73 cents for each hour spent on the dairy herd in 1958 plus 4 percent interest on his dairy investment.

Milk production costs can also be computed using industrial wages as the basis for the labor charge. The average Wisconsin industrial worker earned $87.53 per week in 1958 working 40.4 hours, or $2.17 per hour. If dairy labor is charged at the weekly industrial wage of $87.53 ($1.38 per hour assuming a 63.5-hour farm workweek), the net cost for this herd would be $3.89 per hundredweight of milk sold. Charging labor at the average hourly industrial wage of $2.17 would raise the net cost to $4.85 per hundredweight.

Calculating the cost of production on the basis of different annual labor incomes may be more meaningful to most dairymen than returns on an hourly basis. Labor income is the return for operator labor and management after all other operating and investment costs have been paid. Net costs for the average herd, assuming various levels of dairy labor income, are as follows:

Annual dairy labor income:	*Net cost per hundredweight milk sold*
$1,000	$2.88
$1,500	3.14
$2,000	3.54
$2,500	3.87
$3,000	4.20
$3,500	4.53
$4,000	4.85

The average price of $3.11 per hundredweight yielded, therefore, slightly less than $1,500 labor income last year for the average herd of 20 cows producing 8,000 pounds of milk per cow.

COSTS AT VARIOUS PRODUCTION LEVELS PER COW

Within a given herd size, the net cost per hundredweight of milk sold largely depends upon production per cow. Many costs (bedding, labor, etc.) are about the same regardless of production per cow with a given herd size. Therefore as total production rises, the net cost per hundredweight milk sold drops substantially.

Total milk production per cow:	*Net cost per hundredweight milk sold*
7,000 pounds	$3.93
8,000 pounds	3.54
9,000 pounds	3.24
10,000 pounds	2.99
11,000 pounds	2.79

The above table shows the importance of high-producing cows. The figures are based on the 20-cow herd with all feed purchased. The net costs listed represent the farm prices needed for 3.5 percent milk in order to yield $2,000 annual dairy labor income from the dairy enterprise (20 cows) plus 4 percent interest on the dairy investment, under 1958 cost conditions.

COSTS WITH HERDS OF VARIOUS SIZES

Herd size is another major determinant of net cost per hundredweight of milk sold. Again, fixed costs, particularly for the barn and equipment, can be spread over greater sales volume through herd expansion.

Net costs per hundredweight of milk sold are estimated below for herds of varying size. It is again assumed that all feed including pasture is purchased and that total annual

milk production is 8,000 pounds per cow. Labor is charged at $1 per hour to take into account differences in the amount of labor required. It is evidence that reductions in cost resulting from herd expansion are most pronounced with the smaller herds.

Number of cows:	*Net cost per hundredweight milk sold*
10	$4.78
15	3.88
20	3.43
25	3.16
30	2.99
35	2.86

COMPARING HERD SIZE AND PRODUCTION PER COW AS UNIT COST REDUCERS

Which offers the average dairyman the best chance to reduce costs, increasing herd size or increasing production per cow?

The diagram indicates that the average Wisconsin dairyman can cut his unit costs more by improving production per cow than by expanding herd size even with no charge for labor.

If a labor charge based on requirements is added, better herds become even more attractive than larger herds for cost reduction.

Nevertheless, as previously shown, both are good ways to reduce unit costs. In fact, on the average, the larger Wisconsin herds also have higher production per cow. Thus they benefit from the twofold income advantage of lower unit costs and greater sales volume.

SOME FARM RECORDS

Production costs on selected Wisconsin farms

The relationship between volume and cost for milk sold from 400 Wisconsin farms in 1957: These farms, mostly grade A, averaged 35 cows with 9,500 pounds of milk sold per cow. Costs per hundredweight decline with expanded milk production throughout the range of production found on these farms. The cost reduction possibilities are most pronounced at lower production levels.

This does not mean that volume alone is important. Volume obtained from a large herd of low producers would come at much higher cost than shown here. On the average, however, size of herd and production per cow increase together on Wisconsin farms so they can be combined into the single measure of "production per farm." Efficient feed production is also found more commonly with higher levels of milk production.

All cash operating expenses are taken from these actual farm records. They include only operating expenses (not living expenses) and only the farm's share of electricity, automobile and other joint costs. In contrast with the figures presented earlier, the costs given in this section are based on the entire farm operation; this includes the cost of producing feed rather than buying it. It also includes hauling costs, the cost of produce used in the home and the cost of providing the house.

The investment costs are interest on all capital (including owned capital) and depreciation on buildings, machinery and equipment.

Labor costs include the actual cost of hired labor, the value of unpaid family labor and a labor income of $3,000 for the farm operator. This $3,000 figure is sometimes used to approximate a labor income equal to that of the average industrial worker when allowance is made for use of the farmhouse and farm produce used in the home.

WHAT'S THE ANSWER?

Cost of production as basis of pricing milk

Much of the interest in milk production costs stems from the belief that milk prices should be set at the average cost of production plus some reasonable profit margin.

The idea of pricing any commodity on the basis of its cost of production implies two basic assumptions: (1) production costs are sufficiently uniform that the average cost would apply to a major portion of its producers, and (2) the amount produced at such a cost price could regularly be sold and consumed.

The second assumption would not ordinarily occur without monopoly elements which make it possible to control total production. In fact, an increase in the price of milk would decrease somewhat the amount that the market would take and would certainly not reduce the amount produced.

The first basic assumption is essentially that a milk price established at the average cost of production would give good incomes to most dairy farmers.

But in Wisconsin an average cost would apply only to a very few dairy farmers. Most are above or below the average. Hence, if the price of milk was set at the average cost of production, most dairy farmers would either still not earn an acceptable income or earn significantly more than the acceptable level.

What about lowering costs?

If pricing milk on cost of production is not acceptable one might ask, "Why not solve the problem by lowering costs?" It's a good thought, but it has serious complications as a single "solution."

It is to the definite advantage of any individual farmer to lower costs. However, costs per unit are reduced most easily through expanded production. If all farmers expanded milk production, the resultant price reduction could more than offset the benefit of lowered unit costs.

Even so, there are limits to how fast and effectively Wisconsin dairy farms can adjust to achieve lower costs. Many dairymen are limited by available capital, management ability and other considerations such as age, nonfarm work, etc.

Others can and are moving out into the lower cost range. For example, the proportion of Wisconsin farms producing 150,000 pounds of milk or more per year increased by almost 25 percent from 1954 to 1957. This expansion is very rapid, but it still leaves many dairy farms in the relatively high cost positions.

The dairy income dilemma

Dairy farmers, as well as farmers generally, are faced with the need to increase production in order to improve their income through lowered unit costs and greater sales volume. But if all farmers accomplish this, the resulting price decline can more than offset the gains made. This is the dilemma confronting the Wisconsin dairyman.

Edmonds Harbor Deserves Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Works has approved a resolution which authorizes the Chief of Engineers to determine the feasibility of a small-boat harbor at Edmonds, Wash.

This review survey has been delayed because of a lack of funds. I believe every effort should be made to get the survey started, particularly in light of an independent study by the University of Washington. I hope the Bureau of the Budget will release any available funds for the engineers review study during the current fiscal year.

The Lynnwood (Wash.) Enterprise published a news story July 15, 1959, which tells of the difficulty faced by the port of Edmonds in getting Federal aid. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the story in the RECORD.

The story follows:

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON SURVEY FAVORS EDMONDS BOAT HARBOR

Edmonds port commissioners heard a favorable report this week on prospects for a boat harbor in Edmonds. Paul Flint, of McClean & Co., Inc., added his opinion that the boat harbor would have a good chance for 100-percent occupancy and that there is a very good chance to put it over.

The University of Washington preliminary survey, conducted by Prof. Don Parker, recommended that the port of Edmonds should construct a pleasure boat harbor, that dry storage space should be provided, that serious consideration should be given to satisfying a demand for covered space, that the port of Edmonds should make subletting of mooring leases a part of the yearly contract, that self-sufficient facilities such as a restaurant, and gas and oil concessions should be provided, and that necessary facilities such as fresh water, electrical outlets, and restrooms be made available.

The survey further disclosed that a minimum of 820 boatowners can be expected to sign mooring leases, and that a maximum of 2,328 boatowners could be expected to sign mooring leases.

Paul Flint told the commissioners that an Edmonds boat harbor, financed as proposed, solely by the issue of revenue bonds, would be only the second in the country to do so.

The port commission faces a 1962 deadline from the Union Oil Co., and for that reason agreed that Federal aid would arrive too late to help with the harbor financing. Congressmen sent the Edmonds boat harbor a telegram that the Senate Appropriations Committee recommended a $476,000 increase in navigation surveys, and that action was expected soon. Commissioner Scott said that 10 years had already been spent in efforts to get such Federal aid.

The port commission received a complaint regarding misuse of the float by fishermen who become belligerent when boats try to tie up at the float. The commission stated that the float is intended primarily for the use of boatowners, and that if fishermen continue to disregard its proper use, the commission will act jointly with Edmonds police to enforce freedom of the float for boatowners.

Mr. Speaker, also I want to include in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Edmonds (Wash.) Tribune-Review on July 16, 1959. This editorial points out the demand for the small-boat harbor and the action taken by the port of Edmonds to get the project started. Anyone who reads the news item and the editorial must come to the conclusion that the people of Edmonds deserve Federal help in getting this harbor.

The editorial follows:

WHERE THE BOAT HARBOR STANDS NOW

The survey just completed for the Port of Edmonds by the University of Washington Marketing and Research Bureau pretty much confirms what port commissioners have felt all along—that there is enough demand for a small boat harbor here to fill every moorage space as soon as it is built. If that is so, people often ask impatiently, why in heck don't they go ahead and build it?

The answer can be wrapped up in one little word—money. That's all, just money.

To get that money, the port commissioners have now completed two steps. First they called in a firm of financial analysts to study all the costs and revenues which would be concerned in the operation of a small boat harbor, and determine if it would pay its way. The firm concluded that given a reasonable degree of occupancy, it would.

Next the port commission engaged the services of an experienced and accepted surveying service to make a scientific study of the potential customers of that boat harbor, to determine if the leases would reach the number which the financial analysts say would make it pay. That report, summarized on our front page, says that they would.

Now the port commission has turned all this information over to a bonding company to see if it considers that it is solid enough to persuade bond buyers to invest in it. Up to now, it looks good. But from here on out, the port commission is in the position of anyone who goes to a financial firm for a loan—the lender wants to be pretty sure of the borrower's prospects for paying back the money.

Right at this point, whether or not a small boat harbor is built on the Edmonds waterfront depends entirely on how good a case has been made to the cold and calculating eye of the bond buyer.

Economy and Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on Friday I submitted Senate Resolution 150, proposing the creation of a select Senate committee on the economic impact of the defense program. In a column published in the Washington Evening Star on the following day Saturday, July 25, Sylvia Porter discussed the possible problems arising from changes and adjustments which might occur in our economy if defense spending was gradually to be cut. She has set forth the importance of the subject quite forcefully.

I ask unanimous consent that her column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 25, 1959]

HOW'S IT GOING TO END?

(By Sylvia Porter)

Increasing numbers of us are playing a "game" around the lunch and board room tables in Wall Street today which is guaranteed to cause shivers on the hottest day. We call it:

"How's it going to end this time?"

The rules for the mental exercise are simple.

First, we quickly agree that the stock market has been in a spectacular upswing and that while none of us knows how high is high, many stocks do appear fully priced. We also note that financial relationships have become quite abnormal when an investor can get a much higher income from a short-term Treasury security than from lots of top-rated stocks.

Second, we quickly agree that the shock which will trigger the next stock market break will not come from a direction we expect. As always, most people will be caught off guard.

Then, we put the question on the table: "What could be the development that will send stock prices into a slump this time?"

One answer which professionals are mentioning more and more is: An unanticipated acceptance by the West and the Soviet Union of a plan encouraging both sides to limit defense expenditures. It would mark a start toward leveling out of the $41 billion military budget and toward gradual cuts over the coming years.

This acceptance would be properly hailed throughout the world as progress toward sanity. But, in Wall Street the pros would concentrate on the extent to which a ceiling on defense spending might cause dislocations in industry, major layoffs, and pay slashes—and the stock market well might shudder at what could happen.

Putting it bluntly: A glimpse of peace and future relief from the load of armaments spending could be "it"—the trigger.

Cynical? Sure. The pros, though, emphasize how even the modest stretchout in defense spending in 1957 chilled the economy and paved the way for the 100-point stock market break in late 1957.

At this point in a "game" session this past week, I exploded.

"I won't take the insult to our intelligence you imply. We know what should be done to fill the gaps created by any big cut in defense spending and we can take every step needed.

"We should put through instantaneous tax cuts to release spending cash into the hands of consumers and businessmen. We would start at once on the programs we all admit are desperately needed for more schools, water systems, roads, middle-income housing. We would at last begin a real drive for redevelopment of our cities.

"We can develop practical programs to aid specific industries and areas through the transition. An improved unemployment insurance program would be of vital help. So would a return to easy money."

The men around the table listened politely, but as I halted for breath, back came the cold comments:

"But the programs you suggest are not on the books. The public hasn't confidence they will be put there in time. No effort has been made to convince Americans that what is needed will be done to prevent a transition to lower defense spending from being cruel and severe."

And as I protested, the men continued with the "game" and the warning to each other that unexpected "peaceful" developments might be the shocker setting off the slump this time.

A New Look for the Solid South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article recently appeared in the July 1959 issue of the National Republic magazine, which should provoke a great deal of thought among our national political leaders. This article was prepared and written by our distinguished colleague from Mississippi, Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER, and expresses, I am sure, the sentiments of a vast majority of the people of the Southern States.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include this article and commend it to the House:

A NEW LOOK AT THE SOLID SOUTH—THE ELECTORAL PLAN ADOPTED BY SIX SOUTHERN STATES IS NEITHER REACTIONARY NOR CONSERVATIVE BUT A RETURN TO THE CONSTITUTION

(By Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER)

The electoral plan promulgated by six Southern States has been called the newest brainchild of reactionary states righters. I take exception to the words "newest" and "reactionary."

There is nothing new about the idea. It is as old as the Constitution of the United States. In fact that is just where the idea originated. It was the brainchild of the Founding Fathers—their idea as to how presidential elections should be conducted.

The men who shaped the framework of our Nation believed that to be an elector was to be something more than a mere rubber stamp. They confidently expected electors to be chosen as carefully—and as critically—as any legislator. Electors were to be men of unquestioned integrity, fully aware of the sentiment of their State, and ready to put that sentiment ahead of mere party loyalty.

Had there been a deviation on the part of the candidate around election time—after nomination—or were he shown to be under the influence of some group inimical to the best interests of the State represented by the elector, that elector might change his vote at the very last moment.

In fact, the reason for the electors was to implement the very freedom of choice of Government officials for which the United States was founded.

Listen to the original words of the Constitution and you will see that this so-called newest brainchild of reactionary states righters is but a return to the Constitution of the United States with all of its safeguards against individual or mass tyranny. Article II, section 1 reads:

"Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress. * * *

"The electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot for two persons. * * * The person having the greatest number of votes shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such majority, and have an equal number of votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately choose by ballot one of them for President; and if no person have a majority, then from the five highest on the list the said House shall in like manner choose the President.

"But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice.

"In every case, after the choice of the President, the person having the greatest number of votes of the electors shall be the Vice President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal votes, the Senate shall choose from them by ballot the Vice President."

The 12th amendment made a change in this procedure. Under the original electoral provision the electors voted for two persons; without designating either for President or

Vice President. But the election of 1800 pointed out a weakness. In that election Jefferson and Burr received an equal number of votes and 35 ballots had to be taken in the House of Representatives before the choice fell to Jefferson. The 12th amendment requires electors to vote separately for President and Vice President.

But in neither the original proviso, nor in the amendment, is the elector barred from voting as the thinks best.

As for those ultraliberals who invariably link States rights with reaction, may I suggest a closer study of American history.

They are inconsistent, for they talk of civil rights as though they had invented rights, and, with their next breath, they urge any one of the socialistic regimentations which have so cut into our individual liberties guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

It was the States righters who promulgated the Bill of Rights. The fight for this cornerstone of all of our liberties did not stem from the northern industrial States, but from the South.

It was at the Hillsborough Convention in 1788 that North Carolina refused to ratify the Constitution until there was incorporated in it a Bill of Rights that would preserve forevermore those inherent freedoms for which the States had fought.

It was the gallant stand of men who believed in the individual American and in his ability to do his own thinking, that preserved and protected the freedoms which we still enjoy—and upon which the radicals in our midst call for aid whenever they are exposed to the public eye.

The States righters of those days—and of today—believed that there should be no loophole for tyranny—whether of the man or the State. If to believe that is reactionary, then I am proud to be so called.

When the United States of America was formed and the Constitution was written, the people of the several States were insistent and demanding that local government be forever preserved in all of its dignity and with all of its safeguards.

The Constitution specifically provided for the right and authority of each State to conduct its own affairs and that this should be preserved inviolate. There was conferred upon the Federal Government only so much power and authority as was necessary to control the relationships of the States, one with another, and the conduct of the Nation's foreign affairs and unified defense.

Even so, out of an abundance of caution, the States refused to ratify the Constitution until they had received further definite and positive assurances that this fundamental concept of government would in deed and in fact be set up. The result was the first 10 amendments to the Constitution—the Bill of Rights.

The Bill of Rights consists of two kinds of guarantees: guarantees of the rights of individuals, and guarantees of the rights of the several States.

The greatest danger to our rights and liberties arises from the tendency to merge our dual system of government into one single, consolidated system. This tendency already has, to a large degree, destroyed the Federal principle, and is, in many ways, converting the States into compliant, dependent and parasitic subdivisions of the Central Government.

The answer given by proponents of big government is that it promotes material welfare and expedites foreign relations. It is, in fact, nothing less than an abdication of constitutional government in favor of tyranny. No matter under which party label it masquerades and out of which emergency it arises, it is contrary to the spirit and letter of the Constitution, abhorrent to American traditions and principles, and subversive of religion, culture, and the freedom and responsibility of the individual.

As complex as are our social and economic problems of today, social and economic justice, desirable as they are, cannot be attained or safeguarded by violation of the Constitution. Only a strict adherence to the Federal Constitution and the constitional rights of every State and individual will assure economic and social justice.

The problem facing the electorate in 1960 will be this: How much larger in size and in function will we allow the Federal Government to become? Is the Federal Government to establish the spiritual, economic and cultural conditions under which the several States wish to live? If the answer in a strict constitutional and American sense is "no," then each State must, under the Constitution, retain full control of education, police power, use of the ballot, marriage, transportation within its own borders, health, welfare, and all such matters as provide for peace and good order within the sovereign States.

Federal invasion of these States' rights must be brought to an emphatic halt. This includes usurpation by the Federal executive, or by the Congress, or by the courts through judicial legislation.

The real division today is not between the Democratic and Republican Parties, but between the modern Republicans and the radical Democrats on one side, who hold that we must submit our freedom and fate to a government which, whatever its name or label, will be but a species of national socialism, and those men and women of both parties who believe in the freedoms as originally intended and actually written into the Constitution.

What then is the answer?

There is already in being the legal machinery in six Southern States which may offer a solution. The legislatures of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi and South Carolina have rewritten their own State election laws, in such a way that the names of presidential candidates may be left off States' ballots in 1960. These six States have a total of 57 electoral votes, which in a close election on November 8, 1960, might well force the election of a President and Vice President into the House of Representatives under provisions of article II and amendment 12 of the Constitution. Also this legal machinery might well be used by the South in advance of the 1960 election to influence the choice of a nominee.

If the five other Southern States follow the lead—Florida, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia—the South will have a bloc of 128 electoral votes—almost half the number needed to elect a President. The votes in the six States now, and in others that may take similar action before the election of 1960, will not be pledged to support the Democratic candidate when they cast their electoral college vote. These votes could be cast for the other major party candidate or for any other candidate. Thus, the Democrats could carry the South and yet the Democratic Party machine could lose the election.

The framework is simple, legal, and has a solid historical perspective back of it. In the States already providing legal machinery for this, the presidential electors would be placed on the ballot as unpledged electors of the Democratic Party, but not pledged to support any presidential candidate. There would be no moral obligation to support the national candidate of the party, although they would be bound by the actions of the executive committee of the State Democratic Party.

After the votes are counted and the results made known on November 8, 1960, it will soon be known how close the election is, and whether or not a shift of unpledged electors might rob the majority of the election, causing the House of Representatives to elect a President.

Much bargaining and "horse trading" could go on meanwhile, before the actual electoral votes were cast. The prize could well be a more "conservative" President and a victory of the prized principle of States rights. In short, it might well mean a return to constitutional principles.

The answer is political independence. In spite of President Eisenhower's tremendous popular victories, the Republican Party is still a minority party. Political independence for the South provides the South once again with its great opportunity to not only save our basic institutions but also to perpetuate the cherished Jeffersonian principles of government in the Republic itself, by militant, peaceful, and aggressive action in the Democratic councils and conventions.

Disliking as I do government by minority groups, the time has arrived when the South must, of necessity, follow one of three courses: Remain in the bag and be counted on to go Democratic under all conditions; become an independent two-party section and thus appeal to vote-hungry Republicans; or become an organized militant minority group in itself. There is too much at stake for the South to continue to afford the luxury of being taken for granted. The South cannot stand idly by and watch its cherished Democratic Party be controlled by NAACP, AFL–CIO, ADA, and the like.

If this plan is adopted and carried through in 1960, the South will play once again a glorious role in the political arena of this Nation and States rights will have been preserved for all the States—both North and South. This plan is a call for an organized militant southern unity within the Democratic Party for the cause of individual and State liberty of all the peoples of this Republic.

The issues for 1960 are crystal clear. No one ever despairs of Americanism when the issues are clearly drawn. Americans have risen up before and saved the Union of States. The people still believe that this Nation will live forever if the people retain control of their government. The heart of America at the grassroots is strong and dead set against big government. The trouble has been, and is, that they do not know what they as individuals can do about it. The South has a basic answer to these wishes of the people. Out of it all the Republic itself will be perpetuated.

M. L. Benedum, a Great and Good West Virginian, Has Passed Away, Leaves a Lonesome Place Against the Sky

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in this forum 2 weeks ago I observed that on Thursday, July 16, Michael L. Benedum would sit quietly in his living room reading congratulatory letters on his 90th birthday anniversary.

But today, Mr. President, the same Mr. Benedum, an outstanding native West Virginian, who enjoyed a fabulous career as the most successful oil wildcatter in history, and who also possessed the great quality of maintaining concern and compassion for the well-being of his fellowman, passed to the greater reward.

In response to an inquiry from Editor Randal Strother of the Clarksburg Exponent, Clarksburg, Harrison County, W. Va.—the county in which Mr. Benedum and I were born and in which his philanthropic gifts have exceeded $2½ million—I issued a statement today on Mike Benedum's passing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my statement as released to the Exponent.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RANDOLPH

M. L. Benedum traveled the extra mile to build successes of both his business endeavors and his philanthropic activities.

Possibly no native West Virginian had a more outstanding industry career. He was creative and courageous but, more importantly, he was considerate of the needs of his fellow men.

No one typified to a greater degree his quality of Christian citizenship.

Mr. Benedum was a firm believer in the philosophy that man is only temporarily a trustee of the wealth acquired through God-given talents. Consequently, he had a real awareness of his Christian responsibilities.

The fruits of his labors were wisely and frugally conserved, and it was properly said of him that only of friendship and good cheer was he a spendthrift. Great though he was in the industry which endowed him with much wealth, Mr. Benedum will best be remembered for the generosity of his gifts of time, energy, and worldly substance to the church, to education, and to philanthropy in general.

From my youth, and during my private and public service, his dedicated life has been my personal inspiration.

Peoria Journal Star Editor in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the seventh in a series of articles by Mr. Charles L. Dancey appearing in the July 26 issue of the Peoria Journal Star. Mr. Dancey is the editor of the paper and is reporting on his recent trip to Russia.

NOTHING IS FREE FOR PEOPLE IN SOVIET UNION

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Communism certainly doesn't mean a lot of free service for folks. Almost nothing is free in the Soviet Union under its Communist regime.

It is true that a great many things are "furnished" by the Soviet Government, but whenever you get in touch with an ordinary citizen who has used this service you discover it was furnished by the government, all right, but at a price.

Throughout the Black Sea area are great "sanitoriums" for ailing "workers" and the Communists make a big thing out of the fact that these magnificent buildings were once the homes of rich nobles that now have been turned over to the use of the workers.

A sanitorium user, however, will tell you that it costs 1,400 rubles a month for a bed there and that he must pay one-third of it. His trade union pays the other two-thirds.

Then, if you inquire where the union welfare fund comes from you discover that the worker automatically pays 6 percent of his wages to the union every payday. That's it. A mighty high cost for such sketchy insurance.

Another of the functions about which much has been said and written, and for which the Communists have often been praised, are their nursery schools which free mothers from care for many hours and serve as preschool training.

But nowhere have I read or heard—until I inquired on the scene of Soviet parents—the plain fact that this great service furnished by the state, costs the parents 100 rubles or 130 rubles a month. (The person who said he had to pay 130 rubles explained this was his fee because his wife also worked).

I was told the students at the Institutes or college levels have dining rooms and dormitories furnished, usually in the same building where instruction is given. I assumed this was all free.

I don't know, though, since the person who was describing these glories to me went a step farther and announced that if a student has full marks and is a needy person, he may get a stipend or scholarship from the government.

This being a society where everyone not only has a job but must have a job, and where all wages are supposed to be adequate, I asked the straightforward, obvious question—what is considered a needy student?

"An orphan," was the blunt reply. "Maybe both parents were killed in the war. Like that."

This doesn't sound like free education to me. (On the other hand, if a student doesn't have full marks he cannot go to college under any circumstances. His future is settled for good at age 14 or 15.)

Even in our own materialistic, capitalistic society you can walk into the Government's fabulous Smithsonian Institution or National Art Gallery without reaching in your pocket. Not so in the Soviet Union. There is an admission charge for everything including national museums and art galleries.

The only thing that I'm sure is really free in Russia are the public parks—and if there is entertainment there, the gates will be closed and admission charged there as well.

Clinic treatment by doctors may also be free. I don't know. I do know that they say you can get the doctor you want if you pay enough—and I was also told on very good and reliable authority that the proud boast that 80 percent of the doctors are women is not as it sounds.

The fact that the doctors are terribly overworked and terribly underpaid, there being a shocking shortage of men in the Soviet Union, well-educated men who prefer other duty generally get their preference. Hence, few men doctors. They don't want to be.

There are many such surprises in the Soviet Union for the visitor who asks simple questions of ordinary people.

Integrity Makes News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a fine article published in the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, of today, July 30, 1959, written by John Herling, praising Eric Peterson, secretary-treasurer of the Machinists Union, who has served his union and the public with integrity and distinction.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEGRITY MAKES NEWS

(By John Herling)

Organized labor has been placed on the defensive so long by certain revelations of the McClellan committee investigating improper practices that frequently union spokesmen do not appear to have energy left for some positive thinking.

Although Senator MCCLELLAN has sought to assure the country more than once that the great majority of union men are "fine upstanding Americans," almost nobody has taken time out to get down to cases.

This reporter believes integrity makes more significant, if less spectacular, news than skulduggery. For me and for other observers of the labor scene, the symbol of character in action, one who spoke for and administered his union without fear and without reproach, is a man named Eric Peterson.

Eric Peterson is no noisemaker, and no newsmaker, either, in the conventional sense. He is secretary-treasurer of the Machinists Union, with 900,000 members, one of the largest in the United States. His whole life has been a union life. For him the union has been the base from which flowed great concern for the needs of the whole community, in its broadest meaning.

I am talking about Mr. Peterson for a special reason. He is going to leave his union post next month when he reaches 65, the age of compulsory retirement from a working life which began in Teddy Roosevelt's day.

The Peterson story is typically American because Eric is American by choice, so to speak. At 10 he came from Sweden with his mother to join his father, a "real boot and shoe craftsman," Eric says, who had settled in Rawlins, Wyo., 2 years before. Young Eric sped through school and soon was doing what came naturally to poor folks 50 years ago, he began to work. He started his apprenticeship as a machinist in a railroad shop.

Eric continued to train himself through independent reading and endless debates on political and social issues, the give and take which sharpened the minds of generations of union men. In 1911, came the strike on the Union Pacific, the Harriman line. In that day and age, when you went on strike, you took your job in your hands. Young Peterson became a marked man. He was blacklisted by the company.

He moved on to Deer Lodge, Mont. He was elected an officer of the local machinists lodge. He became machinists' delegate on the Milwaukee line which ran from Chicago to the Pacific. People began to know him as a straight shooter, a man of simply stated principles.

Then he took part in the famous 1922 railroad shopmen's strike. This was a dispute over management's effort to cut wages. Mr. Peterson recalls it as a long and bitter strike, which the unions lost. "It was worth the sacrifice," he says. "We stopped the wage cutting. Only old Dan Willard, then president of the Baltimore & Ohio, arranged to have the union men go back to their jobs with their honor and union intact. The others started company unions."

In craft unions, recognition usually comes slowly, but once given, it sticks. Nothing nails a man faster than being too big for his britches. But Eric became known as a man who helped his union grow and grew with, and not past, his union.

Machinists secretary-treasurer since 1944, Mr. Peterson's conduct of his offices was strict and straight. Grief came to him once. About 10 years ago, a trusted employee was found to have been stealing payroll funds. There was no hesitation on the union's part; the man was convicted. But, the incident of misplaced trust almost shattered Eric. As a responsible officer, he wouldn't duck. He insisted on taking responsibility. Even more, he believed his stern sense of duty required him to resign.

He went before the union convention, gave a complete, unvarnished report and offered his resignation. The tension in the hall was almost unbearable. Then the silence was broken as if by a deep sigh. One rank-and-file delegate after another arose to tell Eric, sitting on the platform pale and quiet, that they wouldn't hear of his quitting. The convention became a meeting of solemn dedication. The vote of confidence became a roar of appreciation. On the platform, Eric wept. It was a great moment for him, perhaps even greater for his union. For the assembled delegates knew that without Eric Peterson, the trade union movement would shed bitter tears.

The Bentley Bill, H.R. 2729

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, Washington, D.C.

The statement treats the Bentley bill, H.R. 2729, which would require manufacturers to maintain equal prices in sales to independent retailers and company-owned stores.

The statement follows:

The Department of Commerce has a new "two-way look," according to George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business. "And the style doesn't look good for the Nation's 4 million independent businessmen," he added.

Burger spoke out today against the Department's endorsement of legislation which would provide auto dealers with territorial security and its stand on the Bentley equal pricing bill, which they stated: "is diametrically opposed to the present antitrust and business practice laws and philosophy."

"The Department of Commerce is looking in both directions. The two-way look comes from their reaction to the Bentley bill—H.R. 2729—which would strengthen already existing antitrust laws, and the territorial security legislation which would weaken present antitrust philosophy." The territorial security legislation is now pending before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, while the Bentley bill is pending before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

"It would be interesting to find out," Burger said, "why Commerce favors legislation permitting auto manufacturers to allocate sales territories to dealers, an idea which already has been vigorously opposed by the antitrust agencies."

"And then, at the same time, the Department of Commerce registers opposition to the Bentley bill—H.R. 2729—which has as its basic purpose fair and equitable treatment for the independent retailer."

The Bentley bill would require manufacturers to give equal prices to independent retailers and company-owned stores. This would affect merchants in the many concentrated industries.

North Dakota Summer Drama Needs Vocal Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, North Dakota has many assets. It offers as much or more opportunity as perhaps any State in the Nation. Far too few people realize that North Dakota is one of the most interesting vacation areas in the United States. It is a paradise for hunters. Its highly developed agriculture makes it a garden spot of the world in the summertime.

The scenic Badlands in North Dakota attracted no less a personality than the late President Theodore Roosevelt long before the turn of the century. It was in the Badlands that Theodore Roosevelt established a ranch and became one of our most loved and repected residents.

One of the greatest attractions for tourists is the theatrical production playing almost nightly in the beautiful Burning Hills Amphitheater at Medora entitled "Old Four Eyes." This production depicts the life of Theodore Roosevelt in the Badlands. Thousands of tourists have stopped to enjoy this expertly presented and interesting drama.

Another very interesting drama being played nightly in North Dakota is "Trail West" at Mandan. This depicts the story of General Custer from the time he left Fort Lincoln near Mandan until his ill-fated battle with the Sioux Indians at the Little Big Horn.

Mr. President, an editorial appearing in the Fargo Forum published at Fargo, N. Dak., under date of July 26, 1959, very aptly and interestingly discusses these two productions. It is the kind of editorial I am sure would be of interest to people everywhere. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be prirnted in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA SUMMER DRAMA NEEDS VOCAL SUPPORT

North Dakota has planted two cultural flowers along U.S. Highway 10 in the western part of the State which may produce a State promotion crop of significance, economically and otherwise, to virtually every citizen.

The seed is of good quality, the soil couldn't be better, the flowers have begun to bloom, and all that remains to bring out their full beauty and fragrance is for North Dakotans to use their tongues.

For the truth appears to be that the only element lacking for the full flowering of the State's two outdoor historical dramas, "Old Four Eyes" and "Trail West" near Medora and Mandan, is talk.

Persuasive chatter with the tourists swarming through the State like so many bees; telling the story of these colorful summertime theatrical productions and sending them to the "flowers" may spell the difference between success and failure.

Some may be inclined to reason that the flourishing or withering of these lively demonstrations of North Dakota's capabilities in the field of fine arts will have little influence on the business or cultural life of the State.

Pondering the facts might lead to another conclusion.

By their silence North Dakotans may be passing up their greatest opportunity in many years to sell the State and the charm of its colorful frontier history and western landscape to the thousands of visitors who pass through on U.S. 10 every summer.

What can result from the experiences of these tourists is anybody's guess.

Of one fact there can be no doubt. When they get home they are going to recall the highlights of their excursions and relate them to their kin and friends.

Among those highlights are going to be tales of the nights at colorful Fort Abraham Lincoln, and the quaint old cowtown of Medora.

Of sitting under the stars with sagebrush scenting the air, watching the reenactment of dramatic episodes in the lives of such famous figures as Gen. George A. Custer, and Theodore Roosevelt in his Dakota Territory days.

That these tourists may be induced by the dramas to linger and learn more about the State, to visit historic sites, beauty spots, and other attractions goes without saying. That their recitals may send many others into the State is a pretty safe guess.

Tourists taking a liking to North Dakota can stimulate many things.

Business for hotels, cafes, and many other enterprises; acquaintance with the State's scenic beauty, its lusty frontier days, and its many commercial advantages; a dispelling of unfavorable concepts about the climate and topography; employment for more people in the service fields, and perhaps other things not now envisioned.

To sum up, North Dakota has in these two plays an investment in a bigger share in America's fabulously large expenditure in the tourist industry and the prospect of expansion in the State's economic life from which it may realize abundant dividends.

While "Old Four-Eyes" and "Trail West" are the flowers from which honey can be drawn and poured back into North Dakota, it appears from a study of the situation that North Dakotans need to do some sipping too.

As a matter of fact, only a fraction of the State's own 600,000 "bees" have been drawn to the blossoms.

Despite the substantial "hovering" about "Old Four-Eyes" by locals last year the percentage of State support lacks a volume to gloat about. Many more need to come and see, and take a role in telling the story to tourists as well as their neighbors and friends.

Much printed publicity has been spread around the country but North Dakotans appear not to be using this effective means of evoking widespread interest in such a venture—enthusiastic chatter directed at tourists.

Every service station attendant, garage worker, hotel clerk, busboy, waitress, and cafe cashier in the State could train their voices effectively on the pleasure-seeking traveler and his family. They can deliver a "don't miss it" sales talk that will be persuasive and convincing.

And this is the goal at which the organizations and leaders in the two enterprises are now aiming and in which they are already achieving some success.

North Dakotans who have seen the plays are being asked to write 10 letters to friends

telling them the story. At Mandan recently, several waitresses were awarded prizes for their outdoor drama chatter in a citywide contest.

Some North Dakotans seem to have conceived the belief that lack of lodging and poor roads will make trips to the plays uncomfortable and inconvenient.

This is unfortunate since there are both ample facilities and hard-surfaced roads, although hotels and motels are not as concentrated as in a metropolitan area.

What about the plays themselves? The brain children of Dr. Frederick Walsh, head of the drama department at NDAC in Fargo, who had dreamt about them for years, they were brought out over a 2-year period. He produced "Old Four-Eyes" in 1958 and added "Trail West" this year.

Thomas Patterson of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C., wrote "Old Four-Eyes" and Walsh and W. T. Chichester, a new member of the NDAC drama department, coauthored "Trail West."

They are fashioned in the form of the symphonic drama, similar to the well known "Lost Colony" production of Paul Green, a former associate of the two Fargoans, which was introduced to the theatrical world in 1937 with remarkable success.

Tried and proven in the East, this form of play was viewed by Walsh as likely to enjoy similar favor in North Dakota. The State had a colorful landscape for its staging and an atmosphere and such dashing figures as Custer and Roosevelt for the story line, he felt.

"Old Four-Eyes" drew large crowds in its first year, earned money and led to the second production. The zeal, energy, and physical labor of Walsh, his players and assistants had paid off.

To tell the story of how Walsh, Chichester, and their players turned common laborers to dig in the earth, build seating, stages, and settings, and engage in the thousand and one other activities to making a play would be material of a volume to fill a book.

To tell of the cooperation of other North Dakotans in attending meetings, raising funds and otherwise contributing to the project would be to assemble enough facts for another.

The actors are people with dramatic ability and a willingness to work hard because of their love of the stage. Some are North Dakotans, others are young people from other States, most of them college drama students.

Without doubt Walsh, Chichester, and the players stand to gain prestige and some financial benefit in the minimum salary incomes from the plays but the money can total but a bagatelle compared with the benefit to the State.

Funds in excess of expenses are going into North Dakota promotional and development projects of various kinds.

Statehood and Hawaii's People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, our Delegate to Congress from Hawaii describes the victory for statehood in the summer, 1959, issue of State Government. The Honorable JOHN A. BURNS explains that the achievement of statehood is both a fulfillment and a beginning. It is a fulfillment of the peoples' longstanding aspirations and efforts and the beginning of a new period of opportunity for them to release their energies to realize their full identity and deep hopes.

Delegate BURNS' article, entitled "Statehood and Hawaii's People," follows:

STATEHOOD AND HAWAII'S PEOPLE

(By JOHN A. BURNS, Delegate from Hawaii)

Like most events in human life, statehood for Hawaii's people is both a fulfillment and a beginning. In one sense the profoundest hopes and desires of Hawaii's people are, with statehood, realized; in another sense, statehood is only the first step toward realizing those hopes and desires. Statehood signifies the full emergence of Hawaii's people, and it signifies also their first real opportunity for full, genuine emergence.

Anyone who thinks, and who has bothered to give some context to his thinking—who knows history, literature, and the like—knows that the search for identity, which characterizes most of our individual lives, is one of the great problems of modern life. It has, of course, been a human problem ever since human life began, but it is so potently and primarily a modern problem that one may be excused for thinking it only a modern one. The great question—for individuals, as for larger groups—is "Who am I?" One thinks, for example, of such a book as "The Education of Henry Adams," and of such a peculiarly modern phenomenon as nationalism. It would be easy to multiply examples.

Within the political sphere—using the word "political" in its widest, almost its Aristotelian sense—we in the United States have proposed as the best answer to this problem the institutions of democracy. These institutions, we believe, insure for the human person the opportunity to develop and realize himself in whatever way he can best do this. They provide for the individual person, therefore, both incentive and milieu for his discovery of self, for his emergence. Democracy, as we understand it, is characterized principally by this kind of openness, an openness which allows for and encourages a genuine "aristocracy of talent" in Adams' and Jefferson's phrase.

A MOVEMENT OF THE PEOPLE

The movement for statehood in Hawaii has always been, first and last, a movement of its people. All of the benefits of statehood which one usually lists are certainly important, but they all point to something deeper. For Hawaii's people statehood represents at once their achievement of identity and their opportunity, finally, to achieve that identity as best they can.

Under statehood, for example, Hawaii's people can at last elect their own Governor. State government, therefore, will reside in their hands. They are now fully responsible for their own affairs. They can, by means of their government, shape their milieu in whatever fashion they think best. They can, in a real sense, create through this means their own image of themselves.

It is no accident that statehood comes at precisely the time when there is now in Hawaii—for the first time ever—a genuine two-party system. As late as 1945 the then leading figure in the Republican Party in Hawaii stated, privately, his firm belief that one would never see the day when there would be a Democratic Party worth much notice in Hawaii. In 1954 the Democratic Party won control of both houses of the territorial legislature, and has since maintained this control, by large majorities. Whatever future political contests may determine in this respect, we now have real contests. The narrowly partisan aspects of this development are irrelevant here. What it signifies—and one could cite other events signifying in different ways the same thing—is the emergence of Hawaii's people, their discovery of their own possibilities, their own strength, their own ability to make choices, their own voice.

Hawaiian statehood is, from many points of view, a victory. It is a victory for America, for world peace, for freedom. But in the sense in which it concerns us here, it is a victory for Hawaii's own people. It comes as a climax of a long, hard struggle, not simply in the Congress, but more especially and really in Hawaii itself. The reasons why Hawaii did not achieve statehood, say, 10 years ago—and one could without much exaggeration say 60 years ago—lie not in the Congress but in Hawaii. The most effective opposition to statehood has always originated in Hawaii itself. For the most part it has remained under cover and has marched under other banners. Such opposition could not afford to disclose itself, since it was so decidedly against the interests and desires of Hawaii's people generally.

STATEHOOD VERSUS CENTRALIZATION

I cannot clarify these remarks, as I would like to by a detailed account of pertinent Hawaiian history, but perhaps I can at least adumbrate briefly and generally some relevant facts of this history. The term that best describes the situation which more recent events in Hawaii have broken through is "centralization." And one can best see the significance, in at least one important sense, of Hawaiian statehood for Hawaii's people, if he views statehood as the converse of this centralization—a centralization which the emergence of Hawaii's people, gradual at first and accelerated since World War II—has largely destroyed. Traces of it still remain but statehood will enable us to dispose of them.

TERRITORIAL FORMATIONS

In 1893 with the collusion of the American minister in Hawaii and a contingent of U.S. Marines, a group of insurgents overthrew Hawaii's independent monarchy and set up a so-called "provisional government." This government negotiated with the United States resulting in a treaty not consented to by the U.S. Senate, whereby Hawaii was "incorporated with the United States as an integral part thereof." In 1898 Hawaii was annexed to the United States; in 1900 it was given the political status of an incorporated territory, and its new "constitution," the Hawaiian Organic Act, was enacted by Congress.

These are rather bare facts, and I should like to amplify them a little. The overthrow of the monarchy was a decidedly unpopular event, and so—as the report of Presidential Commissioner Blount, who investigated the "revolution," clearly showed—was the proposed annexation to the United States. The small group which overthrew the monarchy was distrusted by the people at least as much as it in turn distrusted them. The people's opposition to annexation was not at all a sign of antagonism to the United States—for which, on the contrary, they had deep affection and respect—but rather a sign of antagonism to the ruling group in Hawaii. The form of government which this group "provisionally" set up was much more rigidly centralized than that of the previous constitutional monarchy. The mass of the people were prevented from voting, and power remained in the hands of a very few, the propertied class.

Senator Morgan of Alabama, who came to Hawaii after annexation as a member of the commission set up to devise an organic act had urged that Hawaii apply for admission as a State in the Union. But the Hawaii members of the commission did not agree with the Senator's opinion that Hawaii's people were ready for statehood.

The constitution which the commission drew up and proposed to the Congress for adoption is interesting in many respects, but in none more than in its suffrage provisions. At the adamant insistence of the two Hawaiian members of the commission—S. F. Dole and W. F. Frear—property and income qualifications had been added to the usual educational qualification. Had this proposal been adopted, the majority of Hawaii's people, though citizens of an incorporated Territory of the United States, would not have been able to vote. Since the literacy rate among Hawaii's people was extremely high, a simple educational qualification would have allowed most of those who were of age to vote. It is interesting to note that Senator "Pitchfork Ben" Tillman of South Carolina was the man who secured for Hawaii's people the right to vote under their territorial form of government. As a result of Senator Tillman's persistence, the organic act passed Congress with only a literacy qualification of voting, much to the consternation of the ruling group in Hawaii.

A CONSTRICTIVE STRUCTURE

Still, the territorial form of government itself was decidedly centralized and constricting, especially in its executive structure. The Territorial Governor, appointed by the President of the United States, himself controlled by appointment the entire administrative machinery, exercised a two-thirds veto power over the elected legislature, and had such powers on the whole that he would have been considered unusually strong even if he had been an elected Governor. And there was no local government of any kind.

Although the Territorial legislature passed measures providing for the establishment of county governments, the Territorial executive vetoed these measures. Finally, after an investigation into Hawaii affairs, a congressional committee, in its report, deplored the lack of local government, severely rebuked the Territorial executive for his antagonism toward popular government, and warned that if the Territory did not soon institute county governments—which obviously the people wanted, needed, and were thoroughly qualified to sustain—the Congress would institute it. The Governor, as a result, allowed a bill to pass without veto.

MOTIVES FOR STATEHOOD

Clearly the issue in the events I have described is between a deep antipathy toward popular government on the one hand and the pressure of the people on the other. I have described statehood as the resolution of this issue, as a victory of the people, because the same principles and desires were at work in the movement toward statehood as in, for one instance, the movement for county government. The desire was for a free, open system as against a closed one whose control came from the top—for democracy, in other words, as against hegemony rule. Only statehood would bring full self-government and confer upon Hawaii's citizens full, responsible participation in the life of their country.

It is interesting that, while the first statehood bill introduced by a Hawaiian Delegate to Congress came in 1919, the Territorial legislature as early as 1903 had petitioned the Congress to pass an enabling act permitting Hawaii to adopt a constitution. The initiative clearly came from the people through their elected representatives.

ACTION HELD UP

Really serious action on statehood did not emerge for some time, despite clear if not as yet articulate or organized popular desire for it. The reasons were many. Time was spent on the Hawaiian Homes Commission, county government, the bill of rights and other projects. These were all good and necessary, but occupied an unnecessary amount of time and effort, since many in power prolonged the process of attaining these programs and making them effective in order to allay any great demand from the people for a serious, all-out effort in behalf of statehood. The top economic group in the Islands was then adamantly opposed to statehood, as were the political powers, whose continued existence as powers depended upon these top economic interests. Referring to the first introduction of a statehood bill in Congress by Delegate Jonah Kuhio Kalanianole in 1919, one authority states further:

"The leading Honolulu newspapers were opposed to it. They were greatly concerned over the Japanese problem in the territory * * * and the Star-Bulletin referred to the statehood bill as a 'ridiculous proposal.'" [1]

Despite the very real and sincere desire of Hawaii's people for statehood, and despite the similarly real and sincere efforts of such Delegates as William Jarrett and Victor S. K. Houston, little progress was made toward that end for some time, since controlling groups in the Islands so strongly opposed the statehood bill as, in the words of the Star-Bulletin, a "ridiculous proposal." But with passage of the Jones-Costigan Sugar Act of 1934,[2] the slightly earlier Massie case [3] and its resultant exhaustive investigation into every cranny of Hawaii's affairs, even the controlling groups thought it would be wise to support statehood.

NEW LIFE FOR THE MOVEMENT

In 1935, at the request of Delegate Samuel Wilder King, a congressional House subcommittee visited the Islands to investigate the possibilities of statehood. The report of this subcommittee was favorable, but it recommended further study. In 1937, a joint congressional committee, composed of 12 Senators and 12 Representatives, visited the islands, where they held hearings and conducted a comprehensive study of Hawaii's affairs. The committee concluded that Hawaii had "fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted of Territories," and was therefore entitled to a "sympathetic consideration of its plea for statehood." The committee recommended further that a plebiscite be held in the islands to determine whether a substantial number of Hawaii's citizens wanted statehood. Such a plebiscite was held in the November 5, 1940, general election—in the midst of a tense world situation—and the vote exceeded 2 to 1 in favor of statehood. The war postponed further efforts.

The war changed many things. Perhaps the most significant change in Hawaii since the war, and to a great extent because of the war, has been the emergence of its people to a new self-awareness. Two factors played a great part in this: the activity of the labor unions, and the activity of returning veterans, especially those of Japanese ancestry, which became a potent force for economic democracy and, as a result, for democracy in general. These factors, especially, buttressed the fight for statehood.

In 1946 a House subcommittee, headed by Representative Henry Larcade of Louisiana, conducted an exhaustive on-the-spot survey of conditions in Hawaii. In its report the subcommittee stated that Hawaii's people had "demonstrated beyond question not only their loyalty and patriotism but also their desire to assume the responsibilities of statehood." It stated further that "The Territory now meets the necessary requirements for statehood," and recommended "that the Committee on Territories give immediate consideration to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood."

Under the leadership of Delegate Joseph R. Farrington, who had succeeded Delegate King when the latter, in 1942, resigned to accept a commission in the Navy, a Hawaiian statehood bill passed the House of Representatives in 1947 by a vote of 195 to 133. No final action was taken in the Senate.

ACTION IN HAWAII—COMPLICATIONS IN CONGRESS

In Hawaii, meanwhile, the territorial legislature had established the Hawaii Statehood Commission, replacing an Equal Rights Commission, which was to assist Hawaii's Delegate to Congress in his efforts in behalf of statehood. The legislature, further, enacted in 1949 a bill authorizing a convention to draft a proposed State constitution. An election was held in which the people elected their delegates to the convention. The convention drafted a constitution which was subsequently approved by the territorial legislature. At the November 7, 1949, general election, Hawaii's people approved the constitution by a 3-to-2 margin.

In Congress the House again passed a Hawaii statehood bill in 1950. The Senate Interior Committee favorably reported the bill, but no further action was taken. In 1953 the difficulty was compounded when, after the House had passed a Hawaii bill, the Senate passed one only after adding Alaska to it. The House Rules Committee refused to grant a conference request and thus killed the bill. The main problem for the two Territories thereafter involved the attempt to combine their bills, since this attempt joined those who opposed both bills with those who opposed one bill but not the other.

THE VICTORY WON

Thus in the 85th Congress, in which sentiment, for whatever reason, favored Alaska rather than Hawaii, Hawaii deliberately stepped aside, allowing Alaska to be considered alone. The astonishingly swift passage—not unanticipated—of the Hawaii bill in the 86th Congress was a direct result of Hawaii's part in passage of the Alaska bill and of that passage itself.

It is impossible to name here the many outstanding people in the Congress, in the 49 States and in Hawaii who have played special and notable parts in preparing for and helping to secure the passage of the Hawaii statehood bill. Fundamentally, no one man or group of men is responsible. Statehood is, as I have said, a victory of and for Hawaii's people, and it is they who are responsible. It is they who have made for Hawaii the distinguished record by which it so patently deserved statehood. Anything that any man from Hawaii did to help secure statehood was successful only insofar as he genuinely represented Hawaii's people, and embodied their deeds and achievements.

Just to hint at the tremendous, joint effort that made statehood possible, let me note very briefly a few things that helped secure passage in this 86th Congress. Certainly one major factor in the bill's swift passage was a prodigious letter-writing campaign that originated in Hawaii. The newspapers, radio, TV, civic and citizen groups, and the people of Hawaii generally, joined in promoting and implementing the idea that each citizen of Hawaii should write his friends in the States urging them in turn to write their Congressmen and Senators in support of Hawaiian statehood. In another significant move, the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce, with no publicity and a modesty that belied its very real effectiveness, sent

[1] R. S. Kuykendall and A. G. Day. Hawaii: A History. Prentice-Hall, New York, 1948, p. 288.

[2] The act severely limited the amount of Hawaiian sugar marketable in the United States.

[3] A celebrated case in which a Naval officer and others were tried, convicted and pardoned for the murder of a Hawaiian.

businessmen to Washington to assist the Delegate in his efforts in behalf of statehood.

A NEW ERA IS OPENED

I have tried, very briefly, to suggest something of what statehood means to Hawaii's people, some of the events that occurred, and some of the factors involved, in the long effort of Hawaii's people to secure statehood. I have characterized this effort as part of a movement from a closed, centralized scheme of things to more open, diversified, and flexible forms. Statehood, I have said, in one sense completes this movement, and in another sense gives it an opportunity really to begin. Statehood is the ground and condition for a full sense of identity on the part of Hawaii's people, a full sense of their possibilities and potentialities, and for the maximum development of these.

As a State, Hawaii is a unique and powerful asset to the United States in two chief ways. Geographically, economically, commercially, and culturally Hawaii occupies the central, preeminent position in the Pacific Ocean. To this world, therefore, and to the East—which together contain more than two-thirds of the world's population and countless other tremendous untapped resources—Hawaii is America's bridge. America's very real, tangible, and practical key to friendly, profitable relations with these areas. Further, in Hawaii's people—who are thoroughly American yet understand the peoples of the Pacific and the East, and can sympathize with their problems—the United States has its best means of utilizing Hawaii's position.

Statehood is the catalyst which releases the energies of Hawaii's people and gives them the opportunity to exploit these energies. Statehood opens up, as a result, a whole new era, a whole new area of possibility, for Hawaii and for the Nation.

A Food Stamp Plan as Part of Public Law 480

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture today opened hearings on the various proposals before Congress for distributing more surplus food to our needy, particularly through H.R. 1359, my bill to establish a food stamp plan. I appreciate very much the courtesy and kindness of Chairman COOLEY in permitting me to open the hearings and to discuss the proposed mechanics of a food stamp plan. I suggested today that H.R. 1359 be made a part of Public Law 480 for reasons I think are persuasive.

Because of the widespread interest among so many Members of Congress in the food stamp issue, as demonstrated last year in the 197 to 187 rollcall vote we had here on August 18 on this same measure, and as demonstrated by the many questions and comments made by members of the Committee on Agriculture during the 2 hours I testified this morning, I believe a good purpose might be served by placing my testimony in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for general review.

TABLE SHOWS PERCENTAGES OF RELIEF RECIPIENTS RECEIVING FOOD

I am also submitting for printing in the RECORD, a breakdown I have made of the reports and statistics from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as to the number of public assistance beneficiaries in each State, on the one hand, and of reports from the Department of Agriculture on the number of such welfare recipients receiving surplus food under the present distribution program. I have then struck the rough percentage figures to show what proportion of the provably most needy people in each State is actually receiving surplus food under the present program. These, I emphasize, are approximate rather than exact figures as to welfare recipients, but I have doublechecked them over a period of several months and I know they vary month to month within a very narrow range from those I have used.

Under unanimous consent, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit, first, my testimony this morning as follows:

AIDING THE FARMER BY PROVIDING MILLIONS OF NEW CUSTOMERS FOR NUTRITIOUS FOODS THROUGH A FOOD STAMP PLAN

(Testimony of Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, before House Committee on Agriculture at opening of hearings on H.R. 1359 by Mrs. SULLIVAN, and related bills for establishing a food stamp plan for distribution of surplus food to the needy, Thursday, July 30, 1959, 10 a.m.)

Chairman COOLEY and members of the committee, I am grateful to the chairman for scheduling full committee hearings on this legislation. In the three previous Congresses in which I have introduced this bill—or one very much like it—the hearings were usually conducted by subcommittee and I found afterward that the committee members who opposed the plan most vigorously in committee or on the House floor were almost always those who had not participated in the subcommittee hearings and thus, perhaps, were not fully aware of the opportunities provided in this legislation not only to help our needy but to help the farmer, too.

H.R. 1359, by the way, is the same bill which a majority of the members of this committee voted for last year and which a majority of the members of the House of Representatives also supported in a roll call vote on August 18, on which the tally was 196 to 187. As you know, the bill was considered under suspension of the rules requiring a two-thirds majority, so the bill did not pass despite majority support.

MILLIONS OF AMERICANS HAVE INADEQUATE DIETS

This year, I trust we can finally see it enacted. Many of those on the Republican side of the House who opposed the bill last August are no longer in Congress and their successors, I trust, will support this kind of bill to assure a better diet for the 7,000,000 or more Americans not now able to afford minimum levels of nutrition.

We are now sending frozen chickens to the United Arab Republic, and other foods of all kinds to Yugoslavia, Poland, India, and other countries all over the world—yet for our neediest here, we can provide only some corn meal or wheat flour, some powdered milk, and that's about all. We should be ashamed of ourselves for permitting this situation to exist, in the midst of such abundance of food—a blessing from God. The surplus is such that we are desperately trying to give it away and dump it all over the world and are in effect paying some countries to take it away. We even subsidize the shipping in some cases—pay the ocean transportation costs.

BILLIONS SPENT IN FEEDING HUNGRY OF OTHER COUNTRIES

This committee has just completed extensive hearings on Public Law 480, the basic legislation for foreign distribution of surplus American food. We have spent many billions in giving food away overseas in these past 5 years. I am not against aiding the people of other nations, sharing our abundance with them, promoting peace by helping to feed the hungry. I merely want to point out that we also have hungry people here. And we are not doing, in proportion, nearly as much for them as we are for the underprivileged and undernourished of other lands. The figures prove it. More surplus food is sent as a giveaway overseas than is donated in the United States—even including the gifts of food to the school lunch program.

AMEND PUBLIC LAW 480 TO INCLUDE FOOD STAMP PLAN AND GIVE FIRST PRIORITY ON SURPLUS FOR OUR OWN NEEDY

Since Public Law 480 includes in title III, authority for domestic distribution of surplus food to our needy, and since Public Law 480 will shortly have to come before the House for renewal and extension, I would like to suggest now that H.R. 1359 be written into Public Law 480 as an additional program. The language for accomplishing that could be worked out easily and quickly, and we would thereby achieve two important purposes: One, we would assure that the first priority on distribution of foods in surplus go to our own needy rather than to the needy of other countries—under present law, the Department of Agriculture apparently contends it is not permitted to give away some surplus items here if any foreign country wants to arrange to obtain those same items under Public Law 480; and secondly, we would assure prompt House consideration of this plan as a logical provision of legislation dealing with the whole question of surplus distribution. We saw last year how H.R. 13067 was locked up in the Rules Committee so that it could come up for a vote only under the suspension of the rules procedure which led to its demise.

I believe Chairman COOLEY agrees with me that this bill now belongs as part of Public Law 480, and I earnestly urge that it be so included.

HARD CORE OF 7 MILLION NEEDY

Now, Mr. Chairman and colleagues, let me tell you why I think this legislation is so vital not only to our own needy but to the American farmer as well. We have, as I said, more than 7 million Americans not now able to buy even the barest minimum diet. These are the people on various forms of public assistance. The are—most of them—in dire need in either good times or bad. They form a hard core of the needy aged, the needy disabled, the blind, the families without income except what comes from public agencies or private charities. Their monthly checks do not cover minimum needs. In addition, in bad times—in recession—the ranks of the needy are swelled by millions more temporarily without jobs who may have used up their unemployment benefits—or who were not eligible for unemployment compensation. Many of them cannot get on public assistance regardless of need, in certain States, if they are "employable." Nevertheless, they still have to eat.

Here in Washington, in the Nation's Capital, Eve Edstrom of the Washington Post did a heartrending series of articles a year or so ago about hungry children rooting in garbage cans for something to eat. Out of this came a surplus distribution program here and a movement to provide more school lunches. But the problem Eve Edstrom wrote about in Washington was not an iso-

lated one—it can be duplicated in cities all over America.

PRESENT DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM A FAILURE

We have the food. We have, as I said, such an abundance of food, it is now considered by Mr. Benson to be a great calamity. It could be a great blessing if properly used. It is not now properly used to help our own needy—that is clear and undeniable.

True, we have a surplus distribution program in operation in this country. But it is a very inadequate program. Only one-third of our counties participate in it because of its cost. And the figures show, too, that only one-third of our public assistance recipients throughout the country receive any of the food—2⅓ million out of 7 million. If you take into account another fact, the statistics are even more discouraging—of the 2⅓ million relief recipients receiving surplus food, 400,000 are in Puerto Rico, one-quarter million each are in New York and Pennsylvania and Michigan. Another 175,000 are concentrated in Mississippi. For the rest of the States, therefore, in most cases anyway, far fewer than one-third of the relief recipients receive any surplus food. For instance, in the chairman's State of North Carolina, there are nearly 180,000 people on various forms of public assistance, but none of them receives any surplus food. In South Carolina there are 85,000 on public assistance, but none of them receives surplus food. It is not distributed to the public assistance people in Oregon, Nebraska, Louisiana, Idaho, Florida, or Delaware, to name a few. In my State, Missouri, only about 15 percent of the people on public assistance receive surplus food; in Texas and Wisconsin it is about the same; in California it is about 3 percent; in Georgia about 8 percent; in Massachusetts about 2 percent; in North Dakota about 4 percent; the same in Washington State, and so on. Of course, some of the States do much better than that, but on the whole it is a very spotty program as to coverage, and a completely unsatisfactory program in operation. It is a cruel hoax—a fraud—an illurion.

Any member of this committee who would disagree with me on that has just not bothered to go down to the distribution centers in the cities of our country and see this program in operation—not just in the distressed mining areas, but in any large city participating. People—old people, crippled, undernourished people—stand in long lines once a month or so to obtain big bags of flour or corn meal and some dried skim milk they cannot carry. There used to be some cheese and butter—but not now. Once, years ago, there was some canned beef. That was disposed of in one vast splurge—and then it was gone and there was never any more.

NO VARIETY IN FOODS DISTRIBUTED

When you investigate this present distribution system in places like Kentucky, West Virginia, the mining areas of Pennsylvania and Ohio and elsewhere, or talk to Members of Congress from those areas, you find it is a scandal—a crime against humanity. The costs of distribution far outweigh the value of the food. There is no variety.

Those are strong words, and I mean every one of them. I don't care how fine—how pious and decent—Mr. Benson and his aides may be in their personal lives—in this program they are participating in a cruel and inhumane thing when you stop to consider how much good—how much real good—could be accomplished with this surplus food. Even the chairman of the Republican National Committee concedes it is woefully inadequate. Of course, he blames the law for that; I blame the administration of the law.

Let me point out something that every one of you knows better than I—that the farmers of this country—most of them—are in real difficulty. You have struggled to devise legislation which can help the farmer, and you have received precious little help from the administration. And now you find that the House Members from city districts like mine are looking more and more askance at your proposals for aiding agriculture.

CITY FOLKS SEE NO RELATION TO FARM PROGRAMS

Why? Not because we are against the farmer. We know the farmer must be prosperous if the goods we make in the cities are to be sold. A prosperous farmer is a good customer for city industry.

But if I may say so, I would point out that most—nearly all—legislation you bring forward to aid the farmer neglects completely to tie your objective of reasonable farm prices into the companion problem of helping us to assure an adequate diet for all of our citizens. A food stamp program would establish that bond. It would provide at least 7 million new customers—regular customers—for the output of the average farm. Can you devise any better legislative device for increasing the consumption of farm commodities than by bringing in more customers—regular customers—for food items those people are not now buying?

FOOD STAMPS WOULD COVER ALL FOODS IN SURPLUS SUPPLY

As I have set up the program under H.R. 1359, the food stamp plan would provide for distribution through the stores of not just the storable surpluses but of the kind of foods, too, which can be acquired under section 32. We all know the Department has not used section 32 authority as Congress intended it to be used to help the farmer. We have had to force its greater use in the school lunch program, for instance.

There is no reason—no good reason—why fresh fruits and vegetables, and meats, when they are in such surplus as to cause marketing difficulties and depressed farm prices, cannot be utilized in season in a good stamp plan. There are hundreds of millions of dollars set aside each year from customs receipts—30 percent of customs receipts—for use in removing farm surpluses from the market. We have the maximum permissible annual carryover of $300 million in this fund, plus the additional $200 million or more made available each year—much of which is never used.

IS SECTION 32 WORTH CONTINUING?

This raises the question: If section 32 funds are not to be used both to help the farmer and the needy, then why continue section 32? By what right should this money be made available each year just to help the farmer, if no one else gets any benefit from it? If we cannot use it both to help the farmer and the needy in our cities, by providing more variety in the diets of our 7 million at the bottom of the economic ladder—people who go without the kind of food they need—then it seems to me that the usefulness of the section 32 program is over as far as the average citizen and taxpayer is concerned.

We all pay tariffs on imported goods, and the farmer no more so than anyone else. This fund has in it $500 million right now which could be used to reduce the national debt, if it is not going to be used to help those who need help. A food stamp plan, on the other hand, would provide a real incentive to the full use of the section 32 funds and authority.

DIRECT FARM PAYMENTS EXCEED 1 BILLION YEARLY

One last point and then I will try to answer your questions:

It has been suggested by some of the members of this committee that relief—public welfare—is not the job of the Department of Agriculture. That is true. But it seems to me that in first accumulating billions upon billions of dollars worth of food, then in dumping billions of dollars worth of food overseas for currencies we will probably never use to any significant extent except to give it back to the countries involved, and now in paying out more than $1 billion a year in direct cash payments to farmers, and another billion a year just to store our surplus food—there should also be room—there must be room—in such a program to aid the farmer by getting him more customers—7 or 8 million more regular customers each week for fresh eggs and fresh milk and an occasional half pound of bacon, or some fresh fruits and vegetables in season, or some chickens—all items at present well under parity.

WHY POWDER EGGS AND MILK?

We now buy up milk and eggs and powder them and give the powdered milk and powdered eggs away. Why not give out fresh milk and fresh eggs? Eggs are only at 58 percent of parity. We seem to be able to send chickens to Egypt but we can't provide them to our poorest here even though the price to the farmer is at 56 percent of parity. Apples here are at 53 percent of parity. Citrus fruits go up and down—they're up now—but often they are way down. Why not distribute some surplus oranges or grapefruit in season to our provable needy? A food stamp plan provides the machinery for using our surplus—not storing it or dumping it.

I do not agree with some Members who believe the surplus distribution program should be switched over to the Department of Health, Education, and Labor. It would mean complete duplication in two separate departments of surplus food distribution systems—one for the needy, another for the school lunch and other programs. The responsibility for using this food properly—effectively—lies in the Department of Agriculture, although my bill also includes consultation with Health, Education, and Welfare, and also Labor. The Agriculture Department has failed to use its authority to institute any effective food distribution program. Congress must force it to be done.

FOOD STAMP PLAN SAFER FROM VETO IN PUBLIC LAW 480

The only effective way of accomplishing that now would appear to be through the inclusion of a food stamp plan as part of Public Law 480. I am not unmindful of the fact that a veto could stop my food stamp bill much more effectively standing by itself than as part of Public Law 480, which the administration wants and needs. I ask your help, therefore, in working it out in this fashion.

And I sincerely believe that such a step would be one of the most effective things you could do at this point to help the hard-pressed small farmer who raises the varieties of foods needed for an adequate diet. Adding 7 or 8 million Americans to the number of his customers able to obtain a decent diet would be a tremendous help in boosting farm sales and farmers' income.

Thank you.

STATISTICS ON RELIEF RECIPIENTS RECEIVING SURPLUS FOOD

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit the tabulation I have prepared on the number of persons in each State on various forms of public assistance, the number of such persons and the percentage of such persons receiving surplus food under the present distribution system. The figures, as I said, are rough—but generally accurate:

TABULATION PREPARED BY REPRESENTATIVE SULLIVAN SHOWING STATE-BY-STATE PARTICIPATION IN PRESENT FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM BY PERSONS ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The following figures and percentages are rough approximations based on monthly estimates from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and on periodic re-

ports from Department of Agriculture. There may be some variation from month to month:

State	Number on assistance	Number on assistance receiving food	Approximate percentage welfare class receiving
Alabama	207,000	46,000	22.0
Alaska	6,410	0	0
Arizona	46,000	21,000	45.0
Arkansas	98,000	89,000	90.0
California	622,000	20,000	3.0
Colorado	93,000	20,000	22.0
Connecticut	58,000	800	1.5
Delaware	13,000	0	0
District of Columbia	20,000	20,000	100.0
Florida	185,000	0	0
Georgia	182,000	13,000	7.0
Hawaii	16,000	0	0
Idaho	16,000	0	0
Illinois	114,000	58,000	50.0
Indiana	91,000	49,000	55.0
Iowa	80,000	45,000	55.0
Kansas	62,000	12,000	20.0
Kentucky	150,000	75,000	50.0
Louisiana	251,000	0	0
Maine	44,000	26,000	58.0
Maryland	50,000	22,000	49.0
Massachusetts	168,000	4,000	2.0
Michigan	316,000	220,000	70.0
Minnesota	109,000	27,000	25.0
Mississippi	175,000	150,000	86.0
Missouri	245,000	35,000	14.0
Montana	24,000	235	1.0
Nebraska	35,000	0	0
Nevada	8,000	853	10.0
New Hampshire	15,000	4,600	30.0
New Jersey	96,000	14,000	15.0
New Mexico	39,000	29,000	75.0
New York	509,000	262,000	50.0
North Carolina	179,000	0	0
North Dakota	18,000	769	4.0
Ohio	345,000	61,000	18.0
Oklahoma	181,000	113,000	62.0
Oregon	58,000	0	0
Pennsylvania	362,000	271,000	75.0
Puerto Rico	239,000	400,000	[1] 165.0
Rhode Island	36,000	8,600	24.0
South Carolina	85,000	0	0
South Dakota	24,000	13,500	57.0
Tennessee	147,000	36,000	25.0
Texas	368,000	47,000	13.0
Utah	28,000	18,000	65.0
Vermont	15,000	4,700	31.0
Virgin Islands	1,700	0	0
Virginia	66,000	6,900	10.0
Washington	139,000	5,000	4.0
West Virginia	109,000	85,000	78.0
Wisconsin	107,000	17,000	16.0
Wyoming	8,800	5,000	57.0

[1] Estimates of persons on public assistance from HEW; estimates of persons on public assistance receiving surplus food from Department of Agriculture.

TEXT OF H.R. 1359

Mr. Speaker, because the bill itself clearly outlines the proposed mechanics of an effective food stamp plan in language which I believe is clear and understandable, I now submit for inclusion at this point in the RECORD the full text of H.R. 1359 as follows:

[86th Cong., 1st sess., in the House of Representatives, January 7, 1959, Mrs. SULLIVAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture]

H.R. 1359

A bill to provide for the establishment of a food stamp plan for the distribution of $1,000,000,000 worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to promote the general welfare, raise the levels of health and of nourishment for persons whose incomes prevent them from enjoying adequate diets, and dispose in a beneficial manner of food commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Department of Agriculture in carrying out price support operations or diverted from the normal channels of trade and commerce under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate and put into operation as quickly as possible, but not later than January 1, 1960, a program to distribute to needy persons in the United States through a food stamp system such surplus food commodities.

SEC. 2. In carrying out such program, the Secretary shall—

(1) distribute surplus food made available by the Secretary for distribution under this program only when requested to do so by a State or political subdivision thereof;

(2) issue, or cause to be issued, pursuant to section 3, food stamps redeemable by eligible needy persons for such types and quantities of surplus food as the Secretary shall determine;

(3) distribute surplus food in commercially packaged form, preferably through normal channels of trade;

(4) establish standards under which, pursuant to section 3, the welfare authorities of any State or political subdivision thereof may participate in the food stamp plan for the distribution of surplus foods to the needy;

(5) consult the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor, in establishing standards for eligibility for surplus foods and in the conduct of the program generally to assure achievement of the goals outlined in the first section of this Act; and

(6) make such other rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall issue, to each welfare department or equivalent agency of a State or political subdivision requesting the distribution of surplus food under section 2(1), food stamps for each kind of surplus food to be distributed, in amounts based on the total amount of surplus food to be distributed and on the total number of needy persons in the various States and political subdivisions eligible to receive such food. The food stamps shall be issued by each such welfare department or equivalent agency to needy persons receiving welfare assistance, or in need of welfare assistance but ineligible because of State or local law, and shall be redeemable by such needy persons at local distribution points to be determined by the Secretary under section 2(3).

SEC. 4. Surplus food distributed under this Act shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) granted needy persons by a State or any political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 5. In any one calendar year the Secretary is authorized to distribute surplus food under this Act to a value of up to $1,000,000,000, based on the cost to the Federal Government of acquiring, storing, and handling such food.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this Act, a needy person is anyone receiving welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) from the welfare department or equivalent agency of any State or political subdivision thereof, or who is, in the opinion of such agency or agencies, in need of welfare assistance but is ineligible to receive it because of State or local law.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor, shall make a study of, and shall report to Congress within six months after the date of enactment of this Act, on the feasibility of, the costs of, and the problems involved in, extending the scope of the food stamp plan established by this Act to include persons receiving unemployment compensation, receiving old-age and survivors insurance (social security) pensions, and other low income groups not eligible to receive food stamps under this Act by reason of section 6 of this Act.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The Great Menace to America's Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following address by Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield appeared in Child Family Digest for May-June 1959.

The subject is the handling of obscene literature, pictures, slides, and so forth, through the Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress should not adjourn without passing legislation to strengthen the Postmaster General's and the Department's hand in this matter. The flood of absolute, unmitigated filth going through the mail now is something that is truly alarming, especially as most of it goes into the hands of our schoolchildren.

There is no doubt that we could get action now if the public, especially the mothers of America, knew what is happening:

THE GREAT MENACE TO AMERICA'S CHILDREN: WHAT CAN I DO ABOUT IT

(Address by the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, before Conference of Women Leaders of Civic, Educational, Parent, and Religious Organizations and Women Members of the Congress and Government Agencies, Washington, D.C., May 12, 1959)

There is flourishing in this country today a vile racket of huge proportions about which the public is not well informed.

This racket involves the use of the U.S. mails for the wholesale promotion and conduct of mail-order business in obscene and pornographic materials.

I say it is huge advisedly. We can estimate at present that the sale of these materials through the mails is running at more than $500 million a year.

The especially vicious aspect of this racket is the fact that these purveyors of filth are aiming their attention more and more at the Nation's children—teen-age boys and girls, and even younger.

They are dumping pornographic sewage into the hands of hundreds of thousands of our children, through the family mailbox—most of it material that has not been ordered—material intended to solicit the sale of utterly obscene pictures, slides, films, and related trash.

How do these merchants of filth obtain the names and addresses of children?

They have any number of ways. One of the most common is to offer, in a legitimate ad in a normal publication, the sale of a product of interest to a boy or girl. This would be stamps, or model airplanes, or doll clothes, and the like. These items are frequently offered at bargain prices.

The child, usually with the parent's assistance, sends for and receives the item. Now the smut dealer has the name on his list,

and soon the child is receiving lewd solicitations through the mail.

These racketeers also buy prepared mailing lists of children's names, of which there are many. They even go to the extent of gathering up high school year books, from which they take names and match them up with addresses in city telephone books.

Recently, we conducted a raid in New York City in which we confiscated 17 tons of highly obscene printed and filmed materials. The producer of these materials had in his possession a mailing lits of names and addresses of 100,000 persons, including many high school students.

If you were to read some of the solicitation material that these debauched persons send to the children, I believe you would be sickened.

You would also be deeply disturbed to read the letters our postmasters receive from parents. Such letters for example as one from a mother who wrote: "The enclosed material was received by my son, age 8 years, a few days ago. Is there anything that can be done to stop this?"

The material sent to the 8-year-old boy began with the statement: "I am writing to you as a person interested in collecting all types of art photography of nudes."

Or like the letter which read: "Is there anything that can be done about literature like the enclosed? This is a mother's plea to you to do all in your power to stop the flow of this filth from seeping into our home. Thank you for anything you can do to protect my 10-year-old girl."

Or the letter which stated: "I am enclosing a folder sent to boys at our camp. Is there any way that this terrible literature and its source can be destroyed?"

It is apparent that many children, without parental attention, do fall into the trap of ordering such material, for the filth merchants regard their traffic with children as a major and growing part of their highly lucrative business.

Most parents who intercept these solicitations in the mail are, of course, shocked and greatly concerned. Last year, our Postal Inspection Service investigated 14,000 complaints about obscenity in the mails. Nearly two-thirds of these complaints were from parents objecting to the receipt of lewd materials by their adolescent children.

In the case of a single mailing by one purveyor of filth, over 5,000 complaints were received, and all but three were from parents protesting mailings to their children.

On the basis of all the facts we have, our Inspection Service estimates that probably 700,000 to one million children this year will receive such invitations to depravity through the mails.

This is big business. It thrives on the curiosity of adolescents. It has no boundaries based upon social position, religion, race, or location. Your child, or the child next door, may be on a list. If not, he—or she—may get on one. For the lists are expanding. Nobody is immune. Obscene mail is addressed to both sides of the track. It finds its way into orphanages. It is addressed to children as young as 8 years.

Yes, their parents will be worried—and well they should be. For it is well known to law enforcement groups that juvenile delinquency stems in measurable part from the demoralizing influence of exposure to obscenity and pornography.

Consider this, if you will, in the light of a recent report on delinquency by a Senate subcommittee. The report states that 1 out of every 5 boys in this country, of ages 10 to 17, has a court record, charged with breaking the law.

Again and again, in the investigations of armed robbery, extortion, embezzlement, and forgery, authorities find that those guilty of these crimes were early collectors of obscene pictures and films.

And it is well known that almost all sex criminals and sex murderers prove to have a long record of addiction to pornographic and sadistic material. Your children may never be exposed to this material. But they could be victims of sex criminals who have been exposed to it.

Let me quote from the report of the Senate subcommittee that studied this problem:

"There is a peculiar resemblance to narcotics addiction in exposure of juveniles to pornography. There is the same pattern of progression. Once initiated into a knowledge of the unnatural, the impressionable young mind with the insatiable curiosity characteristic of those reaching for maturity inevitably hunts for something stronger, something with more jolt, something imparting a greater thrill.

"The dealer in pornography is acutely aware of this progressive facet; his array of material to feed this growing hunger is carefully geared to the successive stages. Like the peddler of narcotics, his only interest is to insure that his customers are hooked; he knows that once they are hooked they will continue to pay and pay."

It is clear the Congress is concerned with this problem. Much good should come from the hearings now being held by the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Obscene Literature, headed by Congresswoman KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN.

This is a problem that must be met. I personally am both revolted and incensed by this depraved, arrogant, and poisonout attack on the minds of our children. These feelings are shared by our postmasters around the country and by my associates in the Post Office Department.

We recognize that there is urgent need for positive action now. We are, therefore, in effect, declaring war on these purveyors of filth, big and little, high and low.

We are launching an intense and unrelenting effort to stop this monstrous assault on the Nation's children in every way possible.

And let me say we are confident that, with adequate public support, this job can be done.

I do not mean to imply at all, of course, that the Post Office Department is only now awakening to this problem.

The records show quite clearly that the Post Office, over the years, has diligently tried to keep the mails clear of indecent material. It has done so even while subjected to attack and ridicule by those who hope to benefit personally from obscene mailings, and by those who, confusing liberty with license, unwittingly give them assistance.

Investigations conducted by our postal inspectors, in fiscal 1958, caused the arrest of 293 persons. Our General Counsel issued 92 orders barring use of the mails.

The arrests last year were 45 percent above the previous year, and this year they will increase substantially again.

Congress, as far back as 1865, made it a Federal offense to mail obscene matter.

The Post Office has lent its fullest support to such legislation. But commercialized pornography has continued to grow.

It has expanded tremendously since World War II.

It has doubled in just the past 5 years alone.

Especially, as I have pointed out, the effort has been to expand the market through sales to children.

There appear to be two basic reasons for this rapidly growing volume:

First, the huge profits realized from a relatively small capital investment; and second, the very broad definition of obscenity handed down by certain courts, notably in Los Angeles and New York, where the great bulk of the mail order business in obscenity and pornography originates.

These liberal rulings have established, over a period of time, virtual sanctuaries in which dealers of obscenity have operated with impunity and in defiance of justice.

We in the Post Office for several years have strongly urged legislation which would permit prosecution not only at the points of mailing of obscene material, but in the communities where it is received—where the real damage is done—and where citizens have an opportunity to express their standards of morality and decency.

Such legislation was passed by the 85th Congress and signed into law by President Eisenhower last year. It is, we believe, among the most important legislation adopted in recent years.

We have pressed, and are determined to press, its use to the fullest possible extent. The first case following this legislation was at Boise, Idaho, and it had to do with mailings made from California and Oregon. The offenders, a man and his wife, each received a 10-year prison sentence and a fine.

Similar cases are now pending. And I would like to say that a goodly series of stiff sentences of that kind can go a long way toward discouraging other such people from further mailings of their degenerate trash to children.

To make full use of this new legal weapon, however, the Post Office must have the cooperation of parents and decent-minded citizens everywhere. Without such cooperation on a broad and resolute scale, we are under great handicap.

As you know, the absolute privacy of the mail is one of our basic American rights. The Post Office Department cannot, and will not, violate this right, even when it has strong evidence that the mail is being used for unlawful purpose. I, for one, believe fully in this right.

The Post Office, therefore, can legally identify and take action against violators of the mails only on the complaints of citizens who receive such material.

Let me repeat that point: We can act only after the recipient of obscene mail has opened that mail, and the material has been forwarded to the local postmaster as evidence.

To achieve this cooperation on the largest possible scale, our intensified program for action is fourfold:

1. To draw maximum public attention to the menace of this racket;

2. To urge parents to help us apprehend the mailers of filth to their children:

3. To help mobilize community support behind adequate law enforcement of local ordinances or State laws when these purveyors are apprehended and brought to court.

4. To rally public opinion behind new and stiffer legislation on obscenity.

Obviously there is going to be less likelihood of putting dealers in obscenity out of business if they are not "given the book" when they are caught.

Unfortunately, giving them the book is not easy. Most of these smut merchants make such profits that they are able to retain high-priced lawyers who know all the tricks.

And these gentlemen all too often have used the tricks of hamstringing, delaying, and confusing action until their clients have gone free or received only small prison terms or fines. Unperturbed, the peddlers have been back in their racket under a new name within days.

They are also experts at raising a hue and cry about "censorship," "fredom of the press," and "civil liberties." And all too

often they are able to find willing pawns to take up their cry and carry on their slimy battle for them.

This, of course, is utter nonsense I would only ask any such misguided person these questions:

Is it a violation of civil liberties to deny the sale of liquor to a 10-year-old boy?

Is it censorship to prosecute those who sell narcotics to junior high school girls?

Are we abridging civil liberties when we do not permit children to drive a car?

I am sure the answers, and the point to be made, are quite clear.

Peddling pornographic poison to children is a heinous crime. And that community which does not punish the criminal to the full extent of the law is failing its duty—failing just as surely as if it were to allow sales to children of liquor or dope.

Now, what is likely to happen if we do not rid ourselves of this social cancer?

First, we may as well concede that the obscenity business, with its vast revenue, will be taken over by organized crime to a far greater extent.

It will become a gigantic organized racket far beyond even its present scope, with millions more of our children its principal victims.

The undermining of the moral fiber of the Nation's children will spread, with the poisoning of increasing millions of minds.

Sex crimes will be a spreading blight on our society, and will become far more prevalent than they are today.

And overall, we could expect an ultimate breakdown of order and decency in this country.

My friends, I am not asking you simply to view with alarm. I am asking you to view with deep conscience, deep concern, and determination.

Thorough action must be taken now. I am asking you to take part. You have both the opportunity and—I would dare to say—the responsibility for joining with the Post Office in this drive.

Help us to alert parents across the country. Help us through your organizations, and your publications, and by your individual efforts. Let the parents of America know what to do on any day that obscene mail arrives in their home.

The process is very simple.

First, parents should save all materials received including the envelopes and all enclosures.

Second, parents should report the material immediately to their local postmaster and turn the materials over to him, either in person or by mail.

Finally, all citizens, whether or not their children have been touched with this filth, can help by backing up Members of Congress and local officials in their growing efforts to stamp out this evil.

I urge you to carry this message to the other officers of your organizations, and to your local chapters. Urge your local members to enlist the support of religious and educational leaders, newspaper editors and citizen groups in their communities. The task calls for everyone who can, and will, contribute effort and dedication to it.

I pledge to you that the Post Office Department will lead the way. And if the American people are made properly aware of this challenge, I am confident—as I know you are—that the challenge will be firmly and successfully met.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—As protection to children, parents might either be present when mail from unknown sources is opened, or open such mail themselves, carefully explaining to the young addressee the reasons. In addition, parents can prevent children from ordering by mail bargain toys, etc., unless the parent knows or can investigate the advertiser.)

Mr. Secretary of Public Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 14, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the July 1959 issue of Public Relations Journal, published by the Public Relations Society, the largest public relations organization in the United States, and also to include an article by the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT, U.S. Senator from South Dakota, entitled, "A Department of International Public Relations for the United States" which appeared in the same issue.

The editorial and article are as follows:

MR. SECRETARY OF PUBLIC RELATIONS

"What we need is some central, coordinating agency for improving our public relations abroad. It is time we put our experts to work in some department of Government headed by an officer at Cabinet level so we can develop and operate a cohesive program."

KARL E. MUNDT, U.S. Senator from South Dakota, wrote these words in the lead article in the current issue of the Journal.

It seems to us that Senator MUNDT's statement quoted above, plus other comments in his article, have tremendous significance. They spell a heightened recognition and appreciation of the public relations function on national and international levels.

Because some readers may not know fully the highlights of the career of this powerful protagonist of public relations, we mention a few: He received his master of arts degree at Columbia University. After working as a teacher he became a superintendent of schools. In 1938 he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives continuing for 10 years, and then as U.S. Senator since 1948.

While serving as acting chairman of the House Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities, the famous "pumpkin letters," involving Alger Hiss, came to light.

Later he chairmaned the Army-McCarthy hearings in the Senate. Today he is a member of several Senate committees—Appropriations, Government Operations, Investigating, and Agriculture and Forestry.

We hope that everyone who receives a copy of this issue of the Journal will read the complete article. To encourage such readership, if any urging is needed, we select a few key points which the Senator makes:

The shocking treatment received by Vice President NIXON and Mrs. Nixon in South America awakened many people in the United States, inside, and outside of our government, to the great need for preventing such hostility. The right kind of program could still repair and build up our prestige in many countries where we have lost friends or need to win them.

The Senator goes in swinging at the Communists and their methods—and the dangers to our friends and ourselves.

He makes favorable comments about the Voice of America and other news media. The Soviet government spends a great deal of money to jam our broadcasts and to cast discredit on our publications. This indicates clearly that the Communists fear and hate our informational programs.

But we lack coordination in these efforts. Fifteen different U.S. Government agencies take active part in our programs of international public relations. This creates a certain amount of confusion. Often one agency doesn't know what the others are doing or planning to do. Such conditions make it harder to get approval of Congress for really needed projects.

A new Department of International Public Relations could administer and further our whole complex of activities designed to build human understanding everywhere, so necessary for peace. The article continues with this passage:

"Such a department could handle all our information media—such as motion pictures, the Voice of America (soon to be supplemented, I hope, with the Vision of America by utilizing television), our overseas libraries, foreign news services, low cost book programs, international exhibits and the like."

The article proceeds to state that we have 1,500,000 U.S. citizens located outside our national borders (not including countless tourists). Most of them do not know the language or sensitivities of the country in which they are stationed. They have had insufficient training in how they could and should improve our public relations abroad.

This editorial merely touches the treetops of the Senator's material. So we believe you will enjoy the full text. And then we hope you will continue to read on. We include two widely varied case studies—something most readers have asked to have included in issues of the Journal.

We present examples showing how public good will is won or lost on the firing line—where the salesperson encounters the customer; how well-trained librarians can provide vital help in public relations work. There are several other items which we believe will interest and benefit many readers.

Public relations encompasses a vast variety of interests. With this issue and others already planned we will try to cover a large segment of the waterfront.

VERNE BURNETT.

A DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC RELATIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES

(By KARL E. MUNDT,[1] U.S. Senator from South Dakota)

The stoning of Vice President NIXON during his South American tour was the most shocking act of discourtesy ever demonstrated to an official of the United States in our history. When mobs spat on Pat Nixon, the Vice President's attractive wife, they violated the traditional Latin American concept of courtesy to women, and by so doing

[1] KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, U.S. Senator from South Dakota, was born in Humboldt, S. Dak. He received his early education in that State and in 1923 was graduated with a bachelor of arts degree from Carleton College in Minnesota. He received his masters degree from Columbia University, New York City, in 1927.

After a business career as a teacher and a superintendent of schools, he resigned and was elected to Congress in 1938. He served in the U.S. House of Representatives for 10 years and was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1948.

During the time he served as Acting Chairman of the House Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities the much-publicized, so-called pumpkin papers were discovered, leading to the disclosure and conviction of Alger Hiss.

He also served as chairman of the widely televised Army-McCarthy hearings.

Currently Senator MUNDT is a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee; the Committee on Government Operations; the Senate Investigating Committee; and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

they virtually spat on every woman in our country.

Yet, these incidents may have value, if they awaken us to a pressing need in our Government for methods to prevent such open hostility. I believe that the incidents most surely could have been prevented—that they need never have occurred. It is now late, but proper action can help repair the damage to U.S. prestige in many areas of the world where we have lost friends and have ceased to influence people.

FEEDING GROUNDS OF DISTRUST

It is not enough to blame local Communists in Bolivia and other South American countries for the sorry spectacle of mob violence against a visiting statesman. The Communists cannot create all the bitterness that exists, but they can sound it out and exploit it, fully. And that is what they did. Our job is to destroy these international feeding grounds of distrust.

This is clearly a job for public relations experts. I have felt that our Government needs to have a Department of International Public Relations which is given the authority and the scope of operations to ease international tensions through proper utilization of public relations techniques and practices.

Our country long avoided using any such program, or setting up any agency or commission which has any connotation of public relations. This was done, largely, because there exists a feeling that to attach the term "public relations" to anything we do overseas is to tag it as progaganda. Where that attitude does not exist, those who disclaim use of the term "public relations" say that such usage would give the Communists something to use further in lying about the United States.

These attitudes are too squeamish to be practical. We can never hope to do anything that the Communists won't lie about, and, as for public relations being propaganda, we have only to go ahead with a good program to soon erase any such misconceptions in the minds of foreign nationals. In the end, the Communist lies will be turned against themselves as we demonstrate that just telling the truth is good enough for us.

It is important to note that the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information said in a report recently released, "Another limitation is that there is some lack of acceptance both in Washington and abroad of the importance of the public relations aspects of foreign policy. Often advice in this area is not even sought by the relevant departments or agencies. This leads to inconsistencies in presentation and explanation which, in turn, creates confusion in the minds of our foreign audience."

VOICE OF AMERICA HAS BEEN EFFECTIVE

We have been effectively telling the truth to the world for years with our Voice of America program and other news media. That has been demonstrated by the fact that the Soviet Government spends heavily to jam our broadcasts and to discredit our magazines and booklets.

In fact, we have a number of programs in our Government that do effective jobs in creating good will around the world in behalf of the United States. We have a number of programs—but they are not all interrelated and few, if any, are coordinated so that one agency knows what another is doing in a similar program. Instead of coordination we are more likely to find duplication.

Our former Minister to Rumania, Robert H. Thayer, who recently headed the Bureau of Intelligence and Research in the Department of State, has been appointed as Special Assistant for the Coordination of International Education and Cultural Relations in the hope that he can bring some order out of the tangled web of multifarious international education activities. In his early report on this project, Mr. Thayer pointed out that he found it necessary to call together representatives of 15 different Government agencies to bring into focus the various facets of our programs of international human relations.

The reason I worry about the lack of coordination is that such confusion tends to discredit the effectiveness of such programs. It makes it more difficult to get congressional approval for needed projects. These programs offer us our best opportunities to win friends around the world, but in the field of exchanges of persons and other cultural relations programs, which do the overall job of creating abroad the proper image of America, we find ourselves in a veritable jungle of repetition and confusion.

It often appears that the shortage of coordination is even more serious than the shortage of cash with which to operate a king-sized program.

EXCITING CHALLENGE

There is an exciting challenge in the creation of a Department of International Public Relations. Such an agency could administer and advance our entire fabric of activities in building the human understandings so essential to a lasting peace.

Such a department could handle all our information media—such as motion pictures, the Voice of America (soon to be supplemented, I hope), with the Vision of America by utilizing television), our oversea libraries, foreign news services, low cost book programs, international exhibits, and the like.

The see-for-yourself programs which include the exchange of persons, trade fairs, cultural exchanges, which include the performing arts and artists, poets, philosophers, technicians, health officers, specialists in agriculture, labor and commerce, and other related activities, should be handled on a public relations basis.

Again, critics of such a program will say, "But a consulting engineer doesn't want to be part of a propaganda program."

THE AMERICAN ABROAD

The answer to that is simply this: like it or not, designated or not, any American going abroad under Government sponsorship is considered to be a representative of our Government and he has propaganda value, either good or bad.

Studies have shown that we have neglected this phase of our getting along with people programs. We have sent billions of dollars abroad, and end up finding that the foreign nationals still don't like us. The reason? Perhaps some clique of Americans stationed abroad have formed a country club set where cocktail parties abound. In another, no effort is made to mingle with the native population, and, generally the attitude of those few Americans is one of superiority and pained acceptance that the non-Americans are a necessary evil.

Such things do happen. It is difficult to discover and correct them. It would be better to prevent them from happening in the first place. Only coordinated handling of these problems at high Government level can do the job. Language training and orientation are as important in maintaining a high level of national prestige abroad as are the dollar loans or the donation of surplus foods. Yet, these matters are left more to chance than to careful planning.

IMPROVING OUR POSITION

How, then, can a department devoted to improving our international public relations work to improve our position in the family of nations?

It can begin, as most public relations projects begin, by making a careful survey of the "publics" that are to be reached. It can catalog the problems, the places to be reached, the methods for meeting challenges. In short, it can help develop an empathy for the peoples and cultures of other nations. By understanding these, we can better know how we can operate to develop lasting alliances and permanent friendships.

We have a continuing problem of finding more avenues of communications with other peoples. An uneasiness exists in the minds of many who are interested in our oversea programs that this problem has not received the full attention that it should. Certainly, there are enough specific incidents which indicate a general failure in some parts of the world in getting our message to the people.

BETTER ORIENTATION

If we do nothing more than to develop better orientation and training programs for Americans going overseas, the entire project will be worthwhile. Over one and a half million citizens of the United States are scattered over the face of the globe, outside the continental limits of our country. Every day these Americans will be rubbing shoulders with nationals of other countries. With spirits filled with good will and pockets filled with money, they will make efforts to change the military establishments, the economic picture or the social behavior of these foreign nationals. Not always will Americans with a background developed in a competitive capitalistic system handle problems of old societies smoothly. How to avoid mutual misunderstandings is a real business with us—at least, it should be.

LANGUAGE BARRIERS

Language training has been so neglected, even among the diplomatic set, that primary communication between our citizens abroad and the native population of the country they visit often breaks down. Among our State Department Foreign Service officers only a small percentage can handle the language requirements of their posts. Among the military, the technical service personnel and others, the percentage must be dismally low.

All information about people of other countries should be made more readily available to citizens of our own countries. Just as we want to get more information about America into the hands of foreign nationals, it is just as important for us to know that modern Holland doesn't resemble the world of Hans Brinker as it is for the people of Holland to know that our midwesterners don't wear feathers in their hair. It would not be out of line for a department of international public relations to work through our schools, our domestic radio and television industry, the movies, and newspapers and magazines to give Americans at home understanding of our neighbors across the seas. Since we hope to expand and accelerate the exchange of persons programs, it is essential that we increase the basic knowledge about other peoples so our exchangees will not be poorly prepared to handle their assignments. Studies made among students going abroad indicate a pressing need for more information about foreign cultures and languages among our high school and college people.

CREATING UNDERSTANDING

There are numberless ways in which we can do additional work in the area of creating mutual understanding, and in which we can use our techniques of public relations to strengthen our world position.

Such a department would be able to give us more flexible programs. We need to be able to change the types of program to meet current needs. We need to be able to shift the emphasis, geographically, in our programs. Should the need arise to have short-term exchanges of labor or agriculture people in some specified area, we should be able to do it in a short time. If we need sociological resarch people to work for 2 to 4 years in a country struggling to rehabilitate itself, we should be able to carry on that type of program. But what we need is some central,

coordinating agency of Government which views these problems from the angle of improving our public relations abroad. In all our programs—military, economic, sociological—that has always been our aim. It is time we clearly defined it and put our experts to work on the job in some department of Government headed by an officer at Cabinet level so we can develop and operate a cohesive program of waging the cold war in such a manner that we can be certain to win it.

Must We Have a Marine Corps? Chairman Vinson Tells Why

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I ask unanimous consent that a recent article entitled "Must We Have a Marine Corps?" by the distinguished and honored chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, be printed in full in the RECORD.

In this brief account, prepared for the recent reunion of the Third Marine Division Association here in Washington, the distinguished chairman draws upon his vast experience and unequaled knowledge of the Nation's defense needs to answer affirmatively the question posed in the title of his article. Concisely and with irrefutable logic he has set forth the reasons, which over the years, have prompted the Congress to insist upon a strong, combat-ready Marine Corps.

I commend this article to all Members as one of the most comprehensive statements of the Nation's continuing need for this Corps, our principal force-in-readiness, it has ever been my privilege to read.

MUST WE HAVE A MARINE CORPS?—CHAIRMAN VINSON TELLS WHY

(By Congressman CARL VINSON, chairman, House Committee on Armed Services)

The Marine Corps is performing a vital role in helping preserve our national security.

It is my firm conviction that this Nation must have a Marine Corps embodying its historic characteristics of professionalism, versatility, readiness, and mobility.

As one who has long insisted on the Marine Corps being provided the manpower and weapons to discharge its proper roles and missions—which Congress so deliberately and clearly has written into law—I believe that the demands of national security require a Marine Corps prepared to discharge two principal functions:

(a) A combat-ready, striking force to swiftly seize key objectives on the outbreak of general war, and

(b) To serve as a fire brigade national force-in-readiness to support U.S. policy in the crises which will continue to characterize the so-called cold war for many, many year to come.

The Marine Corps, by tradition, experience, training, and inclination, is peculiarly qualified to do these vital jobs.

There has never been a significant period in the history of our Nation when we did not need a strong and ready Marine Corps.

As our Nation has progressed, become more powerful, and consequently assumed a greater role in world affairs, the need for an adequate Marine Corps has progressively increased. It has been evident, particularly since our Nation became a great world power as the result of the Spanish-American War, that a Marine Corps of meaningful capabilities was an indispensable element of our defense forces. Such a requirement stems neither from abstract theory nor mere sentimentality. Rather, the need for a Marine Corps of strong combat ability rests upon the very strategic and geographic nature of our Nation. While we are a Nation of vast land expanse, we are, in the final analysis, an island Nation. We are in every sense—strategically, economically, and geographically—a truly great maritime power. This very maritime character of our Nation requires that we maintain, in addition to our normal mobilization base, a constant strength—combat-ready Marine Corps to provide the landing forces essential to the balanced fleet.

The House Armed Services Committee, of which I am honored to be the chairman, has long taken the position, one consistently approved by Congress, that our Nation must take no chances in the matter of providing an adequate Marine Corps.

Consequently Congress, in 1947, wrote the specific roles and missions of the Marine Corps itno the law, overriding as it did so the objections of the Pentagon. These provisions of law recognized the historic attributes of the corps—readiness, professional proficiency, and the inherent mobility which Marine landing forces possess as a part of the balanced fleet. Also, the law recognized the irreplaceable experience that Marines have gained from more than a century and a half of close association with the Navy in the development and application of the Nation's sea power. Versatility and unsurpassed strategic mobility are salient characteristics of our balanced fleets in which the Marines ready forces play such a vital part.

However, in spite of this statutory emphasis of the intent of Congress and the sharp delineation of the roles and missions of the Marine Corps, the corps underwent a drastic and almost disastrous reduction that was halted only by the outbreak of Korean hostilities. As a result of a truly Herculean effort, characterized by a perhaps unprecedented combat mobilization of Reserves, the corps was able, through the mobility of its sister service, the Navy, to project itself into the Korean conflict. By timely arrival it staved off disaster in the Pusan perimeter. Then, again exploiting the mobility of our seapower, Marines spearheaded the amphibious assault at Inchon, raised the American flag at Seoul and then pressed the attack northward.

Once again, in Korea, the Marines had demonstrated to us all the indispensable value of a specially trained amphibious force-in-readiness.

Of course, as you will all remember that the Inchon landing, which turned the tide of battle in that conflict, happened only a few months after we had been told that there would be no more amphibious operations.

The Marine Corps did not believe that prophecy.

Fortunately for the Nation, neither did Congress.

After Korea, in order to make certain that our Nation would, in the future, be assured of a combat-ready Marine Corps to meet the many crises that would confront us in the continuing so-called cold war, Congress wrote into the National Security Act the required organizational framework of the Marine Corps. This amendment (Public Law 416, 82d Cong.) established the requirement that the Marine Corps should be maintained at three combat divisions and three air wings. This Congress did, not out of sentimentality but in recognition of the cold, hard fact that only the Marine Corps has the background, experience, special qualifications and intimate association with the Navy as a partner in the balanced fleets necessary to the performance of the versatile functions required.

The decision of Congress to assure such a ready force has been amply justified by the magnificent manner in which the Corps has performed the duty expected of it in the crises of Lebanon, Taiwan, Indonesia, Syria, and Suez. Marine availability and actual readiness to be used, if necessary, strengthened U.S. policy in each of these instances, and forestalled further Communist gains that could have assumed disastrous proportions for ourselves and the free world.

Lebanon, in my view, will stand as a salient example of the great dividends which our Nation reaps from Marine Corps-Navy partnership in the application of our seapower. The time interval between the decision to land Marine forces in Lebanon and the time of landing was extremely brief. The Marine units hit the beach exactly on time and moved inland with precise, tactical efficiency. As a result, U.S. influence in the Middle East was enhanced. Another possible Russian power grab in the Eastern Mediterranean littoral was thwarted.

Such an example of military and naval efficiency is not accidental. An amphibious operation, the most difficult and intricate of all military operations, involving as it does the transition from sea to land, cannot be improvised. The smoothness and rapidity of the Marines' landing in Lebanon can only be explained by the long experience of our Marines in their difficult amphibious specialty and their generations of close knit relationship with the Navy. These two services, which together comprise the fighting elements of the Department of the Navy, have worked together so long and so well in the exercises of seapower that it becomes almost an intuitive matter for them to move quickly to a troubled area and apply the precise degree of necessary military power.

Lebanon was an eloquent example of the value of the balanced fleet. Only the United States has been successful in developing this unequaled instrument for the application of true seapower. A basic element of its structure is the Fleet Marine Force, a force of amphibious troops no other nation, no other fleet, possesses. Together with the Navy elements of the fleet, this integral landing force gives the Nation and the fleet commander the balanced force uniquely the product of American genius.

Lebanon is a recent example. But it has not been and it will not be the only example of how necessary the Navy-Marine Corps team is in the long and continuing struggle against the unceasing attempts of communism to encroach against the free world. When one looks at the globe of the world in the light of the fact that the basic objective of Soviet communism is the enslavement of the world, we realize only too clearly that in the years ahead there will be more Lebanons, more Quemoys, and more Koreas.

Such a situation establishes a national requirement for the Marine Corps' capability of swift and effective response to international crises.

The Marine Corps' obligation to develop the most modern and effective amphibious doctrine and techniques of any armed force in the world is thus underscored by strategic requirements as well as those of the law itself.

The vertical envelopment concept, combining the airborne versatility of the transport helicopter with the range of the aircraft carrier is an example of how well the Marine Corps has discharged its duty in advancing the science of landing operations.

This adaptation of the helicopter to modern amphibious assault is also a fine example of the versatile manner in which Marine

aviation supports Marine ground forces. The relationship of air and ground elements in the Marine Corps is, in many ways, unique in modern military organization. The effectiveness of Marine aviation results directly from the fact that it has the specific and specialized function of being a purely supporting arm.

Marine aviation must focus its attention and total effort on the perfection of its close supporting techniques. If it expands its activity beyond this specific function of being a supporting arm, it will inevitably duplicate tactical aviation of the Air Force and thus be in jeopardy of being assimilated or eliminated.

In enumerating some of the reasons for Marine Corps efficiency and success, one must never forget the Marine Corps' emphasis on the individual fighting marine. There is no doubt but what a large measure of the efficiency and success of the corps results directly upon its emphasis on the importance of the individual fighting marine. In these days of great scientific advancement and reliance on technological devices, the importance of the individual is frequently overlooked. This, however, has not been the case in the Marine Corps. The esprit, the dedication to duty and the self-reliance which continues to characterize the corps is a collective reflection of the important role that each individual marine—officer and enlisted—performs in discharging the missions assigned to the corps.

In the troubled international situation that confronts us now and which will continue to confront us through at least the foreseeable future, the Marine Corps has a vital and important role to perform. It has long enjoyed the confidence of Congress and the Nation. I am confident that the corps will continue to justify our Nation's confidence as the first echelon of our Nation's limited war forces.

Hawaii: The Aloha State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, with the advent of Hawaii's admission into our Union I believe it is essential that each of us be well informed on the background of our 50th State. In the first of three articles in the current issue of State Government, Gov. William F. Quinn describes the Aloha State—including its background as a kingdom, its governmental status as a Territory of the United States, and its social and economic character today. In doing so, Governor Quinn makes it clear why our new partner in statehood is a great deal more than a "Paradise of the Pacific."

Mr. Quinn writes as follows:

HAWAII: THE ALOHA STATE

(By William F. Quinn, Governor of Hawaii)

History was made for Hawaii on March 12, 1959. On that day, the people of the mid-Pacific territory achieved a long-sought goal. The 86th Congress finally gave approval of a bill providing for admission of Hawaii as the 50th State.

The statehood bill was signed with "great satisfaction" on March 18 by President Eisenhower. When the citizens of Hawaii decide in a forthcoming plebiscite[1] on making Hawaii the 50th State, the President said, "they will demonstrate anew to the world the vitality of the principles of freedom and self-determination—the principles upon which this Nation was founded 172 years ago."

FIRST-CLASS CITIZENSHIP DAY

Although formal admission of Hawaii depends upon the approval of statehood and related questions at the plebiscite on June 27 and upon an official proclamation of admission by the President later in the year, there is little doubt that March 12 is marked in the minds of Hawaii's people as the day on which they became first-class citizens of the United States.

There was excited anticipation at both ends that eventful day. Direct oversea telephone lines connected Iolani Palace—the Territorial capitol—with the House of Representatives in the Nation's Capitol. The night before the Senate had passed the bill overwhelmingly, by a 76 to 15 vote.

As the House rollcall reached the 218 affirmative votes needed for passages, I telephoned a signal from a booth just off the House floor, to start the celebration in Honolulu. The final House vote was 323 to 89 in favor of the bill.

In Honolulu, civil defense sirens blew a steady blast to announce the event, firecrackers exploded, and auto horns added to the noise of celebration. March 12 and 13 were declared official holidays. Schools were closed. Churches were filled with people offering prayers of thanksgiving. The millenium had arrived.

PREANNEXATION DEVELOPMENT

The newest State lies in the Pacific Ocean 2,090 nautical miles southwest of San Francisco. It consists of eight major islands and numerous small islands with a total area of 6,423 square miles. From southeast to northwest the principal islands are Hawaii, Kahoolawe, Maui, Lanai, Molokai, Oahu, Kauai, and Niihau. Honolulu, a modern city on the island of Oahu, is the capital of the Territory and will be the capital of the State.

Hawaii's recorded history begins in 1778 when Capt. James Cook landed in the islands and found a feudal society of Polynesians, with each major island goverened by a hereditary chief as an independent kingdom. By 1810 King Kamehameha the Great had united all the islands under his rule.

The association of Hawaii with the United States has been long, close, and significant. American Congregational missionaries, first arriving in 1820, had a profound influence on the social and governmental institutions of the Kingdom of Hawaii. In addition to bringing the Christian religion to a formerly polytheistic society, the missionaries reduced the native language to writing, established schools to develop a literate population, and advised the royal families on problems of government, health, and business.

Hawaii has enjoyed some measure of constitutional government since 1840 when King Kamehameha III proclaimed its first constitution which, in addition to a house of nobles, provided for seven representatives to be informally selected by the people. A new constitution adopted in 1852 provided for universal manhood suffrage.

Pressure for annexation to the United States was stimulated in the mid-19th century by the growing sugar industry, the whaling interests and the California gold rush. After years of negotiation a treaty of commercial reciprocity between the United States and Hawaii was put into effect in 1876. Under this treaty Hawaiian sugar was allowed to enter the United States free of duty, and the identification of American and Hawaiian interests was clearer than ever. Although American influence was strong, Hawaii remained an independent kingdom until 1893 when the reigning queen, Liliuokalani, was deposed and a provisional government formed to negotiate for union with the United States. For the brief period from July 5, 1894 until steps leading to annexation of the islands by the United States could be completed, the Republic of Hawaii carried out the functions of government.

TERRITORIAL STATUS

A joint resolution providing for annexation was adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress on July 6, 1898 and signed by President McKinley on the following day. On August 12, 1898, the Hawaiian flag was lowered from the staff on Iolani Palace and the Stars and Stripes of the United States of America were raised as formal transfer of sovereignty to the United States was accomplished. In April 1900, Congress passed the Hawaiian Organic Act, which gave Hawaii the status of an incorporated, organized Territory and extended to its citizens the protection of the laws and Constitution of the United States.

Under the Organic Act, the Governor and the Secretary of the Territory (who corresponds to a State Lieutenant Governor) have been appointed for 4-year terms by the President of the United States, subject to U.S. Senate approval. Judges of the Supreme Court and the circuit courts have also been appointed by the President. In Congress, Hawaii has been represented by one Delegate to the House of Representatives, who can introduce bills and serve on committees but who has no vote. Within the limitations imposed by territorial status, Hawaii has long functioned to a great degree as a State, and any public official from any of the other States would find much that is familiar to him in Hawaii's government. The elected legislature, the appointed executive and judicial branches, all function in traditional American style.

GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE: FAMILIAR PARALLELS

Like most States, Hawaii has in recent years been concerned with the multiplicity and overlapping of government functions, and for nearly a decade it has given serious study to the reorganization of Territorial agencies mandated by the State constitution. At present, State officers such as the attorney general and the treasurer, heads of some 30 administrative agencies and members of numerous boards and commissions with administraitve or regulatory duties, are appointed by the Governor, subject to the confirmation of the Territorial senate. Health, welfare, libraries, education, and public works are among the governmental activities and functions that are maintained by the Territorial government. As a Territory, Hawaii has been eligible for most Federal aid programs.

The bicameral territorial legislature is typically American in organization and procedure. Until reapportionment was brought about by act of the U.S. Congress in 1956, imbalance in representation between urban and rural areas existed in Hawaii, just as it does in many mainland States. Under reapportionment the senate was increased from 15 to 25 members, with the rural areas retaining control, while the house of representatives went from 30 to 51 members, giving numerical control to the Oahu metropolitan area. The total of 76 members gives Hawaii one of the smallest State legislatures in the country.

[1] The plebiscite and a primary election will have been held when this issue of State Government appears. They were scheduled for June 27. A final election was set for July 28 to select the Governor of the State, the Lieutenant Governor, the legislature, two U.S. Senators and one U.S. Representative.

A significant step forward in judicial administration was taken by the last territorial legislature this year with the creation of an administrative office in the courts, under the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Hawaii has only 22 governmental units, far fewer than any State in the Nation. The low number is indicative of a simplification and centralization of structure that might be the envy of many a State or large city faced with complex overlapping of government functions and confusing duplication of government services. In addition to the territory, there are the city and county of Honolulu, three neighbor island counties of Hawaii, Kauai, and Maui, and 17 special districts (most of them soil conservation districts). A fourth county, Kalawao, is coterminous with the Hansen's disease settlement at Kalaupapa, Molokai and is administered by the territorial board of health. Hawaii has no cities or towns as governmental units, and no school districts. The city and county of Honolulu is a single unit of government covering the whole island of Oahu. This is probably the only metropolitan area in the United States which is entirely governed by one unit of local government.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT IS CENTRALIZED

The high degree of centralization present in Hawaii's governmental pattern is quite startling to a mainlander familiar with considerable local autonomy and numerous small jurisdictions. For example, a Territory-wide system of public schools is operated by the department of public instruction as a single unified school district, although for administrative purposes the Territory is divided into five districts responsible to the superintendent of public instruction. Each county is represented among the commissioners of public instruction. The construction and maintenance of schoolbuildings are the responsibility of the counties.

Members of county police commissions, liquor commissions, and three out of four county library managing boards are appointed by the Governor.

Counties are governed by elected boards of supervisors headed by a chairman or, in the case of the city and county of Honolulu, by a mayor. Certain other county officers are also elected. The 30th legislature in 1959 passed, with some amendments, a strong mayor charter for the city and county of Honolulu, which had been approved by voters at a special election in June 1958.

FINANCE

Under the Organic Act, Hawaii has a taxing power equal to that of any mainland State. A general excise tax, personal and corporate income taxes, gasoline, liquor, and tobacco taxes are the chief revenue sources at the territorial level. A real property tax is collected by the Territory for each of the several counties. The net assessed valuation of real property for the calendar year 1958 was $1,086 million, and the average property tax was $16.22 per $1,000 of assessed value.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958, territorial receipts (both general and special funds) amounted to $151,301,000, while disbursements totaled $148,089,000. Territorial bonded debt for 1958 was $94,357,000.

INTERSTATE COOPERATION: POLITICAL PARTIES

As a territory, Hawaii has recognized the advantage of participating to the fullest extent possible in organizations and compacts of an interstate character in order to reap the benefits of cooperation with the rest of the Nation on common problems. For example, Hawaii has joined the Interstate Parole and Probation Compact, the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, and has been active in the Governors' Conference and other national gatherings of public officials.

Both major political parties are active in the territory. During the 20 years of Democratic national administration, the presidentially appointed Democratic Governors faced Republican-controlled legislatures. Since 1955, the Democratic Party has had a majority of legislative seats, while the Governors have been Republicans. Both political parties are seeking new strength and effectiveness as they prepare for the first State elections and the selection of the first Senators and Representative to the U.S. Congress.

A PARADISE-PLUS

Hawaii has been dubbed the "Paradise of the Pacific," and the familiar cartoon portrayal of a hula-skirted maiden, backed by a little grass shack under waving palm trees, comes to mind. True, Hawaii has palm trees and hula dancers, but the stereotype of the cartoons must give way to the realities of contemporary Hawaii. Gleaming sands of tropical beaches, the sound of rolling surf, the richness of flowers and foliage are all part of present day Hawaii. The average temperature in Honolulu is 75 degrees and trade winds from the east of northeast prevail during most of the year. From the snowcapped peaks of Mauna Loa and Mauna Kea to spectacular Waimea Canyon, Hawaii is indeed a paradise for visitors and residents alike.

But Hawaii is more than a tropic paradise. It is also known as the "Crossroads of the Pacific" because of its strategic location on the air and sea lanes between East and West. The 50th State is about 10 hours by air from the west coast of the mainland United States and will soon be less than 5 hours' travel by jet flight.

As a military bastion for America's Armed Forces, Hawaii boasts such famous military heaquarters as Pearl Harbor, Fort Shafter, Schofield Barracks, Camp H. M. Smith, Hickam Air Force Base, and Kaneohe Marine Air Station.

PATTERNS OF THE ECONOMY

Hawaii's civilian population has been growing rapidly for several years and was estimated at 575,771, in July 1958. The population is youthful, with 43 percent below 20 years of age. Over three-fourths of Hawaii's people are on the island of Oahu, whose population and economy have to some extent developed at the expense of the outlying islands. While territorial unemployment is low and territorial income and population are both rising, there has been decline in business activity and a commensurate decrease in employment and income of islands other than Oahu. Government and industry are both concerned with finding means for developing a balanced economy in all parts of Hawaii.

Diversification of industry and economic activity is clearly needed and is to some extent being achieved. In large measure Hawaii is an agricultural economy, although the agriculture is large-scale, highly mechanized and equivalent to major industry. Hawaii is also a service oriented area. Federal expenditures, primarily by the military, rank as the territory's largest single source of income, having amounted to $385 million in 1957. Other major sources of income are the sugar industry ($147 million in 1957), pineapple ($112 million), construction ($135 million) and the tourist trade ($78 million). Diversified agricultural crops, livestock products, coffee and fishing are other important segments of the economy. The growth of a garment industry, construction of an oil refinery and industrial park, a steel rolling mill and other fabricating plants are signs of healthy variety in an essentially agricultural community.

Extensive bauxite deposits, particularly on the island of Kauai, offer prospects for a new basic industry. Efforts are being made to find a commercial use for the vast lava wastes created by volcanic action.

The gross territorial product reached a new high in 1957 of about $1.4 billion. Personal income for the same period increased over previous years to $1.09 billion, with per capita income amounting to $1,821. Federal internal revenue collections for 1957 amounted to $166 million, more than the amounts paid by each of 10 other States. A favorable balance of payments with the mainland United States has been maintained since 1952. In 1957, Hawaii earned $856 million outside the territory, or $23 million more than it spent that year.

Hawaii has relatively little land to open for homesteading purposes. Much of the land is held by a few owners, a pattern of ownership which has prevailed since King Kamehameha III divided his land with the nobles and people of Hawaii in 1848. There is great pressure for land, especially on the island of Oahu, and considerable legislative and executive attention has been given to the problem of making the most effective use of the limited areas available for public and private development. Efforts to create new land on Oahu by filling offshore reef areas, acquisition by the territory of land now held by the Federal Government, and acceleration of efforts to make territorial lands available to the public are some of the approaches being taken to the land problem.

CULTURE AND EDUCATION

In the area of culture Hawaii is a well rounded community with a fine symphony orchestra, a community theater which presents hit musicals while the original cast still performs on Broadway, an academy of arts renowned for its remarkable collections in Asiatic art, and the Bishop Museum, which is world famous as a research center in the history and science of the Pacific area.

The University of Hawaii, a land-grant institution with over 7,000 students currently enrolled, corresponds to mainland State universities and offers accredited undergraduate and graduate programs in the arts and sciences, engineering, nursing, and education, among other fields. Tropical agriculture, marine biology and Far East studies are, of course, particularly well developed.

An outstanding feature of life in Hawaii, commented upon with appreciation by visitors from the world over, is the harmony among the Americans of many races and ancestries who make up the population of the new State. Equality of opportunity is a reality, with business, professions and government service open to all qualified persons regardless of ethnic background. About 87 percent of the entire population are American citizens.

Successful operation of the International Cooperation Center under the Governor's Office, establishment of an overseas training program and an Asian studies program at the University of Hawaii are indicative of the areas of world understanding to which Hawaii can contribute. In a recent address Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton emphasized Hawaii's role as a trade and cultural center for the entire Pacific area. With its roots in the East as well as in the West, Hawaii can have a significant role as a State of the Union, on an equal footing with the other 49.

For its State nickname, Hawaii has chosen to be known as "the Aloha State," a phrase which sums up, through the use of the Hawaiian word so rich in meaning, the warm friendship and sincere hospitality which characterize the outlook and attitudes of the citizens of the 50th State.

Joint Declaration Issued by the Governments of Ghana, Guinea, and Liberia at Sanniquellie, Liberia, on July 19, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and joint declaration:

GHANA INFORMATION & TRADE CENTER,
New York, N.Y., July 29, 1959.
Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: I forward, herewith, texts of joint declaration and joint communique issued by the Governments of Ghana, Guinea, and Liberia at Sanniquellie, Liberia on July 19, 1959.

Very sincerely,

R. O. MENSAH,
Press Attaché.

JOINT DECLARATION ISSUED BY THE GOVERNMENTS OF GHANA, GUINEA, AND LIBERIA AT SANNIQUELLIE, LIBERIA, ON JULY 19, 1959

Resolved to assist, foster, and speed up the total liberation of African nonindependent territories whose peoples are struggling for national independence and self-determination, racial equality, and human dignity, conscious of the fact that freedom, equality, justice, and dignity are noble objectives of all peoples and are essential to the achievement of the legitimate aims and aspirations of the African peoples, determined to bring about unity, cooperation, harmony, coherence, and mutual understanding among ourselves, bearing in mind the historical differences among the peoples of Africa in various fields, but convinced that joint action is necessary to attain our common purpose, the President of the Republic of Liberia, the President of the Republic of Guinea, and the Prime Minister of Ghana, after a frank exchange of views, have agreed on the necessity for immediate action, and, in the light of this, they have reviewed the two communiques issued by Ghana and Guinea, on the one hand, and the official Gazette Extraordinary issued by Liberia, on the other hand, and have proposed the holding of a special conference in 1960 of all independent states of Africa, as well as nonindependent states which have fixed dates on which they will achieve independence, to discuss and work out a charter which will achieve their ultimate goal of unity between independent African states.

They have agreed further on a declaration of principles, which will be presented to the special conference of independent African states, as well as those nonindependent states invited to participate, as the basis for the discussions of the special conference.

These principles are:

1. The name of the organization shall be the Community of Independent African States.

2. Africans, like all other peoples, have the inherent right to independence and self-determination and to decide the form of government under which they wish to live.

3. Each state or federation, which is a member of the community, shall maintain its own national identity and constitutional structure. The community is being formed with a view to achieving unity among independent African states. It is not designed to prejudice the present or future of international policies, relations, or obligations of the states involved.

4. Each member of the community accepts the principle that shall not interfere in the internal affairs of any other member.

5. (a) The acts of states or federations, which are members of the community, shall be determined in relation to the essential objectives which are freedom, independence, unity, the African personality, as well as the interest of the African peoples.

(b) Each member-state or federation shall, in its acts or policies, do nothing contrary to the spirit and objectives of the community.

6. (a) The general policy of the community shall be to build up a free and properous African community for the benefit of its peoples and the peoples of the world and in the interest of international peace and security.

(b) This policy shall be based essentially on the maintenance of diplomatic, economic, and cultural relations, on the basis of equality and reciprocity, with all the states of the world which adopt a position compatible with African interests and African dignity.

(c) Its main objective will be to help other African territories, subjected to domination, with a view of accelerating the end of their nonindependent status.

7. The community shall set up an economic council, a cultural council, and a scientific and research council.

8. Membership in the community shall be open to all independent African states and federations, and any nonindependent country of Africa shall have the right to join the community upon its attainment of independence.

9. The community shall have a flag and an anthem to be agreed upon at a later date.

10. The motto of the community shall be "Independence and Unity."

W. V. S. TUBMAN,
President of the Republic of Liberia.
SEKOU TOURÉ,
President of the Republic of Guinea.
KWAME NKRUMAH,
Prime Minister of Ghana.

JOINT COMMMUNIQUE ISSUED BY THE GOVERNMENTS OF GHANA, GUINEA, AND LIBERIA AT SANNIQUELLIE, LIBERIA, ON JULY 19, 1959

We, the President of the Republic of Liberia, the President of the Republic of Guinea, and the Prime Minister of Ghana, meeting at Sanniquellie, Republic of Liberia, from July 15 to 18, 1959, having reviewed the matters of common concern to our respective States and Africa in general, have decided that:

1. Cameroons: We deplore the present situation in that territory, and we consider that free elections under United Nations supervision before independence is the most effective and democratic means of solving the present crisis. We appeal to the conscience of the world and the members of the United Nations to support our efforts to bring the matter before the next session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

2. Algeria: We reaffirm the terms of the resolution adopted at the Conference of Independent African States held in Accra in April 1958, and support the inscription of the Algerian question on the agenda of the next session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. We will consider the recognition of the Provisional Government of Algeria at the forthcoming Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Independent African States to be held in Liberia in August 1959.

3. Racial discrimination: We condemn racial discrimination in any form wherever it exists, and in particular the policy of apartheid practised in South Africa, and will do all in our power to implement the provisions of the universal declaration of human rights.

4. South West Africa: We maintain that this territory is in fact a trust territory of the United Nations, and as such the United Nations cannot relinquish its legal and moral responsibilities to the indigenous inhabitants, who are entitled to the same treatment given to other trust territories. Consequently, we will request the United Nations to give further consideration to this question, declare the territory not a part of South Africa, and fix a date for the independence of the trust territory of South West Africa.

5. Nuclear tests in the Sahara: We deprecate France's insistence on carrying out these tests in Africa, and appeal to all African peoples, including those in the French community, and to all members of the United Nations to realize the destructive effects of such tests and associate themselves with us in our endeavor to dissuade France from embarking upon such a devastating course. We express our strong disapproval of all nuclear tests, and appeal to the conscience of all peoples to condemn the production and use of nuclear weapons. We specifically appeal to those nations which produce such weapons to put an end to such tests.

6. Cooperation and unity of action: Touching their mutual relationships, we agree to consult together on all international questions, and insure unity of action at the United Nations.

7. African culture: Considering African culture as one of the essential elements in the struggle against colonialism and the assertion of African dignity and personality, we have decided to make the rehabilitation and diffusion of African culture an imperative national duty.

W. V. S. TUBMAN,
President of the Republic of Liberia.
SEKOU TOURÉ,
President of the Republic of Guinea.
KWAME NKRUMAH,
Prime Minister of Ghana.

What's in a Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, while many of us are striving to find a solution to the important problem of providing health care of our aged, and while most of the opponents to my bill, H.R. 4700, are also working to solve the problem by other means, I regret to say that among the opponents of my bill are some whose opposition is so vehement that they have become abusive.

My bill, H.R. 4700, would provide insurance against the cost of hospital, nursing home and surgical care under the social security system.

As an example of the blind opposition and bitterness of some of the opponents to my bill I cite the case of Dr. Herbert Berger, president-elect of the New York State Society of Internal Medicine.

Dr. Berger recently was a witness before the Ways and Means Committee during hearings on the Forand bill, H.R. 4700. He admitted that he was accepting fees from the New York City Department of Welfare but at the same time opposed H.R. 4700 which he termed "communistic legislation."

Dr. Berger was placed in his proper light, I feel, in a weekly news column written by Dewey Anderson, executive director of the Public Affairs Institute, under date of July 17, and under leave to extend my remarks I include this column. It follows:

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

In the ornate hearing room of the House Ways and Means Committee, with the American eagle of freedom spreading its protective wings over all, Herbert Berger, M.D., F.A.C.P., president-elect of the New York State Society of Internal Medicine recently took the witness stand. He was testifying on the Forand bill to provide medical and hospital care to the aged sick. And he was against the measure. Why?

Because, the eminent physician said: "* * * A nation cannot survive half socialized and half free enterprise any more than, prior to 1860, our country could endure half free and half slave. Certainly if we embrace this much socialism then it will follow that the ancillary medical professions, pharmacy, hospital management, nursing, and dentistry will be forced to accept the same ideology, which is so foreign to that which has made this country great. * * * Does it not seem inconsistent that we should be fighting such communism in Geneva while introducing legislation supporting it in Washington?"

Then followed a curious inconsistency in the doctor's reasoning, for he advocated that instead of using the social security system for handling health aid we should make direct public assistance payments to the aged.

"If these people were given a full day's pay for a half day's work their economic and emotional problems would disappear," he declared.

Decrying social security on the one hand as socialistic and even communistic, then advocating a program which would put the retired back to work at half time and full pay, the doctor would let the aged buy privately the medical services they needed and pay for these services out of only half-earned money. The other half would be a contribution of society, the very socialism which he hates.

One wonders what the doctor says as he crosses Brooklyn Bridge, built at public expense and used the same way—"never should have been built, ought to be run privately for profit." Or, as he sends his children to public school, "never should have been opened, ought to pay privately for this service."

Bringing another contradiction right home, Congressman FORAND elicited the fact that Dr. Berger served the New York City Department of Welfare as a consultant in a city-approved nursing home for 200 patients, and the 2,500 patients at the publicly supported farm colony. The doctor got his payment for these services right out of the public till, without ever complaining except as to the size of the fee. "I give service for $5 which I get $200 for from a private patient," the doctor told the Congressman.

Congressman FORAND questioned the witness at some length regarding his use of the Red-baiting word "Communist" applied to this form of social legislation, and the doctor stuck by his guns. He just believes this is communism. He thinks the social security program is a long step toward a denial of individual freedom, not the means of underwriting freedom for the great masses of our people.

One wonders whether Dr. Berger, chosen spokesman for his profession, is at all representative. Or whether, in attaining such a high proficiency in their chosen profession, doctors have ever been exposed to the social sciences. Or whether, in opposing legislation to provide medical and hospital care to the aged on philosophical grounds, they have ever run across and pondered such a solid piece of philosophy as Hobhouse's remark in his "Elements of Social Justice":

"The organizer of industry who thinks he has 'made' himself and his business (or profession) has found a whole social system ready to his hand in skilled workers, machinery, a market, peace and order—a vast apparatus and a pervasive atmosphere, the joint creation of millions of men and scores of generations. Take away the whole social factor and we have, not Robinson Crusoe with his salvage from the wreck and his acquired knowledge, but the naked savage living on roots, berries, and vermin."

Perhaps the doctor and his colleagues would like to ponder still more about their philosophic position, taking into account in so doing that society has provided them with the major costs of their education, surrounded them with some $8 billion worth of hospitals and operating rooms, a whole array of modern paraphernalia without which they could not do their highly skilled and socially necessary job of tending the sick, and for which they do not pay a cent directly.

In this modern day, cooperation of equally free men and women is essential. That it is done under laws voted by the peoples' representatives, and administered in the public interest, is the guarantee of the liberty of the individual. Whenever the people decide that they want the cooperation made possible under the social security laws extended to the health and material care of the aged who are no longer able to provide it themselves, this is in keeping with the freedom under law we have tested so amply as both good and democratic. Such is the judgment of our history.

Cold War Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of July 24, 1959.

COLD WAR WEAPON

Although differences have been expressed on details, impressively widespread support has been shown before the House Ways and Means Committee for legislation offering tax incentives for investment of American capital abroad.

In principle, at least, three Government departments—State, Commerce, and Treasury—as well as numerous spokesmen of industry have indorsed the idea as one that would provide an added weapon in the cold war political-economic competition with the Soviet Union. Implementing legislation, containing several proposals by which taxes would be eased on oversea earnings of American firms, has been introduced by Representative BOGGS, Louisiana Democrat. While industry witnesses thus far heard by the House committee have been almost uniformly approving, departmental spokesmen have suggested qualification on two major details.

One of these, encouraging American firms to set up domestic subsidiaries to carry on foreign business, would permit deferral of taxes on the earnings of these subsidiaries until the earnings are sent back to the United States. Government witnesses, most anxious that the oversea investment be channeled to underdeveloped countries, suggested that the deferral not apply to earnings in countries already highly developed industrially. The Treasury Department also recommended that the provision apply only to corporations which do not earn more than 50 percent of their gross income from exports. The Treasury likewise recommended against granting a reduction of 14 percentage points in the present 52 percent corporation income tax to all firms doing business abroad—questioning again that such a broad provision would be an effective incentive for investment in the areas most desired, namely, in the under-developed countries.

Despite these qualifications, however, the administration has made it clear from the beginning that it favors a greater flow of American venture capital abroad and that tax incentives provide a feasible method to accomplish the purpose. On this basis, prospects are encouraging that a final formula may be worked out within the framework of the BOGGS bill that will stimulate this type of enterprise.

You Can't Eat It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial on the Purple Heart decoration, which was published in the National Tribune, the Stars and Stripes, on July 30, 1959:

YOU CAN'T EAT IT

These are harsh words especially when they are applied to the Purple Heart decoration bestowed by the Government for wounds received in battle.

They were expressed in a letter from a discouraged veteran who wears the medal, in a letter written recently to a Florida newspaper. Here is how the veteran tells his story:

"Perhaps the greatest travesty of American justice is being perpetuated right under our noses. I speak of the disabled veteran, the man who served his country until he was returned to civilian life classified 'Living Dead.'

"From personal experience I have found that it is easier to gain employment if you have been paroled from a penal institution than it is to ask for work being a disabled vet.

"The vet is shunted from one agency of the Government to another. No one seems to be able to coordinate the facilities available.

"Should you tell the truth about your physical limitations? If you do they are polite but the position has just been filled.

"Until such time as people realize that disabled vets want no exceptional consideration, but rather the chance to prove they can be useful workers, there will be a growing feeling of discord which will eventually break the morale of the disabled and make them easy prey to Communist way of thinking.

"I have found out you can't eat a Presidential citation, or a Purple Heart."

As we have said, these are harsh words used as they were by the veteran but, in reality, his words are only the expression of

a discouraged and disillusioned man and they speak for many like him who find it impossible to secure decent employment because of a battle-incurred disability.

It is true that certain firms throughout the country have made a serious effort to find a way to employ our war disabled but in far too many instances the fact remains that a good many employers are guided only by their selfish instincts and are quick to deny aid to worthy and willing jobseekers.

America for the most part has forgotten the service rendered by wearers of the Purple Heart and the sacrifices they made in order to be worthy of that proud decoration. As we once heard another cynical veteran say, speaking of a war decoration, "that and 10 cents will get you a cup of coffee." Gratitude, apparently dies out as soon as an armistice is signed.

Congressmen Have No Right To Peddle Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Legislative Oversight Committee, I have taken an active part in exposing undue influence by the executive departments. While I fully realize that the regulatory agencies were established as an arm of the Congress, I feel that the Members of Congress should not intervene in proceedings before these Federal agencies.

One of the outstanding Republican newspapers has written a fine editorial on this subject, which I felt might be of interest to the Members of the House. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this editorial which appeared in the Decatur Herald on July 27, 1959:

CONGRESSMEN HAVE NO RIGHT TO PEDDLE INFLUENCE

To Illinois' Senator EVERETT MCK. DIRKSEN, the public is indebted for his candid remarks about congressional influence being applied to executive agencies.

The Senate Republican leader was speaking on a bill which seeks to bar anyone, including Members of Congress, from making informal approaches to quasi-judicial Federal agencies about official matters.

Washington, the Senator says, "is a big, baffling, labyrinthine Government in which even Senators and Representatives get lost and cannot find "where the authority in a certain field rests."

Senator DIRKSEN said he will continue to help constituents find their way around official Government circles "until there is a mandate in the law which says it is wrong and that I will be put in jail for doing it." He added that if such a law is passed, "I shall have outlived my usefulness in public life."

The Senator may be missing the mark. Members of Congress will continue to act as Washington agents for their constituents, within the limit of their time and resources. Their Washington staffs will continue to make appointments, procure necessary information, and even open some doors not otherwise open for constituents having legitimate business with the Government.

But it is not proper for a Member of Congress to attempt to influence the judgment of a Federal administrator on a case pending before him, any more than it is proper to attempt to influence a Federal judge in a case at law.

Sherman Adams, once powerful assistant to the President, was forced out of public life by congressional revelations of his intervention in proceedings before a Federal regulatory agency on behalf of a powerful friend. It is no more justified when a Congressman exercises such influence.

Congressmen, too, are sometimes found to have a conflict of interest between their private holdings and an area of public concern in which they are called upon to legislate. This conflict is no more excusable on Capitol Hill than in an executive agency.

A Member of Congress has every right to help a constituent find the right door in official Washington. But he has no right to enter in an attempt to do a favor for a friend. Senator DIRKSEN should make it clear that he believes this, too.

John Paul Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the East Side News, a weekly publication with wide circulation in the 19th Congressional District of New York:

FIGHTER FOR FREEDOM: JOHN PAUL JONES, 1747–92

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

We salute John Paul Jones, our greatest naval hero. We honor our defender of democracy. We hail the 212th anniversary of his birth. His name is revered by all Americans. His fame walks the pathway of the stars.

Biography is the key to history. The greatest souls of history are those who conquered in the face of adversity; who hitched their chariot to the star of hope; who snatched immortality from the ruins of time. Such a man was John Paul Jones.

Let us raise the curtain that conceals the past. Let us illustrate the lofty patriotism that characterizes the Revolutionary era. Let us contemplate the life and service of John Paul Jones, one of the most glorious in the galaxy of American immortals.

He was an immigrant. He was born John Paul at Kirkbean, Scotland, July 6, 1747, and died at the age of 45 in 1792. He settled in Fredericksburg, Va., in 1773, and added Jones to his name. He entered the American Navy at the outbreak of the American Revolution and was commissioned lieutenant on December 7, 1775. He was promoted to captain in 1776 and made a successful cruise as commander of the *Ranger* in waters around the British Isles in 1778.

His story reads like a fairy tale. His life rises to the simplicity of an epic. His deeds will never cease to excite men with the splendor of events and inspire them with the majesty of his achievements.

His supreme courage, with heroic endurance, with unfaltering faith in God, he became one of the elect of Americans. He was the trusted friend of Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin. He was the personification of valor. He was the foremost naval commander of the Revolution.

His genius blew the breath of life into the drama of an infant republic. His deeds were the inspiration of the dawning sea power of the new world. His services were of the highest moment to the glory of the nation. He won his battles not by ships, but by his genius. He was the conqueror of the conquerors of the sea. He was the Bayard of the blue waters.

On water he was the wizard of the sea. On land he was the master of diplomacy. He believed in the royalty of man. He believed in the sovereignty of the citizen. He believed in the matchless greatness of the republic. Love of liberty was the master passion of his soul, and he longed to have his name and fame associated with his adopted country—America.

Whose blood does not run faster, Whose blood does not run warmer, When he reads the thrilling exploits of John Paul Jones. What American has not treasured up in his mind Captain Jones' bloody sea skirmish with the British *Serapis*. "Are you prepared to surrender," shouted the British captain. And Captain Jones, commanding the *Bonhomme Richard* in the thickest of combat, hatless and begrimed with powder, the very incarnation of battle, shouted the historic words: "I have not yet begun to fight."

By the inspiration of his example, he forged weaklings into giants. He captured his opponents. He snatched victory from defeat. He transferred his crew to his prize. Just in time to see his own ship *Bonhomme Richard* sink beneath the waves with the Stars and Stripes floating from the mast.

He was the first to hoist our flag upon a man-of-war. He was the first to raise our flag upon a hostile ship captured in battle. He was the first to receive a salute from a foreign power. He was the first commander in history who ever landed an American force upon the European shore.

Every officer of the Navy should know by heart the deeds of his undaunted commander. Every officer of the Navy should feel in every fibre of his being the desire to emulate the indomitable determination of John Paul Jones who strengthened the soul of our people in their great struggle for nationality.

John Paul Jones resided in Paris at the time of his death. His remains was brought to this country in 1905, and later buried in a crypt of the U.S. Naval Academy chapel, Annapolis, Md., in 1913.

But his true sepulcher will ever rest in the hearts of the American people. The people are his memorial. He is our hero. He will live on in immortal youth. He will live for all time in our history.

Indecision on Atomic Powered Airplane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial entitled "Atomic Plane Indecision," which appeared in the Atlanta Journal on July 26, 1959:

ATOMIC PLANE INDECISION

Many Americans will be inclined to side with Representative MELVIN PRICE that there

has been too much indecision and delay in the administration's approach to problems involved in construction of an atomic-powered airplane.

A joint congressional subcommittee headed by Representative PRICE has held 36 hearings on the subject in the past 13 years—and still there is no go-ahead signal from the Government.

Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Chief of Staff, and Maj. Gen. Donald J. Keirn, Air Force Chief for Nuclear Propulsion, are in favor of going ahead with construction of the plane. There are reports of the Russians going all-out in completion of such a project.

The need is for a firm decision one way or another. Considerably more vigor was given to plans for the development of nuclear submarines; otherwise this country today would have no atomic-powered underwater craft.

The Government has wasted enough time on the atomic plane project. The situation calls for an explanation.

International Association of Firefighters Opposed to Extending OASI Program to Firefighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter which I have received from Mr. John C. Kabachus, secretary-treasurer of the International Association of Firefighters:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF FIREFIGHTERS,
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1959.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: H.R. 213 originally provided for additional time in which certain State agreements under section 218 of the Social Security Act may be modified to secure coverage for nonprofessional school district employees. It was acted upon by the House and subsequently appeared on the Senate Calendar.

The Senate, in its deliberations, has further amended this act seeking to extend social security coverage for police and fire in the States of Vermont, North Dakota, California, and Kansas, and to provide coverage for a small unit of police officers in the State of Oklahoma who have erroneously been making contributions into the system.

These amendments in the Senate deprived our organization of an opportunity of formal hearings with respect to the position of the firefighters. May we take this opportunity to state the position of the firefighters.

Our international organization, since the very inception of the Federal act dating back to 1937 consistently at its biennial conventions where delegates representing 95,000 firefighters affiliated with our international organization have constantly taken the stand that, as an international union, we would oppose extending the OASI program to the firefighters.

The objections raised by the firefighters toward the Federal Social Security Act are that it is primarily and basically designed as a social measure and was never intended to serve as a retirement plan. In contrast, we find State and local retirement plans designed to meet the needs of superannuated employees where benefits are based on the amount of contributions and geared to the amount of salary and length of service. A retirement plan is viewed as an arrangement between one employer and his employee.

In the case of the social security program, there is little individual equity; the contributions are not earmarked to buy protection for specific employees on whose wages they are based. I am sure you will agree that the principles of a retirement plan are exactly the contrary.

We, as firemen, enjoy a very privileged position in our communities where retirement systems exist. It is universally known that, through the generosity of our States and city fathers, early retirement opportunities are provided for any of our firefighters, substantial disability benefits as well as provisions for adequate ordinary disability retirement allowances, benefit payments to our widows and orphans do not fall into the category of being subsistence allowances and most areas provide for an adequate income as the result of the loss of the breadwinner. Under the provisions of many of the retirement organizations that are presently in existence, firefighters also enjoy the benefit of special consideration being given for the hazardous nature of the firefighter job in his community by providing for additional creditable service in computing his actual retirement allowance.

In the event the existing retirement programs in our communities covering the firefighter indicate a deficiency in the benefits in the survivor's awards for employees who at an early age expire under conditions that cannot be attributed to the fire service, it is our feeling that the local retirement plan can effectively be amended providing for the coverage at less cost of the local taxpayer than by the extension of a Federal social security program.

Hoping that this information will indicate our position in opposition to the OASI program being extended in the direction of covering the firefighters, I am,

Respectfully,

JOHN C. KABACHUS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Job Development Legislation Urgently Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by Hon. David L. Lawrence, Governor of Pennsylvania, before the Pennsylvania congressional delegation, Washington, D.C., Wednesday, July 29, 1959:

As far as Pennsylvania is concerned, Senate bill 722, the job development legislation, is the most important piece of legislation before the Congress.

Our State suffered severely during the recent recession. It continues to suffer. During May, the last month for which complete figures are available, unemployment stood at 364,000. That is 10.7 percent of all the unemployed in the United States; we have only 6.35 percent of the Nation's population.

The reasons for this chronic condition are well known to all of us. They bear on the shift of textiles to the South; the depletion of our forests; the mechanization of our coal mines and coal's competition from other fuels; the automation process in many industries; notably steel; and the dieselization of our railroads.

Needless to say, whether your particular district is rated as chronic, or just falls into a temporary labor surplus area, there is a direct overall impact to your constituents. People of the more prosperous areas are carrying a disproportionate share of Pennsylvania's obligations—for roads, for schools, for public assistance and for general government. On this basis, one area of the state cannot fully prosper while another area is economically distressed.

As you know, the Senate completed action on March 23, 1959. The House Banking and Currency Committee completed action on May 14. Since then S. 722 has languished in the Rules Committee.

It is most urgent to Pennsylvania that S. 722 be acted upon promptly and favorably.

I have heard the argument that S. 722 is an antiunemployment bill; that it is not needed now that the recession is largely over. This is based on two misconceptions: (1) That chronic long-term unemployment in economically distressed areas ends when national recessions end; and (2) that S. 722 is an antirecession bill. Both are incorrect.

Chronic area unemployment in our State and the Nation persists even in the midst of national prosperity. The first attached chart [not printed in RECORD] illustrates this point.

As you can see, even in the boom years of 1952, 1956, and 1959 when national unemployment got down as low as 2.8 percent, 3.4 percent, and 4.9 percent, respectively, unemployment in our chronic surplus areas in Pennsylvania remained at 7.8 percent, 8.9 percent, and 12.6 percent.

The second chart [not printed in RECORD] shows the location of these chronic surplus areas in the State, all of which would qualify for help under the area redevelopment bill, according to the committee report.

The third chart [not printed in RECORD] shows the severity of unemployment, as of May and January, in each area currently classified as substantial labor surplus.

The fourth chart [not printed in RECORD] shows the location of these areas of substantial labor surpluses.

As you can see, unemployment even today remains as high as 18.2 percent in the Uniontown-Connellsville area, due to shutting down of mines and many other industries.

The Uniontown-Connellsville figure is a dramatic demonstration of Pennsylvania's need for this legislation. Only seven other towns in the Nation exceed the 18.2 percent rate—six of these are small towns in West Virginia and Kentucky coal fields; the seventh is a small Maine town where the textile factory moved out.

Most dramatic of all is the Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Hazleton complex. With a 14.1 percent unemployment figure, it has the highest unemployment rate of the 149 metropolitan areas in the United States.

Unemployment stands at 7.6 percent in Pittsburgh and 6.4 percent in Philadelphia. These statistics, remember are for May, and do not reflect the steel strike.

It is quite clear that long-term unemployment is a boom time phenomenon in some areas of the State, and not just a byproduct of national recessions.

Our State and our communities have done a magnificent job through local industrial authorities. But the Federal Government has failed to assume its share of the responsibility in chronic area unemployment in the United States for far too long. It is our hope that this will end with the implementation of S. 722.

Pennsylvania is the classic illustration of this problem, gentlemen. We ought to have unanimity, or close to it, from our own dele-

gation. If we don't, then other Congressmen, with no distressed area problems of their own, might very well question, and doubt, the severity of the problem as we know it.

Statement by Murray A. Sadler, Chairman, South Carolina Highway Users Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Murray Sadler, representing the South Carolina Highway Users Conference, was well received by the Ways and Means Committee. He made an excellent statement, worthy of the attention of the Congress and the country. His testimony follows:

My name is Murray Sadler. I am from Donalds, S.C., and am here as chairman of the South Carolina Highway Users Conference. In appearing before this committee today, I am representing the following highway user groups: Association General Contractors; Atlantic Greyhound Corp.; Carolina Motor Club; Carolina Ready-Mixed Concrete Association; Columbia Outdoor Advertising, Inc.; Esso Standard Oil Co., Truck Division; Motor Transportation Association of South Carolina; Palmetto State Oil Marketers' Association; Portland Cement Association; South Carolina Association County Road Officials; South Carolina Automobile Dealers Association; South Carolina Bakers Council; South Carolina Dairy Association; South Carolina Farm Bureau; South Carolina Oil Jobbers Association; South Carolina Rural Letter Carriers; South Carolina State Chamber of Commerce; South Carolina State Grange; South Carolina State Motor Club; Textile Manufacturers Association.

Every one of these South Carolina organizations is unalterably opposed to any further increases, in any amount and for any purpose whatever, in the Federal gasoline tax or other Federal taxes levied on highway users.

Just 3 years ago, in 1956, the Congress raised the Federal gasoline tax to 3 cents a gallon and authorized the start of this great new Federal highway program. That increase was justified to the motoring public on the premise that it would help finance the program on a pay-as-you-go basis, without any need for further taxation.

To insure the integrity of the plan, the highway trust fund was established and certain Federal automotive taxes, including the new 3-cent-a-gallon tax, were earmarked to go into the fund.

That was yesterday. Today, the highway program is no longer on a pay-as-you-go basis, and motorists are threatened with another gasoline tax increase, whose justification this time is that not enough money is available to pay for the program.

I am sure that others today have pointed out, or will point out, the heavy highway tax burden already borne by motorists all across the country. In South Carolina, our motorists are now paying over $150 per year per vehicle in special automotive taxes. More to the point, the Federal gasoline and other automotive taxes alone are now taking more than $40 million a year out of our State.

Our motorists have never objected to paying their own way and have always been willing to bear a special highway tax load for the roads they need and use. No highway-minded person or organization could feel otherwise, but how much can they take?

Forty million dollars a year is a staggering special Federal tax load for vehicle operators.

Moreover, they are not getting a square deal on the money they already pay. We have not yet heard it denied that current Federal revenue from these taxes far exceeds the cost of the road program.

The South Carolina Highway Users Conference and its member organizations strongly urge that all of this automotive tax money be dedicated, as it should rightly be, to roads.

We are of the unequivocal opinion that our motorists not only pay more than enough for the roads necessary to their well-being, but that any added taxes on motor fuels would be utterly unjustified.

I would like also to make one final point. We are totally unimpressed by suggestions that this tax might be increased on a temporary basis.

Twenty-seven years of experience with the Federal gasoline tax have demonstrated to us that there is nothing temporary about it.

In our view, no case whatsoever has been made for any type of gasoline tax increase.

John Harris, Houston Chronicle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include what I believe to be a thought-provoking article written by one of the newest and youngest members of the Texas press corps here in Washington.

The article dealing with the present steel strike was written by John Harris, Washington correspondent for the Houston Chronicle:

[From the Houston Chronicle, July 26, 1959]

STRIKEBOUND STEEL PLANTS FACE RUIN

(By John Harris)

WASHINGTON.—Many shutdown steel plants may never reopen, Commerce Department officials warned Saturday.

This is because the steel strike, if prolonged, will hand to foreign producers a part of the domestic steel market on a platter—permanently.

"If the strike stretches on, American buyers will wind up trying to get foreign-made steel at any price," a spokesman warned.

"Buying habits and contacts will be established, causing permanent penetration of the home industry," he said.

IMPORTS WIRE

The United States imports huge quantities of barbed wire, wire fencing, rods, and reinforcing bars. But foreign mills have long sought to increase these, and to establish in the U.S. market for other products.

Many feel the strike will provide their big chance.

An estimated 21 million tons of steel is now in inventory in the United States. This is roughly a 90-day supply. But some lines may run out faster than this, it was predicted, causing a demand for foreign replacement.

BIGGEST CENTER

Last year the Houston-Galveston area was the Nation's biggest center for importation of foreign steel products. About 334,000 tons of imported steel poured into the area.

Oddly, an initial result of the strike will tend to reduce foreign steel imports, however. But this will disappear if the strike continues beyond a few weeks.

The reduction is being caused by two factors:

1. Huge amounts of foreign steel have been stockpiled in anticipation of the strike.

2. A resurgence of European economy is providing a ready market for steel that would otherwise only find a buyer in the United States.

DELIVERY LONGER

Commerce Department experts said this is why delivery time for steel destined for the United States is now lengthened, and why the price of foreign steel is already edging up. (Some foreign steel products are higher priced than their U.S. counterpart, as in the case of galvanized sheet.)

Concrete reinforcing bars, formerly $70 per metric ton f.o.b. Antwerp, Belgium, are now $100, and still rising.

Western European and Japanese steel plants, many built with foreign aid dollars, are getting into high gear from a period of recession. Japanese steelmen, whose production dropped 54 percent last year, are known to be encouraged by the steel strike here.

SMALL NATIONS

Biggest exporters to the United States are the postage-stamp size countries of Belgium and Luxembourg. Together they account for about half of steel imports.

Japan is next, followed by West Germany, France, and Britain.

Sources of steel in Belgium and Luxembourg are a giant complex of firms tied closely in a cartel. They set their own minimum prices for steel they export; there is no competition.

CARTEL CENTER

Headquarters of the cartel is in Brussels; cartels are legal in most European countries. Some of their plants are the most modern in the world, for many were destroyed in World War II, and were rebuilt in the latest style.

Ownership is mostly private. In Britain 10 percent of steel industry is owned by the Government.

But combined, steel exports to the United States comprised less than 3 percent of the steel in the United States during 1958.

However, in certain products, their contribution is significant.

PERCENTAGE

More than 50 percent of our barbed wire is imported. We import 20 percent of our wire fencing, 32 percent of wire nails, 19 percent of concrete reinforcing bars, and 17 percent of our wire rods.

Foreign producers are hoping to step these percentages up considerably.

Belgium and Luxembourg have to export almost all their steel products; their domestic economy is too small to absorb them. West Germany, Japan, France, and Britain are traditionally nations of heavy steel industries.

In 1957 the United States imported 1,500,000 tons of steel. In 1958 this rose to 1,700,000, and in the first 5 months of 1959, 1,500,000 tons were imported, mainly in anticipation of the strike. Of this, 171,000 tons come into the Houston-Galveston area.

Basic Difference: We Trust the People, Communist Rulers Do Not

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of July 25, 1959, commenting on the magnificient speech on American life and attitudes given by Vice President NIXON in Moscow at the opening of the American Exposition there:

WE TRUST THE PEOPLE

Friday, July 24, 1959, will go down in history for one of the most curious episodes in the annals of diplomacy. On that day, in Moscow, before an aghast audience of newspapermen, photographers and officials, the Premier of the Soviet Union grew so vehement in his arguments with the Vice President of the United States that he waggled a minatory finger under Mr. NIXON's nose. And in the exchange of warm words, the Vice President gave as good as he received.

Dramatic as this incident of the opening of the American Exposition might be, however, the true importance of the day lies in other directions. For it is doubtful whether the effervescent Mr. Khrushchev, who is fond of trading blunt, off-the-cuff remarks and finds few foemen worthy of his steel among the sycophants and satellites who surround him, attached much importance to the matter. He may even have found it refreshing.

What was serious was Mr. NIXON's formal speech, a very clear and candid explanation of what the physical objects on display at the exposition stood for in terms of American life. It was an excellent speech, one to make Americans proud both of what inspired it and the man who gave it. There was neither brag nor bluster, but a plain and factual statement of what freedom, a long course of industrial development and the drive of a people still young in history had been able to do to refute the classic criticisms of capitalism, made a century ago. And perhaps the heart of it lay in Mr. NIXON's assertion: "We trust the people."

The force of this statement received a blunt and unexpected tribute from the Soviet Government. Before the Vice President spoke, Soviet officials started culling out American books from the exposition. And news stories telling of this intrusion of censorship were themselves censored. And after Mr. NIXON's speech, the Soviet radio put it on the air—without translation.

Whatever may be done in explanation of these acts, or to change the impression they created, it is patent that the Soviet Union does not trust the people. The speech of Norman Cousins is another case in point. Premier Khrushchev might throw an arm in friendly wise about a worker's shoulders, but his government puts its paternal hands over that worker's eyes and ears.

Mr. Khrushchev's cavalier treatment of his distinguished guest is an interesting example of his concept of diplomatic manners. But far more fundamental is the Soviet treatment of Mr. NIXON's speech, of American books and the American press. Of all the gulfs that policy has opened between East and West, of all the dangers that Soviet expansionism has created, this basic difference between the two societies is the most serious. The Russian people and the American people both want peace, both would like to be friends and to engage in the fruitful exchange of ideas and goods. But in America we trust the people. In the Soviet Union, their rulers do not.

Jersey Drum Corps Are Nation's Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article from the Jersey Journal of July 27, entitled "Jersey Drum Corps Are Nation's Best."

I am especially proud because the drum corps which are the Nation's best, emanate from my district. They are St. Vincent's in Bayonne and St. Patrick's in Jersey City.

Anyone who witnesses a performance of these drum corps is in for a most entertaining experience.

A special tribute is due to the organizers and moderators of the respective corps: Rev. Edward F. Wojtycha of St. Vincent's and Rev. David Gaffney of St. Patrick's. Also, my commendations to the fine boys and girls who do such an able job of performing. They work very hard and have a rigorous training schedule year round.

Perhaps if any of my colleagues are interested in viewing a performance on August 30 in Roosevelt Stadium in Jersey City, St. Vincent's will perform their annual dream contest. St. Patrick's has already held their preview of champions show on May 31 of this year.

The article follows:

HAPPY, BUSY YOUNGSTERS—JERSEY DRUM CORPS ARE NATION'S BEST

Let blare the bugle; let roll the drum: here come the champion musical-marching corps of New Jersey.

Rigorous training is a year 'round must for drum and bugle cadets, and this is the season it pays off in colorful competitive displays. Here in Hudson County are two topnotch units, St. Vincent's in Bayonne and St. Patrick's in Jersey City.

The junior corps perform with about 50 members under the age of 21, and have all-girl color guards. At the heads of the bands are drum major, John Salvato, and color guard captain Patricia Walsh of St. Vincent's, and their St. Patrick's counterparts, Simon Coscia and Patricia Reid, all 18.

The experienced Vinnies have marched to the tune of 11 national junior championships since 1946, reports the Reverend Edward F. Wojtycha, organizer and moderator.

The Jersey City corps is "still in the growing stage," says the Reverend David Gaffney of St. Patrick's, "but we're moving up quite fast." His evidence is the fourth place (out of 15) copped by the cadets in their third try at the State title.

The Bayonne group wears green and white uniforms, trimmed with gold, and black leather riding boots. The Patties sport black and white outfits and cowboy hats.

Military maneuvers are skilled to precision by popular songs and solid marches. Father Wojtycha said the crowd pleasers range from Sousa to Lerner-Lowe.

Father Gaffney regrets that his audiences are sometimes disappointed. "But there's just not enough Irish music adaptable to a marching drum corps," he says.

Expenses are high, report the clergymen. Outfits cost $2,000, new drums $850, and an August trip to Minneapolis for the nationals between $3,000–$3,500.

Much of the high cost of marching is met with funds raised at the competitive rallies held from May to October. St. Vincent's will sponsor the annual dream contest at Roosevelt Stadium, Jersey City, August 30, and expects up to 25,000 fans. St. Patrick's played host to 13,000 at the stadium at their preview of champions, May 31.

Other county-sponsored annuals are the Union City Independence Day celebration with a crowd of 14,000 and the Bayonne PAL and Union City PBA affairs in the fall.

Charles R. Naber of Union City, chief judge of the Eastern States Association of Contest Judges, explained the scoring of maneuvers, which are penalized if lasting more or less than the prescribed 8 minutes.

Two judges rate each performance on a 100-point system. This is the breakdown: marching and maneuvering (30), bugling (25), drumming (25), and general effect (20).

Other Jersey groups with national reputations are the Caballeros of Hawthorne, a senior corps that won first place in the 1958 American Legion nationals; the Golden Knights of Blessed Sacrament, Newark, that received top trophies in last year's Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars nationals; and the Holy Name Cadets of Garfield, who placed second in 1958 junior nationals.

Naber, a 25-year judging expert, says corps training is an outstanding deterrent to juvenile delinquency, because members are just too busy. His colleagues have an old saying: "The kid who blows a bugle will never blow a safe."

Judge James R. Nolen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. I was inexpressibly shocked to learn of the sudden passing of my friend, the distinguished judge of the Ware, Mass., district court, Hon. James R. Nolen.

Judge Nolen was in the prime of his very brilliant career. For years he had been a successful, outstanding, practicing lawyer in the State of Massachusetts, New York, Washington, and Europe. Indeed, his practice carried him to many countries and he was known as an expert on international law as well as domestic law.

His services on the bench were of the very highest order. He was recognized for his great ability, fairness and impartiality, and had frequently been called by the chief justice for a considerable period of time to serve at sessions of the great Superior Court of Massachusetts where he won new acclaim for his capacity, legal knowledge, and talents as a brilliant and fairminded lawyer and judge.

Judge Nolen was former distinguished chairman of the Port of Boston Authority, and in that important work he

rendered most valuable services to the port of Boston. He was chairman of the Ware Selective Service Board which served five Massachusetts communities during World War II. Judge Nolen served as adviser to the Foreign Economics Administration in Washington during that war and was also a sage adviser at the World Monetary Conference in 1945.

Very highly trained and educated, he was a graduate of Holy Cross College, Boston University Law School, and held an honorary degree of doctor of laws from Mount Mary College in Milwaukee.

In his early years, he had studied at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point for 2 years until he decided to take up law.

Judge Nolen was possessed of an amiable, magnetic personality and was respected and loved by all who knew him. He was a man of action and a man who loved to move in many circles.

He was a member of the Knights of Columbus, the Erie Society, the Charitable Irish Society, the Ancient Order of Hibernians, the Red Men, the American Turn-Verein, and the Algonquin Club of Boston.

I had known Judge Nolen for many years and entertained highest regard and affection for him. Prior to his elevation as presiding judge of the Ware court, he came to Washington quite frequently on business and I often met him and always enjoyed his visits.

He had a sharp, legal mind, was a man of a broad variety of interests, a careful student of government, and a learned judge. A man of rugged character, great ability, strong purpose and undeviating loyalty, he won the respect, esteem, and affection of all those who knew him and was admired and respected by the community to which he made so many valuable contributions.

He was taken by his Maker right at the height of his career, at a time when those of us who knew him all believed that he had many more years of promise, progress, and advancement in his chosen profession.

He leaves behind him a very large number of people who mourn his loss and a loving family to whom he was so deeply devoted. To his beloved wife, Mrs. Nolen, and his distinguished sons, State Representative James R. Nolen of Ware and Dr. William Nolen of New York City; his two daughters, Mrs. Mary McGrath of New Britain, Conn., and Miss Judith Nolen of New York City; his distinguished brother, Judge William R. Nolen, of Holyoke; and the rest of his family I tender my deepest sympathy.

I hope and pray that the good Lord will bestow upon them in their profound sorrow and grief that measure of consolation and reconciliation that comes from their spiritual faith. I extend them all my most sincere condolences with the devout prayer that they may accept their sorrowful bereavement with true Christian fortitude. May Judge Nolen find peace and rest in his heavenly home.

Resolutions Adopted at Convention of North Dakota Stockmen's Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the North Dakota Stockmen's Association held their annual convention in Bismarck, N.Dak., early in June. I have just received a copy of their resolutions, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I think that Members of the Senate will find the views of the North Dakota Stockmen's Association most helpful to them.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE 30TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NORTH DAKOTA STOCKMEN'S ASSOCIATION HELD AT BISMARCK, N. DAK., JUNE 8, 9, 10, 1959

RESOLUTION NO. 1

Livestock research

Whereas the potential for livestock production in North Dakota is vastly underdeveloped; and

Whereas it is a recognized fact that our industry spends pennies for research where other industries spend dollars; and

Whereas the future economy of North Dakota is directly dependent on continued advancements in the livestock industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are in favor of a vastly augmented livestock research program including nutrition and veterinary research at the North Dakota Experiment Station.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

Light or suspended sentences

Resolved—

1. It is of primary importance to the people of this State that the laws enacted for the protection of the stock grower should be enforced where guilt is clear whether by admission or by conviction. The only legal deterrent to theft is in the hands of the courts and this must be effective and not result in such light or lacking punishment as to make the laws ineffective.

2. Whereas the suspended sentence is often used by the District Court of North Dakota with convicted cattle thieves; and

3. Whereas a suspended sentence has little or no effectiveness unless the person whose sentence has been suspended has adequate supervision;

4. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in order to bring about better understanding and cooperation, the North Dakota Stockmen's Association requests that the district courts, county authorities, the North Dakota Parole Board and all State officers work together toward the end that every suspended sentence involving punishment for livestock theft be carefully supervised and revoked upon violation.

5. And that we recommend imposing heavier sentences for stealing or illegal killing of cattle or other livestock.

RESOUTION NO. 3

Beef promotion

Be it resolved, That the North Dakota Stockmen's Association urge the American National Cattleman's Association and its officers to fully cooperate with the National Beef Council in its current educational, promotional and research program; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Beef Council be recognized by the American National Cattleman's Association as the proper collecting and disbursing agency of all beef promotional funds collected for national beef promotion and education.

RESOLUTION NO. 4

Beef promotion funds

Whereas we reaffirm our position that the beef producers are directly concerned with the promotion of beef to bring about an increased consumer demand for beef through an augmented an enlarged producer program of education, research, merchandising and promotion, and

Whereas the primary obstacle to financing an effective beef promotion program is the restricting provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act with respect to voluntary deductions from proceeds of sale of livestock at public markets: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we support proposed legislation amending the Packers and Stockyards Act whereby any marketing agency may, upon request of a responsible State livestock producer organization, make voluntary deductions not exceeding 10 cents per head on cattle, payable to the aforesaid livestock producer organization.

RESOLUTION NO. 5

Coordination of beef promotion

Whereas various organizations throughout the State have been very active in beef promotion and in the promotion of cattle feed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, To continue coordination of all groups now actively interested in beef promotion.

RESOLUTION NO. 6

Bangs vaccination for recertification brucellosis program

Whereas official vaccination has proven to be a practical and effective means for the control of brucellosis: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge that official vaccination of bovine beef type females properly identified shall be acceptable as an alternate method for recertification of modified accredited areas in the Federal-State cooperative brucellosis eradication program; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge that bovine beef type females which have been officially brucellosis vaccinated and are properly identified, regardless of age may be moved or transported interstate.

RESOLUTION NO. 7

Experiment station and extension service budget

Whereas the North Dakota Experiment Station and Extension Service are direct contributors to the welfare of the operating farmers and ranchers in the State of North Dakota; and

Whereas the increased need for further research in livestock is a recognized fact; and

Whereas the ranchers and farmers of North Dakota firmly believe that the budgets for these two services are not compatible with the schools of higher education; and

Whereas the present budget for agricultural research in livestock production is not in keeping with the technological advances in present day agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the North Dakota Stockmen's Association promote and request of the legislature that proceedings be initiated to the effect that the future appropriations of the experiment station and extension

service be completely separated from the college budgets of North Dakota.

RESOLUTION NO. 8

Feed lot branding

We recommend that the brand department of the North Dakota Stockmen's Association investigate and recommend a uniform charge per head for feed lot branding—this to be performed at point of purchase where facilities are available.

We recommend that the department clarify procedure for feed lot branding on cattle purchased. We suggest this information be publicized through all media available to the brand department.

RESOLUTION NO. 9

County livestock groups

We recognize the value of county livestock groups to the livestock industry. The North Dakota Stockmen's Association desires to cooperate with these groups to the fullest extent. We invite them to call on the Stockmen's Association for any help we can give in the way of speakers, program materials, or any other assistance they may desire.

RESOLUTION NO. 10

North Dakota Water Users' Association

Whereas North Dakota is a State that is the drainage area providing runoff water that is now impounded in dams and reservoirs in the State and outside of the State, and more dams and reservoirs will be made in the future storing water originating in North Dakota; and

Whereas each year more demands are made on this water by States in the lower reaches of these streams draining North Dakota water; and

Whereas the future of North Dakota's agricultural and industrial growth will depend progressively heavier on the available supply of water, and

Whereas the North Dakota Water Users' Association is endeavoring to promote use of this water in North Dakota and the safeguarding of the legal rights to these waters for North Dakota use: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the North Dakota Stockmen's Association commend the North Dakota Water Users' Association on their most needed endeavors to preserve the rights to North Dakota water for North Dakota users and encourage the activities of this organization.

RESOLUTION NO. 11

Wilderness legislation

Whereas legislation has been proposed in the Congress that would authorize the creation of a wilderness system which contains no definite limitation of the federally owned lands which may be removed from multiple use and thus set aside for the enjoyment of a fortunate few; and

Whereas this legislation provides no recognition of natural resources within their borders for commercial and general recreational purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the provision and protection of needed wilderness areas be left to the agencies administering the lands and to the citizens of the States where such areas are practical.

RESOLUTION NO. 12

Waterfowl refuges

Whereas the U.S. Government, especially through its agency, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, is sadly failing in the administration of the professed multiuse policy as concerns grazing of livestock on game refuges, resulting in gross inefficiency of the use of said land, and

Whereas the Fish and Wildlife Service is constantly acquiring and attempting to acquire more private lands for refuge purposes, we, the North Dakota Stockmen's Association, strongly oppose the further acquisition of any land within North Dakota for refuge purposes as it affects private livestock operations, and strongly urge that the multiuse policy be continued as originally intended.

RESOLUTION NO. 13

Economy in Government

Whereas the Hoover Commission report has pointed out various ways of economizing in Government spending that would save taxpayers billions of dollars without impairing Government effectiveness; and

Whereas Congress has been loath to adopt these economy measures, which in no way would interfere with necessary spending for defense: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we again urge Congress to enact measures as suggested in the Hoover Commission report.

RESOLUTION NO. 14

Third brakeman

Whereas the progress of North Dakota and this association is in part tied to transportation; and

Whereas this association is vitally interested in sound and economic transportation; and

Whereas North Dakota railroads are hampered in their operation by an outmoded 1919 law which requires railroads to use a surplus third brakeman on freight trains of more than 40 cars on their main lines: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association commend the 1959 legislative assembly for their action in passage of senate bill 94, which amended an obsolete law, and we express the belief that the people will sustain and affirm this legislative action.

RESOLUTION NO. 15

Thank you

To the city of Bismarck, it various organizations, business establishments, and the many individuals who have contributed so generously of both time and effort in making this convention a success, we wish to express our thanks. The job was well done and we have had a wonderful convention.

Also, to Gov. John Davis, we express our appreciation for his generous invitation to use the State Capitol for our first day's meetings.

RESOLUTION NO. 16

Sympathy

We wish to express our sincere sorrow at this time for the loss of advice, counsel, and fellowship of those members who have passed on during the year. We extend our deepest sympathy to their families.

Veto of Wheat Bill Should Result in Stabilizing Prices and Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune. This editorial sheds light on the recently vetoed wheat bill, and attests to the political motivation of the vote harvesting farm bloc. I hope it will be read by my colleagues, as well as by wheat farmers and the taxpaying, bread-buying public.

VETO OF WHEAT BILL SHOULD RESULT IN STABILIZING PRICES AND INCOME

President Eisenhower vetoed the wheat bill handed to him by a congressional majority that knew in advance it would be disapproved. Reaction from Democrats confirms what opponents of the bill have been saying all along—it was conceived for political gain and not from a sincere effort to make things profitable for the farmer.

The Democrats gleefully said they are convinced the veto handed them a farm issue which will help elect a Democrat to the Presidency next year. Four Senators with presidential aspirations were on record as favoring the bill the President vetoed. Senators LYNDON JOHNSON, STUART SYMINGTON, and HUBERT HUMPHREY voted for it. Senator JOHN KENNEDY who was absent paired his vote in support of the bill.

The Republican Party leadership will be lacking in astuteness if it does not immediately begin making it plain to the people that indeed an issue has arisen, but not in the light the Democrats see it. It is time the farmers are given convincing evidence that they have been used too long as tools for political profit. The wheat bill that Mr. Eisenhower vetoed is one of the best examples.

Any farmer worthy of the name should realize that there is no basis to the Democratic claims that the rejected measure would have reduced wheat production and cut the cost of farm programs in general to benefit the taxpayer.

The history of past programs calling for reduced acreage, as this one did, reveals that in no instance has production been reduced as a result. Improved methods of cultivation, better fertilizers and more mechanization have increased the yield in percentages that have outstripped acreage reductions. To anyone who challenges that, the statistics on wheat in storage, the increasing costs of the program, and the payments to the farmers provide enough answer.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, the greatest of the farmers' organizations, which has consistently been opposed to the gradual strangling of the farmer's independence through regimentation, but which has been just as consistently ignored by the farm State politicians, in its latest attack on Government controls, has this to say:

"Farmers have been hurt by accumulated surpluses, overproduction, and inefficient marketing practices that have resulted from these laws. Government stockpiles of surplus farm products represent an investment of close to $10 billion. The surplus is still growing despite everything that is being done to reduce it through allotments, quotas, soil bank programs, cut-rate sales, and outright gifts. The end is not yet in sight."

Those are facts which cannot be disputed but which somehow manage to be ignored. They are facts in spite of the 30 years that Congress has been running the farmer's business for him without achieving that which every farmer would like to see, greater stability in prices and incomes.

Union Oil's "Poppycock" Advertisement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the practice of certain big corporations to buy space in national magazines and news-

papers to beat their ideological drums is all right as free speech. However, when they use their expensive soapbox to spread misleading and erroneous poppycock, then they should be answered—if not in a full-page advertisement, then elsewhere.

Below are the text of such an advertisement and a copy of my answer, along with the press release we issued to help the answer catch up, to some extent anyfay, with the advertisement which appeared very widely.

The only other consideration, Mr. Speaker, is whether such an advertisement is properly deductible as a legitimate business expense. That is a question I have addressed to the Internal Revenue Service.

Under unanimous consent previously granted I am including hereafter my press release, the text of the Union Oil Co. advertisement from the July 13, 1959, Life magazine, and my letter to the company's board chairman, Reese H. Taylor:

A national advertisement of a major oil company alleging that wage hikes and taxes threaten the jobs of its employees has drawn a requested response from Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat, Oregon.

In an open letter to the board chairman of the Union Oil Co. of California Thursday PORTER termed the advertisement misleading in many respects and "unfair poppycock." The Oregon Congressman cited facts and figures to disprove the assertions Chairman Reese H. Taylor was credited with making in a full page appearing in Life magazine July 13, 1959.

PORTER, in turn, invited comments from Taylor. He told Taylor "Businessmen belong in politics but they need facts and intelligence in this area as well as in business. I know it (the advertisement) utterly fails to do credit to the great ability you must have demonstrated to qualify for your present very responsible position."

The ad suggested:

1. That our Nation is being flooded with foreign imports to the detriment of the American economy. PORTER pointed out that U.S. merchandise exports exceed merchandise imports by $3 billion or more (1958 figures).

2. That the United States is faced with wage hikes not based on increased productivity and that other countries do not have this handicap. PORTER said available information showed 1958 total manufacturing production up 32 percent over 1948 while the number of man-hours of work in manufacturing was 10.3 percent lower. "This indicates that output per man-hour was 47.2 percent over the figure in 1948," he said.

(During the period, according to the Joint Economic Committee report of February 9, 1959, payrolls went up 41.6 percent and real average hourly earnings were up 31.5 percent. PORTER wrote Chairman Taylor that hourly earnings in manufacturing in Canada, West Germany, Great Britain, and France increased a higher percentage rate than in the U.S.A. from 1952–58.)

3. That the United States, unlike other countries, faces growing taxes, PORTER said the reverse is true. He said Federal tax rates on corporate and individual incomes "have been remarkably stable since World War II." PORTER quoted the U.S. News & World Report of April 3, 1959, which said U.S. taxes are among the lowest of all major nations.

Congressman PORTER told the oil company executive he didn't like high taxes either. eH said he felt, though, there were things a lot worse, such as jeopardizing national security by cutting back essential defense expenditures, increasing the Federal deficit to spur inflation or cutting expenditures for schools, highways, and hospitals to the detriment of national future health and welfare.

[Text of full page advertisement in Life magazine, July 13, 1959]

HOW WAGE HIKES AND TAXES THREATEN YOUR JOB

(By Charlie Perkins)

"Walk into nearly any store with the idea of buying something.

"You'll see products from abroad right alongside our American-made ones. Nails, woolen and cotton fabrics, dinnerware, sewing machines, cameras, bicycles, cars, and watches are some of them. And practically in every case, the imports cost less.

"Foreign manufacturers compete sharply now with our own industries. And they do so without two handicaps every American business faces today.

"1. Wage hikes not based on increased productivity. These result in continually rising prices for U.S. consumers and ever-mounting production costs for our manufacturers.

"2. Growing taxes. Each year taxes take more of industry's dollars. This, too, is reflected in higher prices to the consumer.

"It makes you wonder. If we price ourselves out of world markets, what's next? If we don't stay competitive, isn't that the same as pricing you and me and all of us right out of our jobs?"

Charlie Perkins, manager of our purchasing department, points up some cogent facts.

In 5 years U.S. imports climbed 77 percent while our exports rose only 27 percent. In 1958 our exports were $1 billion below 1957.

Unearned wage increases and ever-mounting taxes could reduce us to second rate status among nations—with a real unemployment problem here at home.

Your comments invited. Write: Chairman of the Board, Union Oil Co., Union Oil Center, Los Angeles 17, Calif.

UNION OIL COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA,
Manufacturers of Royal Triton, the Amazing Purple Motor Oil.

JULY 30, 1959.

Mr. REESE H. TAYLOR,
Chairman, Union Oil Co. of California,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. TAYLOR: In the July 13 issue of Life, the Union Oil Co. of California, of which you are the distinguished chairman, inserted a full-page advertisement which appeared also in many other magazines and which included an invitation for comments to be directed to you. I am pleased to accept this invitation.

Your advertisement is entitled, "Charlie Perkins, how wage hikes and taxes threaten your job." Charlie Perkins, as you note in the advertisement, is the manager of the purchasing department of your company.

Your advertisement is in many respects misleading and unfair poppycock. It suggests: (1) That our Nation is being flooded with foreign imports to the detriment of the American economy; (2) that the United States is faced with wage hikes not based on increased productivity and that other countries do not have this handicap; and (3) that the United States, unlike other countries, "is faced with growing taxes."

Each of these contentions is spurious. Let's look at the record.

Certainly we find a lot of items manufactured in other countries in our stores. But let me ask you a few simple questions, Mr. Taylor. Don't you believe that a lot of our manufacturers are mighty eager to sell some of their output in other countries? Does it disturb you when American-made sewing machines, typewriters, and farm machinery are sold abroad? How do you think foreign countries are going to pay for these goods if they can't sell their wares in this country?

Did you forget, if you ever knew, Mr. Taylor, that in no year since 1936 have our imports been as great as our exports and in recent years the excess of exports over imports has been most substantial.

Your Mr. Perkins is correct in his statement that merchandise exports were lower in 1958 than in 1957; in fact they were lower by $3.1 billion. But, in spite of this fact, 1958 merchandise exports were still $3.4 billion more than merchandise imports. (In 1957 merchandise exports were $6 billion greater than merchandise imports.)

I am sure that you must recognize, Mr. Taylor, as well as I do that the available data on productivity for industry as a whole is not very satisfactory. This is an area on which much more accurate information is needed. What information there is, however, does not point to any general conclusion that wage increases have been outstripping the productivity of American labor.

For example, based on statistics released by the Joint Economic Committee on February 9 of this year, it can be seen that in 1958 total manufacturing production was 32 percent greater than in 1948, while the number of man-hours of work in manufacturing was actually 10.3 percent lower. This indicates that output per man-hour was 47.2 percent greater in 1958 than in 1948. At the same time payrolls were 41.6 percent greater, and real average hourly earnings were 31.5 percent higher. Thus, while hourly earnings have more than kept pace with increases in the cost of living, real hourly earnings have increased only about two-thirds as much as output per man-hour. The broad generalizations of your advertisement hardly seem justified.

In fact, Mr. Taylor, you as a leader of industry should be proud of the high wages which prevail in this country. In no other respect does the economic superiority of the United States over the standard prevailing in the rest of the world stand out more clearly than in the high wages paid here.

Where else does the average factory worker have the automobiles, the electric appliances, the comfortable homes, the leisure, and the luxuries that are commonpalce here?

Who, if I may ask, paid for most of the 24.6 million barrels of gasoline your company marketed last year?

Where would your company be if the average American worker had to content himself with wages prevailing in Britain, France or Germany?

Where do you think the $125,000 salary you earned in 1956 and again in 1957 (as reported in Business Week for May 24, 1958) came from, if not primarily from the markets created by the earnings of the American workingman?

Somehow you think wage hikes are a handicap that foreign manufacturers don't have to contend with. There must be millions of foreign manufacturers who just wish that this were true. Let's look at the facts. From 1952 to 1958 average hourly earnings in manufacturing in the United States increased 27.5 percent; in Canada they increased 28.2 percent; in West Germany 36.5 percent; in Great Britain 43.9 percent; and in France 52.5 percent.

You also appear to be under a similar misapprehension with regard to the American's tax burden. You speak of "growing taxes" in the United States as a second handicap to American business that foreign manufacturers do without.

The facts are practically the reverse.

The Federal tax rates on corporate and individual incomes have been remarkably

stable since the end of World War II. In fact corporate tax rates have been cut back since 1953 with the expiration of the excess profits tax. Canada is increasing its corporate and income taxes this year. In France, tax increases amounting to $626 million were approved at the end of 1958. The Dutch have recently raised taxes. Of the major industrial nations of Western Europe, only the British have had a significant tax cut, and that was from a tax level that had been retained from the high rates of World War II.

As a recent article in the U.S. News & World Report (April 13, 1959) points out, high as U.S. taxes are getting, they remain among the lowest of all major nations. Many have higher income taxes than the United States and most have higher sales taxes. A table in this article shows the total taxes, National, State, or provincial, and local as a percent of gross national product for 11 major countries in the world.

Only three, Canada, Belgium-Luxembourg, and Denmark rank lower than the United States, based on 1958 data (Canada's data is for 1957). Compared to the U.S. taxes of 25.2 percent of gross national product, West Germany has taxes of 32.5 percent of gross national product, Netherlands, 32.4 percent; Austria 31.3 percent; France, 31.1 percent; Norway, 29.2 percent; Great Britain, 29.2 percent; and Italy, 28 percent.

Certainly I don't like high taxes any more than you do. In fact, I suspect that comparing our two annual incomes, the burden of taxes weighs more heavily on me and my family than on you and yours. But there are a lot of things that to my mind would be far worse than the high taxes I am paying. It would be a lot worse to jeopardize the security of our country by cutting back on essential defense expenditures. It would be a lot worse to increase our deficit in a time of general prosperity and thereby add fuel to the danger of inflation. It would be a lot worse to forego the needed expenditures for schools, highways, and hospitals on which the future health and welfare of our Nation depend.

I don't know, Mr. Taylor, how much of your business depends on the defense activities of our Nation, but I suspect it is a considerable portion. You speak of the danger to Charlie Perkins' job from wage hikes and taxes. I say to you that Charlie Perkins' job, and much more than Charlie Perkins' job, is endangered if we as a nation put our primary emphasis on holding down taxes and wages. It is the initiative, the vigor, and the know-how of millions of Charlie Perkinses throughout this Nation that have made it possible for them to get and to justify the high wages which prevail in America today and of which we should all be proud. It is the willingness of the Charlie Perkinses to pay taxes and to support the Nation's needs in times of peace and of war that has made our Nation strong. Let none of us in our search for greater sales and higher profits for our companies forget these facts.

Businessmen belong in politics, but they need facts and intelligence in this area as well as in business. I doubt that such advertisements as the one under discussion deserve tax deduction as a business expense. I know it utterly fails to do credit to the great ability you must have demonstrated to qualify for your present very responsible position.

I, in turn, invite your comments.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

Library of Congress Analysis of the Amendments of the House Committee on Education and Labor Bill to the Kennedy-Ervin Bill (S. 1555)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives will, I am sure, find helpful the following analysis of the amendments made by the House Committee on Education and Labor to the Kennedy-Ervin labor-management reform bill, S. 1555.

The amendments to which the anlysis refers are to be found in H.R. 8342, the bill reported by the committee and introduced by Mr. ELLIOTT, of Alabama.

The analysis follows:

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR AMENDMENTS TO KENNEDY-ERVIN BILL (S. 1555)

(By Sar A. Levitan, Specialist in Labor Economics and Industrial Development, July 22, 1959)

The House Committee on Education and Labor adopted 102 amendments to the Senate-approved bill. Only part of the proposed changes are of a substantive nature. These deal with penalties provided for violation of the bill, powers of the Secretary of Labor in connection with enforcement, reporting requirements by employers and small unions, and amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, including provisions dealing with secondary boycotts in the construction industry, filing of non-Communist affidavits, NLRB jurisdiction, economic strikers, definition of "supervisors," and ban on hot cargo.

MEMBERS' RIGHTS (TITLE I)

Both the Senate and House Committee on Education and Labor versions of the bill guarantee members' rights vis-a-vis their unions. These rights include: Freedom of speech and assembly; protection against arbitrary dues, initiation fees and assessments; rights to sue a union or its officers for alleged violation of rights; and safeguards against improper disciplinary action. However, the Senate version makes violation of those rights punishable by 2 years' imprisonment and $10,000 fine (sec. 607). The House committee bill relies upon internal union remedies for 6 months. If remedy is not secured within the 6 months, the aggrieved member may bring a civil action suit in a district court to prevent and restrain the violation of the members' rights. No penalty is provided under the House bill for the violation of the rights guaranteed to members.

Freedom of speech and assembly (section 101(a)(2))

The Senate bill makes these rights subject to the union's "established and reasonable rules." The House committee bill eliminates this limitation.

Dues, initiation fees and assessments (section 101(a)(3))

The Senate bill provides that dues and initiation fees may be changed only by (1) a majority secret vote at a general meeting; (2) majority vote in a referendum; or (3) in case of a national union by a majority vote at a convention.

The House committee retains the above two methods as far as local unions are concerned. But in case of a labor organization other than a local union or a federation of unions, the following means for raising dues or initiation fees is provided:

(1) majority vote of delegates at a convention;

(2) majority vote in referendum;

(3) majority vote of the union's executive committee, if authorized by the constitution and bylaws. This method of raising dues remains in effect until the next convention of the union.

Safeguards against improper disciplinary action (section 101 (a) (5)

The Senate bill provides that a union member may not be suspended, fined or expelled unless the member has been served with specific written charges and given an opportunity to defend himself at a hearing. The House committee bill requires only a fair hearing on written charges in accordance with the union constitution.

REPORTING (TITLE II)

Verification of reports by members (sec. 201(c))

The Senate approved bill requires that to make available to members copies of reports which they file under the bill and to permit members to examine the records kept to verify the reports. The bill also directs the Secretary of Labor to prescribe forms and conditions under which unions would be required to disclose financial records to members. The House Committee on Education and Labor also requires union officials to make available to members reports required under Title II. This requirement is enforceable through court actions, which may also award the union member(s) attorney fees and other costs involved in filing action against the union.

Exemptions from reporting (sec. 201(d))

The Senate bill authorized the Secretary of Labor to exempt local unions with less than 200 members or gross receipts of less than $20,000 a year from filing annual financial reports. The House Committee version exempts such unions from filing reports, but authorizes the Secretary of Labor to withdraw the exemption after determining that the members of a union have been denied information about their local's finances.

Reports on transactions with employers (sec. 202(a))

The Senate approved bill requires that union employees whose compensation and allowances are in excess of $5,000 annually must report business and financial transitions with employees bargaining with the employers. The House bill makes the reports mandatory of all union officers regardless of their compensation.

Employer reports (sec. 203)

The Senate bill requires employers to report to the Secretary of Labor expenditures made in connection with persuading employees to organize or bargain collectively. The House version limits employer reports to expenditures involving interference or coercion in connection with union activities.

Publication of reports (sec. 204(a) Senate; 205(a) House bill)

The Senate bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to publish any information and data submitted by unions or employers under title II. The Secretary is also authorized to publish reports and studies based upon the data. The House bill strikes out this authorization.

Recordkeeping (sec. 205 Senate; and 206 in House bill)

The Senate bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to prescribe the information which unions and employers must keep in order to verify the financial reports filed under the provisions of the bill. The House version requires that the needed information be kept by those who filed the informatoin for 5 years. It does not grant the Secretary of Labor any authority in the matter.

Secretary of Labor powers to investigate violations (sec. 206(c))

Both versions of the bill require the Secretary to investigate violations of the bill. The Senate bill also authorizes the Secretary to report his findings to interested parties. The House Committee bill does not contain this authorization. It also denies the Secretary power to investigate alleged violations of members' rights under title I.

Loans by unions (sec. 207(a), Senate; 503(a) House)

The Senate bill limits union loans to members or officers to a total of $1,500; the House version raises the limit to $2,500.

Paying fines or litigation costs (sec. 207(b) Senate; 503(b) House)

The Senate bill prohibits unions or companies to pay in advance fines or litigation costs of a person indicated for the violation of any provisions of the bill, though upon acquittal the expenses incurred by the official in his defense may be reimbursed by the union. The House version prohibits the payments of fines of a convicted person but not the payment of defense costs.

Criminal provisions (sec. 208 (a) and (b), Senate; sec. 207 (a) and (b), House)

The Senate bill makes the violation of regulations issued by the Secretary of Labor with reference to title II or failure to comply with the provisions of the title punishable by 1-year imprisonment or a fine of $10,000, the same punishment as for willful violation of the provision of the title. The House version provides for punishment of willful violation only.

Commissioner of Labor Reports (sec. 210)

The Senate version establishes the position of Commissioner of Labor and authorized the Secretary to employ a staff to administer the provisions of the bill. The House committee bill makes no provision for these positions.

Non-Communist affidavits (sec. 212)

The Senate version requires union officers and employers filing petitions or complaints under NLRB to file non-Communist affidavits; the House committee bill repeals this requirement.

TRUSTEESHIP (TITLE III)

Duration of trusteeships (sec. 304(c))

The Senate bill limits trusteeships to 12 months unless clear and convincing reasons exist for its continuance. The House committee extends the initial time limitation upon trusteeships to 18 months.

Suits to restrain violation of trusteeships (sec. 306(a) Senate; 304(a) House)

The Senate bill grants only the Secretary of Labor to enter suits in Federal district courts to restrain violation of the trustee provisions. The House committee grant the same right to union members.

ELECTIONS (TITLE IV)

Membership lists (sec. 401(b))

The Senate bill requires unions to distribute campaign literature of a bona fide candidate for union office—at the candidate's expense—and also guarantees candidates equal access to membership lists. The House Education and Labor Committee guarantees bona fide candidates the right to inspect and copy membership lists, when union security provisions are part of a collective bargaining agreement.

Removal of officer guilty of misconduct (sec. 401(g))

The Senate bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to promulgate rules and regulations governing the removal of a union officer guilty of serious misconduct. Union members may remove the officer by secret ballot under the Secretary's regulations. The House committee bill grants the power to district courts, upon a member's petition, to order a recall election.

Election of officers (sec. 402)

Under the Senate bill a union member alleging irregularities in elections can take his complaint to the Secretary of Labor after exhausting remedies available under the union constitution. The Secretary is empowered, under the Senate bill to secure an injunction and to supervise a new election. The House version authorizes the members, after exhausting remedies under union procedures, to secure an injunction in a Federal court. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to supervise a new election, if ordered by the court.

Persons barred from holding union office (sec. 405(a) Senate; 504(a) House)

Persons convicted of committing specified crimes including violation of titles II or III of the bill are barred by the Senate bill from holding union office (except clerical or custodial jobs) for a period of 5 years after serving any part of a prison term. The House version would extend the prohibition to labor relations consultants or employer associations dealing with labor organizations. However, this prohibition is not applicable in cases where citizenship rights have been restored or when a U.S. Board of Parole determines that the person's holding office would not be contrary to the purposes of the bill. The House version applies the 5-year prohibition of holding office to former members of the Communist Party.

CODES OF ETHICAL PRACTICES (TITLE V)

This title in the Senate bill—dropped in the House version—is an exhortation to unions and employer associations to adopt codes of ethical practices which would safeguard the rights of members.

MISCELLANEOUS (TITLE VI)

Punshment for interference with rights of members (sec. 607)

The Senate approved bill provides the punishment of 2 years' imprisonment or a fine of $10,000 for interfering with the rights of union members guaranteed by the bill. This provision is deleted in the House committee bill.

Fiduciary responsiblity (sec. 610, Senate; 501 House)

The Senate bill makes union officers responsible in a fiduciary capacity for union money or other property in their trust. The House version adds that officers may expend union funds in accordance with the provisions of the union constitution and resolutions of the unions-governing bodies.

TAFT-HARTLEY AMENDMENT (TITLE VII)

NLRB jurisdiction and administration (sec. 701)

The Senate bill authorizes State agencies to exercise jurisdiction in labor relations cases when the NLRB has refused to act. The State agencies are required to apply Federal law in handling these cases. The House committee bill requires the NLRB to assert jurisdiction on all labor-management disputes affecting interstate commerce referred to the Board.

In addition the House committee adds the following amendments relating to the NLRB not found in the Senate bill:

1. Increases NLRB membership from 5 to 7 (Section 701(c)).
2. Delegates' determination of representation disputes to regional offices, but reserves the NLRB the authority to review the regional decisions (Section 701(d)(1)).
3. Delegates many of the Board functions to the General Counsel (Section 701(d)(2)).

Construction industry—secondary boycott (sec. 702(c))

The House committee adds an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act which declares that it is not an unfair labor practice to boycott a "secondary employer who is engaged as a joint venturer, price contractor, subcontractor, or cocontractor, together with the primary employer in a labor dispute, in a construction project * * *"

Economic strikers (sec. 703)

The Senate bill permits economic strikers to vote in accordance with regulations promulgated by the NLRB. The House bill strikes out the Taft-Hartley provisions denying economic strikers the right to vote.

Definition of supervisor (sec. 704)

The Senate bill provides that service assistants in the communications industry do not qualify as supervisors under the Taft-Hartley definition of the term. The House committee eliminates this provision.

Hot cargo agreement (sec. 707, Senate; 705 House)

Both the Senate and House committee bills ban hot cargo agreements. But the House version adds that this provision does not deny an employee the right to refuse to cross a picket line when the employer is engaged in a primary dispute nor is a collective bargaining contract to be invalidated because it "provides that such refusal shall not be cause for the discharge of such employee."

The Farm Mess—End It, Say the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, very many of our citizens are anxious to rid the country of the farm mess. In order to express this feeling on to my colleagues I have from time to time placed in this RECORD extracts of letters received from various parts of the country approving a plan I have suggested which involves cutting off the subsidy programs

and disposing of stored surpluses. The following are new and additional extracts approving such a course of action:

"I wish to join the many others who have come forward to congratulate you on your stand on the farm mess. It's refreshing to see forthrightness in Washington and I sincerely believe yours is the right answer."

"I am extremely anxious to see the Federal budget balanced and some of the national debt paid off. With this in mind I wholeheartedly approve of your plan to stop all farm subsidies."

"I should like to say you are 100 percent right to end the farm mess."

"I am also very happy about your sensible farm policy. It seems so unjust to have so much food in storage when there is near starvation in so many parts of the world."

"Stop spending money to teach farmers how to grow more per acre, then paying them to grow less."

"While I would not want to cheat a real honest-to-goodness farmer out of anything he is entitled to, I am hoping that something will be done about farm subsidies, and the huge subsidies paid to farm corporations. Hope you and your fellow Representatives can work out a solution to the farm mess."

"We wish to especially endorse your views on the subject of the farm mess."

"The staggering debt which has already been compiled due to subsidization of agriculture is overwhelming. Instead of correcting a bad situation it seems to me we are adding to it each year by continuing this unfair support of the farmers. In many cases this support is being given to large agricultural organizations and landowners who are in no need whatsoever of this drain on the national dollar."

"I think your program to end the farm mess is a wonderful idea. I certainly hope it gets through."

"I believe the farm subsidy program must be drastically reduced soon."

"I'm glad to hear the plan is to stop all farm subsidies now. I was outraged when it started. Was born in Berks County, Pa., on farm my grandfather got in 1820 or thereabouts, so know a little of farm life. A subsidy of this kind is most unjust to taxpayers and other consumers."

"I certainly think you are right on this farm plan. Sure hope there are others in Washington that will someday wake up to the facts of life."

"I would like to take this occasion to congratulate you on your efforts and hard work you are doing in Congress, especially on the farm subsidy plan. You say that this subsidy will cost another $5.4 billion this year. As you probably know, that is approximately 2½ times as much as the budget was in 1929 ($2.2 billion.) If this giveaway plan can be stopped, it will go a long way toward slowing up inflation."

"Stopping all farm subsidies now sounds like such good sense—that seems the only logical way."

"Thanks for trying a realistic approach to the farm subsidy mess. Please keep trying to bring us back to a free U.S. Government. It will be a hard fight but I hope you will find good support and win in time."

Continuation of Lamb Grading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Department of Agriculture decided last week that, for the time being at least, the Department will continue its voluntary program for the grading of lamb and mutton carcasses. The decision was announced July 23, and I am at this point in the RECORD including the official statement from the Department announcing the decision.

On Wednesday, July 22, I placed in the RECORD at pages A6356–7 some material of mine pointing out why the lamb-grading program should not be terminated and urging the women's page editors of the Nation, as well as the TV-radio commentators on homemaker subjects, to alert the Nation's consumers to the intention of the Department to abandon the lamb-grading program. While the immediate danger of such an abandonment of the program has now passed, the announcement from the Department of Agriculture makes it clear that powerful producer interests are anxious to see the program drastically changed and that unless their objections can be compromised the Department may still decide to abandon the lamb-grading program.

PROGRAM STILL IN DANGER

Under the circumstances, I think it is most important that more consumers learn about this issue and make their voices heard on it. It is not very encouraging to learn that less than 1,000 communications came to the Secretary of Agriculture on this issue during the 2 months following the Department's original announcement that it intended to abandon the lamb-grading program. Included in the 1,000 or fewer communications were all of those from producers and feeders, farm organizations, meatpackers and other trade groups directly affected economically, as well as those from consumers. Obviously, there could not have been very many consumer letters in the group.

Equally obviously, the consumers have not seen much in the newspapers or heard much over the air as to this problem, or I am sure more of them would have voiced their views. It is just as important now as it was prior to July 23 for them to advise the Secretary of Agriculture of their opinions on the necessity for assuring adequate grading standards to protect the consumers.

The Department of Agriculture press release on the issue of revising or discontinuing grading standards for lamb and mutton carcasses is as follows:

USDA TO CONTINUE FEDERAL GRADING OF LAMB CARCASSES—TO REVISE GRADE STANDARDS

WASHINGTON, July 23, 1959.—Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today announced that Federal grading of lamb and mutton carcasses will be continued, and that the Department will proceed promptly to consider revised grade standards for lamb and mutton to eliminate any deficiencies in the present standards. "If improved grade standards for lamb and mutton are not developed to meet more adequately the needs of the industry the Department will give further consideration to suspension of Federal grading of lamb and mutton carcasses," the Secretary said.

The Department has had under consideration the request of some groups that Federal grading of lamb and mutton be suspended. Since May 25, the Department has been receiving the views of interested individuals and groups on this question. The decision to continue the Federal grading service to lamb and mutton was made after a careful analysis of these views.

Secretary Benson expressed appreciation for the broad response which enabled the decision to be made. He said that many of the comments and views received indicated the need for a revision of the criteria in the present grade standards. One of the principal contentions was that the present standards place too great a premium on overfat lamb.

The Secretary invites the livestock and meat industry and other interested parties to submit to the Department by September 1, 1959, proposals for improving the grade standards for lamb and mutton carcasses. The Department would make public by October 1, 1959, recommendations for changes in the expectation that the revised standards would be announced by December 1, 1959.

The Secretary emphasized that the Federal grading of lamb and mutton carcasses has no relation to Federal meat inspection required by law for all meat moving in interstate commerce. Meat inspection is to assure wholesomeness of the product while grading relates to the quality of the meat. Also, the question before the Department was not in any way concerned with Federal grading of beef which comprises the major share of Federal meat grading.

The Federal meat grading service is a completely voluntary service of the Department, performed only upon request, and paid for by those receiving the service.

Notice that the Department was considering suspension of this voluntary service on lamb and mutton, and the invitation for interested parties to comment on the proposal brought a large volume of responses. Almost 1,000 communications were received. Comments and views were received from lamb producers and feeders, farm and other organizations, State and local government officials and agencies, land-grant colleges and other university representatives, consumers, meatpackers, livestock and meat-marketing

agencies, and institutional purchasers. The preponderance of the views received was for continuance of the Federal grading of lamb and mutton.

Poison in Your Water—No. 148

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the San Diego (Calif.) Tribune of June 1, 1959, entitled "Sewerage Woes Grow in County."

[From the San Diego, Calif., Tribune, June 1, 1959]

SEWAGE WOES GROW IN COUNTY

(By Mike O'Connor)

Mention the word "sewer" in San Diego County's unincorporated areas and the chances are you'll get an argument.

Like smog and water, sewage is a problem many southern Californians have grumbled about one time or another.

A county official once described the sewerage facilities at Rancho Santa Fe, an exclusive residential area, as an "outhouse."

Few will disagree that the sanitation argument boils down to one point: How to provide adequate facilities for the thousands of persons who move to southern California each year.

Here is what has happened in unincorporated San Diego and what may lick the sanitation problems of the future.

Sewage in unincorporated areas is handled by 14 sanitation districts. They are locally created and operated by the county public works department.

COUNCIL CONTROLS DISTRICT

The districts, at Alpine, Cardiff, Julian, Lakeside, Lemon Grove, Poway, Ramona, Rancho Santa Fe, Rolando, Solana Beach, Spring Valley, and Vista, are controlled by the county board of supervisors.

The Palm City district committee consists of the mayor and one councilman of Imperial Beach and the mayor of San Diego. The San Ysidro district is controlled by the San Diego City Council.

Budgeted appropriations for all districts in the 1959–60 year totaled more than $642,000.

Most of the districts have had the same growing pains.

They floated bond issues to build filtration plants and lay sewer lines. Then, explosive residential growth taxed facilities and raised the problem of expansion.

VISTA PROBLEM BARED

Jean Vincenz, county public works director, tells this story:

"Three years ago the Vista Sanitation District found its sewage treatment facilities nearing capacity. An addition was built increasing the capacity five times. Now, this year, the addition is approaching capacity."

Vista is not an isolated case. Rancho Santa Fe, which Vincenz describes as the most overloaded sanitation district in the county, last week asked the board of supervisors to prepare a bond report.

This report could lead to another bond issue to build a second filtration plant.

The rate of growth indicates the north county area is the sanitation sorespot.

It has been estimated that a 9-community area of northern San Diego County will swell from a population of 29,000 to 365,000 in 40 years.

UNIT URGES STUDY

In 1957, these communities joined to form the San Dieguito Area Sewerage Planning Group. The communities stretch from Del Mar to a point south of Oceanside and inland to Poway and San Marcos.

The group seeks a long-range county master plan for sewerage control.

Americanism in Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial published in the July 17, 1959, issue of the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News entitled "Americanism in Danger." This article was written by the Honorable Tom Q. Ellis, clerk of the Mississippi State Supreme Court, who recently completed a 3-year term as general grand high priest of general grand chapter, Royal Arch Masons, a worldwide organization and the largest Masonic group in the world, under one jurisdiction.

Also included with Mr. Ellis' article is an editor's note prepared by Mr. James M. Ward, editor of the Jackson, (Miss.) Daily News setting out Mr. Ellis' Masonic background and accomplishments.

The article, "Americanism in Danger" is an excellent dissertation on a subject of deep concern to all of us. This article, including the aforementioned editor's note follows:

AMERICANISM IN DANGER

(By Tom Q. Ellis)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Ellis is a past grand master of Mississippi F. & A.M.; is a past grand presiding officer of every other York Rite statewide body in Mississippi; past grand patron, Order Eastern Star in Mississippi; a Scottish Rite K.C.C.H.; and in 1957 finished a 3-year term as general grand high priest of General Grand Chapter, Royal Arch Masons—a worldwide organization and the largest Masonic organization in the world, under one head. It has been stated many times that he has been accorded more Masonic honors than has any other man in the entire written history of Freemasonry.

By invitation he has spoken before fraternal, civic, school and other organized groups in practically every State in the Union and is said to be known personally by more people than any other living man. He humbly states that because of these things he feels a responsibility in "speaking up" in what he considers a serious crisis, for whatever of good his influence may mean. The above article was approved and sent out by the governing body of the Shrine (Imperial Council) to its 166 Shrine Temples, representing approximately 900,000 Shriners in North America. By this means he hopes it will "seep down" to the 5 million Masons in America, and there are already convincing instances that it is doing just that. * * * Medina Shrine Temple in Chicago, the third largest Temple in America, with about 23,000 Shriners, publishes a monthly magazine that goes out to all its members. This article was featured in their recent July issue. A Shrine Temple in Oklahoma City, Okla., has made a recording of the article for broadcasting purposes. He states that Freemasonry, being a human organization, there is a small percentage who will take issue with him and perhaps attempt "reprisals" in some form, but he is doing his duty as he sees it, "let the chips fall where they may.")

Pure and undefiled Americanism for which our forebears fought, bled, and died is today under serious and dangerous attack; not only from without but tragically and dangerously from within. It results from long range, boastful plans formulated by communism more than 30 years ago. Swept along with its ever-rising tide are multitudes of otherwise good Americans who under the misnomer of tolerance or liberalism are aiding and abetting this godless, hellborn objective.

The Scottish Rite, the York Rite, and the Shrine are of common parentage, viz: the Blue Lodge, whence come their philosophy, their humanitarian ministry, their faculty for leadership and their inspiration. Friendly rivalry is healthful and much to be desired. But misguided, overly enthusiastic brethren sometimes render hurtful disservice to the entire Masonic structure by overstepping the bounds of friendly rivalry and by overlooking the human imperfections of their favorite Masonic body, while holding up to ridicule and sarcasm, the imperfections of another segment. United we stand because united we must stand in order to defeat the dangerous enemy who has gained such a foothold in our very midst.

The time is here for real Masons to avoid any semblance of hiding behind the cloak of refusing to engage in controversial matters.

Saving our America is not a controversial matter among real Masons and other good Americans.

It is time for us to stand up and be counted. A political court (and that is being kind to them) is freeing rapists, murderers, and Communists with alarming regularity. At the last count they have freed some 59 known Communists who were jailed for plotting the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. They have nullified subversive control laws of 41 States and they have nullified State laws and bar association regulations as to Communists. They have told State and city governments that a teacher in our schools, or a prospective teacher cannot be questioned as to his or her associations with the Communist Party.

We Masons make no public boasts, but unquestionable records disblose that the Boston Tea Party had its inception in a lodge room in Boston. We know that George Washington was master of his lodge when sworn in as our first President; that the oath was administered by Chancellor Livingston who at the time was grand master of New York, and the Bible used was taken from a masonic altar. We know that Benjamin Franklin, Paul Revere, and other leaders of their day were past grand masters. We also know that other leading Masons of that day were dominant figures in framing and signing our Declaration of Independence, and writing our great Constitution which Glad-

stone said was the greatest instrument ever struck by human hands. But that great document is being emasculated by psychological and sociological judicial decrees purporting to be the law of the land.

Yes, the time is here for all good Masons, Scottish Rite, York Rite, and Shriners to join hands and hearts with all other good Americans (and there are plenty other good Americans) and stand up and be counted in saving that brand of Americanism which is our most priceless heritage. Mighty is truth and it shall prevail.

The truth for which united we must stand will prevail throughout all eternity. The pyramids of Egypt will sink beneath the sands of the desert; all the great masterpieces of human genius that adorn the art galleries of the world will fade beneath the still lapse of time; structures of steel and stone that kiss the skies in lofty grandeur will be leveled in the dust. But the eternal truths and principles for which all good Masons and all other good Americans must stand will be shedding forth their glorious light when stars and sun are sunk in night.

Bob Considine Praises Nixon Conduct in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr .Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast from Moscow on July 26 by Bob Considine, giving a ringside report of the outstanding poise, skill, and effectiveness with which Vice President NIXON has conducted himself and our country's interests in his dealings with the Soviet dictator. The latter apparently thought he could browbeat the Vice President as he bullies his own unfortunate peole. NIXON, like Americans as a whole, did not seek a fight, but he did not run away from one or weaken under threats. The dangers of war started by Khrushchev in his ignorance of American character has been lessened by the poised and dignified but frank and firm way Mr. NIXON stood up to him.

The broadcast follows:

ON THE LINE WITH BOB CONSIDINE

ANNOUNCER: "Now, here is Bob Considine in Moscow."

CONSIDINE: "Hello, everybody. There are more Americans rattling around Moscow these warm days than ever before in the city's 800 years of life. There are busloads from Akron, Ohio, smaller groups from California and Jersey, and a big jet planeload of newspaper, radio, and TV people from Washington, New York, Chicago, Kansas City, New Orleans, San Francisco, and what have you at the American exhibition in Sokolniki Park, where the tsars once hunted with falcons. By the way, the American flag flies next to the scarlet hammer-and-sickle, and a Russian band the other day played 'The Star Spangled Banner' with the assurance of the U.S. Marine Band.

"There's another American here in town, a fellow named DICK NIXON, the Vice President to the United States. I'm going to do my level best, ladies and gentlemen, to keep this from sounding like a campaign speech in his behalf. I happen to be a Democrat, but whatever your political affiliation or how you may have felt about NIXON in the past, you would have been damned proud of him if you had seen him in action here the past few days.

"President Eisenhower had defined the scope of NIXON'S duties and missions in his Wednesday news conference. The President said, 'It's really an exchange of visits between Mr. Kozlov and Mr. NIXON. It's a good-will gesture and we wanted to have a prominent American to officiate at the opening of our exhibit over there.'

"Well, it's turned out to be a lot more than that, and will continue to be as Nixon goes to Leningrad tomorrow and thence to several Siberian industrial cities before flying into Warsaw. The unexpected has been happening a lot more than the expected, as in the case of the decision to visit Poland. It is the manner in which NIXON has met and dealt with these incidents and emergencies which has won him a warm spot in the hearts of the people around him, including the aforementioned Americans in Moscow.

"The big hurdle he had to overcome, of course, was the unusual turn his first meeting with Premier Khrushchev took. NIXON had been assured in Washington that the ony serious or semiserious discussion he would have with Russia's No. 1 man, would be at Khrushchev's home, today, Sunday. Such earlier meetings as there might be would be largely ceremonial affairs—oh, an exchange of handshakes, let's say, proposals of toasts, cutting of the ribbon at the fairgrounds, and so forth. But nobody told Khrushchev about these polite rules, and even if he had been told, he was under no obligation, certainly, to abide by them.

"They were calculated plans, drawn up by well-meaning, excessively polite and not very realistic career men in our State Department in Washington. They would apply almost anywhere else on earth and merit the cooperation of almost any other statesman. But NIXON found himself in realistic Russia and faced by the foremost master of the blunt approach now operating on the international stage, Comrade Nikita Khrushchev.

"Khrushchev was sore at the Americans, notably at the Senate and the President, for proclaiming this past week a week of prayer for the captive nations. It is his often angrily repeated contention that there are no captive nations under the Red flag. NIXON represented or symbolized the American view on this, and thus caught the brunt of Khrushchev's assertions and accusations. What was supposed to be little more than a tete-a-tete immediately erupted into NIXON'S toughest day since the time he was called upon to explain his campaign expenses over a nationwide TV network—or the time when Harold Stassen seemed to be making headway in his efforts to replace him on the GOP ticket with Christian Herter.

"I happened to be standing close to NIXON and Khrushchev at the beginning of what turned out to be hours of public horn-locking. The men had just alighted from their big Russian limousines outside the entrance to the lovely fairgrounds. And now they stood together while others came up to be introduced—NIXON, in his lean Madison Avenue Oxford gray; Khrushchev in a light suit with an enameled dove of peace and his two orders of Lenin on his chest, a light piped sunhat cocked on his bald head.

"Anastas Mikoyan, Russia's trade wizard, joined the group and was introduced to NIXON. NIXON took him by the arm and said to Khrushchev, 'In my country, Mr. Khrushchev, we have a lot of respect for Armenians like Mr. Mikoyan here. We regard them as shrewd traders.' And Khrushchev immediately snorted, 'Then you've lost your ability to trade. Mikoyan couldn't make a single deal while he was in your country.' NIXON grinned and said, 'Oh, oh. I guess I shouldn't have gotten into that.

"But that beginning was mild compared to what followed. The two men went immediately from the entrance gate to the RCA color TV exhibition, the purpose of which visit was to show Khrushchev our newly developed video tape which is rapidly replacing film or kinescope on delayed TV shows.

"Well, it turned out to be much more than a simple electronic demonstration. Khrushchev naturally assumed he was on the air, and this, he figured, was no time to waste with lukewarm words of greeting and similar nonsense. He plunged right into NIXON, brusquely brushed aside the Vice President's polite contentions and joking denials. He took complete charge of the scene, alternating laughs, grunts, vigorous gestures, and fist-pounding statements.

"This was no sick man, as he has been mistakenly painted in recent weeks. This was a vital, dynamic, positive world leader who'd stolen the show from a man who was at first puzzled, then in a mood to placate and dismiss, and finally as full of fire as Khrushchev himself. It was a superb comeback on NIXON'S part.

"The two exponents of separate ideologies then had another 50-minute session while in the course of inspecting the model American home that is part of the exhibition. The talk and the arguments, and in some cases, agreement, covered a vast range of matter—the Berlin situation, German Peace Treaty, war and peace, threats, ultimatums, washing machines and rockets, Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers, relative strength of the two powers, American bases on foreign soil, dictatorship and women.

"Sometimes there were honest misunderstandings of the interpreters. At one point NIXON tried to explain that the American housewife has become emancipated more or less because of the number of labor-saving devices in her kitchen. Khrushchev glumly commented that Russian men don't think of their women in terms of closets and other kitchen gimmicks.

"The major misunderstanding, of course, was over the meaning of a statement by NIXON that no country, however strong, could inflict its will or strength on another power in such a way as to be issuing a tacit ultimatum. It sounded very much like a threat to Khrushchev, and he hotly retorted that his country had the means, better means, indeed, to answer any such threats. The debate got a little out of hand at that point.

"Late in the afternoon, NIXON delivered the best speech of his life, I think, at the official opening of the exhibition. Halfway through it, Khrushchev started to interrupt again. NIXON turned to him and said, 'I have the floor.'

The band played our national anthem beautifully. "Americans who are inclined to fidget and look at their watches through the playing of 'The Star Spangled Banner' back home, and who regard all manifestations of patriotism as pure corn, should have been in Moscow Friday. They would have experienced, as did those of us who were lucky enough to be present, the exhilarating sensation of being fiercely proud of our heritage, a flag and an embattled countryman named RICHARD NIXON.

"I don't quite see what's left for the two men to talk about today when Khrushchev has NIXON as his guest. The salient differences of opinion and policy have been gone over time and again. They were restated in another way yesterday at a luncheon given to NIXON by V. V. Matskevich, the Soviet Minister of Agriculture. Matskevich criticized the action of the U.S. Senate and the President in passing and OK'ing the 'prayers for captive nations' resolution, but said, 'These small clouds will not prevent our people from marching to peace and freedom.'

"NIXON replied, 'We have differences from time to time, which are critical. We disagree, of course, with your comments on the captive nations resolution. But it does indeed seem that something always happens when we begin one of these good will affairs. When your Deputy Premier, Kozlov, was in California talking peace, Mr. Khrushchev, at the same time made a speech in Poland which was not kind to the United States. When Mr. Khrushchev calls us imperialists and colonialists our reaction is adverse, but we respect his right to say it.'

"As you probably know by now, NIXON's going to visit Warsaw while on this trip. He had hoped to be able to fly out of Siberia and onward to Alaska and then back to Washington, completing a circumnavigation. But the Russians could not see their way clear to let him go out that way. He immediately entered into negotiations with the Poles apparently, and now they have consented to receive him for the last 2 days of his long trip.

"It's been a great trip for the tireless NIXON and his equally indefatigable wife. Now that the Muscovites have seen them in their newspapers, heard them on the radio and watched them on television, the couple is instantly recognized. They are a friendly twosome, the Nixons, and the people respond warmly to their smiles and to their waves. They have conducted themselves impeccably.

"Well, that's about it, friends. I'll see you next week, same time, same station and with the same good old sponsor, and I'll be talking to you also from Russia on that occasion."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*——408 A St. NE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*——
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*——
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*——
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*——
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*——
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*——
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Engle, Clair, *Calif*——3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*——
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*——
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*——
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*——
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*——3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*——
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*——2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*——
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*——
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*——
Proxmire, William, *Wis*——
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John, *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*——
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*——

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.
First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.
Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.
Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.
Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.
Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.
Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.
Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.
Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.
Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.
Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.